

Prof. Dr. Ivar Giaever, 2008 - 58th Meeting of Nobel Laureates

**»Panel Discussion on "Climate Changes and Energy Challenges" with Nobel Laureates
Profs. Deisenhofer, Giaever, Michel, Osheroff, Rubbia, von Klitzing, Steinberger (Chair:
Prof. Dr. Hans Joachim Schellnhuber)«[July 1, 11:15 - 12:45]**

<http://www.lindau-nobel.de/LecturesOnline.AxCMS?ActiveID=1173>

Then click on the link (about half way down the page):

"Watch Lectures of the 2008 Meeting in Physics online (complete archive)"

Then click inside (on right hand side) the (currently missing) picture frame of:

Ivar Giaever

Panel Discussion on "Climate Changes and Energy Challenges" with Nobel Laureates Profs.
Deisenhofer, Giaever, Michel, Osheroff, Rubbia, von Klitzing, Steinberger (Chair: Prof. Dr.
Hans Joachim Schellnhuber [member of the IPCC; advisor, on climate change, to head of
German state, Merkel])

Watching the Video:

To get to various points by scrolling, let the whole video run through it 92:24 (92 mins 24 secs)
length (you can turn down the volume by dragging along to the right near the speaker icon on the
right side bottom of the screen).

Listening to the Recording:

The following is a list of remarks by Ivar Giaever + associated comments leading to or on his
remarks (approximate times are given for playing the recording in iTunes; the cursor, that moves
from left to right as the recording proceeds, can be dragged and placed pretty close to a particular
time. --- And this can also be done when watching the video. --- One place the Recording can
be obtained [hopefully in about a week; after some further editing] is from the site
<http://uhaweb.hartford.edu/lgould/> under the heading, "Nobel laureates and AGW_Lindau":
12:30 - 17:13 [Giaever: "I'm a skeptic." Critiques the bogus "acid rain" and the "ozone hole"
scares. "Now we are gotten into Global Warming. It's become a new religion. You're *not* [his
stress] supposed to be against Global Warming. You have basically no choice. And I tell you

how many scientists support that. But the number of scientists is not important. The *only* [his stress] thing that's important is if the scientists are *correct* [his stress]; that's the important part.”] **53:23 - 57:20** [Schellnhuber: He mentioned that we can precisely calculate the orbital parameters, for the Milankovitch cycles, exactly when we'll go into another ice age. “The planet will not cool down. ... The other thing is, ... sea level rise; ... another little bit of evidence. In principle we know, that just from geological measurements — no models involved — that one degree [presumably “Celsius”] global warming means about twenty meters sea level rise, there's an almost perfect linear fit...”; he says that going back to pre-industrial levels; “the European target... confines global warming” to a projected increase possible of two degrees, which means we would get forty meters sea level rise; but “we don't know how fast it would happen” — could be a thousand years or three hundred years.

--- My comments on this are as follows: Over the 20th century there's been about 0.7 C “global warming” and the sea levels have risen about 20 cm. However, according to his projections — assuming they are testable — sea levels should have risen about 1400 cm! Since, however, he does not make any statement about how long it would take to reach the 1400 cm then his claims are not testable. (NB: I am only commenting on two of the scientific errors made during the panel discussion.)

Giaever: Ice on Greenland has been increasing; and there's more ice on Greenland now than ten years ago. Schellnhuber: Disputes that claim by claiming that the overall result is "negative". Then he rushed on to the next person];

1:05:00 – 1:08:00 [Giaever: Says no one knows what's the cause of the Little Ice Age.

However, it is likely driven by the Sun as there are strong correlations between the lengths of the solar cycle -- as determined by sunspot numbers -- and temperatures over the Earth. Giaever said that we should be spending the money on real problems instead of on trying prevent something [AGW] "that we can't prevent anyway." Schellnhuber: In reply to Giaever's statement that we can't be sure whether there is AGW, said that although we "can never be absolutely sure" the IPCC has given a very profound probability analysis where they found that a "larger than 90%" probability "that humans are seriously interfering with the atmosphere"

--- My comments on this are as follows: I have seen the 90% figure thrown around as meaning **very significant** ---- thus getting a lot of mileage out of a pseudo-vehicle(!:

From the Essex and McKittrick book, "Taken by Storm", I have confirmed what they say (2nd paragraph on p. 279 of their book) about the IPCC report ---- [report is at --- http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/tar/wg1/pdf/WG1_TAR-FRONT.PDF] and what they say in the 3rd paragraph on p. 279 of the book; which quotes part of the following:

“For the projected changes in the right-hand column, ‘very likely’ indicates that a number of models have been analysed for such a change, all those analysed show it in most regions, and it is physically plausible.”

[buried on p. 574; see the report at --- <http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/tar/wg1/pdf/TAR-09.PDF>]

As Essex and McKittrick say (p. 280): "*Very Likely* [*superscript "7"*] means in the PUN [Panel of the United Nations which produces the climate reports/IPCC] report: some computer models, of some sort, somewhere, were able to simulate this in some places, and it is not physically impossible. Otherwise the event is merely *Likely* [*superscript "7"*]."

Their Table 8.1 on p. 281 does an enlightening job at mocking the table in the PUN.

1:15:00 – 1:17:00 [issue of energy loss during transmission]

1:26:00 – 1:27:00 [Will the Nobel prizes in the next decade be won for energy issues. Giaever: “In my opinion the Nobel prize in global warming and such has already been given last year by Gore; who got the Nobel Prize for global warming and what not. And I hate to say something bad about Norway, but in this case I *sharply* [his stress] disagree with that prize.”]

L.I. Gould, Professor of Physics

University of Hartford

30 January 2009