

1030

1031 STATEMENT OF DR. S. FRED SINGER PRESIDENT THE SCIENCE AND
1032 ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROJECT FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA

1033

1034 Dr. SINGER. I wish I could give as emotionally charged a
1035 presentation as my colleague has just done. But I'll try to
1036 be calm and factual.

1037 I'm a scientist who has worked for a number of years on
1038 atmospheric and ozone problems.

1039 My relevant biography is given in the testimony. I've also
1040 attached to my testimony a recent peer-reviewed article that
1041 I've written on the ozone issue. It lists further
1042 peer-reviewed articles that I've written in the last few
1043 years.

1044 I'm very distressed that Congresswoman Rivers was not able
1045 to find some of my peer-reviewed articles. I think there are
1046 about 200 of these in the literature and I'd be glad to
1047 supply a list.

1048 But perhaps it's her staff that's at fault. So I should
1049 not blame her for this.

1050 I was asked to supply some examples of lack of scientific
1051 integrity in dealing with the ozone CFC issue.

1052 I thought I would list about half a dozen of these and
1053 you'll find them listed in my testimony and hopefully,
1054 thoroughly explained. These are cases where the science was

1055 twisted, shaped, in order to gain certain ideological
1056 objectives. There was never a case where the actual facts
1057 were, shall we say, misstated, where there was actual wrong
1058 information presented.

1059 But it was presented in such a way as to give a misleading
1060 impression.

1061 You, ladies and gentlemen, here are being today misled,
1062 bamboozled, and otherwise manipulated by some of the
1063 testimony that you've just heard.

1064 My job today, I think, is to expose this to you, and I'd
1065 like to do that. I hope there will be many questions to me
1066 so that I'll have a chance to comment in some detail on the
1067 way in which the scientific information has been
1068 misrepresented to you in order to achieve certain political
1069 objectives.

1070 I'm fortunate to have Dr. Baliunas here. She's the
1071 distinguished research astrophysicist at the Harvard
1072 Observatory. She'll be addressing the issue of ozone
1073 depletion, or so-called ozone depletion.

1074 But let me address the issue which is an important one of
1075 the possible or claimed rise or increase in ultraviolet
1076 radiation.

1077 You know, the people who believe that ozone has been
1078 depleted are looking very, very hard for some evidence for
1079 an increase in ultraviolet radiation to prove that ozone has

1080 been depleted.

1081 They've not been able to find it.

1082 If you look, for example, at Dr. Watson's testimony on
1083 page 7, you'll find some convoluted language, saying that
1084 various factors have precluded the unequivocal
1085 identification of a long-term trend in surface UV.

1086 What this means is that he has no evidence.

1087 Later on he says, it's highly unlikely that there is no
1088 long-term trend in UV-V.

1089 Again, this means that he has no evidence.

1090 But why doesn't he have any evidence for an increase in
1091 UV? I'll tell you why. Because the evidence we have shows
1092 that UV-V did not increase. It decreased. The evidence was
1093 published and covers the period of 1974 to 1985.

1094 Now let's see how he deals with the evidence, how does he
1095 explain it away.

1096 Well, first he says, the instrument is no good. Bad
1097 calibration. Well, when it's pointed out that the instrument
1098 is okay, then he says, well, okay. The instrument is fine,
1099 but the record is too noisy. The UV goes up and down. You
1100 can't tell if there's a trend.

1101 When you point out that the same argument applies to
1102 ozone, he then goes to the same argument. He says, well,
1103 pollution increased in the atmosphere and that's what
1104 absorbed the UV.

1105 But the EPA tells us that pollution has decreased in the
1106 United States as a result of the Clean Air Act, so that's a
1107 difficult problem for him.

1108 Well, fortunately, to the rescue comes a publication in
1109 Science magazine in 1993, claiming that UV-B, over Toronto
1110 has increased by up to 35 percent per year. 35 percent per
1111 year--that's a very large trend if it goes on for many years.

1112 We examined that paper. By the way, the paper was supposed
1113 to be peer-reviewed. We published a paper in Science showing
1114 that the analysis was incorrect, based on faulty statistics,
1115 and that the trend of UV-B was zero. Zilch. Nothing. Nada.

1116 There was no trend and the paper is wrong. And it's still
1117 being quoted, not only by Dr. Watson, but also in the
1118 scientific assessment of 1994 that has been referred to
1119 earlier.

1120 Well, after he shows that you cannot detect the UV trend,
1121 he then goes to a nonsequitur. If you can't get it here, you
1122 switch to something else.

1123 The nonsequitur is, well, UV-B has increased in the
1124 Antarctic whenever ozone decreased.

1125 Well, of course it would do that if there's a clear sky.
1126 What he doesn't tell you is that as soon as ozone increases,
1127 the UV-B decreases.

1128 In other words, it goes up and it goes down.

1129 But if you look at his testimony, you'll find only

1130 references to cases where the UV-B goes up. It's like
1131 telling you that it gets warmer every July and never tells
1132 you that it gets colder in December.

1133 It leaves you with the impression that this is going to be
1134 a very hot climate some day.

1135 Finally, there's a suggestion that the satellite
1136 instrument, the TOMS instrument, has measured a UV trend on
1137 the surface.

1138 I know something about the instrument. I designed it many
1139 years ago. If you read his testimony carefully, you'll find
1140 out that the UV trend that he talks about is not measured.
1141 It's derived from the TOMS instrument. It is estimated.

1142 In other words, it's calculated. It's not a direct
1143 measurement of UV reaching the surface of the earth. There
1144 simply is no evidence for this. And this is crucial, I
1145 think, because it is UV at the surface of the earth that's
1146 supposed to produce all the harmful health effects that
1147 we're talking about. It's supposed to produce all the skin
1148 cancer that we're talking about, and I hope I'll have a
1149 chance later on to comment on this, but I'd better stop at
1150 this point.

1151 Mr. ROHRBACHER. Do you have a 30-second summary that
1152 you'd like to make?

1153 Dr. SINGER. Yes, only one point here. You often hear the
1154 statement from Dr. Watson and others that the depletion of

1155 ozone is worse than expected. Or that the ozone hole this
1156 year is worse than expected. Or that the increase in UV is
1157 worse than expected.

1158 Expectations are based on theory, on calculation.

1159 If you think about the statement for a minute, it sounds
1160 awful. It's very frightening. Isn't it scary--worse than
1161 expected.

1162 What it really means is that the expectation, the theory,
1163 is wrong. Or the observations are wrong. Or, more likely,
1164 they're both wrong.

1165 Thank you.

1166 Mr. ROHRABACHER. Dr. Albritton?

1167 [The complete statement of Dr. Singer follows:]

1168

1169 *****INSERT*****