

Speech opposing the motion by Richard Courtney:

Madam Speaker, Friends:

Climate change is a serious problem. All governments need to address it.

In the Bronze Age Joseph (with the Technicolour Dreamcoat) told Pharaoh that climate has always changed everywhere: it always will. He told Pharaoh to prepare for bad times when in good times, and all sensible governments have adopted that policy throughout the millennia since.

It's a sensible policy because people merely complain at taxes in good times. They revolt if short of food in bad times. But several governments have abandoned it and, instead, are trying to stabilise the climate of the entire Earth by controlling it.

This attempt at global climate control arises from the hypothesis of anthropogenic (that is, man-made) global warming (AGW).

AGW does not pose a global crisis but the policy does, because it threatens constraint of fossil fuels and that constraint would kill millions – probably billions – of people.

There's no evidence for man-made global warming; none, not any of any kind.

The existence of global warming is not evidence of anthropogenic global warming because warming of the Earth doesn't prove human's warmed it. At issue is whether humans are or are not affecting changes to the Earth's temperature that have always happened naturally.

The AGW-hypothesis says increased greenhouse gases – notably carbon dioxide – in the air raise global temperature, and anthropogenic emissions of carbon dioxide are increasing the carbon dioxide in the air to overwhelm the natural climate system.

But empirical evidence says the hypothesis is wrong.

1. The anthropogenic emissions and global temperature do not correlate.
2. Change to atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration follows change to global temperature at all time scales.
3. Recent rise in global temperature has not been induced by rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations.

Global temperature fell from 1940 to 1970, rose to 1998, and has fallen since. That's 40 years of cooling and 28 years of warming. Global temperature is now similar to that of 1990. But atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration has increased at a near constant rate and by more than 30% since 1940. It has increased by 8% since 1990.

4. Rise in global temperature has not been induced by anthropogenic emissions of carbon dioxide.

Over 80% of the emissions have been since 1940 and the emissions have been increasing at a compound rate. But since 1940 there have been 40 years of cooling with only 28 years of warming. There's been no significant warming since 1995, and global temperature has fallen since the high it had 10 years ago.

5. The pattern of atmospheric warming predicted by the AGW hypothesis is absent. The hypothesis predicts most warming of the air at altitude in the tropics. Measurements from weather balloons and from satellites both show cooling at altitude in the tropics.

So, the normal rules of science say the AGW-hypothesis is completely refuted. Nothing the hypothesis predicts is observed, and the opposite of some of its predictions are observed.

But some people promote the hypothesis. They've several reasons (personal financial gain, protection of their career histories and futures, political opportunism, and...). But support of science cannot be one such motive because science denies the hypothesis. So, additional scientific information cannot displace the AGW-hypothesis and cannot silence its advocates. And those advocates are not scientists despite some of them claiming they are.

Advocates promote AGW using three kinds of pseudo-science.

They use 'argument from ignorance'. This isn't new. In the Middle Ages experts said, "We don't know what causes crops to fail: it must be witches: we must eliminate them." Now, experts say, "We don't know what causes global climate change: it must be emissions from human activity: we must eliminate them." Of course, they phrase it differently saying they can't match historical climate change with known climate mechanisms unless an anthropogenic effect is included. But evidence for this "anthropogenic effect" is no more than the evidence for witches.

Advocates rely on not-validated computer models.

No model's predictions should be trusted unless the model has demonstrated forecasting skill. But climate models have not existed for 20, 50 or 100 years, so they cannot have demonstrated forecasting skill.

Simply, the climate models' predictions of the future have the same demonstrated reliability as the casting of chicken bones to predict the future.

Advocates use the Precautionary Principle saying we should stop greenhouse gas emissions in case the AGW hypothesis is right. But that turns the Principle on its head.

Stopping the emissions would reduce fossil fuel usage with resulting economic damage. This would be worse than the 'oil crisis' of the 1970s because the reduction would be

greater, would be permanent, and energy use has increased since then. The economic disruption would be world-wide. Major effects would be in the developed world because it has the largest economies. Worst effects would be on the world's poorest peoples: people near starvation are starved by it.

The precautionary principle says we should not accept the risks of certain economic disruption in attempt to control the world's climate on the basis of assumptions that have no supporting evidence and merely because they've been described using computer games.

So, global warming is not a global crisis but the unfounded fear of global warming is. It threatens a constraint of fossil fuel use that would kill millions – probably billions – of people.