

Hoaxes refuted: There is no global warming

The Washington, D.C.-based George C. Marshall Institute on April 3 released a study, "The Global Warming Experiment," demonstrating that world temperature measurements show that computer model predictions of global warming are just full of hot air.

"The overwhelming evidence is that the computer models are not able to predict changes in global temperatures based on carbon dioxide levels," said Dr. Sallie Baliunas, the Harvard astrophysicist who authored the report.

Dr. Baliunas presented a chart of temperature records from the Arctic, where computer models predict the most warming to occur. The satellite data show that temperatures have gone down more than 0.5°C, and ground measurements show that they have gone down more than 2°C—exactly the opposite of what the models predicted.

A chart of ice core records presented by Baliunas showed that between 135,000 and 115,000 years ago, temperatures declined sharply, but the carbon dioxide concentration remained constant. Her conclusion is that there is *no correlation between CO₂ and temperature*, which is the fundamental tenet of the global warming

theory. Furthermore, the ice core record, if anything, shows that temperature increased first, followed later by an increase in CO₂, most likely as a result of increased vegetation.

Dr. Baliunas pointed out that the climate models cannot even account for the basic effects of water vapor and clouds. She noted the fact that over 90% of the greenhouse effect is determined by atmospheric water vapor, not carbon dioxide or other "greenhouse gases" produced by man. She said that if the actual role of water vapor is not even understood yet, how could anybody make a model of the atmosphere to predict future climate?

Dr. Baliunas agreed with the evidence that temperatures had increased half a degree in the past century, but said that most of the increase happened before World War II, and was well within the range of natural temperature variability.

She concluded that there was insufficient evidence to warrant any action to try to limit greenhouse gas emissions by the U.N. Climate Conference in Berlin, adding that the consequences of such policies to the world economy, particularly developing countries, would be devastating.

The Marshall Institute was founded in 1984 by several scientists who wanted to fight environmental irrationality with scientific evidence. The founders include Dr. Fred Seitz, former head of the National Academy of Sciences, and Dr. Robert Jastrow from the Goddard Institute for Space Studies.—*Rogelio Maduro*

places limits on the growth of the human population (actually, this idea was concocted, not by Lester Brown, but by the Venetian hoaxster Giammaria Ortes, in the 18th century).

Speaking as if there were no financial and political policies that have created these "natural" limits, Brown stated that there has been a "loss of momentum in the growth of food production," because since 1984, grain production has been growing worldwide at 1% per annum, but population is growing at 2% per annum. As an example, Brown zeroed in on China.

China "may become a massive food importer" by the turn of the century, Brown warned. This, because its 1.2 billion people are "moving up the food chain" (perhaps he thinks they are animals on a World Wide Fund for Nature preserve). The problem, claims Brown, is not that China cannot produce enough grain to feed its growing population and prevent famine; the problem is that economic growth in China is increasing the rate of consumption and demand for meat and other animal products, and this could "overwhelm world supplies."

Brown said that feeding a country that counts its people in billions rather than millions is virtually inconceivable. For example: the Chinese government has promulgated the goal of annual per capita egg consumption rising from an average of 100 in 1990 to 200 at the turn of the century—an enormous task. He recited a litany of statistics on how many hens that would mean (1.3 billion), how much grain those chickens would consume (24 million tons), and concluded that we may "find ourselves competing with the Chinese for *our own grain*." And, yes, they "can afford to import all of our grain." This year's trade surplus with the United States would allow China to import all of our grain for export, two times over.

In response to a question by a Chinese-American attendee, as to whether this means that China will have only two choices in the future—deliberate mass starvation of its own people, which has happened in the past, or going to war—Brown said China could mitigate the situation through increases in efficiency in water use, smaller families, and using bicycles and trains rather than reducing agricultural land to build roads.