

**NIPCC *versus* IPCC:
ABSENCE OF GHG WMG IN 20TH CY
DESTROYS IPCC PROOF FOR AGW**

S Fred Singer



Univ of Virginia and SEPP

ICCC-12

Heartland Int'l Conf on CLIMATE CHANGE

Washington DC, March 23, 2017

Global Temperature: Land-Ocean Index



ICONIC IPCC FIG SHOWS

two 20th -cy sfc wmg [1910-40&1975-2000]

- The earlier wmg is genuine but generally considered of natural origin, unrelated to rising GHG levels. Backed by proxy data [Jacoby-1996- fig16 of HTCS, Mann-1998???
- The later reported wmg is not global-FAKE [NIPCC 2011] but an artifact of the data analyses -disagrees with 8 other datasets.
- Lastly, “pause” shows CO2 ineffective as GHG; mechanism under investigation.

Discrepancies between Data Sets

- Criterion adopted: Temp difference 1995-1942
-

Land-based sfc; Global (IPCC): Diff= $\sim 0.5\text{C}$

» US (GISS): Diff= $\sim \text{zero}$

- **Ocean:** SST (Gouretski GRL 2012) Diff= $\sim \text{zero}$

NMAT (Hadley Centre) Diff= $\sim \text{zero}$

OHC (1997 -1979) “ave” Diff= $< 0.1\text{C}$

- **Atm:** Satellite MSU-LT (1997-79) Diff= $\sim \text{zero}$


Radiosondes (1997-79) Diff= $\sim \text{zero}$

- **Proxies** (mostly land-sfc) Diff= $\sim \text{zero}$



NIPCC [2011] RESULTS

- 1910-40 wmg supported by proxy data
- 1975-00 “global wmg” trend contradicted by 8 datasets: USA sfc, atm, SST, NMAT, extreme temps, solar,
- atm trends [radiosonde&sat;Santer hotspot],
- proxies [withheld by Mann’s *Nature* trick]


AR-IL-IN-IA-KS-MO-NE-OK Number of Record Daily High
Temperatures as of 2012 for **229** USHCN stations with 80+
years




The *Missing* Greenhouse Gas “Hot Spot” All The IPCC Computer Models Predict It; Real World Measurements Do Not Find It




Temperature Changes from more than 30 Years of Satellite Observations








NMAT <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/hadobs/mohmat/>







Monthly Average.

Fig. 16. The climate record as deduced from the width of tree rings. Compared are the ring-width chronology (solid line) and the reconstruction of Arctic annual temperature anomalies (dashed line) [Jacoby et al. 1996, reprinted with permission, (c) American Association for the Advancement of Science]. Note the sharp increase between 1880 and 1940.







S. Fred Singer


NIPCC vs. IPCC

**Addressing the Disparity
between Climate Models and Observations:
Testing the Hypothesis
of Anthropogenic Global Warming**



Interim Science Update
Presented at Majorana Conference in Erice, Sicily
August 2011

- Thus, there is no real evidence at all for GHG wmg; yet IPCC AR4&5 use this later wmg as proof for AGW
- HERE WE TRY TO EXPLAIN WHY THE SURFACE DATA OF 1975-2000 SHOW A GLOBAL WMG THAT DOESN'T EXIST
- -----




Nature — Not Human Activity— Rules the Climate



REPORT OF
THE NONGOVERNMENTAL INTERNATIONAL PANEL
ON CLIMATE CHANGE





SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY PROJECT




Source: JJ Kennedy et al. JGR 2011.

10/29/2011





Stalagmite Records in Oman



^{14}C – a Proxy for Solar Activity
 ^{18}O – a Proxy for Temperature

The stalagmite record shows
a remarkably close
correlation between ^{14}C and
 ^{18}O over a period of more
than 3,000 years.

Thus, a strong association
exists between solar activity
and temperature.

Neff *et al.* (2001)

Why don't we see Greenhouse Warming in the Climate record? Where is it?

After all, CO₂ is a GH gas whose level is increasing

Climate sensitivity much less than IPCC's

Models do not include negative feedbacks

How I became a Skeptic

- **The Early Years (1956 –1988)**
- **GW Promotion And Skepticism (1988)**
- **Sat data: My Doubts Become Stronger (1990)**
- **Proxy data (1996)**
- **UHI And Loss Of Stations**
- **Sea Surface Temperatures (SST) (2005-**
- **Fingerprints (1995-**
- **Negative Feedbacks**
- **Solar Influences**
- **Denial**

Conclusions

- We see no evidence for significant AGW
-
- GH models and observations disagree
-
- Hence, the human contribution to GW is not significant.
-
- And CO₂ is not a pollutant.

Global upwelling radiation in the atmosphere for the
GH-gases H_2O , CO_2 , O_3 and CH_4 at $T=288\text{K}$

