

1 James K.T. Hunter (State Bar No. 73369)
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, 13th Floor
2 Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: (310) 277-6910
3 Facsimile: (310) 201-0760
E-mail: jhunter@pszjlaw.com

4 Attorney for Petitioner,
5 Government Accountability & Oversight, P.C.

6
7 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
8 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT**

9 GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY)
10 & OVERSIGHT, P.C.,)

11 Petitioner,)

12 v.)

13 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF)
14 CALIFORNIA,)

15 Respondent.)
16)
17)

Case No. 20STCP01226

**DECLARATION OF RICHARD LINDZEN
IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT**

Trial Date: September 14, 2021 (*Reserved*)

Time: 9:30 a.m.

Place: Dept. 82

Petition filed: April 1, 2020

18 I, Richard Lindzen, declare:

19 1. I have spent almost my entire life in academia. I have an A.B. degree in physics
20 and a Ph.D. in applied mathematics both from Harvard. My doctoral dissertation (completed in
21 1964) was actually in atmospheric sciences dealing with the interaction of photochemistry,
22 radiation, and dynamics, and, it was in this field that I continued my career. In the course of this
23 career, I have held professorships (including endowed chairs) at 3 of the world's premier
24 universities (the University of Chicago, Harvard, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
25 During the late 1960's, I was also a visiting professor in UCLA's Department of Meteorology. I
26 was elected to both the National Academy of Science, and the American Academy of Arts and
27 Sciences. I am a fellow of the American Meteorological Society, the American Geophysical
28 Union and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In my long career, I have

DECLARATION OF RICHARD LINDZEN IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT

1 never seen an issue as bizarre as the current obsession with allegedly catastrophic climate
2 change. I make this declaration in support of the Petition for Writ filed by Petitioner Government
3 Accountability & Oversight, P.C. ("GAO") in the above-captioned proceeding. Except as
4 qualified, I make this declaration based on my personal and firsthand knowledge of those facts
5 hereinafter set forth and could and would testify competently thereto under oath if called as a
6 witness.

7 2. Over 30 years ago, when this issue first appeared in the public arena, many senior
8 scientists throughout the world were appalled at the naïve approach to climate. Here was one of
9 the world's most complex systems, and we were asked to believe that it was totally characterized
10 by a single ill-defined and poorly measured metric, globally averaged temperature anomaly
11 (incorrectly referred to as the Earth's temperature), and controlled by a single relatively minor
12 factor, the concentration of carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere. CO₂ was declared a
13 pollutant despite the fact that reducing its concentration by a bit more than half would end
14 advanced life forms on Earth. If one finds this surprising, I recommend finding any elementary
15 biology text and look up 'photosynthesis.' However, it was equally clear that the government
16 funding agencies were supportive of this picture. Support was ended for those questioning the
17 narrative. Publication became extremely difficult. When I managed to get papers accepted by
18 the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, the editors responsible for the review of
19 these papers were promptly dismissed.

20 3. The Climategate emails clearly illustrated how the enthusiasts for the narrative
21 orchestrated such outrageous behavior. Unlike virtually any serious scientific subject, debate
22 was largely forbidden. The science was formally designated as 'settled,' and the public was
23 assured (to quote from Newsweek in 1988) that all scientists agreed. It should be noted that in
24 1990, climate was still a small field with few departments involved. However, in the 1990's
25 funding for climate related 'science' was vastly increased leading to a comparable increase in the
26 number of individuals who self-designated as climate scientists and who understood that their
27 funding was predicated by the narrative of dangerous climate change. Those questioning the
28 narrative were commonly referred to as 'deniers' analogous to holocaust deniers. At the same

1 time, the narrative of global warming became, in the political sphere, a crisis and an 'existential'
2 threat.

3 4. The relation of the science and the political narrative is well illustrated by the
4 reception of the third report of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (generally
5 referred to as the IPCC; it is a report that international organizations treat as the basic reference).
6 The IPCC has three working groups, but only one (WG1) deals with the science. I was a lead
7 author on the section dealing with atmospheric processes.

8 5. Although we were instructed to avoid being overly critical of models, we were, on
9 the whole, accurate and we avoided saying anything that was overtly untrue. The WG1 report,
10 however, was over 1000 pages long and had no index. I think it is fair to say that it was not
11 really meant to be read. So, in addition to this report, there is a summary for policymakers. This
12 is a much shorter report put together by government representatives and a few scientists. This
13 summary tends to emphasize danger more than the full report does, but, it too, is rarely read.
14 Finally, there is a one sentence press release that issues what ends up being the iconic statement
15 for the whole report. In the case of the third assessment, this statement claimed that there was
16 now high confidence that most of the increase in the global mean temperature anomaly (now
17 referred to as global temperature) since about 1950 was due to man's activities. Even this claim
18 was unjustified. It assumed that models accurately displayed natural internal variability.
19 However, the fact that the temperature index remained essentially flat between 1998 and 2015
20 clearly indicated that there was indeed something at least as important as man's activities.
21 Moreover, careful analyses (for example Larminat, 2016) showed that a more careful analysis
22 led to the conclusion that man's activities were a minor factor. That said, the iconic statement
23 itself was far from alarming. The increase in temperature was small (ca 0.5C), and 51% of this
24 was essentially negligible. The observed increase was most consistent with a low sensitivity to
25 increasing CO2 with the small warming probably beneficial. Indeed, the predictions of the IPCC
26 models for subsequent years all proved greatly excessive. One would never know this from the
27 political response. Instead, Senators McCain and Lieberman declared the IPCC statement to
28 constitute a 'smoking gun' that demanded immediate action to decarbonize (as advocates

1 commonly refer to eliminating CO2), thus confusing the harmless, odorless, biologically
2 essential gas with soot. This situation has only gotten worse since then. Professor Steven
3 Koonin, in a recent book (“Unsettled”) has carefully documented the absence of apocalyptic
4 claims in the official documents. The evidence for an existential crisis is virtually nil.

5 6. So where does this leave us? Under the assumption that CO2 emissions are
6 responsible for an alleged climate crisis, we are proposing policies that call for a radical
7 revolution of the energy economy and indeed the economy as a whole. Left largely unsaid is that
8 the proposed policies will have virtually no impact on climate regardless of what one thinks
9 about climate. That is to say, we are pursuing a purely symbolic response to a wholly
10 improbable crisis. However, also unsaid is that the proposed policies represent a very real threat
11 to the economy, the reliability and affordability of energy, and, for the billions of people in the
12 developing world, we are foreclosing the opportunities for a better life.

13 7. Given the implications of proposed policies, the public clearly is entitled to a full
14 disclosure of what is at stake. It is important to understand why institutions like Emmett Center
15 appear to support what is a painful but purely symbolic policy, and what Prof. Carlson is offering
16 them. Given the vital public interest in such matters, and widespread activity on behalf of the
17 policies, it is hard to believe that academic freedom is at stake. Whether the interest of the
18 university in fund raising supersedes the public interest in why such policies are being imposed
19 on them seems doubtful. Indeed, depending on what is found, interference with university fund
20 raising might not always be a bad thing.

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and
22 correct, and that this declaration was executed on July __, 2021 at Paris, France.

23
24 _____
Richard Lindzen
25
26
27
28