



# ENVIRONOMICS (NZ) TRUST



*Ensuring that evidence-based science is at the forefront of discussion for policy development in New Zealand*

Honorary Chairman and CEO: Peter J. Morgan B.E. (Mech.), Dip. Teaching mobile: 021 489 497 email: [pjm.forensic.eng@gmail.com](mailto:pjm.forensic.eng@gmail.com)

24 September 2020

An Open Letter to the senior executives of NIWA, MBIE, Ministry for the Environment, Climate Change Commission, the NZTA, and all university vice-chancellors

## **Irrevocable refutation of the UNIPCC's 'Climate Change' hypothesis, that mankind's increasing emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> cause the atmosphere to warm up dangerously – known as Dangerous Anthropogenic Global Warming (DAGW)**

Recently, my wife and I, and a young friend of ours, went for a walk on Takapuna Beach, Auckland.

At the northern end of the beach we walked past the plaques that are adhesively bonded on to the boulders beside the footpath, right close to the holiday park. The plaques describe the volcanic eruption that happened approximately 200,000 years ago, forming Lake Pupuke. The lava flowed around the trunks of kauri trees in a forest. There are circular holes in the basalt rock of the Takapuna Reef, formed when the trees burned away as the lava cooled. One hole is 1.5 metres in diameter and about 4 metres deep. It is covered by a stainless steel grill to prevent people falling in as they walk along the path beside the sea.

I got to thinking.... kauri trees don't grow with their roots in salt water, so the sea level back then must have been a very long way below the present-day level. Then I thought, "It must have taken a huge amount of carbon dioxide to cause enough global warming to make the sea rise that much. I'm going to check it out and make some calculations when I get home!" To the best of my knowledge, nobody else on the planet has ever made such calculations. This is 'left-field' thinking, something for which I have a reputation, ever since my time at The University of Auckland School of Engineering. I'll never forget our metallurgy lecturer, Professor Alan Titchener, saying to me, "When are you going to get interested in metals, Morgan, instead of spending so much time studying these new-fangled composites – they're just a passing fad!" and my replying, "Prof., in not too many years' time, there will be giant civil airliners plying the skies, and they'll have their whole airframes made from composite materials, and just about the only metals in them will be in their engines." Prof. Titchener replied, "Never!". The Boeing Dreamliner is but one such aircraft. In 1964 - 1966 I designed and built New Zealand's first-ever composite sandwich boat, a six-metre deep-V powerboat that was far ahead of its time.

When I was a schoolboy way back in the 1950s, I learned that the scientific method involves the putting forward of a hypothesis, and then testing that hypothesis in order to try to refute it. I learned that no theory or piece of physical evidence can *prove* that a hypothesis is true. I also learned that it takes just one piece of physical evidence or observation to *irrevocably refute* a hypothesis. Any hypothesis that is *irrevocably refuted* by at least one piece of physical evidence must be withdrawn and a new explanation sought.

The UNIPCC's '*Climate Change*' hypothesis is that increasing atmospheric concentrations of man-made CO<sub>2</sub> cause the atmosphere to warm up dangerously – known as Dangerous Anthropogenic Global Warming (DAGW) thereby warming the oceans and *causing sea level rise* because:

1. Water expands when its temperature increases, and
2. Ice melts when ambient temperature exceeds 0°C; on land, most melting ice runs into the sea.

While driving home from Takapuna Beach that day, I realised that I could test the UNIPCC's hypothesis by calculating the approximate rate of increase of sea level per 100 ppm increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration for, say, the last 100 years, and comparing that rate with the rate calculated for some past period of approximately known sea level rise and approximately known increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration. Should the two rates of increase, measured in metres of sea level rise per 100 ppm increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, be equal or nearly equal, then the UNIPCC's 'Climate Change' hypothesis would be reinforced. However, should the two rates be substantially different, the UNIPCC's 'Climate Change' hypothesis would have been *irrevocably refuted*. Note that in this real-world test of the UNIPCC's hypothesis, I have tilted the playing field in favour of the UNIPCC by ignoring the fact that increases in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> are never all caused by mankind alone, as volcanoes are

continually spewing vast quantities of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere. As well, warming oceans and lakes de-gas CO<sub>2</sub> because its solubility declines with increasing temperature.

On NIWA's website I found that for the period from 1904 to 2004, sea level rose by 160 mm. Over that time, atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration increased by approximately 130 ppm, from 280 ppm to 410 ppm.

Hence the rate of increase in sea level for that period was  $0.160/((410-280)/100) = 0.123$  metres per 100 ppm increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration.

From a paper by Professor John Chappell of Australian National University (ANU), Canberra, I found that approximately 18,000 years ago, the sea level was approximately 145 metres below the level it was at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. From a graph on the website of the UK's Royal Society, I found that the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration 18,000 years ago was approximately 225 ppm.

Hence the rate of increase in sea level from approximately 18,000 years ago to 1904 was approximately  $145/((280-225)/100) = 264$  metres per 100 ppm increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration – a rate that was more than **2000 times** that for the period from 1904 to 2004.

These real-world calculations show that the rate of increase in sea level, measured in metres per 100 ppm increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, are so markedly different – by a factor of more than 2000 – that they are an *irrevocable refutation* of the UNIPCC's 'Climate Change' hypothesis.

The inevitable conclusion to be drawn from the above irrefutable, verifiable facts, is that increasing atmospheric concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> – from whichever source, and mankind's contribution is most likely minor anyway – cannot possibly be responsible for sea level rise, or for global warming. There must be one or more other causes. The really good news is that increasing levels of CO<sub>2</sub> are greening the planet.

Therefore, the UNIPCC should withdraw its 'Climate Change' hypothesis and apologise to all seven billion or so of the people on our planet. So should all those 'climate change' believers, including all of our main political leaders and the leaders of our major central government institutions, including NIWA, MBIE, the Ministry for the Environment, the Climate Change Commission and the NZTA.

Of course, the IPCC will not withdraw its 'Climate Change' hypothesis and apologise, because rather than being a scientific organisation, it is a political one, where common sense is uncommon and adherence to the strict disciplines of science is rare.

It is noteworthy that when formally asked, *neither* the UNIPCC, *nor* the Royal Society, UK, *nor* the Royal Society, NZ, *nor* NIWA, *nor* the NZ prime minister's Chief Science Adviser Professor Juliet Gerrard, of The University of Auckland, could provide even a single piece of verifiable physical evidence to support the UNIPCC's 'Climate Change' hypothesis. All any of them could provide was a blind belief in consensus – which has no place in science – and papers commenting on the output of mathematical computer models. Of course, the outputs of computer models can *never* be regarded as verifiable physical evidence.

Here is the URL for a recent paper by astrophysicist and mathematician Professor Valentina Zharkova of Northumbria University, UK. In this paper, she explains how it is the sun, cosmic rays and the dominant greenhouse gas water vapour that control earth's climates, and why Planet Earth entered a Modern Grand Solar Minimum in June this year:

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/23328940.2020.1796243?needAccess=true>

Professor Zharkova has warned us that Planet Earth has recently entered a severe cooling phase and that the portents are there that it could be as severe as the Maunder Grand Solar Minimum of 1645 to 1710, during which the River Thames in the UK froze over in winter and there were widespread crop failures.

Further information on the topic is available here:

<https://electroverse.net/british-astrophysicists-mini-ice-age-is-accelerating-new-maunder-minimum-has-begun/>

Within the next twenty years or so there will most likely be an urgent need for New Zealand to produce much more food to supply to those parts of the world – including northern Canada, the northern USA, the UK, Scandinavia, Europe, Russia and China – suffering from decreased production, and possibly famine, due to the extreme cold. We need to be investing now in agriculture and horticulture in order to meet this need.

The 'Zero Carbon Bill' must be scrapped immediately, along with all subsidies on renewable energy and electric cars. The oil and gas industry must be immediately reinstated, in order to give New Zealand a good chance of becoming self-sufficient in oil and gas.

For New Zealand, boom times are coming!

Sincerely

Peter J. Morgan

Honorary Chairman and Chief Executive Officer