

Subject: Statement by EIKE in response to the Short Query from Green parliamentarians submitted to the German Government; Printed Document No. 17/3613; dated 3 November 2010.

On November 3, 2010, the faction of *BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN* (ALLIANCE 90/THE GREENS) submitted a short query, document number 17/3613, titled Deniers Of Climate Change In The Coalition Government (*Leugner des Klimawandels in der Regierungskoalition*) to the German Government. Named as its authors were parliamentarians Dr. Hermann Ott (formerly of the Wuppertal Institute), Bärbel Höhn, Hans-Josef Fell, Sylvia Kotting-Uhl, Oliver Krischer, Undine Kurth (Quedlinburg), Nicole Maisch, Dorothea Steiner and the ALLIANCE 90/THE GREENS party. Its text (partially quoted herein) cites slander appearing in the Financial Times Deutschland and news magazine Der Spiegel without any check for accuracy on the defamation of Prof. Singer and EIKE, or checking whether these sources were later corrected. The daily Rheinische Merkur followed and repeated the same slander in an article appearing 28 October 2010 (History of Looking Away, by Hans-Jochen Luhmann, who was acting in a fulltime position as Director for Principle Issues at the Wuppertal Institute).

Because of the widespread nature of these publications, the articles being almost identical in content, and their timing with the Short Query from the Green parliamentarians, it is plain to see that this is an orchestrated campaign against the climate realists (also called climate sceptics, or intentionally "climate deniers"). And when looking at earlier comments made by the lead author of the Short Query, Dr. Ott, on 17 September 2010, one sees that comments critical of climate must be "massively attacked" from now on, see <http://www.klimaretter.info/kolumnen/kolumne-dr-h-e-ott2/6852-klimawandelleugner-jetzt-auch-im-bundestag>. The objective is to manoeuvre them into the same boat as Holocaust deniers, in thought and morally. The primary target of the attacks is Prof. Dr. S. Fred Singer and the European Institute for Climate and Energy (EIKE), and their supporters. Obviously those in the climate religion see themselves seriously threatened and deeply fear being exposed. The scientific arguments to counter climate realists are simply missing, and so personal attacks using half-truths, distortions, and even slander, have to be used.

As a gesture to open up the channels of communication and to return to professionalism, we cordially invite all parliamentarians of the German Parliament and Ministry employees to the **3rd International Climate and Energy Congress** on December 3 -4, 2010 in Berlin. There you can get all the facts on the subject of climate change. Details here: <http://www.eike-klima-energie.eu/news-anzeige/iii-internationale-klima-energiekonferenz-in-berlin-3-4-dezember-2010-findet-in-berlin-die-iii-internationale-klima-und-energiekonferenz-statt/>. Getting informed of both sides of an issue is a fundamental prerequisite for a functioning democracy and so we hope parliamentarians will take advantage of this.

We now respond to the Short Query - first its preamble:

"The so-called "climate change sceptics" or "climate change deniers" for years have been a permanent fixture in American politics. They are mainly supported and funded by the fossil fuels industry like Exxon (Esso) or Koch Industries."

It is true that the climate realists have been able to get their word out in the USA, and that public opinion on climate change has swayed dramatically in favour of climate realism. Currently the proponents of the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis have lost much ground in public opinion, and are now about even with those who dispute it (See a Pew survey from October of this year: <http://www.eike-klima-energie.eu/news-anzeige/keine-angst-vor-eingebildeten-klimakatastrophen-umfrage-des-pew-centers-klimafurcht-nimmt-weiter-ab/>), and some surveys even indicate a substantial majority for those who reject the hypothesis (http://www.surveymonkey.com/sr.aspx?sm=ON-SUsVTBSpkC_2f2cTnptR6w_2fehN0orSbxLH1gIA03DqU_3d). To what extent these surveys are representative, we cannot ascertain. The preamble is also correct in describing the recognisable fear that the results of the latest US elections will have a notable impact on US climate policy. All measures in implementing Cap & Trade have all but been abandoned and the environmental protection agency (EPA) will not be able to implement its factually absurd determination that CO₂ is a pollutant (every child learns at school that CO₂ is the main component in the photosynthesis process – a natural gas that is vital for all life).

[From Cooler Heads Digest]: Significant is the fact that the new Republican majority in the House is largely skeptical of the claim that global warming is a potential crisis and is close to unanimously opposed to cap-and-trade and other energy-rationing measures. Not only is cap-and-trade dead, but there is a good chance that the House next year will move legislation to block or delay the EPA from using the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gas emissions.

The question is, can such a measure pass the Democratic-controlled Senate? There is certainly a majority in the Senate for blocking EPA, but sixty votes will be needed. My guess is that there will be more than sixty votes. As EPA regulations start to bite next year, Senators will start to hear complaints from their constituents. And a number of Democratic Senators are up for re-election in 2012 and will want to avoid the fate of so many of their colleagues this year.

Whether or not the named "fossil fuel" industries, like Exxon or the Koch Industries, have swayed public opinion, we are unable to say. But one can plainly discern that the authors of the Short Query have a complete lack of understanding of democratic principles when they on one hand complain about completely legal funding by companies, but on the other hand enthusiastically support the billions of dollars and euros in funding that flow to the proponents of the AGW hypothesis. In addition to state funding of the Postdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, the Wuppertal Institute and other green organisations, companies like Münchner Rück Re-Insurer, Siemens and others, and companies in Germany such as BP, and Shell in foreign companies pour millions into the green coffers of environmental organisations as well.

Also stated in the preamble:

“In the past weeks various press releases and other reports have appeared in the Financial Times Deutschland and news magazine Der Spiegel about how certain climate change deniers were given a discussion forum by the CDU and FDP Bundestag’s factions and that some parliamentarians of the ruling CDU and FDP factions were sympathetic to the ideas put forth by climate denier Fred Singer.”

As we have already pointed out, here one finds the repeated use of the term "denier", which attempts to destroy the right to freedom of expression, which every parliamentarian is also granted by the German Constitution. Moreover, there is absolutely no evidence – not even from the IPCC, in scientific literature that can be easily checked, that shows climate change is induced by anthropogenic CO₂. To the contrary, the views and claims of natural climate change asserted by the climate realists are supported by the main report of the Non-Governmental IPCC NIPCC (see here: <http://www.nipccreport.org/>) with over 4000 peer-reviewed papers listed. The German summary version of this report "*Nature, Not Human Activities, Drive the Climate*" lists over 200 peer-reviewed references.

Because of these facts, one must have the right to question the fixed belief of the single scientific view that the authors hold, which is in no way shared by the majority of all scientists involved. Moreover, the authors defend this fixed belief using an agenda that is completely foreign to democratic principles. On question no. 1:

1. Is the German Government aware of a scientifically published paper that has been subjected to peer-review that questions climate change caused by man, and that is supported by scientific data?

This question shows that its writers have a complete lack of knowledge of the scientific literature, and they did not even bother to inform themselves. There are numerous papers available in scientific journals. The following question no. 2 also falls into the same category. It even poses the strange question of whether or not climate change is even happening:

2. In the view of the German Government's leadership, is there a scientific discussion on whether climate change is taking place and whether man has a decisive impact on climate?

Only an individual that is completely ignorant of climate science would claim there is no climate change. All climates in all the different climate zones on earth change naturally, and have been so for over 4 billion years. Sometimes it changes quickly, and sometimes slowly, and at times abruptly - and of course without human influence, as shown by climate palaeontology. Question 2 has to be answered with “yes“. Indeed a comprehensive discussion is taking place on whether climate is influenced by man or to what extent. In the scientific literature, the search for anthropogenic influences on climate parameters is referred to as the attribution and detection problem. The facts simply do not change even when attempts are made to silence those who disagree, or to deny them resources or to morally discredit them. On question no. 3:

3. Is the German Government aware of the publications from American physicist Fred Singer on the subject of climate protection? How does the German Government view the scientific reputation of Mr Singer in regards to climate protection?

Also here a search in the Internet would have quickly shown that the scientific publications and honours of Prof. Singer¹ are numerous, and include several books. His book "Unstoppable Global Warming - Every 1500 Years" was on the New York Times bestseller list for a long time. A very important publication on the subject appeared in the renowned International Journal of Climatology of the Royal Meteorological Society in 2008, which shows that actual observations of climate did not agree with model predictions.

1) Prof. Dr. S. Fred Singer was born in Vienna and is an atmospheric and space physicist, is founder and chairman of the Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP), Project Science and Environmental Policy, which is a community research and education organisation in Arlington, Virginia. He is professor emeritus in the field of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia. Singer has authored a number of books and scientific articles. Last year he published a second printing of the book he authored together with Dennis T. Avery *Unstoppable Global Warming - Every 1,500 Years*, Rowman & Littlefield, 2007, which was on the New York Times bestseller list for a long time. His earlier books include *The Greenhouse Debate Continued: An Analysis and Criticism of the IPCC Climate Assessment*, ICS Press, 1992), *Climate Policy - From Rio to Kyoto*, Hoover Institution, 2000 and *Hot Talk, Cold Science - Global Warming's Unfinished Debate*, in dependent Institute, 1997, 1999). Singer was a leading scientist at the US Dept. of Transportation (1987-89), as deputy assistant and administrator for policy in the US Dept. of Environment (1970-71) and acted as deputy assistant secretary for Water Quality and Research in the US Dept. of Interior (1967-70). He also was one of the founders of the School of Environmental and Planetary Sciences (Faculty of Science of the Environment and Planet) at the University of Miami (1964-67), first director of the "National Weather Satellite Service, 1962-64 and Director of the Center for Atmospheric and Space at the University of Maryland (1953-62).

In the 1980s, Prof. Singer was Vice Chairman of the *National Advisory Committee for Oceans and Atmosphere* NACOA for period of five years. Currently he is directing the *Science and Environmental Policy Project*, which he founded in 1990. You can find more information at SEPP website: www.sepp.org.

On question 4:

4. For the German Government, do the arguments made by Fred Singer and other arguments presented have merit and are they "enlightening"? How do you assess the statements by Mr Singer that "Politicians that are embedded in climate change are more dangerous than climate change itself?"

The numerous publications by Prof. Singer – especially the above mentioned disagreement between model projections and actual observation – has led to a broad scientific discussion, and for this reason it should be reasonable and enlightening for the German Government. And when taking into account the extremely high costs arising from the completely useless policy of CO₂ prevention and considering that the hard-earned standard of living for future generations of the entire population will be massively impacted, the statements made by Prof. Singer are justified. Concerning question no. 5:

5. Is the German Government aware of the ideas Mr Singer has previously promoted? What is your view on the fact that he, for example, questioned the hazards of passive smoke, or that he contested the fact the ozone layer was damaged by CFCs, or that he trivialized acid rain? With this background, how does the German Government judge the credibility of Fred Singer's activities with regards to climate protection?

Here the authors, particularly former Wuppertal Institute employee Dr. Hermann Ott, cite claims made by environmental activists (and repeated by careless journalists) without first checking sources. The claims made do not withstand objective review. The target is to discredit the moral credibility of Prof. Singer. What is correct: Singer neither supports smoking, nor passive smoking. He has been a non-smoker his entire life and has never worked for the tobacco industry, whose excise taxes have flowed into all government coffers worldwide. Just recently tobacco taxes have once again been increased in Germany. Singer only determined that the statistical analysis on passive smoking made by the EPA is faulty, a conclusion that every honest scientist would reach.

Hermann Ott and his colleagues misinterpret, either on purpose or just cluelessly, the statements Prof. Singer made on the ozone layer. Singer never questioned the impact of CFC gases on the depletion of ozone. The only question that was discussed was whether or not the natural sources of chlorine from e.g. oceanic salt mist or volcanic activity could play a more major role than CFCs.

On the subject of acid rain: A clear answer would have been obtained simply by referring to the plentifully available literature about the German-made phantom of *Waldsterben* (Dying of Forest). Has this idea never occurred to them? In question no. 6:

6. Is the German Government aware of who financed Mr Singer for his activities? Is the Federal Government aware of the funders who - like Exxon und Koch Industries in den USA - fund the activities of the climate change deniers in Germany?

As usual, here once again the term "climate denier" pops up. This nonsense has already been addressed numerous times in the past. Here again this is an attempt to attack the freedom of science. Obviously the authors surrounding Mr Ott, believe that only money flowing to "green activists" is morally justifiable. The reality is that the money that the opponents of this new religion receive is orders of magnitude less than the huge sums showered on activists of anthropogenic global climate change that come from an array and state and corporate sources (Münchener Rück, Deutsche Bank, BP, Shell, etc.) as well as various ministries and groups. Except for funds to Prof Singer from company Exxon for approx. \$10,000 about 10 years ago, other funds are unknown. Singer denies receiving all other donations. Until today, his numerous adversaries have yet to produce any proof to support their accusations. And concerning EIKE, it receives exclusively private contributions, donations and fees for studies and presentations. On question no. 7:

7. Does the German Government share the opinion that events involving Mr Singer provide a forum for the pure interests of the fossil fuel industry, and thus enhance their unscientific work and non-serious activities?

First of all, the so-called fossil fuels industry has made our high standard of living possible. These companies are not criminal and they pay their taxes like every other company does. Although no one has to like them, insinuating that these companies work unscientifically and in a non-serious manner indicates a complete lack of seriousness by those attacking them. The question is rhetorical and non-pertinent. The rights to freedom of expression are not reserved only for certain persons or groups, such as green activists. Every citizen and every private group is guaranteed the right to free expression by the German Constitution, and this includes companies who produce fuel, gas, and coal. In fact, they are obligated to express themselves in the interest of protecting the jobs and livelihoods of their employees, which are expected to be sacrificed because of the dubious assertions of a man-made climate change. Because of a lack of research and competence, those posing the questions to the German Government are simply ducking the science put forth by the climate realists. This is demagoguery. Should the German Government answer this question with "yes", then it would only be putting itself in the same boat as the demagogues. On question no 8:

8. Are there voices within the German Government who question the anthropogenic causes of climate change?

The German government may know this, but it is not obligated to know. According to our knowledge, due to the overwhelming evidence and observation of natural climate change, there is a steadily growing number parliamentarians who question the dogma of man-made climate change. And, looking at the immense damage caused by climate policy so far, this is long overdue. On question no. 9:

9. How does the German Government view the activities of the **European Institute for Climate and Energy (EIKE) with regards to climate change? EIKE is supported by Fred Singer. In the Federal Government's view, does the Institute work on the scientific question regarding the subject of climate change?**

EIKE is a privately operating scientific think tank and it is known to the German government. Various correspondence have been sent from EIKE to the responsible ministers, under-secretaries and department managers. In particular an open letter which was signed by over 400 scientists and highly qualified citizens was sent to Chancellor Merkel dated 26 July 2009 (<http://www.eike-klima-energie.eu/news-anzeige/klimawandel-offener-brief-an-kanzlerin-merkel-temperaturmessungen-ab-1701-widerlegen-anthropogen-verursachte-temperaturschwankungen/>). This open letter still remains unanswered today. The signatories of the open letter have exercised the rights granted by Article 17 of the German Constitution very seriously, which gives every citizen the right to appeal to a representative of the state. It states: *“Every person has the right, either individually or as a group, to make in writing a request or complaint to the appropriate offices and representatives of the citizens“*.

For this reason, it is that much more regrettable that an acknowledgement of receipt of this letter still has not been received thus far, thus indicating a rather ominous regard for the Constitution. In addition a letter was forwarded to Environment Minister Dr. Röttgen on 20 June 2010 (<http://www.eike-klima-energie.eu/news-anzeige/brief-an-umweltminister-roettgen-als-nachtrag-zum-energiepolitischer-dialog-der-cdu-csu-bundestagsfraktion-vom-9610/>), which in turn was tersely and non-directly responded to by the department director of the Ministry of Environment Josef Schafhausen, who particularly dodged our request a second opinion on the question of climate change be summoned.

The fact is that EIKE supports Dr. Singer, and Dr. Singer supports EIKE. In addition to advising and performing public relations work, EIKE also conducts – without any public funds or support – scientific research on the subject of the fertilization effect of CO₂, the quality of historical CO₂-temperature and sea level data, the analysis of this data using the most advanced statistical and mathematical methods, and research on the influence of the sun on our climate. The scientists who work with and for us are working on a voluntary basis for the most part. More information on this can be gladly provided by our members, especially by press spokesman Prof. Dr. Horst-Joachim Lüdecke. It is unknown whether the German Government is aware of this. Other institutions such as PIK or VDI know this.

The remaining questions posed by the parliamentary query are irrelevant, and are at times insistent and slanderous, and are therefore unworthy of response. And finally, to the best of our knowledge, the Friedrich Naumann Stiftung for Liberty has never held an event called *Climate Change Deniers* in Germany, nor would it support such a conference.

Michael Limburg,
Vice President, EIKE

Prof. Dr. Horst-Joachim Lüdecke
Press Spokesman EIKE

(European Institute for Climate and Energy)