

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

### ***No. 17***

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

---

#### **PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE**

According to a recent Gallup Poll a record number of Americans (41%) now believe that the seriousness of global warming is exaggerated. This represents the highest level of public scepticism about main stream reporting on global warming seen in a decade of Gallup polls on the subject.

The worm is definitely turning as people question “received truth”. While the Friends would like to think that recognition of flawed AGW science forms the basis of the scepticism the truth is probably less subtle. It is probably the recognition that the recent cold winters are inconsistent with a warming atmosphere and the sudden awareness that during these hard financial times our monies should not be wasted on hypothetical problems.

But the science may be nonetheless potent in swaying the legislators. Names of over 700 dissenting scientists have now been added to U. S. Senate Minority Report of sceptical international scientists. There numbers are increasing at the rate of four scientists a week. The over 700 dissenting scientists are more than 13 times the number of UN scientists who authored the media-hyped IPCC 2007 Summary for Policymakers.

The Friends are holding a luncheon May 21, 2009 to examine the global trends in annual temperatures which have occurred over the last ten years (see attachment). Our guest speaker will be Dr. Timothy Ball who has been, with his well grounded scepticism, a thorn in the side of “warmers” for over ten years. His well illustrated and compelling talks have been widely appreciated by non-scientific general audiences. Each attendee at the luncheon will receive a free copy of Bruno Wiskel’s book entitled “The Emperor’s new Climate” courtesy of The Frontier Centre for Public Policy. We hope that you will support the Friends in this endeavour by attending with your friends and associates.

Dr. Gerald Osborn of the University of Calgary’s Earth Science Department is currently giving a two part lecture at the University with respect to “climate change”. We were disappointed that while Osborn frequently remarked as to his “unbiased” approach, he nonetheless seemed to delight in ridiculing the anti-warmers. And he made several patronizing comments about the Friends. But on balance we found the lectures worthwhile in-so-far as they demonstrated to somewhat surprised students that there were defensible arguments against positions adopted by Al Gore and his acolytes.

The Friends were recently represented at The 2009 International Conference on Climate Change (ICCC) <http://www.heartland.org/events/NewYork09/proceedings.html> by Bruno Wiskel who distributed FoS literature and copies of our DVDs. Bruno was much impressed by the high level of the scientific presentations and especially enjoyed Lord Monckton’ “evangelical” delivery of an entertaining talk entitled *Great is Truth and Mighty above All Things (Magna est Veritaset Praevalet)*. More information about the ICCC is given later in this newsletter by Peter Burns.

---

The science section of this newsletter is perhaps of special interest because it provides additional evidence regarding the importance of solar fluctuations to climatic temperature variations.

The Friends continue to seek funding for a cross Canada radio blitz which would attempt to educate Canadians on issues related to climate warming. But so far our efforts have been met with very limited success. We need much greater assistance from our members in this matter if we are to succeed.

Douglas Leahey PhD  
President Friends of Science

### **INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CLIMATE CHANGE (ICCC) AND OTHER MATTERS**

If you're a Climate Skeptic, or a Climate Realist, as **Joseph Bast**, Chairman of the recently concluded ICCC conference thinks we should call ourselves, then you will enjoy the Conference Proceedings. This conference (which you can see and hear – Just go to News & Events on the Friends of Science website, or click <http://www.friendsofscience.org/index.php?id=419> ) brought together the real stars of the Global Warming debate. The scientists and politicians who have both the courage and the facts that disprove and cast shame upon the alarmist scientists (such as **James Hansen**), profiteers (such as **Al Gore**), and politicians (such as **Nancy Pelosi**, who in recent weeks has reportedly been bragging about the hundreds of billions of dollars that she would extract from corporations through the sale of Emission Certificates). From the opening address by Vaclav Klaus, right through to the almost evangelical speech given by Christopher Monckton, renowned scientists from around the world poured the coldest of water on the entire notion of a Runaway Greenhouse Gas Catastrophe as envisioned by the "**Algorites**".

It was a conference among men and women who know they are right, who know the other side is using debased science together with, misstatements, distortions and outright lies to prove a thesis that is false, and who are determined not to allow this to happen.

But as good as the conference was (and I urge you once more to check out at least some of the proceedings, particularly the closing address by **Christopher Monckton**), it was not the best of last week's events. The best thing was the increasingly favourable response we are getting in the popular press and other media. Columns by **Christopher Booker**, **Lorne Gunter**, **Peter Foster** and others are becoming more critical in their reporting on climate change. They are beginning to take notice of the discrepancies between the doom-laden prophecies of the Algorites and the actual weather/climate we are experiencing. Most important, they are calling into question the global climate modelling that forms the basis of the alarmist's predictions.

It's time for all of us to call attention to the shabby science and the ad-hominem attacks that characterize the Algorites response to criticism. There's no need to be disrespectful. Simply ask four questions when you meet with these people. It would be surprising if they could respond to

---

any of them satisfactorily. (Other people standing nearby may get the message even if your target doesn't.)

The questions are:

- 1) *Where's the hot spot?*
- 2) *It has been established that CO<sub>2</sub> increases lag behind global warming by an average of 800 years. How can CO<sub>2</sub> have any effect on the Earth's climate?*
- 3) *Has the temperature increased since 1998?*
- 4) *Why do you want to raise my energy costs?*

Clear unequivocal answers to the first three of these questions can be found in a document entitled "The Skeptics Handbook", by Joanne Nova, one of the presenters at the IPCC conference. You can obtain your own copy from the website below.

[http://joannenova.com.au/globalwarming/skeptics\\_handbook\\_2-0.pdf](http://joannenova.com.au/globalwarming/skeptics_handbook_2-0.pdf)

As far as the 4<sup>th</sup> question is concerned, there is no right answer, but it might be fun to watch the response.

Peter Burns  
Director Friends of Science

## SCIENCE NEWS

### Using the Oceans to Quantify Solar Forcing

An important paper by Nir J. Shaviv, of the Racah Institute of Physics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel, shows that the solar forcing associated with the eleven year solar cycle is about seven times larger than that caused by the total solar irradiance (TSI) variations. TSI refers to the total amount of solar radiation energy received from the Sun.

Small changes in the TSI are not enough to significantly affect Earth's climate and the IPCC has repeatedly dismissed solar forcing for these reasons. However, hundreds of studies show strong correlations between the solar changes and global temperatures.

The paper uses three independent records to estimate the heat flux into and out of the oceans over the solar cycles:

1. Ocean heat content
2. Sea level changes from tide gauges
3. Sea surface temperature

These three records vary with the solar cycle and show that there *must* be an amplification mechanism of the solar irradiance to explain the large heat flux associated with the oceans. The

---

author considers the heat flux calculated from the ocean heat content data to be the most accurate. This record shows that the heat flux is seven times that of the TSI forcing.

Nir Shaviv favors the solar-wind cosmic ray theory promoted by Svenmark as a likely amplification mechanism. In this theory, changes of solar wind change the galactic cosmic ray flux entering the atmosphere. Cosmic rays act as nucleus for water droplets which form clouds which reflect solar radiation.

The heat flux going into the oceans is consistent with the low-altitude cloud variations. The heat flux per change of TSI is estimated to be 1.2 +/- 0.3, while the Sun & cloud forcing per change of TSI is estimated to be 1.3 +/- 0.4. The Sun-cosmic ray-climate link predicts the correct radiation imbalance observed in the ocean heat flux variations.

A summary of the technical paper with a link to it is below.

[http://www.friendsofscience.org/assets/documents/Oceans\\_Solar\\_Forcing.pdf](http://www.friendsofscience.org/assets/documents/Oceans_Solar_Forcing.pdf)

### **Changes in Outgoing Longwave Radiation**

Dr. Richard Lindzen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology gave a keynote address at the recently concluded Heartland Institute 2009 International Conference on Climate Change. He says that greenhouse gases act to inhibit the emission of infrared radiation, known as outgoing longwave radiation (OLR), somewhat like a blanket. Water vapour is by far the most powerful greenhouse gas. Climate models predict that water vapour and clouds would reduce the OLR, creating a positive feedback and greatly amplifying the small direct effect from CO<sub>2</sub> increases.

He says that satellite data shows the OLR during the 1990s “was not only much greater than what models predicted, but also greater than what would have been expected if there were no feedback at all.” This implies that nature is dominated by stabilizing negative feedback, contrary to model predictions.

[http://www.heartland.org/full/24841/Climate\\_Alarm\\_What\\_We\\_Are\\_Up\\_Against\\_and\\_What\\_to\\_Do.html](http://www.heartland.org/full/24841/Climate_Alarm_What_We_Are_Up_Against_and_What_to_Do.html)

A paper presented at the conference by Dr. William Gray of the Colorado State University showed that upper tropospheric water vapour has decreased over the last several decades, allowing OLR to increase. He showed that CO<sub>2</sub> increases could have caused at most 0.2 °C global surface warming over the 20<sup>th</sup> century. From 1950 to 2008, OLR has increased by three percent, while water vapour content (at 400 mbar pressure level) has declined by three percent. The climate models are programmed to have a simultaneous moistening of the lower and upper tropospheric levels, but the observations show a drying of the upper troposphere, allowing heat to escape to space.

[http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\\_policybot/pdf/24891.pdf](http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/24891.pdf)

### **Satellite Evidence of Negative Cloud Feedback**

---

At the climate conference, Dr. Roy Spencer presented satellite evidence of negative feedback that has been obscured by radiative forcing due to natural cloud variations. The strong negative feedback means that the influences of increasing CO<sub>2</sub> are too weak to cause the observed global warming. [http://www.heartland.org/bin/media/newyork09/PowerPoint/Roy\\_Spencer.ppt](http://www.heartland.org/bin/media/newyork09/PowerPoint/Roy_Spencer.ppt)

Roy Spencer & William Braswell, in a paper published in the Journal of Climate, November 2008, show that feedbacks can only be measured in response to non-radiative forcing, so radiative forcing from cloud variations have to be removed from the analysis. The paper presented the results of a simple climate model which produces temperature variation statistics similar to satellite data, and shows that the usually feedback interpretation is strongly biased to positive feedback. If warming causes a reduction in low clouds, this would be a positive feedback because it would let more sunlight in to heat the Earth's surface. But if natural atmospheric variations cause a decrease in low clouds, the resulting warming would be an effect, rather than a cause. This confusion of cause and effect gives the illusion of a positive feedback, when the true feedback is negative. <http://www.drroyspencer.com/Spencer-and-Braswell-08.pdf>

Climate modelers falsely assume that all cloud changes are due to temperature changes. This results in climate models predicting too much warming in response to greenhouse gas emissions.

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.

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. Potential contributors are urged to call FoS director Chuck Simpson (403-345-9512) to discuss their priorities with respect to fund allocation, proposed projects etc.

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)