

Discovery will Change Climate Debate

A mistake in the climate model architecture changes everything—heat trapped by extra carbon dioxide just reroutes to space from water vapor

Dr David Evans¹, 18 November 2015

Project home: sciencespeak.com/climate-basic.html

There is an intellectual standoff in climate change. Skeptics point to empirical evidence that disagrees with the climate models. Yet climate scientists insist that their calculations showing a high sensitivity to carbon dioxide are correct—because they use well-established physics.

Dr David Evans mapped out the architecture of the current climate models and discovered that while the underlying physics is correct, the climate scientists applied it wrongly.

Dr David Evans earned six degrees related to modeling and applied mathematics over ten years, including a PhD from Stanford University. He was instrumental in building the carbon accounting system Australia uses to estimate carbon changes in its biosphere, for the Australian Greenhouse Office.

The basic climate model, used to calculate the Earth's sensitivity to carbon dioxide, dates back to 1896. It is the cornerstone of the carbon dioxide theory of global warming. Predating computer simulations, it applies “basic physics” to the climate.

The idea that “it’s the physics” makes the carbon dioxide theory impregnable in the minds of the establishment.

Two serious architectural errors were discovered in the basic climate model. Fixing the architecture but keeping the basic physics, future warming due to carbon dioxide was found to be a fifth to a tenth of official estimates. Less than 20% of the global warming since the 1970s was due to increasing carbon dioxide.

The conventional climate models *decrease* the heat emitted to space by water vapor when the carbon dioxide concentration increases, which amplifies the surface warming and is responsible for more than half of the officially projected warming.

The improved model finds instead that the heat trapped by extra carbon dioxide just reroutes to space from water vapor instead, and there is little surface warming.

The empirical evidence on what has been happening with water vapor for the last few decades supports the improved model and contradicts the conventional climate models.

Press: [Miranda Devine, UK Express.](#)

¹ david.evans@sciencespeak.com, sciencespeak.com