

Dear Prof. Hamilton --

This is the note that I wrote to the forum in response to your article. I decided to try and send it directly to you since it appears that you are withdrawing from the forum. I know you have very strong beliefs on global warming issues, but I believe that you are poorly informed. But there is no shame in this since most people have only gotten a one-sided story. I will be very happy to do what I can to help you get the facts in order to make a more informed decision.

Best Regards -- John Brosnahan

NOTE: Professor Clive Hamilton certainly has the intellectual credentials to understand the importance of a debate on any topic, especially one so important as global warming (which has now been renamed climate change because of the lack of any warming since 1998).

Charles Sturt University (CSU) has appointed Australia's first professor of public ethics with a commitment to help invigorate intellectual debate in Australia. A distinguished Australian public intellectual, Dr Clive Hamilton, has taken up the newly created Vice-Chancellor's Chair at CSU.

Dr. Hamilton, I cannot fault you for not having the personal scientific credentials to debate the validity of the scientific arguments from either side. But without science credentials you must rely on the input from people who do have those credentials and then make an informed decision based on all of the science. To discount one side of the debate out of hand is intellectually dishonest and dare I say -- unethical.

I have spent the past 30 years as a research physicist, specializing in remote sensing of the winds, waves, and turbulence of the atmosphere from the troposphere to the ionosphere. But I have no "dog in the fight" since I am retired and have no funding dependent on any particular intellectual position. I have based my belief in what is real and what is not on my education, my experience, and an intense two-year review of the literature (much to the dismay of my wife).

I find my position to be exactly the opposite of yours, Dr. Hamilton, and I believe I can justify my beliefs and, if you are intellectually honest and will read a very select list of short articles, you will gain a new perspective on the debate. I am restricting the reading list to more popularized articles due to your lack of scientific experience, but I am happy to provide a huge volume of peer-reviewed literature to back all up my comments.

Your position only echoes the talking points of the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) crowd, because you are only familiar with this side of the debate due to the bias of the media and a political agenda that has suppressed much of the published work in the field.

One point you make in your sign-off statement that I find somewhat offensive is:

>>>infected with the sort of emotional fanaticism that causes climate change denialists to lose perspective.

In fact I think this is exactly backwards. The AGW believers claim that "the debate is over" and that "everyone agrees" -- but this is the domain of someone losing an argument and who has nothing with which to back up his position. It seems that the desire to "save the planet" has made the CO₂-based global warming believers to be the ones who have lost perspective and unwilling to debate the merits of the science. Usually they have been unwilling to engage in any more debates, because the few times that debates have happened there has been very little science to support the CO₂-based global warming position other than computer modeling. According to AGW supporters the "best" evidence of CO₂-based warming is the CO₂ data set from Mauna Loa. Unfortunately, over the fifty plus years of these data, they have been poorly correlated with global temperatures. (A correlation factor of 0.22 and getting worse with the continued increase of CO₂ during a time when the temperatures have been falling. Whereas the correlation between solar activity and global temperatures is 0.76 and getting better with the recent decline in solar activity as well as global temperatures.) So the AGW supporters choose to believe something that is not well correlated (note: correlation must be understood not to mean causation) and to reject the source of climate change from something that is correlated by a factor of more than three times as great. That seems to

be a perfect example of losing perspective -- but from the AGW side.

>>>>there is a legitimate debate among scientists about the weight of scientific evidence on global warming. This is false and misleading.

Well, yes and no, but not for the reasons you think. There is an ATTEMPT at a legitimate debate by the "deniers" (as you call them) but the AGW supporters continue to dodge any forum that has been offered. So the debate only happens in cyberspace and in the publishing of scientific papers.

>>>>denialists have conspicuously failed to generate contrary evidence that can be published in refereed journals and instead devote themselves to creating doubt by exaggerating, exploiting and twisting the various uncertainties and unexplained phenomena that naturally characterise a body of science as complex and emergent as climate change science.

Again you are quoting the talking points of the AGW supporters without any real evidence. In fact you could not be more incorrect. There are hundreds of peer-reviewed papers that question the validity of CO2-based global warming and make strong cases for other mechanisms. I can provide copies to whatever extent you want. But what I suggest you do is to read the ANNOTATED list of sixty-nine peer-reviewed papers that was prepared by Dr Madhav Khandekar -- "Questioning the Global Warming Science: An Annotated bibliography of recent peer-reviewed papers." Here is a link to the paper that may be helpful. The annotations are quite readable even if the underlying papers are too technical for your background.

<http://www.friendsofscience.org/assets/files/documents/Madhav%20bibliography%20LONG%20VERSION%20Feb%206-07.pdf>

(Unfortunately these long links often do not survive the forums, so I am including my personal address if you need a copy of the link.

j.w.brosnahan (at) [gmail.com](mailto:j.w.brosnahan@gmail.com) or you can just do a google search on his name and the title of the paper.)

>>>>The so-called sceptics are not true scientific sceptics at all; they don't treat the arguments and evidence on each side sceptically but are fanatically anti-IPCC, dismissing all of its arguments.

Actually you are correct here, but once again not for the reason you believe. The anti-AGW scientists ARE fanatically dismissive of the UN IPCC because its very charter is one that is biased. The organization is specifically set up to ONLY look at CO2-based warming and has deliberately ignored all other science even to the extent of ignoring many of its own members. One of the UN IPCC's biggest deceptions is that 2,500 scientists all agree on AGW. This claim is patently false. Many of the people that have "reviewed" the claims are not scientists at all but are bureaucrats from various countries and even journalists and media types. There are a number of scientists on the committee who have shared in the Nobel Prize but who totally disagree with the findings of the UN IPCC. The actual number of scientists who endorse some or most of the UN IPCC's position is closer to 25 or 30, not the 2,500 that is claimed. (Yes, I can support that statement!)

>>>>There I also explain why I do not presume to engage in arguments about climate science because I do not have the expertise to do so without making a fool of myself. Denialists without any scientific qualifications, or irrelevant ones, show no such humility.

I understand and that is why my recommended reading list tends to be of a more popularized category. But I am also very happy to provide you with a list of actual climate scientists who dispute AGW and this list is MUCH greater than the list of the AGW supporters. And I surmise that you are unaware of the 103 most preeminent scientists in the world (all working in the field of climate science and related research) who signed a letter to the UN Secretary General disputing the claims of the UN IPCC. I can go on with a lot of other examples of a vast majority of climatology, meteorology, and atmospheric chemists and physicists who disagree with the UN IPCC -- just drop me a note for supporting information.

>>>>None of this information is hard to find. See, for example [here](#).

You use as your reference for information the DeSmog Blog as your authoritative source for information. Let me provide you with some information that is current as of a few months ago. I would not want to base ANY statements on this source if I happened to be professor of public ethics.

John Lefebvre, the top financial benefactor of the DeSmog Blog, is facing substantial prison time after pleading guilty to federal money-laundering charges.

The DeSmog Blog is operated by a small group of public relations people who specialize in attempting to discredit respected scientists and policy analysts who disagree with alarmist global warming theory.

Ironically, DeSmog Blog's favorite tactic is to claim scientists and policy analysts who disagree with alarmist global warming theory are funded by "dirty money."

The revelation of the blog's major source of funding as a convicted money launderer may undermine DeSmog's attempts to smear the integrity of respected, law-abiding scientists who disagree with them.

Apparently unashamed by their criminal connections, the DeSmog Blog Web site proclaims, "The DeSmogBlog team is especially grateful to our benefactor John Lefebvre. ... John has been outspoken, uncompromising, and courageous in challenging those who would muddy the climate change debate, and he has enabled and inspired the same standard on the blog."

Lefebvre, who pleaded guilty in June 2007, faces up to 20 years in a federal penitentiary.

I can also provide information that links RealClimate.org to George Soros of MoveOn.org infamy and the far left public relations firm of Environmental Media Services. So this site is also not an ethical site for unbiased science, but rather it is a spin-doctor site to discredit scientists who do not support the AGW hypothesis. It is driven by agenda politics and not by scientific ethics.

Let me provide you with a fairly easy reading assignment from two sources.

First is Dr. TIMOTHY BALL

Dr. Ball is a long-term ENVIRONMENTALIST as well as a CLIMATOLOGIST by profession. Below is a short bio for him and the links to his 11-part series in the Canadian media (he is Canadian). He is on the UN IPCC and shared in the Nobel Prize, but I think his take on the organization may surprise you. These are all very short articles and are a quick read and demonstrate in some detail how we have all arrived at this point dominated more by a political rhetoric and agenda rather than by science.

=====
Dr. Tim Ball, Chairman of the [Natural Resources Stewardship Project](#). Dr. Ball is a renowned environmental consultant and former climatology professor at the University of Winnipeg. Dr. Ball employs his extensive background in climatology and other fields as the Chairman of Natural Resources Stewardship Project.

- Part 1: [Environmental Extremism](#)
- Part 2: [Historical and philosophical context of the climate change debate.](#)
- Part 3: [How the world was misled about global warming and now climate change](#)
- Part 4: [How UN structures were designed to prove human CO2 was causing global warming](#)
- Part 5: [Wreaking Havoc on Global Economies](#)
- Part 6: [The Hockey Stick scam that heightened global warming hysteria](#)
- Part 7: [The Unholy Alliance that manufactured Global Warming](#)
- Part 8: [UN's IPCC preying on people's ignorance](#)
- Part 9: [Carbon Taxes: Hand over your money! We are saving you from yourself](#)
- Part 10: [Environmentalists Seize Green Moral High Ground Ignoring Science](#)
- Part 11: [Maurice Strong Politics 101](#)

Again, if these links are not maintained through the forum I can provide the actual URLs. Or you can go to the following link to the last article and work backwards since it provides links to the previous articles.
<http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/3618>

This second source for some very interesting reading is LAWRENCE

SOLOMON. He is a very long-time conservationist and writer who believed in AGW and, in order to settle the debate, decided to find and interview the very top scientists in many of the relevant fields. To his amazement (and even shock) he found that the top brains in the field did NOT believe in AGW. He wrote a series of 35 columns, each one covering a separate topic and scientist and this year he expanded the columns with much more detail and turned it into the book "The Deniers." (Highly Recommended) It looks at the people who, at the pinnacle of their research and studies, have each arrived at the conclusion that AGW is a hoax or, at a minimum, that it has been grossly overstated. Here is his bio and the master link to his 35 columns. Each column only taking a few minutes to read.

Lawrence Solomon, whose column appears every Wednesday in Financial Post, is one of Canada's leading environmentalists. His book, The Conserver Solution (Doubleday), which popularized the Conserver Society concept in the late 1970s, became the manual for those interested in incorporating environmental factors into economic life. An advisor to President Jimmy Carter's Task Force on the Global Environment (the Global 2000 Report) in the late 1970's, he has since been at the forefront of movements to reform foreign aid, stop nuclear power expansion and toll roads. Mr. Solomon is a founder and managing director of Energy Probe Research Foundation and the executive director of its Urban Renaissance Institute and Consumer Policy Institute divisions. He has been a columnist for The Globe and Mail, a contributor to the Wall Street Journal, the editor and publisher of the award-winning The Next City magazine, and the author or co-author of several books.

<http://www.nationalpost.com/story.html?id=4432a41c-7c52-4b74-934e-f0dac3b2bcb8>

I have specifically chosen the above two resources since they explain virtually all of the science as well as the politics and history of how we have gotten to this point of total chaos in the debate without getting too technical. And both sources are people with extensive environmental credentials, making it very difficult to discredit them because of some phony tie to "big energy."

Dr. Hamilton, I hope that you will read the articles By Dr. Ball and Mr. Solomon before replying to this note. I think you may want to rethink your position -- at least to the point of being more open-minded to the debate, if not a total rejection of the AGW position. And I will be happy to provide you with as detailed a list of papers, scientists, or whatever you want that will give you a better understanding of the state of the science and the risks that society may face if the wrong decision is made.

Feel free to contact me directly for additional information.

--John Brosnahan