

Voice For Liberty in Wichita

Individual liberty, limited government, and free markets in Wichita and Kansas

Why climate models are wrong

by Bob Weeks on June 4, 2009

in Environment

Could the science behind all the models that predict global warming be wrong? Dr. Roy Spencer believes it is.

His article A Layman's Explanation of Why Global Warming Predictions by Climate Models are Wrong takes a while to read, but it's worth the time and effort. It all comes down to this:

Thus, the most important debate is global warming research today is the same as it was 20 years ago: How will clouds (and to a lesser extent other elements in the climate system) respond to warming, thereby enhancing or reducing the warming? These indirect changes that further influence temperature are called feedbacks, and they determine whether manmade global warming will be catastrophic, or just lost in the noise of natural climate variability.

It turns out that "all 23 climate models tracked by the IPCC now exhibit *positive* cloud and water vapor feedback." Spencer believes that there is a "mix-up between cause and effect" that results in a positive bias in temperature change. According to his research, publication forthcoming, the feedback is actually *negative*. In his words, "The negative feedback was so strong that it more than canceled out the positive water vapor feedback we also found."

He concludes:

While there are a number of other potentially serious problems with climate model predictions, the mix-up between cause and effect when studying cloud behavior, by itself, has the potential to mostly deflate all predictions of substantial global warming. It is only a matter of time before others in the climate research community realize this, too.

Currently we're being asked to accept huge increases in taxes and energy costs all in the name of saving the planet from global warming. It's already started, as our local electric utility in Wichita has had to ask for several rate increases to support its efforts in renewable energy — costs it would not have incurred if not pressured by threats from politicians.

Now it turns out that the science behind these decisions is likely wrong.

The problem of global warming, to the extent it truly exists and is caused by man, is a problem with a very long time horizon for its solution. We need to slow down and make sure we truly understand the problem and its causes before we make drastic policy changes that will harm our economy and our prosperity.



Tagged as: [Climate change](#), [Environment](#)

{ 3 comments... read them below or [add one](#) }

1 Benjamin June 8, 2009 at 6:11 pm

Volcanoes and natural methane releases in the ocean do more than any man could do. China doesn't have to go along with any of this and look where most of the "stuff" you buy is made now. if you want to pay carbon taxes then keep believing in "global warming". they were already caught using Septembers NASA temp. readings and saying it was Octobers.

2 A J Morris, Jr., Ph.D. June 12, 2009 at 2:06 pm

What part of growing grass, flowers, and trees is polluting the world? What part of converting CO2 to O2 through photosynthesis is pollution? EPA is truly out of its mind to listen to the ignorance of this rubbish. School children know CO2 is as valuable to the world as O2. Just because CO2 has increased by half throughout the world is proof that cutting the forests without replanting them has decreased the demand of CO2. However, as the CO2 is required for all vegetable growth, and we do want fast and more vegetable growth, we want the percent of CO2 to increase. It is already clear that the increase has not damaged our health.

The only question is whether the increase in CO2 is related to global warming. As we know the earth was at one time hotter than it is today, in the days before the cooling established stable temperatures. We do not know how much a single volcano changes global temperatures or increases gases. We do not know how much a single sunspot changes global temperatures but we know it does. We do not know how much reversal of the sun's polarity changes the global temperatures but we know it does. Since man is not in control of these, perhaps God has a plan and these are his tools. Last, we do not have a clue how much all the emissions of gasses from industry changes the global temperatures.

One would think that since we don't know any of these answers, we do not have a clue whether man's input into the global temperatures is measurable or changes anything. EPA is making laws without data to prove anything man does is good or bad. We have evidence the earth had twice the O2 level before the flood. If that were the case, the CO2 level would have also been much greater, perhaps as high as 3%.

EPA is measuring the hydrocarbons, sulfates, Phosphates, and gaseous emissions of the earth by the amount of ozone compounds in the atmosphere, and called the "ozone alert." The ozone is God's method to neutralize gases, kill molds, kill pollens, and kill bacteria that would otherwise destroy the world and make it uninhabitable to man. If the CO2 increase reveals there is a corresponding O2 increase, then there must be an increase of ozone destroying world pollutants. We need all the CO2 we can get. EPA has it all wrong. EPA is trying to kill the human population. I say trying, their ignorance defies the books of knowledge. It must be intentional. Are sadists making EPA laws, and listening to all the "chicken Little" people (THE SKY IS FALLING)?

3 [Morgan Wick](#) June 18, 2009 at 5:20 pm

“What part of converting CO₂ to O₂ through photosynthesis is pollution?” No, that’s one way of getting the pollution OUT.

“We have evidence the earth had twice the O₂ level before the flood.” You’re... you’re not talking about the *biblical* flood, are you??? I’d love to know where this “evidence” comes from, not counting crackpots...