

## On Warming Hysteria

John Alfred Protacio  
January 2010

### Introduction

I got a new friend, John Alfred "Al" Protacio. He's a Filipino geophysicist now based in UK. On the subject of warming hysteria, Al posted some of his thoughts in one of my discussion groups, [pilipinasforum@yahoogleroups.com](mailto:pilipinasforum@yahoogleroups.com). He gave me permission to post those ideas of him in my blog, later in the MG website. Readers will find his writings easy to understand.

-- Nonoy Oplas  
-----

*December 19, 2009*

Nonoy, Remember to emphasize that the scientists caught in the Climategate fiasco practice "incestuous" peer review process. The way they practice peer review negates the very reason why the peer review process is being practiced in the first place. This is why the corrupted science of AGW got this far, they have a rubber stamp peer review committee. It is very likely that most scientists working on AGW practice the same "incestuous" peer review process. They have to, or else they will loose their billions of dollars in funding if they publish the truth about AGW. The only scientists who believe in AGW are the ones who benefit from it.

As for convincing our government agencies that AGW doesn't exist, good luck. They are already drooling over the potential \$100B per year grant to combat AGW. They wouldn't deny the existence of something that will give them money. It would be like trying to get the bone away from a hungry dog. The Copenhagen talks are crumbling not because of "Climategate", it's because of greed. The leaders of the poor countries don't want to settle for \$10B a year

in aid. They want at least \$100B. Some even want \$400B a year because there are just so many of them who want a big piece of the pie. Don't also be misled that the rich countries are giving away free money. The rich countries are drooling over the potential sales of their green energy technology and the trade of carbon credits. So, every penny that they give will go back to them. At the end of the whole cycle, the poor countries will be trillions of dollars in debt. They get the poor countries both ways, coming and going. Again, greed!

Who will be at the losing end when this circus finishes, us the tax payers. Since Gordon Brown (I now live in the UK) is promising £10B of aid to battle AGW, our taxes will increase more steeply than usual. Where do you think he will get all that money to give away? We are already paying 17.5% VAT plus all the other taxes which they tie with inflation. This means all our taxes, except for income tax, increase every year. Now, they're also changing the income tax bands to get more money out of the people. For the tax payers in the Philippines, the government will do the same (increase taxes) to pay all the loans related to AGW (do you think the money will be free, it will most likely be as government loans).

For all the people high on the AGW drug, the only way they will wake up is for the US or China or anyone of the big CO2 emitters to bluntly say they are no longer joining the AGW talks because AGW has been proven wrong. They are all still playing the political game because they don't want to be singled out (although wrongly) as uncaring for the environment. They all don't want to strike a deal for the wrong reasons. US wouldn't sign if China will not agree to a means to verify if China is complying with its promised CO2 cuts. China wouldn't want to commit to anything because they say theirs is a voluntary CO2 cut. Of course, they also don't want to miss out on the billions of dollars in green technology and trade that are connected with the mitigation of AGW (solar cells, wind farms, nuclear energy, carbon credits - this one really tops it all, money for nothing - the only thing missing would be the chicks for free - but I think the Copenhagen delegates are getting the free chicks now).

I don't want to dampen your enthusiasm in convincing people AGW is the scam of the millennium (AGW beats Tasaday, Y2K, Busang, etc.). I really appreciate what you're doing. However, to get the desired effect, the big CO2 emitters are the ones that need to be convinced.

-----

*Dec. 23, 2009*

Nonoy, Here in the UK, weather forecasts of a few days to about a week are pretty good. They get it right most of the time but not always. If you monitor the weather websites, forecasts actually change as new data come in. Thus, a weather forecast for the end of the week can change after a few hours to a few days. There have been a few times when the weather forecasts here in the UK have been completely wrong. One summer time, the forecast was a

rainy long holiday weekend. Weekend came; it was bright and sunny with not a drop of rain. Businesses in the beach areas lost money because people stayed home due to the rainy weekend forecast. This is why some MPs have complained to the UK Met Office about a poor job.

Shorter time frame weather forecasts (a few days) are more reliable than longer time frame (1 to 2 weeks) ones. As I mentioned above, weather forecasts do change. So, weather forecasts for the next few hours are more likely to happen than the next few days. Now, imagine a 100 year forecast!

The main problem of computer models is that a lot of the variables which can significantly change the final result are either unquantifiable or are just too complex to enter into the model. So, a lot of simplifications and assumptions are made which make the result less reliable. In science, this is perfectly acceptable as long the limitation/confidence/reliability of the result is specified. Putting 100% confidence in a modeling result is just plain stupid, if not completely fraudulent. Prudence dictates that with less confidence in the results, conclusions and recommendations should be properly tempered. What happened with AGW is that the proponents believed their models to be 100% reliable and thus made their conclusions and recommendations based on that mistaken belief.

I'm familiar with the limitations of models (geological and geophysical) because I use them as part my data interpretation work. Since I know the limitations of the models I created, I never make sweeping conclusions and recommendations. Conclusions are always qualified as "likely" or "possibly" and the bases of the conclusions are stated (e.g. based on the available data..., based on the following assumptions ....). Recommendations are also properly restrained.

However, the problem with AGW is no longer the amount of confidence put in the models. The problem is more basic, the data is not reliable because they have been modified to fit a preconceived conclusion. This is the death blow to the bad science of AGW. No other argument is necessary to prove AGW is a scam.

By the way, the next climate conference will be in Mexico and organizers would like it to be done as soon as summer of 2010. This will guarantee a warm weather and no further embarrassment of thick snow like what happened in Copenhagen.

-----

December 28, 2009

Yes, I agree that the "real" scientists in AGW didn't predict weather conditions for a specific date or area but only predicted climatic conditions. To clarify, weather and climate are two different things. As stated in this NASA website, ([http://www.nasa.gov/mission\\_pages/noaa-n/climate/climate\\_weather.html](http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/noaa-n/climate/climate_weather.html))

"The difference between weather and climate is a measure of time. Weather is what conditions of the atmosphere are over a short period of time, and climate is how the atmosphere "behaves" over relatively long periods of time."

The politicians, media, scientist wannabes, etc. were the ones who went a step too far and equated weather with climate. This is understandable (but not justifiable) because they probably didn't know any better or they needed the shock effect to get their millions of dollars in funding. More effort should have been made by the AGW proponents to correct this misconception. It may have been to their advantage in the beginning to leave this misconception alone and let the hype propel AGW to where it is now but it ultimately helped destroy the credibility of the AGW proponents. Lesson learned, correct misconceptions arising from your statements. It may bite you in the end.

Predictive computer modeling is practiced by other branches of science such as reservoir engineering in the oil and gas industry and in geothermal. As a geophysicist in geothermal, I gave additional data to help constrain the reservoir numerical model. Even with the best available data (geological, geochemical, geophysical, production, injection, etc.), a lot of things can still go terribly wrong. The modeling result is limited by the accuracy of the conceptual model behind the numerical model, accuracy (or even just not being completely wrong) algorithms in the software, complexity (or lack of complexity) of the model, assumptions used, available computer hardware, etc. Correctly modeling the present state of the reservoir is already difficult. Imagine correctly modeling the state of the reservoir 20 to 30 years from now. It is several times more difficult. Aside from the modeling limitations mentioned above, a lot of things can happen in 20 to 30 years (or even as short as 2 years) to make the predictive model completely wrong. In fact, a lot of reservoir engineers will gladly model the present state but would be reluctant to do predictive modeling. I don't blame them. If the company invests hundreds of millions of dollars based on their models and they're wrong, they could be quickly out of a very lucrative job. Bottom line, long-term predictive modeling is shaky at best. Therefore, making sweeping and very strong conclusions (e.g. billions will die in 10 or 20 or 50 or 100 years if we don't stop AGW) and recommendations (e.g. requiring billions of people to pay more taxes to fund the halt to AGW) based on a predictive model is downright wrong.

Having said all these, the problem with AGW is no longer with the science behind it nor with the predictive computer models. The problem is more basic than these. The problem is scientists altered or manufactured data to support AGW!!! No amount of science or computer modeling can prove AGW now. The corner stone of science is data. If data are corrupted, any conclusion coming out of it is wrong!!! The debate about AGW is over (remember how the AGW proponents used this statement to shut-up the so called AGW deniers). The debate is finally over because the AGW proponents have been caught with a very grave lie. AGW is a scam!!!

It just amazes me that the AGW community is still around. OK, they're no longer called AGW but Climate Change. However, it's the same dog with a different collar. No, it's actually a different dog. It's now a fraudulent dog with a different collar. At least in the past, they called themselves as they were, AGW. A man-made phenomenon that has now been proven wrong (remember the altered data). Now, they are hiding behind a naturally occurring phenomenon but still advocating the same AGW scam. With the altered climate data brought to light, the honorable members of the AGW community should come clean and admit that they have been duped by the scientists who altered the climate data and then dump AGW altogether. No one can control climate change. It has happened in the past, it is happening now, and it will happen in the future.

Advocating environmental protection is a very noble cause. I believe people should be told to protect the environment and not waste our limited resources because it is the right thing to do. However, I don't believe in deceitfully scaring people in order to force them to take proper care of the earth. Lying is wrong! The end never justifies the means!

The South Korean scientist caught with the fraudulent stem cell research was shamed and jailed. It's about time that the scientists behind the altered climate data be shamed and jailed as well. However, this is unlikely to happen because a lot of people, even entire governments, are in too deep into this AGW scam (e.g. in the UK, cars are taxed based on their CO2 emission). They wouldn't want to bite the hand that feeds them.

(On the possibility that useful, perhaps critical knowledge can emerge from even "bad" science)

I agree, a lot of new discoveries in science came about by accident. So, some good may still come out of the bad version of climate science. However, this is the shotgun approach. Shoot once and then hope to hit something. Now, imagine the sharp shooter approach. One shot, one hit. If the gazillions are spent only on the good science, be it for climate, medicine, engineering, geology, etc., a lot more can be accomplished faster and at less cost. The limited resources of time and money can be focused on real and urgent problems besetting man such as finding cures for common diseases, etc.

January 10, 2010

(On Bjorn Lomborg's, director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, remark in The Wall Street Journal that Oxfam concluded that if wealthy nations diverted \$50 billion to climate change that "at least 4.5 million children would die and 8.6 million fewer people could have access to HIV/AIDS treatment.")

As I mentioned in my earlier email, we are all working with limited resources (time and money). Thus, resources wasted in tackling fictitious problems are several fold more destructive to society than people may think. It has a knock-on effect on the real problems that need to be addressed. Pouring resources on AGW means less or none at all for the real issues that society needs to sort out.

People have been lead to believe that it would be better to pour resources into fixing AGW, even if it may not be real, because of the catastrophe that may befall us if it is not addressed. They are under the false impression that there is no down side in diverting billions of dollars into AGW even if the problem is not real. There is always a down side, big or small, in wrong decisions. Since funding AGW involves massive amounts of resources, the down side is very, very grave.

Oxfam seems to be sitting on the wall. On one hand, they are supporting AGW. But on the other hand, they are not. Millions dying due to lack of food and medicine is very real and is in fact happening now. Billions will die due to AGW is fiction. They have to take a side.

The only way to stop a monster is to chop off its head. AGW has now become a really despicable monster. Thus, the first step in stopping the AGW monster is to sue the main perpetrators of the AGW scam, starting with Al Gore, Michael Mann, James Hansen and the researchers in CRU. Now is probably the best time to take action against these fraudsters while the revelation of the CRU deception is still fresh in people's minds and while the northern hemisphere is under the grip of "nonconforming" extremely cold weather. However, I don't know if there's any organization with the will and the resources to do this. Whoever will do this may not even have the resolve to carry this through till the end because even if they win, there will be no direct monetary benefit for them. However, the perpetrators of the AGW scam have everything to loose if they don't win. Thus, they will dig in and fight tooth and nail till the end.