



The lost science of climatology

Chris de Freitas

The absurdity of the prevailing politically correct view on global warming was nowhere more clearly revealed than in the declaration by the G8 summit leaders: "We recognise the scientific view that the increase in global average temperature above pre-industrial levels ought not to exceed 2 degrees [Celsius]."

The absurdity is in the belief that a) global climate can be controlled by man; and b) a slight rise in average global temperature is a bad thing.

One wonders about the quality of the advice on which the G8 leaders rely and the sanity of the climate science advisers whose climatology has become a shocking example of politics being used to drive science.

The advice emanates from vociferous members of the global warming industry set on promoting predetermined conclusions that are not supported by empirical data or real-world observations. The science they rely on is all about the percentage of

scientists who agree with them and the desire to use claims of consensus to suppress quality control in climate research.

Climatology has become a sad case of a scientific discipline that has in the main ceased to be scientific.

Unscientific

Thirty years ago global carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuels were increasing at a rate of about 400 million tonnes a year. It was assumed that this was the prime contributor to the observed increase in global temperatures. On this basis the carbon dioxide data were used in climate model projections for future global warming.

By 2002, the global rate of CO₂ emissions jumped to a new rate of increase of more than one billion tonnes of CO₂ a year. Remarkably, this increase of more than two and a half times had no identifiable effect on the rate of atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration increase, which remained constant at just under 2ppmv per year. At the same time the rise in mean global temperature rise slowed

and shows signs of falling.

A similar thing happened from 1940-80 during the post-World War II industrial boom when carbon dioxide increased rapidly but was accompanied by 40 years of global cooling. On the other hand, there was a distinct global warm period in medieval times when carbon dioxide levels were much lower than they are now.

CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere is currently higher than at any time in the past 600,000 years, yet global temperature was much higher during all the major warm interglacial periods that occurred during this time, despite much lower levels of carbon dioxide.

CO₂ highs

From all this it is clear that warming and CO₂ are not well correlated. Empirical data completely falsifies the expectation of a dangerous rise in global temperatures from growing CO₂ emissions. More importantly it is clear that emission-control initiatives are a costly exercise providing no climatic benefit,

but harm the global economy with higher energy and food prices.

The G8 leaders should have heard by now that the basis for the longstanding claim that CO₂ is a major driver of global climate is being questioned; along with it the hitherto assumed need for costly measures to restrict CO₂ emissions.

Warming hysteria

If they have not heard, it is because of the din of global warming hysteria that relies on the logical fallacy of "argument from ignorance" and predictions of computer models.

Closer to home the worry is the same. That there is apparently not one government scientist in New Zealand associated with climate issues who is willing to speak out on global warming alarmism with some sense of balance or with an appearance of an open mind says a lot about how the country is governed.

Dr Chris de Freitas is a climate scientist at the University of Auckland

c.defreitas@auckland.ac.nz