

Following on from your reply dated 14 October 2009 (received on 25 October 2009) I urge you to snap out of your blind acceptance of the UN IPCC - an *intergovernmental* club, not a scientific one! Scientific protocol has deliberately been abandoned by the UN IPCC, you are surely aware of that. After all is said and done John, less than 60 and possibly only five scientists agreed on the man-made aspect of climate change, **sixty** or **five** John, not 2,500 or 4,000 or 99% of scientists. Proper analysis of this was sent to you already.

If anything, 99% of scientists *disagree* with man-made climate change and rightly so; at least **42,000** named and respected scientists to date have signed various declarations, yet you take no notice! But regardless of the numbers of scientists, only **ONE** needs to disprove the AGW hypothesis and the whole house of cards collapses. And disproved the whole idea has been, thoroughly and peer reviewed; try at least to read my approved summary of it: www.tech-know-group.eu/papers/Falsification_of_the_Atmospheric_CO2_Greenhouse_Effects.pdf

Besides the scientific debunking of the greenhouse effect, did you know this detail (my emphasis in red), from: http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/monckton/greenhouse_warming_what_greenhouse_warming_.html

"All five of the computer models whose plots are shown above unmistakably predict the characteristic "hot-spot" signature that UN's graphs show to be unique to warming of the atmosphere caused by emissions of greenhouse gases. But does observation demonstrate what the models predict?"

Real-world temperatures in the upper atmosphere have been measured with balloons since at least the 1960's and with microwave satellite sensors since 1979. However, the Hadley Centre's plot of real-world radiosonde observations does not demonstrate the "global warming hot-spot" at all. **The predicted phenomenon is startlingly and entirely absent from the observational record – No "greenhouse warming" signature is observed in reality.**

Allow me to repeat this bit: **NO GREENHOUSE WARMING SIGNATURE IS OBSERVED IN REALITY.**

Newsweek tells us that each year as much as **\$100 billion** is blown by governments and consumers around the world on green subsidies designed to encourage wind, solar, and other -renewable-energy markets. Yet Newsweek's figures reveal the result is guaranteed great waste and open manipulation demonstrably contravening climate policy objectives. (<http://www.newsweek.com/id/219295>)

Politicians pretending to look good at our expense. Fabricating a 'problem' through unfounded fear and guilt, making election-winning promises to 'fix' climate and then falsely claiming to do so. Holding an auction with our money to fix their non-problem dressed as another global catastrophe.

European heads of state will formally recommend this week that rich countries should hand over around EUR100bn (£90bn) a year to nations such as India and Vietnam by 2020 to help them cope with the impact of global warming. The move marks a victory in Brussels for the UK and Gordon Brown,

A victory John?! To blow £90bn of taxpayers' money on a non-existent problem? Sheer madness John!

One singular fact stands out in all Green propaganda and permeates all the legislation and other programs they sponsor. **It is a contempt and disdain for the Earth's human population.** The growth of literally hundreds of "environmental" organizations has led to an endless barrage of scare campaigns, often without any basis in science, and used to undermine the industrial, agricultural, and transportation sectors of the nation's economy.

Excerpt from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/6425269/The-real-climate-change-catastrophe.html>

Next Thursday marks the first anniversary of one of the most remarkable events ever to take place in the House of Commons. For six hours MPs debated what was far and away the most expensive piece of legislation ever put before Parliament. The Climate Change Bill laid down that, by 2050, the British people must cut their emissions of carbon dioxide by well over 80 per cent. Short of some unimaginable technological revolution, **such a target could not possibly be achieved without shutting down almost the whole of our industrialised economy**, changing our way of life out of recognition.

Even the Government had to concede that the expense of doing this – which it now admits will cost us **£18billion a year for the next 40 years** – would be twice the value of its supposed benefits. Yet, astonishingly, although dozens of MPs queued up to speak in favour of the Bill, **only two dared to question the need for it.** It passed by 463 votes to just three.

One who voted against it was Peter Lilley who, just before the vote was taken, drew the Speaker's attention to the fact that, outside the Palace of Westminster, snow was falling, the first October snow recorded in London for 74 years. As I observed at the time: "Who says that God hasn't got a sense of humour?"

Another folly, John - CCS: Every three tonnes of carbon dioxide buried contain only one tonne of carbon but a massive two tonnes of oxygen, thus burying the building block of all life on earth together with the gas of life for all of us. And that at massive expense in terms of energy and cash with no proven benefit.

If that is not insanity John, then what is?


The whole CO₂ argument behind global climatic variations is now just a discredited sham and is based upon, and driven by, political ideology rather than sound science. Letters to UN IPCC have gone unanswered, why?

It is orchestrated in chief by the UN IPCC which has its roots in the militant Green - Environmental movements. More worryingly, politicians have jumped on board and seem to have left their brains behind at best or are politically corrupt at worst.

John, I implore you in the strongest possible manner to call a meeting with whatever scientist(s) you chose and myself to stop this **undiluted insanity** of man-made global warming, now called man-made climate change.

The science is not there John, it never was, it can not be! Pseudo-science yes, proper science no.

Energy can not be created and neither can it be counted twice, not even by or via carbon dioxide.



The above graphic, used and promoted by the UN IPCC, illustrates an impossible scenario in point 5: “Surface gains more heat and infrared is emitted again.”; John, that is

a perpetuum mobile. If that scenario was to exist, engineers would have long ago designed power stations with greater output than the input – *if only!*

You don't need to be a scientist to see that aspect of energy balance.

Please assemble as many scientists as you wish and ask them to explain how the same energy can be counted twice over, repeatedly to boot, to warm a surface *that was warmed by the sun in the first place!*

And remember what I quoted above: “No “greenhouse warming” signature is observed in reality.” - based on **reality checks** and despite being predicted by all climate models and forecast by academia with their formulae.

Start looking at reality and stop looking at computer simulations that have yet to prove anything at all correctly.

Kind regards,

Hans Schreuder
(full address and contact details supplied)

PS: John, please do not respond to this letter unless it is to inform me of a meeting as per the above suggestion. (a further separate letter was sent the same day, see below in this online version)

John Gummer MP,

Further to my letter of today's date (2 November 2009) I submit this information just in.

Please note the sentences in red. Those underline all of my submissions to you.

Hans Schreuder

<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/3606/Team-of-Scientists-Open-Letter-To-US-Senators-Claim-of-consensus-is-fake>

Team of Scientists' Open Letter To U.S. Senators: 'Claim of consensus is fake'

Science group 'reviewing its stance on global warming' after 160 physicists sign petition

Monday, November 02, 2009

The following letter was sent to all 100 U.S. Senator's on October 29, 2009 by a team of scientists. The letter is reproduced in full below:

A GAGGLE IS NOT A CONSENSUS

You have recently received a letter from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), purporting to convey a "consensus" of the scientific community that immediate and drastic action is needed to avert a climatic catastrophe.

We do not seek to make the scientific arguments here (we did that in [an earlier letter](#), sent a couple of months ago), but simply to note that the claim of consensus is fake, designed to stampede you into actions that will cripple our economy, and which you will regret for many years. There is no consensus, and even if there were, **consensus is not the test of scientific validity. Theories that disagree with the facts are wrong, consensus or no.**

We know of no evidence that any of the "leaders" of the scientific community who signed the letter to you ever asked their memberships for their opinions, before claiming to represent them on this important matter.

We also note that the American Physical Society (APS, and we are physicists) did not sign the letter, though the scientific issues at stake are fundamentally matters of applied physics.

You can do physics without climatology, but you can't do climatology without physics.

The APS is at this moment reviewing its stance on so-called global warming, having received a petition from its membership to do so. That petition was signed by 160 distinguished members and fellows of the Society, including one Nobelist and 12 members of the National Academies. Indeed a score of the signers are Members and Fellows of the AAAS, none of whom were consulted before the AAAS letter to you.

Professor Hal Lewis, University of California, Santa Barbara

Professor Fred Singer, University of Virginia

Professor Will Happer, Princeton University

Professor Larry Gould, University of Hartford

Dr. Roger Cohen, retired Manager, Strategic Planning, ExxonMobil

List of 160 signers of the APS petition available at <http://tinyurl.com/lg266u>