Top scientists cool 'greenhouse' hysteria

by Rogelio A. Maduro

Three of the most respected scientists in the United States released a report June 6, warning about the danger of implementing policies to deal with the "greenhouse effect" that may be quite harmful, before there is solid scientific evidence that climate will be any different next century. The scientists, Robert Jastrow, Frederick Seitz, and William A. Nierenberg, co-authored a report titled "Scientific Perspectives on the Greenhouse Problem," published by the George C. Marshall Institute and released during an overflow press conference at the institute's headquarters.

The report, so far completely blacked out of the major media, puts the brakes on the mad dash to implement a global fascist dictatorship based on solving the world's ecological problems, mainly the alleged heating of the atmosphere due to the release of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, which will supposedly trap excess heat near the Earth, raising temperatures by as much as 5°C by the middle of the next century.

The technical findings of the report were summarized during the press conference by Robert Jastrow, founder and director for 20 years of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, who personally appointed James Hansen, the top "greenhouse" guru, to his present position as director. Jastrow told the press that Hansen is now "the odd man out" in the scientific community. Jastrow's recommendations;

- "Current forecasts of the man-made greenhouse effect do not appear to be sufficiently accurate to be used as a basis for sound national policy decisions. Forecasters cannot rely on the temperature increase observed in the last 100 years as an indicator of greenhouse warming in the next century."
- "The prospect of a natural cooling in the 21st century suggests that government action at this time—in the absence of reasonably accurate information as to the extent of the greenhouse warming expected in the next century—may be unnecessary or even harmful."
- "Policymakers would be wise to invest in the additional resources needed to improve the reliability of greenhouse forecasts before undertaking corrective programs that could turn out to be unnecessary or undesirable."

• "Procurement of top-line supercomputers for the major greenhouse forecasting groups could significantly diminish the level of uncertainty in the greenhouse forecasts by improving the treatment of clouds and oceans—the major unknowns in the present forecasts."

He proposed investing no more than \$100 million in supercomputing facilities to upgrade the the climate models.

Soviets want ecological police

This refreshing report stands in stark contrast to the call by Soviet Foreign Minster Eduard Shevardnadze to create an ecological security council at the United Nations, with enforcement powers and its own military, to protect the earth's ecology. In a letter to U.N. Secretary General Javier Pérez de Cuellar released on June 4 by *Pravda*, Shevardnadze writes that the global Conference on the Greenhouse Effect being sponsored by the United Nations in 1991, "will, to a great extent, determine the strategy for the ecological survival of our planet."

Shevardnadze continues, "The conference should evaluate the state of the main ecological problems, generalize the experience of states in tackling them, and outline the main directions of nature protection policy for all countries and international organizations. Its participants could solemnly approve the norms and principles—a sort of code of conduct for states in the sphere of nature protection. It would seem that giving the conference decisions an obligatory juridical status in the form, say, of a framework global convention would make it possible to ensure strict observance of the rules of an ecologically pure common world home by all states."

Pro-Soviet legislators in the United States have not been slow in following the Russian lead; there are over 20 bills now in Congress dealing with the "greenhouse effect," including the bills sponsored by Senators Timothy Wirth (D-Colo.) and Albert Gore (D-Tenn.), which call for a cutoff of credits to Third World nations if they dare build any more fossil-fuel power plants.

Jastrow, Seitz, and Nierenberg looked at two key issues, the large uncertainty in the forecasts of future climate, and what can be done about improving the forecasts; and whether the 0.5°C warming in the past century, which they consider a real phenomenon, is a reliable guide to future temperature increases. Seitz is the past president of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society and former chairman of the Defense Science Board. Nierenberg is a member of the Global Climate Subcommittee of the EPA and director emeritus of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography of the University of California.

During the press conference, Jastrow addressed the uncertainties in the forecasts, emphasizing:

"The wide spread in the greenhouse forecasts is largely the result of differences in treating clouds. Clouds have a cooling effect on the earth by screening it from the sun's rays; they have a warming effect by blocking the outward flow of

10 Economics EIR June 16, 1989

heat to space. These cloud effects are each roughly 10 times bigger than the man-made greenhouse effect projected for the next century.

"When the earth heats up in the first stages of greenhouse warming, the balance of the cloud effects shifts. The shift is hard to determine because we are trying to calculate small man-made changes within large natural climate factors. Does the cloud effect shift in a direction to amplify the greenhouse warming, or cut it down? Different groups get answers that differ by 300% on this question.

"In addition, oceans play an important role in the greenhouse effect. The oceans absorb and store up large amounts of heat. Consequently, the greenhouse forecasts are affected by ocean currents, which carry huge volumes of water and heat from one part of the globe to another. In one representative case, the calculations showed that when ocean currents are included, the global warming is decreased by 1°C—a significant decrease.

"In particular, the Antarctic Ocean hardly warms at all, and may cool slightly. This diminishes the probability of a breakup of the West Antarctic ice sheet, accompanied by a rise of sea levels and flooding of coastal cities all over the world.

"To handle the oceans requires more observation of ocean currents and temperatures, more scientific manpower, and also an enormous increase in computing power. The forecasters break up the Earth into large areas, up to 500 miles across, in order to complete their calculations in reasonable time. But the Gulf Stream which controls the climate of Western Europe is less than 100 miles wide at some points. A 100-year forecast that takes months now would take decades with 100-mile areas and ocean currents properly included. Yet including the effect of ocean currents is essential."

On the poor quality of regional forecasts, Jastrow points out that "useful greenhouse forecasts have to predict not only global temperature trends but also regional changes. Regional climate changes are often very different from global trends. For example, in the 1970s and 1980s, when the world as a whole became warmer, England and Europe became colder."

According to Jastrow, "unfortunately, the current greenhouse forecasts do very poorly on regional forecasts. In the United States, in forecasts of the effect of the greenhouse warming in three important regions—California, the Southeast, and the Great Lakes—some greenhouse forecasts predicted substantial decreases in summer rainfall, while others predicted substantial increases."

Jastrow also emphasized that the reported increase in the Earth's temperature for the past 100 years could be attributed to causes other than the "greenhouse effect." He stated, "Changes in climate occur without any obvious cause. Dr. Hansen did a trial 100-year computer run and found that it is possible for the Earth's temperature to change by as much as 0.4°C over 25 years as a result of natural variability—nearly enough to account for the observed 0.5°C change in the Earth's temperature increase observed on the Earth."

Currency Rates



