

Temperature Pause – Or Not?

A Dud? For years, *Sciencemagazine* has refused to publish articles from those who question the climate establishment, which claims that human emissions of greenhouse gases, namely CO₂, are the primary influence on global warming/climate change. This view is the position of the current Administration.

One of the major problems with this view, is that it cannot explain the current plateau, or pause, in warming starting near the beginning of this century (using atmospheric data). Using surface data, the pause has been about 18 years. Thomas Karl, the director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Climatic Data Center, (NOAA-NCDC) and some of his colleagues have taken the issue on. They adjusted existing sea surface temperatures to give the appearance of a stronger warming trend over the past 15 years. Sea surface data is collected from several sources including ships and, later, specially designed buoys.

The data from buoys are considered superior in accuracy, than the data from ships, particularly data in the early part of the record.

The paper was published by *Sciencemagazine*. To give journalists time to prepare a medial push, the magazine sent out pre-publication notices embargoed (to be held privately) until June 4. The media push went with certain journalists. But the effort also gave some of those skeptical of the views of the climate establishment opportunity to prepare rebuttals.

As Ross McKittrick, who was co-author of the work that exposed the hockey-stick stated, the Karl team increased the more recent sea surface temperatures by: 1) adding 0.12 degrees C to readings collected by buoys, ostensibly to make them comparable to readings collected by ships. As the authors note, buoy readings represent a rising fraction of observations over recent decades, so this boosts the apparent warming trend; 2) giving buoy data extra weight in the computations; and 3) adjusting post-1941 data collected from ships, in particular applying a large cooling adjustment to readings over 1998-2000.

There is no logical reason for adjusting what most consider to be superior data to bring it in line with what most consider to be inferior data, and Karl et al. gave none.

A team from CATO commented on this questionable adjustment and noted that the adjusted data was still not statistically significant. Comparing the Karl et al. temperatures with those from other sources, particularly satellite temperatures, the CATO team (Michaels, Lindzen, & Knappenberger) also noted:

"If the Karl et al., result were in fact robust, it could only mean that the disparity between surface and mid-tropospheric temperatures is even larger than previously noted.

"Getting the vertical distribution of temperature wrong invalidates virtually every forecast of sensible weather made by a climate model, as much of that weather (including rainfall) is determined in large part by the vertical structure of the atmosphere.

"Instead, it would seem more logical to seriously question the Karl et al. result in light of the fact that, compared to those bulk temperatures, it is an outlier, showing a recent warming trend that is not in line with these other global records."

Sciencemagazine refused to published Fred Singer's rebuttal to its fawning review of the *Merchants of Doubt*, and Singer noted an amusing dilemma created by this re-worked data: What about the dozens of recent articles published by members of the Climate Establishment that try to explain away the missing heat, such as it is hiding in the Southern Oceans (James Hansen)? The article has created a conflict in climate science among advocates who claim it is a settled science.

