

Welcome to the IPCC Alternative Reality with our Roving Reporter Heidi de Klein

(Heidi de Klein's reporting has shown many attempts
to "hide the decline" in global warming)

Welcome Dr Pachauri, we would like to discuss the findings of the recently released Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) of the 5th Assessment.

Heidi: Why was the SPM released ahead of the actual reports?

Pachauri: Well this is to ensure consistency, so that the Science will match the SPM!

Heidi: We thought the SPM was a summary of the Science not vice versa.

Pachauri: We had an unfortunate incident in the 2001 Third Assessment when the Scientific Report said there was no evidence of human causation. But the SPM said "*There is new and stronger evidence that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities*".

Heidi: But we understood that the evidence for this statement (The Mann Bradley and Hughes "Hockeystick") was discredited in 2006 .

Pachauri: Yes, but you will recall that in 2007 the Fourth Assessment (FAR) we cited all manner of evidence of warming so the report stated that, "*the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely (90% probability) due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations.*" This was a significant change from the 2001 SPM which stated that most of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely (66% probability) to have been due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations.

Heidi: So, Dr Pachauri you are saying that with less evidence, no warming between 2001-2007, you are now more certain that greenhouse gases are warming the climate!

Pachauri: yes, that is correct now in the latest SPM we are 95% certain that human influence on climate caused more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951–2010.

Heidi: Well can we clarify in 2007 there was a 90% probability that *most* of the observed increase in global average temperature was the result of human released CO2 but now there is a 95% probability that *more than half* of the observed increase is the result of human influence. Is *more than half (55%?)*, less than *most (95%?)*. So now you are more confident that there is 40% less human influence?

Pachauri: No! The AR5 is the most thorough and complete study of climate ever produced. It is probably the largest, most comprehensive scientific assessment in history. Not just of climate change, but of any scientific subject.

Heidi: Dr Pachauri, we wonder if there is something unique about 1951, did natural forcing stop that year after dominating for 100 years from the middle of the Little Ice Age?

Pachauri: No! This coincides with the great increase in post war industrialisation and major increase in CO2 output.

Heidi: But, Dr. Pachauri the climate cooled from 1951 to 1978. The only warming correlative with CO2 occurred between 1978 and 1997 and there has been no warming for the last 16 years. Using normal math this is only 19 years out of 63 or 30% so that there is a 70% chance that CO2 and the global average temperature are not correlated. So can you explain how you can be 95% confident that the warming results from human influence?

Pachauri: Well our models are unequivocal that there is significant warming from human released CO2 and we are confident that if the heat is not appearing in the atmosphere it must be going somewhere like the oceans.

Heidi: Has it occurred to your researchers that the failure of the models to predict the atmospheric temperature is because their assumptions are wrong!

Pachauri: We are very confident that the climate models are correct, although they are unable to detect small scale variability such as the hiatus and we will see a return to more rapid and serious warming in the future. We are confident that the lack of correspondence with our models is the result of aerosols and unrecorded volcanic activity.

Heidi: You mean by the hiatus that there has been no warming for 16 years -- is this not another effort by climatologists to "hide the decline"? You are asking us to believe that warming has been depressed by unobserved and unrecorded aerosols as well as volcanic activity which have mysteriously escaped our notice. Then, remarkably, the balance of the heat, by some very unusual mechanism, yet to be explained, has vanished into the deep ocean -- very conveniently! -- where it can not be observed or measured. This hardly seems like the scientific method, depending on observation measurement and experiment and does not indicate a 95% confidence in human influence.

Pachauri: Let me assert that this study has been undertaken by the World's leading climatologists who believe that human released CO₂ is a danger to the planet and must be controlled. CO₂ is at the highest levels in the last 800,000 years.

Heidi: We find it curious that you select the last 800,000 years of the Quaternary and ignore 550 million years of geological history. Peer reviewed documents show that CO₂ is actually significantly depleted in the Quaternary relative to earlier epochs. This raises quite fundamental issues regarding your assertions of warming.

Pachauri: The evidence that CO₂ will cause atmospheric warming is unequivocal and a fundamental result of long wave infrared radiation following physical laws as described by Callendar.

Heidi: We can document from thorough and repeated peer reviewed studies that the CO₂ content of the Cambrian was at least 17 to 18 times Quaternary levels. According to IPCC forecasts life in the Cambrian would be sufficiently untenable that the wonderful evolutionary explosion of phyla in the Cambrian could never have occurred. In all probability the planet would be as dead as Mars. On the contrary Cambrian oceans enjoyed an environment not greatly different from our modern oceans and a few exceptionally long lived groups which have almost identical anatomy and physiology to their Cambrian ancestors persist in our modern oceans off Japan and Australia. This is prima facie evidence that the effectiveness of CO₂ as a climate driver must be minimal.

Pachauri: Our studies indicate that the atmosphere is highly sensitive to its CO₂ content and warming is inevitable and will effect climate for thousands of years to come if not in the short term.

Heidi: We wondered why IPCC having in the past calculated a specific range for climate sensitivity which is presumably the basis for climate model projections. Now the SPM states “No best estimate for equilibrium climate sensitivity can now be given because of a lack of agreement on values across assessed lines of evidence and studies.” Does this not invalidate the entire hypothesis that models provide a realistic view of climate?

Pachauri: I believe I have fully made my points already. Was I not clear on something?

Heidi: Thank you very much Dr Pachauri for your input and very high confidence in the accuracy of the Summary, however, I thought it would be informative to have Dr McKittrick's perspective.

McKittrick: SPM in a nutshell: Since we started in 1990 we were right about the Arctic, wrong about the Antarctic, wrong about the tropical troposphere, wrong about the surface, wrong about hurricanes, wrong about the Himalayas, wrong about sensitivity, clueless on clouds and useless on regional trends. And on that basis we're 95% confident we're right.

Heidi de Klein: only in the alternative reality of the IPCC can total uncertainty become 95% confidence.