

Corbella: Pause in global warming upsets religious believers

By Licia Corbella, Calgary Herald May 17, 2014 10:19 AM



Ross McKitrick is best known as the Canadian professor who took the so-called hockey stick graph — which is worshipped unquestioningly by anthropogenic global warming religionists — and snapped it over his scientific data like a piece of kindling.

Now the environmental economics professor at the University of Guelph is putting his data crunching prowess to work on global warming climate models and is similarly destroying the credibility of these forecasts — which are looking less reliable than tarot card reading.

Earlier this week, McKitrick ably showed a crowd of about 300 people at a joint Friends of Science/Frontier Centre for Public Policy luncheon in Calgary how the gap is growing wider and longer between what global warming models predicted and what has actually happened to the world's climate.

In a discussion entitled “The ‘Pause’ in Global Warming: Climate Policy Implications,” McKitrick stated that “it’s not so much the pause but the flaws that matter” most with regard to general circulation models or global climate models (GCMs).

McKitrick showed a lot of graphs and mathematical equations that cannot be adequately reproduced in this space (but can be viewed on the Friends of Science website) which clearly show that since 1994, warming on Earth has levelled off and that the trend actually “goes negative in 2001” to the present day.

McKitrick’s data all comes from what is called HadCRUT — which is the data of monthly digital temperature records formed by combining the sea surface temperature records collected by the Hadley Centre of the UK Met Office and the land surface air temperature records compiled by the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia. (This is the university that was engulfed in controversy in recent years after its CRU emails were hacked and it was shown that these climate scientists wanted to find ways “to hide the decline” in global temperatures. But I digress.)

To his credit, McKitrick pointed out to the crowd that on its own, the 20-year pause in warming “means nothing.”

But then he showed some graphs which show observed temperatures with climate models, and something strange happens. From 1890 to 1990, the maximum amount of time in which the two lines don't cross was nine years, way back in the late 1800s. Currently, the two lines between climate models and real world temperatures haven't crossed for 14 years and climbing.

"This is the real issue," says McKittrick. "At the point when the modelers could no longer peek at the answer, they started getting it wrong. Significantly wrong."

Between 1990 and 2014, CO2 levels increased by 13 per cent. The climate models all agree on what should have happened, which is why the climate religionists at the CRU wanted to cook the books to "hide the decline."

Fully 111 out of 114 models touted by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicted too much warming.

The models predicted warming of 0.21 C per decade — which is more than four times the actual observed level.

As Hans von Storch of the Institute of Coastal Sciences in Germany stated recently: "If things continue as they have been, in five years, at the latest, we will need to acknowledge that something is fundamentally wrong with our climate models. A 20-year pause in global warming does not occur in a single modelled scenario," said von Storch, a renowned "consensus" climate scientist.

Indeed, last year, von Storch said: "We're facing a puzzle. Recent CO2 emissions have actually risen even more steeply than we feared. As a result, according to most climate models, we should have seen temperatures rise by around 0.25 degrees Celsius over the past 10 years. That hasn't happened. In fact, the increase over the last 15 years was just 0.06 degrees Celsius — a value very close to zero."

Judith Curry, climatologist and chair of earth and atmospheric sciences at Georgia Tech, says: "If the 20-year threshold is reached for the pause, this will lead inescapably to the conclusion that the climate model sensitivity to CO2 is too large. Further, 20 years is approaching the length of the warming period from 1976-2000 that is the main smoking gun for AGW (man made global warming.)"

Right. Twenty years of warming caused these scientists to claim that a global crisis was imminent. Will 20 years of no warming or even cooling mean the crisis is averted? Don't count on that.

McKittrick points out that some climate scientists are scrambling to explain the pause. They're saying that the oceans are absorbing more heat than expected, or that there are changes in Pacific wind patterns, or that there is poor coverage of the Arctic surface or on declining stratospheric water vapour.

“These are all new hypotheses,” points out McKittrick, “yet the science was supposedly ‘settled’ over a decade ago.”

Touche!

Of course, there are social and policy implications if the climate models that have predicted catastrophe are proven wrong.

Apparently, “within standard uncertainties, Integrated Assessment Modelling (IAM) estimates of the social cost of carbon falls somewhere between \$0 and \$206 per tonne of CO₂.” The crowd laughed at that slide.

Clearly, the “settled science” was predicting too much warming in response to CO₂ emissions. McKittrick says within the next two to four years, this will be “decisively confirmed” unless it is “explained away.”

In other words, expect new theories. After all, there’s a reason AGW religionists all talk about climate change now instead of global warming: they have too much at stake to let their gravy train crash and burn like the credibility of their climate models.

Licia Corbella is a columnist and the editorial page editor.

A scan of the paper version of this article is [here](#).

The Calgary Herald digital version is [here](#).

The Friends of Science 11th Annual Luncheon with Dr. Ross McKittrick page is [here](#).