

Chairperson and members of the NI Climate Change Committee, greetings and thank you for inviting me to present my oral evidence today, which comprises mostly a number of short pertinent quotations from eminent scientists.

Allow me though to first set the scene by going back one century to an equally momentous event.

"The astonishing discovery that atoms are mainly empty was made in 1909 at Manchester University by the indefatigable Ernest Rutherford. He had great courage as a scientist and was prepared to fly in the face of convention. Forced to explain the atom's mysterious emptiness, *scientists had to jettison everything they had believed to be true for the previous two centuries*. It was a seismic moment in the history of science." End quote. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/6914175.stm>

Fast forwarding now to 2009, Australian scientist Dr Jennifer Marohasy states the following:
"Our understanding of the natural world does not progress through the straight forward accumulation of facts because most scientists tend to gravitate to the established popular consensus also known as the established paradigm. Thomas Kuhn describes the development of scientific paradigms as comprising three stages: prescience, normal science and revolutionary science when there is a crisis in the current consensus. When it comes to the science of climate change, we are probably already in the revolution state." End quote. <http://jennifermarohasy.com/>


From Dr Nasif Nahle, USA:

"Throughout the last decade, supporters of the idea of an anthropogenic global warming or the impact of an anthropogenic "greenhouse" effect on climate have been insisting on an erroneous concept of the emission of energy from the atmosphere towards the surface. The global warming – greenhouse effect assumption states that half of the energy absorbed by atmospheric gases, especially carbon dioxide, is reemitted back towards the surface, heating it up. *This solitary assumption is fallacious when considered in light of real natural processes.*" End quote. http://www.biocab.org/Heat_Stored_by_Atmospheric_Gases.html

That is, the longstanding paradigm says that because of trace gases like CO₂, the atmosphere heats the earth. ***But this isn't true.***

From Meteorologist William DiPuccio, USA:

"For any given area on the ocean's surface, the upper 2.6m of water has the same heat capacity as the entire atmosphere above it! Considering the enormous depth and global surface area of the ocean (70.5%), it is apparent that its heat capacity is greater than the atmosphere by many orders of magnitude."



"The heat deficit shows that from 2003-2008 there was no positive radiative imbalance caused by anthropogenic forcing, despite increasing levels of CO₂. Indeed, the radiative imbalance was negative, meaning the earth was losing slightly more energy than it absorbed." End quote.


<http://climatesci.org/2009/05/05/have-changes-in-ocean-heat-falsified-the-global-warming-hypothesis-a-guest-weblog-by-william-dipuccio/>

Please understand what this means.

There is no evidence of a recent global warming trend per se, despite increasing amounts of CO₂.

From Doctor of Meteorology Joe D'Aleo, USA:

"Given the current global cooling now in its 8th year, declining ocean heat content at least in its 5th year, sea level rises which have slowed or stopped, record rising Antarctic ice extent and rapidly recovering Arctic ice since the 2007 cycle minimum, a sun in a deep slumber, increasing evidence that CO₂ is a harmless gas that is in reality a beneficial plant fertilizer, you would think that this proposed legislation and ruling would in a sane world, have no chance of passing. But there is a huge political and NGO machine and all too compliant media and carbon crusaders like Al Gore and James Hansen and literally many billions of dollars behind making carbon evil and subsidizing unwise energy and carbon control solutions." End quote.



<http://icecap.us/index.php>

A point that is reinforced by geologist Professor Ian Plimer, Australia:

"The proof that CO₂ does not drive climate is shown by previous glaciations. The Ordovician-Silurian and Jurassic-Cretaceous glaciations occurred when the atmospheric CO₂ content was more than 4,000 ppmv and about 2,000 ppmv respectively. The Carboniferous-Permian glaciation had a CO₂ content of about 400 ppmv, at least 15 ppmv greater than the present figure. If the popular catastrophist view is accepted, there should have been a runaway greenhouse when CO₂ was more than 4,000 ppmv. Instead, there was glaciation. This has never been explained by those who argue that human additions of CO₂ will produce global warming." End quote.

The above makes a mockery of saying that today's level is unprecedented.

And finally, from Professor Will Alexander, South Africa :

"If there was strong evidence of undesirable changes, then the whole climate change issue would have been resolved long ago. The tragedy is that there is a world-wide policy in the opposite direction. Not only has the observation theory route been avoided, but climate change scientists and their organisations have adopted a policy of deliberately denigrating all those who practise it. [...] after 20 years of massive international effort (the overwhelming consensus), climate change scientists have still to produce *solid, verifiable evidence* of the consequences of human activities. They were unable to produce any scientifically believable, numerical evidence to support their theories. The periodicity in the data and the unequivocal solar linkage were not even addressed.

This is not science. The whole climate change issue is about to fall apart. Heads will roll." End quote. <http://anhonestclimatedebate.wordpress.com/2009/04/03/climate-change-%E2%80%93-the-clash-of-theories-by-professor-will-alexander/>

There is little point to present ever more observational evidence to what has been presented to you in these few minutes and taken in conjunction with my original Submission and the additional information passed onto you by last Friday's deadline, the case has clearly been made.

What does need reiterating here though is the ***indisputable fact*** that there is *not one single observational item of evidence* to support the widely accepted idea that carbon dioxide is the cause of global warming or *even has an effect on climate change*.

Any and all evidence that has ever been presented to support the idea that carbon dioxide has an effect on global temperatures has been biased, opinionated and based on an agenda that pre-emptively dismissed alternative explanations.

Critically though, the global climate can neither be averaged nor can it be computerised and thus any and all scenarios coming from computer models are at best an exercise in computer programming but stand in no relation to reality, as clearly indicated by the totality of my submitted evidence.

Computer simulations regard the earth as a flat disk, without North or South Pole, without the Tropics, without clouds and bathed in a 24 hour haze of sunshine. The reality is two icy poles and a tropical equatorial zone, with each and every square metre of our earth receiving an ever varying and different amount of energy from the sun, season to season and day to day. This reality is too difficult to input to a computer. ***Did you realise that?***

From Geophysicist Norm Kalmanovitch, Canada:

"It is inconceivable that even after a decade since global warming ended and seven years into a cooling trend with no end of cooling in sight, world leaders are unaware of these facts and are still pursuing initiatives to stop global warming. Something is terribly wrong with the official international science bodies such as the IPCC who have not come forward and properly informed the world leaders of current global temperatures. If in fact there is any validity to the claims of CO₂ increases causing warming; the fact that we are cooling at twice the rate that the climate models say we should be warming is a clear indication that natural forces are about three times stronger than the maximum possible effects from CO₂ increases." End quote. CCNet 78/2009.

If carbon dioxide really is such a danger to mankind, as the US EPA would have us believe, then the upcoming Olympic Games should be cancelled, as well as all other big sporting events, as well as all road transport and all air transport and all coal- and gas-fired powerstations should be shut down. Clearly there is no need for such drastic action and clearly carbon dioxide is not dangerous at all.

From the word go, the UN IPCC has provided us with scenarios based on the principle of perpetuum mobile by clearly indicating that the earth is getting warmer due to re-radiated infrared energy from the increased levels of carbon dioxide. ***That scenario can not physically exist.*** The sun heats the earth, the earth then heats the atmosphere, not the other way around. The only possible effect that carbon dioxide *could* have on the atmosphere is to increase heat *dispersion* and thus cause cooling.

As a further rebuttal of the influence of carbon dioxide over the climate, the alleged IPCC greenhouse effect is a non-existent effect. No greenhouse, whether made from glass, plastic, cardboard or steel will reach a higher inside temperature due to the magic of re-radiated infrared energy. If it did, engineers would have long ago been able to design power stations made from air, mirrors and glass, extracting more energy out of it than was put into it - if only!

In conclusion, then, a century after Rutherford's momentous lecture, I urge this Committee to consider nothing but the facts before them. Those facts are that carbon dioxide does not and ***can not*** cause global warming, the currently accepted paradigm notwithstanding.

Any and all schemes to reduce carbon dioxide emissions are futile in terms of having an effect on reducing global temperatures or affecting the climate and any and all carbon trading exchanges are a fraudulent exercise amounting to no more than hidden taxation.

If this Committee does come to the conclusion that emission controls need to be imposed upon the people of Northern Ireland in order to make a difference to global temperatures, then it will have failed to a substantial degree in understanding the issues in hand.

Thank you.

Hans Schreuder

<http://www.tech-know.eu/NISubmission/>

21 May 2009

Intended but not mentioned due to time pressure, yet important enough to state here:

From eWorldVu: "So, as American and European politicians prepare to fight global warming, Russia is preparing for a different world that may have much colder times ahead. If global temperatures continue to cool, it will be a cold war that Russia can win without ever firing a shot." End quote. <http://www.eworldvu.com/international/2009/2/4/a-cold-war-that-russia-can-win.html>

From Russian News and Information Agency:

"By the mid-21st century the planet will face another Little Ice Age, similar to the Maunder Minimum, because the amount of solar radiation hitting the Earth has been constantly decreasing since the 1990s and will reach its minimum approximately in 2041," he said. End quote.

<http://en.rian.ru/science/20080122/97519953.html>

From Geophysicist Norm Kalmanovitch, Canada:

"There is not a single knowledgeable person in the world who cannot claim that CO₂ is beneficial to the environment. [...] There is not a single knowledgeable person in the world who cannot claim that the globe has been cooling since 2002. [...] There is not a single knowledgeable person in the world who cannot claim that with the past sea level rise of the last 8,000 years being less than four meters and based on the current rate of increase, the sea level rise by year 2100 will be in the order of just 16 cm (less than 7 inches). [...] Based on these *three unequivocal facts* it is clear that there is not a single knowledgeable person in government because governments refer to CO₂ as pollution and want to tax this "pollution" to stop the now non-existent global warming." End quote. CCNet 68/2009.