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Summary

"From the Seine’s cold quays to the Ganges’ burning shores,
The human troupe skips and swoons with delight, sees not
In a hole in the ceiling the Angel’s trumpet
Gaping ominously like a black blunderbuss.

Charles Baudelaire: La Danse Macabre (The Dance of Death),
in Les Fleurs du Mal (The Flowers of Evil)

All public policies, in France, Europe and throughout the world, find their origin and inspiration in the battle against global warming. The initial credo is simple: temperatures at the surface of the planet have been rising constantly for the past thirty years, and human beings are to blame.

This is leading to all sorts of discussions, conferences and regulations, which are having an enormous impact on our economy. Every area of activity is affected: transport, housing, energy – to name just a few. Why do we need to save energy? It is quite simple: we have to reduce human impact on the planet. This is the fundamental credo.

The impact on the entire field of scientific research is particularly clear and especially pernicious. No project can be launched, on any subject whatsoever, unless it makes direct reference to global warming. You want to look at the geology of the Garonne Basin? It is, after all, an entirely normal and socially useful subject in every respect. Well, your research will be funded, approved and published only if it mentions the potential for geological storage of CO₂. It is appalling.

The crusade has invaded every area of activity and everyone’s thinking: the battle against CO₂ has become a national priority. How have we reached this point, in a country that claims to be rational?

At the root lie the declarations made by the IPCC, which have been repeated over the years and taken up by the European Commission and the Member States. France, which likes to see itself as the ‘good boy of Europe’, adds an extra layer of virtue to every crusade. When others introduce reductions, we will on principle introduce bigger reductions, without ever questioning their appropriateness: a crusade is virtuous by its very nature. And you can never be too virtuous.

But mathematicians do not believe in crusades: they look at facts, figures, observations and arguments.

This White Paper is divided into three parts:
Part I: The facts

Chapter 1: The crusade is absurd

There is not a single fact, figure or observation that leads us to conclude that the world’s climate is in any way ‘disturbed’. It is variable, as it has always been, but rather less so now than during certain periods or geological eras. Modern methods are far from being able to accurately measure the planet’s global temperature even today, so measurements made 50 or 100 years ago are even less reliable.

Concentrations of CO\textsubscript{2} vary, as they always have done: the figures that are being released are biased and dishonest. Rising sea levels are a normal phenomenon linked to upthrust buoyancy; they are nothing to do with so-called global warming. As for extreme weather events – they are no more frequent now than they have been in the past. We ourselves have processed the raw data on hurricanes.

We are being told that ‘a temperature increase of more than 2°C by comparison with the beginning of the industrial age would have dramatic consequences, and absolutely has to be prevented’. When they hear this, people worry: hasn’t there already been an increase of 1.9°C? Actually, no: the figures for the period 1995-2015 show an upward trend of about 1°C every hundred years! Of course, these figures, which contradict public policies, are never brought to public attention.

Chapter 2: The crusade is costly

Direct aid for industries that are completely unviable (such as photovoltaics and wind turbines) but presented as ‘virtuous’ runs into billions of euros, according to recent reports published by the Cour des Comptes (French Audit Office) in 2013. But the highest cost lies in the principle of ‘energy saving’, which is presented as especially virtuous. Since no civilization can develop when it is saving energy, ours has stopped developing: France now has more than three million people unemployed – it is the price we have to pay for our virtue.

We want to cut our CO\textsubscript{2} emissions at any cost: it is a way of displaying our virtue for all to see. To achieve these reductions, we have significantly cut industrial activity and lost jobs. But at least we have achieved our aim of cutting CO\textsubscript{2} emissions, haven’t we? The answer is laughable: apparently not. Global emissions of CO\textsubscript{2} have continued to rise, including those generated by France in designing and manufacturing its own products, as the Cour des Comptes clearly states. Quite simply, manufacturing that is held to be environmentally damaging has been relocated. So the same products are now being manufactured in countries that are far less respectful of the environment, and we have lost all the associated jobs. As Baudelaire says, ‘Nature’s irony combines with our insanity’.
Chapter 3: The crusade is pointless

Human beings cannot, in any event, change the climate. If we in France were to stop all industrial activity (let’s not talk about our intellectual activity, which ceased long ago), if we were to eradicate all trace of animal life, the composition of the atmosphere would not alter in any measurable, perceptible way. To explain this, let us make a comparison with the rotation of the planet: it is slowing down. To address that, we might be tempted to ask the entire population of China to run in an easterly direction. But, no matter how big China and its population are, this would have no measurable impact on the Earth’s rotation.

French policy on CO₂ emissions is particularly stupid, since we are one of the countries with the cleanest industrial sector.

International agreements on the subject began with the Kyoto Protocol, but the number of countries signing up to this agreement and its descendants are becoming fewer and fewer, now representing just 15% of emissions of greenhouse gases.

This just goes to show the truth of the matter: we are fighting for a cause (reducing CO₂ emissions) that serves absolutely no purpose, in which we alone believe, and which we can do nothing about. You would probably have to go quite a long way back in human history to find such a mad obsession.

Part II: Scientific aspects

Having looked at the facts and their social impact, we now look at some more or less well-established scientific knowledge.

Chapter 1: The natural variability of the climate

There have already been innumerable variations in the climate in the past, some of them enormous (such as glaciations). The main causes are linked to the Sun and the albedo of the cloud layer (does sunlight penetrate right to the ground, or is it reflected back by the clouds?). Human beings obviously have a role to play, but the natural causes of climate variations are never taken into account by the crusaders, who put all the blame on human activity.

Chapter 2: Are human beings influencing the climate?

One might wonder whether human beings are influencing the climate, with their buildings, transport networks and very civilization. The answer is that their influence is tiny, quite negligible in comparison with natural causes. Nature makes major changes, human beings make small ones, which our natural arrogance lends a significance they simply do not have. Insurance companies know what is what: the cost of natural phenomena (such as tornadoes, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions) is ten times greater than the cost of any man-made disaster.
Another vital question here: do human beings have the technological ability to change the climate? The answer is no: human beings can do nothing about solar activity, the state of the oceans, the temperature of the Earth’s magma, or the composition of the atmosphere. On the other hand, human beings are very capable of getting worked up about all sorts of things, of ‘skipping and swooning’, as Baudelaire put it.

We should like to suggest here an especially interesting and original measure, which is akin to ‘circulation alternée’¹: to increase the Earth’s albedo and thereby counter the greenhouse effect, only bald people should be allowed to go out on sunny days; people with a full head of hair should be allowed to go out only at night or on rainy days.

Chapter 3: The consequences of so-called global warming

One might wonder about the potential consequences of so-called global warming for human beings and the natural world. The answer is very simple: the natural world will adjust very well, as it has always done. Plants, in particular, would enjoy an increase in CO₂ concentrations. In France, the positive effects would far outweigh the negative ones. If there were such a thing as global warming, then we should celebrate. And if it does not exist, then we shall simply have to carry on switching on the central heating nine months a year.

Part III: The IPCC

We are not in a position to question the composition of the IPCC, or its legitimacy and policy decisions, and we shall not do so. However, as mathematicians, we have every right to respond to the following question: if the IPCC’s work were to be submitted for publication in a reputable scientific journal, would it be accepted? This decision is the task of a referee, in a procedure that is common practice in the sciences.

The answer is very simple: no sensible, high-quality journal would publish the IPCC’s work. The IPCC’s conclusions go against observed facts; the figures used are deliberately chosen to support its conclusions (with no regard for the most basic scientific honesty), and the natural variability of phenomena is passed over without comment. The IPCC’s report fails to respect the fundamental rules of scientific research and could not be published in any review with a reading panel.

¹ This is a French measure whereby a ban is imposed on city-center traffic during periods of heavy pollution, with cars whose registration plates have even numbers and those with odd numbers being barred from the roads on alternate days.
Conclusion: ‘The mastiff Liberty growls and shows its sharp teeth.’

(Victor Hugo: Les Châtiments [Castigations])

In a democracy, there is an opposition, and this opposition has a right, in principle, to express its views: this is what distinguishes democracy from dictatorship. But when it comes to the questions about global warming that we are talking about here, the opposition – people who do not believe in global warming – have been told to shut up: no public debate, no contradictory discourse, no articles in scientific journals. They have simply been told that the case is proven and it is time to take action.

In law, there is a fundamental principle known as the ‘adversarial principle’. A case can be thrown out of court if the defense is not informed of every known element of the accusation. Even if twenty people have witnessed the abominable criminal commit his offense, if the defense has not had access to blood-sample analyses, the case will be thrown out. In the case of global warming, a number of bodies are telling us they have all the evidence, but refuse to tell us what it is. The data have been processed, but how? Time series have been altered, but why? Some phenomena have been left out of the equation, but on what grounds? We do not know, and we are simply required to keep quiet and do what we are told. No second opinion is permitted.

It is on the debris of the fundamental principles of the law and of democracy that this White Paper has been written.

Bernard Beauzamy
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