

# Importance of the Stockholm Climate Meeting, September 11/12, 2006

## “Global Warming - Scientific Controversies in Climate Variability”

**Personal declaration:** *It is my persuasion that a confrontation between proponents of human impact on (global) climate and natural scientists are inevitable. The former are not able to defend their assertions in an open, competitive debate where their claims on scientific quality can be validated by independent researchers. Hence, they prefer to avoid an open debate since too much money is at stake for the proponents and the organisations they represent.*

Hans Jelbring  
Ph.D. Climatology, Stockholm University  
M.Sc. Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm

### **Problem identification**

The Organizing Chairman, Peter Stilbs, Royal Institute of Technology, (KTH) assured me that the meeting should focus on science. Meteorologists threatened to boycott it since the organisers lacked professional knowledge in the subject of climate change. The latter might be correct but it is equally correct that proponents of human impact on climate seem to lack proper knowledge concerning scientific methods. A scientific basis is a prerequisite for governments to fund major scientific organizations which assert the reality of human impact on climate change.

The importance of the Stockholm meeting was not primarily to focus on science. The scientific competence of the organisers was not very important either. The importance was to expose the factual situation relating to the assumption that human behaviours are important for changing the climate of Earth. That claim has a long history closely related to Sweden, UN, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and the meteorological institution at Stockholm University.

What separates a claim from any politician and the claim of “human impact on climate” is related to the asserted scientific quality of the latter. Its proponents are assuring that the claim is back up by proper science and scientific methods. They also claim that “science is settled”. The label “scientific” opens up for heavy funding from national governments, not only in Sweden but in nations all over the globe. Without the scientific part there would be no funding. The claim “science is settled” insures continued financing concerning asserted consequences of human impact on the climate based on the unproven assumption that the first claim is correct.

The key issue can simply be identified as:  
Are there scientific evidence showing that humans are impacting on climate or not?

## How to answer the relevant question?

The question can be approached in two ways. One is to secure results from strict scientific reasoning using scientific methods and the other way is to investigate what proponents of human impact on climate change are claiming and to debunk such claims. The former means creative research and the latter a fight with proponents who refuse to discuss the issue in an open honest academic debate.

A scientific result guarantees it to be true with an assigned probability and that the result in question can be verified by independent researchers. If that cannot be done a scientist should keep quiet. Qualified guesswork is not a scientific result. However, qualified guesswork has to be used, and is used in many situations but why should such guesses be done by scientists? There are plenty of people like politicians and CEOs, stock market analysts, fortune tellers etc who are trained in that task.

How do we investigate if proponents of human impact on climate have a scientific basis for their claims? The easiest way is to debunk just one of their claims and the whole reasoning is toppled according to logic, which is a scientific virtue. The easiest topic to assess and debunk is the statement that “CO<sub>2</sub> is causing” global climate change. It just requires that the proponents present the proofs of their case including some prominent people responsible for the claims (James Hansen and NASA GISS could be representing the proponents as an example, since NASA is responsible for the calculations of “greenhouse gas” forcing accepted by IPCC)

Stockholm meeting might not have done very much to forward real understanding of climate variability in a way that it might lead to valid predictions of climate change (months to many years). Instead, its importance has been related to debunking the existence of a scientific basis for the claims of proponents of human impact on climate. This was done in several ways and I will mention in what respect this was done by the speakers at the Stockholm meeting. However, the claims by several speakers need to be discussed and deserve to be discussed openly relating to science without politics involved.

## The confrontation and its reasons

Let me just try present a view from a layman in sociology applying a little logic.

**Given circumstances:** IPCC has a political mandate and still it is claiming to work according to strict scientific standards. It has close to (and is claiming) a monopoly on scientific results relating to human (global) impact on climate change. IPCC and related organizations are receiving the majority of research funding relating to climate change.

**Assumption:** Statements made by IPCC or adopted by IPCC related organizations have little or no scientific basis concerning human impact on climate.

**Deduction if the assumption is correct:**

For fear of losing financing IPCC and related organizations cannot admit the lack of scientific basis in their historical statements. To keep the financing they will manipulate their arguments and conceal facts that will reveal this lack of scientific basis for their statements.

If the assumption is true, this would mean that there is no need for a conspiracy which

proponents love to speak about. Mutual interest and rational behaviours to finance organizations that have been running for years is an explanation for leaving the ethics of “scientific methods” when producing “scientific” results.

## Topics of importance

I would claim that Stockholm Climate Meeting supported the deduction above and I will shortly describe some relevant factors. My arguments will rest on four pillars. They are:

- 1) Selection of speakers and agenda
- 2) Information from speakers
- 3) Oral information from the audience and the panel.
- 4) Importance of the presentations.

The intention of KTH was to get a balance between promoters of human impact on climate and other scientists. Peter Stilbs declared that 60 invited speakers from all over the world promoting human impact were not willing to participate as invited speakers. That can be called a heavy selection. Who did come to defend their case? Call this group A.

The names are: Erland Källén, Prof. Meteorology, Stockholm University  
Hans von Storch, Institute for Coastal Research, GKSS Research Centre  
Lennart Bengtsson, Max Planck Institute of Meteorology, Hamburg  
Sten Bergström, former research director, SMHI (Swedish Meteorological and hydrological Institute)  
Bert Bolin (first president of IPCC), very active in the audience and elsewhere but not a speaker this time.

Some scientists presented personal research results relating to climate variations. Call this group B.

Prof. Wibjörn Karlén, Uppsala University, Dept. of Social & Economic Geography, Sweden  
Prof. Marcel Leroux, Laboratoire de Climatologie, Risques et Environment  
Prof. Zbigniew Jaworowski, Poland  
Richard S. Courtney, UK  
Bob Carter, Marine Geophysical Laboratory, James Cook University, Australia  
Fred Singer, Science & Environment Policy Project, US  
Peter Szakálos, Royal Institute of Technology  
Willie Soon, Harvard-Smithsonian Centre for Astrophysics, US  
Steve McIntyre, University of Toronto, Canada

The heavy scientific side was complemented by more popular presentations by:

Group C: Fred Goldberg, Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden  
Tom V. Segelstad, Resource and Environmental Geology, University of Oslo  
Hans Erren, Netherlands

Besides the presentations the president of Royal Institute of Technology (KTH), Anders Flodström made a great contribution when questioning the panel and both Bob Carter and

Fred Singer were performing excellently when Mr. Flodström raised the issue of “Who are the stake holder, and for what reasons?” Besides that, a graph from an article in press by Prof. Ernst Beck was showed twice. Beck questions the quality of measured global CO<sub>2</sub> variations used by IPCC. The interpretation of CO<sub>2</sub> measurements was dealt with in a theoretical way by Richard Courtney in an innovative approach.

It should be pointed out that all people in group A is connected to a poor attempt to qualify human impact on global climate as scientific (directly or indirectly) which is tied to the first number of the Magazine AMBIO, (click on <http://www.ambio.kva.se/> 1977) (owned by Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences). The guest editor was Henning Rodhe, the dean of natural science at Stockholm University today and also professor at the institution of meteorology at Stockholm University. The world is indeed a small one. 65 international scientists were invited to the Stockholm Meeting to defend the scientific standard of “human impact on climate change” and only 6 show up who are closely related to each other since decades. By the way, the articles in Ambio, nr 1, 1977, were never correctly peer reviewed. There is still a chance to do so and my request a couple of years ago was refused.

In my opinion each one of the presentations (but one) by the scientists in group B can by itself debunk the proponents claim of scientific backing relating to human impact on global climate. This is mostly done by relating to observational facts and logic. The exception is the presentation of Steve McIntyre who debunked the claims related to the infamous “hockey-stick” article by Michel Mann. McIntyre debunked only one article but that one has been of enormous importance. A McIntyre type of scientific quality check is severely wanted.

The strongest objections were coming from (in subjective order):

Marcel Leroux (observed atmospheric mass motion and patterns are not as the modelled ones)

Zbigniew Jaworowski (measured values of CO<sub>2</sub> in ice cores are decreased by natural processes and assumptions are wrong relating to closure of “firn”)

Willie Soon (shows that extraterrestrial influence on climate has to exist. Such an influence is not included in models)

Bob Carter (showed climate variations from ocean drill cores with high resolution that can not be explained by models)

Wibjörn Karlén (contributed with observed climate variations that differ from what models show)

Still, the absolute most potent objection was not treated, namely the unproven claim that “Carbon dioxide is the cause of human impact on global climate”. That one can be refuted in many ways one is presented in an article, Hans Jelbring, “The Greenhouse Effect as Function of Atmospheric Mass, Energy & Environment, Vol. 14, nr 2&3, 2003. For your information I did ask for participating as a speaker and got the ambiguous answer “You are not heavy enough” to qualify. It is a riddle why other members in climate sceptics were invited as speakers.

## Conclusions

A confrontation seems unavoidable. The amount of money involved is too large to give up voluntarily for the proponents. It is just a question of time before the bubble will burst. Media plays a critical rule in providing citizens with proper information and their performance has been poor in Sweden.

Independent testing (by several groups) of some of the works presented at the Stockholm meeting will directly lead to information which might cause a shut down of IPCC. That would be a restart of natural science as a policy tool in Sweden, a valuable resource without which our western societies cannot prosper in the long run. The Chinese, India etc. will not buy useless equipment from western companies in the future. They will make better priorities than that. Sweden could quit cooperating with UN if not stopping the claims of human impact on global climate. There just isn't any physical process that can cause such an effect. An independent assessment of that question should get the highest priority in Sweden now, when there is a new government.

I am truly glad that the Stockholm Meeting did take place but the lack of media coverage is disappointing. That situation can be counteracted by a distribution of a future CD with the addition of the important panel discussion, led by Anders Flodström, concerning "stakeholders". Hopefully, media recovers and start to deliver their basic product which should be correct information relating to science, in the true sense of that word. Maybe they will learn from such a CD.

If our children are the ultimate stakeholders, any Swede is entitled to trust that the arguments rest on a scientific basement and also to get the proper possibility to check that out. The future of our children has been used by our former government when supporting the Al Gore climate propaganda and the Al Gore fund via MISTRA (a governmental owned Swedish research fund aimed at promoting *peak science* according to its own guide lines). MISTRA has also supported SMHI and MISU with around a billion Swedish crowns for developing "downscaling" of General Circulation Model results, a highly suspect project concerning its scientific qualifications. Such work has led to a monumental waste of money and even much more when the simulated results are used for policy decisions relating to the future (flooding suddenly seem to be a main threat everywhere).

It is time to be transparent of this misuse of tax payers' money and the lack of applying strict scientific arguments when applying for funding.

Hopefully, The Royal Institute of Technology can play a vital role when restoring the reputation of natural science in Sweden which has suffered enormously during the politicisation of science the last decades. That process has, without doubt, been led by the proponents of "human induced climate change" in our country. A number of influential people in scientific positions have acted as politicians and betrayed science and our educational system. The Swedish Academy of Sciences has also played a questionable role in this sad evolution.