"The Sky is NOT Falling."

A submission to the Garnaut Climate Change Review
from The Carbon Sense Coalition.
www.carbon-sense.com
January 2008 V3.

"The main difference between genius and stupidity is that genius has its limits."
Albert Einstein

Executive Summary

The Carbon Sense Coalition ("Carbon Sense") is a voluntary group of individuals, mainly Australians, concerned about the extent to which carbon and carbon dioxide are wrongly vilified in Western societies, particularly in government, the media, the UN and in some business circles. We aim to restore science and reason to the carbon debate, and to explain and defend the key role of the carbon group in producing most of our energy for heat, light, and transport, and all of our food.

We believe climate change is a normal feature of earth's history. The IPCC policy proposals will be totally ineffective in changing climate, but very damaging to the interests of most Australians.

The chief conclusions of this submission are:

- There is no unusual global warming, and no consensus on the science.
- Many prominent scientists with relevant knowledge and qualifications have become outspoken critics of the IPCC process and conclusions. We believe this number will grow strongly.
- There is substantial evidence that contradicts the main IPCC conclusion that Man's Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GGE) are the chief cause of the recent mild global warming.
- In recent eras, Earth has spent most of the time in cold barren periods. Judging from past cycles, this warming is close to its end and the human race is more likely to be concerned about Global Cooling.
- The lessons of history and our knowledge of natural processes indicate that most people on earth will benefit from continuation of the current mild warming trend.
- Carbon dioxide (CO2) is not a pollutant, and should not be classified as one - it is one of the four essential gases of life.
- The effect of water on climate via oceans, clouds, snow and ice cover, and water vapour is far greater than that of carbon dioxide.

  "In comparison to water in all of its forms, carbon dioxide is the equivalent of but a few farts in a hurricane."
- None of the IPCC computer models make adequate allowance for the effects of water in all of its forms or the effects of solar system cycles and variations in solar radiation and magnetism.
- Combustion of ALL hydrocarbons (wood, gas, oil, coal and bio-fuel) produces varying proportions of the same two greenhouse gases, water vapour and carbon dioxide. All are warmth retainers.
- Diverting cultivation, pastures and scrub to producing ethanol and other bio-fuels will have no beneficial environmental effects but will decrease food production and increase the potential for world conflict. Bio-fuels should not be subsidised or mandated in any way. The market and consumers should be free to decide what energy source to use.

- There is no evidence or theory to indicate that global warming will bring more widespread droughts, or more species extinctions. Both are more common companions of the cold, barren periods that accompany global cooling.

- There is no evidence that melting ice sheets threaten damaging sea level rises in the foreseeable future.

- There is no theoretical or empirical evidence to suggest we are at or close to a Global Warming Tipping Point.

- Even the mild warming forecast by IPCC is not sufficient to prompt panic reactions to reduce GGE's.

- The cavalier proposals for substantial cuts to GGE's are neither sensible nor achievable without substantial damage to the economy, consumers and taxpayers.

- Governments and corporations who support damaging GGE policies risk class actions, boycotts and lawsuits from shareholders, customers and consumers.

- There is nothing to support the glib suggestions that alternative energy systems have the capacity, technology or economics to replace coal fired power generation in the time frames required to satisfy many de-carbonisation proposals.

- Nuclear power has the ability to replace coal. However Australia, almost alone in the developed world, has no installed nuclear capacity, and lacks the skills, experience and political will to choose this option in the near term.

- Carbon capture and storage is an unproven, hugely expensive and totally unnecessary cost addition to electricity generation costs.

- There is small chance for achieving global agreement on GGE's unless the developed nations surrender to unacceptable discrimination.

- The Carbon Sense Coalition believes that there is no justification for inflicting taxes and punitive regulations on industries and consumers using carbon based foods and fuels.

- In particular, we are totally opposed to Emissions Trading, mandating of energy market shares, subsidies for favoured energy generating methods, retrospective laws, carbon credits and exemptions for any industry or group.

- We support policies that aim to reduce real pollution or waste of resources. This is best achieved by allowing the market to discover the best technology and using unsubsidised market pricing for all consumers to ration scarce resources.

- Natural processes are likely to produce continual and at times damaging climate change for earth. We believe that the most sensible strategy for dealing with this is adaptation. GGE mitigation policies will absorb savings, divert investments and reduce food production, all of which will reduce the ability of the human race to adapt.

- There is widespread scepticism about the whole Global Warming scare both among informed scientists and in the general population. Imposing draconian GGE taxes and penalties for dubious causes will cause this opposition to grow strongly.

- The Bali Conference produced a road map to nowhere. It illustrates our contention that to proceed on these divisive and unnecessary proposals will cause deep divisions and widespread opposition from the victim countries, industries and consumers.

- We believe that the Garnaut Enquiry should recommend that a Royal Commission be set up to enquire into all aspects of the Science of Global Warming before any GGE mitigation policies are introduced.

* *

1. Introduction

This submission addresses the following fundamental questions:

- Is global warming an unusual event?
- Is there a scientific consensus as to the cause?
- What evidence supports the idea that man's emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) have caused global warming?
- What is better – warming or cooling?
- Is Carbon Dioxide a dangerous pollutant?
- What about droughts and pestilence?
- What about species extinctions?
- What about melting ice sheets and rising sea levels?
- Is mitigation an option?
- Is emission control likely to affect future climate, and will this have benefits greater than its costs?
- How should we treat agriculture and forestry?
- What is the greatest risk to the future prosperity of Australians – global warming or the proposed mitigation policies?
- How do we best cope with the natural climate change likely to continue?
- What happened in Bali?
- Recommendations for the Enquiry.

2. Is Global Warming an Unusual Event?

Long term temperature records from several sources show that Ice Ages are the most common condition on earth in recent geological history – long cold barren eras punctuated by a few short warm eras like (and sometimes warmer than) the present.

The record also shows that the earth has been warming in waves since the depth of the last major ice age which ended about 11,500 years ago, long before the first steam engine fired up its boiler. The latest up-wave in this broad era of warming started at the end of the Little Ice age about 1860, well before the modern industrial era. Man had little to do with this warming and will be unable to affect the cooling that is likely to follow it.

Looking at recent times, NASA's Goddard Institute for space research reports that 1934 was the hottest year since record keeping started in the 1880's. And 2007 saw a number of new low temperature records around the globe – Australia had its coldest June on record in 2007.

Despite continual increase in CO2 emissions, there has been no increase in global mean temperature since 1998.

There is nothing in the temperature records that suggest that current temperatures are in the slightest extreme or ominous.

3. The Scientific "Consensus".

It should be said at the outset that science is never about consensus - that is the realm of politics.

In fact, scientific discoveries are always a surprise to the scientific establishment which is usually wedded to the beliefs of the past. One lone scientist or one sound experiment can prove the ruling consensus wrong, even if no one else is prepared to admit it.

Being a scientist is also an attitude of mind. It means searching for truth using logic and evidence. A scientist does **NOT**:

- Select the evidence to prove the conclusion – he must look for exceptions.
- Manipulate graphs to emphasise a conclusion by omitting data, shifting data in time, exaggerating scales, suppressing zero points, showing small unrepresentative parts of long time series and omitting turning points. (All of these things have been done some IPCC polemists.)
- Assume that correlation proves cause.

- Publish conclusions and then edit or rewrite the supporting reports.

Climate research is now big business, paid for overwhelmingly by taxpayers at the direction of committed officials and politicians. These big businesses need to maintain a sense of world crisis to keep the funds flowing.

But there is no consensus on the science of global warming – there is widespread dispute which is now leading to international and outspoken opposition.

Before we embark on a fundamental shift in economic priorities, destroy huge quantities of existing capital and skills, and impose very large costs on consumers or taxpayers, we need to be very sure that the basis of our argument is sound. We need to be ***CERTAIN*** that man-made CO2 is the cause of a problem, and ***CERTAIN*** that curbing man-made CO2 emissions will produce beneficial results.

On the one hand, the Alarmist Camp is dominated by paid academics and officials appointed by governments, often on the basis of their beliefs. The IPCC report is controlled by a few whose whole reputation and future is tied to proving that global warming is caused by human activities. Their case rests more on models, forecasts and scenarios than on science and evidence. They are strongly supported by many other activist groups with other agendas, or vested interests in the result.

On the other hand there is an ever growing band of independent scientists all over the world who believe that the evidence strongly favours the view that man's activities are a minute factor in determining global temperature.

For example, the EPW committee of the US Senate recently published the names of over 400 prominent scientists from more than two dozen countries who had voiced significant objections to major aspects of the "consensus" on man-made global warming.

And during the Clinton era the US senate voted 95 to ZERO against the US signing Kyoto (that really was a consensus).

Another 100 prominent scientists from all over the world sent a team to the Bali UN Conference and signed a letter warning the UN that it was "not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages." They also warned that "attempts to do so are ultimately futile and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources…"
(See Appendix 1).

Moreover, the "Oregon Petition" has attracted over 19,000 signatures from basic and applied scientists over the last few years. This petition says, among other things "We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind."

http://www.oism.org/pproject/s33p1845.htm

The Canadian National Post carried a series of readable articles by prominent Global Warming sceptics. It can be found at:

http://www.nationalpost.com/story.html?id=22003a0d-37cc-4399-8bcc-39cd20bed2f6&k=0

In 2006 a group of sixty climate and related discipline scientists wrote an open letter to Stephen Harper, the Prime Minister of Canada:
They wrote: "There is no "consensus" among climate scientists about the relative importance of the various causes of global climate change... If, back in the mid-1990s, we knew what we know today about climate, Kyoto would almost certainly not exist, because we would have concluded it was not necessary." It can be found at:

http://www.financialpost.com/story.html?id=3711460e-bd5a-475d-a6be-4db87559d605

And in the ultimate dissent, the sanctimonious prophet of the Global Warming Religion, Al Gore, has been tried and found wanting in an English court.

It happened this way. The government schools in England started distributing Al Gore's polemic film "An Inconvenient Truth". An irate parent took legal action on the basis that the film was one-sided propaganda and contained factual errors. The Court found that the film was misleading in 9 respects and that the Guidance Notes drafted by the Education Secretary's advisors served only to exacerbate the political propaganda in the film.

In order for the film to be shown, the Government must first amend their Guidance Notes to Teachers to make clear that:

1.) The film is a political work and promotes only one side of the argument.

2.) If teachers present the film without making this plain they may be in breach of section 406 of the Education Act 1996 and guilty of political indoctrination.

3.) Eleven inaccuracies have to be specifically drawn to the attention of school children.

From:
http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/sustainableschools/news/news_detail.cfm?id=192

Guidance for teaching staff:
http://publications.teachernet.gov.uk/eOrderingDownload/7329-DCSF-Climate%20Change%20Film%20Pack.pdf

Even Pope Benedict XVI recently launched a surprise attack on climate change prophets of doom, warning them that any solutions to global warming must be based on firm evidence and not on dubious ideology. The leader of more than a billion Roman Catholics suggested that fears over man-made emissions melting the ice caps are causing a wave of unprecedented disasters were nothing more than scare-mongering. Pope Benedict said those who prophesy catastrophic global warming caused by humans are wrong.

For more information on the lack of consensus on the Global Warming check the page by Australian paleo-climatologist Professor Bob Carter of the James Cook University in Townsville:

http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_1.htm

It seems there are widening cracks in the consensus. About 2,000 scientists were paid to produce the IPCC reports. Over 20,000 scientists and many non-scientists have volunteered to publicly oppose the prevailing political wisdom.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of water vapour, carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence demonstrating that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.

If the science is “settled”, why are so many prominent (and not so prominent) scientists and so many other thinking people actively opposed to the IPCC’s position?

4. The Evidence

The alarmist evidence consists mainly of complex computer models of the atmosphere. Such models would be well understood by economists like Professor Garnaut. They all rely on lots of assumptions, inputs and equations supposedly replicating natural or real life processes. They are all “tuned” by running them against past real data and tweaking assumptions or equations until results correspond with known reality. The models are then run forward, producing all the scary scenarios needed to scare world politicians and media to act on this menace of global warming. However, such models have never accurately and consistently forecast the future. Even tonight (27th December 2007) our own weather bureau, when commenting on a low pressure system growing in the southern Coral Sea said “Well half of our computer models have it moving towards the coast, the other half think it will head further away from the coast.” That is about the level of accuracy that could be expected from the General Circulation Models relied on almost exclusively by the Alarmists of the IPCC.

Two forecasting experts, Scott Armstrong and Kesten Green of “Public Policy Forecasting” have conducted an audit of the forecasting principles of the IPCC.

Their conclusions include the comments:

“The forecasts in the Report were not the outcome of scientific procedures. In effect, they present the opinions of scientists transformed by mathematics and obscured by complex writing. We found no references to the primary sources of information on forecasting despite the fact these are easily available in books, articles, and websites.

“We conducted an audit of Chapter 8 of the IPCC's WG1 Report. We found enough information to make judgments on 89 out of the total of 140 principles. The forecasting procedures that were used violated 72 principles. Many of the violations were, by themselves, critical. We have been unable to identify any scientific forecasts to support global warming.

Claims that the Earth will get warmer have no more credence than saying that it will get colder."

None of the IPCC models can accurately simulate all the complex interactions between variations and cycles in solar radiation and magnetism, cosmic rays, and the stabilising effect of surface and atmospheric water, and surface convection.
It would therefore be foolish and extremely costly to base public policy on the IPCC models and forecasts.

For a detailed assessment of the IPCC's forecasting methods see:
http://forecastingprinciples.com/Public_Policy/global_warming_audit.html:
http://forecastingprinciples.com/Public_Policy/WarmAudit31.pdf

The growing band of sceptics point to many pieces of real observational evidence that suggest that other natural factors are far more important than man's emissions of greenhouse gases in determining global temperatures. These include:

- Ice cores and other long term records that show that temperature changes precede changes in CO2 levels by several hundred years. Therefore the rising CO2 levels cannot cause the rising temperatures. It is far more likely to imply the reverse.

- Experiments and calculations that prove that the additional global warming potential of CO2 in the atmosphere is almost exhausted. Additional CO2 will have insignificant effects on earth's climate. This well established fact alone indicates that reductions in man-made emissions will have an insignificant effect on average global temperature.

- Actual chemical analyses of CO2 in the atmosphere show that current levels are not extreme. A compilation of more than 90,000 direct measurements at 43 stations over the period since 1812 shows that CO2 levels have not risen smoothly - they have fluctuated, and levels in 1820 and 1940 were well above current levels.

- Recognition of the huge role played by the oceans in emitting CO2 as temperatures rise, and re-absorbing CO2 as temperatures fall.

- Recognition that the IPCC models give insufficient attention to the roles of water in all of its forms. Its effect is far greater than any effect of man's emissions of CO2. Computer models will never simulate the complex role of oceans, winds, clouds and water vapour in transferring and stabilising surface temperatures.

- Discovery of the effects of solar variations on cosmic rays, cloud formation and earth's temperature. When the sun is more active, the solar wind deflects cosmic rays. Since cosmic rays promote cloud formation, the extra warming effect of the sun is increased by the reduction in cloud cover.

- Discovery of a strong correlation between temperature changes and solar activity. Evidence suggests that the last 50 years has seen the highest level of solar activity for several thousand years.

- Discovery of a large number of undersea volcanoes whose periodic eruptive phases can warm the oceans. Any such warming will drive out the CO2 dissolved in the oceans. Warming of the oceans causes CO2 levels in the atmosphere to rise, not the other way around.

- Recognition that the earth itself, via volcanic eruptions and undersea seeps, contributes a large but unmeasured amount of CO2 and methane to the atmosphere.

- Discovery that the pattern of warming in the atmosphere does not fit the pattern forecast by the IPCC models.

- Temperature is rising on other planets in the solar system, suggesting that the sun is the major factor in all planetary warmings.

- Methane levels in the atmosphere are falling, not rising as predicted by IPCC.

And crucially, despite strong increases in man's emission of CO2, (chiefly from rapidly increasing coal fired power generation in China and India), global surface temperatures have stubbornly refused to rise for almost a decade.

(Unfortunately, the Bali conference was relying on IPCC data which had a 2005 cut-off date for submissions. It thus used out-of-date information.)

5. *What is better – Warming or Cooling?*

Any study of history will show that the cold eras are the ones to be feared – the "Dark Ages" characterised by famine, starvation, migrations and wars.
Warm periods, which always have more CO2 and water vapour in the atmosphere, are universally described as "Golden Ages" with benign climates, flourishing plant and animal life, and great advances in prosperity, population, culture and science.

For more information on this subject see:
http://carbon-sense.com/2007/09/25/warm-watered-and-well-fed-is-better/#more-30

6. *Is Carbon Dioxide a Dangerous Pollutant?*

One of the most stupid things done in the name of environmental protection is the definition of carbon dioxide as a **pollutant**.

CO2 is a colourless, odourless, non-toxic gas which is the key recycler in the carbon cycle of life on earth. If the Chicken Littles in the EPA did manage to remove CO2 from the atmosphere, all plant life would die, followed quickly by all animal (and human) life. Like the other natural atmospheric gases (nitrogen, oxygen, and water vapour) CO2 is an essential component of life. Life on earth developed in CO2 and has survived levels of CO2 in the atmosphere far above those now causing terror among earth's stupid children. Life needs all four atmospheric gases to survive, none is a pollutant.

CO2 is not even the most significant greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. Water vapour accounts for 95% of greenhouse warming. Is water our next proscribed pollutant?

The relative importance of water in all its forms (oceans, lakes, rivers, clouds, water vapour) and carbon dioxide is described by Dr Martin Hertzberg of Colorado in this way:

"The most significant atmospheric component in the radiative balance between the sun and the earth is water vapor in all its forms.

"In comparison to water in all of its forms, carbon dioxide is the equivalent of but a few farts in a hurricane."

(Dr. Martin Hertzberg is a combustion research scientist and also served as a meteorologist with the US Navy. He teaches science and maths and has been studying the global warming issue for the last twenty years).

Moreover, natural emissions provide 97% of atmospheric CO2 – humans contribute a mere 3% - are we going to plug volcanoes, put covers on swamps, stabilise the temperature of the oceans and rake up and bury deep all autumn leaves in a doomed quest to "stabilise CO2"?

Benign CO2 should not be confused with real pollution currently growing in Asian skies. These debilitating clouds of noxious fumes consisting of ash particles, gaseous oxides of nitrogen and sulphur (NOX and SOX), chlorine and metal oxides are the result of dirty combustion of coal and wood in open cooking fires and obsolete furnaces and power stations (a replica of the smogs of 19th century London and Pittsburgh.)

When diffused by winds and removed by rain, the aerial products of combustion of natural hydrocarbons are not dangerous, but in fact provide valuable nutrients and trace elements to soil and plants. Only when they are so concentrated by millions of dirty combustion processes concentrated in cities does the pollution become annoying and at times dangerous to human health.

It would be a major benefit to the world to replace these dirty hydro-carbon fires and furnaces with clean silent invisible electricity generated in remote locations by clean modern power plants. Additional benefits could possibly be achieved by harvesting the benefits of the extra CO2 by growing trees, crops or vegetables or pastures nearby.

For more information on this topic see:
http://carbon-sense.com/2007/08/26/chasing-a-will-o-the-wisp-while-ignoring-a-real-monster-in-the-sky/#more-25

7. *What about droughts and pestilence?*

And so around the chorus ran
"It's keepin' dry, no doubt."
"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"Before the year is out."

John O'Brien

It is a common belief that man's carbon emissions probably caused the recent droughts and will cause even worse droughts in future (at every mention of the

new buzz words “Climate Change” a picture of parched crazed mud in an empty dam will flash on the TV screen).

It should be obvious to even the blindest true believer that increased global temperature will cause increased evaporation from the oceans and lakes which must be released somewhere as rain, hail or snow.
Global warming may change the pattern of rainfall, but it can never cause an overall increase in drought. It is the cold, dry, carbon deficient ice ages that the human race should fear.

We are also threatened that, unless we mend our emissive ways, malaria will descend from the tropics to the leafy suburbs of Melbourne. However, even a cursory examination of relevant literature will show that malaria is not a tropical disease. It is found from the tropics to Alaska. It is mosquito control, not emissions control, that keeps malaria at bay.

8. What about species extinctions?

It is said that polar bears, coral reefs and all sorts of plant and animal life will perish in the coming global warming. There is no evidence to support most of these claims. Coral and coral reefs have survived higher temperatures and higher levels of CO2 since the Palaeozoic Era about 400 million years ago; polar bears and their ancestors have survived temperatures above current temperatures; and careful species counts have shown that warming trends merely allow plants to invade cooler areas but do not cause extinctions in warmer areas. Moreover, the increased CO2 released from warming oceans is a boon for all plant life, and allows them the strength to withstand greater range of variations in both temperature and rainfall**.** All life will proliferate with abundant CO2 in the atmosphere but would perish if by some miracle we managed to remove and bury it all.

9. What about Melting Ice Sheets and rising Sea Levels?

In Antarctica, which houses most of the world’s ice, the temperature in the 1990’s was much lower than the mean for 1961 to 1990. In the Arctic and Greenland, the highest temperatures recorded (since recordings started in 1874) from 43 stations were in the 1930’s. Greenland’s highest temperatures for the last 100 years were recorded in the 1920’s. At the summit of the Greenland Ice sheet, the average summer temperature has decreased by 2.2 deg per decade since measurements started at this spot in 1987.

In general, the ice sheets are thinning at the margins (near the warming oceans) but thickening in the centre. Satellite altimetry suggests that the contributions from melting ice would take 1,000 years to raise global sea levels by 5 cm.

Careful observations of sea levels all over the world, including Tuvalu, The Maldives, Vanuatu, Hong Kong and from satellites show no trend of sea levels rising. After 5 international meetings of sea level specialists, (not IPCC computer modellers) chaired by Dr Nils-Axel Morner, they agreed we may see a sea level rise of 10cm over 100 years ie 1mm per year. (see EIR Economics 33, June 22, 2007).

People cope with daily tides that vary from 15 metres in Nova Scotia to a few cm in the Mediterranean Sea. The human race, polar bears and corals have also coped with sea levels which have already risen by about 100 metres since the depth of the last Ice Age.

We will probably cope with a rise of 10 cm per century without Emission Trading or Carbon Geo-sequestration.

For some Shocking Facts on sea level rises see:
http://www.worldclimatereport.com/index.php/2007/02/09/shocking-facts-about-sea-level-rise/

10. Man’s Minute Emissions of CO2.

Let’s put puny man in perspective:

- Carbon dioxide comprises a minute component of the atmosphere – 0.038%.
- Carbon dioxide comprises only 3-4% of greenhouse gases.
- Man’s emissions of carbon dioxide are about 5% of total emissions.
- Australia’s emissions are said to be about 1.4% of the world man-made emissions.
- Over the 100 years ending in the year 2000, the century of coal, steel, electricity, the internal combustion engine, jet planes, two world wars and a population explosion, the average surface temperature rose by only 0.6 deg, and seems to be falling now.

Thus, even if Australia stopped every engine, closed every coal mine and power station, shot all farm animals (they belch a lot) and all held our breath, it would reduce greenhouse gases in the atmosphere by 1.4% of 5% of 4% or 0.0028%. Even if greenhouse gases were the sole factor affecting surface temperature, Australia's ability to affect the growth in temperature over the next century is limited to 0.0028% of 0.6 deg, or, put simply, nothing at all.

Human beings may have been responsible for less than 0.01 deg C of warming during the last century. For the government to contemplate betting our future against odds like this is an exercise in futile, reckless and ill informed speculation.

11. Are we at a "Tipping Point"?

Regularly we are told that the situation is grave, and unless we repent our wasteful ways by next Saturday, we will all be burned in hell.

This suggests that at some point of CO2 concentration in the atmosphere, the system develops positive feedback, becomes unstable, and with just one more puff of CO2, temperatures will soar without end.

A look at earth's history, a look at the physics of CO2 in the atmosphere, and a look at the role of water in stabilising earth's temperature all show that there is no evidence to support the belief in sudden, unstoppable warming.

There have been many times where surface temperature and CO2 content in the atmosphere were at or above what they are now. In every case, the automatic stabilisers went to work and the normal state (cool to frigid) returned.

One of the very big factors in achieving this is surface and atmospheric water.

The oceans are a huge heat sink. It takes a lot of heat to warm them, and once warm, they cool slowly no matter what is happening in the air above. They moderate all extremes.

As oceans heat up, evaporation speeds up, taking large amounts of heat from the oceans in the process. This moisture ends up as clouds, which shade the surface, reflect the sun's heat, and cool the surface. The hot air cools by radiation to space, or by convection currents which take them to cold areas of the higher latitudes. There the moisture condenses as rain or snow.

Increased snow cover again cools the surface by reflecting sunlight.

Even more important in demolishing the tipping point argument, is the behaviour of CO2 in the atmosphere. The first 20 ppm of CO2 in the atmosphere has a greater Greenhouse Effect than the next 300 ppm. Increases beyond this have an ever declining impact on atmospheric temperature. Like a runner at the end of a marathon, CO2 has almost exhausted its global warming potential.

12. Is Mitigation an Option?

The IPCC would have us believe that if only we could cut man's emissions of CO2, the CO2 content of the atmosphere would fall, global warming would cease and earth would return to bucolic equilibrium.

As Dr Martin Hertzberg points out, we have already tried that, well before Kyoto, and it achieved nothing. The economic depression of the period 1929 to 1932 caused fossil carbon production to fall by 25%, far more than Kyoto currently demands. What happened to CO2 content in the atmosphere? It rose steadily during the whole period of the Great Depression.

It is the arrogant and ignorant to think that man can control global temperature by trying to manipulate the amount of his emissions of carbon dioxide entering the atmosphere.

It is also a huge mistake to believe that everyone will accept that the world can or should be maintained at today's or yesterday's temperature. People everywhere are moving to the sun belts. No one finds Singapore, Cairns or the Caribbean too hot for human habitation. But the people of Siberia, Alaska, Canada, Iceland and the Falklands may welcome a little more warmth.

Who claims the right to play God with the world's thermometer?

13. Let's keep a Sense of Perspective on Temperatures.

We are told that CSIRO projections ("guesses" would be a more appropriate word) now indicate that global warming could cause an increase in average temperature of 2 deg Celsius by 2070 – ie an average increase or one degree Celsius per 30 years.

An increase of 1 deg C in temperature is equivalent to an Aussie resident moving north by about 100 km ie from Sydney to Newcastle, from Ballarat to Bendigo, from Port Pirie to Port Augusta or from Brisbane to Nambour. As thousands of people every year shift voluntarily from Sydney to Brisbane, it appears that even if global warming does its worst, most Australian residents would not normally take any notice.

Looking at it another way, on a typical winter day here where I live in South East Queensland, the temperature may rise from 10 degrees to 25 degrees over say 6 hours – about 2.5 deg per hour ie our temperature rises about 1 degree every 25 minutes – not a particularly concerning rate of warming.
I do not think I would notice or be concerned about an increase of 1 degree in average global temperature (whatever that is) over 30 years.

Here is another perspective (first pointed out by Lord Nigel Lawson, former Chancellor of the UK Exchequer):

- Helsinki has an average annual temperature of about 5 deg C.

- Singapore has an average annual temperature of about 27 deg C.

Both are capital cities and large numbers of humans exist comfortably in both of them, despite a range of about 22 deg C in average surface temperature. As Lord Lawson says "If man can successfully cope with a range of 22 deg, it is not immediately apparent why he should not be able to adapt to a change of about 3 deg, when he is given a hundred years in which to do so."

14. Is Carbon Capture and Storage ever likely to prove economic?

CCS research is the new nirvana for those who live on extracting research funds from taxpayers and shareholders, so there will always be glowing progress reports that "success is just around the corner".

But CCS can ***NEVER*** be economic. There are no benefits in removing CO2 from the atmosphere – it is all cost. Therefore all the research, all the retro-fitting of power stations, all the expenditure on finding places suitable for carbon cemeteries, all the money spent on pipelines and relocation of power stations is a ***COMPLETE WASTE*** of funds that could be used solving real problems, building useful infrastructure, providing needed goods and services, or reducing poverty.

The Carbon Sense Coalition believes that corporations who use shareholders' funds to support ill considered Global Warming policies have not done their due diligence, and face reactions from shareholders and customers. (Caterpillar in the US is already facing a boycott from some customers because of its ill considered support of Cap and Trade regulations.)

For more information on risks to business see: "Failure to Disclose: Businesses Lobbying for Global Warming Regulations":

http://www.demanddebate.com,
http://www.freeenterpriser.com, and
http://www.junkscience.com.

15. "Cleaner and Greener than Thou?"

By some quirk of propaganda, natural gas and biofuels are seen as "clean and natural" (not like the ugly sisters – the dirty fossil fuels coal and oil.)

Every bit of coal, every bottle of natural gas (including this year's pin-up, coal seam methane), every bowser of motor fuel and every stalk and branch of plant material or biomass is a form of hydro-carbon. When burnt, without exception, every one produces the same two greenhouse gases, water vapour (H2O) and CO2. Both gases affect temperature in the atmosphere, but CO2 has been elected the fall guy. The ratios vary, but on greenhouse heating grounds, there is no reason to laud some hydrocarbons and damn others.

(Admittedly, biofuels extract CO2 as they grow, but they give it all back, plus some, as they are harvested, transported, refined and burnt.)

16. Burning Biomass

For most humans on earth for all of history, life has been a struggle for protein and energy. All protein is carbon based, and the cheapest, most abundant, most concentrated, most portable and most easily available energy sources are also carbon based (wood, coal, oils, gases and bitumen).

There are only two big sources of carbon energy – plant material or mineral fuels.

Some people think that burning biomass (residue from wheat, sugar and forests etc) is a zero cost option that does not compete with food.

Good soils are a scarce and limited resource. All over the world, the organic content of soils (humus and soil micro-life) is decreasing, mainly because of poor agricultural practice, especially excessive cultivation, harsh fertilisers, and the harvesting or in-situ burning of all organic matter. This is reflected in declining yields, declining protein content and declining mineral content of crops. The micro-life and minerals in our excessively robbed soils is declining and our foods are becoming less nutrient dense.

This is not sustainable farming. The carbon from biomass burnt in the power station is often coming direct from the soil. This short-sighted policy is just robbing the soil of organic matter needed for food for future generations.

It is a far more sustainable policy to use mineral fuels such as coal, gas and petroleum for industry and transport, and leave the soils to cope with the growing burden of providing food. The carbon from mineral fuels is then a net addition to the valuable stock of circulating carbon.

17. Are the Emissions Targets Achievable?

There seems to be a competition amongst the de-carbonisers to see who can propose the most severe punishment to the human race. New emission targets appear daily and each new cut is reported breathlessly by an un-critical media.

One day it is 20% by 2020, then 50% by 2050 and presumably 100% by 2100. Some want closure of all coal power plants, others would eliminate all ruminant animals (just the domesticated ones, we assume?), others dream of new viruses that would decimate the human population.

To these anti-humanists, all evidence of man's scientific and industrial progress since the last Ice Age should be blotted from the earth. (This will ensure a huge increase in employment as we all take up our sickles, hoes and rakes to prepare for next year's wheat crop.)

Other well meaning reformers actually believe some of these targets are achievable without disturbing their comfortable lives in the leafy suburbs.

Since the days of first settlement, Australia has always relied on its great primary industries:

- Wool for the mills of Manchester
- Butter for the tables of Britain
- Frozen lamb for the kitchens of Europe.
- Gold and silver for the war effort.
- Beef for the Anzac Diggers.
- Wheat for our daily bread.
- Copper, lead, zinc and aluminium for the builders and engineers.
- Coke for the smelters of Japan.
- Steel for the backbone of industry.
- Oil for mobility and tractive power.
- Timber and concrete for our houses and bridges.
- Fish and chips for our plates.
- Coal for silent invisible power to clean the skies of our polluted cities.
- Natural Gas for winter warmth and power.
- Food to feed the world.
- Fibre to clothe the world.
- And now, these great primary industries are joined by Tourism to entertain the masses.

These industries have always been the primary generators of new wealth in Australia. Every one generates CO2 emissions.

All Australians earn their living by finding, extracting, processing, transporting, smelting, refining, fabricating, manufacturing, supplying, taxing, regulating, administering, observing or criticising the production from these basic industries. If we destroy or cripple them with foolish policies, our lifestyle will become unsustainable and our right to retain control of this treasure house of resource riches will be challenged.

If we assist or do not oppose this well orchestrated campaign to demonise carbon, we will be cutting our own throats.

The Queensland Government has recently released a document mis-named "Climate Smart 2050" This document proposes to meet a "greenhouse reduction target of 60% below 2000 levels by 2050"

We need to examine what this target could mean. Suppose that the Queensland population grows by, say, 2% per year. By 2050 it will grow to 269% of 2000 levels. That larger population is supposed to exist on 40% of the level of carbon emissions in the year 2000. This indicates that emissions per person are mandated to fall to 15% of 2000 levels – a reduction of 85%!

This means that a population which will be 2.7 times as large as it is now will be expected to exist with:

- A 60% cut in usage of carbon fuels for cars, trucks, planes and tractors.
- Closure of 60% of our coal fired power stations, cement plants and smelters.
- Elimination of 60% of our cattle and sheep.

If this occurs, by the year 2050 Queenslanders will be living like Tibetan monks, eating rabbit food and showering once a week in tepid water from a canvas bucket shower hung under the mango tree.

And the dream of the UN levellers will be achieved – equality of emissions per person.

This is not an extreme example. Another boffin thinks we can halve electricity from coal by 2020 and eliminate all coal power generation by 2050.
Be prepared for brownouts and blackouts.

Of course the Alarmists will cry, "But we will have carbon sequestration, hydrogen fuel and alternate energy by then". Even if we did, we still need to find buckets of money for:

- Retro-fitting, relocating, rebuilding or replacing all of our power plants, cement plants, transport vehicles (and light bulbs).
- Building networks of CO2 disposal pipelines.
- Research, testing and building all the alternate energy facilities.
- Funding the regulatory spider-web required.
- Funding a quarterly international GGE/IPCC conference at some warm resort.

All of this would soak up enormous amounts of scarce capital that could have been used to expand our infrastructure and our economy for our growing population. The carbon killers would have us make less profit but find more capital just to produce the same output.

And how do these utopians think we will cut carbon emissions? Where will we get our electricity?

Geothermal is still a hopeful idea. Carbon geo-sequestration is an unproven, stupid, costly and unnecessary diversion. Hydro and tidal power will be opposed by the usual mob for the usual reasons. Wind and solar will provide unreliable and costly power but only when the sun shines and the wind blows. They can provide small scale power for hot water and domestic use but it will be a long time before we see an aluminium refinery or large city powered by windmills and solar panels. Natural gas creates the same greenhouse gases as natural coal but in different proportions.

Many countries have and will choose the nuclear option to evade their GGE taxes. In particular, many of those who are most critical of coal are already heavily dependent on nuclear power (eg France has no coal mines and generates 80% of its electricity from nuclear - bagging coal suits their national interest).

Australia, almost alone in the developed world, has no nuclear power generating capacity. Moreover, it lacks the engineering experience and the political will to develop it quickly. It has more to lose from forced de-carbonisation than any other country in the world.

So, in the once-lucky country, it will be belt-tightening time.

No doubt an economic modeller will be found to prove that all this destruction will have a minuscule effect on the God of GDP. They will achieve this modern miracle of the loaves and the fishes by counting all the new "jobs" created by the booming Greenhouse "industry" –

- Lobbyists (for obtaining and maintaining the subsidies).
- Traders (for managing the emissions trading and developing options and derivatives).
- Bankers (for financing the scams and discounting future earnings),
- Brokers (to entice the public onto the bandwagon).
- Carbon credit farmers.
- Fiction writers (for describing new abatement plans).
- Auditors (to justify dodgy offset claim).
- Regulators (to draft nifty barriers to new entrants).
- Administrators (to submit paperwork in the right format).
- Bureaucrats (to check if all the paperwork is submitted in the right format).

- Speech writers (for the regular Greenhouse conferences).
- Ministerial assistants (to protect the incumbents).
- Lawyers (to generate disputes on interpretation of the GGE regulations).
- Barristers (to interpret what the competing lawyers are saying).
- Judges (to interpret what the Barristers are saying).
- Courts (to house the competing legal teams).
- Extra employees (Green energy will always need more employees per unit of power generated).
- Demolition gangs (to remove all those unsightly coal processing plants and wool sheds).
- Carbon forest inspectors and auditors.
- Environmentalists (to replant brigalow scrub on all those abandoned cattle runs).
- And so on - the opportunities are indeed unending.

To some people, the Greenhouse industry looks like the new saviour of Australia after the last coal mine is closed and the last bullock is shipped off to Japan. Headlines will read "Greenrise industries boom in the lucky country".

However, most of this new activity is merely redistribution of wealth.

Redistribution is easy. All it requires is a majority vote one sleepy afternoon in Parliament. Creation of new wealth is more difficult. It requires thinking, capital, resources, people, tools and time. These are only mustered with great effort and against many obstacles. They can be redistributed and possibly destroyed in one sleepy afternoon.

Votes will never create one more roof on a new house, a slice of toast on one plate, a steak on a single barby, a blanket on one bed or a light in one dunny. And the warm inner glow will not boil one kettle.

For more commentary on these foolish and destructive policy proposals see:

http://carbon-sense.com/look-before-you-leap/

18. Who pays?

No matter how it is all gift wrapped, any system of carbon credits or carbon taxes must be costly if it is to have any effect – a billion for geo-sequestration research, a billion for clean coal technology, a billion for retro-fitting new controls, a billion in subsidies for alternate energy, a billion in carbon taxes . . . . .

> – *"a billion here and a billion there, and pretty soon you are talking real money."*

The political battle of the century will be about who pays. There are only three groups:

- Consumers of carbon products such as electricity, cement, steel, timber, food, fibre, transport and travel.

- Owners and shareholders (including super funds) of companies producing these products or using them as inputs for further processing or manufacturing.

- Taxpayers

There is no one else.

Any attempts to shield some group such as "consumers", "the poor" or "families" will merely move the initial burden to some other group (the same people largely). The market will then spread it around again via increased costs, decreased dividends, increased taxes or increased unemployment.

On a world scale, a racial complication intrudes. Every member of the UN's IPCC thinks that the Americans should pay to clean up the Greenhouse. Failing that, India and China think that members of the G8 should pay. The Americans think that no one should pay unless everyone chips in. Diplomatic Australia agrees with all of these positions**.**

19. The Risk of Creating a Climate of Fear

The alarmists, assisted by those with other agendas and vested interests, have already created a climate of fear among the young, the gullible and those who cannot understand science and do not recognise the power of political agendas and vested interests. They cannot see where this road leads.

Already we have seen proposals to use the law, not the market, to:

- Ban open fires and pot bellied stoves
- Ban incandescent light bulbs (what about those candles on birthday cakes?)

- Ban bottled water
- Ban private cars from some areas
- Ban plasma TV's
- Ban new airports
- Ban extensions to existing airports
- Ban "standby mode" on appliances
- Ban coal fired power generation
- Ban electric hot water systems
- Ban vacationing by car
- Ban three day weekends
- Tax babies
- Tax big cars (are big people next?)
- Tax supermarket parking areas
- Tax rubbish
- Tax second homes
- Tax second cars
- Tax holiday plane flights
- Tax electricity to subsidise solar
- Tax showrooms for big cars
- Eco-tax for cars entering cities
- Require permits to drive your car beyond your city limits
- Limit choice in appliances
- Issue carbon credits to every person
- Dictate fuel efficiency standards
- Investigate how to reduce production of methane by Norway's Moose (what about those belching whales?)
- Remove white lines on roads to make motorists drive more carefully (no kidding!)

The Global Warming religion has been seized by all of the frustrated "anti" crowds - anti-meat, anti-mining, anti-industry, anti-USA, anti-free trade, anti-humans, anti-growth, anti-motor cars, anti-land development, anti-consumerism, anti-affluence, anti-hunting, anti-fishing etc. They see this as their big chance to create a climate of fear sufficient to allow them the power to enact draconian restrictions on individual freedoms and rights that the general population would never accept normally.

This is not about science, or about the economy or the well being of Australians – it is about power and politics.

Opposition will grow, and the issue if pursued will become very divisive. (Already the Carbon Coalition has been approached by concerned Australians considering a Class Action for damages should their interests be damaged by what they consider misguided greenhouse policies.)

20. Is Global Agreement Likely?

It is well recognised that unilateral action by Australia, or even by the whole European world, would be pointless without Asian and American participation. Bali showed clearly that China and India will never agree to emission targets that limit their ability to reach western levels of prosperity.

The vested interests are also clear. France in particular and Europe in general have destroyed their coal industry by feather-bedding, subsidies, nationalisation or depletion of resources. They are forced to more expensive nuclear, wind and solar power or risky Soviet gas. None of these will compete with cheap Australian coal in efficient new Chinese or Indian power stations. So Europe will bad-mouth coal. That will also hobble USA which is facing a power crisis – fear of nuclear and opposition to coal has left them dangerously short of modern generating facilities. They could swing back to low cost coal, which they have in abundance.

It is also clear that Western economies will never contract or change quickly enough to meet the bloodthirsty emission cuts now being proposed.

Thus, this is what will happen.

First, world targets of emissions based on quotas per person will be set for each participating country.

This will leave emissions from China and India free to surge onward, but it will impose impossible cuts on western countries. These will not be achieved, so they will have to buy emission permits. Where from? From those with spare emissions capacity of course – China and India.

So our industries will be taxed to subsidise a never-ending boom in Asia.

When these realities start to bite, and when the science of global warming collapses in the next cool era, there will be a huge political backlash against those Pied Pipers who led us to the carbon cemetery. The value of carbon credits will disappear quicker than CO2 in the wind, the Australian Greenhouse Office will be closed and many carbon traders, bankers, lawyers, regulators, academics, journalists and politicians will be looking for a new line of work.

21. Land Use Issues.

The Garnaut Enquiry seeks feedback on policies that may affect land use.

Our fundamental policy position is this: Any government policy should apply equally to all industries with no retrospectivity.

It should be obvious to anyone reading this far that the Carbon Sense Coalition believes that there are no net benefits for Australians in the short term or the long term in any of the proposals discussed at Kyoto or Bali. They are unnecessary and will only impose large costs on future Australians for no purpose.

But if some very misguided government leads Australians onto this sticky paper, the long term costs would only be minimised if:

- all policies are applied immediately to all industries.
- there is no retrospectivity in costs or benefits.
- emissions trading is avoided. It will create false industries, excessive regulatory costs, large opportunities for cheating and fraud and big losses when the whole "cap and trade" charade collapses or is destroyed.
- there are no government subsidies for any carbon-free alternatives. Taxes on carbon will be an effective subsidy for all alternatives with no opportunities for playing favourites.
- there is no mandating of market shares for any particular type of energy.
- there is no fiddling with credits for carbon sinks, credits for not polluting etc. (That is a bit like making a donation to the local women's refuge so you can be forgiven for beating up your wife.)
- agriculture and forestry is included. All farmers would love to be included in any carbon trading scheme. Farmers are very innovative. The opportunities for creating credits out of nothing will be endless, so why should they miss out on the fun?
- governments do not subsidise biofuels or mandate their use. People who have done the sums tell us that production of biofuels consumes more energy than is produced, as well as raping the countryside and inflating food prices. Ethanol proponents need to remember:
  "Grasslands run on sunlight,
  Cornfields run on fossil fuel".
- governments do not subsidise one land use above another. All plants absorb carbon from the atmosphere. None should receive more favoured status.
- there is no attempt to treat different animal breeds differently. The suggestion that animal breeders should be encouraged to breed cattle and sheep that produce less emissions is just too silly for words. Why don't we also breed people who live on less air and never break wind? To breed stock which are adapted to our real environment and who have the ability to adapt to whatever nature has to throw at us is more than enough of a challenge for animal breeders. (Feeding ruminant animals on their natural food, pasture, instead of the cow equivalent of baked beans, would probably reduce their emissions potential.)

But, powerful vested interests make it unlikely even this minimalist program will occur. Everyone will agitate for some special position, protected from the painful costs that any Global Warming program must entail.

22. How do we best cope with Inevitable Climate Change?

Climate Change is inevitable, and countless generations of humans, animal and plants have coped with it. But many species and individuals have died in the periodic mass extinctions that are unfortunately not uncommon events in world history.

Mankind cannot prevent climate change and is not yet good at predicting it.

So, we must do what generations of our ancestors did – ADAPT.

Our ability to adapt will be harmed by costly and ineffective policies that destroy many industries and businesses and divert scarce savings and capital to unproductive investments and activities.

23. The Bali Road Map to Nowhere.

The Bali Conference is proof of our contention that the IPCC GGE proposals will not be acceptable to a significant number of people and countries. To proceed will cause rising national and international dispute.

Significant points to emerge from Bali were:

- Social development and poverty eradication are global priorities. (What does this goal have to do with mitigating global warming?)
- Deep cuts in global emissions will be required to achieve the ultimate aim of the convention. (No targets are agreed.)
- When cuts are agreed, they will be compulsory for developed countries but not for developing countries.

(What a recipe for international dispute. "Developed" countries will be forced to help "developing" countries to become "developed" countries while they revert to the status of "previously developed" countries).

The Bali roadmap provides no guidance as to the destination, but describes the roads. It is a road map to nowhere.

It sounds like the pilot who radioed in from somewhere over the Pacific:

"I'm lost, but I'm making record time".

There is no value in getting a road map unless there is agreement where on where you are going.

24. Further Information, References

This submission is not designed as a scientific paper with numerous footnotes and references. However, these can be provided if needed. The Carbon Sense Coalition is also happy to appear before the Review Panel, to provide more information and explanations or to answer questions.

For another good overview of the Global Warming Issues, see "Profits of Doom":

http://carbon-sense.com/2008/01/01/profits-of-doom-an-alternative-view-of-global-warming/

Conclusions and Recommendations

It will be a disappointment to the Garnaut Review that this submission does not address itself mainly to helping to design a Carbon Emissions Trading Scheme. However, the purpose of the review is to review the impacts of climate change and recommend medium to long term policies to improve prospects for long term prosperity.

Destroying a large amount of installed capital will not improve prosperity. Levying carbon taxes will not improve prosperity. An emissions trading scheme will enrich some people but will not make a net positive contribution to long term prosperity. Replacing big tracts of productive grasslands with subsidised monocultures of protected trees will not add to prosperity. Diverting food capacity to provide fuel for cars will not add to prosperity.

Climate change is the normal feature of Planet Earth. It will continue, unabated, no matter what foolishness is legislated by Australian or other politicians.

Our best response is to make sure the Australian economy has the freedom, the diversity and the funds to adapt to whatever climate change comes our way.

The ability to adapt is always reduced by taxes on the successful, subsidies on the unsuccessful and handcuffs on innovation.

We believe it is far more important to question the basis of the whole proposal. The costs of a wrong move will be substantial and long lasting. The benefits are very doubtful. This is a very bad basis for gambling the whole Australian economy. And once an artificial carbon trading industry is created, it will be very difficult to abolish without substantial costs being borne by someone.

We believe (and a substantial and growing body of prominent scientists also believe), that man has little to do with causing variations in earth's global temperature and nothing governments can do will significantly affect future climate.

However, misguided policies prompted by bad science can greatly reduce the profitability and prospects for the most productive and reliable sectors of the Australian economy.

Moreover, there is no risk whatsoever that additional human caused emissions of the greenhouse gases (water vapour, carbon dioxide and methane) will cause runaway global warming. It is a well established fact that the greenhouse heating potential of additional CO2 is largely exhausted; methane levels are already falling and additional water vapour is not a threat.

Moreover, there is substantial evidence to suggest that additional warming, additional water vapour and additional CO2 may be a boon to most of the human population. These changes have already added greatly to food supplies in the world.

This is not to say that control of pollution in our skies, waters and cities is not a worthy goal – it is, but CO2 is **NOT** a pollutant.

We also have no argument with conservation of energy, water and resources. This is best done by charging full price for all resources and allowing suppliers the freedom to conserve their resources and consumers the freedom to choose how to economise on use.

Discriminatory subsidies, taxes and "free services" always cause distortion and waste.

Thus, our advice to the Garnaut Review is this:

"Doing nothing is better than doing something stupid".

Our strong recommendation is:

Advise the government that there is no sound basis for proceeding to attempt the de-carbonisation of our economy. The costs will be substantial and the benefits illusory.

Before any GGE mitigation policies are introduced, we believe strongly that a Royal Commission be set up to enquire into the Science of Global Warming. This should be done in parallel with the Garnaut Enquiry into the economics of mitigation.

If we accept these foolish proposals, it will cause enormous damage to the economic well being of millions of people, but it will do nothing to affect the global climate.

We are indeed at a political tipping point. To go ahead has the potential to cause lasting and irreversible damage to all Australians.

Viv Forbes
Chairman
The Carbon Coalition
22 June 2007

Web: www.carbon-sense.com
Email: info@carbon-sense.com

Disclosure of Interest:
Viv Forbes earns income from three carbon emitting industries - coal, cattle and sheep. He nurtures native grasslands and breeds cattle and sheep adapted to Australian climatic conditions. He also uses cement, steel and electricity, buys diesel for his tractor, petrol for his car and gas for his barby. He uses trains and occasionally boards an aeroplane. He eats carbon based foods, pays taxes and uses government services funded by taxes on the carbon industries. All of these industries and services will be harmed by carbon taxes, emissions trading or carbon sequestration. He is also a scientist, investment analyst, computer modeller and political analyst. No one paid or prompted him to co-ordinate compilation of this report. Like the great majority of Australians, he has a big vested interest in the outcome of this historic debate.

"We have got to ride the global warming issue.

Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic policy and environmental policy"

Timothy Wirth, US Undersecretary of State for Global Issues.

"We may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrial civilisation to collapse".

Maurice Strong, Senior Advisor to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan, and Chairman of the Rio Conference which drafted the Kyoto Protocol.

Appendix 1.

http://www.nationalpost.com/news/story.html?id=164002

Over 100 Prominent Scientists Warn UN: Attempting To Control Climate Is 'Futile'

"Significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming."

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=D4B5FD23-802A-23AD-4565-3DCE4095C360

BALI, Indonesia - The UN climate conference met strong opposition Thursday from a team of over 100 prominent international scientists, who warned the UN, that attempting to control the Earth's climate was "ultimately futile."

The scientists, many of whom are current and former UN IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) scientists, released an open letter to the UN Secretary-General questioning the scientific basis for climate fears and the UN's so-called "solutions."

"Attempts to prevent global climate change from occurring are ultimately futile, and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources that would be better spent on humanity's real and pressing problems," the letter signed by the scientists read. The December 13 letter was released to the public late Thursday. (LINK)

The letter was signed by renowned scientists such as Dr. Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists; Dr. Reid Bryson, dubbed the "Father of Meteorology"; Atmospheric pioneer Dr. Hendrik Tennekes, formerly of the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute; MIT atmospheric scientist Dr. Richard Lindzen; UN scientist Dr. Vincent Gray of New Zealand; French climatologist Dr. Marcel Leroux of the University Jean Moulin; World authority on sea level Dr. Nils-Axel Morner of Stockholm University; Physicist Dr. Freeman Dyson of Princeton University; Physicist Dr. Zbigniew Jaworowski, chairman of the Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection in Poland; Paleoclimatologist Dr. Robert M. Carter of Australia; Former UN IPCC reviewer Geologist/Geochemist Dr. Tom V. Segalstad, head of the Geological Museum in Norway; and Dr. Edward J. Wegman, of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.

"It is not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages. Geological, archaeological, oral and written histories all attest to the dramatic challenges posed to past societies from unanticipated changes in temperature, precipitation, winds and other climatic variables," the scientists wrote.

"In stark contrast to the often repeated assertion that the science of climate change is 'settled,' significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming," the open letter added. ***[EPW Blog Note: To read about the latest peer-reviewed research debunking man-made climate fears, see: New Peer-Reviewed Scientific Studies Chill Global Warming Fears - LINK - & New Peer-Reviewed Study Finds: "Warming is naturally caused and shows no human influence." (LINK) - For a detailed analysis of how "consensus" has been promoted, see: Debunking The So-Called "Consensus" On Global Warming - LINK]***

The scientists' letter continued: "The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued increasingly alarming conclusions about the climatic influences of human-produced CO2, a non-polluting gas that is essential to plant photosynthesis. While we understand the evidence that has led them to view CO2 emissions as harmful, the IPCC's conclusions are quite inadequate as justification for implementing policies that will markedly diminish future prosperity. In particular, it is not established that it is possible to significantly alter global climate through cuts in human greenhouse gas emissions."

"The IPCC Summaries for Policy Makers are the most widely read IPCC reports amongst politicians and non-scientists and are the basis for most climate change policy formulation. Yet these Summaries are prepared by a relatively small core writing team with the final drafts approved line-by-line by government - representatives. The great majority of IPCC contributors and reviewers, and the tens of thousands of other scientists who are qualified to comment on these matters, are not involved in the preparation of these documents. The summaries therefore cannot properly be represented as a consensus view among experts," the letter added. ***[EPW Note: Only 52***

scientists participated in the UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers in April 2007, according to the Associated Press. - LINK - An analysis by Australian climate researcher John Mclean in 2007 found the UN IPCC peer-review process to be "an illusion." LINK]

# # #

Complete Letter with all signatories - As published in Canada's National Post on December 13, 2007:

The National Post

Don't Fight, Adapt; We Should Give Up Futile Attempts to Combat Climate Change

Dec. 13, 2007

http://www.nationalpost.com/news/story.html?id=164002

Key Quote from Scientists' Letter to UN:
"Attempts to prevent global climate change from occurring are ultimately futile, and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources that would be better spent on humanity's real and pressing problems."

His Excellency
Ban Ki-MoonSecretary-General,
United Nations New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Secretary-General,

Re: UN climate conference taking the World in entirely the wrong direction

It is not possible to stop climate change, a natural phenomenon that has affected humanity through the ages. Geological, archaeological, oral and written histories all attest to the dramatic challenges posed to past societies from unanticipated changes in temperature, precipitation, winds and other climatic variables. We therefore need to equip nations to become resilient to the full range of these natural phenomena by promoting economic growth and wealth generation.

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued increasingly alarming conclusions about the climatic influences of human-produced CO2, a non-polluting gas that is essential to plant photosynthesis. While we understand the evidence that has led them to view CO2 emissions as harmful, the IPCC's conclusions are quite inadequate as justification for implementing policies that will markedly diminish future prosperity. In particular, it is not established that it is possible to significantly alter global climate through cuts in human greenhouse gas emissions. On top of which, because attempts to cut emissions will slow development, the current UN approach of CO2 reduction is likely to increase human suffering from future climate change rather than to decrease it.

The IPCC Summaries for Policy Makers are the most widely read IPCC reports amongst politicians and non-scientists and are the basis for most climate change policy formulation. Yet these Summaries are prepared by a relatively small core writing team with the final drafts approved line-by-line by government - representatives. The great majority of IPCC contributors and reviewers, and the tens of thousands of other scientists who are qualified to comment on these matters, are not involved in the preparation of these documents. The summaries therefore cannot properly be represented as a consensus view among experts.

Contrary to the impression left by the IPCC Summary reports:

*Recent observations of phenomena such as glacial retreats, sea-level rise and the migration of temperature-sensitive species are not evidence for abnormal climate change, for none of these changes has been shown to lie outside the bounds of known natural variability.

*The average rate of warming of 0.1 to 0. 2 degrees Celsius per decade recorded by satellites during the late 20th century falls within known natural rates of warming and cooling over the last 10,000 years.

*Leading scientists, including some senior IPCC representatives, acknowledge that today's computer models cannot predict climate. Consistent with this, and despite computer projections of temperature rises, there has been no net global warming since 1998. That the current temperature plateau follows a late 20th-century period of warming is consistent with the continuation today of natural multi-decadal or millennial climate cycling.

In stark contrast to the often repeated assertion that the science of climate change is "settled," significant new peer-reviewed research has cast even more doubt on the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused global warming. But because IPCC working groups were generally instructed (http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/wg1_timetable_2006-08-14.pdf) to consider work published only through May, 2005, these important findings are not included in

their reports; i.e., the IPCC assessment reports are already materially outdated.

The UN climate conference in Bali has been planned to take the world along a path of severe CO2 restrictions, ignoring the lessons apparent from the failure of the Kyoto Protocol, the chaotic nature of the European CO2 trading market, and the ineffectiveness of other costly initiatives to curb greenhouse gas emissions. Balanced cost/benefit analyses provide no support for the introduction of global measures to cap and reduce energy consumption for the purpose of restricting CO2 emissions. Furthermore, it is irrational to apply the "precautionary principle" because many scientists recognize that both climatic coolings and warmings are realistic possibilities over the medium-term future.

The current UN focus on "fighting climate change," as illustrated in the Nov. 27 UN Development Programme's Human Development Report, is distracting governments from adapting to the threat of inevitable natural climate changes, whatever forms they may take. National and international planning for such changes is needed, with a focus on helping our most vulnerable citizens adapt to conditions that lie ahead. Attempts to prevent global climate change from occurring are ultimately futile, and constitute a tragic misallocation of resources that would be better spent on humanity's real and pressing problems.

Yours faithfully,

The following are signatories to the Dec. 13th letter to the Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations on the UN Climate conference in Bali [Link to List of signatories]:

Don Aitkin, PhD, Professor, social scientist, retired vice-chancellor and president, University of Canberra, Australia

William J.R. Alexander, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Civil and Biosystems Engineering, University of Pretoria, South Africa; Member, UN Scientific and Technical Committee on Natural Disasters, 1994-2000

Bjarne Andresen, PhD, physicist, Professor, The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Geoff L. Austin, PhD, FNZIP, FRSNZ, Professor, Dept. of Physics, University of Auckland, New Zealand

Timothy F. Ball, PhD, environmental consultant, former climatology professor, University of Winnipeg

Ernst-Georg Beck, Dipl. Biol., Biologist, Merian-Schule Freiburg, Germany

Sonja A. Boehmer-Christiansen, PhD, Reader, Dept. of Geography, Hull University, U.K.; Editor, Energy & Environment journal

Chris C. Borel, PhD, remote sensing scientist, U.S.

Reid A. Bryson, PhD, DSc, DEngr, UNE P. Global 500 Laureate; Senior Scientist, Center for Climatic Research; Emeritus Professor of Meteorology, of Geography, and of Environmental Studies, University of Wisconsin

Dan Carruthers, M.Sc., wildlife biology consultant specializing in animal ecology in Arctic and Subarctic regions, Alberta

R.M. Carter, PhD, Professor, Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia
Ian D. Clark, PhD, Professor, isotope hydrogeology and paleoclimatology, Dept. of Earth Sciences, University of Ottawa

Richard S. Courtney, PhD, climate and atmospheric science consultant, IPCC expert reviewer, U.K.

Willem de Lange, PhD, Dept. of Earth and Ocean Sciences, School of Science and Engineering, Waikato University, New Zealand

David Deming, PhD (Geophysics), Associate Professor, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Oklahoma

Freeman J. Dyson, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Physics, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.J.

Don J. Easterbrook, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Geology, Western Washington University

Lance Endersbee, Emeritus Professor, former dean of Engineering and Pro-Vice Chancellor of Monash University, Australia

Hans Erren, Doctorandus, geophysicist and climate specialist, Sittard, The Netherlands

Robert H. Essenhigh, PhD, E.G. Bailey Professor of Energy Conversion, Dept. of Mechanical Engineering, The Ohio State University

Christopher Essex, PhD, Professor of Applied Mathematics and Associate Director of the Program in Theoretical Physics, University of Western Ontario

David Evans, PhD, mathematician, carbon accountant, computer and electrical engineer and head of 'Science Speak,' Australia

William Evans, PhD, editor, American Midland Naturalist; Dept. of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame

Stewart Franks, PhD, Professor, Hydroclimatologist, University of Newcastle, Australia

R. W. Gauldie, PhD, Research Professor, Hawai'i Institute of Geophysics and Planetology, School of Ocean Earth Sciences and Technology, University of Hawai'i at Manoa

Lee C. Gerhard, PhD, Senior Scientist Emeritus, University of Kansas; former director and state geologist, Kansas Geological Survey

Gerhard Gerlich, Professor for Mathematical and Theoretical Physics, Institut für Mathematische Physik der TU Braunschweig, Germany

Albrecht Glatzle, PhD, sc.agr., Agro-Biologist and Gerente ejecutivo, INTTAS, Paraguay

Fred Goldberg, PhD, Adjunct Professor, Royal Institute of Technology, Mechanical Engineering, Stockholm, Sweden

Vincent Gray, PhD, expert reviewer for the IPCC and author of The Greenhouse Delusion: A Critique of 'Climate Change 2001, Wellington, New Zealand

William M. Gray, Professor Emeritus, Dept. of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State University and Head of the Tropical Meteorology Project

Howard Hayden, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of Connecticut

Louis Hissink MSc, M.A.I.G., editor, AIG News, and consulting geologist, Perth, Western Australia

Craig D. Idso, PhD, Chairman, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Arizona

Sherwood B. Idso, PhD, President, Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, AZ, USA

Andrei Illarionov, PhD, Senior Fellow, Center for Global Liberty and Prosperity; founder and director of the Institute of Economic Analysis

Zbigniew Jaworowski, PhD, physicist, Chairman - Scientific Council of Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection, Warsaw, Poland

Jon Jenkins, PhD, MD, computer modelling - virology, NSW, Australia

Wibjorn Karlen, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Dept. of Physical Geography and Quaternary Geology, Stockholm University, Sweden

Olavi Kärner, Ph.D., Research Associate, Dept. of Atmospheric Physics, Institute of Astrophysics and Atmospheric Physics, Toravere, Estonia

Joel M. Kauffman, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry, University of the Sciences in Philadelphia

David Kear, PhD, FRSNZ, CMG, geologist, former Director-General of NZ Dept. of Scientific & Industrial Research, New Zealand

Madhav Khandekar, PhD, former research scientist, Environment Canada; editor, Climate Research (2003-05); editorial board member, Natural Hazards; IPCC expert reviewer 2007

William Kininmonth M.Sc., M.Admin., former head of Australia's National Climate Centre and a consultant to the World Meteorological organization's Commission for Climatology

Jan J.H. Kop, MSc Ceng FICE (Civil Engineer Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers), Emeritus Prof. of Public Health Engineering, Technical University Delft, The Netherlands

Prof. R.W.J. Kouffeld, Emeritus Professor, Energy Conversion, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Salomon Kroonenberg, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Geotechnology, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Hans H.J. Labohm, PhD, economist, former advisor to the executive board, Clingendael Institute (The

Netherlands Institute of International Relations), The Netherlands

The Rt. Hon. Lord Lawson of Blaby, economist; Chairman of the Central Europe Trust; former Chancellor of the Exchequer, U.K.

Douglas Leahey, PhD, meteorologist and air-quality consultant, Calgary

David R. Legates, PhD, Director, Center for Climatic Research, University of Delaware

Marcel Leroux, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Climatology, University of Lyon, France; former director of Laboratory of Climatology, Risks and Environment, CNRS

Bryan Leyland, International Climate Science Coalition, consultant and power engineer, Auckland, New Zealand

William Lindqvist, PhD, independent consulting geologist, Calif.

Richard S. Lindzen, PhD, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology, Dept. of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

A.J. Tom van Loon, PhD, Professor of Geology (Quaternary Geology), Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznan, Poland; former President of the European Association of Science Editors

Anthony R. Lupo, PhD, Associate Professor of Atmospheric Science, Dept. of Soil, Environmental, and Atmospheric Science, University of Missouri-Columbia

Richard Mackey, PhD, Statistician, Australia

Horst Malberg, PhD, Professor for Meteorology and Climatology, Institut für Meteorologie, Berlin, Germany

John Maunder, PhD, Climatologist, former President of the Commission for Climatology of the World Meteorological Organization (89-97), New Zealand

Alister McFarquhar, PhD, international economy, Downing College, Cambridge, U.K.

Ross McKitrick, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Economics, University of Guelph

John McLean, climate data analyst, computer scientist, Australia

Owen McShane, PhD, economist, head of the International Climate Science Coalition; Director, Centre for Resource Management Studies, New Zealand

Fred Michel, PhD, Director, Institute of Environmental Sciences and Associate Professor of Earth Sciences, Carleton University

Frank Milne, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Economics, Queen's University

Asmunn Moene, PhD, former head of the Forecasting Centre, Meteorological Institute, Norway

Alan Moran, PhD, Energy Economist, Director of the IPA's Deregulation Unit, Australia

Nils-Axel Morner, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Paleogeophysics & Geodynamics, Stockholm University, Sweden

Lubos Motl, PhD, Physicist, former Harvard string theorist, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

John Nicol, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Physics, James Cook University, Australia

David Nowell, M.Sc., Fellow of the Royal Meteorological Society, former chairman of the NATO Meteorological Group, Ottawa

James J. O'Brien, PhD, Professor Emeritus, Meteorology and Oceanography, Florida State University

Cliff Ollier, PhD, Professor Emeritus (Geology), Research Fellow, University of Western Australia

Garth W. Paltridge, PhD, atmospheric physicist, Emeritus Professor and former Director of the Institute of Antarctic and Southern Ocean Studies, University of Tasmania, Australia

R. Timothy Patterson, PhD, Professor, Dept. of Earth Sciences (paleoclimatology), Carleton University

Al Pekarek, PhD, Associate Professor of Geology, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences Dept., St. Cloud State University, Minnesota

Ian Plimer, PhD, Professor of Geology, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide and Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences, University of Melbourne, Australia

Brian Pratt, PhD, Professor of Geology, Sedimentology, University of Saskatchewan

Harry N.A. Priem, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Planetary Geology and Isotope Geophysics, Utrecht University; former director of the Netherlands Institute for Isotope Geosciences

Alex Robson, PhD, Economics, Australian National University Colonel F.P.M. Rombouts, Branch Chief - Safety, Quality and Environment, Royal Netherland Air Force

R.G. Roper, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Sciences, School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Georgia Institute of Technology

Arthur Rorsch, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Molecular Genetics, Leiden University, The Netherlands

Rob Scagel, M.Sc., forest microclimate specialist, principal consultant, Pacific Phytometric Consultants, B.C.

Tom V. Segalstad, PhD, (Geology/Geochemistry), Head of the Geological Museum and Associate Professor of Resource and Environmental Geology, University of Oslo, Norway

Gary D. Sharp, PhD, Center for Climate/Ocean Resources Study, Salinas, CA

S. Fred Singer, PhD, Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia and former director Weather Satellite Service

L. Graham Smith, PhD, Associate Professor, Dept. of Geography, University of Western Ontario

Roy W. Spencer, PhD, climatologist, Principal Research Scientist, Earth System Science Center, The University of Alabama, Huntsville

Peter Stilbs, TeknD, Professor of Physical Chemistry, Research Leader, School of Chemical Science and Engineering, KTH (Royal Institute of Technology), Stockholm, Sweden

Hendrik Tennekes, PhD, former director of research, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute

Dick Thoenes, PhD, Emeritus Professor of Chemical Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Brian G Valentine, PhD, PE (Chem.), Technology Manager - Industrial Energy Efficiency, Adjunct Associate Professor of Engineering Science, University of Maryland at College Park; Dept of Energy, Washington, DC

Gerrit J. van der Lingen, PhD, geologist and paleoclimatologist, climate change consultant, Geoscience Research and Investigations, New Zealand

Len Walker, PhD, Power Engineering, Australia

Edward J. Wegman, PhD, Department of Computational and Data Sciences, George Mason University, Virginia

Stephan Wilksch, PhD, Professor for Innovation and Technology Management, Production Management and Logistics, University of Technolgy and Economics Berlin, Germany

Boris Winterhalter, PhD, senior marine researcher (retired), Geological Survey of Finland, former professor in marine geology, University of Helsinki, Finland

David E. Wojick, PhD, P.Eng., energy consultant, Virginia

Raphael Wust, PhD, Lecturer, Marine Geology/Sedimentology, James Cook University, Australia

A. Zichichi, PhD, President of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, Switzerland; Emeritus Professor of Advanced Physics, University of Bologna, Italy

# # #

Related Links:

Skeptical Scientists Urge World To ‘Have the Courage to Do Nothing' At UN Conference

Debunking The So-Called 'Consensus' On Global Warming

New UN Children's Book Promotes Global Warming Fears to Kids (11-13-2006)

Scientists Counter AP Article Promoting Computer Model Climate Fears

New Peer-Reviewed Scientific Studies Chill Global Warming Fears

Newsweek Editor Calls Mag's Global Warming 'Deniers' Article 'Highly Contrived'

Newsweek's Climate Editorial Screed Violates Basic Standards of Journalism

Latest Scientific Studies Refute Fears of Greenland Melt

EPA to Probe E-mail Threatening to ‘Destroy' Career of Climate Skeptic

Prominent Scientists Reverse Belief in Man-made Global Warming - Now Skeptics

Senator Inhofe declares climate momentum shifting away from Gore (The Politico op ed)

Scientific Smackdown: Skeptics Voted The Clear Winners Against Global Warming Believers in Heated NYC Debate

Global Warming on Mars & Cosmic Ray Research Are Shattering Media Driven "Consensus'

Global Warming: The Momentum has Shifted to Climate Skeptics

Prominent French Scientist Reverses Belief in Global Warming - Now a Skeptic

Top Israeli Astrophysicist Recants His Belief in Manmade Global Warming - Now Says Sun Biggest Factor in Warming

Warming On Jupiter, Mars, Pluto, Neptune's Moon & Earth Linked to Increased Solar Activity, Scientists Say

Panel of Broadcast Meteorologists Reject Man-Made Global Warming Fears- Claim 95% of Weathermen Skeptical

MIT Climate Scientist Calls Fears of Global Warming 'Silly' - Equates Concerns to ‘Little Kids' Attempting to "Scare Each Other"

Weather Channel TV Host Goes 'Political'- Stars in Global Warming Film Accusing U.S. Government of ‘Criminal Neglect'

Weather Channel Climate Expert Calls for Decertifying Global Warming Skeptics

ABC-TV Meteorologist: I Don't Know A Single Weatherman Who Believes 'Man-Made Global Warming Hype'

The Weather Channel Climate Expert Refuses to Retract Call for Decertification for Global Warming Skeptics

Senator Inhofe Announces Public Release Of "Skeptic's Guide To Debunking Global Warming"