

Nils Axel-Morner

No increase in sea level rise; some falling in sea levels around Maldives, Tuvalu, Bangladesh, even Venice

If sea level were rising, earth rotation would be slowing, but it's not.

Bob Carter, NZ

Sea level has fallen around Australia over last 6000 years, falling about 1-1.5 meters

In northern Scandinavia, sea level was 20-30m higher 5000 years ago, due to melting of ice cap allowing land to rise.

In using IPCC advice to set their policies, national governments are negligent and fail utterly to do their duty to their people.

Fred Goldberg, Stockholm

"Icebergs are growing scarcer and in some places the seals are finding the water too hot" US Weather bureau 1922

2007 had unusual strong winds and currents pushing ice together, and even out of arctic. Then ice increased

Ice disappeared in Canadian arctic in 1877

Ice was 1m thicker in 2009 than in 2008

Predict next winter will be colder than this winter

Don Easterbrook, West Washington Univ

“We have begun global cooling which I predicted in 1998.”

Natural global warming much more intense than modern warming has occurred many times in the geologic past without CO2 change

From about 10K years ago to about 3K years ago, planet was consistently warmer than now

Briffa and man tried to argue the medieval warm period didn't happen despite nearly 500 peer-reviewed papers about them

Three potential scenarios for global cooling...

Moderate, like 1945-77

1880-1915

Dalton min 1790-1820 – “seem to be heading for that based on solar activity”

Maunder min – return to Little Ice Age

return to full ice age

Twice as many people are killed by extreme cold as by extreme heat

We'll have reduction in food production and increase in energy demands

-----

Oregon petition project founder didn't come because he's decided to run for Congress.

---

James Taylor:

Only two of dozens of pro-AGW scientists invited agreed to come to conference.

Dr. Richard Lindzen:

Doubling CO2 would only contribute 1 degree C. All IPCC models predict more because they assume positive feedbacks.

If one assumes all warming over the past century is due to AG forcing, then the derived sensitivity of the climate to a doubling of CO2 is less than 1C

Higher sensitivity of existing models is made consistent with observed warming by invoking unknown addition negative forcings from aerosols and solar variability as arbitrary adjustments.

Even if it were true that models are our only tool, it would only be true if models were objective and not arbitrarily adjusted. But models are hardly our only tool. Models do show why they get the results they get.

Should be suspicious of presentation of alarm because of:

Claim of 'incontrovertibility'

Arguing from authority instead of scientific reasoning and data or even elementary logic

Use of term 'global warming' without either definition or quantification

Identification of complex phenomena with multiple causes as based on single cause

Conflation of climate change with AGW

The claims that earth has been warming and that man's activities have contributed to warming are trivially true and essentially meaningless in terms of alarm.

Important are 1 magnitude of warming and 2 relation of warming to possibility of future catastrophe

Cannot determine sensitivity of CO<sub>2</sub> change by assuming you know the cause. If the cause isn't what you assume it yields infinite sensitivity. This problem infects most attempts to infer climate sensitivity from paleoclimate data

Models cannot be tested by comparing models with models.

It's essential to know sensitivity...

Satellite data is used to calculate negative feedback but models all have positive feedbacks.

"skepticism" implies doubts about a plausible proposition. Current global warming alarm hardly represents a plausible proposition. Twenty years of repetition and escalation of claims does not make it more plausible. Quite the contrary. The failure to improve the case over 20 years makes the case even less plausible as does the evidence from climategate and other instances of overt cheating.

Science has changed to “programmatic” which means that when you get the answer, you end the program. So we have a structure in science that tends to cause scientists to want to avoid getting answers; it’s an inherently corrupting structure.

---

(scientists asking McKittrick and McIntyre to sign Mann-made global warming hockey sticks.

---

Joe D’Aleo

Phil Jones said that his surface temp data are in such disarray they probably cannot be verified or replicated.

75% of stations dropped out around 1990, missing data increased tenfold after 1990

Urban adjustment not used or totally inadequate

Adjustments made to data

We still say we can predict temps to a tenth of a degree

Moscow’s Institute for econ analysis said that Hadley center had used data from only 25% of available stations leaving 40% of Russian territory uncovered, creating 0.64C greater warming

Stations in Canada went from 600 to less than 50.

Low altitude went up in number, high altitude almost eliminated

Land use change accounts for half of all warming, esp. urban heat island effect. Rural locations far less warming than city locations.

Rome’s airport weather station is right behind jet takeoff.

Cooling trend of .7 turned into warming trend of 1.2 at Darwin, AU after data adjustment

NASA GISS: 20% of data changed 16 times in 2.5 years ending 2007

NOAA dropped satellite data which caused .24C increase in ocean temp measurements and .15 in land/sea avg, then said ocean was warmest ever.

Manmade warming is real, but the men are in East Anglia, Asheville and NY City.

Global data bases are seriously flawed and can no longer be trusted to assess climate trends...

NOAA Administrator Jane Lubcenco said Urgent and unprecedented environmental and social changes challenge scientists to define a new social contract. This contract represents a commitment on the part of all scientists to devote their energies and talents to the most pressing problems of the day, in proportion to their importance, in exchange for public funding.

---

Fred Singer

About "hide the decline"

1920s and 1930s increase is "genuine" and 1975-1998 is not genuine

US record doesn't show nearly the increase that global record shows, perhaps because of better measurement

Airports were the stations most likely to stay working...maybe we're mostly seeing temp increase at airports.

Satellite data only shows very slight increase during this time.

Many reasons to doubt recent increase:

Can't find any data that show proxy data that show recent increase but lots of data that show 1930s increase

No warming in troposphere

Sea surface temp warming may be artifact

Proxy data don't support wmg

Real investigation of SFC data is still outstanding. Need to audit selection of stations and adjustments made to temp records.

Perhaps that's what's really being hidden in climategate

Perhaps mann stopped proxy record in 1979 and then grafted on instrumental record.

---

Ross McKittrick

Global avg co2 emission is basically static since 1970 but ipcc scenarios which track old data fairly well include distributions which go to nearly triple historical emissions.

---

Bill Gray: models assume that relative humidity does not change when temp increases.

---

Jim Johnston:

Based on elasticity of demand formulas for oil, predicts that increase in energy prices could be 2.5 times the percentage reduction in greenhouse gases.

Might not go up that much because of trading/regulation:

Current system denies property right status for allowances

FERC also has power for "just and reasonable" regulation of electricity rates.

---

Chris de Freitas, U of Auckland

Satellite and balloon data make investigation of ENSO (el nino southern oscillation) more accurate.

Rationale: enso is linked to global atmospheric circulation, thus will affect Mean Global Temp (MGT)

normal is clockwise circulation in pacific.

Ocean holds 1500 times more energy than atmosphere

When northern west-to-east "Walker circulation" breaks down, pattern turns into El Nino

Graph of global mean temp shifted 7 months overlaid on southern oscillation index shows "uncanny correlation", leaving "little room for anything else like CO2 or variation in solar activity."

---

Gerald Marsh, Argonne Nat'l Lab (retired) physicist

Gemarsh.com

---

Andrei Illarioneov, pres of institute for econ analysis in Moscow

CRU used 121 sites in Russia but there are 476 sites available. (meteo.ru)

40% of Russian territory not covered by hadcrut3

Turns out that the data itself is very little different between 121 and 476. Indeed just using 4 stations give a similar chart of temp anomaly.

But what are those 121,37,12, and 4 stations that they are able to offset all the rest?

They are the oldest stations, established before 1859 and they are in large urban centers

So it's not the data that's the problem, it's the methodology

Weather stations where no permanent pop shows -.36 change

Less than 10K people, -.26.

10K-50K, +.17, 50K-300K +.23, more than 300K +.26

Temp increase correlates very well to population increase

If Russian temp increase of 1.29 over century in Russia, then what does 0.74 increase in global temp mean?

---