

[Even IPCC scientists are contradicting the 'consensus'](#) [1]

Written by [Dr Fred Hansen](#) [2] | Thursday 17 January 2008



A comprehensive new scientific study comparing 22 climate change models with recent actual measurements of the troposphere highlight the clear failure of their predictive accuracy. The group of climate scientists, among them IPCC member John Christy, [found](#) [3] new evidence that the computer models are failing because they do not reflect actual causes of climate change.

This is only the latest in a series of studies that have cast systematic doubts on the efficacy of climate modelling. These models form the basis for future global warming predictions and have projected significantly more warming in recent years than has actually occurred. Their main weakness seems to be that they are unable to deal with confounding factors such as cloud cover and water vapour, which is the dominant green house gas.

Satellite data and independent balloon data agree that atmospheric warming trends do not exceed those of the surface. Greenhouse models, on the other hand demand that atmospheric trend values be 2-3 times greater. Satellite observations suggest the greenhouse models ignore negative feedbacks, produced by clouds and by water vapour, that diminish the warming effects of carbon dioxide.

This is a devastating message given that the whole global warming alarmism is almost entirely based on computer climate models. And put simply, the models are completely unable to account for the facts on the ground ? like the observed cooling periods in recorded temperatures between 1940 and 1975. The models falsely project fast warming in the middle atmosphere compared to the earth surface - whereas in fact the opposite is happening. And they cannot explain the present cooling of the Antarctic, which forces me to put an extra pullover on when sitting on the balcony of my 30th floor Melbourne apartment with south westerly winds.

[blog comments powered by Disqus](#) [5]

Links:

[1] <http://www.adamsmith.org/blog/environment/even-ipcc-scientists-are-contradicting-the-consensus>

[2] <http://www.adamsmith.org/taxonomy/term/5857>

[3] <http://www.heartland.org/Article.cfm?artId=22604>

[4] http://disqus.com/?ref_noscript

[5] <http://disqus.com>