

## ***FOS MEMBERSHIP QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER***

### ***No. 19***

***“FOS is dedicated to providing the public with insight into Climate Change”***

---

#### **PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE**

The test of any scientific hypotheses is its ability to predict future behaviour. The alarmists have employed their theory of greenhouse gas within various models of global atmospheric behaviour to predict rising global atmospheric temperatures, catastrophic increases in sea levels, and marked increases in the intensity and frequency of hurricanes. In all instances they have been proven wrong. But they took comfort in the presumed decrease in Arctic ice cover. During 2007 this cover was at a historic low. Such evidence of global warming was trumpeted with great fanfare. It was certain that the Arctic would be ice free by 2015. But a strange thing happened. The ice cover grew in 2008 and now appears in 2009 to have increased back to average levels. We have yet another failure of the greenhouse gas “theory” to predict physical phenomena.

There is still more evidence that AGW proponents have again bungled their arguments. They have historically ascribed atmospheric cooling observed during the period from the late forties to the early seventies to the albedo effect of industrial aerosols. One of the more prominent effects of the Clean Air legislation of the seventies was to greatly reduce particulate emissions from industrial sources. This reduction should logically have been accompanied by a warming trend. But the “warmers” insisted that the warming observed from the late seventies to the late nineties was due to greenhouse gas effects. Recent research presented in the science portion of this newsletter shows that the reduction of aerosols significantly contributed to global warming since 1975, especially in the Arctic. The role played by greenhouse gas increases was a minor one.

Empirical evidence related to the failure of Al Gore and his acolytes to predict observed phenomena is of much more than academic interest. This is because our governments are proceeding to re-organize all industrial activities based on the validity of these prognostications. Such a re-organization has the potential to negatively impact our standard of living. The Friends continue to believe that our governments should, in the interest of due diligence, require that AGW proponents defend their scientific positions in open forum debates. As most members of The Friends you are probably aware, that we have initiated two projects aimed at putting public pressure on our politicians: a cross country tour by Lord Monckton, (an eloquent and high profile speaker for the anti-AGW cause) and a radio “blitz” of major Canadian population centres.

The Monckton tour will extend from September 29 to October 08 and will cover Toronto, Ottawa, Calgary, Vancouver, Regina and Winnipeg. It will entail luncheon and dinner addresses, radio interviews, private meetings and university gatherings. Other groups collaborating with FoS in this speaker’s tour will include The Frontier Centre for Public Policy (FCPP), The Economic Club of Toronto (ECOT), The Fraser Institute (FI) and The Ranchmen’s Club of Calgary.

The radio blitz is expected to be conducted in mid to late October. (It will, paradoxically, be delayed, if there is an election campaign during this period. Reasons for the delay relate to existing arcane campaign advertising rules.) The radio advertisements will be designed for two purposes:

- 
1. To demonstrate the futility of any sacrifices caused by greenhouse gas reductions and
  2. To pressure AGW proponents to either debate and defend their positions or fold their tents and depart the field.

We hope that all members will demonstrate their support of our initiatives by attending the events scheduled for Monckton and by contributing much needed monies towards our planned radio “blitz”.

Douglas Leahey PhD  
President

### **POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS – CLIMATE CHANGE BILL IN US SENATE**

Apparently, Democrats in the United States Senate have again been forced to delay the introduction of their global warming cap-and-trade bill. They don’t have the votes, and they know it. So rather than have the bill go down to defeat, they will postpone any discussion of the proposal until things look more favourable.

Here is a short list of the reasons why various members of the Democratic Party are NOT PREPARED to support this bill. These reasons have been stated publicly by Democratic Party members, together with statements from the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”).

**Pres. Barak Obama** *“electricity prices would necessarily skyrocket”*

**Rep. John Dingell (Dem.-Mich.)** *“Cap and Trade is a tax and a great big one”*.

**Rep. Peter De Fazio (Dem.-Mich.)** *“a cap and trade system is prone to market manipulation and speculation without any guarantee of meaningful GHG emission reductions. A cap and trade has been operating in Europe for three years and is largely a failure.”*

**Senator Byron Dorgan (Dem. -N. Dak.)** *“The wall street crowd can’t wait to sink their teeth into a new trillion dollar-trading scheme ... “*

**Senator Maria Cantwell (Dem.-Wash.)** *“a cap and trade program might allow wall street to distort a carbon market for its own profits”*

**Administrator Lisa Jackson–EPA** *“US action alone would be futile.”*

**Senator John Kerry (Dem.-Mass.)** *“There is no way the USA acting alone can solve this problem. So we have to have China. We have to have India.”*

---

**Senator Claire McCaskill (Dem.–Mo.)** *“If we go too far with this, then all we’re going to do is chase more jobs to China and India where they’ve been putting up coal-fired plants every 10 minutes.”*

**EPA-** *“It will not reduce our dependence on foreign oil”*

*“It will do nothing to reduce global temperature.”*

We hope that these reasons, though not formally based on science, will ultimately prevail, and Cap-and-Trade will disappear from the political scene. Many of you in Alberta have heard the warning that our power and gas bills will triple over the next ten years. Please support The Friends in opposing any kind of carbon tax, be it direct or through schemes like Cap and Trade. Associated sacrifices will not have any beneficial effects.

Peter Burns

Director Friends of Science

## **SCIENCE NEWS**

In this issue of Science News, we focus on how aerosols affect climate. Aerosols are a suspension of fine particles in the atmosphere and include smoke, oceanic haze, smog, etc. The most significant aerosols from human sources that affect climate are sulphate and black carbon aerosols. Sulphate aerosols are primarily from the burning of fossil fuels and generally cause a cooling effect by reflecting solar radiation. Black carbon aerosols are from burning of biomass, and generally have a warming effect as it absorbs solar radiation.

Three recent papers discussed below show that change in aerosols account for a much larger portion of recent climate change than assumed in climate computer models, implying that the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> is much less than what the climate models show. The sun is likely the main cause of the global warming of the 20<sup>th</sup> century with aerosol changes providing a significant contribution. When one combines the effects of aerosols with the Sun, ocean cycles and the urban heat island effects, discussed elsewhere on the Friends of Science website, there is no climate change left for CO<sub>2</sub> to explain.

### **“Global Dimming and Brightening: A Review”**

By: Martin Wild

Institute for Atmospheric and Climate Science, Zurich, Switzerland

Journal of Geophysical Research, June 2009

A paper published in *Journal of Geophysical Research* shows that changes in the amount of aerosols in the atmosphere over the 20<sup>th</sup> century has had a much larger impact on global temperatures than they are given credit for in the climate computer models. His research shows that the increase of sulphate aerosols from fossil fuels caused a global solar dimming effect from

---

the 1950's to the 1980's and contributed to global cooling. Air pollution control measures have reduced sulphate aerosols from the 1980's to the 2000's, resulting in solar brightening which significantly contributed to global warming. Air pollution controls allowed more solar radiation to warm the surface. However, on a global basis the effect of aerosols has been stable since 2000 and there has been no global warming this century. Wild says satellite data and Earthshine observations both show a stable planetary albedo after 2000.

The abstract is at <http://www.agu.org/pubs/crossref/2009/2008JD011470.shtml>

See a discussion at <http://www.worldclimatereport.com/index.php/2009/06/10/sulfates-and-global-warming/#more-380>

### **“Consistency between Satellite-Derived and Modelled Estimates of the Direct Aerosol Effect”**

By: Gunnar Myhre

Centre for International Climate and Environmental Research–Oslo, Norway  
Science, July 2009

A new paper in the journal *Science* reports that a careful study of satellite data show the assumed cooling effect of aerosols in the atmosphere to be significantly less than previously estimated. Gunnar Myhre states that previous values for aerosol cooling are too high—by as much as 40 percent—implying the IPCC's model sensitivity for CO<sub>2</sub> are too high. The main anthropogenic aerosols that cause cooling are sulphate, nitrate, and organic carbon, whereas black carbon absorbs solar radiation. Myhre argues that since preindustrial times, black carbon soot particle concentrations have increased much more than other aerosols.

The abstract is at <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/abstract/325/5937/187>

See a discussion at <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/07/15/9373/>

### **“Climate Response to Regional Radiative Forcing During the Twentieth Century.”**

By: Drew Shindell

NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies  
Nature Geoscience, April 2009

New NASA research suggests that much of the atmospheric warming observed in the Arctic since 1976 may be due to changes in aerosol particles. Scientists led by Drew Shindell of NASA found that the mid and high latitudes are especially responsive to changes in the level of aerosols. The research suggests aerosols likely account for 45 percent or more of the warming that has occurred in the Arctic during the last thirty years to 2005. (Arctic temperatures have been falling since 2005.) Since decreasing amounts of sulphates and increasing amounts of black carbon in the Arctic both encourage warming, temperature increases can be especially rapid. In the Antarctic, in contrast, the impact of sulphates and black carbon is minimized because of the continent's isolation from major population centres. Antarctica temperatures have not increased over the last 30 years.

---

The abstract is at <http://www.nature.com/ngeo/journal/v2/n4/abs/ngeo473.html>  
See a discussion at [http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/warming\\_aerosols.html](http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/warming_aerosols.html)

Ken Gregory  
Director Friends of Science

### **DONATIONS**

We are very proud of the work we've done so far, but we still have a long way to go in our efforts to impact public opinion on the climate change issue. Our concern is that public opinion has suffered from political manoeuvring and biased focus groups. We should not be wasting valuable resources on a hypothetical problem when we have many **real** problems that need addressing: better educational system, more money for health care, better infrastructure, better equipped military, etc.

Friends of Science, as the leading Canadian advocate, is often asked, "Why don't you just put pressure on politicians to change their policies around climate change?" Most certainly, we would go that route if politicians listened and responded so easily to science, facts and reasoned argument, but they don't, as you well know.

The hard truth is that politicians take direction from polls, public opinion, media and the voices of the loudest and most strident pressure groups, not the best researched, i.e. Friends of Science. Everyone knows that the voices in support of man-made global warming theories have been backed by an international avalanche of misguided media, interest group and academia, whose livelihood, in most cases, depends on continuation of the argument. Their stubbornness has created an incredible effect on public opinion. Still, only about half of Canadians believe that man causes climate change. Surely that half is enough to drive policy.

We have developed plans for the upcoming year, to emphasize the fact that CO<sub>2</sub> and greenhouse gas emissions have only a minor influence on climate change. We are therefore asking our members for their financial support, which is badly needed to finance future programs.

Chuck Simpson  
Past Director Friends of Science

Donations made directly to Friends of Science will provide us with funds for administrative expenses which are sorely needed in order to back up our volunteer work force.

**Friends of Science** at P.O. Box 23167,  
Connaught P.O.  
Calgary AB T2S 3B1

**E-mail** [contact@friendsofscience.org](mailto:contact@friendsofscience.org)    **Web** [www.friendsofscience.org](http://www.friendsofscience.org)