

Global Warming ‘Consensus’ in Freefall - Inhofe Speech

More Than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims

Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) – Ranking Member, Environment and Public Works Committee

Speech Delivered on Senate Floor January 8, 2009

[Link to Press Release:](#)

[Link to Speech Excerpt: Politically Left Scientists Now Rejecting Climate Fears](#)

[Link To Senate Minority Report: More Than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims](#)

As we begin a new Congress and a new Administration, we begin a new chapter in energy and environmental policy. Now is the time that environmental activists, the United Nations, and many of my Democratic colleagues have been salivating over for years. The stars are aligned, the Democrats control both sides of Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Supreme Court has spoken out that carbon dioxide is a pollutant under the Clean Air Act, even though it was a split 5-4 decision. They believe the stage is set for a home run on mandatory Kyoto-like climate controls and the dawn of a new, bustling green energy economy.

However, before many of my colleagues rush to leap before they look, I want to remind them of some very unfortunate developments that may complicate their early action-item wish lists. I ask my colleagues to at least consider some of the facts that I will be revealing over the next series of speeches and to keep an open mind before rushing to sweeping action after waiting for so many years. The scale and pace of the climate proposals and regulatory actions we have debated in the past, including the recently failed Lieberman-Warner bill, and the ones we will likely be debating this Congress, leave little room for error in this fragile, recession-ridden economy. And the inflated promises of a sweeping green jobs revolution need an honest and frank reality check.

The proponents of mandatory global warming controls need to be honest with the American people. The purpose of these programs is to ration fossil based energy by making it more expensive, and therefore, less appealing for public consumption. It is a regressive tax that imposes a greater burden (relative to resources) on the poor than on the rich. Let me say that again. The purpose of these programs is to ration fossil based energy by making it more expensive, and therefore, less appealing for public consumption. It is a regressive tax that imposes a greater burden (relative to resources) on

the poor than on the rich. We must be honest with the American public and with ourselves.

Advocates may argue that the redistribution of wealth towards low income consumers will offset the balance of revenue or taxes being taken in, but we learned firsthand during the Lieberman-Warner debate that this was simply not true. While the bill's sponsors tried to convince us that there was actually tax relief in the bill, we learned that families and workers would still have to pay \$6.735 trillion in to the system in the form of higher energy costs to get back an estimated \$802 billion in tax relief. That's a return of \$1.00 for every \$8.40 paid! It's time for the proponents of climate policies to be honest. It's expensive and it's going to cost taxpayers money.

In the upcoming weeks, I will go into more detail about other false promises that the proponents of mandatory global warming policies are advocating. Among them are a reality check on green jobs projections (I believe the number of new green jobs from a climate regime are overstated compared to the number of manufacturing jobs lost), a review of the weaknesses of offset policies (it appears that companies have bought offsets which may not be real), and a review of the attempts to estimate the costs of inaction (many advocates are claiming it is more expensive to do nothing than the costs of a cap and trade but they use untested, and non-transparent economic modeling). All of these issues will play a vital role in the debate on both energy and global warming policy, which have become unavoidably intertwined.

When there are sensible proposals debated this Congress that can achieve double benefits of reducing emissions and making America's energy supply more stable, diverse, and affordable, then I will look forward to working in a bipartisan manner to achieve these goals. Increasing our domestic energy production and lowering our dependence on foreign oil are two issues that are critically important to myself and my state of Oklahoma. However, we need to be smart and realistic about these policies. Unfortunately, I fear that the scale and pace that many of my colleagues will be advocating for with mandatory climate policies are unrealistic, extraordinarily expensive, and ill advised. And what is the driver for these unrealistic proposals that seek to make unnecessarily abrupt and painful increases to our energy costs in the near term? It's all rooted in global warming science.

I have given over 12 floor speeches on the science of global warming. Today, I want to update my colleagues on some of the latest science that has not been reported in the mainstream media. But before I do that, I ask all my colleagues to think about this issue. Science should not be viewed through any one frame. It is not partisan. It is not regional. However, the political process has largely engulfed the science behind climate change, and as I have documented in speeches before, the politicization of global warming science has become one of the most unfortunate developments of the last 8 years. Anytime one questions a hypothesis or a conclusion that does not fall in line with "the sky is falling" doom and gloom scenario of global warming alarmists, it is ridiculed, written off, denigrated, and not reported by the mainstream media. Yet anytime a more severe interpretation or alarming statistic is related, it is headline grabbing. Objective,

transparent, and verifiable science gets lost in the public dialogue. Funding has a way of influencing this debate as well. Former Vice President Al Gore's family has [reportedly gone from a net worth at \\$1 million to \\$2 million in 2000 to a net worth well in excess of \\$100 million today](#). According to [Bloomberg News](#), Gore "left the White House seven years ago with less than \$2 million in assets." But by 2007, Gore's "net worth was 'well in excess' of \$100 million," according to Fast Company magazine. According to Fast Company, Gore made the money due in part to a "steady flow of six-figure speaking gigs" some as high as \$175,000 a speech. Gore is also spending \$300 million dollars to promote his brand of climate fear to the public.

When the stakes of the policy outcomes with cap and trade and other mandatory climate proposals are this high, I hope that the Senate this year will embrace my calls for objectivity and transparency in science and modeling, and I welcome my colleagues' comments on these issues as the debate moves forward. As policy makers, it is our duty to ensure that models developed by agencies and used in policy are useful for their intended purpose, articulate major assumptions and uncertainties, and separate scientific conclusions from policy judgments.

Huffington Post Features Article Demanding Apology From Gore

However, with global warming science this has not been the case, with many left-of-center scientists and environmental activists now realizing that the so-called "consensus" on man-made global warming is not holding up. The left-wing blog *Huffington Post* surprised many by featuring an article on January 3, 2008 by [Harold Ambler, demanding an apology from Gore](#) for promoting unfounded global warming fears. The *Huffington Post* article accused Gore of telling "the biggest whopper ever sold to the public in the history of humankind" because he claimed the science was settled on global warming. The *Huffington Post* article titled "Mr. Gore: Apology Accepted" adds, "It is Mr. Gore and his brethren who are flat-Earthers," not skeptics.

Again, it is not Jim Inhofe saying this about Gore, it is the left-wing blog *Huffington Post* saying these things.

The *Huffington Post* article continues, "Let us neither cripple our own economy by mislabeling carbon dioxide a pollutant nor discourage development in the Third World, where suffering continues unabated, day after day."

Another left-of-center atmospheric scientist who has dissented on man-made climate fears is the UK's Richard Courtney. Courtney, a UN IPCC expert reviewer and a UK-based climate and atmospheric science consultant, is a self-described socialist who also happens to reject man-made climate fears.

Joining Courtney are many other progressive environmentalist scientists:

Former Greenpeace member and Finnish Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a lecturer of environmental technology and a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in

Finland who has authored 200 scientific publications, is also skeptical of man-made climate doom. Ahlbeck wrote in 2008, “Contrary to common belief, there has been no or little global warming since 1995 and this is shown by two completely independent datasets. But so far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming.”

Life-long liberal Democrat Dr. Martin Hertzberg, a retired Navy meteorologist with a PhD in physical chemistry, also declared his dissent of warming fears in 2008. “As a scientist and life-long liberal Democrat, I find the constant regurgitation of the anecdotal, fear mongering clap-trap about human-caused global warming to be a disservice to science,” Hertzberg wrote. “The global warming alarmists don't even bother with data! All they have are half-baked computer models that are totally out of touch with reality and have already been proven to be false,” Hertzberg added.

In addition, CNN -- not a bastion of conservatism -- had yet another one of its meteorologists dissent from warming fears. Meteorologist Chad Myers, a meteorologist for 22 years, certified by the American Meteorological Society, spoke out against anthropogenic climate claims on CNN in December. “You know, to think that we could affect weather all that much is pretty arrogant,” Myers said during a December 18, 2008. “Mother Nature is so big, the world is so big, the oceans are so big – I think we’re going to die from a lack of fresh water or we’re going to die from ocean acidification before we die from global warming, for sure,” Myers explained.

Myers joins fellow CNN [meteorologist Rob Marciano who compared Gore’s film to ‘fiction’ in 2007](#) and CNN anchor Lou Dobbs who just said of global warming fear promotion [on January 5, “It’s Almost a Religion without Any Question.”](#)

It is becoming increasingly clear that man-made global warming is not a partisan left vs. right issue. It is a scientific question and the promoters of global warming fears now realize they have significantly overreached. *[Note: See this speech excerpt for a more complete analysis of progressive scientists and environmentalists who believe climate fear promotion has “co-opted” the green movement.]*

I am hopeful that if we begin debating the costs of inaction this year as part of climate policy, that the Senate will embrace these objectives so all sides of the debate can be heard.

More than 650 Scientists Dissent

Recently, [I released a new minority report on climate science which documents many of the studies ignored by the mainstream media. That report included over 650 scientists who have challenged man-made global warming claims made by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change \(IPCC\).](#) I have been detailing these science issues for a number of years. In a [July 28, 2003, floor speech](#) in this chamber, I said the issue of global warming “is far from settled, and indeed is seriously disputed.”

I explained that “anyone who pays even cursory attention to the issue understands that scientists vigorously disagree over whether human activities are responsible for global warming, or whether those activities will precipitate natural disasters.” And I noted that “not only is there a debate, but (at least in certain corridors) the debate is shifting away from those who subscribe to global warming alarmism.”

After that speech, I led the charge against the McCain-Lieberman global warming cap-and-trade bill in 2003 and again in 2005, both times easily defeating the bills. At times, it was a lonely battle with few Republican members willing to join me on the Senate floor to publicly oppose the McCain-Lieberman bills.

This past June, not only was I joined by dozens of Republican Senators, [but nearly 30% of the Democratic Senators \(Boxer only had 35 Democratic Senators willing to vote for final passage\)](#) rebelled against their leadership and opposed the Lieberman-Warner/Boxer Climate Tax Bill. This Climate Tax Bill was so thoroughly disowned by Democratic Leadership that proponents of climate taxes will now be forced to start from scratch this year.

Republicans were prepared to debate the bill and were ready to offer amendments, but the Democrats did not want to debate, much less vote, on our amendments that were aimed at protecting American families and workers from the devastating economic impacts of this bill. When faced with the inconvenient truth of the bill’s impact on skyrocketing gas prices, it was Democratic Senators who wanted to see this bill die a quick death.

The Wall Street Journal aptly noted that environmentalists are “stunned that their global warming agenda is in collapse.” The paper added, “The green groups now look as politically intimidating as the skinny kid on the beach who gets sand kicked in his face.” The paper quoted a political analyst, noting that “this issue is starting to feel like the Hillary health care plan.”

Despite claims that we must “act now” to prevent a climate “crisis,” the Climate Tax Bill would not have resulted in any “action” whatsoever. The bill, often touted as an “insurance policy” against global warming, would instead have been all economic pain for no climate gain. This is because without a global treaty, and binding commitments by both developing and developed countries, the climate bill debated here would not have had any measurable impact on reducing greenhouse gasses. This was confirmed by the EPA.

Americans are suspicious of the need for “solutions” to global warming. A Gallup Poll released on Earth Day 2008 revealed that the American public’s concern about man-made global warming has remained unchanged since 1989. According to Gallup, “Despite the enormous attention paid to global warming over the past several years, the average American is in some ways no more worried about it than in years past.”

What perhaps is most striking is that aside from the economics of global warming “solutions,” the science has continued to move in the direction I predicted in 2003.

In 2007, I released a Senate Minority Report detailing over 400 scientists disputing man-made global warming claims and the inconvenient real world climate developments refuting warming fears.

Now in 2008, we have updated our report and the so-called “consensus” on global warming is even more disputed. Over 650 dissenting scientists from around the globe challenged man-made global warming claims made by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and former Vice President Al Gore. Our new 233-page U.S. Senate Minority Report features the skeptical voices of over 650 prominent international scientists, including many current and former UN IPCC scientists, who have now turned against the UN IPCC. This updated report includes an additional 250 (and growing) scientists and climate researchers since the initial release in December 2007. The over 650 dissenting scientists are more than [12 times the number of UN scientists](#) (52) who authored the media-hyped IPCC 2007 [Summary for Policymakers](#).

The chorus of skeptical scientific voices grew louder in 2008 as a [steady stream of peer-reviewed studies, analyses, real world data](#), and [inconvenient developments](#) challenged the UN’s and former Vice President Al Gore’s claims that the “science is settled” and there is a “consensus.” Despite what is being portrayed in the media, on a range of issues, 2008 proved to be challenging for the promoters of man-made climate fears.

In addition, the following developments further secured 2008 as the year the [“consensus” collapsed](#). [Russian scientists “rejected the very idea that carbon dioxide may be responsible for global warming.”](#) An American Physical Society editor conceded that [a “considerable presence” of scientific skeptics exists](#). [An International team of scientists countered the UN IPCC, declaring, “Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate.”](#) [India issued a report challenging global warming fears](#). A team of [international scientists demanded the UN IPCC “be called to account and cease its deceptive practices,”](#) and [a canvass of more than 51,000 Canadian scientists revealed that 68% disagree that global warming science is “settled.”](#)

This new report is the latest evidence of the growing groundswell of scientific opposition challenging significant aspects of the claims of the UN IPCC and Al Gore. Scientific meetings are now being dominated by a growing number of skeptical scientists. The prestigious International Geological Congress, dubbed the geologists' equivalent of the Olympic Games, was held in Norway in August 2008 and prominently featured the voices of scientists skeptical of man-made global warming fears. The conference was reportedly [overwhelmed with skeptical scientists, with “2/3 of presenters and question-askers were hostile to, even dismissive of, the UN IPCC.”](#)

Even the mainstream media in 2008 began to take notice of the expanding number of scientists serving as “consensus busters.” A November 25, 2008, [article in Politico](#) noted that a “growing accumulation” of science is challenging warming fears, and added that the “science behind global warming may still be too shaky to warrant cap-and-trade

legislation.” Canada’s [National Post noted](#) on October 20, 2008, that “the number of climate change skeptics is growing rapidly.” New York Times environmental reporter Andrew Revkin noted on March 6, 2008, "As we all know, climate science is not a numbers game (there are heaps of signed statements by folks with advanced degrees on all sides of this issue)." I agree with him, and it’s a shame that we have had to resort to a numbers game. It should be focused on objective, transparent and peer reviewed science, and debate should not be quarantined. In 2007, Washington Post staff writer Juliet Eilperin conceded the obvious, writing that climate skeptics "appear to be expanding rather than shrinking."

Skeptical scientists are gaining recognition despite what many say is a bias against them in parts of the scientific community and are facing significant funding disadvantages. Dr. William M. Briggs, a climate statistician who serves on the American Meteorological Society's Probability and Statistics Committee, explained that his colleagues described “absolute horror stories of what happened to them when they tried getting papers published that explored non-‘consensus’ views.” In a March 4, 2008, report Briggs described the behavior as “really outrageous and unethical ... on the parts of some editors. I was shocked.”

Here are some of the highlights of my [2008 Senate Minority Report featuring over 650 international scientists dissenting from man-made climate claims](#):

“I am a skeptic...Global warming has become a new religion.” - Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever.

“Since I am no longer affiliated with any organization nor receiving any funding, I can speak quite frankly....As a scientist I remain skeptical...The main basis of the claim that man’s release of greenhouse gases is the cause of the warming is based almost entirely upon climate models. We all know the frailty of models concerning the air-surface system.” - Atmospheric Scientist Dr. Joanne Simpson, the first woman in the world to receive a PhD in meteorology, and formerly of NASA, who has authored more than 190 studies and has been called “among the most preeminent scientists of the last 100 years.”

Warming fears are the “worst scientific scandal in the history... When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists.” - UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist.

“The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn’t listen to others. It doesn’t have open minds... I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists.” - Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.

“So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming.” - Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland, author of 200 scientific publications and former Greenpeace member.

“Anyone who claims that the debate is over and the conclusions are firm has a fundamentally unscientific approach to one of the most momentous issues of our time.” - Solar physicist Dr. Pal Brekke, senior advisor to the Norwegian Space Centre in Oslo. Brekke has published more than 40 peer-reviewed scientific articles on the sun and solar interaction with the Earth.

“The models and forecasts of the UN IPCC "are incorrect because they only are based on mathematical models and presented results at scenarios that do not include, for example, solar activity.” - Victor Manuel Velasco Herrera, a researcher at the Institute of Geophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico

“It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don’t buy into anthropogenic global warming.” - U.S Government Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA.

“Even doubling or tripling the amount of carbon dioxide will virtually have little impact, as water vapour and water condensed on particles as clouds dominate the worldwide scene and always will.” – . Geoffrey G. Duffy, a professor in the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering of the University of Auckland, NZ.

“After reading [UN IPCC chairman] Pachauri's asinine comment [comparing skeptics to] Flat Earthers, it's hard to remain quiet.” - Climate statistician Dr. William M. Briggs, who specializes in the statistics of forecast evaluation, serves on the American Meteorological Society's Probability and Statistics Committee and is an Associate Editor of Monthly Weather Review.

“The Kyoto theorists have put the cart before the horse. It is global warming that triggers higher levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, not the other way round...A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace. As a result, the discussion was one-sided and heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact,” Andrei Kapitsa, a Russian geographer and Antarctic ice core researcher.

“Nature's regulatory instrument is water vapor: more carbon dioxide leads to less moisture in the air, keeping the overall GHG content in accord with the necessary balance conditions.” – Prominent Hungarian Physicist and environmental researcher Dr. Miklós Zágoni reversed his view of man-made warming and is now a skeptic. Zágoni was once Hungary’s most outspoken supporter of the Kyoto Protocol.

“For how many years must the planet cool before we begin to understand that the planet is not warming? For how many years must cooling go on?” - Geologist Dr. David Gee the chairman of the science committee of the 2008 International Geological Congress who has authored 130 plus peer reviewed papers, and is currently at Uppsala University in Sweden.

“Gore prompted me to start delving into the science again and I quickly found myself solidly in the skeptic camp...Climate models can at best be useful for explaining climate changes after the fact.” - Meteorologist Hajo Smit of Holland, who reversed his belief in man-made warming to become a skeptic, is a former member of the Dutch UN IPCC committee.

“The quantity of CO₂ we produce is insignificant in terms of the natural circulation between air, water and soil... I am doing a detailed assessment of the UN IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science.” - South African Nuclear Physicist and Chemical Engineer Dr. Philip Lloyd, a UN IPCC co-coordinating lead author who has authored over 150 refereed publications.

“Many [scientists] are now searching for a way to back out quietly (from promoting warming fears), without having their professional careers ruined.” - Atmospheric physicist James A. Peden, formerly of the Space Research and Coordination Center in Pittsburgh.

“All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead.” - Geophysicist Dr. Phil Chapman, an astronautical engineer and former NASA astronaut, served as staff physicist at MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)

“Creating an ideology pegged to carbon dioxide is a dangerous nonsense...The present alarm on climate change is an instrument of social control, a pretext for major businesses and political battle. It became an ideology, which is concerning.” - Environmental Scientist Professor Delgado Domingos of Portugal, the founder of the Numerical Weather Forecast group, has more than 150 published articles.

“CO₂ emissions make absolutely no difference one way or another....Every scientist knows this, but it doesn't pay to say so...Global warming, as a political vehicle, keeps Europeans in the driver's seat and developing nations walking barefoot.” - Dr. Takeda Kunihiro, vice-chancellor of the Institute of Science and Technology Research at Chubu University in Japan.

“The [global warming] scaremongering has its justification in the fact that it is something that generates funds.” - Award-winning Paleontologist Dr. Eduardo Tonni of the Committee for Scientific Research in Buenos Aires and head of the Paleontology Department at the University of La Plata.

“Whatever the weather, it's not being caused by global warming. If anything, the climate may be starting into a cooling period.” Atmospheric scientist Dr. Art V. Douglas, former Chair of the Atmospheric Sciences Department at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, and is the author of numerous papers for peer-reviewed publications.

“But there is no falsifiable scientific basis whatever to assert this warming is caused by human-produced greenhouse gasses because current physical theory is too grossly inadequate to establish any cause at all.” - Chemist Dr. Patrick Frank, who has authored more than 50 peer-reviewed articles.

“The ‘global warming scare’ is being used as a political tool to increase government control over American lives, incomes and decision making. It has no place in the Society's activities.” - Award-Winning NASA Astronaut/Geologist and Moonwalker Jack Schmitt who flew on the Apollo 17 mission and formerly of the Norwegian Geological Survey and for the U.S. Geological Survey.

“Earth has cooled since 1998 in defiance of the predictions by the UN-IPCC....The global temperature for 2007 was the coldest in a decade and the coldest of the millennium...which is why ‘global warming’ is now called ‘climate change.’” - Climatologist Dr. Richard Keen of the Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences at the University of Colorado.

“I have yet to see credible proof of carbon dioxide driving climate change, yet alone man-made CO2 driving it. The atmospheric hot-spot is missing and the ice core data refute this. When will we collectively awake from this deceptive delusion?” - Dr. G LeBlanc Smith, a retired Principal Research Scientist with Australia's CSIRO.

#

The distinguished scientists featured in this new report are experts in diverse fields, including: climatology; geology; biology; glaciology; biogeography; meteorology; oceanography; economics; chemistry; mathematics; environmental sciences; astrophysics, engineering; physics and paleoclimatology. Some of those profiled have won Nobel Prizes for their outstanding contribution to their field of expertise and many shared a portion of the UN IPCC Nobel Peace Prize with Vice President Gore.

The notion of "hundreds" or "thousands" of UN scientists agreeing to a scientific statement does not hold up to scrutiny. Recent research by Australian climate data analyst John McLean revealed that the IPCC's peer-review process for the Summary for Policymakers leaves much to be desired. The 52 scientists who participated in the 2007 IPCC Summary for Policymakers had to adhere to the wishes of the UN political leaders and delegates in a process described as more closely resembling a political party's convention platform battle, not a scientific process. Repeat: Only 52 scientists wrote the media hyped UN Summary for Policymakers and they had to conform with the political

leaders wishes.

One former UN IPCC scientist bluntly told EPW how the UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers “distorted” the scientists’ work. “I have found examples of a Summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said,” explained South African Nuclear Physicist and Chemical Engineer Dr. Philip Lloyd, a UN IPCC co-coordinating lead author who has authored over 150 refereed publications. A 2008 Internal report of the UN found it’s climate agency “rife with bad practices.”

Proponents of man-made global warming like to note how the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the American Meteorological Society (AMS) have issued statements endorsing the so-called "consensus" view that man is driving global warming. But both the NAS and AMS never allowed member scientists to directly vote on these climate statements. Essentially, only two dozen or so members on the governing boards of these institutions produced the "consensus" statements. This report gives a voice to the rank-and-file scientists who were shut out of the process.

The more than 650 scientists expressing skepticism comes after the UN IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri implied that there were only “about a dozen” skeptical scientists left in the world. Former Vice President Gore has claimed that scientists skeptical of climate change are akin to "flat Earth society members" and similar in number to those who "believe the moon landing was actually staged in a movie lot in Arizona." Proponents of man-made climate fears have now been reduced to name calling.

Examples of "consensus" claims made by promoters of man-made climate fears:

UN special climate envoy Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland on May 10, 2007, declared the climate debate "over" and added that “it's completely immoral, even, to question” the UN’s scientific “consensus.”

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Executive Secretary Yvo de Boer said it was “criminally irresponsible” to ignore the urgency of global warming on November 12, 2007.

ABC News Global Warming Reporter Bill Blakemore reported on August 30, 2006: "After extensive searches, ABC News has found no such [scientific] debate" on global warming.

While the dissenting scientists contained in the report hold a diverse range of views, they generally rally around several key points. 1) The Earth is [currently well within natural climate variability](#). 2) Almost all climate fear is [generated by unproven computer model predictions](#). 3) An [abundance of peer-reviewed studies](#) continue to debunk [rising CO2 fears](#), and 4) "[Consensus](#)" has been [manufactured](#) for [political, not scientific purposes](#).

Princeton University Physicist declares man-made global warming fears ‘mistaken’

Since I released the report on December 11, [other scientists have contacted us to be included.](#)

On December 22, 11 more scientists were added, including meteorologists from Germany, the Netherlands, and CNN, as well as professors from MIT and University of Arizona. One prominent scientist added was [award-winning Princeton University Physicist Dr. Will Happer](#), who was reportedly fired by former Vice President Al Gore in 1993 for failing to adhere to Gore's scientific views. Happer has now declared man-made global warming fears "mistaken."

Happer is a professor in the Department of Physics at Princeton University and former Director of Energy Research at the Department of Energy who has published over 200 scientific papers, and is a fellow of the American Physical Society, The American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Academy of Sciences. Happer does not mince words when it comes to warming fears. "I am convinced that the current alarm over carbon dioxide is mistaken...Fears about man-made global warming are unwarranted and are not based on good science," Happer declared.

As we face a new administration and a UN eager to draw the U.S. into its climate policy, let us not forget that this aspect to the debate is still alive and well, and only growing. We should not become weary of calling into question policy choices when they are driven by still-evolving scientific assessments, especially when the stakes are so high, and the costs are extraordinary. Let us hope this Administration and our news media recognizes this new reality as we move forward this Congress.

On a personal note, I have to say it's been a lonely fight. For the last six years, I have been talking about the Hollywood and media-driven fear on the Senate floor that tries to convince us that those who are fueling this machine called America are somehow evil and fully responsible for global warming. We don't allow ourselves to appreciate all of the advancements that have been made for quality of life and how much more convenient our way of life is now than just 50 or 100 years ago. And energy technology will continue to evolve and become more efficient, less emitting, and greener. It is already doing so. As I stated earlier, I stand ready to work in a bipartisan manner on policies that are smart, consistent, and make economic sense to improve energy security and reduce emissions where possible. But my concern is that when these policies are driven by overreaching fear and hype, and they do not recognize the global impact of greenhouse gas emissions and the need for a global response, then we will be paying the consequences in higher energy bills and less economic competitiveness for years to come.

In the past, the only argument that defeated all the cap-and-trade schemes was economic: A \$300 billion dollar annual tax increase was too much, even if the science was fully settled. Now that serious flaws have been exposed in the process and the economy is in recession, it should be easier to oppose the \$300 billion dollar annual tax increase this year, or the \$6.7 trillion dollar cost over the life of a similar bill to Lieberman-Warner.

So let me conclude by repeating something I've said many times on the Senate floor. Even if you want to ignore the new science or the current temperature observations that suggest we are in a cooling period, all we would be doing by passing CO2 cap-and-trade legislation without a global agreement is sending our manufacturing jobs to third world countries that have no emission controls, resulting in a net increase.

#

[Link to Press Release:](#)

[Link to Speech Excerpt: Politically Left Scientists Now Rejecting Climate Fears](#)

[Senate Minority Report: More Than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims](#)

#