

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

***No. 28***

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

---

### **PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE**

I wish to extend a warm greeting to all Friends of Science members.

The Friends of Science Society sponsored, along with The Frontier Centre for Public Policy, a presentation on global warming by Rex Murphy at the University of Calgary. This event was held Sept. 29 in McEwen Hall. We attracted about 500 or 600 people, mostly university students during their lunch hour. Rex gave a non-technical but common sense approach to the subject. He introduced an important concept that many people do not stop to consider - that we human beings are part of the environment too, and thus our well-being is important and needs to be respected.

The open debate concerning the science of climate change was held November 29 at Mount Royal University (MRU) in Calgary. Supported by the Friends of Science, it was sponsored by The Frontier Centre for Public Policy and was hosted by Professor Duane Bratt, Chair Department of Policy Studies at MRU. Pro and con positions relating to anthropogenic global warming were respectively presented by Professors Shawn Marshall and Ian Clark. Dr. Marshall, who took the warming side, is the Canada Research Chair in Climate Change at the University of Calgary, while Dr. Clark, who took the skeptics side, is Professor of Earth Sciences at Ottawa University. Both Drs. Marshall and Clark have been actively engaged in matters relating to climate change.

The debate was handled in a very professional and relaxed manner, with moderator Duane Bratt doing his job well, without showing any bias on either side. Both debaters handled themselves well, respecting their opponent and answering all questions from the audience, which were submitted in writing. We are no doubt biased, but felt that Dr. Clark did a much better job in presenting his case. Unfortunately the room chosen by MRU was quite small, seating only about 100 people. Many were left standing, while a number of late-comers simply left. We would be very interested in assisting a similar event at a larger venue in the future.

Our efforts for the new year will be to expand our membership and increase our communication both to members and others. We will be soliciting more help to expand our capabilities, especially in the area of public relations. If as the old saying goes, "science tells us what can happen, economics tells us what should happen, and politics tells us what will happen", then we must continue to understand and debate the science behind global warming, as well as to communicate the economic and political problems being created worldwide by those following the myths perpetrated by the IPCC. On that subject, many of you recently received our email informing you of the newly published incredible book by Donna Laframboise, "The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken For The World's Top Climate Expert". This is the first time we have seen such a detailed and factual expose of this "delinquent teenage" political body posing as a scientific one. She obviously spent an incredible amount of time and effort to reveal errors concerning many things, such as their deceptive peer review claims and outright mistruths coming from their chairman, Rajendra Pachauri. To quote Prof. Robert Carter, "The IPCC has for long been a public disgrace awaiting exposure. Donna Laframboise's accomplished dismemberment of that organization's pious and often unscientific alarmism is a must read." We strongly recommend everyone obtain a copy. It may be ordered from [TinyUrl.com/ipcc-book](http://TinyUrl.com/ipcc-book) The ISBN number is 978-1466453487. The electronic copy is a bargain.

---

The recent conference in Durban (which is nice and warm this time of year) ended as usual with no agreement among nations concerning action on their part. Friends of Science received an email from a group in Pretoria, South Africa, requesting a telephone discussion concerning the myths of global warming. We were quite flattered that they were aware of us, and suggested this subject would be too lengthy to discuss on the phone, but to email their questions instead.

The recent withdrawal from Kyoto by the Canadian government is an encouraging sign. We do not know how much they have been influenced by our messages to them and the public over the years, but we congratulate them for their courage and intelligence. As their public pronouncements still speak of controls on Greenhouse gases in relation to climate, there is obviously a need to continue our thrust, informing them of the scientific facts. The disconnect between the proper scientific foundation and the worldwide multibillion dollar consequences of mitigation and abatement schemes is apparently still not clear to our politicians, the media and much of the public. We encourage our followers to email their MP's in regard to the Kyoto decision, and remind them of the need to consider the scientific facts. Especially recommend they read Donna Laframboise's book.

**Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to everyone.**

Len Maier  
President Friends of Science

## **POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Durban Climate Conference**

The UN's annual climate summit started on November 28 and was to conclude on December 9, but was extended two days in order to end with a face-saving "breakthrough" agreement, known as the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action. As Margaret Wentz of *The Globe and Mail* (Dec. 13) put it: "The key thing to understand about the climate talks is that they're not really about the climate. They're about power and money."

With this in mind, the group with the most to gain from the process are the fast-growing emitters – Brazil, South Africa, India and China – wanting to extract billions in climate reparations from the rich countries, but without reducing their own emissions. China is also keen to keep selling wind turbines and solar panels to subsidized markets abroad. The other developing countries are simply looking for free money and technology. Lastly there are the EU countries, desperate to keep alive the Kyoto Protocol and the carbon market that has cost their citizens \$285 billion. In the end, the EU agreed to implement its own reductions under the aegis of a Protocol extended to 2017. Traders weren't fooled, however, as the European carbon market sank to below €7/tonne, far below the €20-€50 needed to encourage investment in "green" energy.

---

In summary, the Durban Platform:

- Notes the goal of keeping global temperatures 1.5°C or 2.0 °C above preindustrial levels, repeating the earlier agreements in Copenhagen and Cancún;
- Asserts that countries should “launch a process to develop a develop a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change applicable to all Parties”;
- States that the above agreement should be concluded by 2015, with any resulting emissions reductions to begin by 2020.

## **Canada Pulls Out of Kyoto Protocol**

Hours after his return from the Durban conference, Environment Minister Peter Kent announced that Canada would be the first country to formally withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol. He said that withdrawal would avoid paying \$14 billion to buy carbon credits for not achieving the country’s Kyoto targets and it’s “really only the Europeans who are staying with Kyoto.” To meet the 2012 targets would mean either removing all vehicles from Canadian roads, or closing down the entire agricultural sector and cutting heat to every building in Canada.

Predictably, Mr. Kent’s announcement was attacked by environmental and opposition groups at home. International criticism came quickly from India and China, which claimed that Canada’s action puts the Durban Platform in doubt. However, Russia’s Foreign Ministry supported Canada’s decision and reaffirmed that Moscow will not undertake any new commitments.

Despite the withdrawal, Mr. Kent, implicitly acknowledging the UN’s climate science, praised the Durban Platform as “a fair and balanced framework for responsible and effective action.” Also, his department is in the process of implementing emissions regulations on coal-fired power plants for 2015-2030, justified on a “social cost of carbon” of \$25/t.

## **Ontario’s Green Energy Slammed**

Ontario Auditor-General Jim McCarter’s annual report allocated more than a quarter of its “value for money” page count to electricity matters. Two themes stood out: ministerial intervention in the decisions of expert agencies, and the costs for consumers. Under the *Green Energy Act*, the Ontario Minister of Energy has the power to control to bypass the legal mandates of the Ontario Energy Board and the Ontario Power Authority. In 2009 the minister overrode an OPA recommendation to automatically reduce the excessive incentives paid to solar generators. The AG estimates that the recommendations would have saved Ontarians \$2.6 billion. On another occasion a ministerial delay in implementing price reductions cost consumers \$950 million.

One of the most touted benefits of the GEA was to be the creation of 50,000 jobs. The AG noted that about 30,000 of these will be temporary, construction positions. He also referred to studies in other jurisdictions showing that 2-4 jobs are often lost in other sectors of the economy due to high electricity prices. The AG also criticized the \$7 billion deal with Samsung Electronics Corp to build 2,500 MW of wind and solar power, saying that it was done with “no formal economic analysis.”

---

Cutbacks to Ontario’s subsidies are inevitable, but the beneficiaries of the feed-in tariffs – 13.5¢/kWh for wind and up to 80¢/kWh for solar – are mounting a campaign through their lobby organization, the Ontario Sustainable Energy Association. The OSEA is attacking subsidies given to nuclear power producers.

Ian Cameron  
Director, Friends of Science

## SCIENCE NEWS

### Climategate II

A second instalment of over 5000 emails from the CRU/ East Anglia Hockey Team and their IPCC colleagues was released November 22, (in)conveniently in time for the COP-17 Durban conference. These correspondences put the original climategate emails into better context and further shows that IPCC scientists are not objectively reporting climate science.

The climategate emails covers many topics. To pick one item, in 2003 Chris de Freitas published in the journal “Climate Research” a meta-analysis by Harvard astronomers Willie Soon & Sallie Baliunas of all the papers that have been written on the Medieval Warming Period (MWP). The paper showed that the vast majority of published, peer-reviewed papers on the MWP conclude that it was both geographically widespread and significantly warmer than now, contradicting the IPCC storyline. The emails show the IPCC scientists conspiring to close down the journal and to have Chris de Freitas fired. There was a series of emails initiated by hockey stick creator Michael Mann to take direct punitive action at Harvard against Willie Soon and Sallie Baliunas. Mann wrote to Trenberth and other “colleagues” alleging that Soon and Baliunas had “hijacked” Harvard’s public relations office. The emails discuss ways to discredit the work of Soon and Baliunas. Senior scientist Tom Wigley states “It would also be useful to have Harvard disassociate themselves from the work...”

The conspirators managed to persuade the wider community that Soon and Baliunas had conflated temperature and precipitation proxies, but in fact they got it right. Steven McIntre writes “Wigley clearly recognized that Soon and Baliunas had raised valid issues in connection with precipitation proxies, but, instead of acknowledging valid points, conspired with the others to deny them any credit whatever. Wigley’s conduct here seems to me particular despicable.” Wigley writes June 5, 2003 (email 0682). “By chance SB03 may have got some of these precip [sic] things right, but we don’t want to give them any way to claim credit.”

See <http://climateaudit.org/2011/11/28/direct-action-at-harvard/>

And <http://climateaudit.org/2011/12/06/climategate-2-0-an-ar5-perspective/>

Chris de Freitas is a current member, and Sallie Baliunas is a past member of the Friends of Science Scientific Advisory Board.

A sampling of the emails is at <http://www.friendsofscience.org/index.php?id=558>

<2884> Wigley:

“Mike, the Figure you sent is very deceptive [...] there have been a number of dishonest presentations of model results by individual authors and by IPCC [...]”

<0953> Jones:

“This [adjustment] will reduce the 1940-1970 cooling in NH temps. Explaining the cooling with sulphates won't be quite as necessary.”

<3373> Bradley:

“I'm sure you agree--the Mann/Jones GRL paper was truly pathetic and should never have been published.”

<4758> Osborn:

“Because how can we be critical of Crowley for throwing out 40-years in the middle of his calibration, when we're throwing out all post-1960 data ... and also all pre-1881 or pre-1871 data”

<4443> Jones:

“Basic problem is that all models are wrong - not got enough middle and low level clouds.”

<2440> Jones:

“I've been told that IPCC is above national FOI Acts. One way to cover yourself and all those working in AR5 would be to delete all emails at the end of the process”

<1577> Jones:

“Any work we have done in the past is done on the back of the research grants we get - and has to be well hidden. I've discussed this with the main funder (US Dept of Energy) in the past and they are happy about not releasing the original station data.”

## **Climate Models versus Observations**


The IPCC climate projections are based on climate computer models that don't work. The models do not work because they do not include natural causes of climate change, especially ocean cycles and solar activity changes. The IPCC claims that some climate models include solar forcings by including changes in solar irradiance, which is called the “solar constant”. But the tiny changes of the solar constant are an insignificant portion of the total solar impacts on climate.

Climate scientist and blogger Bob Tisdale has recently prepared a series of graphs which compares hindcasts of climate models to actual sea surface temperature (SST) measurements. A hindcast is a computer simulation of the past which includes the history of all the factors that affect climate in the climate models. These factors may include changes in greenhouse gases, aerosols, volcanic events, ocean cycles and solar

activity. If the climate model is realistic, it should reproduce the historical temperature record, which is called a history match. A model that fails the history match will not produce reliable projections.

The graphs show that the models do a very poor job of simulating climate variability, they produce too much warming in the tropics and the southern exotropics and they do not match the frequency, magnitude, and trend of ocean cycle events.

The graph below compares the Easter Pacific SST to models by latitude. This includes the important El Nino region so a good history match here is critical. The South Pole is on the left, the North Pole is on the right and the equator is at the middle of the graph. The graph compares the actual SST trend (in degrees Celsius per decade) by latitude band for the 9-year period to February 2011 to the multi-model average trend. The Eastern Pacific tropical SST has **declined** at the equator at 0.14 C/decade, but the models show a strong warming of 0.19 C/decade.



There is no correspondence between the hindcasts and measurements. Bob Tisdale writes “The sea surface temperature models appear to have no basis in reality.”

I have prepared a short summary presenting six of Bob Tisdale’s graphs at;  
<http://www.friendsofscience.org/index.php?id=557>

Readers are encouraged to view Bob Tisdale's original posts (which are linked to the summary) for further information.

Ken Gregory  
Director, Friends of Science

## **DONATIONS**

To accomplish our educational goals we need financial help from our members. We realize that these tough economic times are not conducive to many charitable donations, but in order to stop excessive taxation for a non-existent problem and get life back onto a normal stream we need to raise important questions – **this debate matters, and it starts with you.**

Please go to the upper right of the home page, [www.friendsofscience.org](http://www.friendsofscience.org) and make your contribution. 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 and for other planned activities including luncheons and the sponsorships of high profile speakers to address student bodies and other gatherings.

### **Friends of Science Society**

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)  
[www.climatechange101.ca](http://www.climatechange101.ca)