

”

Al Gore and Michael Mann have been mostly counterproductive as key players in the polarisation of the climate debate.

”

The GWPF membership, on the other hand, has been entirely, seriously, and studiously, fair and balanced. Polarization of the so-called climate debate is something they would never condone.

When I want to blame player counterproductivity on someone, I always reach for Al Gore and da Mann too.



daveburton says:

Your comment is awaiting moderation.

June 27, 2018 at 6:53 pm

I wrote, “*Even in 1988 it was common knowledge that CO₂ (the most important of the GHGs they discussed) has a logarithmically diminishing effect on temperature.*”

ATTP replied, “*I’m pretty sure that Hansen was well aware of this.*”

I then quoted Hansen 1988 saying, “*the assumed annual growth averages about 1.5% of current emissions, so the net greenhouse forcing increases exponentially,*” and noted, “We all know that’s wrong.”

But izen proved me wrong, saying “*it is not false.*”

So obviously not “all” of us know it. But I know it, and Ken knows it, and presumably even Hansen knows it, now.

izen continued, “*Read more carefully, Hansen says... “net greenhouse forcing increases exponentially“ ... Not CO₂ forcing, the NET forcing, so including water vapour as a positive feedback and CFCs...*”

[Water vapor feedback](#) doesn’t turn an asymptotically linear forcing into an exponential one. It just makes the linear slope steeper.

CFCs are another example of the many glaring errors in that paper. The [Montreal Protocol](#) was agreed upon in 1987, and the [Vienna Convention](#) in 1985, so there’s no excuse for Hansen 1988 (published August 1988) nevertheless projecting exponential increases in CFCs. That’s yet another way in which Hansen and his seven co-authors were **wildly wrong about almost everything.**

izen continued, “*we are seeing unprecedented warming, sea level rise... over the last 30 years...*”

Unprecedented? Really? Which of these two half-century temperature graphs do you think is “unprecedented,” and which is natural?

http://www.sealevel.info/1895-1946_1957-2008_temperature-compare.html

http://www.sealevel.info/1895-1946_1957-2008_temperature-compare.png

And sea-level rise? Do you really think the right-hand bits of the following graphs show “unprecedented” sea-level rise?

http://sealevel.info/Wismar_Honolulu_Oslo_Stockholm_vs_CO2_annot1.png

The first two graphs show typical trends from especially high-quality measurement records, on opposite sides of the Earth (12 time zones apart, during summer), at sites little affected by known distortions like tectonic instability, vertical land motion, and ENSO.

The last two graphs are from two sites which experience so much PGR that “sea-level rise” is negative, illustrating the fact that the global trend is so tiny that in many places it is insignificant, because it is dwarfed by common coastal processes, like

vertical land motion, sedimentation, and erosion.

However, when I show climate alarmists graphs like those, they usually accuse me of cherry-picking. So here's NOAA's full 2016 list of 375 long term trend tide stations:

http://sealevel.info/MSL_global_thumbnails5.html

As you can see, not of the best-quality, long, sea-level measurement records show appreciable acceleration since the 1920s, or before.

izen continued, "...the egregious distortion of Hansen you attempt..."

I distorted nothing, and you surely know it. That sort of nastiness is destructive to scientific dialog. Please stop it.



Everett F Sargent says:

June 27, 2018 at 6:57 pm

DB sez ...

"Under their Scenario A, emissions would have increased by 1.5% per year, totaling 47% in 26 years."

$1.015^{26} \sim 47\%$ increase in 26 years

Wrong answer! 😊

Did you even read the paper? Because it said quite clearly ...

"Specifically, in scenario A CO₂ increases as observed by Keeling for the interval 1958-1981 [Keeling et al., 1982] and subsequently with 1.5% yr⁻¹ growth of the annual increment."

... and ...

"However, observations show that CO₂ is increasing gradually: its abundance was 315 parts per million by volume (ppmv) in 1958 when Keeling initiated accurate measurements and is now about 345 ppmv, with current mean annual increments of about 1.5 ppmv [Keeling et al., 1982]"

You do understand compounding of the CO₂ time series itself versus compounding of the RATE of the annual CO₂ "increment" (e. g. the rate of growth of the rate of growth, where annual rate of growth is in units of ppmv/yr)?

I'm getting ...

1958,315 (Hansen's 1958 starting number)

2017, 407.36 (correct annual rate compounding calculation), 406.53 (Annual observational ESRL MLO CO₂ for 2017)

ftp://aftp.cmdl.noaa.gov/products/trends/co2/co2_gr_mlo.txt

ftp://aftp.cmdl.noaa.gov/products/trends/co2/co2_annmean_mlo.txt

Time to go home knucklehead.



izen says:

June 27, 2018 at 7:18 pm

@-daveburton

"The purpose of the paper (and the associated congressional testimony), was to agitate for curbing GHG emissions, and creating the IPCC. It did that very successfully."