

# THE SCIENCE & ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROJECT

## A PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM ON GLOBAL WARMING proposed by the Science & Environmental Policy Project

President  
B. Fred Singer, Ph.D.

Executive Vice President  
Candace B. Oswald

Deputy Executive Vice President  
Richard S. Bader, Ph.D.

Director, Communications  
Mark La Motte

### Board of Directors

Robert B. Hoffman, Jr., Chair

B. Fred Singer, Ph.D.

Candace B. Oswald

Sam T. Harper

### Board of Science Advisors

John Apple, Ph.D.  
Leaves Laboratory,  
Washington, D.C.

L.P. Berman, Ph.D.  
State Institute for the  
Study of Natural Resources,  
The Hague

Walter R. Boyer, Ph.D.  
University of Rochester

Larry Underwood, Ph.D.  
State Institute of  
Technology, Chicago

W. William Michael, Ph.D.  
University of Oxford

John Salomon, M.D.  
Department Center for  
Global Ecology, Paris

Richard Stoff, Ph.D.  
The Rockefeller University,  
New York City

James H. Hunt, Ph.D.  
State Policy Institute  
Wilson, Palo Alto, CA

ETP is an independent  
branch of the Science  
& Environmental Policy Project  
in Berkeley, California

101 Wilson Boulevard  
Arling 1000

Arlington, VA 22201

tel (703) 527-0130

fax (703) 527-0678

*How to stem the tide towards ever more onerous controls on energy use-- even as the scientific base for a future greenhouse warming dwindles? We must organize the atmospheric science community to speak up and make its voice heard by the media, the public, and decisionmakers. Using the new scientific evidence of a reduced climate "stress" we must become proactive and use the provisions of the Global Climate Treaty to establish more appropriate policies.*

\*\*\*\*\*

As a result of agreements reached at the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit in June 1992, a Global Climate Treaty (UN Framework Convention on Climate Change or FCCC) has been ratified by more than the fifty nations required to put it into effect. (The United States was the fourth nation to ratify, right after Mauritius, the Seychelles, and the Marshall Islands.) Underlying the Treaty are the false claims, expressed in the 1990 Policymakers Summary, issued by the steering group of the UN-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), namely: that the global temperature data of the last century are "broadly consistent with predictions of climate models", and that there is a "scientific consensus" backing this claim.

As a first step, the Treaty signatories from developed countries have agreed to stabilize the emissions of greenhouse gases in the year 2000 at the 1990 level. Even if achievable, it would do little more than slow down somewhat the rate of increase of atmospheric concentration (whose stabilization would require an emission reduction, for CO<sub>2</sub>, of 60 to 80% according to the 1990 IPCC report). Activists are already clamoring for policy steps in that direction, such as reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions beyond 2000 by 20% or more.

\*\*\*\*\*

The most important manmade GHG gas is carbon dioxide, created in the burning of fossil fuels: oil, gas, and coal. In October 1993 the White House announced its Climate Change Action Plan, which aims to reduce emissions in the year 2000 to the 1990 level. Informed opinion holds that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve this goal, even if the largely voluntary policies of the Plan are carried out conscientiously (Wash. Post, Sept. 3). Accordingly, environmental activists are pushing for mandatory measures to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> and control energy use. They lobbied for such policies at the August 1994 Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) meetings in Geneva, and will continue to do so at the 11th INC in New York in January 1995. All this is leading up to the first Conference of the Parties (COP-1) in Berlin in March 1995, where the Treaty signatories will consider whether further steps should be taken to reduce emissions.

Some measures proposed in the US—carbon taxes, extreme fuel efficiency for automobiles and other energy-using devices, etc.—would be very costly and threaten a recession. They would also be quite ineffective in dealing with what is truly a global problem, unless countries like China and India are willing to forego increasing their populations and their per-capita energy use—especially the use of coal, which is abundant in both countries. The best that the U.S. and other OECD nations could achieve with even the most drastic cutbacks of energy use is to delay the doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> by a few years.

[A 40% increase in fuel efficiency would reduce the present contribution of US cars and light trucks from 1.7% of global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to only 1.2%—after total fleet penetration; assuming no increase in vehicle-miles-traveled as a result of lower operating costs per mile; assuming no relative increase in emissions outside of the US.]

Notwithstanding all of this hectic regulatory activity, amplified by countless international conferences, there appears to be no evidence as yet that enhanced greenhouse warming is really taking place. In spite of the continuing increase in atmospheric concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases, observing stations on the earth's surface and instruments in satellites have not seen the expected temperature rise of 1-2 degrees C. As a result, many scientists are beginning to doubt whether the predictions of catastrophic global warming, based merely on theoretical climate models, can be relied on. This skepticism has been heightened by the revelation that most models have been "adjusted" to make them match present climate. To quote *Science* (Vol. 265, p. 528): "In climate modeling, everybody cheats a little."

Three independent surveys conducted in 1992 established that there is no scientific consensus to support the predictions of the climate models on which all warming "threats" are based. All claims of a consensus are false and not backed by evidence.

A new IPCC report on Radiative Forcing has done nothing to counter the conviction that the computer models are greatly overestimating a future warming. Nor is there any evidence that a slight warming would cause economic or ecological disruptions. On the contrary, agriculture and many other activities would benefit. (See R. Mendelsohn, *Amer. Econ. Review*, Sept. 1994.)

For all of these reasons, one should pursue only low-cost policies to reduce the emission of CO<sub>2</sub>, policies that make sense even if the theory of enhanced greenhouse warming proves to be worthless. The most appropriate policy is more energy conservation wherever this makes economic sense, including higher-efficiency fossil fuel power plants, coupled with the proven methods of electricity generation by hydropower and nuclear reactors.

**PROPOSED PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAM BY SEPP  
AIMED AT REVISING THE IPCC AT THE BERLIN COP-1**

1. As a first step, a group of experts would prepare a scientifically sound and persuasive Critique of the IPCC Summary, updating the widely distributed and quoted 1992 SEPP critique "The Greenhouse Debate Continued." The scientific issues would be laid out clearly and persuasively.
2. Next, we would distribute the Critique widely throughout the scientific community and publish a Statement of Support signed by a hundred or more climate experts. This Statement could then be quoted and reprinted in newspapers.
3. Our proposal envisages assembling a panel of about five distinguished scientists/technologists. This panel would issue a Release pointing up the IPCC Critique and conduct press briefings to defend its conclusions. If funding can be provided without delay, the panel could function before the end of 1994, review the Critique, and issue its Release in January 1995, during or before the INC meeting in New York City.
4. As an additional task, a smaller (international) panel would conduct press briefings on the IPCC Critique in Berlin during or before the Conference of the Parties, which convenes there on March 24, 1995.
5. Before the Berlin briefing, one would conduct briefings in Amsterdam, Copenhagen, and several German cities, as part of a public education campaign on climate change and its consequences.
6. At the same occasion, a General Statement of Support could be released, endorsed by the Heidelberg Appeal, representing the voices of some 4000 scientists, incl. 70+ Nobelists.

\*\*\*\*\*

Time is of the essence. Even a minimal educational program must be started almost immediately. The stakes are too great to delay action. Remember what happened to CFCs, the paradigm for CO<sub>2</sub>: It took only five years to go from the 1987 Montreal Protocol, mandating a simple freeze of production at 1985 levels, to the 1992 decision of a complete production phase-out—all on the basis of quite insubstantial science.

Submitted by:



**E. Fred Singer, Ph.D.**  
Director, Science & Environmental Policy Project

**REVISED BUDGET for BEPP Proposal to GCC**

**November 7, 1994**

**Phase I: Tasks 1, 2, 3, and 6** **Total Cost: \$30,000**  
**(includes office expenses and overhead of \$17,000)**

**Phase II: Tasks 4 and 5** **Total Cost: \$45,000**  
**(includes office expenses and overhead of \$18,000)**

.....

<b>Task 1.</b>	<b>IPCC Critique</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>
	Preparation and printing of IPCC Critique	
	Honoraria for expert reviewers (incl. travel)	
<b>Task 2.</b>	<b>Statement on GHW</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>
	Drafting of Statement	
	Mailing to approx. 500 scientists	
	Analysis and publication of Statement	
<b>Task 3.</b>	<b>Panel meeting in New York (Feb. 1995)</b>	<b>\$8,000</b>
	Honoraria and travel (2 days)	
	Drafting of press release	
<b>Task 4.</b>	<b>Panel meeting in Berlin (March 1995)</b>	<b>\$20,000</b>
	Drafting of press release	
	Honoraria and travel for 2 US and 2 European panelists	
<b>Task 5.</b>	<b>Public Information Campaign in Europe</b>	<b>\$10,000</b>
	Honoraria and travel for 2 US and 2 European panelists	
	Fees to public affairs consultants	
<b>Task 6.</b>	<b>Heidelberg Appeal</b>	<b>\$5,000</b>
	Preparation of Statement	
	Mailing and analysis	
	Press release	
	Publication	

**Notes:**

1. Discussion with potential panelists and reviewers (US and European are now underway)
2. Media interviews and op-eds based on Statements and press releases are included in the Tasks

gwberlin.prp

**LIST OF POTENTIAL PANEL MEMBERS**

**Dr. Frederick Seitz**

former President, US National Academy of Sciences  
President (Emeritus) Rockefeller University

**Dr. Champney Starr**

founding President, Electric Power Research Institute  
awarded National Medal of Technology

**Dr. Henry Linden**

founding President, Gas Research Institute  
Professor of Power Engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology

**Dr. Harold Finger**

former president, Committee for Energy Awareness

**Dr. S. Wm. Gouss**

former managing director, The Mirc Corporation

**Prof. Richard Wilson**

Physics Department, Harvard University

**Dr. Robert Froeh**

former director of research, General Motors Corporation  
former Administrator, NASA

**Dr. Edward E. David**

former White House Science Adviser  
former director of research, EXXON Corporation

**Dr. Rodney W. Nichols**

Chief Executive Officer, New York Academy of Sciences

**Dr. Philip H. Abelson**

associate editor (and former chief editor), Science magazine

**Prof. Richard Lindzen**

Sloan Professor of Meteorology, MIT

**Dr. Robert Jastrow**

President, Marshall Institute  
Director, Mount Wilson Observatories

**Dr. William Niorenberg**

former director, Scripps Institution of Oceanography

**Rough transcription of Fred Singer's 1994 proposal to the Global Climate Coalition for "A Public Education Program on Global Warming" (parts of the original document is hard to read)**

PAGE 1

A Public Education Program on Global Warming  
Proposed by the Science and Environmental Policy Project

How to stem the tide toward more onerous controls on energy use -- even as the scientific base for a future greenhouse warming dwindles? We must organize the atmospheric science community to speak up and make its voice heard by the media, the public and decisionmakers. Using the new scientific evidence of a reduced climate "threat" we must become proactive and axe(?) the provisions of the Global Climate Treaty to establish more appropriate policies.

\*\*\*\*\*

As a result of agreements reached at the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit in June 1992, a Global Climate Treaty (UN Framework Convention on Climate Change or FCCC) has been ratified by more than the fifty nations required to put it into effect. (The United States was the fourth nation to ratify, right after Mauritius, the Seychelles, and the Marshall Islands.) Underlying the Treaty are the false claims, expressed in the 1990 Policymakers Summary, issued by the steering group of the UN-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), namely:

- That the global temperature data of the last century are "broadly consistent with predictions of climate models", and
- That there is a "scientific consensus" backing this claim.

As a first step, the Treaty signatories from developed countries have agreed to stabilize the emissions of greenhouse gases in the year 2000 at the 1990 level. Even if achievable, it would do little more than slow down somewhat the rate of increase of atmospheric concentration (whose stabilization would require an emission reduction, for CO<sub>2</sub>, of 60 to 80%! according to the 1990 IPCC report). Activists are already clamoring for policy steps in that direction, such as reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions beyond 2000 by 20% or more.

\*\*\*\*\*

The most important manmade GH gas is carbon dioxide, created in the burning of fossil fuels: oil, gas and coal. In October 1993 the White House announced its Climate Change Action Plan, which aims to reduce emissions in the year 2000 to the 1990 level. Informed opinion holds that it will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve this goal, even if the largely voluntary policies of the Plan are carried out conscientiously (Wash. Post, Sept. 3). Accordingly, environmental activists are pushing for mandatory measures to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> and control energy use. They lobbied for such policies at the August 1994 Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) meetings in Geneva, and will continue to do so at the 11th INC in New York in January 1995. All this is leading up to the first Conference of the Parties (COP-1) in Berlin in March 1995, where the Treaty signers will consider whether further steps should be taken to reduce emissions.

PAGE 2

Some measures proposed in the US --carbon taxes, extreme fuel efficiencies for automobiles other energy-using devices, etc. -- would be very costly and threaten a recession. They would also be quite ineffective in dealing with what is truly a global problem, unless countries like China and India are willing to forego increasing their populations and their per-capita energy use -- especially the use of coal, which is abundant in both countries. The level that the U.S. and other OECD nations could achieve with even the most drastic cutbacks of energy use is to delay the doubling of CO2 by a few years.

[A 40% increase in fuel efficiency would reduce the percent contribution of US cars and light trucks from 1.7% of global CO2 emissions to only 1.2% -- after total fleet penetration: assuming no increase in vehicle-miles- involved as a result of lower operating costs per mile; assuming no relative increase in emissions outside of the U.S.]

Notwithstanding all of this hectic regulatory activity, amplified by countless international conferences, there appears to be no evidence yet that enhanced greenhouse warming is really taking place. In spite of the continuing increases to atmospheric concentration of CO2 and other greenhouse gases, observing stations on the earth's surface and instruments in satellites have not seen the expected temperature rise of 1-2 degrees C. As a result, many scientists are beginning to doubt whether the predictions of catastrophic global warming, based merely on theoretical climate models can be relied on. This skepticism has been heightened by the revelation that most models have been "modified" to make them match (unreadable) climate. To quote *Science* (Vol.265, p 1528): "In climate modeling, everybody cheats a little."

Three independent surveys conducted in 1992 established that there is no scientific consensus to support the predictions of the climate models on which warming "threats" are based. All claims of a connection are false and not backed by evidence.

A new IPCC report on Radioactive Forcing has done nothing to counter the conviction that the computer models are greatly overestimating future warming, Nor is there any evidence that slight warming would cause economic or ecological disruptions. On the contrary, agriculture agriculture and many other activities would benefit. (See R. Mendelsohn, *Amer. Econ Review*, Sept. 1994.)

For all of these reasons, one should pursue only low-cost policies to reduce the emission of CO2, policies that make sense even if the theory of enhanced greenhouse warming proves to be worthless. The most appropriate policy is more energy conservation wherever this makes economic sense, including higher-efficiency fossil fuel power plants, coupled with the proven methods of electricity generation by hydropower and nuclear reactors.

**Proposed Public Education Program by SEPP  
Aimed at Revising the FCCC at the Berlin COP-1**

1. As a first step, a group of experts would prepare a scientifically sound and persuasive Critique of the IPCC Summary, updating the widely distributed and quoted 1992 SEPP critique "*The Greenhouse Debate Continued.*" The scientific issues would be laid out clearly and persuasively.
2. Next, we would distribute the Critique widely throughout the scientific community and publish a Statement of Support signed by a hundred or more climate experts. This Statement could then be quoted and reprinted in newspapers.
3. Our proposal envisages assembling a panel of about five distinguished scientists/technologists. This panel would issue a Release pointing up the IPCC Critique and conduct press briefings to defend its conclusions. If funding can be provided without delay, the panel could function before the end of 1994, review the Critique, and issue its Release in January 1995, during or before the INC meeting in New York City.
4. As an additional task, a similar (international) panel would conduct press briefings on the IPCC Critique in Berlin during or before the Conference of the Parties, which convenes there on March 24, 1995.
5. Before the Berlin briefing, one would conduct briefings in Amsterdam, Copenhagen, and several German cities, as a part of a public education campaign on climate change and its consequences.
6. At the same occasion, a General Statement of Support could be released, endorsed by the Heidelberg Appeal, representing the voices of some 4000 scientists and 70+ Nobelists.

\*\*\*\*\*

Time is of the essence. Even a minimal educational program must be started almost immediately. The stakes are too great to delay action. Remember what happened to CFCs, the paradigm for CO<sub>2</sub>: It took only five years to go from the 1987 Montreal Protocol, mandating a simple freeze of production at 1985 levels, to the 1992 declaration of a complete production phase-out--all on the basis of quite (unreadable) science.

Submitted by:  
S. Fred Singer Ph.D.  
Director, Science & Environmental Policy Project



**Revised budget for SEPP Proposal to GCC**

**November 7, 1994**

Phase I: Tasks 1, 2, 3, and 6  
(includes office expenses and overhead of \$17,000) Total Cost: \$30,000

Phase II: Tasks 4 and 5  
(includes office expenses and overhead of \$13,000) Total Cost: \$43,000

\*\*\*\*\*

Task 1. IPCC Critique	\$15,000
Preparation and printing of IPCC Critique	
Honoraria for expert reviewers (Incl. travel)	
Task 2. Statement on GHW	\$5,000
Drafting of Statement	
Mailing to approx. 500 scientists	
Analysis and publications of statement	
Task 3. Panel Meeting in New York (Feb. 1995)	\$8,000
Honorarium and travel (2 days)	
Drafting of press release	
Task 4. Panel meeting in Berlin (March 1995)	\$20,000
Drafting of press release	
Honorarium and travel for 2 U.S. and 2 European panelists	
Task 5. Public Information Campaign in Europe	\$10,000
Honorarium and travel for 2 U.S. and 2 European panelists	
Fees to public affairs consultants	
Task 6. Heidelberg Appeal	\$3,000
Preparation of statement	
Mailing and analysis	
Press release	
Publication	

**Notes:**

1. Discussion with potential panelists and reviewers (US and European are now underway)
2. Media interviews and op-eds based on Statements and press releases are included in the tasks gwberlin.prp

**List of Potential Panel Members**

Dr. Fredrick Seitz

Former President, U.S. National Academy of Sciences  
President (Emeritus) Rockefeller University

Dr. Chauncey Starr

Founding President, Electric Power Research Institute  
Awarded National Medal of Technology

Dr. Henry Lindon

Founding president, Gas Research institute  
Professor of Power Engineering, Illinois Institute of Technology

Dr. Harold Finger

Former President, Companies for Energy Awareness

Dr. S. Wm. Gouse

Former managing director, The Mitre Corporation

Prof. Richard Wilson

Physics Department, Harvard University

Dr. Robert Frosch

Former director of research, General Motors Corporation  
Former Administrator, NASA

Dr. Edward E. David

Former White House Science Advisor  
Former director of research, EXXON Corporation

Dr. Rodney W. Nichols

Chief Executive Officer, New York Academy of Sciences

Dr. Philip H. Abelson

Associate editor (and former chief editor), *Science* magazine

Prof. Richard Lindzen

Sloan Professor of Meteorology, MIT

Dr. Robert Jastrow

President, Marshall Institute  
Director, Mount Wilson Observatories

Dr. William Nierenberg

Former director, Scripps Institute of Oceanography