

Viscount Monckton talking with Leighton Smith of NewsTalk ZB, New Zealand. 4 August 2011.

This is a transcription of the voice record at <http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/podcasts/audio/04144639.mp3>, an mp3 podcast

See also A presentation by Viscount Monckton and Paul Maynard here ... [http://www.klimarealistene.com/debate\\_at\\_last.pdf](http://www.klimarealistene.com/debate_at_last.pdf), a 3.7 MB pdf

**Leighton Smith:** NewsTalk ZB, It's 11 after 10; Number's 0800 80 1080, the FAX is 0800 003299, e-mail is [leighton@newstalkzb.co.nz](mailto:leighton@newstalkzb.co.nz) and you can text on 9292.

When it was announced that Viscount Monckton was going to visit New Zealand there were feelers put out as is usual, for platforms, or for televisions, radio shows, newspapers, for meetings, for people who were interested to - you know - take him on board.

I've been privileged, shall we say, during the week, to have much correspondence - it has gone backwards and forwards, been bandied about, between various media organisations and the people involved in bringing Viscount Monckton to New Zealand. What I have to say is this ...

The cowardice of the media in this country is appalling. It is disgraceful. You should all go and hang your heads in shame; hang up your shingles, give up on the media that you so - I presume - proudly represent, or think you do; because you're not. You're incompetent. You are useless, and I make no bones about this, that applies to producers, the reporters, the people who, I'd have to describe as "living in fantasia", (to borrow the phrase), and are just plain ignorant.

Now, I mention Professor Murray Selby, the Chair of Climate at Macquarie University, who has worked at leading research institutions including the US National Centre for Atmosphere Research, Princeton University, the University of Colorado. The author of a book due out this year called "Fundamentals of Atmospheric Physics and the Physics of Atmosphere and Climate". The only reason that I mention him above any other - like Bob Carter for instance - Professor Bob Carter, is that Murray Selby came out of nowhere, today, as far as I am concerned. He gave a speech in Sydney a couple of days ago, in which he used the - in which he said "anyone who thinks the science of this complex thing is settled, is in fantasia".

Now, I don't care, particularly, if you believe in man-made global warming, or not. That part of it is irrelevant to me.

What I do care about, is that people get sucked in and believe that the science is settled. Because too many interested parties, people on the public pit, and others, tell you so.

And then the media ignores those who counter them. Now, keep in mind this: it wasn't the independent scientists of those who are fighting this battle, who made this war. It is a war. As somebody uses the quote, it is a war for your mind. It is not only a war for your mind, it is a war for your dollar. Through tax. And a war for your future and your freedom. (Comment undecipherable)

The fantasia that these people live in has them locked in, and seemingly unable to escape. This morning we shall endeavour to assist them, with Viscount Christopher Monckton, after the break.

**Leighton Smith:** Newstalk ZB, it is 17 after 10. I have spoken with Viscount Monckton before, um ... we have spoken with him at least once before, it could have been twice, I don't remember - it doesn't matter.

I want to quote to you something that Owen McShane has sent me a short time ago. He said that "I have just posted this on Kiwi Blog in response to a chorus of Greens saying that "he is not a scientist, and therefore a proper scientist will not debate with him"."

Owen says "I do not know the current definition of a scientist, but Monckton is a mathematician, and a mathematician with specific expertise in modelling. He was also Science Policy Advisor to Maggie Thatcher's government where his job was to review the quality of science being put to Cabinet as a basis for policy. The IPCC theories are based on models, and so as an expert on mathematical modelling, Monckton is qualified to debate the topic. He may not be an atmospheric scientist, but then the atmospheric scientists are not experts in modelling. The models are really basic.

Sceptics are often called "flat-earthers". The irony is that the IPCC models assume a flat earth.

Viscount Monckton, Good Morning.

**Viscount Monckton:** Well Leighton, it is lovely to be with you and to meet you for the first time, and to be in New Zealand for the first time.

**Leighton Smith:** And I may say you are most welcome; others might say otherwise; but - we'll leave that to them. I want to start at the very beginning with you, if you wouldn't mind. I want you to regale us with the history of how man-made Global Warming - anthropogenic Global Warming, first came into being, and how it got traction.

**Viscount Monckton:** Alright, let's go back a couple of hundred years to Fourier, (See Fourier's bio - and - some of his maths ) who first posited that certain kinds of gaseous molecules, which are known as "hetero-atomic molecules" , could react with outgoing long-wave radiation and cause warming of the atmosphere. Now, this was experimentally demonstrated by John Tyndall, at the Royal Institution in London, in 1859, and you can still see his apparatus, to this day. And it is very easy to replicate his experiment, where you can put CO<sub>2</sub> into a chamber that previously had an atmosphere without it, and you will see that light doesn't go through it so easily, you can tell therefore that some warming will result. So the theory that greenhouse gases do cause warming is extremely well and long established, and no true scientist would seek to argue against that because it is amply demonstrated and easily replicable by simple experiment.

Now then, Svante Arrhenius, (See in Wikipedia Ed. and 1906) in 1896, produced a paper, published in the Proceedings of the Royal Society, which suggested that, for a doubling of the CO<sub>2</sub> concentration in the atmosphere, there would be a warming of somewhere between 4 and 8 Celsius. His guess was 5 Celsius, That is the paper which is quoted at us time and time again, by the usual suspects. However, in 1906, \*\* ten years later, having come across the fundamental equation of radio ( exact word still to come) transfer - it wasn't available to him before - it had been available but he hadn't come across it - he was able to recalculate in a much more simple way, and he divided his previous estimate by three. And he said

" In ähnlicher Weise berechne ich, dass eine Verminderung des Kohlensäuregehalts zur Hälfte oder eine Zunahme desselben auf den doppelten Betrag Temperaturänderungen von -1,5° C bzw + 1,6° C entsprechen wurde."

( page 4, paragraph 3) and (see the Wikipedia paper above - Ed.)  
(\*\* Svante Arrhenius, 1906, Die vermutliche Ursache der Klimaschwankungen, Meddelanden från K. Vetenskapsakademiens Nobelinstitut, Vol 1 No 2, pages 1:10), and for his first paper on this topic .

**Leighton Smith:** That tells me you have a good memory, but ..

**Viscount Monckton:** Now, he wrote it in German, and that's why - and I did it in German deliberately - not to show how clever I am, but to show that **because** it was in German, most of the scientists who read only English papers, never came across it. And that's still a problem today.

When I came across it, I was absolutely fascinated. What he's saying, Leighton, is that if you halve or double CO<sub>2</sub>, then you will get a decrease, or an increase, respectively, of minus 1.5 or plus 1.6 Celsius, **not** 4 to 8 Celsius.

So he revised his own estimates, but the usual suspects, to this day, will tend only to quote the 1896 paper, with the figure which he himself later came to regard as wildly exaggerated.

So, then there were experiments by Callender in 1938, confirming that there was such a thing as a greenhouse effect; then, by the early 70's where global cooling was the thing that everybody was publishing scientific papers on, and there were headlines in Time Magazine, saying, you know, the Big Freeze, and that was the scare story of that time.

Then, a couple of papers came out, which suggested respectively, that the amount of warming from a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub>, would be either 2 Celsius, one of them said, or 4 Celsius, the other. The average of the two was 3 Celsius from the two papers, and that's where the figure of 3 Celsius for a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration comes from.

And that was the figure which the IPCC picked up, when in 1988 it was founded, and in 1990 it produced its first assessment report. And by that time there was still only a handful of papers in the literature which tried to determine climate sensitivity, as it was called, which is how much global warming will we expect to get once the climate has settled down after a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration.

**Viscount Monckton:** So then, the IPCC began producing successive reports; there was a second big one in 1995, and in that one, as in the first one, the scientists - there was several hundred of them who compiled it - said they couldn't find any evidence of any human effect on global temperature.

**Leighton Smith:** So in 1995, in the IPCC report;

**Viscount Monckton:** that's it, they said - and they said it five times; they said "when will an anthropogenic (that means man-made) effect on global temperature be identified". It is not surprising they went on to say - and I am quoting exactly here - "we do not know". They said that, or words equivalent to that, five times.

But, the bureaucrats had a fit; they were hoping they could go around to Bali and places like this, at tax-payers expense which all the lead authors of the IPCC are, having an absolutely lovely time, running huge Climate Change departments etc; if, actually, we are not having an impact that anyone can find on the climate. So, when the bureaucrats received this report from the scientists, they called in one scientist Ben Santer, of Norwich Livermore Laboratory - on this programme we will name names - and he re-wrote it; and he re-wrote it single-handed, and he made two

hundred changes to the report, so that he could remove all five of the statements in different parts of the report "that we don't know when we will find a human influence on climate", they are certainly not there now, and he replaced it with a single sentence to the effect that a human influence on the climate is now discernable. That has been the so-called consensus of opinion ever since, **and it is worth remembering that it is a consensus of just one man** . OK.

**Leighton Smith:** When did it become politicised?

**Viscount Monckton:** Well, by then, of course, it was politicised. It was very very clear by the 1995 report, that all the bets were off; this was no longer a scientific process, if it ever had been. Because science is NOT done by consensus, it is not done by vast international committees sitting down and saying "Let's decide among ourselves by vote what goes on. And if I may continue the history a little ...

**Leighton Smith:** Please ...

**Viscount Monckton:** OK. We then went on to the 2001 IPCC report, and that one was the one where they published a graph, and again I'd better name names - by Michael Mann and Bradley and Hughes - which had been published originally in the journal Nature, (which has become a huge cheer-leader for the extremist position on global warming) and this particular paper abolished the Medieval Warm Period, which had been shown loud and clear and large in a diagramme in the 1990 FIRST report (which was relatively honest), and they abolished the Medieval Warm Period, and they did so because - and here I name names again - it was Dr Ken Overpeck - who was an IPCC scientist, in 1995, had written to an honest scientist, and said (not realising he wasn't part of the plot), "We have to abolish, we have to get rid of the Medieval Warm Period". Now, he said this in an e-mail. (See <http://drtimball.com/2011/climate-terrorism-contrived-climate-science-holds-world-to-ransom/> Ed.) And so by 2001, that's what they did. They wiped it out. They wiped out the Little Ice Age as well - when the Thames in London and the Hudson in New York froze over every winter. They've never done so since. All that was abolished from history. Rather like the Communists; air-brushing people out of photographs, rewriting history to take them out. They took out the Medieval Warm Period which was warmer than the present all over the world; we know this from papers by very nearly a thousand scientists over the last 20 or 25 years.

Publishing papers about various parts of the world, using what are called proxies, for the biggest terrestrial temperatures, which we now measure using thermometers. But; they ignored all that, they used what they call Bristle-cone Pine - cut a Bristle-cone pine down and you can see its tree rings. ( Actually, the tree rings are assessed using a thin sample rod-like taken using a hollow drill. Ed.) Their idea was that if the tree rings were wider in a particular year - you can literally tell which tree ring belongs to which year - that would mean Global Warming because Bristle-cone pines; which was their chief source of data - trying to reconstruct temperatures before we had thermometers and all the rest of it; they said, with these Bristle-cone pines, right we are going to use these, BUT, Bristle-cone pine tree rings will also widen in a particular year if you get more rainfall, and, crucially, if you get more CO2 in the atmosphere. Because of CO2 fertilisation - because CO2 is not a pollutant, it is where the carbon in the tree trunks comes from. It doesn't come from the soil, it comes from the CO2 in the air; people don't realise this. If you want to green the paddocks, you add it. Anyway, they used the Bristle-cone pine proxies, and then the ones that gave them the shape they wanted - no Medieval Warm Period, no Little Ice-Age - and then a huge up-tick in the 20th century (naturally caused by us) they gave those three hundred and ninety (390) times as much weight in that model that drew this graph, than the ones that didn't give them the shape they wanted.

(See Ross McKittrick APEC Study Group, Australia What is the Hockey Stick Debate About? April 4, 2005 McKittrick Ed.)

Then they used a program which always drew this hockey-stick shape - with no real change in temperatures for a thousand years then a huge up-tick that they said was caused by us, in the 20th century. They had a computer program that didn't - that even if you put random red noise ( a particular kind of mathematical random data) into this algorithm, this program, I should say, then you would get this hockey-stick shape, even if you weren't using any real data.

Even that - even all these three or four fiddles - didn't succeed in abolishing the Medieval Warm Period. So then, they cut off all the data that they had been using from all these different tree rings from 19 - from 1500, going backwards from that, and they replaced these data with numbers of their own that they simply made up, and only then could they make the Medieval Warm Period disappear.

**Leighton Smith:** After the break I want to ask you about "what's in it for them for them to do this".

**Viscount Monckton:** We will indeed.

**Leighton Smith:** I want to ask you about the "Gore effect", and then I want to talk with you about a whole lot more. And we will take calls as well. It's 28 after 10, on NewstalkZB

**Leighton Smith:** NewstalkZB, 24 to 11. Viscount Monckton until 11:30. And we'll take some calls, although it has been suggested that - don't worry about calls, just let him talk. In one of my e-mails; tell Danny, he has the answer, then off, Look, I made mention during the break " Blue Planet in Green Shackles: What Is Endangered: Climate or Freedom?" by Vaclav Klaus of the Czech Republic; you also will be publishing, next year, I gather?

**Viscount Monckton:** That's right, yes. My book is going to be called "Climate of Freedom". And it's going to suggest that what's really going on here has nothing to do with the climate.

There isn't a problem with the climate; that instead what is happening is that the usual suspects, the people who would have been in the past instinctual fascists and communists - the difference between the two is being that fascists are openly anti-democratic and communists pretend to be democratic but they're not - these people have now decided to gather around this supposedly environmental cause for the sake of shutting down the West.

**Leighton Smith:** But there are some who genuinely believe ...

**Viscount Monckton:** This we must always accept. Because if you haven't had any kind of scientific background or training and you are told endlessly that there is a consensus, which I can assure there isn't, on the major question of how much warming we are going to get, or you are told – "Oh - the fact is that because the science is settled we must now act, you - on a complex question like this you must act earlier". Quoting Professor Salby, a very eminent man, a proper scientist, "of course the science isn't settled".

And, I shouldn't really be saying this, but I think that he is working on a ground-breaking paper which is going to blow an enormous hole in the official theory. I can't give details yet because he's not ready, but but it's very exciting. So all of this is going on. So I'm going to be covering (? – Ed) and saying not just "here's a little bit of very simple science, here's a little bit of very simple economics", but here also is a bit

of rather tiresome politics that we are facing. Nothing less than not only the end of the West, but the end of the Age of Enlightenment and Reason in which rationality prevailed and decisions were taken for sensible scientific reasons. We've now got the attempt by the usual suspects, the totalitarians, to try and politicise the science itself and use this politicisation as a way of destroying not only the freedom of the Press, but the Age of Reason and Enlightenment itself, driving humanity back into a Dark Age the like of which we haven't seen since the Roman Empire fell.

**Leighton Smith:** You have one more historical paragraph to conclude I think.

**Viscount Monckton:** Yes, that's right, we were looking at the history, if you like, of the various IPCC documents. First of all on that 2001 report where they falsely tried to abolish the Medieval Warm period. No less a prosecutor than the Attorney-General for the State of Virginia, Mr Kenneth Cuccinelli, is now conducting, and has been for some months, a criminal investigation into alleged tampering with data and results by the compilers of that paper, under the Fraud Against Taxpayers Act 2000, and he has announced publicly that that is what he is doing. So, already, those who have been producing what is arguably bogus science - of course they haven't gone to trial yet - we can't actually say that they have bent the data - but clearly there are some who think they have, and they are now looking into that.

Now, we come on to the 2007 report very briefly; that, too, had as its major conclusion a result which is manifestly bogus. They have this time taken the instrumental temperatures, that is, the temperatures measured by thermometers all round the world since 1850. And they plotted those, quite correctly as far as I can see, but then they have superimposed on the data, four, least squares linear regression trend lines. One starting 150 years back, then a hundred years back, then fifty years back, then twenty-five years back. And the more recent ones are steeper than the ones before. Now, they are drawing from this circumstance a completely inappropriate conclusion that therefore the rate of Global Warming is itself accelerating, and they use that word. Been accelerating. And that therefore it's our fault. Now, that technique, of using multiple trend lines on a single data-set, and drawing conclusions from the relative slopes of them, is entirely bogus; it's known to be bogus.

I have confronted both of the IPCC Science Chairmen; Dr Petchori, the Railroad Engineer for some reason, with it and he didn't even understand what I was saying - did nothing about it; I also confronted one of your scientists here, whom I shan't name, for once, and asked him to, he's one of the lead authors of this IPCC report - to put this right - and he has now written to me just before I came here, declining to do so, and I have already consulted lawyers about whether that should be reported to the Police as fraud.

**Leighton Smith:** I want to come back to that, maybe, shortly, but in two minutes, tell me about the AI Gore effect. How much has AI Gore had to do with the progression of this theory.

**Viscount Monckton:** AI Gore was responsible for, originally, when he was Vice President, giving a lot of air time to James Hansen of NASA, who had been pushing an extremist view of Climate Change, ever since he wrote a rather bad paper in 1981 which effectively set out the method by which the IPCC calculates or determines climate sensitivity like the warming you are going to get. There are very very many problems with that method, but AI Gore wanted the message, he didn't understand the science - he wanted the message. So he got Hansen to testify in front of Congress, on a deliberately chosen hot day, in 1988 in June; in fact there hasn't been such a hot day in Washington since I think - a very hot day, and he had the air conditioning tampered with so it was putting in heat instead of cold, so that then got

all the Congressmen frightened. And he then of course made his mawkish sci-fi horror movie, which a Judge in London has found is full of scientific errors. And yet, Gore has made no corrections to that.

In Australia where I have just come from they are made to watch this at least twice and sometimes four or five times during their school career; every kid is made to watch this garbage. And so he has had enormously baneful bad influence because he has been able to operate at Government level, and persuade largely scientific illiterate government that they should follow this extremist line.

**Leighton Smith:** Newstalk ZB, it's 18 to 11. More with Christopher Monckton after the break.

**Leighton Smith:** OK, if I call for Christopher Monckton after the news at 11, in the interim, I want to discuss a couple of other things with you. Just on the Gore matter, because I short-changed you slightly. He continues, and as I understand it - we've had publicity, he's planning a revival - to indoctrinate America in particular - I think it is some time in August, or it could be September. It's a massive campaign.

**Viscount Monckton:** It's a re-launch of the dead horse, I think is the best way to put it. Because America has now decided that it's not going to play. Even Obama has said he's not going to countenance a successor to the Kyoto Protocol. And this is really a remarkable change. And the moment when the Republicans changed from saying "Oh, we can't get into this argument, it's all too difficult"; which was their reaction when I went to see them two years ago about it. The moment I knew they'd changed was a couple of years ago.

I went in front of the "Ways and Means Committee" of Congress, at the invitation of the Republicans, to give testimony on this issue. And I showed them - the Republicans, at a little session before-hand, the slides I was going to use at the presentation, one of which was the bogus graph from the 2007 Report - an entirely fraudulent graph - showing the spurious acceleration in global warming when we know that for the last 10 years there hasn't been any. And so, I showed them this graph, and representative John Lindauer who was the Republican leader on the Committee, and he understood; they are so much brighter than legislators elsewhere; he understood at once what the problem was, he said "They CAN'T have done that!". I said, "They have, and they refuse to correct it". And he turned to the rest of the Committee, and said: "Gentlemen, I think we've heard all we need to know about the science of Climate Change".

He realised that if they were doing that, they clearly didn't have a real case, and from then on the Republicans switched, and said "We are not going to co-operate with the Democrats on this, we don't believe the science, there's too much fraud in it, and - you know - every time we try to get this corrected the other side simply resist and won't do it." . So, a very very important moment in history when the Republicans in America are not playing.

That stopped Cap in Trade going through the Senate, and as a result they haven't done the sort of ETS that you've got here in New Zealand, which is just about to cripple your farming because next year the 2 for 1 swaps will be taken away, and the effective price of the right to emit a ton of carbon dioxide, or the methane equivalent if you've got cattle, is going to double to twenty-five dollars. That is going to destroy farms right across New Zealand. I'm going up to address the farmers of Whangarei, the day after tomorrow on this, and they are very very worried about this, I can tell you. And rightly so. And if this were going to make some difference to the climate I would think "OK, there might be something in it", but (a) it's not going to make the slightest difference whatsoever - you could wipe New Zealand and Australia off the

map - and you wouldn't be able to measure with any instruments, any difference to global temperature a hundred years hence ..

**Leighton Smith:** After the break I have the first of the challengers for you.

**Viscount Monckton:** Excellent.

**Leighton Smith:** Newstalk ZB, it is coming up 8 to 11; we'll take any calls that you might have, any questions you might have for Viscount Monckton, after the news at 11. Here's the first challenge; I just want to throw this at you, because somebody has written it to me..

**Viscount Monckton:** OK.

**Leighton Smith:** And it goes this way; "I also am a global warming sceptic. Climate sceptic. In a simple Googling of Viscount Monckton, it comes up that he knows not of what he speaks. Citing him as a credible source is flawed because (a) he has no training in climatology or related sciences, and (b) he gets most of what he has heard about those sciences spectacularly wrong." Then there is a headline in this e-mail "Why Viscount Christopher Monckton is wrong" by Barton Paul Levinson, written in 2007. I don't know where it comes from. Can you ask your guest to comment on this criticism?".

**Viscount Monckton:** Well, no, of course I can't. Unless someone is specific and says what I've got wrong, then it is very difficult. I mean, this is just "hand-waving". This is exactly the way that the extreme left tends to operate; They say "Oh, well. We don't like Lord Monckton because the House of Lords says that he isn't a Lord, and he says he is, and and this is all terrible, and he knows nothing about science" .. Well, Hey, You know; I've lectured at Faculty level in the determination of climate sensitivity, I do it all over the world. I've delivered a talk on this subject - the only layman ever to do so, on a scientific subject - to the World Federation of Scientists' annual conference on Planetary Emergencies, last year. I've just given a Distinguished Visiting Fellows Lecture at the - not a Visiting Fellow; a Visitor's lecture, at the Prague School of Economics, on the Economics of Climate Change. Now, people like that don't invite, to give distinguished talks on this subject, somebody who knows absolutely nothing about it. Now that - these are only very general responses I can give, because unless I'm told what it is I've got wrong, then I can't very well answer it.

**Leighton Smith:** Well, I want somebody to tell you what they think you've got wrong, after 11. I'm inviting; I want it.

**Viscount Monckton:** Yes.

**Leighton Smith:** So, we'll see. There's a couple of other things just I want to drop in. The history of your visit, and I'm privy to some of the information. For instance, you were going to be debating tonight with a fellow called Kennedy Graham who is the Green Party spokesman on such matters.

**Viscount Monckton:** Yup.

**Leighton Smith:** He withdrew, or he was withdrawn, or whatever, and the Party announced they wouldn't debate with you, and the reasoning went something like this; if somebody was going to debate with you from the Green Party it should be the party co-leader Russell Norman, but he's out of the country or not available or something, so therefore nobody should. Because they decided he wouldn't anyway.

My interpretation of things goes a little differently. Professor Manning won't debate with you. The Green Party won't debate with you, And the reason is, as far as I'm concerned, is because they would get wiped across the floor by you. They would be destroyed.

Tell me quickly about the debate in Canberra; who was the scientist?

**Viscount Monckton:** Right. He wasn't a really scientist, he was a not a very good economist called Richard Dennis. He was a head of an environmental pressure group called The Australia Institute. It sounds much grander than it is. Indeed his predecessor, the head of it, has said "We must bring democracy to an end for the sake of saving the planet", because you can't trust ordinary people like your listeners to get this right; and he was saying - he said to me two things; (1) There is a consensus, and (2) Even if there isn't, we have to give the planet the benefit of the doubt.

In fact I gave specific scientific examples and economic examples and I won the debate handsomely; that's why the Greens here retreated; when they saw the debate they panicked, and ran.

**Leighton Smith:** Newstalk ZB it's 3 to 11. A couple of e-mails; "This stuff is fantastic, never heard it before, just keep him talking"; "I'm loving this show", "I can see why none of the climate change proponents were willing to go up against him, Gutless."

They'd get wiped, that's why.

If you would like to attend the discussion tonight with Viscount Monckton and Professor Geoff Austin from Auckland University, it's in lecture hall AF114 at the A.U.T. Akaranga Campus in Northcote, entry through the main entrance gate on Akaranga Drive, it starts at 5:30 today, adults 20, children and students \$5, pay at the door, and I would encourage you to take your kids along especially if they are in High School; it would be a great event for them. Now, Viscount Monckton is with us until 11:30, at that point he moves along to a luncheon at which he is speaking, which I understand is sold out or damn near sold out. From now until then, if you have a question; I don't care what it is provided it is to do with the subject to hand. Then we are very happy to entertain your call. 0800 80 1080

Let me begin by - or if you want to e-mail it, because a couple have - let me quote you this: it's a little too long, Todd to go right through it, but at the beginning of the segment you, referencing KiwiBlog, say that Monckton has a degree in mathematics.

Now, I didn't say that, what I said, quoting, "Monckton is a mathematician, and a mathematician with specific expertise in modelling." So that doesn't say that he has a degree.

"But as far as I can see this is not the case. He has a Bachelor of Arts in Classics and a Diploma in Journalism, no reference to any mathematical or scientific training."

Would you care to respond to that?

**Viscount Monckton:** This is a typical socialist argument, That you ...

**Leighton Smith:** I don't know that he is doing that ...

**Viscount Monckton:** Well, I .. yes, let me answer this ... What he's saying is that you have to have a piece of paper that says you are qualified to do a certain thing before you can do it.

Now, I don't have any formal qualification in mathematics on its own, but of course higher mathematics formed part of the course in Classical Architecture that I did, otherwise the buildings I used to design wouldn't stand up!

I'm therefore quite familiar with differential calculus, familiar with various kinds of modelling, including modelling of chaotic objects from the Mandelbrot fractal set, via the Verhaas population model, to the oscillation of pendula. All of these things are relevant to Climate Science because the climate is reckoned by the IPCC to be a mathematically chaotic object, and that tells a great deal about climate science, So all of these are relevant areas of my expertise. I have also modelled the spread of infections such as HIV - retrovirus infections - which are quite different from any others. And my model was used in several NHS hospitals when I first did it. So I have got quite a bit of experience, but I don't have a piece of paper which specifically says I have a Mathematics degree; I haven't. I have a degree in which mathematics forms a significant part.

**Leighton Smith:** OK; So Todd, I can answer the other bits that you; one of the rest of the questions that you asked; you also asked why there was a door charge for his talk; the answer is simple so far as I am aware; and this is - I haven't consulted anybody - but I know that private people - there was an e-mail sent out to people - if they would like to contribute to the cost of bringing Lord Monckton to New Zealand ; because he was brought privately. I even got a copy of that asking if I would - well it was a circular - if I would care to contribute. By the way, I didn't.

**Viscount Monckton:** Shame !

**Leighton Smith:** Well, I'm contributing, now.

**Viscount Monckton:** You are !

**Leighton Smith:** Paul - Viscount Monckton. Rick, Good morning. Hello Rick; See you mate.

**Rick** Oh, Good morning. This experience thing; sorry I haven't caught the whole programme, but yeah it has been interesting. Been hopping out of the car with this World Cup thing. I'm just one of your Joe Bloggs out there; caught up bit and pieces about climate change; haven't really formed a sort of strong view either way, but I did see at one stage half of that Al Gore thing a few years ago , and one of the things that hit me was when they were graphing the carbon and the ..

**Viscount Monckton:** Temperature.

**Rick:** You remember - you know what I'm talking about?

**Viscount Monckton:** Yes, I do, and I can help out with that Rick. You are quite right. There was a quite misleading graph shown by Al Gore which tracked the temperature change over the last 450 thousand years against carbon dioxide change, and the two appeared to track quite closely together. We know however, that the temperature graph on Al Gore's movie, was in fact not done by a computer or a climate scientist, but by a PR agent because at one point, time on that graph runs backwards. So, we know that that was bogus. We also know that in the early climate, it was always the temperature that changed first, by about 800 to 2,800 years, according to numerous papers that appeared in the early two thousands; Molyneux, and Invermueller and others. And, so we know that in fact that in the past it was always the temperature that drove the CO<sub>2</sub>, and not the other way around. Now, we have got to be careful,

we can't go on and say that therefore CO2 can't drive temperature now; all we can say is that it didn't in the past. Correct?

**Rick** If you looked at that graph, what you are saying is that the time scale for the temperature change was incorrect ?

**Viscount Monckton:** That's right, he got it the wrong way round. He stated that when CO2 changed, temperature changed, when in fact it was the other way around. He simply got that flat wrong.

**Rick** So that means the axis and the scale on the timing on the temperature change was incorrect. Is that what you are saying?

**Viscount Monckton:** The temperature change graph was simply fictitious. And then he drew the wrong conclusion, in any case. And it was one of the nine errors found in Gore's film by a High Court judge, but so far no corrections have been made to that film even though the High Court judge had found these serious errors.

**Leighton Smith:** Rick, thanks for your call. Clive, you're after the break. Newstalk ZB, 18 minutes after 11.

The author of the questions with regard to modelling and mathematics is flicked back:- "Thanks for addressing those questions. Would you like to get some background on this. I'm sure he's familiar with Fortran." I've no idea what Fortran is. What is it?

**Viscount Monckton:** Fortran is "Formula translation". it's the precursor to what later became more widely used which is Basic, but I myself tend to program in machine language or in assembler because it's faster.

**Leighton Smith:** Is that OK, Todd? Will that keep you happy? I hope. Tony, Good morning.

**Tony** Good morning.

**Viscount Monckton:** Hi Tony.

**Tony** I was - totally believe what you say about the climate change and everything, but what I'd like to know is, what is actually driving these guys to push this climate change, with what ...

**Viscount Monckton:** Yup, OK, Got you; Money, Power, and Glory, just as it always is.

These people are making fortunes. Al Gore has made, certainly, several hundred million on it, the scientists are getting status, they are getting trips all around the world, to places like Bali, to interface in a meaningful way with the ladies in grass skirts, they are all having a lovely time doing this. And it gives them a status that weathermen have never really had before. They are endlessly the lions of the chat shows now, they've never had this before, and it has gone to their heads more than somewhat, and they realise that if they want to keep on doing that, they've got to keep the scare alive.

But frankly it's too late now, Tony, because the science is in, the truth is out, the game is up, and the scare is over.

**Tony** But is it? Well, why is the New Zealand Government, and the Australian Government still buying into it?

**Viscount Monckton:** Because the governing class again can make enormous amounts of money out of this through additional crippling taxation, and they can say that it's good for you. There's nothing that a governing class likes more, than to save you from yourselves at your expense, when in fact there is no danger to the climate. We are going to get, perhaps one Celsius of warming for a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub>, and if you take the Australian Carbon Tax scheme which I have been able to study in some detail because they have published rather more figures than the New Zealand one has, it's exactly four to forty times more expensive to do that scheme, world wide, than it would be do nothing, sit back, enjoy the sunshine, and endure the cost of any climate-related damage that **might** - and I stress **might** - occur.

**Leighton Smith:** Alright, address for me, if you would - or for us - that there may be - in fact there is now a suggestion that there will be a lessening of - a cooling.

**Viscount Monckton:** That is certainly a possibility. I was alerted to this by a solar physicist from NASA who privately got in touch - oh - three years ago now, saying they were very worried that the magnetic convection currents beneath both hemispheres of the sun had slowed to what he described as walking pace, and that they'd never seen this before, and that this correlated apparently with general solar output. They were expecting therefore a longer solar cycle, which duly happened, and longer solar cycles mean that they gradually attenuate, and they become less active, and that should lead certainly to a slowing of the general warming that I would otherwise have expected to occur as we add CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere.

Now let me get it clear; if you add CO<sub>2</sub> to the atmosphere you are going to get some warming. The question is not about that, there is certainly a consensus on that. The question is about how much warming you are going to get. And in my talk at - with Professor Geoff Austin this afternoon at the A.U.T. Akaranga Campus, 5:30, Lecture Hall AF114, - be there or be square, I shall be giving ten different estimates of one Celsius for a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> concentration by different methods.

**Leighton Smith:** Did you memorise that before you came in? Because you didn't look at the paper in front of you; I was watching.

**Viscount Monckton:** Isn't it horrifying !!

**Leighton Smith:** Alright; Clive, for Viscount Monckton, good morning Clive.

**Viscount Monckton:** Hello Clive,

**Clive.** Hello Leighton, Good morning Lord Monckton, I'm aware you have lots of people wanting to talk to you, so can I very quickly ask you two questions;

**Viscount Monckton:** Yes.

**Clive.** Am I right in thinking that you would say that the recession of glaciers world-wide is basically a sort of (unclear - Ed.) coming out of the last little Ice Age, and secondly, can I ask you to comment on the given that mankind is to make some sort of amelioration on warming if it exists, if it is at all able to be intervened, that it would be better to look at the effect of methane rather than CO<sub>2</sub>, thinking of the success ..

**Viscount Monckton:** Alright, OK, let me deal with both of those very briefly,

First of all the glaciers. They began receding in 1820 in some parts of the world, in 1880 in others. If you take Kilimanjaro, for instance, which Al Gore uses as a Poster Child for Global Warming, that began receding in 1880, and more than half the ice in that plateau had already gone by 1936 when Hemmingway wrote his book "The

Snows of Kilimanjaro", and the rate of loss of course has slowed down since. So we know that the glaciers began receding long before we could have had any impact on it, so certainly at least some of the recession of the glaciers - not necessarily all of it - is indeed caused by a recovery of solar activity, after the Maunder Minimum between 1645 and 1715. when the sun was at its least active in the 11,400 years since the end of the last Ice Age.

Now, remind me of you second question again

**Clive.** Methane

**Viscount Monckton:** That's it. Methane, no you don't need to worry about methane. It's only risen in concentration by 20 parts - sorry - 18 parts per billion in the last 10 years, and that would give you a global warming, if you convert it to - multiply by 23 to give you equivalent CO2 concentration. Would give you a global warming of around 1/450th of a Celsius degree over the 10 years.

Methane is no longer a problem. It **was** a problem when the Soviet gas pipeline leaked. But Gas-Putin, when he took over, went round with chewing-gum and string and blocked up all the holes in the pipeline because he reasoned that every square cubic metre of gas that farted out of there was a cubic metre he couldn't overcharge Europe for, so he fixed it. And the rapid rise in methane that has effectively stopped in 1999, and it's been very much slower since, and from that we know that cattle, for instance, have virtually nothing whatever to do with it. In fact the largest biogenic source of methane is actually termite ants, so if you want to save the planet from global warming, get rid of all those termites.

**Leighton Smith:** Glen, Good morning.

**Glen:** Yeah; Good Morning. I am of the Kunean ( ? – Ed.) School, and with a friend of mine who couldn't get funding to study snails unless they studied the effect of climate change on snails, when do you see the paradigm shifting, and the climate science - having the - with the amount of holes that are in it, when do you see it shifting in academia?

**Viscount Monckton:** As far as academia is concerned there have been two major shifts.

One is that there are only a few dozen scientists who have studied the one question that actually matters in this scientific debate about the climate, which is, how much warming we are going to get in response to a doubling of CO2 concentration over the next century. And more and more papers; Linton and Joy 2009 & 2011, Spenser and Bratwell 2010 & 2011; papers like that; Halfridge et al 2009, all of these papers are suggesting maybe ONE Celsius degree of warming for a doubling of CO2 concentration. This is the growing trend among the scientific papers as far as they try to derive climate sensitivity, as it is called, by measurement and observation, rather than by mere modelling, which is not satisfactory as a way of trying to reach the answer.

But the other important thing that's happening is that in the economic peer-reviewed literature, it is near unanimously agreed that it is cheaper to do nothing, than to spend a single cent now, on global warming. We are simply not faced with a sufficiently severe threat to justify any expenditure whatsoever at the moment. And that's the near unanimous view of the peer-reviewed economists. Of course the Government economists from Sterne to Ganau use various dodges, tricks, ducks and dives, such as an artificially low intertemporal purator time preference discount rate, to get away with saying that it's going to a be cheaper to do something, than to do nothing, but in fact that's wrong.

**Leighton Smith:** I'm going to get myself into trouble soon because time is now a major factor. Look, tell me if I'm wrong, my Ganau and Sterne are economists,

**Viscount Monckton:** Yes

**Leighton Smith:** they are not climate people at all,

**Viscount Monckton:** Yes

**Leighton Smith:** they know less than you by far, but they work off a base or given - they are given - or they accept a theory and statistics that they then interpret into economic formula ...

**Viscount Monckton:** Let me explain what they did.

First of all, they started by assuming as a central case that the amount of global warming we would get will be one and a half times the amount of warming actually taken as a central case by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). They didn't accept the science, they exaggerated it. And of course that science itself was exaggerated before they started.

Then what they did was to assume that the damage arising from this exaggerated warming would be exaggerated, even if that warming were right - compared with what would be expected in the economic literature.

And then on top of that, they used artificially low intertemporal discount rates. Sterne used 0.1 percent - the lowest ever used. It should be 5 percent. If you correct for that, then the 5 to 20 percent of World GDP this century that he said it would cost, if we didn't do something about Climate Change. If you use a 5 percent rate, instead of a 0.1 percent rate and you keep all his other exaggerations, then even with those exaggerations the cost of doing nothing falls to between 0.4 and 1.5 percent of GDP which is **1/40th** of the cost of, say, doing Julia Gillard's ETS or New Zealand's ETS, world-wide.

**Leighton Smith:** One last call; Tim, Morning.

**Tim:** A quick question. Where or how can I find Arrhenius's second paper, the one that Lord Monckton read out in German. I think it's quite important.

**Viscount Monckton:** Ah, yes, certainly; it was published in Volume 1 of, sorry - it was - ah yes that's right - Volume 1 Issue 2 of the Journal of the Royal Nobel Institute, and so you should be able to find it quite easily on the Web. If you can't find it, e-mail me, the programme will give you the details later, and I will gladly send it to you.

**Tim:** Thank you very much indeed; thank you for your presentation this morning Sir.

**Viscount Monckton:** And thank you so much for your question.

**Leighton Smith:** I'm going to include, I know this show, I'm going to get into trouble; I'm going to include one more thing; and this is from the original author who was challenging you earlier,

**Viscount Monckton:** Yes.

**Leighton Smith:** and asking you questions. One more thing. "The relative importance or unimportance of methane is more to do with the earth's electromagnetic radiation emissions spectrum than the slight increase Monckton referred to".

**Viscount Monckton:** That is correct because methane has what's called "a global warming potential" between 21 and 23 times that of CO<sub>2</sub>, molecule for molecule. However, the fact is that if you are only increasing the methane concentration by 20 parts per billion, and you multiply that by 23, as I say, taking the bigger estimate, then you are still only going to get the equivalent of say half of a part per million of CO<sub>2</sub> as your warming, and it's a relatively simple calculation from there to work out how much warming that would have caused over the last 10 years. And it is approximately 1/450th of a degree, as I have said.

**Leighton Smith:** Todd, I await your comment on Viscount Monckton's comment. At which point I am forced to say; they told me that an hour and a half wouldn't be enough, and they were right. Thank you very much ..

**Viscount Monckton:** Leighton, it's been a real honour and a pleasure. And a delight, because you are one of the most distinguished broadcasters on this subject, around the world. And it's a huge pleasure to have been here with you.

**Leighton Smith:** Yeah; I'm one of the few, that's why. Professor Geoff Austin will discuss with you, Climate Change, tonight. Lecture Hall AF114, A.U.T. Akaranga Campus, at Northcote, at 5:30, Adults \$20, and children and students \$5, I'll see you there.

**Viscount Monckton:** Bless you, look forward to that.

**Leighton Smith:** Newstalk ZB, it's 11:31, we are running behind schedule.

The End