

MONCKTON VS THE SCIENTISTS HE CITES

But the solar physicists, you might take Scafetta and West, say in 2008, they attribute 69% of all the recent global warming to the sun. Most solar physicists agree. The International Astronomical Union in 2004 held a symposium on it. They concluded that that was the case. They said we're now going to get global cooling because the sun's turned itself off for a bit.



Citing the International Astronomical Union

I can assure you there is not such a formal position endorsed by the IAU. Let alone any claim from IAU that suggests that global warming (defined as the heating trend observed on Earth during the last mid 20th century) can be explained by solar variability.

Valentin Martinez Pillet,
President of the
International
Astronomical Union

They [the NOAA] rely only on data from ships dropping canvas buckets down as they randomly pass across the oceans, and pulling up some water and sticking a thermometer in.



Mr. Monckton's statement to the effect that we used temperature measurements of seawater gathered by dragging canvas buckets through the ocean are completely false. In fact, I know of no scientific group that would even think such a technique could supply useful measurements!

Sydney Levitus,
National Oceanographic
Data Center

Grand Minimum to Grand Maximum: 300 years' warming.



Citing Hathaway 2004

I did not then, nor did I ever, suggest that solar variability plays a dominant role in climate change.

David Hathaway

The population of polar bears has increased dramatically since the 1940s and 1950s. Somewhere between 2 and 5 times, we don't know exactly but it's certainly a huge increase in polar bear population. Hardly as you would think the profile of a species in imminent threat of extinction.



I do not believe that Christopher Monckton has read my work, or recent work of prominent polar bear biologists that is easily obtained thru Google.

Charles Monnett

MONCKTON VS THE SCIENTISTS HE CITES

What, then, caused the third period of warming? Most of that third and most recent period of rapid warming fell within the satellite era, and the satellites confirmed measurements from ground stations showing a considerable, and naturally-occurring, global brightening from 1983-2001.



Citing Pinker et al., 2005

This statement in effect equates temperature change with surface solar radiation change which, as noted in points 2 and 3 above, is only one input into a complex climate process. Also, it is not necessarily the case that global brightening is naturally-occurring; it can be caused by anthropogenic aerosols or changes in the atmospheric moisture content as well as clouds, possibly affected by increasing CO2 levels.

Rachel Pinker

Arctic sea-ice extent is just fine: steady for a decade.



Citing IARC-JAXA

The NSIDC group tracks sea ice variations over a longer timeframe (back to 1979), and they point out that a striking feature of recent years is the relative absence of older, thicker (multiyear) sea ice. This finding provides a physical basis for the extreme summer losses of the recent years.

Dr. John Walsh
IARC Chief Scientist

No ocean heat buildup for 50 years.



Citing Catia Domingues

We have found that the upper 700 m of the global ocean has warmed from 1950-2003.

Catia Domingues

...sea level has not risen for four years.



Citing University of Colorado

There is indeed a leveling off over the past ca. 1.5 years but Monckton's conclusion that sea level rise is over on this basis strikes me as a bit like assuming at dusk that the sun will never rise again. It's not actually an impossible outcome, but it's probably worth waiting until morning to find out if you're right.

Tad Pfeffer
(author of
University of Colorado
sea level graph)

MONCKTON VS THE SCIENTISTS HE CITES

The studies that are currently available for MWP temperature estimates have little to say about global warming in the context of anthropogenic contribution to Earth's radiative balance.

Dr. Lowell Stott

No, I do not think there is evidence that the world was warmer than today in Medieval times.

Dr. Raymond Bradley

Dr. Craig Idso has collected papers by almost 1000 scientists worldwide, nearly all of which demonstrate the influence of the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) and show it was at least as warm as, and in most instances warmer than, the present.



The MWP is seen in many proxy archives, but it is not yet certain how global in extent it was. Whether or not it was warmer than today's temperatures depends on the proxy and the place. Most global temperature reconstructions suggest that on average, the MWP was not warmer than today. Regardless, a warm MWP doesn't disprove the fact that humans are changing climate presently.

Dr. Jessica Tierney

You are right, we never said the MWP was warmer than today.

Anil Gupta

The last IPCC report has a separate sub-chapter in its paleoclimate chapter that reviews the work up to 2007 and several other papers have been published since then. Together these investigations tell that the available evidence suggest that - globally - the warmth at medieval times was not as warm as today, although some regions (in particular around the northern North Atlantic) may have been warmer. Whatever the exact temperatures were in medieval times, warmth at that time does not disprove the AGW.

Anders Moberg