

Starting in the 1990s, and gradually building up in time, concern has grown amongst many climatologists that putative global warming produced by greenhouse gas emissions presents a grave danger to humanity. With the advent of Al Gore's film *An Inconvenient Truth*, in 2006, this concern has escalated to become one of the major defining issues of our time. Governments are contemplating policies for extreme reduction of carbon emissions that are likely to cost many trillions of dollars and could produce global economic woe. Climatology, which used to be a minor science that was widely ignored, became thrust into the limelight. Prominent climatologists responded by issuing many repeated warnings of impending disaster, and now receive much attention, adulation (and funding) as a result. As a result, we note that many climatologists routinely distort or misrepresent their results in such a way as to exaggerate the threat of rising CO<sub>2</sub>. Others strive to relate almost any distant phenomenon to greenhouse gases – often to an absurd degree. Some have simply lied, while others have operated in a heavy-handed way to shut out opposing views and avoid criticism of their own work. Funding for climate research and analysis has become the goose that laid a golden egg, and human nature being what it is, many have succumbed to the temptation to seek a share of the lucre.

The problems for politicians in planning policy center around uncertainty. The MIT Group has published a series of reports dealing with climate change policy under uncertainty (e.g. Webster *et al.*, 2008, 2009). They pointed out

“Though the climate policy challenge is essentially one of risk management, requiring an understanding of uncertainty, most analyses of the emissions implications of these various policy targets have been deterministic, applying [specific] scenarios of emissions and reference (or at best median) values of parameters that represent aspects of the climate system response, and the cost of emissions control.... These efforts provide insight to the nature of the human-climate relationship, but necessarily they fail to represent the effects of uncertainty in emissions, or to reflect the interacting uncertainties in the natural cycles of CO<sub>2</sub> and other gases or the response of the climate system to these gases”.

While these authors utilized a range of possible future emission scenarios, they used specific model results for the ultimate concentrations of greenhouse gases, forcings, and temperature increases resulting from any emission scenario. In other words, they accounted for uncertainty in the emission scenario, but not for uncertainty in the climate impact of such emissions.