The Climate is Changing, naturally."

A Submission from:

The Carbon Sense Coalition
www.carbon-sense.com

to
the Garnaut Climate Change Review
on its Issues Paper No 4

"Low Emissions Energy Technology."

11 April 2008

*(Submissions to be forwarded to the Greenhouse and Energy Reporting Taskforce by **11 April 2008** at: contactus@garnautreview.org.au)*

1. The Climate is Changing

The fundamental reason for the establishment of the Garnaut Review, and all the dramatic and costly changes it portends, is a belief in this sentence:

"Man's emissions of carbon dioxide (CO2) have caused significant and unusual warming of the planet and, unless checked by government decree, will cause further dangerous and destructive global warming."

Neither the science nor the past climate history support this belief. It is untrue for several reasons:

- For two significant periods of the 20th Century, the planet has cooled while CO2 emissions rose strongly. The first cooling started in the late 1940's just as CO2 emissions rose strongly in the post war boom. The second started in 1998 and continues to today despite huge increases in man's emissions.

- In another period of last century, the reverse occurred. Man's emissions fell during the Great Depression of the 1930's but global temperature rose to the peak temperature of the century in 1934.

- The geological record shows that there is nothing unusual about today's temperatures or CO2 content of the atmosphere. It also shows that while temperature and CO2 show similar patterns of variation, the temperature changes precede the changes in CO2. This correlation does not necessarily prove that rising temperature causes rising CO2, but it does prove that rising CO2 in the atmosphere does ***NOT*** cause rising temperature.

- Comparison of trends, and actual experiments, show that variations in solar activity, magnified by its effect on clouds, are the chief factor in causing warm eras and ice ages.

A study of geological history shows clearly that we are lucky to live in a naturally warm era. Ice ages are far more threat to the human race than the bountiful and pleasant warm eras.

The most vocal groups still supporting the "CO2 causes global warming hypothesis" are the Climate Modelers in the IPCC, extremists in the environmental movement, sensation seeking media, politicians using the issue for vote gathering, the claque of officials supporting the official line and their own fiefdoms, and the cabal of vested interests who see huge profit potential in the artificial industry created by a Carbon Trading Scheme. Other corporate alarmists see de-carbonisation as a chance to erect huge barriers to entry to those unable to afford the so called "clean energy" options being developed with huge dollops of government and shareholders' funds. The general public is bemused and confused but sceptical about the increasingly shrill claims of imminent doom. This bemusement will quickly turn to hostility and opposition once the bills for carbon taxes and emission permits start appearing in their monthly bills for electricity, food, heating, cooling, travel and motor fuels. Already we have seen food price riots caused when food crops and land were diverted to ethanol production.

The real climate is changing, naturally, as it always has done; the scientific "consensus" has been shattered as more scientists focus on the flimsy basis for the scare claims; and the climate of public opinion is also changing - more people are starting to question the wisdom of classifying a colourless, non-toxic natural atmospheric gas, which is the key source of all food on earth, as a deadly pollutant needing to be buried at huge cost in barren carbon cemeteries.

These changes in climate lead us to our first recommendation to the Garnaut Review:

Recommendation 1

"That before any policies are introduced on a Carbon Tax, Carbon Trading, or subsidies and mandates for non-carbon energy sources, there should be a Royal Commission of Enquiry into the science of the role of CO2 in global warming."

For a selection of news on the Cooling of 2007, see Appendix 1. People all over the world were very thankful for any energy that kept them warm.

For a flavour of the changing climate of opinion, see Appendix 2. This trickle of dissident opinion can only grow until it is such a tide that even politicians not in election mode will hear it.

2. Be Careful what you wish for - the Cost Benefit Analysis

CO2 is a very minor gas in the atmosphere and will remain so no matter what man does. The oceans are the great stabilisers of CO2, and natural sources and sinks will always swamp man's emissions.

However CO2 is a critical gas for the future of all life. The more CO2, the more life. At 150 ppm of CO2 in the atmosphere, plant growth almost ceases. At 1000 ppm, plant growth is prolific as long as water and warmth are well supplied. Current levels are about 380 ppm.

If we proceed with the folly of attempting to slash carbon emissions, and if it has the effect of greatly reducing atmospheric CO2, the results will be all bad for mankind – reduced plant growth and reduced food supply. (Fortunately, man lacks the power to do this, no matter how many committees of IPCC say it should be done at any cost.)

Thus the alarmists are proposing taxes and restrictions which will reduce the supply and increase the cost of our most basic human needs, food and energy, for no climate benefits. Moreover, even if it achieves its aims, it will produce wholly negative consequences on plant growth and future food supply. This is not a zero sum game which is being proposed - the likely outcome is either bad or disastrous. This result is far more predictable than is next year's weather.

Finally, it is ludicrous to believe that unilateral action by Australia to influence the world climate by a process of slow strangulation of our key carbon industries (food and energy) is a sensible policy.

This leads to our next recommendation:

Recommendation 2

That Australia should not introduce any taxes, permits, subsidies or market sharing schemes which discriminate against carbon fuels on the basis of CO2 emissions.

If the whole world, including China, India, USA, Russia and Africa, decides to commit carbon suicide, and Australia feels they must join the lemming rush, we recommend that Australia stays well back in the pack, only joins when faced with unanimous world retaliation, and retires from the race on the slightest excuse.

3. Supporting Documents

Carbon Sense has already made known its views on the lack of evidence or proof that man-made CO2 has caused or will cause dangerous global warming, and the dangers of costly and perverse consequences of precipitate legislative action on de-carbonisation. These include:

1 A submission to the Garnaut Review, "The Sky is not Falling", which recommends that no action be taken on any de-carbonisation proposals until a Royal Commission is held on the Science of Global Warming:
http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/01/garnaut-submission.pdf

2 A specific proposal from a group of Australian and New Zealand organisations and scientists to set up such a Royal Commission (the ANZIG Enquiry):
http://carbon-sense.com/2008/02/05/time-for-an-australia-new-zealand-royal-commission-on-global-warming/

3 A Submission to the Queensland Government, "Look before you Leap", on their Proposed Energy and Climate Policies. In it, The Carbon Sense Coalition accuses the Queensland Government of proposing draconian policies which will have no effect whatsoever on global temperature, but will, if pursued, do tremendous damage to most Queenslanders:

http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2007/06/look.pdf

4 A submission to The Garnaut Review, "Keep it Simple, Stupid", which recommends that if any reporting system is mandated, it should be the very simplest system.

http://carbon-sense.com/2008/02/17/keep-it-simple-stupid/

The above reports should be treated as part of and complementary to this submission.

4. Possibilities for "Low Emissions Energy Generation" – the Energy Options for Mankind.

For the whole of human history, the only sources of energy for the human race can be classified into a few broad categories:

- Warmth and light by direct and indirect radiation from the sun.
- Human energy from carbon foods extracted from CO2 in the atmosphere.
- Animal energy from horses, camels, oxen and donkeys running on carbon fuels from plants.
- Wind, generated by the sun, which can be used as a source of energy by windmills and sailing clippers.
- Ocean tides generated by the sun and the moon which can generate tidal power.
- Rain and rivers recycled by the sun and which can be harnessed for hydro energy.
- Wood and other plant material which can be burnt for warmth or turned into combustible liquids. These fuels utilise carbon from atmospheric CO2 plus solar energy to create hydrocarbons.
- Natural hydrocarbons extracted from the earth such as coal, oil, coal seam gas, natural gas, methane and oil shale.
- Earth energy - geothermal and nuclear - which rely on radioactive decay to produce heat, either deep within the earth's crust (geothermal) or in specific minerals such as uranium and thorium.

This boils down to just three energy options for mankind:

- Solar energy from the Sun via radiant heat, wind, hydro and tidal power.

- Carbon energy from sunlight captured and stored in recent organic matter such as peat, wood, fish and chips; or in preserved organic matter such as coal, oil and gas.

- Earth Energy from radioactive decay either deep within the earth (geothermal) or from mined radioactive fuels such as uranium (nuclear power).

Solar power suffers four large problems which no amount of government research money will solve.

Firstly, direct solar power is intermittent - it ceases at night and is greatly reduced by clouds during the day. Wind power ceases when the wind drops. These energy sources must be backed up by generation or storage capacity equal to the full capacity of the solar or wind generators.

Moreover, these sometimes abrupt fluctuations in power supply also cause instability in the power networks, and this limits the proportion of solar/wind power that can be accommodated in a power network.

Secondly, it arrives in very diffuse form, so very large areas of land are needed to collect sufficient energy to have significant value to a large industrial society.

Thirdly, a large amount of energy and resources is needed to manufacture, transport and erect the imposing hardware required, and to collect and concentrate the electricity produced. This infrastructure is very invasive and destructive of the natural environment.

And fourthly, its supply is generally not concentrated in areas where the bulk demand for power is situated, so large transmission costs are required. Solar has maximum potential in tropical deserts, and wind power has maximum potential on rocky promontories in the zone of "The Roaring Forties". Neither will supply the peak power needed in foggy Canberra on cold still winter mornings.

Solar energy is very useful for hot water systems, farm windmills, grass, crops, vegetables and trees. To believe it can run a large power network with the reliability and costs that people expect, is a joke.

Hydro power can produce good clean reliable energy, but all the good sites are already taken by hydro schemes or world heritage no-go areas.

Is it possible to produce "low emission energy" from traditional carbon fuels? No, this is only feasible if carbon capture and storage (CCS) is feasible.

CCS is clearly not feasible for all hydrocarbons used in mobile engines – cars, trucks, trains, planes, ships and dozers. Moreover, there is no other feasible fuel to replace hydrocarbons in transport applications. People talk glibly about "hydrogen fuel". Hydrogen gas does not occur naturally in useful quantities. It can be extracted from water using electric power, and the only feasible energy sources for doing this on a large scale are coal, oil, gas or nuclear power. It can also be extracted from hydrocarbons such as coal or natural gas. Electric cars with energy storage batteries could be combined with carbon or nuclear power but it is not possible to retro-fit our huge current fleet of vehicles and engines. Do we trash the savings of a couple of generations? And where do we get the energy and materials to mine, smelt, refine, fabricate and deliver the huge quantities of batteries required?

CCS has not been proven even for fixed facilities generating electricity from coal or gas – this is at least 10 years away, and even if it can be done, it will cost large amounts in capital and operating costs which have to be recovered from electricity consumers, power station owners/shareholders or taxpayers.

This leaves Earth Energy as the only options to replace coal and oil. ***Geothermal*** will not generate significant electricity for decades. And ***nuclear*** power seems politically unacceptable.

So, we are driven to the conclusion that there are no near term feasible options for replacing carbon fuels with low emission fuels. Thus, to cut emissions means to live on less electricity and motor fuel.

It is a policy for poverty (and don't try to read by candle-light – candles also emit CO2).

This leads us to the next recommendation:

Recommendation 3

That no special subsidies be given to any particular low emissions option. Even if carbon taxes or permits are levied on the carbon fuels, let the market decide which energy source satisfies consumer needs at the lowest cost.

For most of the world's cities and industries, carbon fuels will still provide most of the world's energy no matter what the politicians do.

5. Planning the Energy/carbon Market – the Hippo or the Gazelle?

A period of economic turmoil (like the one we look likely to enter in the energy market), always leads to calls for or imposition of some government backed "Master Plan". These are most alluring to computer literate engineers who believe they could plan society or industry "better than leaving it to chance and speculators".

This is not a question of whether or not we should make plans. The question is, which leads to better outcomes:

- Centralised Government master plans drawn up by the Minister and his officials, assisted by his industry cronies, and imposed on everyone else – ie rely on the massive power and small brain of the government planning hippo,

  OR

- Decentralised plans, where every market participant is left free to make his own plans with his own assets and knowledge ie leave it to the many smart nimble gazelles (and a few hippos) of the private sector .

The twentieth century provided a number of massive social experiments testing these two methods of planning the economy:

The Comrade Societies put their faith in Government master plans. The relatively free societies left their people somewhat free to compete in an open market using their own information, forecasts, assets and plans. The results were stark and unanimous. Compare East Germany to West Germany on the day of re-unification. Or North and South Korea now, or Hong Kong and China before unification, or Israel and Syria.

Ordinary people are in no doubt where life is better. The Berlin Wall was not built to keep Berliners in, no boat people leave Australia seeking to enter Burma, there is no flood of illegal migrants going South across the Rio Grand, and no queue of Britons trying to enter Sri Lanka. Countries are prosperous, not as they are fertile, but as they are free.

Everywhere, the relatively free countries with the fewest Master Plans and the least powerful bureaucrats are the most prosperous, the most environmentally conscious and the most contented.

This leads to the next recommendation:

Recommendation 4

That no Carbon Master Plans be considered or imposed by state or federal governments. The damage that will be done by carbon taxes or permits will be minimised if all industry participants and consumers are left free to adjust in their own ways and according to their own value judgements.

6. Government Funding of Research

Most of the great breakthroughs in science and technology are made, not by salaried officials in pretentious technology parks, but by dreamers, rebels and sceptics working in their garages and too stupid to know that what they were attempting was, according to the consensus of experts, "impossible or impractical".

To find some marvellous new energy source will require a breakthrough. The best discovery tool is an atmosphere of freedom and competition. Research is also maximised when there are surplus funds, and it is minimised when profits and savings are soaked up in taxes and where many innovative minds are engaged on devising fancy schemes to profit from the complex rules in the huge new rule book entitled:

"Emissions Trading and Carbon Credits under the All Australia Carbon master plan (with appendices to cover overseas carbon capers, and amendments to noon yesterday)."

This leads to our next recommendation:

Recommendation 5

That no government funds be directed to research of low emission technology, and no grants be given to any particular technology, energy source or corporation. But any energy research by any individual business should attract a full tax deduction in the year of expenditure.

7. The Dangers of Protectionism – "Pass the Poverty around".

Should Australia be so silly as to "go it alone" on carbon taxes or emission permits, this will immediately disadvantage Australians who have to compete in the wider world. No politician will sit and watch all industry in his electorate close or shift overseas because China, for example, had enough sense to refuse to flagellate their people and sacrifice their local industry on the de-carbonisation altar.

Immediately, some lucky businesses who manage to get classified as competing with un-hobbled foreign competitors will get exemption certificates, and evade the carbon impositions. Others, faced with import competition from countries with no extra carbon imposts, will immediately clamour for "compensatory carbon import taxes" and a destructive protectionist war will break out. Such trade wars can lead quickly to real wars, or economic depressions.

This leads to a repeat of Recommendation 2:

Australia must not go it alone.

The Carbon Sense Coalition is happy to appear before the review or answer questions on the questions posed by this Issues paper.

Viv Forbes BSc App, FAIMM, FSIA
Chairman
The Carbon Sense Coalition
MS 23, Rosewood, Qld 4340

www.carbon-sense.com
info@carbon-sense.com
Phone 07 5464 0533

This submission was prepared by individual members of the Carbon Sense Coalition on their own initiative with no encouragement or financial support from any other groups or individuals.

"Everyone is entitled to their own opinions, but not to their own facts." *US Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan*

Appendix.1 – Climate Change is always with us.

During 2007 we saw:

China's coldest winter for 100 years.

Record snow levels across Northeast America,

Brisbane airport had its lowest ever temperature in June, 2007 and several Queensland towns from SE Queensland to the tropics (Townsville) had record cold temperatures.

Darwin had its coldest day on record.

Coral off Gladstone bleached in June because of cold temperatures.

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://www.iceagenow.com/Enduring_Tajikistans_coldest_winter.htm
14 Feb 08 - After suffering its worst winter in 50 years, Tajikistan has finally appealed to the United Nations for aid. But a total loss of electricity is still a possibility, and could have terrible consequences.
Left without heat, electricity or running water, hundreds of thousands of people who are trying to survive the coldest winter Tajikistan has seen for decades.

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://www.ana.gr/anaweb/user/showplain?maindoc=6157497&maindocimg=6154941&service=6
A raging snow storm that blanketed most of Greece over the weekend also continued into the early morning hours on Monday, plunging the country into sub-zero temperatures. Public transport buses were at a standstill on Monday in the wider Athens area, while ships remained in ports, public services remained closed, and schools and courthouses in the more severely-stricken prefectures were also closed. Scores of villages, mainly on the island of Crete, and in the prefectures of Evia, Argolida, Arcadia, Lakonia, Viotia, and the Cyclades islands were snowed in.

Meanwhile, more than 100 villages were snowed-in on the island of Crete -- 54 in Chania prefecture, 26 in Iraklion prefecture, 19 in Lasithi prefecture, and 5 in Rethymno prefecture -- as wel as 25 villages in Evia, 15 in Argolida, 3 in Arcadia, 9 in Lakonia, 2 in Viotia, and 4 in the Cyclades prefecture. Temperatures in Athens dropped to -6C before dawn, while the coldest temperatures were recorded in Kozani, Grevena, Kastoria and Florina, where they plunged to -12C.

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://wattsupwiththat.wordpress.com/2008/02/09/jan08-northern-hemisphere-snow-cover-largest-since-1966/
There have been a number of indications that January 2008 has been an exceptional month for winter weather in not only North America, but the entire Northern Hemisphere.

We've had anecdotal evidence of odd weather in the form of wire reports from Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and China where record setting cold and snow has been felt with intensity not seen for 30-100 years, depending on the region.

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://thenewamerican.com/node/7009#SlideFrame_1

Dr. Robinson: Gore, et al., tell us that CO_2 is a pollutant, and that humans have caused this terrible problem. But actually the atmosphere contains lots of carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide, water, and oxygen are required for life. Without these substances in the atmosphere, life would not be possible. All of the carbon in our bodies originates as atmospheric carbon dioxide. Plus, we're only adding moderately and temporarily to CO^2 levels.

Carbon dioxide moves through the atmosphere on its way to the oceans and biosphere. Human use has caused a transient increase during the past century — from about 0.03 percent to 0.04 percent of atmospheric molecules.

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2008-02/26/content_7672647.htm

In southwest China's Yunnan, which is known for its mild weather, the local meteorological station has warned residents of a heavy snowfall in the coming days.

The snowfall was expected to affect tourist resorts such as Xishuangbanna and Lijiang, where the evergreen plants and picturesque landscapes have drawn a large magnitude of visitors from home and abroad. In some areas in Yunnan, continuous sleet is still playing havoc, disrupting the repair of the damaged pylons and telecommunication infrastructure. More than 1.1 million phone and Internet subscribers have been affected.

The government estimated the total area of heritage buildings damaged at 34,220 square meters, with losses at all cultural heritage sites exceeding 26 million yuan (3.6 million U.S. dollars).

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://www.nbr.co.nz/home/column_article.asp?id=21153&cid=39&cname=NBR

The key issue in this debate is whether anthropogenic greenhouse gases or natural solar activities are the prime drivers of climate change. A closely related argument is whether the climate is highly sensitive to carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere. Put together, these uncertainties raise doubts as to whether the IPCC models can accurately forecast the climate over the long term. If they cannot, then we have to wonder how much damage we should risk doing to the world's economies in attempts to manage the possibly adverse effects of these "predictions."

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://climatesci.colorado.edu/publications/pdf/NR-143.pdf

The process for completing the CCSP Report (Climate Change Science Progam) excluded valid scientific perspectives under the charge of the Committee. The Editor of the Report systematically excluded a range of views on the issue of understanding and reconciling lower atmospheric temperature trends.

The Executive Summary of the CCSP Report ignores critical scientific issues and makes unbalanced conclusions concerning our current understanding of temperature trends.

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.)

http://planetgore.nationalreview.com/post/?q=YjYwOTQzY2NlNmFhODczOGY0MDBiOWRjMmI4NTc0YWI=

Thursday, April 10, 2008
Krupp's "Warming" meets Ponte's "Cooling" [Henry Payne]

Michigan, like the Midwest in general, has endured a brutal winter with record cold temperatures, snow two feet above normal as of March, six inches of snow in Detroit on Easter, 26 inches in Marquette on April 5, and more snow predicted for Detroit Metro this weekend as temperatures maintain their sub-normal trend.

(Meanwhile, man's emissions of carbon dioxide continued to rise strongly.

But like their news-media brethren, bookstore shelves are strangely at odds with the world outside. While Michigan freezes, local sellers are showcasing Environmental Defense Fund President Fred Krupp's acclaimed new book about the warming apocalypse called: *Earth: The Sequel — The Race to Reinvent Energy and Stop Global Warming.*

Krupp gets right to it in Chapter One, warning of warming calamity even as current temperature data suggests recent temperature trends have moderated:
The scientific consensus is that inaction will change the earth within a few decades into a place unlike any ever inhabited by humans. Business as usual will open the door to catastrophe: flooding and dislocation of millions of people; chronic drought and mass malnourishment in Africa; wildfires, deadly heat waves, and coastal destruction; the extinction of half the world's living species.

The words are eerily similar to another acclaimed book on my shelf published 32 years ago.

In 1976 Lowell Ponte — like Krupp, an influential think-tank figure with the International Research Technology Corp. — published a book called: *The Cooling: Has the Next Ice Age Already Begun? Can we Survive It?*

It too was written at the apex of a frightening (in his case, cold) climate trend. Here's Ponte in Chapter One:

In 1975, the U.S. National Academy of Science issued . . . a warning by some of the world's most prestigious, cautious scientists that an Ice Age (was) beginning in the near future. The tone of the report was one of repressed alarm. A study completed in 1971 by Drs. S. I. Rasool and S. H. Schneider of NASA's Goddard Institute estimates that man's potential to pollute . . . could increase the atmosphere's opacity by 400 percent. That would reduce sunlight enough, say the scientists, to drop the Earth's surface temperature by 3.4 degrees C, which would almost certainly bring on an Ice Age.
The consequences will hamper world food production as weather gets progressively worse. The damage this can cause is already apparent in global food shortages and the recent deaths of more than 400,000 people in Africa and Asia. If global famine arises, we can expect world war.

Warming, cooling . . . choose your fad. The prevailing weather is simply an excuse to scare us silly.

Appendix 2 - The Changing Climate of Opinion

Garth George: *Climate change warriors, cast down your weapons*

5:00AM Thursday April 10, 2008
By Garth George *(a New Zealand Journalist)*

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/section/466/story.cfm?c_id=466&objectid=10503093&pnum=0

While the nation obsesses over the trade deal with China, the parliamentary finance and expenditure select committee is hearing 200-plus submissions on the Climate Change (Emissions Trading and Renewable References) Bill.

The committee will be in Auckland next week, so it is a good time to remind ourselves that the bill is not only unnecessary but would quickly void any benefits due from our China trade.

For, as the 2008 International Conference on Climate Change held in New York City last month announced in its conference theme: "Nature, not human activity, rules the climate."

The conference was attended by 500 scientists and researchers in climate and related fields, economists, policy-makers and business leaders, and included three New Zealanders - Dr Vincent Gray *(an IPCC scientific reviewer),* of Wellington, and Owen McShane, of Kaiwaka, both of whom were speakers; and Auckland's Terry Dunleavy, founding chairman of the International Climate Science Coalition (ICSC).

In its Manhattan Declaration on Climate Change, issued after the meeting, the conference declared: " 'Global warming' is not a global crisis."

The declaration was written by Mr Dunleavy, assisted by Tom Harris, of Canada, newly appointed executive director of the ICSC, and Viscount Christopher Monckton, a retired British international business consultant, policy adviser, writer and inventor.

The declaration affirms that scientific questions should be evaluated solely by scientific methods and avers that the global climate has always changed and always will, independent of the actions of humans, and that carbon dioxide is not a pollutant but a necessity for all life.

It says it recognises that the causes and extent of recently-observed climatic change are the subject of intense debates in the climate science community and that assertions of a supposed "consensus" among climate experts are false.

It affirms that attempts by governments to legislate costly regulations on industry and individual citizens to encourage CO2 emission reduction will slow development while having no appreciable impact on the future direction of global climate change.

Such policies, it says, will markedly diminish future prosperity and so reduce the ability of societies to adapt to inevitable climate change, thereby increasing, not decreasing, human suffering.

And, it notes, warmer weather is generally less harmful to life on Earth than colder.

It declares that plans to restrict human-produced CO2 emissions are a dangerous misallocation of intellectual capital and of resources that should be dedicated to solving humanity's real and serious problems.

"There is no convincing evidence that CO2 emissions from modern industrial activity has in the past, is now, or will in the future cause catastrophic climate change," the declaration says.

"Adaptation [to climate change] as needed is [much] more cost-effective than any attempted mitigation, and a focus on such mitigation will divert the attention and resources of governments away from [the] real problems of their peoples."

The declaration recommends that "world leaders reject the views expressed by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, as well as popular, but misguided works such as [Al Gore's discredited movie] An Inconvenient Truth".

And, it concludes, all taxes, regulations and other interventions intended to reduce emissions of CO2 should be abandoned forthwith.

The declaration has received more than 400 signatures so far from scientists and other experts from around the world, and more are signing each day.

Now why this forthright declaration did not receive prominent coverage in the press anywhere in New Zealand, including this newspaper's vaunted Green Pages, I have no idea. It was, after all, a Kiwi initiative.

It seems that so-called global warming has created an international hysteria, encouraged by scientists and politicians who are talking through their pockets, and that no amount of common sense will divert the doom-sayers from their misguided and deeply dangerous path.

You would think that in pragmatic New Zealand at least, the Manhattan Declaration, and others like it, would be greeted with great relief and joy.

Except that our politicians, who seriously miscalculated the cost of Kyoto Protocol carbon credits, are scrabbling to dig themselves out of the cowshit.

Meanwhile, we will continue to export to China (and elsewhere) lots of our coal and oil. Our vast reserves of coal alone would keep us warm and dry and powered up for thousands of years.

But we can't use them because we signed, without thinking it through, the ridiculous Kyoto Protocol.

END OF SUBMISSION.