

Summary Speech on Global Warming, 2011

Dr David Evans

“NO CARBON TAX” PROTEST IN PERTH, 10:30 AM WED 23 MAR 2011, ON THE STEPS OF WA’S PARLIAMENT HOUSE.

PUBLIC FORUM ARRANGED BY THE COUNCIL FOR THE NATIONAL INTEREST (CNI), WA COMMITTEE, MONDAY 30 MAY 7:30, ROYAL PERTH YACHT CLUB.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr David Evans consulted full-time for the Australian Greenhouse Office (now the Department of Climate Change) from 1999 to 2005, and part-time 2008 to 2010, modeling Australia’s carbon in plants, debris, mulch, soils, and forestry and agricultural products. Evans is a mathematician and engineer, with six university degrees including a PhD from Stanford University in electrical engineering. The evidence supporting the idea that CO₂ emissions were the main cause of global warming reversed itself from 1995 to 2006, causing Evans to move from being a warmist to a skeptic.

Inquiries to david.evans@sciencespeak.com.

TEXT OF SPEECH

The debate about global warming has reached ridiculous proportions. It is full of micro-thin half truths, misunderstandings, and exaggerations. I am a scientist. I was on the carbon gravy train, I understand the evidence, I was once an alarmist, but now am a skeptic. Watching this issue unfold has been amusing but, lately, worrying. This issue is tearing society apart, making fools and liars out of our politicians.

The idea that carbon dioxide is the *main* cause of the recent global warming is based on a guess that was proved false by empirical evidence during the 1990s. But the gravy train was too big, with too many jobs, industries, trading profits, political careers, and the possibility of world government and total control riding on the outcome. So rather than admit they were wrong, the governments, and their climate scientists, now outrageously maintain the fiction that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant.

Let's be perfectly clear. Carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas, and other things being equal, the more carbon dioxide in the air, the warmer the planet. Every bit of carbon dioxide that we emit warms the planet. But the issue is not **whether** carbon dioxide warms the planet, but by **how much**.

Most scientists, on both sides, also agree on how much a given increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide raises the planet's temperature, **if just the extra carbon dioxide is considered**. These calculations come from laboratory experiments; the basic physics have been well known for a century.

The disagreement comes about what happens next.

The planet reacts to that extra carbon dioxide, which changes everything. Most critically, the extra warmth causes more water to evaporate from the oceans. But does this extra water hang around and increase the height of the moist air in the atmosphere, or does it simply create more clouds and rain? Back in 1980, when the carbon dioxide theory started, no one knew. The alarmists guessed that it would increase the height of moist air around the planet, which would warm the planet even further, because moist air is also a greenhouse gas that blankets the planet.

This is the [core idea of every official climate model](#): for each bit of warming due to carbon dioxide, they claim it ends up causing two extra bits of warming due to the extra moist air. The climate models **amplify** the carbon dioxide warming by a factor of three – so two thirds of their projected warming is due to extra moist air (and related factors); only one third is due to extra carbon dioxide.

That's the core of the issue. All the disagreements and misunderstanding spring from this. The alarmist case is based on this guess about moisture in the atmosphere, but there is **simply no evidence for this amplification** that is at the core of their alarmism. And there never was any such evidence; it was simply assumed to be true, and they expected to find the evidence later. 'Later' arrived around 1995, and they found that they had guessed wrong.

Weather balloons had been measuring the atmosphere since the 1960s, many thousands of them every year. The climate models **all** predict that as the planet warms due to a thickening of the carbon dioxide blanket, a hotspot of moist air will develop over the tropics about 10km up, as the layer of moist air expands upwards into the cool dry air above, thickening the blanket of moist air that does most of the job of keeping the planet warm. During the warming of the late 1970s, 80s, and 90s, the [weather balloons found no hotspot](#). None at all. Not even a small one. This evidence proves that the climate models are fundamentally flawed, that they greatly overestimate the temperature increases due to carbon dioxide.

This evidence first became clear around the mid 1990s.

At this point official "climate science" stopped being a science. In science empirical evidence always trumps theory, no matter how much you are [in love with the theory](#). If theory and evidence disagree, real scientists scrap the theory. But official climate science ignored the crucial weather balloon evidence, and other subsequent evidence that backs it up, and instead clung to their carbon dioxide theory – that

just happens to keep them in well-paying jobs with lavish research grants, and gives great political power to their government masters.

There are now several independent pieces of evidence showing that the earth responds to the warming due to extra carbon dioxide by **dampening** that warming. Every long-lived natural system behaves this way, counteracting any disturbance, otherwise the system would be unstable. The climate system is no exception, and now we can prove it.

But the alarmists say the exact opposite, that the climate system amplifies any warming due to extra carbon dioxide, and is potentially unstable. It is no surprise that their [predictions of planetary temperature made in 1988](#) to the US Congress and in the peer reviewed literature, and again in 1990, 1995, and 2001, have all proved much higher than reality. Their models have also failed the crucial test of predicting temperatures.

They keep lowering the temperature increases they expect, from 0.30°C per decade in 1990, to 0.20°C per decade in 2001, and now 0.15°C per decade – yet they have the gall to tell us “it’s worse than expected”. These people are not scientists. They over-estimate the temperature increases due to carbon dioxide, selectively deny evidence, and now they conceal the truth.

One way they conceal is [how they measure temperature](#).

The official thermometers are often located in the warm exhaust of air conditioning outlets, over hot tarmac at airports where they get blasts of hot air from jet engines, at wastewater plants where they get warmth from decomposing sewage, or in hot cities choked with cars and buildings. Global warming is measured in tenths of a degree, so any extra heating nudge is important. In the United States, in a survey by volunteers, nearly 90% of official thermometers violate official siting requirements that they not be too close to an artificial heating source.

The misrepresentation is that they use selected thermometers in artificially warming locations, and call the results “global” warming. They say that 2010 was the warmest recent year, but that was only true at various airports, near selected air conditioners, and in certain car parks.

Global temperature is also measured by satellites, which measure nearly the whole planet 24/7 without bias. The satellites say the hottest recent year was 1998, and that since 2001 the global temperature has leveled off.

So it’s a question of trust. Why does the western climate establishment present only the surface thermometer results and not mention the satellite results? And why do they put their thermometers near artificial heating sources? This is so obviously a scam now.

The earth has been in a [warming trend](#) since the depth of the Little Ice Age around 1680. Human emissions of carbon dioxide were negligible before 1850 and nearly all came after the Second World War, so human carbon dioxide cannot possibly have caused the trend. Within the trend, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation causes alternating global warming and cooling for 25 – 30 years at a go in each

direction. We have just finished a warming phase, so [expect mild global cooling](#) for the next two decades.

We are now at an extraordinary juncture. Official western climate science, which is funded and directed entirely by western governments, promotes a theory that is based on a guess about moist air that is now a known falsehood. Governments gleefully accept their advice, because the only ways to curb emissions are to impose taxes and extend government control over all energy use. And to curb emissions on a world scale might even lead to world government – how exciting for the political class!

A carbon tax? Even if Australia stopped emitting all carbon dioxide tomorrow, completely shut up shop and went back to the stone age, according to the official government climate models it would be cooler in 2050 by about [0.015 degrees](#) than if we kept on emitting. But their models exaggerate tenfold – in fact our sacrifices would make the planet in 2050 a mere [0.0015 degrees](#) cooler!

Finally, to those of you who still believe the planet is in danger from our carbon dioxide emissions: Sorry, but you've been had. Yes carbon dioxide is a cause of global warming, but it's so minor it's not worth doing much about.