

## THE BODY OF EVIDENCE AGAINST GLOBAL WARMING/CLIMATE CHANGE

By George Abramson, Member, Board of Directors

JNF, Southern California, Orange County/Long Beach/Rancho Palos Verdes Region

*Note: This article does not reflect the opinion of the Board of Directors of the JNF Southern California Orange County/Long Beach/Rancho Palos Verdes Region, or any other member of JNF. Additionally, the links concerning Vice President Gore are not necessarily my opinion. (GA)*

The following is based upon a presentation that I gave to Russell Robinson in a private meeting at the National Conference in September 2008. It is a combination of scientific writing and opinion. Since arguments for global warming are well publicized in the general media, this presents only the case against global warming. ***It is critical that serious examination of a wider view of global warming includes reading the links to the Internet references listed in the endnotes.*** It is possible that some links have expired.

### PURPOSE OF THIS DISCUSSION IS TWOFOLD

1. JNF's references to global warming/climate change is detrimental to our fundamental mission. Case in point: a woman calls Dennis Prager. *Child in Jewish Day School brought home JNF pamphlet - page about global warming – very upset - didn't think JNF was a political organization- “why are they spreading lies about global warming?”* If one caller bothers to call and gets through, how many thousands or tens of thousands feel the same way and may stop supporting JNF?
2. The second purpose of this presentation is to offer a cross section of a huge and increasing body of evidence, which shows that it is unlikely that global warming, if in fact it is occurring, is caused by human activity. Since the media at large has amply made the case for global warming/climate change, I am only presenting information on the other side of this debate.

### THE FUNCTION OF SCIENCE

Science does not establish truth. Science reaches conclusions based on current evidence built upon verifiable, reproducible experimentation and data analyses. The probability of conclusions being correct increases when, after review of said information, the examiners (scientists) reach a general consensus.

### UNIPCC

The IPCC, (Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change) a UN Committee, has been the source of the global warming hypothesis based upon data input from many sources. However, there are challenges to the accuracy and analyses of these data.

1. **HOW MANY SCIENTISTS ARE ON IPCC:** Within IPCC, McLean and Harris determined how many scientists agreed with the most important IPCC conclusion, namely that humans are causing significant climate change, the key parts of WG I. According to them only 62 scientists reviewed the critical chapter in which this statement appears. Of the **62 expert reviewers** of this chapter, **55 had serious vested interest**, leaving only **seven expert reviewers who appeared impartial**. That is a very long way from the “**consensus of 2,500 scientists**” that is constantly reported. A second source reported that **only 5 scientists explicitly endorsed this critical chapter**.<sup>1</sup>
2. **IPCC PREDICTION OF GLOBAL WARMING: The “hockey stick” model.** Certain data was used by the IPCC from 1400 to 1998. Based upon an apparent sudden rise in the early 1990s the IPCC predicted global warming and all of the resulting dire consequences. We hear about world climate predictions to the year 2100, an extrapolation of a very small portion of a curve to almost 100 years. This is scientifically unsound. A huge body of peer reviewers and statistical analysts reject the validity of the model.<sup>2</sup>
3. **IPCC REJECTS OBJECTIONS:** There are countless articles that disagree with IPCC's conclusions, but IPCC has continuously rejected objections to their data that would change conclusions about global

warming. Scientists who were originally members of IPCC, as well as many others, have challenged the model for climate change.<sup>3</sup>

## SCIENTISTS THROUGHOUT WORLD REJECT GLOBAL WARMING

1. **MORE THAN 31,000 SCIENTISTS** in fields such as atmospheric science, climatology, earth science, environment and dozens of other specialties, have signed a petition rejecting “global warming,” and the assumption that the human production of greenhouse gases is damaging Earth's climate. The list of scientists includes 9,021 Ph.D.s, 6,961 M.S.s, 2,240 medical doctors, and 12,850 carrying a Bachelor of Science or equivalent academic degree.<sup>4</sup>
2. **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.<sup>5</sup>
3. **OVER 400 PROMINENT SCIENTISTS** from more than two-dozen countries recently voiced significant objections to major aspects of the so-called “consensus” on man-made global warming. These scientists, many of whom are current and former participants in the UN IPCC, criticized the climate claims made by the IPCC and former Vice President Al Gore. . . .<sup>6</sup>

## SOLAR ACTIVITY, GLACIERS, POLAR ICE

1. **SUN, NOT MAN, MAIN CAUSE OF CLIMATE CHANGE, NEW STUDY SAYS. . .** [C]limate scientists . . . found that the climate change models based on human influence do not match observed warming. . . . The new report, which challenges the claims of Gore and the IPCC, was published in the December 2007 issue of the *International Journal of Climatology of the Royal Meteorological Society*. . . . The report was written by David Douglass at the University of Rochester, John Christy at the University of Alabama, and Benjamin Pearson and S. Fred Singer at the University of Virginia. . . .<sup>7</sup>
2. **STUDY SAYS GLACIERS FORMED DURING A VERY WARM PERIOD.** Giant glaciers formed about 90 million years ago during a warm period when alligators thrived in the Arctic, researchers said Thursday, calling into question the belief that all ice melts in a “super greenhouse” climate. . . .<sup>8</sup>
3. **SEA ICE, OCEAN CURRENTS** . . . When the Arctic sea ice last year hit the lowest level ever recorded by satellites, it was big news and heralded as a sign that the whole planet was warming. **When the Antarctic sea ice last year reached the highest level ever recorded by satellites, it was pretty much ignored.** A large part of Antarctica has been cooling recently, but most coverage of that continent has focused on one small part that has warmed. . . .  
. . . Two studies by NASA and university scientists last year concluded that **much of the recent melting of Arctic sea ice was related to a cyclical change in ocean currents and winds**, but those studies got relatively little attention . . .

Once a cascade is under way, it becomes tough to sort out risks because experts become reluctant to dispute the popular wisdom, and are ignored if they do. Now that the melting Arctic has become the symbol of global warming, **there's not much interest in hearing other explanations of why the ice is melting — or why the globe's other pole isn't melting. . . .**<sup>9</sup>

---

## Endnotes

**1 COMMENTS ON GLOBAL WARMING BY JOHN COLEMAN** [jcoleman@kusi.com](mailto:jcoleman@kusi.com). Breakdown of number of scientists versus non-scientists attached to the IPCC: Number of scientists on the IPCC. Number that agree with findings. John McLean, a climate data analyst based in Melbourne, Australia and Tom Harris, the Ottawa, Canada based Executive Director of the Natural Resources Stewardship Project, researched the inside story of the IPCC and wrote about it in the Canada Free Press. They tell us the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is actually divided into three working groups. Only one of those groups, Working Group I (WG I) is assigned to report on the extent and possible causes of past climate change as well as future projections. <http://images.bimedia.net/documents/Comments+on+Global+Warming.pdf>, Pages 31-32

### ANALYSIS OF UNIPCC 4AR DISPELS MYTH OF "THOUSANDS" OF SCIENTISTS

Analysis shows just 5 reviewers, none with impeccable credibility, explicitly endorsed the critical Chapter 9 or WG1 of UNIPCC's 4th Assessment Report which claims that humans have a significant influence on climate. New Zealand Climate Science Coalition Last Updated November 2007 [http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=163&Itemid=1](http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=163&Itemid=1)

### 2 WILL MEDIA EXPOSE GLOBAL WARMING CON JOB?

ACCURACY IN MEDIA SPECIAL REPORT | By Jerry Carlson | February 2008  
<http://www.aim.org/special-report/will-media-expose-global-warming-con-job/>

... IPCC reached conclusions that seem to be unwarranted now that it is about 15 years after the predictions. Let's look at some of the promises and pitfalls of climate models, which are the primary basis for carbon taxes and the CO2 theory of climatic forcing.

... What justifies such extreme confidence in long-term computer models of projected climate?

One poster-child controversy is the "Hockey Stick" computer model of past and future climate, developed primarily by Michael Mann, Associate Professor in Pennsylvania State University's Department of Meteorology. ... Mann's model result was published by the IPCC as proof of unprecedented, man-made global warming. ... The model generates a dramatic uptrend in recent years, then a parabolic rise in global temperatures over the next few decades. [Several statistical experts have declared Mann's study invalid](#), and went on to point out the "peer review" involved was primarily among Mann's mutually supportive colleagues.

Mann and fellow researchers still use the same statistical approach, and the hockey-stick formation remains in IPCC-published charts as evidence for man-caused world warming.

A friend of mine who teaches graduate-level statistics uses Mann's climate model as an example of how not to apply principle component analysis. As used in the climate model, "it will generate a hockey-stick projection 99% of the time when applied to purely random data over time. ... " This misuse of statistics was verified by Canadian researchers Steven McIntyre and Ross McKittrick, who offer a rich array of other evidence at this web address: <http://www.uoguelph.ca/~rmckitri/research/trc.html>.

Prof. Mann has recently boasted that our 2003 paper in E&E has been completely discredited. In that paper we made 10 claims. Steve has written up a [scorecard that goes over the public record](#) and reveals Mann's claim to be at odds with the facts.

### ALSO, WASHINGTON ROUNDTABLE ON SCIENCE & PUBLIC POLICY

The IPCC, the "Hockey Stick" Curve, and the Illusion of Experience  
By Stephen McIntyre & Ross McKittrick  
<http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/188.pdf>

... In total, these are the kinds of problems we found: truncated sources, arbitrary plugging of data, use of obsolete data, geographical mislabeling. Here is one that is rather fun: There is a data series that was inserted for a grid box for precipitation near Boston and the data actually came from Paris, France. ...

**3 IPCC — INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE: CALL IT PROPAGANDA, NOT SCIENCE** Gary Novak, Independent Scientist. Extensive collection of articles explaining IPCC's errors and political behavior. <http://www.nov55.com/ipcc.html>.

**THE NEW ZEALAND CLIMATE SCIENCE COALITION** Long time expert reviewer Dr Vincent Gray explains how the UN IPCC has outlived its usefulness.

**SUPPORT FOR CALL FOR REVIEW OF UN IPCC** Dr Vincent Gray, a member of the UN IPCC Expert Reviewers Panel since its inception, has written to Professor David Henderson, to support the latter's call for a review of the IPCC and its procedures.

Dr Gray wrote:

... I have been an "Expert Reviewer" for the IPCC right from the start and I have submitted a very large number of comments on their drafts. It has recently been revealed that I submitted 1,898 comments on the Final Draft of the current Report. Over the period I have made an intensive study of the data and procedures used by IPCC contributors throughout their whole study range. I have a large library of reprints, books and comments and have published many comments of my own in published papers, a book, and in my occasional newsletter, the current number being 157. ...

Penetrating questions [to IPCC] often ended without any answer. Comments on the IPCC drafts were rejected without explanation, and attempts to pursue the matter were frustrated indefinitely.

Over the years, as I have learned more about the data and procedures of the IPCC I have found increasing opposition by them to providing explanations, until I have been forced to the conclusion that for significant parts of the work of the IPCC, the data collection and scientific methods employed are unsound. Resistance to all efforts to try and discuss or rectify these problems has convinced me that normal scientific procedures are not only rejected by the IPCC, but that this practice is endemic, and was part of the organisation from the very beginning. I therefore consider that the IPCC is fundamentally corrupt. The only "reform" I could envisage, would be its abolition. ...

[http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=155&Itemid=30](http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=155&Itemid=30)

**4 31,000 SCIENTISTS REJECT 'GLOBAL WARMING' AGENDA** 'Mr. Gore's movie has claims no informed expert endorses'

Posted: May 19, 2008 By Bob Unruh © 2008 WorldNetDaily URL: <http://wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=64734>

LIST OF SIGNERS BY NAME [http://petitionproject.org/gwdatabase/Signers\\_By\\_Last\\_Name.php?run=all](http://petitionproject.org/gwdatabase/Signers_By_Last_Name.php?run=all)

LIST OF SCIENTISTS BY STATE [http://www.petitionproject.org/gwdatabase/Signers\\_BY\\_State.html](http://www.petitionproject.org/gwdatabase/Signers_BY_State.html)

**5 OVER 100 PROMINENT SCIENTISTS WARN UN: ATTEMPTING TO CONTROL CLIMATE IS 'FUTILE'** Complete Letter with all signatories, including titles and affiliations, is available as published in Canada's National Post on December 13, 2007 EPW Blog Thursday, December 13, 2007 <http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/963>

---

<sup>6</sup> **U.S. SENATE REPORT: OVER 400 PROMINENT SCIENTISTS DISPUTED MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING CLAIMS IN 2007** Senate Report Debunks "Consensus" Report Released on December 20, 2007 Names, titles, and current/past affiliation linked to article. <http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.SenateReport>

<sup>7</sup> **SUN, NOT MAN, MAIN CAUSE OF CLIMATE CHANGE, NEW STUDY SAYS**, Monisha Bansal, CNSNews.com Staff Writer, December 2007 . . . "Our findings basically are that fingerprints - that is to say the pattern of warming - that's predicted by greenhouse models does not match the fingerprints of observations, so there is a disconnect between greenhouse models and the actual reality of observations," Singer told Cybercast News Service. "This means that the greenhouse effect - while real - is not very important in producing climate change," he said. "It's a lot smaller than what the models calculate."

Singer said the reason why the models "overestimate the effectiveness of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases is that the models ignore what are called negative feedbacks which occur in the atmosphere, such as clouds, which reduce the effect of the greenhouse gases." . . . But Singer said because global warming is a natural event. "There is little point to try to control emission of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide, which means that all of this legislation and all of these efforts to find substitutes for fossil fuels are pointless, useless and very, very expensive," he said. . . . <http://www.cnsnews.com/ViewNation.asp?Page=/Nation/archive/200712/NAT20071211a.html>

<sup>8</sup> **STUDY SAYS GLACIERS FORMED DURING A VERY WARM PERIOD** By REUTERS, Published January 11, 2008 . . . The researchers, in the study published in the journal Science, wrote that the "super greenhouse climate" was "not a barrier to the formation of large ice sheets, calling into question the common assumption that the poles were always ice-free during past periods of intense global warming." . . . <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/11/world/europe/11glacier.html?ex=1357707600&en=4bbd7c6f3c820d92&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>

<sup>9</sup> **IN 2008, A 100 PERCENT CHANCE OF ALARM** JOHN TIERNEY NY TIMES: January 1, 2008 Discussion of aspects of the "business" of global warming. Shows inconsistencies. [http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/01/science/01tier.html?\\_r=2&ref=science&oref=slogin&oref=slogin](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/01/science/01tier.html?_r=2&ref=science&oref=slogin&oref=slogin)