

4 February 2007

Mr. Glenn Beck
The Glenn Beck Program
CNN
me@glenbeck.com
www.glenbeck.com
+001-212-981-5239

Suggestions for a series: **The Kyoto Premise (KP): the scientists have no clothes**

I'm glad to see that in the USA people can still have programs like yours. I am doubly glad that you have taken up the BIG challenge of questioning the:

"Kyoto Premise": the presumption that man-made GreenHouse Gas (GHG) emissions [have, are, and/or will have] a catastrophic impact on the environment and mankind."

It's important to "fix" that definition in the public's mind - even now there are shifts in the politically correct winds (*Blowing in the wind*, see the program outline) and key promoters of the Kyoto Premise ("Kyotoists") are weaseling their way into slightly different positions. Don't let them. The phrase above is a good representation of the message that has persistently misled the American public for 10 or 20 years. My opinion is that:

"The Kyoto Premise is a "fraud" by government and academic research scientists, amplified by government policy analysts, and taken to a lunatic scream by environmentalists."

"The real issue behind the Kyoto Premise has nothing to do with the climate at all. The real issue is: How do you explain the genesis and propagation of [dysfunctional and/or dishonest and/or delinquent] thinking by scientists, between scientists, and within scientific institutions and funding agencies."

That's an exaggeration of course, but completely in keeping with the style and rhetoric of many scientists who are Kyotoist (eg. it's the oil companies, it's the capitalist system...), so it is appropriate that they get a dose of their own medicine.

"It's not that we know what the answer is, it's really that we don't know what the answer is, and some of us don't even know that."

(I tried to do a Yogi Berra there, but it didn't work...) Repeated claims that very few scientists question the KP are greatly exaggerated, but pointless: every great issue starts with one or a very few people disagreeing with the crushing majority. Consensus isn't a way to conclude right and wrong in science, any more than in a court of law.

My recommendation is that you mount a 5-emission series on climate change, two emissions per week,

and each portion of the series taking half of the show time. The themes would be recapitulated on each emission, with Web-based support. An outline is attached to this letter.

I don't usually like cute sayings and captions. But this isn't a question of reason nor logic. The environmentalists and their brethren "healthists" have clearly shown that pretty pictures, cute sayings, very little data, and "zero dimensional" analysis carry the majority consensus. We human beings vastly over-rate our mastery of logic and rational thinking, and most scientists are really not much different in a general sense. I think the battle will be won on a the basis of the politically correct fashion-of-the-day, but I also think that we should not ourselves lose a firm grounding in science, in constant questioning and revision of our thinking, and of always retaining multiple hypothesis, and a knowledge of the history of the details and trends of science in the area (there are many, many ghosts in the closet).

I'm neither a climate change expert nor an expert on putting together TV series. But I do hope that something like this gets off the ground.

*"Most people are believers.
There are very, very few critical thinkers.
Most scientists are like most people."*

Canada is lucky to have some of the world's leading climate realists. On the other hand, we've got people like David Suzuki, too. Sucks.

I have a great deal of confidence that the forthcoming UN-IPCC "Fourth Assesment Report" on climate change will follow in the grand UN tradition and the previous Assessment Reports on climate change: beautifully packaged, hyperbolically hyped, politically correct, counter-productive nonsense that the taxpayer for some reason has to support. I sure hope that you can do something about this. (Maybe the rest of us too..., I'd certainly be willing to help).

Mr. Bill Howell
IJCNN07 Orlando Publicity Chair www.ijcnn2007.org
Project Manager: Facilities & Special Projects
Mining & Mineral Sciences Laboratories, Natural Resources Canada, Ottawa (on "leave")
1-403-889-6792 Bill@BillHowell.ca www.BillHowell.ca
P.O. Box 2387 Station M, Calgary, Alberta T2P 3C1

P.S. Obviously this theme and thinking DOES'T fit with the science nor the policy of federal government of Canada, neither did my recommendations to review the fundamental science (and I would like to be a part of it), nor did I as an employee. I am currently looking for a real career in Calgary.

Outline of a 5-half-night series on:

The Kyoto Premise: the scientists aren't wearing any clothes

1. Climate Change - 4 billion years old, but news to Kyotoists

"Climate change has been going on for 4 billion years, climate change is happening right now, and the climate will continue to change for billions of years into the future.

Moreover, natural changes in the climate far exceed in magnitude and rapidity anything being discussed by the Kyotoists."

Don Quixote approach to science: Often you hear that skeptics try to show that the temperature hasn't been rising. Actually, skeptics are THE leading group that has always vocalized the natural, ongoing variations in temperature. As for temperature changes, using the same anecdotal approach as the Kyotoists, they've clearly shown ongoing temperature declines from 1930 on in many regions.

Where most scientists fail is to distinguish between Climate Change, global warming as a very short term (on the order of hundreds of years) trend and a small part of Climate Change, and the Kyoto Premise, a very poorly supported hypothesis, as we'll see during the series.

2. GreenHouse Gas (GHG) effect: a lot of hot vapour, LITERALLY

It has been known for 150 to 200 years that the vastly dominant GHG is water vapour, something that I've never seen seriously contested. Estimates range from 90 to 99% of the effect, but that needs to be clarified. Furthermore, although CO₂ concentrations are largely a function of temperature (look more closely at the EPICA and Vostok ice core data), so is water vapour, and with the phase changes is probably far, far more variable than CO₂. (this has to be checked) The commonly-cited 5 Celsius rise per doubling of [CO₂] is CRAP, and I'll stand by that statement - it's most likely due to changes in water vapour concentration and water cycle!!

Climate is substantially a giant water cycle - temperature really doesn't vary much at all, and we all intuitively know that (even day/night temperature swings go far beyond the 150 years average rise in global temperature (0.6 to 0.9 Celsius if I remember correctly).

In the distant past, CO₂ concentrations were 5 to 50 TIMES higher (geologic data inputs to the Geocarb model), and there were still occasional glaciation periods during this period of time. Furthermore, while short term variations of [CO₂] were mostly due to temperature-mediated processes (ocean reservoir and carbonate deposition)

Scientists have consistently, persistently misled the public about this in the way they've presented the issue. In my view, this is the greatest science fraud in history.

3. The REAL drivers of climate: Astronomy and Geology

It currently looks like the interaction of galactic rays with the sun-Earth magnetic field, plus variations in solar irradiance are the dominant driver of short -to-mid-term climate (1 to 10,000 years very rough), while astronomical Milankovic cycles drive 100,000 to 1 million year time periods. (I may be off a bit

here.) CO2 just doesn't correlate, other than as a function of temperature, and probably in the last 20 to 50 years as a function of man-made CO2 emissions.

Perhaps yet another step in the direction of computers dominating over human beings is provided by the scientists running the General Circulation Models. Although work in this direction is essential, it seems that the scientists doing it are puppets of their own creation. Do they understand that we understand what fudging can do for computer programs? We may need a complete replacement of that whole scientific population. Perhaps the current scientists could work on computer games and Video Lottery Terminals.

4. **The Precautionary Principle: Betrayed by modern scientists**

How come nobody seems to understand the first simple consequences of the Precautionary Principle. What are we doing to prepare for Global Cooling? Believe the solar physicists, starting with sunspot cycle 25 in ~2020, that may really be the issue, but that's a bit of a crap shot. When you make decisions away from scientific certainty, then the possible situations explode exponentially and rapidly would require actions that defeat one another (we already see this - wind mills for sustainable energy versus Not-In-My back yard, environmentalists now pro-nuclear just because of the KP, not that they had ANY basis in the past...).

It's clear that Climate Change is a complex subject. It's also clear that the vast majority of scientists fail at the first few simple steps at the very beginning (eg session 1 above, the precautionary principle etc etc). There is absolutely no reason to have any confidence on the "scientific consensus" ion

5. **Conclusion and Wrap-Up: What to do**

In general, we need to promote a diversity of creative scientific thinking and viewpoints instead of the catastrophe of consensus. We clearly have to remove politically-correct, fashion-oriented, and policy types from the management and leadership of science.

- Reduce funding to the CO2 science losers, to at most 1/10 of the climate change funding
- Reallocate at least 1/3 to 1/2 of the climate change funding to alternative viewpoints (especially those that can actually explain climate change!!) - astronomy, geology, biology. Solar physics and geo-magnetics in particular would have huge real benefits for mankind other than just climate science. They also require a huge amount of \$\$.
- Continue to fund "Impacts and Adaptation", possibly 1/4 to 1/3 of the total, but shifting most of that funding to alternate, non-government organisations of a variety of backgrounds and viewpoints. The climate's going to change anyways, but we don't want to throw away funding on the current politically-correct I&A research institutes and funding groups.
- Trash the whole idea of "Chief scientists", this always was an abomination.

Many scientists are frustrated that the public isn't catching on to climate change. I suggest that they have. Scientists have lied to them too many times before...

That's enough for now - I'm supposed to be looking for a job in Calgary, so this is night-time/ week-end stuff for me.

enddoc