

Author's Response to Critical Commentary

Science is about evidence, and Mr. Leiter has not provided any substantive response to either my evidence or my arguments. If he has any evidence to present, I would be delighted to consider it; however, appeals to authorities (argumentum ad verecundiam) and unsubstantiated complaints about sources (argumentum ad hominem) do not constitute a scientific argument. Furthermore, it is peculiar to complain about anyone "disrespecting" the IPCC; the IPCC is an international organization that has made scientific arguments that are, therefore, open to scientific challenge. As US Democrats repeatedly reminded us during the George W. Bush Administration, disagreement is not disrespect. Moreover, my paper took the IPCC's conclusions as "the scientific reference point" of departure for my discussion (see p. 4), so I'm not entirely clear on why "disrespect" for the IPCC is even an issue.

Concerning Mr. Leiter's assertion that linear extrapolation cannot be used to predict the behaviour of nonlinear systems, this is a non-sequitur, for two reasons: first, because this is the foundation of short-term prediction of nonlinear behaviour (e.g., weather forecasting); and second, because this is also the foundation of the IPCC's core argument, to wit, that "the amplitude of the large-scale pattern of [temperature] response scales linearly with the forcing" (see page 670 of Chapter 2 of the report of WG1, AR4). On this latter point, the IPCC argues that anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions have been the single most important "forcing" factor over the past 250 years (see page 203 of Chapter 2 of the report of WG1, AR4), and that they are therefore "very likely" responsible for "most" of the observed late-20th Century increase in average global temperatures (see page 5 of the IPCC's 2007 Summary for Policymakers). Since there has been no statistically significant increase in global average temperature since the late 1990s (1995 or 1998, depending on which temperature datasets you use) despite a 6.2% increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations between 1998 and 2010 (according to US NOAA data available on-line), the AGW thesis, according to the standards of empirical science, has been falsified.

Furthermore, as there is no statistically significant correlation between atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations (much less human carbon dioxide emissions) and average global temperature over any time period for which temperature measurements or suitable proxies exist (see, *inter alia*, Ian Plimer, *Heaven and Earth: global warming – the missing science* (Lanham, Maryland: Taylor Trade Publishing, 2009), Figure 24, p. 242), there is simply no empirical support for the AGW thesis. The sole exception to this universal non-correlation is the fact that over the past million years, according to ice core samples, temperature change has correlated with but preceded change in carbon dioxide concentrations, which suggests that temperature affects carbon dioxide concentrations, rather than the reverse (see, *inter alia*, Arthur B. Robinson, Noah E. Robinson, and Willie Soon, “Environmental Effects of Increased Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide”, *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons* 12 (2007), 85).

Of course, these arguments should be unnecessary, as in order to be considered credible a scientific hypothesis must be based on observations, and to date no one has presented any empirical evidence to substantiate the core tenets of the anthropogenic global warming thesis - i.e., there is no data to support the contention that human GHG emissions are "very likely" responsible for "most" of the late-20th Century warming. Contrary to Mr. Leiter's assertion, computer model runs are not evidence. But history is. The fact that linear extrapolations cannot predict the future is neither here nor there; *nothing* can predict the future. However, a thorough knowledge of how trends like climate have varied in the past provides at least a baseline for attempting to assess how they are likely to vary in the future.

It would be unwise for governments faced with costly force development and procurement decisions to rely solely on the projections of climate models - or for that matter, on any other form of non-empirical 'analysis.'

D.A. Neill, CD, Ph.D.

Ottawa, Ontario