

Links to Evidence

Dr David Evans (david.evans@sciencespeak.com)

24 July 2008

Introduction

This is a brief list of links to some of the easier-to-understand evidence behind the four points in my article of Friday 18 July 2008 in *The Australian* newspaper,

www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,24036736-7583,00.html.

1. The Greenhouse Signature is Missing

Here is a simple briefing on this topic that draws its data from documents from the two most authoritative alarmist sources, the IPCC and the US CCSP:

www.lavoisier.com.au/papers/articles/DavidEvansmissingsignature.pdf

2. There is No Evidence That Carbon Emissions Caused the Recent Global Warming

For the notable lack of evidence that carbon emissions causes global warming, you might look through the relevant chapter of the latest assessment report from the IPCC (AR4, 2007)

ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/Report/AR4WG1_Print_Ch09.pdf

and note that you cannot actually find any.

If you are more ambitious you might also look at these two calculations. Both demonstrate that the expected temperature rise in the event that the concentration of atmospheric carbon doubles (which will happen on current trends around 2100 AD) is around 0.3°C — only 10% of the 3.2°C that the IPCC predicts.

- www.aps.org/units/fps/newsletters/200807/monckton.cfm. Some parts of this paper are written at a level of 1st year physics, but even if the calculations are too tough to follow there is a lot of non-mathematical material that might give you some insights into the theoretical problems with the IPCC case. This paper is sort of peer reviewed—it was written by a journalist and its status is a bit controversial.
- met.hu/doc/idojaras/vol111001_01.pdf. This was produced by a NASA mathematician, and contains high level maths and physics. It is the first detailed calculation of the expected temperature increase that goes to the trouble of solving the problem using a realistic atmosphere. He gets a temperature increase for carbon doubling of 0.24°C (page 22), which is much lower than the 3°C that NASA

previously calculated by assuming that the atmosphere went up forever. It makes the problem much easier mathematically if you pretend the atmosphere is of infinite height, but it turns out this made a huge difference to the answer—who would have guessed? It is peer reviewed.

3. Global Temperatures Stopped Rising in 2001

There are four bodies around the world that produce global temperature records. Note that satellite data only goes back to 1979.

- Remote Sensing Systems in California. Uses only satellite data:
www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/RSSglobe.html.
- University of Alabama in Huntsville (UAH). Uses only satellite data:
www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/UAHMSUglobe.html.
- The Hadley Centre in the UK uses a mix of satellite data and land based thermometers: www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/HadCRUG.html.
- The Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) at NASA uses land thermometers (plus a few ocean thermometers), but not satellite data (oddly enough, for NASA):
www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/GISSglobal.html.

JunkScience (despite their name) do a good factual coverage of temperature data:

www.junkscience.com/MSU_Temps/Warming_Look.html.

To get a graphic idea of why satellite temperature data is trusted more than land based thermometers, see www.surfacestations.org/odd_sites.htm or

wattsupwiththat.wordpress.com/test/.

4. New Ice Core Data

There is lots of stuff on the web on the 800 year lag of carbon behind temperatures in the ice cores, but no single value-free data source. Maybe look at the abstract of the single most significant paper, which came out in 2003:

icebubbles.ucsd.edu/Publications/CaillonTermIII.pdf

And here is a colourful but informative and link-filled discussion of the ice-core issue:

motls.blogspot.com/2006/07/carbon-dioxide-and-temperatures-ice.html.