

Global Warming (AGW): Separating Fact From Fiction & Recognising False Claims

Issue 4: IPCC Admits Human Caused Global Warming is NOT Global, & is NOT Local!

**Graham Williamson
March 2015 (3rd edit)**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines the IPCC AR5 report with respect to so called global warming or climate change and evidence of changes in local regions around the world.

The following conclusions are based upon the content of the IPCC [AR5 Working Group 1 Physical Science Basis report](#) and the [Working Group 1 Summary for Policymakers \(SPM\)](#).

- **Climate scientists confirm that human caused global warming cannot be identified and quantified in local towns and local regions around the world;**
- **Although policymakers require clear local data upon which to base policy, IPCC scientists can only provide statistical average data based upon climate data sourced not from Australia, but sourced predominantly from the other side of the world;**
- **IPCC scientists confirm that global warming is NOT global, with large areas of the Southern Hemisphere cooling as emissions increase;**
- **Antarctic ice levels are increasing as emissions increase.**
- **IPCC is increasingly agreeing with 'sceptics', contradicting previous alarmist claims, and refusing to make precise future predictions because of past mistakes.**
- **Since climate models have been repeatedly shown by scientists to be unreliable, and since climate scientists admit that human caused global warming cannot be confirmed or quantified in cities and towns around Australia, any public authorities squandering public money on expensive climate change mitigation related strategies, are inviting actions for extortion or fraud if they cannot substantiate the degree of human caused climate change in their particular administrative region, and reveal their cost/benefit studies for reversing this local warming.**

As the IPCC increasingly contradict their previous alarmist claims it is clear this process is being led by scientists who are increasingly rejecting the politicisation of science which has always been an integral part of the IPCC system. Division is increasingly building within the IPCC as contributing scientists disagree with the politicising, exaggerating, and sensationalising of their research, and for this reason, the latest IPCC report is characterised by its increasing abandonment of previous precise alarmist predictions.

While those driven by self-interest and [ideological or political motives](#) desperately seek to prolong the climate change hysteria, scientists, including contributing IPCC scientists, are increasingly separating the scientific facts from the political spin and deception. But who will be the last scientist, and the last politician, to finally admit the truth?

The Problem – “Dangerous” Human Caused Warming Around the Globe?

According to the [Technical Summary of the latest IPCC AR5 WG1 Science Report](#), the challenge for mankind is to prevent humans causing a “dangerous” degree of global warming.

“The concept of stabilization is strongly linked to the ultimate objective of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which is ‘to achieve [...] stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system’”

But as the IPCC were quick to point out in the [Technical Summary](#), not only is the term dangerous meaningless, but in reality, different localities around the world have wildly varying climates and do not obey the law of averages:

“Climate impacts, however, are geographically diverse and sector specific, and no objective threshold defines when dangerous interference is reached. Some changes may be delayed or irreversible, and some impacts could be beneficial. It is thus not possible to define a single critical objective threshold without value judgements and without assumptions on how to aggregate current and future costs and benefits.”

But how can this be? Everyone knows the IPCC and contributing scientists have scientifically created an average global climate.

The Science Behind Averaging Global Climate

The averaging of global climate data is quite complex, and involves the sharing of high temperatures in hot parts of the world with the cooler regions, and vice versa. [According to Chapter 10 of the AR5 Science report](#):

“Warming trends associated with global change are generally more evident in averages of global temperature than in time series of local temperature (‘local’ here refers generally to individual locations, or small regional averages). This is because most of the local variability of local climate is averaged away in the global mean..... Future warming trends cannot be predicted precisely, especially at local scales, so estimates of the future time of emergence of a warming trend cannot be made with precision..... A full answer to the question of when human influence on local climate will become obvious depends on the strength of evidence one considers sufficient to render something ‘obvious’. The most convincing scientific evidence for the effect of climate change on local scales comes from analysing the global picture, and from the wealth of evidence from across the climate system linking many observed changes to human influence.”

So because no clear warming trend is evident from local data, in an effort to detect warming such data must be averaged to produce an imaginary global average, and then this fictitious global average must be applied to every local region on earth to reveal a warming trend which was absent from the original local data. In other words, global warming is a statistical artefact made possible by creating an imaginary global average which is of absolutely no relevance to any place in the world, especially every local region in the world. This is according to the science. So although there is a 97% consensus and the science is settled, at least we know the science cannot be relied upon for any place on earth.

The [IPCC WG1 Summary for Policymakers](#) pointed out that although climate models still cannot be relied upon to predict local climate around the world, at least the models have made some improvement since the last IPCC report:

“On regional scales, the confidence in model capability to simulate surface temperature is less than for the larger scales. However, there is high confidence that regional-scale surface temperature is better simulated than at the time of the AR4. {9.4, 9.6}..... There has been some improvement in the simulation of continental-scale patterns of precipitation since the AR4. At regional scales, precipitation is not simulated as well, and the assessment is hampered by observational uncertainties.....Global surface temperature change for the end of the 21st century is likely to exceed 1.5°C relative to 1850 to 1900 for all RCP scenarios except RCP2.6. It is likely to exceed 2°C for RCP6.0 and RCP8.5, and more likely than not to exceed 2°C for RCP4.5. Warming will continue beyond 2100 under all RCP scenarios except RCP2.6. Warming will continue to exhibit interannual-to-decadal variability and will not be regionally uniform (see Figures SPM.7 and SPM.8).”

The ‘science’ of global averages was further explained by [Australia’s Chief Scientist](#) in an article entitled “[Climate Change The Story So Far](#)”, which states:

“Climate change patterns are mostly discussed at a global level; however they will be experienced differently depending on location or region. Though global average climate changes may seem subtle, they can result in highly variable local changes”

But when I sought clarification of this issue from the Chief Scientist I received the following response (pers. comm. 10/01/2014):

“As mentioned in our paper, although global average climate changes may seem subtle, at present, they can result in highly variable local changes. This means that different parts of the globe will experience climate change differently. The key fact to remember is that all of Australia has experienced warming over the past 50 years.² Warming has occurred in all seasons, however the strongest warming has occurred in spring (about 0.9 °C) and the weakest in summer (about 0.4 °C).²”

And on 12th January I responded, seeking further clarification from the Chief Scientist:

*“You claim that local climatic changes are **caused by** (ie ” global average climate changes..... can result in highly variable local changes) a hypothetical statistical global average. How is this possible? Can you explain the science which confirms that local climatic changes are determined by a hypothetical global average? Taking Sydney for example, can you explain the scientific basis for the claim that local Sydney policies should be determined by temperature readings taken on the other side of the world (ie global averages) rather than local data? Where is the science to support this? In other words, if Sydney’s climate is ‘normal’ but extreme changes are occurring on the other side of the world, should local policies be changed due to changes to the global average? Please supply the scientific basis for this.”*

Of course, this query remains unanswered by the Chief Scientist.

It is clear that the science of global averages is exceedingly complex. So complex in fact, that even the scientific experts are unable to explain the science in layman’s terms.

IPCC Admits Global Warming is NOT Global!

While the IPCC is confident they can accurately predict warming at the global level, not the local level, they point out that in the real world, according to the [IPCC WG1 Technical Summary](#), in the period from 1979-2010 when emissions were reportedly increasing most rapidly, the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans were defying model predictions and actually cooling when they should have been warming.

“Over the period 1979–2010 most observed regions exhibited warming (Figure 10.2d), but much of the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans cooled. These regions of cooling are not seen in the simulated trends over this period in response to anthropogenic and natural forcing (Figure 10.2h), which show significantly more warming in much of these regions (Jones et al., 2013; Knutson et al., 2013). This cooling and reduced warming in observations over the Southern Hemisphere mid-latitudes over the 1979–2010 period can also be seen in the zonal mean trends (Figure 10.3d), which also shows that the models tend to warm too much in this region over this period.”

Cooling of large sections of the Southern Hemisphere was also confirmed in [Chapter 10.3 of the AR5 WG1 report](#).

“Areas of disagreement over the 1901–2010 period include parts of Asia and the Southern Hemisphere (SH) mid-latitudes, where the simulations warm less than the observations, and parts of the tropical Pacific, where the simulations warm more than the observations.....Over the period 1979–2010 most observed regions exhibited warming (Figure 10.2d), but much of the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans cooled. These regions of cooling are not seen in the simulated trends over this period in response to anthropogenic and natural forcing (Figure 10.2h), which show significantly more warming in much of these regions (Jones et al., 2013; Knutson et al., 2013). This cooling and reduced warming in observations over the Southern Hemisphere mid-latitudes over the 1979–2010 period can also be seen in the zonal mean trends (Figure 10.3d), which also shows that the models tend to warm too much in this region over this period.”

Indeed, according to Cobb in an article entitled [“Paleoclimate: A Southern Misfit”](#), [cited by Curry](#), it seems that the entire Southern Hemisphere has been refusing to abide by the rules of IPCC projections. Similarly, according to Karoly and colleagues in [“Inter-hemispheric temperature variability over the past millennium”](#):

“Our analysis of inter-hemispheric temperature variability in an ensemble of climate model simulations for the past millennium suggests that models tend to overemphasize Northern Hemisphere–Southern Hemisphere synchronicity by underestimating the role of internal ocean–atmosphere dynamics, particularly in the ocean-dominated Southern Hemisphere. Our results imply that climate system predictability on decadal to century timescales may be lower than expected based on assessments of external climate forcing and Northern Hemisphere temperature variations alone.”

The fact that so called climate change is not global, and the use of global averages and a “one-size-fits-all” approach to climate, is unscientific and irrelevant, has been recently confirmed again by a report by Henrik Rother and colleagues, published in the [Proceedings of the National Academy of Science](#). According to Professor Jamie Shulmeister, [Climate Change is Not so Global](#):

“Scientists are calling for a better understanding of regional climates, after research into New Zealand’s glaciers has revealed climate change in the Northern Hemisphere does not directly affect the climate in the Southern Hemisphere. The University of Queensland study showed that future climate changes may impact differently in the two hemispheres, meaning a generalised global approach isn’t the solution to climate issues.....“This study highlights the need to understand regional climate rather than a global one-size-fits-all.”

Graham Lloyd has also noted the [“North-South Divide in Climate Change.”](#)

So now climate scientists are confirming that it is the entire Southern Hemisphere which refuses to conform to IPCC global averages, not just local regions around the world. But as [Chapter 10 of the](#)

[IPCC Science report](#) emphasises, global averages are nice on paper, but when it comes to developing real policies for real local areas, what is needed is reliable real life local data:

“Anthropogenic influence on climate has been robustly detected on the global scale, but for many applications an estimate of the anthropogenic contribution to recent temperature trends over a particular region is more useful. However, detection and attribution of climate change at continental and smaller scales is more difficult than on the global scale for several reasons”

But since the local data is unreliable, and refuses to consistently show a warming trend, and since global warming has been shown NOT to be occurring in the Southern Hemisphere, Australians must be misled or tricked into believing global warming really is global. In an article entitled [“Global warming ‘unequivocal’ and ‘unprecedented’ – IPCC”](#). [Michael Parker](#), Environment and Energy Editor at [The Conversation](#), claims the AR5 WG1 report states:

“the report concluded that the 30 years until 2012 were probably the warmest in 1,400 years”

But if we turn to page 5 of the [AR5 WG1 SPM](#) we find the correct quote:

“In the Northern Hemisphere, 1983–2012 was likely the warmest 30-year period of the last 1400 years (medium confidence).” {2.4, 5.3}

In an astonishing misrepresentation of the IPCC report, the term “Northern Hemisphere” was deleted, and **The Conversation** also omitted the fact, admitted by IPCC scientists, that this warming DOES NOT apply to the Southern Hemisphere. As a result of bringing this issue to the attention of [Michael Parker](#), [Managing Editor Misha Ketchell](#), [Executive Director Andrew Jaspan](#), and [Chair of the Conversation’s Editorial Board, Mark Lonsdale](#), the above article was amended [as can be seen](#).

But although The Conversation are to be commended in this instance for addressing this misinformation and misrepresentation of the IPCC report, as my complaint revealed, they did not go anywhere near far enough. The full details of my complaint, and the response from The Conversation, are detailed in [Vol 5 of this series](#).

Sadly, this is a typical example of how the media spreads misinformation about climate change.

Sea Level Also Refuses to Obey IPCC Predictions

[According to the IPCC](#), a ‘dangerous degree of global sea level rise of about 1.7mm annually is occurring. But the [Bureau of Meteorology has pointed out](#) not only that **“nothing can be done to stop”** natural climate variations such as El Niño or La Nina, but further, [according to BOM](#), these natural phenomena may increase sea level in some areas by 20-30cm. [The IPCC though, concedes that not all areas of the globe](#) will experience a dangerous sea level rise of 1.7mm:

“It is very likely that in the 21st century and beyond, sea level change will have a strong regional pattern, with some places experiencing significant deviations of local and regional sea level change from the global mean change. Over decadal periods, the rates of regional sea level change as a result of climate variability can differ from the global average rate by more than 100% of the global average rate. By the end of the 21st century, it is very likely that over about 95% of the world ocean, regional sea level rise will be positive, and most regions that will experience a sea level fall are located near current and former glaciers and ice sheets. About 70% of the global coastlines are projected to experience a relative sea level change within 20% of the global mean sea level change.”

So the 1.7mm rise may vary by 100% but eventually 70% of coastlines are expected to increase by within 20% of 1.7mm!

But even in spite of such a precise prediction, [the IPCC stresses the many factors which make this prediction uncertain](#), especially in local regions around the world:

“Along any coast, vertical motion of either the sea or land surface can cause changes in sea level relative to the land (known as relative sea level). For example, a local change can be caused by an increase in sea surface height, or by a decrease in land height. Over relatively short time spans (hours to years), the influence of tides, storms and climatic variability—such as El Niño—dominates sea level variations. Earthquakes and landslides can also have an effect by causing changes in land height and, sometimes, tsunamis. Over longer time spans (decades to centuries), the influence of climate change—with consequent changes in volume of ocean water and land ice—is the main contributor to sea level change in most regions. Over these longer time scales, various processes may also cause vertical motion of the land surface, which can also result in substantial changes in relative sea level. Since the late 20th century, satellite measurements of the height of the ocean surface relative to the center of the Earth (known as geocentric sea level) show differing rates of geocentric sea level change around the world (see FAQ 13.1, Figure 1). For example, in the western Pacific Ocean, rates were about three times greater than the global mean value of about 3 mm per year from 1993 to 2012. In contrast, those in the eastern Pacific Ocean are lower than the global mean value, with much of the west coast of the Americas experiencing a fall in sea surface height over the same period....In summary, a variety of processes drive height changes of the ocean surface and ocean floor, resulting in distinct spatial patterns of sea level change at local to regional scales. The combination of these processes produces a complex pattern of total sea level change, which varies through time as the relative contribution of each process changes. The global average change is a useful single value that reflects the contribution of climatic processes (e.g., land-ice melting and ocean warming), and represents a good estimate of sea level change at many coastal locations. At the same time, however, where the various regional processes result in a strong signal, there can be large departures from the global average value.”

[The IPCC summarises in the Summary for Policymakers:](#)

“While it is likely that extreme sea levels have increased globally since the 1970s, mainly as a result of mean sea level rise due in part to anthropogenic warming (WGI AR5 3.7.5, 3.7.6; WGI AR5 10.4.3), local sea level trends are also influenced by factors such as regional variability in ocean and atmospheric circulation, subsidence, isostatic adjustment, coastal erosion, and coastal modification (see also 5.3.2). As a consequence, the detection of the impact of climate change in observed changes in relative sea level remains challenging (Nicholls et al., 2007; Nicholls et al., 2009; Menéndez and Woodworth, 2010).”

Like global warming, which the IPCC have shown to be not global, so too, according to the science, global sea level rise is also not global. Could it be that there is global cooling, and no warming at all?

Increasing Antarctic Ice as the World gets Warmer!

As human caused global warming continued and emission levels increased more rapidly from 1979 to 2012, according to the IPCC [in the AR5 WG1 Summary for Policymakers](#), levels of ice in the Antarctic were steadily increasing:

“It is very likely that the annual mean Antarctic sea ice extent increased at a rate in the range of 1.2 to 1.8% per decade (range of 0.13 to 0.20 million km² per decade) between 1979 and 2012. There is high confidence that there are strong regional differences in this annual rate, with extent increasing in some regions and decreasing in others. {4.2}”

In [Chapter 10.5 of the AR5 WG1 report](#) the IPCC not only confirmed this increasing Antarctic ice, but they also admitted “*there is low confidence in the scientific understanding*” of this increase:

“Overall we conclude that there is low confidence in the scientific understanding of the observed increase in Antarctic sea ice extent since 1979, owing to the larger differences between sea ice simulations from CMIP5 models and to the incomplete and competing scientific explanations for the causes of change and low confidence in estimates of internal variability (Section 9.4.3).”

As noted [in the SPM](#), although the cause of this increasing Antarctic ice is unknown, this unknown cause is NOT causing the alleged decrease in Arctic ice, which, according to the IPCC, must “*very likely*” be caused by humans:

“Anthropogenic influences have very likely contributed to Arctic sea ice loss since 1979. There is low confidence in the scientific understanding of the small observed increase in Antarctic sea ice extent due to the incomplete and competing scientific explanations for the causes of change and low confidence in estimates of natural internal variability in that region (see Figure SPM.6). {10.5}”

Undaunted though, and needing to make a prediction, even a “*low confidence*” prediction, the IPCC concludes [in the SPM](#), that this unknown cause of increasing Antarctic ice will result in a decrease in Antarctic ice by the end of the 21st century:

“In the Antarctic, a decrease in sea ice extent and volume is projected with low confidence for the end of the 21st century as global mean surface temperature rises. {12.4}”

Cooling Claims About Global Warming

It seems [the world is now cooling](#) and [not warming](#). But [according to Khandekar](#), the IPCC expresses no interest in reports of cooling or extreme cold weather events:

“The reality of climate change, as we shall discuss below, is that there have been increasing cold weather extremes in recent years, which have been totally ignored by the IPCC and its adherents. [Chapter 2 of the IPCC WGI](#) (AR5) entitled: ‘Observations: atmosphere and surface’, makes no mention of cold weather extremes of recent years. There have, however, been news reports of hundreds of deaths due to extreme cold weather in central and eastern Europe, northern India and parts of South America in the last six years. Regional as well as international news media (TV, newspapers, internet blogs) have reported cold weather extremes in various parts of the world. Also, several peer-reviewed papers on the increasing severity of cold weather extremes over Europe and elsewhere have also appeared in the literature in the last few years. None of these is mentioned anywhere, either in the [SPM-AR5](#) or in [Chapter 2 of the WGI](#). The IPCC scientists, while sifting through hundreds of peer-reviewed papers, appear to be completely oblivious of the evidence of climate change.....The [IPCC SREX Report](#) (2012) similarly focuses solely on adaptation strategies for hot weather extremes, completely ignoring cold weather extremes. The IPCC scientists naively assume that in a warmer present and future climate, cold weather extremes will decrease automatically and will pose no problem. This is certainly not true, as we will see below. In the next section, we examine some recent extreme weather events that were highly publicized and consider whether they can be blamed on human emissions of carbon dioxide or whether they should actually be attributed to natural climate variability.....Most of the media seem to be obsessed with extremes of heat, completely ignoring cold weather extremes, despite these apparently being on the rise and despite the IPCC’s science failing to offer an explanation for them. In fact, the IPCC extreme weather events table projects ‘fewer cold days and frost in future’. It is also of interest to note here that most climate scientists and advocates of the global warming hypothesis have ignored the ‘cold’ reality of present climate change. The IPCC (2007) has discussed in some detail the European heatwave of summer 2003, but made no mention of the severely cold winter of 2002/03 and the deaths it caused in south Asia. The latest [IPCC SPM-](#)

AR5 released in Stockholm in September 2013 once again fails to mention increasing cold weather extremes of recent years...Cold weather extremes have definitely increased in recent years; for example, the severe winters in Europe (2012/13, 2011/12, 2009/10) and North America (2012/13, 2007/08). There have also been colder winters in parts of Asia (2012/13, 2002/03) and South America (2007, 2010 and 2013)."

But there is little wonder why the IPCC seem unconcerned. After all, unlike warming, these cooling reports are not global.

New IPCC Report Wary of Repeating Embarrassing Past Mistakes

In the 3 previous reports of this series we have seen how the IPCC is reversing previous alarmist claims and is increasingly agreeing with so called 'sceptics' in regard to:

- [The 15 year cessation of global warming and the failure of climate models;](#)
- [Global warming and droughts;](#)
- [Global warming and health consequences or loss of life.](#)

Now, in this report, we see this trend continuing as the IPCC points out that:

- Human caused global warming cannot be identified and quantified in local towns and areas around the world;
- Although policymakers require clear local data upon which to base policy, IPCC can only provide statistical average data based upon climate on the other side of the world;
- Global warming is NOT global.
- Antarctic ice is increasing as emissions increase.

With billions of dollars being wasted on expensive climate change mitigation strategies by the Commonwealth government, State governments, and local Councils around Australia, all such public authorities must be required to supply the following.

- Scientific evidence confirming the degree of anthropogenic warming in their municipality or local region; and
- Cost effectiveness studies demonstrating the efficiency with which their strategies will reverse this anthropogenic warming.

Since climate models have been repeatedly shown by scientists to be unreliable, and since climate scientists admit that human caused global warming cannot be confirmed or quantified in cities and towns around Australia, any public authorities squandering public money on expensive climate change mitigation related strategies, are inviting actions for extortion or fraud if they cannot substantiate the degree of human caused climate change in their particular administrative region, and reveal their cost/benefit studies for reversing this local warming.

As the IPCC increasingly contradict their previous alarmist claims it is clear this process is being led by scientists who are increasingly rejecting the politicisation of science which has always been an integral part of the IPCC system ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)). Division is increasingly building within the IPCC ([1](#)) as contributing scientists disagree with the politicising, exaggerating, and sensationalising of their research, and for this reason, the latest IPCC report is characterised by its abandonment of previous precise alarmist predictions. [According to Pearce:](#)

“Past impacts reports from the IPCC were based around attempts to produce detailed forecasts of local climate in future decades and somewhat mechanistic assessments of what this would mean for society. But the new report is much more wary, especially of putting numbers on likely changes. Many previously firm-sounding forecasts have disappeared since the last major IPCC climate-impacts report in 2007, such as spreading droughts and crop losses in Africa and more violent hurricanes in the Atlantic.....The reason for avoiding precise forecasts is twofold. First, overly precise predictions got the authors of the 2007 report into trouble. The most famous faux pas was the claim that Himalayan glaciers would be gone by 2035, when 2350 is a more likely date..... Another reason for the more measured tone is that hopes that better science and greater computer power would allow more precise forecasts than seven years ago have often proved wrong. For parts of the world, model forecasts of regional climate change are diverging rather than converging. The more we know, it seems, the less we know for sure..... Asia has fallen into a similar forecasting limbo. Last time, the IPCC warned that there would be less water in most Asian river basins and up to a billion people could experience “increased water stress” as early as the 2020s. This time, “there is low confidence in future precipitation projections at a subregional level and thus in future freshwater availability in most parts of Asia.” Last time the IPCC predicted “an increase of 10 to 20% in tropical cyclone intensities” in Asia. This time it reports “low confidence in region-specific projections of [cyclone] frequency and intensity.”.... The 2007 report was almost all about the impacts of climate change. Most of this report, and in particular most of the summary for policymakers, is about resilience and adaptation to inevitable climate change.....”

While those driven by self-interest and ideological or political motives desperately seek to prolong the climate change hysteria, scientists, including contributing IPCC scientists, are increasingly separating the scientific facts from the political spin and deception. But who will be the last scientist, and the last politician, to finally admit the truth?