

7 Shorter Avenue,  
Beverly Hills 2209  
November 29, 2012  
Email: jim.hawes@bigpond.com

Mr Ben Cubby,  
Environment Editor,  
Sydney Morning Herald,  
GPO Box 506,  
Sydney 2001

Dear Mr Cubby,

I am always very interested in your SMH articles – particularly those related to the anthropogenic climate change hypothesis. However, I think you are inclined to favour the 'alarmist' side of the story and neglect the views/arguments of the growing number of sceptics within the informed community. I hope my letter below might influence you to better balance your treatment of the topic.

#### WHY I AM SCEPTICAL ABOUT THE ANTHROPOGENIC CLIMATE CHANGE HYPOTHESIS

My career path has included more than 25 years teaching science at Secondary and Tertiary levels. I have taught all four major science disciplines (Physics, Chemistry, Biology and Geology to HSC level at High School level as well as Physics, Chemistry and General Science at undergraduate Level in Universities and TAFE Colleges).

In the mid nineties, I was involved as a co-author of a school science textbook dealing with Environmental Issues. As part of that task, I was commissioned to prepare a chapter entitled "Global Warming". At that time, I had no reason to doubt that the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis was based on sound scientific evidence.

However, my literature search failed to find any empirical evidence (i.e. evidence based on real life observations or experiments) which demonstrated that emissions of carbon dioxide, methane or other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere were the main drivers behind the mild global warming which had been occurring (unevenly) during the twentieth century. It seemed that the hypothesis had assumed the status of a fact, had become an unchallenged assumption adopted by many climatologists and then had been fed as a 'given' into computer modelling of future climate change and the possible effects of those changes.

Surprised by the lack of supportive evidence for a greenhouse gas / global warming hypothesis, I began to look more closely at what real world science was saying about the effects of rising carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere. In the fifteen years since my 'enlightenment', I have discovered that:

1. Carbon dioxide levels increased steadily throughout the twentieth century and early twenty first century from 280 ppm to 390 ppm.
2. Atmospheric carbon dioxide levels have been many times higher in the past.
3. Average global temperatures rose until 1940 then fell to 1975 then rose again until 1998 and then levelled until the present (actually a cooling trend in recent years).
4. Clearly, points 1 and 3 show that the correlation between rising CO2 levels and global temperatures in recent times is very poor.
5. Greenhouse gas warming operates on a logarithmic scale which means that carbon dioxide is already doing almost all the warming it can do regardless of increasing levels in the atmosphere.

6. Ice core evidence has become available which shows that warm periods in the earth's history PRECEDED rises in CO<sub>2</sub> levels by, on average, a period of 800 years. This data suggests that global warming causes CO<sub>2</sub> increases rather than the reverse.
7. 'Hotspots' in the troposphere, which climate models predict would characterise greenhouse gas forcing of atmospheric temperature increases, have not been detected by radiosonde measurements (detectors in weather balloons).
8. Dramatic sea level rises and extreme weather events predicted by computer models have not eventuated.
9. Numerous studies prove that the health and growth rates of native plants and agricultural crops are enhanced by higher levels of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

As a result of the above studies (and others), I shifted in my thinking from being a 'true believer' in anthropogenic climate change to being a confirmed 'sceptic' regarding that hypothesis. I am not alone. Many experts (far better qualified than I) have seen the weaknesses in climate alarmism and, over the last 10 years have changed their mind (*see attachment 1*). THE SCIENCE IS CERTAINLY NOT SETTLED. A number of more credible hypotheses to explain cyclic climate change have now been put forward including the role of solar activity controlling cloud formation by admitting or deflecting cosmic radiation from outer space. Another credible hypothesis suggests that increasing activity of undersea volcanoes is causing warming of the seas which, in turn, causes atmospheric warming and venting of dissolved carbon dioxide.

The Government is disguising its Carbon Tax Legislation under the banner "Clean Energy Future". Australia's major energy suppliers are NOT DIRTY. Modern coal fired power stations have employed technology to minimise release of true pollutants such as soot and sulfur dioxide (*See attachment 2*). Carbon dioxide is NOT CARBON and it is NOT DIRTY. It is a colourless, odourless gas which is an intrinsic part of the carbon cycle in nature. MORE CARBON DIOXIDE IN THE ATMOSPHERE WOULD ALMOST CERTAINLY BE BENEFICIAL TO ALL LIFE, INCLUDING HUMANS.

*For these reasons, I am totally opposed to introduction of 'Carbon Pricing' (= tax on carbon dioxide emissions). I believe that, to do so, was a reckless act of Government based on dubious, if not bogus, science.*

*I believe all proposed actions aimed at reduction of carbon dioxide emissions (including The Opposition's Direct Action Plan) should be suspended, at least until an unbiased Royal Commission is established to explore the current state of Climate Change Science, and has presented its findings.*

In view of the above, you will understand why I am devoted to exposing the pseudoscience behind the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis and in campaigning against the implementation of the Government's Carbon Pricing legislation.

James H. Hawes B.Sc. M.Ed. Dip.Ed. Grad. Cert. Phys. Grad. Cert. Chem.  
Former President of The Science Teachers' Association of NSW and The Australian Science Teachers' Association

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **PAGE 1**

#### **WHO SAYS THE CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE IS SETTLED?**

**Following is a sample of some of the scientists and other experts who actually worked for the IPCC as contributors / editors / reviewers and have publicly expressed their scepticism about the IPCC "process."**

Dr Robert Balling: "The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected." (This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers).

Dr. Lucka Bogataj: "Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don't cause global temperatures to rise.... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed."

Dr John Christy: "Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."

Dr Rosa Compagnucci: "Humans have only contributed a few tenths of a degree to warming on Earth. Solar activity is a key driver of climate."

Dr Richard Courtney: "The empirical evidence strongly indicates that the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis is wrong."

Dr Judith Curry: "I'm not going to just spout off and endorse the IPCC because I don't have confidence in the process."

Dr Robert Davis: "Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers."

Dr Willem de Lange: "In 1996, the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3,000 "scientists" who agreed that there was a discernable human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."

Dr Chris de Freitas: "Government decision-makers should have heard by now that the basis for the longstanding claim that carbon dioxide is a major driver of global climate is being questioned; along with it the hitherto assumed need for costly measures to restrict carbon dioxide emissions. If they have not heard, it is because of the din of global warming hysteria that relies on the logical fallacy of 'argument from ignorance' and predictions of computer models."

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **PAGE 2**

Dr Oliver Frauenfeld: "Much more progress is necessary regarding our current understanding of climate and our abilities to model it."

Dr Peter Dietze: "Using a flawed eddy diffusion model, the IPCC has grossly underestimated the future oceanic carbon dioxide uptake."

Dr John Everett: "It is time for a reality check. The oceans and coastal zones have been far warmer and colder than is projected in the present scenarios of climate change. I have reviewed the IPCC and more recent scientific literature and believe that there is not a problem with increased acidification, even up to the unlikely levels in the most-used IPCC scenarios."

Dr Eigil Friis-Christensen: "The IPCC refused to consider the sun's effect on the Earth's climate as a topic worthy of investigation. The IPCC conceived its task only as investigating potential human causes of climate change."

Dr Lee Gerhard: "I never fully accepted or denied the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) concept until the furor started after [NASA's James] Hansen's wild claims in the late 1980's. I went to the [scientific] literature to study the basis of the claim, starting at first principles. My studies then led me to believe that the claims were false."

Dr Indur Goklany: "Climate change is unlikely to be the world's most important environmental problem of the 21st century. There is no signal in the mortality data to indicate increases in the overall frequencies or severities of extreme weather events, despite large increases in the population at risk."

Dr Vincent Gray: "The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."

Dr Kenneth Green: "We can expect the climate crisis industry to grow increasingly shrill, and increasingly hostile toward anyone who questions their authority."

Dr Mike Hulme: "Claims such as '2,500 of the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that human activities are having a significant influence on the climate' are disingenuous ... The actual number of scientists who backed that claim was "only a few dozen."

Dr Kiminori Itoh: "There are many factors which cause climate change. Considering only greenhouse gases is nonsense and harmful. When people know what the truth is they will feel deceived by science and scientists."

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **PAGE 3**

Dr Yuri Izrael: "There is no proven link between human activity and global warming. I think the panic over global warming is totally unjustified. There is no serious threat to the climate."

Dr Steven Japar: "Temperature measurements show that the climate model-predicted mid-troposphere hot zone is non-existent. This is more than sufficient to invalidate global climate models and projections made with them."

Dr Georg Kaser: "This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing,"

Dr Aynsley Kellow: "I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."

Dr Madhav Khandekar: "I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."

Dr Hans Labohm: "The alarmist passages in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."

Dr. Andrew Lacis: "There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department."

Dr Chris Landsea: "I cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound."

Dr Richard Lindzen: "The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."

Dr Harry Lins: "Surface temperature changes over the past century have been episodic and modest and there has been no net global warming for over a decade now. The case for alarm regarding climate change is grossly overstated."

Dr Philip Lloyd: "I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **PAGE 4**

Dr Martin Manning: "Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."

Dr Stephen McIntyre: "The many references in the popular media to a "consensus of thousands of scientists" are both a great exaggeration and also misleading."

Dr Patrick Michaels: "The rates of warming, on multiple time scales have now invalidated the suite of IPCC climate models. No, the science is not settled."

Dr Nils-Axel Morner: "If you go around the globe, you find no sea level rise anywhere."

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: "The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."

Dr Roger Pielke: "All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."

Dr Jan Pretel: "It's nonsense to drastically reduce emissions ... predicting about the distant future-100 years can't be predicted due to uncertainties."

Dr Paul Reiter: "As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."

Dr Murray Salby: "I have an involuntary gag reflex whenever someone says the "science is settled. Anyone who thinks the science is settled on this topic is in fantasia."

Dr Tom Segalstad: "The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."

Dr Fred Singer: "Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

### **PAGE 5**

Dr Hajo Smit: "There is clear cut solar-climate coupling and a very strong natural variability of climate on all historical time scales. Currently I hardly believe anymore that there is any relevant relationship between human CO2 emissions and climate change."

Dr Roy Spencer: "The IPCC is not a scientific organization and was formed to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. Claims of human-cause global warming are only a means to that goal."

Dr Richard Tol: "The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices."

Dr Tom Tripp: "There is so much of a natural variability in weather it makes it difficult to come to a scientifically valid conclusion that global warming is man made."

Dr Robert Watson: "The (IPCC) mistakes all appear to have gone in the direction of making it seem like climate change is more serious by overstating the impact. That is worrying. The IPCC needs to look at this trend in the errors and ask why it happened."

Dr Gerd-Rainer Weber: "Most of the extremist views about climate change have little or no scientific basis."

Dr David Wojick: "The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates."

Dr Miklos Zagoni: "I am positively convinced that the anthropogenic global warming theory is wrong."

Dr. Eduardo Zorita: "Editors, reviewers and authors of alternative studies, analysis, interpretations, even based on the same data we have at our disposal, have been bullied and subtly blackmailed. By writing these lines... a few of my future studies will not see the light of publication."