

----- Original Message -----

Subject:The Global Climate report

Date:Wed, 07 Feb 2007 10:35:41 -0800

From:Lon W. House, Ph.D. <lwhouse@innercite.com>

Organization:Water and Energy Consulting

To:undisclosed-recipients::;

You've no doubt been subject to the hysteria surrounding the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report **Climate Change 2007** for the U.N. released last week. Typical headlines are: "*Scientists Call Global Warming Unequivocal, Two Reports Say Efficiency and Renewables the Answer*". The problem is, that is not what the report says. Here's the full disclosure.

The Report: [*Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis Summary for Policymakers*](#) is attached for your reading pleasure. The document that caused such a stir was only a short policy report, a summary of the full scientific report due in May. It was mainly by policymakers (not scientists), and followed by - you guessed it - a call for an international environmental agency to address the problem.

The Summary:

The most important conclusion of the report was not widely reported - **THERE IS NOTHING HUMANS CAN DO TO STOP CLIMATE CHANGE.**

The LA Times did have the following summary:

"Game over on global warming?"

By Alan Zarembo

February 5, 2007

Everybody in the United States could switch from cars to bicycles.

The Chinese could close all their factories.

Europe could give up electricity and return to the age of the lantern.

But all those steps together would not come close to stopping global warming."

Here are some of the more notable conclusions: There is no doubt that the planet is warming, according to all sorts of measures, from rising air and ocean temperatures to widespread melting of snow and ice. Increases in global temperature are "very likely" the result of higher concentrations of greenhouse gases, which are far higher now than they have been over the past 650,000 years. Policymakers should expect global temperatures to continue to rise, even if greenhouse gas concentrations stay at the levels of the year 2000. Continuing to release greenhouse gases at current rates would warm the Earth even more and would be "very likely" to yield much more severe consequences during this century than those we saw in the previous one. Sea levels will rise, heat waves and droughts will strike longer and more often, hurricanes will become more intense, and it will rain more in high latitudes.

Being the contrarian that I am, I must refer you to the following article that appeared in December *Environmental Geology*:

Khilyuk, L.F., and G. V. Chilingar. 2006. On global forces of nature driving the Earth's climate. Are humans involved? *Environmental Geology*, **50**, 899–910.

These guys are two USC scientists. The authors begin the article with the sentence “Identification and understanding of global forces of nature driving the Earth's climate is crucial for developing adequate relationship between people and nature, and for developing and implementing a sound course of action aimed at survival and welfare of the human race.” From there, they review the literature on solar output variations and earth's temperature and show that a “one percent increase in current solar radiation reaching the Earth's body translates directly into approximately 0.86 K increase in the Earth's global temperature.” They show that the earth's orbit about the sun changes over long periods of time resulting in up to a 7.5 K (1 K = 1°C = 1.8°F) modulation of the earth's temperature. They describe how outgassing alters the composition of the atmosphere over long periods thereby altering the temperature of the earth over by over 50 K. They finally review microbial activities at the interface of the lithosphere and atmosphere that also substantially alter the composition and temperature of the global atmosphere at geological time frames. Khilyuk and Chilingar repeatedly quantify the effect of the various processes that alter global temperature and conclude “The scope and extent of these processes are 4–5 orders of magnitude greater than the corresponding anthropogenic impacts on the Earth's climate (such as heating and emission of the greenhouse gases).” The authors place the recent warming into an interesting perspective noting “the global warming observed during the latest 150 years is just a short episode in the geologic history. The current global warming is most likely a combined effect of increased solar and tectonic activities and cannot be attributed to the increased anthropogenic impact on the atmosphere. Humans may be responsible for less than 0.01°C (of approximately 0.56°C (1°F) total average atmospheric heating during the last century)”. Their conclusions with respect to potential policy will more than raise some eyebrows as well as they write “**Any attempts to mitigate undesirable climatic changes using restrictive regulations are condemned to failure, because the global natural forces are at least 4–5 orders of magnitude greater than available human controls.**” They show that the climatic effects of the Kyoto Protocol would be negligible, leading them to state “Thus, the Kyoto Protocol is a good example of how to achieve the minimum results with the maximum efforts (and sacrifices). Impact of available human controls will be negligible in comparison with the global forces of nature. Thus, the attempts to alter the occurring global climatic changes (and drastic measures prescribed by the Kyoto Protocol) have to be abandoned as meaningless and harmful.”

Now you have both sides of the story.