

To the Stern Committee

Please acknowledge by email receipt of the following documents (including 4 attachments).

The current scientific basis of the Kyoto Protocol is deeply flawed - its

greatest weaknesses include excessive reliance on:

1) The IPCC 2001 Summary for Policymakers (SPM) report, which is now in

disrepute. The cornerstone of that IPCC report is the "hockey stick" curve"

produced by Mann Bradley and Hughes in 1998 (often called MBH98) and two

subsequent papers by Mann et al. This work by Mann et al concluded that the

20th century was the warmest in the past 1000 years and the 1990's was the

warmest decade, and this warming was primarily due to humankind.

It is highly probable that none of this is true. Canadians Ross McKittrick

and Steve McIntyre have demonstrated the flawed science behind Mann's hockey

stick and have shown, among other fatal deficiencies, that any random number

data fed into the MBH98 computer code produces a hockey stick shaped graph.

The US House Energy Committee has launched a federal investigation of the

Mann hockey stick fiasco and the work of IPCC 2001.

See

<http://energycommerce.house.gov/108/Letters/06232005_1570.htm>

2) Climate computer models that greatly exaggerate the impact on global

temperatures of increased atmospheric CO2 levels.

The following email exchange with Lord May of the Royal Society summarizes

this situation:

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

From: Allan MacRae
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2005 5:40 AM
To: 'May, Robert'
Subject: RE: To the Officers of The Royal Society, London SW1

Dear Lord May,
Thank you for your response - I have read your joint statement on climate change at

<<http://www.royalsoc.ac.uk/displaypagedoc.asp?id=13034>>

This statement is materially inaccurate on at least two counts:

1. The underlying physics is incorrect - the correct physics is as outlined

by Veizer (in the paper previously sent to you, and in an earlier paper by

Veizer and Shaviv) and is the opposite of that assumed by the IPCC and your

Royal Society. The primary driver of Earth's climate is solar and celestial,

which drives the water cycle, which in turn drives the CO2 cycle. In

summary, CO2 is not the driver, but the result.

2. Even if the IPCC's physics was correct, which it is not, the IPCC's

climate computer models vastly exaggerate the amount of warming. A

hypothetical doubling of atmospheric CO2 from pre-industrial levels (an

event which is highly unlikely to occur due to human activity) would cause

warming of less than 1 degree C.

The Kyoto Protocol and other such CO2 abatement schemes are massive wastes

of scarce global resources that should be used to alleviate real problems,

not squandered on fictitious ones.

Respectfully yours, Allan MacRae

Attached in pdf format for use of the Stern Committee as you see fit are the following:

1. A Public Comment in response to the announcement in the Canada Gazette, Part 1, July 16, 2005 regarding proposed "LFE regulations" for Large Final Emitters of Greenhouse Gases.

2. A paper published by Dr. Sallie Baliunas, Harvard University astrophysicist, Dr. Tim Patterson, Carleton University Paleoclimatologist and me in 2002 which provides an alternative view of the science of global warming - this paper still remains valid today, although it does not include new insights such as those provided by Dr. Jan Veizer of University of Ottawa and colleagues.

3. A 2003 paper by Veizer and Shaviv.

4. A 2005 paper by Veizer.

In conclusion, even if the mandate of your committee is not to examine the flawed scientific basis of climate change as presented by the IPCC, you should include in your economic analyses a scenario in which humanmade global warming does not exceed 1 degree C - this will largely eliminate the errors of IPCC 2001 SPM and the climate computer models.

A further suggestion for your committee is to conduct a full life-cycle energy audit of alternative energy technologies such as fuel ethanol produced from corn and land-based wind power. You may be surprised to learn that some of these energy technologies produce less energy in their entire operating lifetime than is consumed in their fabrication, construction, tie-in, operation and decommissioning.

Respectfully yours,
Allan M.R. MacRae, B.Sc., M.Eng., P.Eng.
#902 - 318 26th Ave SW
Calgary, Canada T2S2T9

URL's are provide below for the following attachments:
2: Baliunas, Patterson and MacRae - This includes our
article and our
rebuttal and a pro-Kyoto argument from the Pembina
Institute.

<http://www.apegga.org/whatsnew/peggs/WEB11_02/kyoto_pt.htm>

3. Veizer and Shaviv 2003 - Full article at
<[http://www.gsajournals.org/pdfserv/10.1130%2F1052-5173\(2003\)013%3C0004:CDOPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2](http://www.gsajournals.org/pdfserv/10.1130%2F1052-5173(2003)013%3C0004:CDOPC%3E2.0.CO%3B2)>

4. Veizer 2005 - Full article at
<<http://www.gac.ca/JOURNALS/GACV32No1Veizer.pdf>>

Best regards, Allan

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

From: Allan MacRae [mailto:firsst@shaw.ca]
Sent: Friday, October 14, 2005 5:26 AM
To: 'callforevidence@sternreview.org.uk'
Subject: Call for Evidence - Response

To the Stern Committee

Please acknowledge by email receipt of the following
documents (including 4
attachments).

The current scientific basis of the Kyoto Protocol is deeply
flawed - its
greatest weaknesses include excessive reliance on:
1) The IPCC 2001 Summary for Policymakers (SPM) report,
which is now in
disrepute. The cornerstone of that IPCC report is the
"hockey stick" curve"
produced by Mann Bradley and Hughes in 1998 (often called
MBH98) and two

subsequent papers by Mann et al. This work by Mann et al concluded that the 20th century was the warmest in the past 1000 years and the 1990's was the warmest decade, and this warming was primarily due to humankind.

It is highly probable that none of this is true. Canadians Ross McKittrick and Steve McIntyre have demonstrated the flawed science behind Mann's hockey stick and have shown, among other fatal deficiencies, that any random number data fed into the MBH98 computer code produces a hockey stick shaped graph.

The US House Energy Committee has launched a federal investigation of the

Mann hockey stick fiasco and the work of IPCC 2001.

See

<http://energycommerce.house.gov/108/Letters/06232005_1570.htm>

2) Climate computer models that greatly exaggerate the impact on global

temperatures of increased atmospheric CO2 levels.

The following email exchange with Lord May of the Royal Society summarizes

this situation:

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

From: Allan MacRae

Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2005 5:40 AM

To: 'May, Robert'

Subject: RE: To the Officers of The Royal Society, London SW1

Dear Lord May,

Thank you for your response - I have read your joint statement on climate change at

<<http://www.royalsoc.ac.uk/displaypagedoc.asp?id=13034>>

This statement is materially inaccurate on at least two counts:

1. The underlying physics is incorrect - the correct physics is as outlined

by Veizer (in the paper previously sent to you, and in an earlier paper by Veizer and Shaviv) and is the opposite of that assumed by the IPCC and your Royal Society. The primary driver of Earth's climate is solar and celestial, which drives the water cycle, which in turn drives the CO2 cycle. In summary, CO2 is not the driver, but the result.

2. Even if the IPCC's physics was correct, which it is not, the IPCC's climate computer models vastly exaggerate the amount of warming. A hypothetical doubling of atmospheric CO2 from pre-industrial levels (an event which is highly unlikely to occur due to human activity) would cause warming of less than 1 degree C. The Kyoto Protocol and other such CO2 abatement schemes are massive wastes of scarce global resources that should be used to alleviate real problems, not squandered on fictitious ones.

Respectfully yours, Allan MacRae

Attached in pdf format for use of the Stern Committee as you see fit are the following:

1. A Public Comment in response to the announcement in the Canada Gazette, Part 1, July 16, 2005 regarding proposed "LFE regulations" for Large Final Emitters of Greenhouse Gases.

2. A paper published by Dr. Sallie Baliunas, Harvard University astrophysicist, Dr. Tim Patterson, Carleton University Paleoclimatologist and me in 2002 which provides an alternative view of the science of global warming - this paper still remains valid today, although it does not include

new insights such as those provided by Dr. Jan Veizer of University of Ottawa and colleagues.

3. A 2003 paper by Veizer and Shaviv.

4. A 2005 paper by Veizer.

In conclusion, even if the mandate of your committee is not to examine the flawed scientific basis of climate change as presented by the IPCC, you should include in your economic analyses a scenario in which humanmade global warming does not exceed 1 degree C - this will largely eliminate the errors of IPCC 2001 SPM and the climate computer models.

A further suggestion for your committee is to conduct a full life-cycle energy audit of alternative energy technologies such as fuel ethanol produced from corn and land-based wind power. You may be surprised to learn that some of these energy technologies produce less energy in their entire operating lifetime than is consumed in their fabrication, construction, tie-in, operation and decommissioning.

Respectfully yours,

Allan M.R. MacRae, B.Sc., M.Eng., P.Eng.

#902 - 318 26th Ave SW

Calgary, Canada T2S2T9

<< File: Kyoto - Canada Gazette Response Aug 2005.pdf >>

<< File: Kyoto -

PEGG article Dr.8d.pdf >> << File: Kyoto - Veizer & Shaviv 2003.pdf >> <<

File: Kyoto - Veizer 2005 GACV32No1.pdf >>

