

In his book *Historical Perspectives on Climate Change*, James Fleming noted that around 1950, the climatologist C. E. P. Brooks, echoing Rudyard Kipling's "nine and sixty ways of making tribal laws," quipped, "There are at least nine and sixty ways of constructing a theory of climatic change, and there is probably some truth in quite a number of them."

That is as true today as it was half a century ago. Yet today, the media, the UN and many of the world's governments have declared that only one is valid. The one politically correct theory is greenhouse gas induced global warming, arguing that mankind is dramatically altering the climate by the burning of fossil fuels. As part of this campaign, any scientists (climate specialists) who criticize, or fail to whole-heartedly endorse this "dogma" have been targets of personal attacks, have lost their funding and in some cases their jobs. Accused of being bought and paid for, their findings have been portrayed as being entirely without scientific merit and driven exclusively by financial self-interest, even when the accusations have no basis whatsoever in reality.

Meanwhile along the way, many others have made lucrative careers off the theory and the literal billions of dollars the government and non governmental organizations have pumped into the national centers, institutions and universities for the study and modeling of global warming. In the U.S. alone, this grant level is estimated now to be as high as \$4 billion/year. Environmental groups have raked in an estimated \$24 billion each year from the latest in the never ending series of environmental world crises. Should the world suddenly cool and the theory somehow be discredited, a lot of this funding and many people's careers and reputations would be in jeopardy. That is why dissent is so quickly dealt with and the data as we will show you maybe even manipulated.

More than just climate modelers and environmental groups stand to receive financial gain:

- Governments down to the local level see a carbon tax as a potential windfall.
- Natural gas producers see a shift from high carbon coal to lower carbon natural gas as a boon for their industry.
- The nuclear power sees government controls favoring a resurgence in their zero-carbon-emission technology.
- Key utilities see to take advantage of wind, nuclear or existing hydro power.
- Less industrialized states, that either export hydropower or have moderate climates, realize that they can beggar their more carbonized neighbors.
- Farmers see a windfall converting food to fuel, and forestry companies hope to exact extra rents for sequestering carbon by doing what to them comes naturally – growing trees.

To be sure, many corporations see themselves as being good citizens by taking actions reducing emissions, but they also see profit there, too – for them, if not for the whole economy.

Indeed, global warming may be viewed as the biggest grab for money and power in history, with such carbon trading regimes as the U.N. negotiated Kyoto Protocol amounting to little more than a “socialist scheme,” as Canadian Prime Minister Harper once called it, to suck money out of rich countries and give it to poorer ones.

Yet despite the vital importance of the issue, and demands that the United States join the crowd on emissions, little investigation is given such plans and the science promoting them. Curiously, though, the very climate models whose forecasts are used to raise fears of warming, such as that of the British Hadley Center, show that even if Kyoto were adhered to by all nations, the net cooling, by the models’ standards, would be 0.06 degrees Celsius – a tenth of a degree Fahrenheit—by 2050, and at a cost to the average American family of \$2,700/year. That is certainly very little bang for a very big buck.

Europe, which readily signed on to Kyoto, is realizing that fact already. It is suffering more economically ([see just one story here](#)) than its nations anticipated, even as developing countries such as Russia, China and India with few or no obligations under the protocol are increasing their industry and their emissions at the developed world’s expense.

Because it hasn’t submitted to a regime that causes overall economic pain for no environmental gain, the media makes out the United States to be a climate change villain – despite its nearly \$2 billion a year in climate research and another \$3 billion investment in climate technology eclipses that from all of Europe. And part of that vilification extends to the suppression of any who express skepticism about the premises of climate catastrophism.

The great scientific journals, and even their parent organizations, have been taken over by editors who blatantly display their biases, such as Science’s editor-in-chief Donald Kennedy. They support publication of articles – some with no scientific merit—favoring their position, or they write editorials attempting to tie any natural catastrophe, such as Hurricane Katrina, to global warming, and then reject articles and letters from scientists who actually know something about it, a clear threat to any young academic in the publish-or-perish world of academia.

In the process, some important research gets rejected; any contradictory peer-reviewed work gets ignored or proclaimed ‘discredited’ with the flimsiest of reasons meanwhile wild and erroneous claims are readily publicized without challenge. Cries about future devastation get shriller and more extreme even as more and more evidence emerges that the theory is flawed and the reports exaggerated. Politics has in effect hijacked science. Nigel Calder, a former editor of New Scientist, told the UK Telegraph: “Governments are trying to achieve unanimity by stifling any scientist who disagrees. Einstein could not have got funding under the present system.”

On our website, Icecap.us, we will not be bullied or intimidated. We are not funded by government grants nor by big oil but by private investors interested in free thinking and getting at the true story whatever that may be. Some of our experts have been fighting small battles alone in their own specialty areas. By uniting the many different experts and specialties in this country and abroad, with varying viewpoints on climate change, we plan to bring the whole story to you.

We position ourselves in the sensible middle – men and women whom New York Times science writer Andrew Revkin might include in the class of scientists he calls the “mainstream skeptics.” I personally dislike the word skeptic. As Skeptic Magazine notes “Some people ...confuse skeptic with cynic and think that skeptics are a bunch of grumpy curmudgeons unwilling to accept any claim that challenges the status quo. This is wrong. Skepticism is a provisional approach to claims. It is the application of reason to any and all ideas—no sacred cows allowed.”

We are not cynics and do care about our planet.

We all believe in climate change, that the only constant in nature is change. We believe man plays a role through urbanization, land use changes and the introduction of greenhouse gases and aerosols. We believe in the greenhouse effect but recognize carbon dioxide for what it is, a minor greenhouse gas that without significant positive feedback from its big brother water vapor (not supported by actual data) would produce only minor warming. We also believe we do not yet know how much of a role man plays, that models are fallible, and that you can't dismiss, as some are doing, natural variability.

We believe that we need to be better stewards of our planet and environment, and find and utilize better, cleaner alternative energy sources. Ergo, we believe that as a nation we can best advance our environmental and climate goals not with grand new government programs, but with incentives for industry to innovate and the public to conserve. For we believe that, unlike the Europeans who have already made their bed and have had sleepless nights in it, we shouldn't race ahead with ill-conceived government programs that in the end may do far more harm than good.

To that end, we believe that more research and more voices are desperately needed. More serious scrutiny is required of the temperature observations of air, sea and land stations, which have their own set of [issues](#) that are largely being ignored. We also believe that we need to take a closer look at the role of the sun, which some solar physicists see having important indirect effects up until now not understood and others entering a cool phase, and the oceans, which undergo major multi-decadal shifts with global consequences on climate, rather than just gases and aerosols.

Most of all we believe, as empiricists, that we need to look at real data instead of basing our thinking on computer models. Even modelers will admit a less than adequate understanding of all the solar factors, of the ocean processes and of the effect of changes

on water vapor and cloudiness, all critical for determining the future temperatures. This renders them unreliable for making major costly policy decisions. Models are a tool for examining possible scenarios of climate, not a proof of what is actually happening or will happen.

As Peter Godfrey Smith in *Theory and Realism* (2003 Oxford Press) wrote of Karl Popper's two stages of scientific change: Stage 1 is conjecture, a hypothesis is advanced that might explain some part of the world. A good conjecture is a bold one, one that takes a lot of risks by making bold predictions. Stage 2 in the cycle is attempted refutation – the hypothesis is subjected to critical testing, in an attempt to show it is false. If the hypothesis is refuted, we go back to stage 1 again – a new conjecture is offered. That is followed again by stage 2 and so on.

Greenhouse gas induced warming was one of the theories proposed during the early 20th century warming by Callendar but not given much support as the warming peaked in the years of the Great Depression and when the post war industrial boom occurred, the earth actually cooled for three decades. With the next phase of cyclical warming began in the 1980s, the theory that man through greenhouse gases had become the main driver of global climate change suddenly reemerged and this time gained more universal support and in Kuhn's terminology became the paradigm of the day (today). Bold conjectures about the devastation it will bring have become the topics of newspaper and magazine stories and essays, blogs, television and cable network specials and an award winning movie.

If and when the next cyclical cooling occurs (some of us believe that will be soon), the theory would again be refuted and a Kuhn scientific revolution and paradigm shift will take place with natural variability and the [sun](#) and [oceans](#) getting the credit they likely deserve

We believe that Nigel Calder put it very well when he wrote: "... humility in the face of Nature's marvels seems more appropriate than arrogant assertions that we can forecast and even control a climate ruled by the sun and the stars." And we believe that now is the time to bring that sense of humility and reality back to the field of climatology once and for all.