

1 November 2018

Chris Stark, Chief Executive
Climate Change Committee
7 Holbein Place
London SW1W 8NR

Sir,

RE: REQUEST FOR A DISCUSSION

Following on from your recent statement on catastrophic climate change at the hands of anthropogenic emissions of CO₂, allow me to make you aware of some related issues.

Firstly, human use of fossil fuels is only a minor source of carbon dioxide emissions. The UN IPCC estimates that [only 4%](#) of all atmospheric CO₂ comes from anthropogenic sources. The majority comes from natural sources. To blame undesirable climate change, if any, solely on anthropogenic sources is biased and unrealistic.

Secondly, almost all major developing countries and even top developed countries like Germany and Canada have failed to meet their promised emission reduction targets.

Nations are unlikely to pay high carbon taxes to an international institution like the UN, which doesn't even have proper compliance and co-operation from its leaders. The absence of the world's biggest economic powerhouse, the U.S., is another major excuse that will be used by developing countries not to pay the proposed taxes.

Moreover, both India and China have continued to defy their promises to reduce emissions. They, along with Russia, Australia, and the U.S., have been involved in increased coal production, use, and export in 2018.

Others, like Germany and Japan, continue to depend on coal because of their aversion to nuclear energy. Japan, especially, had a massive overhaul of its energy sector following the Fukushima incident. It has shifted its dependence from nuclear to coal.

With all the top emitters refusing to comply, the UN's flagship Paris agreement and the newly announced taxes are just imaginary, make-shift policies that appear good only on paper. And maybe even not that. At an estimated cost of \$70 trillion to \$140 trillion by the end of the century, the Paris agreement would prevent at most an inconsequential 0.17°C of warming – if at all, since CO₂ can not cause more warming than the Sun does, see attached peer reviewed papers.

The reality is that the perceived anthropogenic climate change is not catastrophic. National leaders know this, even if they're too timid to say it aloud. We need some with the courage to shout out loud: "The emperor has no clothes!"

By tracking predictions over the long term, psychologist Philip Tetlock has discovered that personality types who are confident they know how the future will unfold are *less* likely to make accurate forecasts than personality types who make more hesitant, highly contingent ones.

The fact that IPCC scientists have 'high confidence' versus 'medium confidence' in any particular conclusion is meaningless.

No sane person should take such judgments seriously until the IPCC explains why the above concerns don't apply to its own personnel.

In summary then:

1. IPCC reports are a collection of subjective judgment calls.
2. Political operatives at the IPCC can – and do – override confidence levels determined by scientists.
3. These confidence levels likely have no connection to reality.

Additionally, by pushing for an electric car mandate, GM is also selling the fiction that plug-in cars are “zero emissions.” They're not. When you consider what it takes to make battery-powered cars, plus the fact that electricity production is not emission free, plug-in electrics can produce more CO₂ emissions than gas-powered cars.

Science's wounds are at least partially self-inflicted. In 2005 statistician John Ioannidis presented evidence that “most published research findings are wrong.”

That is, the findings cannot be replicated by follow-up research. Many other scholars have now confirmed the work of Mr. Ioannidis.

The so-called replication crisis is especially severe in fields with high financial stakes, such as oncology and psychopharmacology.

But physics, which should serve as the bedrock of science, is in some respects the most troubled field of all.

Over the last few decades, physics in the grand mode practised by Hawking and Rees has become increasingly disconnected from empirical evidence.

Attached are two peer reviewed papers about the issue of atmospheric carbon dioxide and it's associated “greenhouse effect” for your comments.

Please let us have a discussion over these papers and also your evidence that anthropogenic emissions of CO₂ have such a drastic effect upon the earth's climate that unlimited amounts of tax-payer's money need to be spent on preventing any change.

Sincerely,

Hans Schreuder
Ipswich, England

Attachments: https://tech-know-group.com/papers/Role_of_CO2-EaE.pdf
https://tech-know-group.com/papers/Role_of_GHE-EaE.pdf

Cc: as the spirit moves

With thanks to [Vijay Jayaraj](#), [Donna Framboise](#) and [John Horgan](#)

This letter is online at <https://tech-know-group.com/CCC/submission-11-2018.pdf>