

SPPI News Search 10-1-08

Climate Meal Nannies

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2008/sep/30/food.ethicaliving>

Meat must be rationed to four portions a week, says report on climate change

*Study looks at food impact on greenhouse gases
Return to old-fashioned cooking habits urge*

[SPPI Note: These people seem to live in an alternative universe in which it is totally ignored that no net CO₂ reductions can be achieved because of annual increases in emissions from China, India and the rest of the developing world.]

Tuesday September 30 2008

People will have to be rationed to four modest portions of meat and one litre of milk a week if the world is to avoid run-away climate change, a major new report warns.

The report, by the Food Climate Research Network, based at the University of Surrey, also says total food consumption should be reduced, especially "low nutritional value" treats such as alcohol, sweets and chocolates.

It urges people to return to habits their mothers or grandmothers would have been familiar with: buying locally in-season products, cooking in bulk and in pots with lids or pressure cookers, avoiding waste and walking to the shops - alongside more modern tips such as using the microwave and internet shopping.

The report goes much further than any previous advice after mounting concern about the impact of the livestock industry on greenhouse gases and rising food prices. It follows a four-year study of the impact of food on climate change and is thought to be the most thorough study of its kind.

Tara Garnett, the report's author, warned that campaigns encouraging people to change their habits voluntarily were doomed to fail and urged the government to use caps on greenhouse gas emissions and carbon pricing to ensure changes were made. "Food is important to us in a great many cultural and symbolic ways, and our food choices are affected by cost, time, habit and other influences," the report says. "Study upon study has shown that awareness-raising campaigns alone are unlikely to work, particularly when it comes to more difficult changes."

The report's findings are in line with an investigation by the October edition of the Ecologist magazine, which found that arguments for people to go vegetarian or vegan to stop climate change and reduce pressure on rising food prices were exaggerated and would damage the developing world in particular, where many people depend on animals for essential food, other products such as leather and wool, and for manure and help in tilling fields to grow other crops.

Instead, it recommended cutting meat consumption by at least half and making sure animals were fed as much as possible on grass and food waste which could not be eaten by humans.

"The notion that cows and sheep are four-legged weapons of mass destruction has become something of a distraction from the real issues in both climate change and food production," said Pat Thomas, the Ecologist's editor.

The head of the United Nations intergovernmental panel on climate change, Rajendra Pachauri, also sparked global debate this month when he urged people to have at least one meat-free day a week.

The Food Climate Research Network found that measured by production, the UK food sector produces greenhouse gases equivalent to 33m tonnes of carbon. Measured by consumption - including imports - the total rises to 43.3m tonnes. Both figures work out at under one fifth of UK emissions, but they exclude the indirect impacts of actions such as clearing rainforest for cattle and crops, which other studies estimate would add up to 5% to 20% of global emissions.

The report found the meat and dairy sectors together accounted for just over half of those emissions; potatoes, fruit and vegetables for 15%; drinks and other products with sugar for another 15%; and bread, pastry and flour for 13%.

It also revealed which parts of the food chain were the most polluting. Although packaging has had a lot of media and political attention, it only ranked fifth in importance behind agriculture - especially the methane produced by livestock burping - manufacturing, transport, and cooking and refrigeration at home.

The report calls for meat and dairy consumption to be cut in developed countries so that global production remains stable as the population grows to an estimated 9bn by 2050.

At the same time emissions from farms, transport, manufacturing and retail could be cut, with improvements including more efficient use of fertilisers, feed and energy, changed diets for livestock, and more renewable fuels - leading to a total reduction in emissions from the sector of 50% to 67%, it says.

The UN and other bodies recommend that developed countries should reduce total emissions by 80% by 2050.

However, the National Farmers' Union warned that its own study, with other industry players, published last year, found net emissions from agriculture could only be cut by up to 50% if the carbon savings from building renewable energy sources on farms were taken into account.

The NFU also called for government incentives to help farmers make the changes. "Farmers aren't going to do this out of the goodness of their hearts, because farmers don't have that luxury; many of our members are very hard pressed at the moment," said Jonathan Scurlock, the NFU's chief adviser on renewable energy and climate change.

Different diets

**The way we eat now (average person in the UK, per week)
1.6kg meat and 4.2 litres of milk, which is equivalent to:**

6 sausages (450g)
2 chicken breasts (350g)
4 ham sandwiches (100g)
8 slices of bacon (250g)
3 burgers (450g)
3 litres of milk
100g of cheese and a helping of cream

**Future recommended diet (average person, per week)
500g of meat and 1 litre of milk, which is equivalent to:**

1 quarter-pound beefburger
2 sausages
3 rashers of bacon
1 chicken breast
1 litre of milk or 100g of cheese

EU CLIMATE GOALS UNDER PRESSURE AS RECESSION LOOMS

EurActiv, 26 September 2008

<http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-change/eu-climate-goals-pressure-recession-looms/article-175773?Ref=RSS>

Poland has joined Germany in calling for industry exemptions to EU climate rules as a recession in Europe's major economies is casting doubts on whether Brussels will be able to push through its ambitious CO₂ reduction programme.

Background:

Energy-intensive industries in the EU claim that, as the EU tightens its carbon 'belt', producers operating in countries where pollution is cheaper will drive European operators out of business. A global climate change deal, with emissions reduction commitments from both developed and developing countries, is meant to resolve any such imbalance, but negotiations are progressing slowly and will only be concluded in Copenhagen in December 2009.

The EU's aluminium, cement, steel and other heavy industries want Brussels to spell out which sectors could benefit from safeguards in

the form of free CO₂ emissions allowances before December 2009 in case international climate talks fail. Otherwise, warn heavy industries, the EU will be at risk of '**carbon leakage**', meaning that factories would be forced to evacuate their operations, jobs and - crucially - emissions to third countries.

But the Commission does not want to preclude the outcome of global climate talks by publishing such a list before the discussions wrap up. In its proposal for a revised EU Emissions Trading Scheme (EU ETS) for beyond 2012, the EU executive acknowledges the problem and pledges to identify sectors and special exemptions by 30 June 2011.

EU Industry Commissioner Günter Verheugen yesterday (25 September) gave specific assurances to Poland that **100% free CO₂ permit allocation** "should be possible" for the country's energy intensive industries.

Verheugen, speaking at a conference on the Competitiveness Council, repeated the Commission's position that exemptions should not be formalised before an international climate change deal is reached in December 2009, and insisted that pushing industries out of Europe is not the aim of the EU climate package.

But Brussels' resolve on the issue may be softening. A non-paper circulated by the Commission cites the aluminium, steel and cement sectors as "likely to be strongly affected [and] would therefore be amongst the substances likely to benefit from **partial to totally free allocations**" (EurActiv 22/09/08).

The growing financial crisis in the US, which analysts say will have considerable recessionary impacts on major EU economies like Germany, the UK and France, may also **make it increasingly difficult for the Commission to justify higher operating costs for industries**.

Member states are getting nervous about asking their industries to pay more for CO₂ pollution, says Christian Egenhofer, a senior researcher at the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) in Brussels. The "assumptions have gone", Egenhofer said in reference to likely declining investments and growing constraints on

governments' abilities to use macro-economic instruments towards 'green' aims.

Poland's leaders in particular have been crying foul, arguing that their country's **coal dependent economy**, which is still struggling to catch up with Western European economies that were allowed to emit CO₂ with impunity for decades, could be severely undermined by the climate and energy package. **The country's miners yesterday (25 September) marched on Brussels in direct protest of the EU's climate plans.**

Polish concerns are mirrored by the three other members of the 'Visegrad Group' - Hungary, the Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic - which have banded together with several of the EU's new member states to call for a revision of their national targets for cutting greenhouse gas emissions (EurActiv 02/06/08). A slight delay in the adoption of the EU's climate package to March 2009 may also be necessary to ensure fairness, according to a joint statement by the Visegrad group. This is in contrast to the agenda set by the French EU Presidency, which is pushing for an adoption of the package by December 2008.

The demands of the Visegrad countries were given indirect backing at the beginning of the week (22 September) when **German Chancellor Angela Merkel announced that her government "could not support the destruction of German jobs through an ill-advised climate policy"**, the Financial Times reported.

EU Environment Commissioner Stavros Dimas, meanwhile, argues that an economic slowdown should not stall the EU's climate efforts. "The financial crisis is here one day and it is gone another day. But the climate crisis will be there always and we must face it," Dimas told reporters in Brussels on 24 September.

ECONOMIC CRISIS THREATENS EU MEASURES ON CLIMATE CHANGE

AFP, 21 September 2008

<http://www.eubusiness.com/news-eu/1222005723.17>

(BRUXELLES) - The recent economic downturn could push the European Union to adopt more modest ambitions in its fight against climate change.

Although the **European Commission has said it wants to cut greenhouse gases by 20 percent by 2020**, business leaders oppose the use of fines to oblige industry to reduce its emissions -- especially in the current economic crisis.

The cost to industry is estimated at some 44 billion euros per year between 2013 and 2020, with a tonne (1.1 US tons) of CO₂ costing 30 euros.

Business leaders have denounced the policy as a "tax", threatening to take their investments elsewhere and move their more polluting activities out of Europe.

Faced with the threat of job losses, governments are feeling the pressure.

"As the economic situation becomes more challenging, it's normal that government becomes more defensive on climate change as the required efforts will lead to additional costs in the short term," a senior Commission official told AFP on the condition of anonymity.

A number of European politicians are now speaking openly about diluting, or even abandoning the project.

"This plan is garbage. It's politically correct, but it won't happen," former Italian prime minister Guilano Amato said at the end of August.

Renato Brunetta, Italy's minister for innovation, has been equally blunt.

"If it happens, it would kill the economic upturn. No one needs to kill themselves," said Brunetta, a trained economist.

One negotiator involved in the talks between the Commission and member states, said: "We're hearing these arguments more and more, notably from countries such as Italy and Germany, where industry is increasingly worried."

Brussels was taking the threat very seriously, the negotiator added.

The EU's Environment Commissioner Stavros Dimas has nevertheless also publicly called on politicians and businesses not to oppose the measures.

And European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso said: "I'm counting on Mr. Sarkozy's authority that the package will be adopted without being watered down before the end of the year."

France has made this plan one of its priorities during its EU presidency. But Sarkozy's own difficulties finding agreement at home on how to finance his "environmental revolution" suggest the size of the task facing the EU.

French negotiators still have a few weeks and two ministerial meetings to agree on a common position to be presented to the European parliament in October, with a view to reaching an agreement by the end of the year.

"There has been no fundamental breakthrough as yet, but the final phase of negotiations has begun and provided the economic situation does not worsen, we hope to find an agreement," one negotiator said.

The plan has two goals, the same source said: "It's about putting in place the tools to maintain European industry's competitiveness and helping member states achieve their national objectives.

But the negotiator cautioned: "Some decisions are very political and will involve trade-offs."

EASTERN EUROPE FEARS EU CARBON PLAN EMPOWERS RUSSIA

Reuters, 27 September 2008

http://www.worldbulletin.net/news_detail.php?id=28855

Eastern members of the European Union said on Friday its tough plans to tackle global warming could force them to rely more on Russian gas and the bloc should be equally ambitious in ensuring their energy security.

The EU is pushing through measures aimed at cutting CO₂ emissions by a fifth by 2020, compared with 1990 levels, in hopes of averting the worst effects of climate change.

But ex-communist EU members such as Warsaw fear such targets will increase their reliance on imports from their former overlord Russia of natural gas, which produces much less carbon dioxide than coal, a resource Poland has in abundance.

"The (EU's) climate and energy package will significantly increase the demand for imported natural gas in some member states, enhancing their dependence on external sources of energy," senior officials of five ex-communist EU states said in a joint statement after talks in Warsaw.

"The European Commission should act ambitiously in the field of secure supplies of energy resources and should propose solutions equally challenging as those proposed in the climate and energy package," they said.

Officials from Poland, Hungary, Slovakia, Bulgaria and Romania signed the statement. A Czech representative who attended Friday's talks did not sign as Prague takes over the EU's rotating presidency in January and wants to remain neutral.

Moscow's war with ex-Soviet Georgia in August has reignited regional fears of becoming too dependent on Russian energy.

But EU Energy Commissioner Andris Piebalgs, a Latvian, told Reuters in an interview this week the 27-nation bloc should build up its energy ties with Russia.

After the Credit Crunch comes the Energy Crunch

By David Howell

(Courtesy of Bennie Peiser)

Opening remarks by The Rt. Hon. Lord Howell of Guildford, President of the British Institute of Energy Economists, at the BIEE Annual Conference at St. John's College, Oxford. Wednesday 24th September 2008 (Lord Howell was Energy Secretary 1979-81)

Britain is now in real danger of running out of power in the period immediately ahead, thanks to incoherent national energy policy, misplaced green zealotry, dithering for years over nuclear power (for which no amount of eleventh hour enthusiasm can compensate) and a huge thirst for imported gas which can only be met, if at all, at painfully high prices.

Britain is now being once again described as the sick man of Europe, with the highest gas and electricity prices, the heaviest extra taxes and charges, the weakest gas storage facilities, a prospect of the most inadequate power generating infrastructure and the worst fuel poverty. **According to the National Housing Federation 25 percent of all households will next year be paying more than ten percent of their net income on energy bills.**

The whole scene is now shaping up in exactly the ways predicted in the book I wrote with Carole Nakhle, published a year ago*. In that book we forecast that **energy security would become the near-term prime issue** and that the so-called 'compelling' message of Al Gore and others about climate change and CO₂ would simply be pushed off the screen. Unless policy-makers understood this, we said, they would **end up with NO long-term CO₂ reductions, huge short-term energy security problems and a lot of very angry and frightened people.**

It seems that some economists, and maybe one or two politicians, have at last caught up with what we have repeatedly warned. There is now authoritative talk of serious UK power cuts (as in the Fells/Whitmill recent study). Meanwhile, some business leaders and personages are queuing up to bemoan the fact that worries about energy security and costs are taking strong priority over green obligations, just as we warned. Some other, wiser, business heads are pointing out that **EU policy on climate change is blindly heaping costs on industry (one estimate is £60 billion over five years), thus chasing investment away to lower cost countries, like China and India.**

Even wiser observers are pointing out that the carbon pricing schemes jacking up costs , by paying for permits to emit CO₂, such as the EU's Emissions Trading Scheme and the UN's Clean Development Mechanism, are causing hardship and damaging growth, WITHOUT actually reducing CO₂ emissions, which is supposed to be their purpose.

It is no surprise that Germany is now backing almost total exemption for its industries from CO₂ payments, and from what Angela Merkel calls 'ill-advised climate policy'.

Finally, at the global level, the attempt to foist on poorer countries these extra energy cost burdens in the name of combating global warming, are antagonising the developing world which is rightly determined to put poverty eradication before emissions restrictions .

Little wonder that scepticism about the climate change 'crisis' is growing, as critical immediate needs seem to be ignored or met merely with hand-wringing.

FULL TEXT at <http://www.staff.livjm.ac.uk/spsbpeis/Howell-2008.htm>

BACK TO THE DARK AGES: NATIONAL GRID RAISES THE SPECTRE OF UK BLACKOUTS

Daily Mail, 26 September 2008

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1062089/Back-Dark-Ages-National-Grid-raises-spectre-blackouts-winter.html>

By Sam Fleming

Homes could be plunged into darkness this winter as the nation faces the shocking prospect of power cuts.

The warning, following the release of grim industry figures yesterday, will dredge up memories of **the last electricity crisis in 1974**.

Then, households had to manage with candles, factories were put on short-time and TV broadcasts ended at 10.30pm.

The figures from the National Grid suggest that the country could be crippled by energy shortages when the colder weather bites because there is so little spare capacity.

The loss of only one of our 38 biggest power stations at times of high demand could lead to **breaks in supply, bringing factories to a halt and leaving many homes in darkness.**

'We should be very worried - this is reaching national crisis proportions but the response is piecemeal and inadequate,' said the industry watchdog.

In addition, the rising cost of power could also prompt further 'savage' hikes in families' energy bills, analysts claimed.

The National Grid figures sent the price of wholesale electricity skyrocketing to record levels yesterday. It also focused attention on the Government's faltering energy policy and **evoked memories of the grim period between January and March 1974 when millions endured regular blackouts.**

Last night Allan Asher, chief executive of Energywatch, warned of a national crisis. On prices, he added: '**Consumers are being bled white** by the generators and the retailers. The outlook is for further price shocks for consumers.'

The National Grid figures detail exactly how much power it expects to have in reserve this winter above its minimum safety target.

It said that surplus supplies will be as little as 826 megawatts, or 1.5 per cent of total consumption. Only last week, it estimated that the available back up would be 1,373 megawatts.

CARBON DEADLINE ADDING TO CREDIT CRISIS DOWN UNDER

News.com, 29 September 2008

<http://www.news.com.au/story/0,23599,24417385-5007133,00.html>

By Matthew Franklin

KEVIN Rudd has been urged to rethink his "obsession" to deliver a carbon emissions trading scheme by 2010 because it is **placing intolerable pressure on major companies battered by the global financial crisis.**

Opposition emissions trading spokesman Andrew Robb told The Australian last night he had spoken to several **companies that were preparing to dump or shelve investment plans because of their concern over the combined effect of the credit crunch and uncertainty about emissions trading.**

Mr Robb cited as an example recycler Visy, which warned yesterday the Government's plan to put a \$20-a-tonne price on carbon could force it to close two facilities and sack 160 workers.

"The companies are worried about what liquidity there could be in the future," Mr Robb said.

"But if you superimpose on top of that what amounts to a tax which none of your competitors will confront? It starts to choke off investment decisions today, tomorrow and next month."

FULL STORY at <http://www.news.com.au/story/0,23599,24417385-5007133,00.html>

EU ENERGY CHIEF BACK ARCTIC DRILLING

EurActiv, 22 September 2008

<http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-change/eu-energy-chief-backs-arctic-drilling/article-175601?Ref=RSS>

Despite environmentalists' warnings against drilling for oil and gas in such a fragile ecosystem, EU Energy Commissioner Andris Piebalgs said guaranteeing Europe's energy security justified further exploration of the North Pole.

Background:

On 9 September 2008, EU Fisheries and Maritime Affairs Commissioner Joe Borg announced that Brussels was preparing proposals to safeguard the Arctic, a region on the front line of global warming and increasingly at the centre of sovereignty conflicts (EurActiv 11/09/08).

The move comes as climate change is causing Arctic ice to melt, endangering many species of the region's flora and fauna, but, at the same time, making the resource-rich area more navigable and opening up new trading possibilities.

As formerly frozen territories become accessible, the continent's suspected large oil and gas reserves have triggered an Arctic 'rush' amid an increasing number of sovereignty disputes.

No country owns the North Pole or the region of the Arctic surrounding it. The surrounding Arctic states of the USA, Canada,

Russia, Norway and Denmark (Greenland) have a 200 nautical mile economic zone around their coasts.

In August 2007, a Russian icebreaker reached the North Pole and a Russian mini-submarine planted a titanium Russian flag on the seabed. The move was widely seen as a claim by Russia to the North Pole seabed and its resources.

"You even need to go into hostile environments [...] You can't say 'this is a sanctuary' because it will not work [...] Otherwise, where will we get energy from?" he said, speaking at a debate organised by Friends of Europe on Friday (19 September).

The commissioner nevertheless stressed the need to take "all environmental precautions". "You need clear-cut rules, clear environmental impact assessments and very responsible implementation," he said.

"I believe the Commission should help the countries that actually have these resources under their jurisdiction to develop the technologies or to use the technologies in an appropriate way," he added, saying the Commission should in no way fight for a ban on the use of Arctic resources.

But WWF Director Stephan Singer insisted that no amount of environmental and safety legislation would ever be sufficient to prevent oil companies' drilling activities from endangering the whole Arctic ecosystem.

He accused governments and energy companies of creating a "perverse situation" by choosing to drill "a very fragile ecosystem that is already basically dying" rather than working on reducing dependency on "inefficient oil and gas" and investing more in renewable energies.

"We need to get rid of our oil dependency overall [...] We cannot wait until the last drop," he stressed. {SPPI Note: [Then is Singer for a crash building program for CO2-free nuclear generation plants? No.](#)}

Piebalgs however agreed with Norwegian oil and gas firm Statoil, which has already invested hugely in searching the Arctic coastline for new reserves, that "any realistic energy strategy in the future will have to rely on oil and gas". According to Statoil CEO Helge Lund, a "massive exploration effort" is required in the Arctic. "Having options is always a good thing," he stressed, highlighting the EU's major dependency on Russian and Middle Eastern energy supplies.

But Piebalgs nevertheless conceded that the Arctic "will not provide the magical solution we are looking for" in terms of global energy security and will "hardly" reduce the EU's dependency on Russian energy "looking at the borderlines Russia has with the Arctic".

FULL STORY at <http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-change/eu-energy-chief-backs-arctic-drilling/article-175601?Ref=RSS>

CLIMATE WARS: BBC2 SHOW IGNITES CONTRIBUTOR ROW

Broadcast, 24 September 2008

http://www.broadcastnow.co.uk/news/2008/09/bbc2_show_ignites_contributor_row.html

BBC2's Earth: The Climate Wars is at the centre of a new TV global warming row after four contributors claimed it misrepresented them.

The complaints surround the 14 September episode of the three-part, in-house programme, in which presenter Dr Iain Stewart interviewed key global warming sceptics, including Lord Monckton of Brenchley.

Lord Monckton has made a formal complaint to Ofcom and the BBC Trust that the programme-makers unfairly misrepresented him in a 90-minute interview.

"In the two minutes it [BBC2] broadcast, it omitted all my scientific points, including my criticism of the defective 'hockey-stick' graph which the presenter had questioned me about," Monckton told Broadcast.

Canadian climate expert Dr Tim Ball and fellow contributor Dr Fred Singer also told Broadcast that they would complain to Ofcom and another scientist, Dr Roy Spencer, said he was considering complaining to both Ofcom and the BBC Trust.

The row follows the controversy that surrounded Channel 4's 2007 documentary The Great Global Warming Swindle.

Ofcom said it had received four complaints from viewers about the 14 September episode of Climate Wars.

The BBC said it stood by the programme.

GULF STREAM HERE TO STAY: ANOTHER CLIMATE SCARE BITES THE DUST

Aftenposten, 26 September 2008

<http://www.aftenposten.no/english/local/article2677486.ece?service=print>

The Gulf Stream, that almost mythical flow of warm seas that makes Norway and a few other Nordic countries liveable, isn't about to disappear any time soon. **New research contradicts earlier theories that it might.** [SPPI Note: [this is one of scares in Gore's film](#)].

Cold water is still heading south through the Gulf Stream, climate researchers say.

Climate researchers have re-examined studies that indicated the Gulf Stream was weakening. It's long been a source of warmer seas flowing north through the Atlantic, and it also sends colder waters south.

The Gulf Stream flows roughly from the east coast of South America, around the Gulf of Mexico and across the Atlantic, where it heads north, east of Ireland, over towards Norway and around Iceland, before heading due south again.

The Danish Meteorological Institute (DMI) reports that several observations in recent years suggested the circulation of the Gulf Stream had weakened, possibly because of global warming. Studies, the institute noted, had suggested that the flow of cold water south was down by half.

A group of researchers from Denmark, the Faeroe Islands, Germany and Norway thus started paying closer attention to the Gulf Stream, and now they're releasing conclusions that can leave climate researchers breathing a sigh of relief.

"It hasn't only been possible to show that **the currents instead have maintained a surprisingly constant strength during the last 50 years**, but we can also point out where **earlier signs of weakness were misleading**," said Steffen M Olsen of DMI.

The researchers have studied new and historic measures of the Gulf Stream's strength over the undersea ridges between Iceland and Greenland.

Olsen cautioned, however, that changes may still occur. "We can't rule that out," Olsen wrote in an article publishing the group's findings. [SPPI Note: [this is now the religion speaking: "the science is clear we are wrong, but we maintain faith it can still happen."](#)] The risk of a collapse in the warm circulation of the Atlantic just "isn't as probable in the near future as we had feared."

THE GLOBAL WARMING TREND HAS STOPPED

From Syun Akasofu [sakasofu@iarc.uaf.edu]

The attached is my latest finding on global temperature changes. I would appreciate it very much if you added it to your CCNet.

Regards, Syun

The Global Warming Trend Has Stopped (indicating that the multi-decadal oscillation overwhelmed the greenhouse effect of CO₂)

Syun Akasofu
International Arctic Research Center

Recent studies of the global temperature changes by the University of East Anglia (UK), the Hadley Climate Research Center (UK), NOAA, the Japan Meteorological Agency, and the University of Alabama Huntsville show that the global warming trend stopped in about 2000-2001. This is contrary to the prediction of the IPCC. They claim that the global average temperature will continue to increase so long as the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere keeps increasing.

During the last several years, I have suggested that the natural causes of temperature changes are important and should not be ignored. The natural causes consist of at least two components. The first component is the earth's recovery from the Little Ice Age (1400-1800), which began in about 1800-1850. This component is, as a first approximation, a linear change of the temperature gradient at a rate of about +0.5°C/100 years. The second component is the multi-decadal oscillation superposed on the linear change, at a rate of about ±0.15°C/10 years (i.e., greater than the linear change of +0.5°C/100 years). The multi-decadal change had a positive change from 1910 to 1940, then a negative change from 1940 to 1975 (in spite of the rapid increase of CO₂ since 1946), and it had again a positive change from 1975 to 2000. It is the warming associated with this most recent positive change of the multi-decadal oscillation that the IPCC has identified as being caused mostly by the greenhouse effect of CO₂. I have suggested that this is a misidentification of the cause of that warming period.

The fact that the global warming trend has stopped since 2000-2001 indicates that at the very least there is another cause of global temperature changes, which in this instance cancelled out the greenhouse effect of CO₂. I suggest it is more likely that the multi-decadal oscillation, which appears to have peaked in about 2000, is the cause of the stoppage of the warming trend, since the multi-decadal oscillation has a greater changing rate (±0.15°C/10 years) compared with the recovery from the Little Ice Age (+0.5°C/100 years). It can stop the warming trend if its change becomes negative.

In any case, as I have said over the last several years, it is crucial to identify the natural causes of climate change and their components, and then subtract them from the ongoing changing temperature trend. Only then, will it become possible to examine the effects of CO₂ quantitatively. It is likely that the future changes of the global average temperature are a combination of the two natural components and the greenhouse effects of CO₂, and perhaps other effects as well.

For details, see

http://people.iarc.uaf.edu/~sakasofu/little_ice_age.php
