

Climate Scepticism

Climate scepticism can include almost any combination of the following claims:

- There is no global warming;
- There is global warming, but it is not the result of human activity;
- Climate varies naturally over geological time;
- We are still emerging from a 'mini-ice-age', so some warming is to be expected;
- Warm periods in the past have been beneficial to life and civilisation;
- The primary drivers of terrestrial temperature are solar activity and the dynamic geometry of the solar system;
- CO₂ level lags global temperature by 400-800 years, suggesting that it is an effect rather than the cause;
- CO₂ is the 'gas of life', beneficial to plants and animals thus we need more of it, especially given how close we are to the lower limit of 200 ppm, below which all life on Earth ceases;
- Climate models are inaccurate and do not accurately predict the past over geological timescales, so why do we believe they can predict the future?
- Climate models are based on an erroneous 'flat Earth' model that underestimates solar heating effects;
- Climate models use 'radiative forcing' as the primary greenhouse mechanism, but this violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which states that heat only flows from a hot body to a colder body, never in the other direction;
- Climate science has become a religion, distorted in furtherance of a geopolitical agenda;
- The claim that 97–99% of scientists support the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis is incorrect and unfounded.
- Many authors and expert reviewers have resigned in disgust from the IPCC, at the lack of scientific integrity in that body.

Useful Resources

<https://co2coalition.org/> (contains a must-see *climate quiz!*)

<https://inconvenientfacts.xyz/>

<https://www.therightclimatestuff.com/>

<https://clintel.org/>

<https://www.thegwpc.org/>

<https://climateofsophistry.com/>

<https://climatechangereconsidered.org/> (also a book: *Climate Change Reconsidered*)

<https://climaterealityforum.com/>

<https://www.climatedepot.com/>

<https://realclimatescience.com/>

<https://wattsupwiththat.com/>

<https://electroverse.info/climate-change-denying-statements-by-former-ipcc-scientists/>

<https://electroverse.net/the-list-scientists-who-publicly-disagree-with-the-current-consensus-on-climate-change/>

<https://www.weatheraction.com>

Documentaries

The Great Global Warming Swindle: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BY-gRFSaP7o>

32 Climate Hoaxes: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E1e5HAZo4iw>

Nobody Understands Climate: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0-Ke9F0m_gw&t=517s

The Dimming [geoengineering]: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rf78rEAvhY>

Climate Sceptics

The following list details academics, scientists, journalists, politicians and other professionals who have publicly expressed some degree of climate scepticism.

As of 21 November 2023, the list contains:

- **2,866** individuals;
- **704** university professors;
- **1,282** known qualified to Ph.D., D.Phil., D.Sc., Dr. rer. nat. level or equivalent;
- **8** Nobel Laureates;

Sources

The list includes names from the following sources:

- General research, web searches, etc.
- [Cabal of climate sceptics to descend on UK parliament \(The Guardian newspaper\)](#)
- [The Climate Denier List](#)
- [UN Scientists Who Have Turned on the UN IPCC](#)
- [Who's Who on Imhofe's List of 400 Global Warming Deniers](#)
- [The Climate Manifest of Heiligenroth](#)
- [The Manhattan Declaration on Climate Change](#)
- [Open Letter to the Chancellor of Germany by 130 Scientists](#)
- [Open Letter to Pope Francis on Climate Change](#)
- [World Climate Declaration](#)
- [Paris Climate Challenge](#)

The Scientific Method and Fake AGW Consensus

The scientific method consists of comparing experimental measurements against a mathematically formulated hypothesis, to determine the statistical probability that the measurements match the theory and are not the result of coincidence. Experiments and studies must be carefully designed to isolate variables of interest and to minimise or control for the influence of other factors. An experiment must be *reproducible* by other researchers and a theory must be *falsifiable*; in other words, there must exist a means by which it could be refuted, typically by making testable predictions about the behaviour of a system. Science can only ever establish a *confidence level* that a theory matches observations; it can never establish 'irrefutable truth' beyond any doubt. Thus, by definition, science can *never* be 'settled' in the way that AGW proponents frequently and erroneously claim.

Scientific consensus is not a reliable indicator of truth. There are many financial, professional, peer and political pressures upon academics, which exert a chilling effect on scientific debate and distort scientific objectivity. Research projects which support the official climate change and anthropogenic global warming (AGW) narrative have far readier access to funding than those which contradict it. Researchers who do speak out against the climate orthodoxy (or indeed any powerful vested interest) suffer cancellation and censorship, damage to their reputation and career prospects, and loss of funding.

The oft-repeated claim¹ that 97% or more of scientists support the AGW hypothesis has been comprehensively refuted on account of methodological problems, misinterpretation, misrepresentation and unwarranted assumptions. Many of the scientists who were claimed to endorse AGW have vehemently denied this and some have even taken legal action to dissociate their names from such claims. Space here does not permit a full exposition of the grounds for doubting the claimed 97% AGW consensus but such analyses may be readily found online.

Validity of Contrarian Opinion

AGW protagonists analysing lists of climate sceptics often attack signatories on certain spurious grounds, which may be rebutted as follows:

- The person is not a climate expert or hasn't published peer-reviewed climate science papers:
 - Experienced academics are perfectly capable of discerning methodological and other problems in other fields. They are also more than likely conversant with the aforementioned truth-distorting pressures brought to bear upon academics and researchers.
- The person is deceased or too old and out-of-touch to hold an up-to-date opinion:
 - A deadist/ageist, *ad hominem* generalisation and a logical fallacy. Older, experienced individuals can be perfectly capable of holding rational viewpoints and critiquing the research of others.
- The person has ties with vested interests such as the fossil fuel industry:
 - The implication being that 'he who pays the piper calls the tune', but the same accusation can be levelled against climate scientists who receive funding to support climate orthodoxy. Alternatively, one could argue that being funded does not necessarily prevent researchers from speaking the truth but again, this argument can be applied equally to both warmists and sceptics. The net effect is to render the argument invalid—instead, the scientific arguments and counter-arguments must be examined on their own merits, not dismissed on *ad hominem* grounds.
- The person has ideological reasons for rejecting AGW:
 - When one appreciates how oppressive, anti-human, 'Net-Zero' measures are deeply underpinned by the AGW narrative, and given ample evidence that the so-called 'climate crisis' is contrived and politically motivated, it is entirely understandable that climate sceptics have ideological objections.

Notes

The scientist lists are alphabetically ordered by surname (excluding prefixes such as 'van', 'de', 'le', and suffixes such as Jnr., Sr., etc.). The list is unlikely ever to be complete.

¹ John Cook *et al*, 2016. *Consensus on consensus: a synthesis of consensus estimates on human-caused global warming*. Environ. Res. Lett. 11 048002. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/11/4/048002>

Climate Sceptics

Every care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of the information presented but no liability is accepted for any errors or omissions. Additional biographical details may have been garnered from university faculty pages, Wikipedia, DeSmog's [Climate Disinformation Database](#), and elsewhere.

Some individuals may have additional or unlisted qualifications (for example, most university professors hold a doctorate but not all such qualifications are shown).

Entries suffixed [C] have had their title and/or qualifications searched or verified.

Entries suffixed [P] are known to have published peer-reviewed articles on climate science. Note that the absence of a [P] flag does not necessarily mean that the person has not published peer-reviewed papers.

The Lists

For ease of maintenance, the actual names are stored in linked files:

The Complete List

Every person in the database. Please see the file "[Climate Sceptics - complete list.pdf](#)"

The Top-Twenty(-ish) List

Scientists with a rating of four stars and higher. Please see the file "[Climate Sceptics - top twenty\(-ish\).pdf](#)"

The IPCC List

Scientists who have worked for the IPCC. Please see the file "[Climate Sceptics - IPCC.pdf](#)"

Climate Science

For a sample of some of the scientific publications which question climate change orthodoxy, please see the file "[Climate Science - bibliography.pdf](#)".

The Database and Web App

Details of climate sceptics and their published science and various public declarations are now held in a master relational database, for which there is an interactive [online web app](#).