



CLIMATECHANGE-DEBATE

IT IS TIME FOR AN OPEN AND HONEST DEBATE WITH NO SCIENTISTS EXCLUDED, WHATEVER THEIR OPINIONS

This is the long awaited 'Sequel' from Robin Davies, Barrister. You can read Part One of his Essay [here](#). You can read his conclusion and his idea on moving forward at the end of this article.

(If you are able to help us reach our goal of a Public Open and Honest Debate with ALL scientists, then please do get in touch by [contacting us](#).)

THE SEQUEL

Since writing my Essay some two years ago, we have arrived at the year of COP26 and Agenda 21. Prior to COP26, the UK government led by Boris Johnson announced a policy of achieving CO2 zero emissions by 2050. This would entail huge increases in energy prices, a mandated form of heating for all residences and prohibitions against eating meat. This could well have a very deleterious and negative effect on the UK economy. The Agenda 21 era of command and control is upon us. The pronouncements during the year have become increasingly hysterical and emotional but with very little rational comments on the state of the Climate Science on the subject. It is interesting to note the following:

“The Arctic Ocean is warming up, icebergs are growing scarcer and in some places the seals are finding the water too hot according to a report to the Commerce Department yesterday from the Consulate at Bergen, Norway. Reports from fishermen, seal hunters and explorers all point to a radical change in climate conditions and hitherto unheard of temperatures in the Arctic Zone. Exploration expeditions report that scarcely any ice has been met as far North as 81 degrees 29 minutes, Soundings to a depth of 3100 meters showed the Gulf Stream still very warm. Great masses of ice have been replaced by moraines of earth and stones, the report continued, while at many points well known glaciers have entirely disappeared. Very few seals and no white fish are found in the eastern Arctic while vast shoals of herring and smelt which have never before ventured so far north, are being encountered in the old seal fishing grounds. Within a few years it is predicted that due to the ice melt the sea will rise and make most coast cities uninhabitable”

Reported by the AP on 2nd November 1922 and published in the Washington Post 99 years ago.

“plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose “ – the more things change, the more they stay the same

It is time to reflect, and a Sequel to my Essay would be timely. My Essay dated July 2020 can be read [here](#) for ease of reference.

The proposition, that we are required to accept without argument or dissent, is that the Climate is warming and changing due to an increase in CO2 emissions caused by the activities of human beings, known as Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW). This has never been proved as a scientific fact. In my Essay, I referred to the fact that 141 scientists wrote a letter in December 2019 to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon on the eve of the Copenhagen summit asking the UN supporters of AGW to demonstrate the proof of their hypothesis. No such proof was provided.

Stepping back and reviewing the actions of the UN Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), it would appear that they are relying on Computer modelling (you will have experienced that during the Covid pandemic strategy) and a litany of weather events. It was announced to world governments by Al Gore during the Obama Presidency that a survey had shown that 97% of all scientists agreed on this Global Warming thesis and that anyone who does not agree is a “Denier” or “Heretic” and intrinsically evil. This attempt to close down debate has continued to the present day with the connivance of all mainstream media. The truth is that this so-called survey has been demonstrated to be flawed and is now discredited. Furthermore, to close down debate would be the very opposite of the scientific process which should be transparent and ongoing. Continuing debate by all scientists is essential. Galileo and Einstein were often alone in their theories but were proved to be correct. Let us now examine the evidence upon which the IPCC appears to rely on, as follows:

1. Computer modelling – this is only as good as the information that the input allows. If you indicate to the computer that an increase in CO2 emissions will cause an increase in temperatures, it will reflect that. It has been pointed out that the computer statistical methodology (prepared by Myles Allen and Simon Tett), on which the IPCC 3rd Report was based, was full of errors. This was pointed out to Allen & Tett by Dr Ross McKittrick. They admitted the errors but said that these errors had been corrected and a new methodology was now in place but failed to give details. Dr Tol – previous statistical economic contributor to the IPCC Summary to Policy Holders – subsequently supported Dr McKittrick on this. Dr Tol indicated that he left the IPCC when his proposed headline comment to the IPCC Summary was deleted because it did not fit in with the accepted narrative. There have been other examples of this similar adjustments being made to scientific submissions. The modelling has proved on all occasions not to reconcile with the observable data.

Prince Charles has predicted catastrophe over certain periods but has been proved wrong. He also predicted the extinction of red squirrels by 2019. They are still here. Prince Charles has come across as somewhat pompous and self-indulgent. It is submitted that he has been badly advised. His support for, and involvement with, a political organisation (IPCC) whose influence on the British Government may cause hardship on the average ordinary people of the country could seriously impact the status of the Crown in the Constitutional structure of the UK. He would be wiser to leave his comments to his interest in the Environment.

2. Litany of weather events. The media are encouraged to publish frightening images of natural weather events to demonstrate that they are evidence of catastrophic changes in the world climate as a result of global warming. Such events, even if true, are not in themselves proof of climate change. However, the claim that they are unusual is not substantiated. (I refer you to the excellent exposition by the original co-founder of Greenpeace, Dr Patrick Moore, in his recent book "Fake Invisible Catastrophes and Threats of Doom"). David Bellamy, now deceased, was originally the lead BBC presenter on all matter relating to plants and the environment. He was very sceptical of the IPCC pronouncements about global warming but was replaced by the BBC in favour of David Attenborough. Dr Patrick Moore has criticised the BBC and David Attenborough for certain distortions in their programmes relating to the death of walrus jumping from cliffs and also birds from eating plastic in the sea. He challenged them for a reply but I understand that there has been none.
3. CO2 Emissions. This is the very foundation of the IPCC movement. It attributes blame to human beings and allows them to be directed and controlled (shades of the Club of Rome, Agenda 21 and Maurice Strong – featured in [my Essay](#)). The assertion that this is a cause of climate warming/change, rather than other natural events such as clouds and sun activities, is on weak foundations. Geological and other historic records demonstrate that a rise in temperature is followed by a rise in CO2 emissions and not the other way round.

An increase in CO2 levels is not a pre-condition to a rise in temperatures, it follows it.

At present, there might be some correlation but there is no cause and effect. Importantly, CO2 and carbon are essential to life. CO2 is crucial to the growth of plants, trees and vegetation, is important to life and makes the earth greener. The current levels of CO2 at 415 ppm is historically at a very low level. At a level of 150 ppm, human life would quickly cease to exist. We need all the CO2 we can get in view of the Modern Grand Solar Minimum upon which we have just entered.

The Grand Solar Minimum

The Sun has entered into the modern Grand Solar Minimum (2020 – 2053) that will lead to a significant reduction of solar magnetic field and activity like during the Maunder minimum (1645-1710) leading to noticeable reduction of terrestrial temperature. From 1645 to 1710, the temperatures across much of the Northern Hemisphere of the Earth plunged when the Sun entered a quiet phase called the Maunder Minimum leading to a decrease in the average terrestrial temperature mainly in Europe by 1.0 -1.5 C. This seemingly small decrease of average temperature in the Northern hemisphere led to frozen rivers, cold long winters and cold summers.

The terrestrial temperature during the next 30 years of the First Modern Grand Minimum (2020-2053) – Second Modern Grand Minimum (2370-2415) – can be reduced by 1.0C from the current temperature. This can have important implications for different parts of the planet on growing vegetation, agriculture, food supplies, and heating needs on both Northern and Southern hemisphere. This global cooling during the upcoming First Grand Solar Minimum can offset for three decades any signs of global warming and would require inter-government efforts to tackle problems with heat and food supplies for the whole population of the Earth.

I refer you to the conclusions & researches by Dr Valentia Zharkova BSc, PhD, FRAS, Professor at Northumbria University, which were published online on 4th August 2020.

CONCLUSION

1. It is accepted that the climate is subject to change. Climate change is an historic fact. However, weather is not climate change which is normally a long -term event.
2. It is accepted that it is desirable to protect the environment and take to steps to maintain it in the best way possible. However, this is best left to persons who live in the areas concerned and have practical experience of it, assisted by scientists knowledgeable and qualified in the respective areas. Certainly, not activists and politicians.
3. It is accepted that reducing pollution to the lowest practical level is desirable in itself. Action to reduce vehicular emissions is desirable and incentives should be given to scientists and vehicle manufacturers. However, this should be achieved through a carefully considered programme with a sensible and practical time scale in order to achieve an efficient result and not rushed.
4. The Climate Scare thesis promoted by the United Nations Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate, is not accepted. It is not scientific but a political project with religious overtones and taking its ideology from left wing socialist ideas based on the Club of Rome and Maurice Strong. I refer you to my Essay on this subject and Agenda 21. It has excluded debate and is increasingly emotional and hysterical. However, it has through its Press releases captured many governments, many politicians, the media of the world and a large part of the population.

As Mark Twain said “it is easy to fool the people, it is difficult to convince them that they have been fooled.”

However, please make the effort to read, investigate and make up your own mind. Keep your mind open and be prepared to listen to other points of view

5. The advent of a new colder period (“little ice age?”), will cast a different light on the subject. We will need more CO₂, not less.
6. “The Science is not settled”

The Government, led by Boris Johnson and inspired by the unproven IPCC view of Climate change and the lobbying of environmental activists, is rushing ahead with policies restricting our sources of energy, mandating us to install a uniform but defective form of heating for every household and threatening to put restrictions on what we can or cannot eat. This will involve the UK population paying huge increases in their utility bills (which will have the biggest effect on the less well off), paying for costly heating for their homes, restricting their choice of transport. Taking into the financial state of the UK following the Pandemic, the cost of these policies will be extremely damaging to the economy and put the UK at risk of bankruptcy, All this for something called “The Science” which can be demonstrated to be false and in error.

IT IS TIME FOR AN OPEN AND HONEST DEBATE, WITH NO SCIENTISTS EXCLUDED
WHATEVER THEIR OPINIONS, WITH AN INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN (THERE TO KEEP
ORDER IN ACORDANCE WITH AGREED RULES OF REFERENCE, BUT NOT TO JUDGE – NO

TV OR MEDIA PERSONEL) – PERHAPS THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, THIS TO BE FOLLOWED BY A PUBLIC VOTE OR REFERENDUM.

Finally, I refer you to the following scientists, experts, and notable commentators, as follows:

Dr Willie Soon

Dr Richard Lindzen

Dr Elliot Bloom

Professor Koonin – (Ex advisor to President Obama) Book: “Unsettled”

Dr Patrick Moore – (original co-founder of Greenpeace) Book: “Fake Invisible catastrophes and Threats of Doom”

Dr William Happer – Professor Princeton University

Dr Richard Tol Dr Plimer – Book “Not the Greens”

Professor John Christy

Professor Judith Curry

Dr. McKittrick

Dr Michael Hulme

Dr Lee Gerhad

Dr. Klaus-Eckhart

Dr Tim Bell PHD University of London – Book: “The deliberate corruption of Climate Science”

Marc Munro – “The Politically Correct Guide to Climate Change”

James Delingpole – Writer & Journalist – Book: “ Watermelons”

Christopher Booker – Writer & Journalist- Book : “The Real Global Warming Disaster”

Gregory Wrightstone – Geologist, University of West Virginia – Book: “Inconvenient Facts”

Michael Crichton – writer – Book “State of Fear”

Lord Monkton – former advisor to Margaret Thatcher

Nigel Lawson – Former Chancellor of the Exchequer- Book : “An Appeal to Reason”

Robin Davies, LL.B, Barrister – Author

If you are able and prepared to help us meet our goal for a Public Open & Honest Debate, then please [contact us](#) .