

## Open Letter on Climate Summit COP21 in Paris

1) There is no demonstrable large effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on the climate. Repeating something does not make the thing true. In history CO<sub>2</sub> was always lagging behind temperature.

2) CO<sub>2</sub> has demonstrable positive effect on nature. CO<sub>2</sub> is the gas of life. Trees and plants breath it. At low CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations they suffocate. At high concentrations they live up and we now see the planet getting greener. As an example, in greenhouses they add CO<sub>2</sub> to the air to speed up growth.

3) There is no 'conspiracy' of industry to defend continuing using fossil fuels. Countries might have an interest in doing so, but it is totally immaterial for for industry what fuel they use. This includes oil industry (Capital is flexible and transforms means of production rapidly to alternative sources. Note, Philips does not make light bulbs anymore, do they?). Even more, the market of green energies and green technologies is an opportunity for business. What is more, if they can be on the law-making side, they can keep an advantage over competitors. This way, the ERT (European Round Table of Industrialists, the largest companies of Europa) has maneuvered itself into a position where they are writing the European laws, from which they subsequently profit by have privileged inside information to the upcoming laws. In some cases this lead can be called fraud, as we recently saw in the Volkswagen scandal.

4) There is an apparent consensus of scientists about this subject. This consensus is the result of the way we have organized science. It is a system with feedback. If there are more 'pro' researchers, pro manuscripts (and pro projects) will be more readily accepted because the chance of a pro referee is bigger. This, eventually, winds up in a consensus of 100%. AT this moment the indicator is at 97% because this subject is only for about 20 years installed in politics. Science is being demolished. Counter-researchers are marginalized (and often demonized). But real science means always being critical (and therefore skeptical) and not repeating someone's political agenda (see the quote of Bertrand Russell at the end). Opposing consensus was always considered heroic in history (take for example Galileo, who maintained all his life that the Earth is rotating). In contrast, nowadays we call the consensus heroic. In 2015 no climate skeptic whatsoever gets funding, neither form government, nor from industry. That we have a consensus now, well "You ask, we play". The people have paid for being lied to.

5) Out of sheer necessity of a proof of global warming data have been adjusted. Heating of our planet in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is mainly due to these adjustments. Another fraudulent data set is the so-called 'hockeystick' of Mann (temperature from the past millennium; flat until about 50 years ago and then rising sharply). This figure has been debunked scientifically, but still floats around in political circles. The above mentioned fraudulent culture of industry has settled itself also in research worlds. First because researchers are nowadays required to have a link with industry ('knowledge-based economy' is the spear point of the European Union) and, moreover, science nowadays has to be 'useful' (read: profitable) for society. This approach goes against the opinion of great minds like Einstein en Feynman and opens the door to fraud. With fraud you can acquire wealth and prestige. Don't forget, "The truth will prevail".

6) All models of the IPCC have failed so far. Every time hey fail, the models (or the data!) are adjusted. This we call 'retrodiction' (hindsight prediction). This is a non-scientific way of going about doing things. Science, according to Philosopher Popper, consists of five ingredients.

One of them is that the model should predict something that can be tested. Moreover, it cannot be a prediction of the type “If P then Q” (P the model, Q an event) and then look for Q, but “If P than *not* Q” and look for Q. “If I am right this and that *cannot* happen”. All research should be aimed at looking where the model fails. In other words, a scientist is a professional skeptic.

The predictions of the IPCC have all failed. In 2007, for example, the natural fluctuation in temperature was estimated to be about 0.1 degree, with no room for doubt whatsoever that all temperature rises were the result of CO2. Considering the fact that CO2 only has been increasing the possibility of a pause in temperature rising was fully excluded. Still, it happened. “If IPCC models correct, then no pause”. There was a pause. Therefore, the models of the IPCC are wrong. Full stop.

The IPCC has gone back to the drawing board and adjusted their model and it now includes a pause. But why should we now not also listen to scientists who *did* predict the pause or even temperature drop? These people indeed do exist. However, they are stigmatized and often falsely accused of having 'ties with industry', that while, mind you, politics has demanded from scientists to have ties with industry, as mentioned at point 5. It rather has a lot of schizophrenic character. The industry is the big (pro)motor behind the entire climate agenda. We challenge journalists to investigate that. Follow the money!

We would like to finish here with the words of philosopher Bertrand Russell: “... a man whose opinions and theories are worth studying may be presumed to have had some intelligence, but that no man is likely to have arrived at complete and final truth on any subject whatever. When an intelligent man expresses a view which seems to us obviously absurd, we should not attempt to prove that it is somehow true, but we should try to understand how it ever came to *seem* true. This exercise of historical and psychological imagination at once enlarges the scope of our thinking, and helps us to realize how foolish many of our own cherished prejudices will seem to an age which has a different temper of mind.”

Faro, 24 november 2015

Prof. Assoc. Agr. Peter Stallinga

Prof. Agr. Igor Khmelinskii

University of The Algarve

[peter.stallinga@gmail.com](mailto:peter.stallinga@gmail.com), [peter@stallinga.org](mailto:peter@stallinga.org), <http://www.stallinga.org>.