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IPCC report paints bleak picture of war, famine and pestilence: ‘Climate change is happening and no one in the world is immune’

From food shortages to loss of species, the latest IPCC report paints a bleak picture for the planet

STEVE CONNOR  Monday 31 March 2014

The negative effects of climate change are already beginning to be felt in every part of the world and yet countries are ill-prepared for the potentially immense impacts on food security, water supplies and human health, a major report has concluded.

In the most comprehensive study yet into the effects of rising levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) warns that global warming could undermine economic growth and increase poverty.

Scientists identified Britain as one of the countries most at risk from some of the more immediate negative effects of climate change, with the UK and northern Europe warned to expect increased coastal and inland flooding, heatwaves and droughts.

The IPCC found that these unwanted impacts have already extended beyond any potential benefits of rising temperatures and that they will worsen if global-average temperatures continue to rise by the expected lower limit of 2°C by 2100 - and will become potentially catastrophic if temperatures rise higher than 4°C.
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In a blunt and often pessimistic assessment of climate-change impacts - the fifth assessment since 1990 - the IPCC scientists give a stark warning about what the world should expect if global temperatures continue to rise as predicted without mitigation or adaptation.

"In recent decades, changes in climate have caused impacts on natural and human systems on all continents and across the oceans," says the report Climate Change 2014 Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, formally released early this morning by the IPCC after a final editorial meeting in Yokohama, Japan.

"Throughout the 21st century, climate-change impacts are projected to slow down economic growth, make poverty more difficult, further erode food security, and prolong existing and create new poverty traps, the latter particularly in urban areas and emerging hot spots of hunger," the report states.

Scientists in Britain said it is the clearest warning yet of what could happen if the world continues to prevaricate over cuts in emissions. "Climate change is happening, there are big risks for
The evidence for climate change can be found in natural systems, such as polar ice and coral reefs. The evidence for climate-change impacts is the strongest and most comprehensive for natural systems, such as melting mountain glaciers and polar ice, and the earlier and earlier signs of spring. However, impacts on human systems, such as a rise in certain tropical diseases, can also be attributed to climate change.

"We live in an era of man-made climate change. In many cases, we are not prepared for the climate-related risks that we already face," said Vicente Barros, co-chair of the IPCC working group II.

The climate-related impacts studied by the IPCC included:

**Food security**

Crop yields have increased in general over recent decades but the rate of improvement would have been even faster had it not been for climate change. The signature of rising temperatures and heat stress are already showing on yield of wheat and maize, the report says.
"All aspects of food security are potentially affected by climate change, including food access, utilisation and price stability," it says.

**Freshwater supplies**

As global temperature rise, then so does the fraction of the human population that are affected by either water scarcity or river flooding. "Climate change over the 21st century is projected to reduce renewable surface water and groundwater resources significantly in most dry subtropical regions," the IPCC says.

**Loss of species**

The risk of plant and animal extinctions increases under all climate change scenarios, but they get worse with higher temperatures. Loss of trees and forest dieback will be a particular problem in a warmer world, the report says.

"A large fraction of both terrestrial and freshwater species face increased extinction risk under projected climate change during and beyond the 21st century, especially as climate change interacts with other stressors such as habitat modification, over-exploitation, pollution and invasive species," it says.

**Ocean acidification**

Coral reefs and shelled marine creatures, especially the smaller animals at the base of the marine food chain, are at special risk of rising carbon dioxide concentrations, which are causing the oceans to become more acidic and less alkaline. This in turn will affect human populations that rely on sea fish as a food source.

**Global economy**

Economic losses due to climate change are difficult to assess and many past estimates have not taken into account the catastrophic changes that could result from the climate passing a "tipping point". Losses, however, are more likely than not to be greater, rather than smaller, than an estimated range of between 0.2 and 2 per cent of global income loss due to a temperature rise of about 2°C.

**Human security**

Climate change can indirectly increase the risk of violent conflicts, such as civil wars, by amplifying the well-documented "drivers" such as poverty and economic shocks. Climate change will also increase the risk of unplanned displacement of people and a change in migration patterns, the report says.

Scientists said that the messages about the threat posed by climate change in the 21st century have never been clearer but there is still time to mitigate the worst effects by cutting greenhouse gas emissions with sustainable energy sources as well as to adapt to the expected changes with technological improvements.

Professor Corinne Le Quere, director of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research at the University of East Anglia, said that the study is not "just another report" but the scientific consensus reached by hundreds of scientists.

"The human influence on climate change is clear. The atmosphere and oceans are warming, the snow cover is shrinking, the Arctic sea ice is melting, sea levels are rising, the oceans are acidifying, some extreme weather events are on the rise, ecosystems and natural habitats will be upset."
Climate change threatens food security and world economies," Professor Le Quere said.

Meat and cheese may have to be off the menu if there is to be any hope of hitting climate change targets.

A separate study says cutting greenhouse gas emissions from energy use and transport will not be enough on its own to hold down the global temperature rise.

The research indicates it will also be necessary to slash emissions from agriculture - meaning curbing meat and dairy consumption. Without such action, nitrous oxide emissions from fields and methane from livestock may double by 2070, making it impossible to meet the UN target.

The lead scientist, Dr Fredrik Hedenus of Chalmers University of Technology in Sweden, said: "We have shown that reducing meat and dairy consumption is key to bringing agricultural climate pollution down to safe levels."
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Midwinter1947 3 hours ago

'Yesterday's editorial in the Daily Telegraph, which was by no means the worst of the recent commentary on this issue, follows the first three acts of the play, [Ibsen's play An Enemy of the People] Marking the new assessment by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the paper sides with the mayor. First it suggests that the panel cannot be trusted, partly because its
accounts are unreliable and exaggerated and partly because it uses "model-driven assumptions" to forecast future trends. (What would the Telegraph prefer? Tea leaves? Entrails?).

George Monbiot.

---

Tom Scott 1 hours ago

As all sensible people know, 'Moonbat' (as it is obligatory to refer to him in sensible circles) is in fact the Number One Enemy of the People himself.

Does he think he can intimidate us by references to obscure Scandinavian playwrights? What does this Ibsen know about anything anyway?

Speaking personally, I would no sooner let a model drive my assumptions than I would let Naomi Campbell behind the wheel of my Land Rover LR4 (14 mpg and proud of it). And that, by the way, is a joke that only sensible people like myself are likely to fully appreciate.

---

Harpo 5 hours ago

"Explain why 13 of the 14 hottest years on record have been this century" Marsinah Jawa

Because we're on a PLATEAU - that means at the top, the crest, the high bit running along before it goes down. Imagine a long hill with a goey-uppy part, an along-at-the-toppy part and a downy-at-the-end part - that's a plateau.

I can't think of a way of making it any simpler; try going to JohnnyT's Climate Kids site.

---

Midwinter1947 3 hours ago

Amazing that you can 'guarantee' a plateau when the reality is that the very notion of a relatively slower rise is the exceptional peak in 1997 and a re-start of the graph at that point. A duplicitous practice to say the least.

---

launchme52 5 hours ago

The government is indeed doing something to create problems: http://www.geoengineeringwatch.org/

---

Atropos 10 hours ago

'Green crap', to use the Cameronian term = increased taxation & higher prices.

---

Nod Glodnig 21 hours ago
Mr. Pachauli is always good for a laugh.

Anyone ever been on Indian railways?

Hmm, could be. Haven't had a large enough sample of his work yet. I have my suspicions of Scrofula, but he's still in the bile-spewing denier-hatred stage which suggests he's fresh out of Climate Thought School.

I've no idea who JohnnyT is, but I am, as my name suggests, Tom Scott. Who are you, 'Nod Glodnig'?

JohnnyT was some greenie activist also known as Jaminthemiddle and another name I forget. He parroted all the usual greeny propaganda but resorted to abuse if asked for evidence to back up his assertions. In short he was very like you, which is why Nod thinks you may be his latest incarnation.

Who is JohnnyT now? I say Tom Scott - yep I'm calling it!

For gsingh85:

I agree the amount of reports coming out are a bit stupid but you're simply wrong by saying "There is diddly-squat evidence that man-made CO2 causes extreme weather events". Look at the average global temperatures since the industrial revolution.

Yep - Little Ice Age up to 1890, temperatures started to pull up then, went down in the forties and sixties I seem to remember from graphs - in the seventies we were talking of the next ice age. Then in the eighties, when power stations cleaned up their acts and stopped pumping clouds of sulphuric acid into the air, the albedo dropped and surprise surprise temperatures went up - until 1997 when it stopped rising.

Correlation with man-made CO2 - very very weak.

But it didn't stop rising in 1997. 13 of the 14 hottest years are this century.
Harpo 17 hours ago

Marsinah, how many times does it have to be repeated? When you are on a plateau, every year is going to be a record or near-record high. I guess there are very few people reading this who can't grasp this elementary idea, so really you aren't fooling anyone except, presumably, yourself.

harry55 5 hours ago

Still waiting for you to tell us the total temperature rise since 1998 or 2000 if you prefer MJ. Come on don't be shy.

Nod Glodnig 21 hours ago

Remember the Club of Rome "Limits to Growth"? An authoritative report saying we'll all be starving by the year 2000, down back in the early seventies. Now the major dietary problem of large (in every sense) parts of the world is obesity. Yet another failed prediction and here's another one - based on false correlations of extreme weather when there is none (hurricanes have becoming less frequent in recent years for example) and a prediction of drought, flood, hot times, cold times - or in other words - WEATHER.

The climate has always changed and always will. We can't do anything to stop it and we are not responsible for changing it. It just does - now, in the future, and in recorded history - LIA, MWP, younger Dryus....

harry55 5 hours ago

N-G

I do remember the Club of Rome telling us growth was evil and populations needed large reductions or the world would be doomed by 2000. I was also forced to sit and listen in school to scientists telling me the world was getting colder and another ice age was on the way. This led to programmes to put central heating in homes, the promotion of double glazing and loft insulation. Sadly many in China and India were forced into population reduction programmes against their wishes by these experts.

Krov 24 hours ago

The IPCC exists only to quantify climate change for other UN groups. It does not exist as a body set to explore and evaluate all aspects of climate change, thus its reason for being conflicts with a balanced study of climate change. There are no working groups within the IPCC that are actively evaluating any sceptical aspects of the situation. Thus the IPCC is totally invalid as an honest scientific evaluation exercise.

IPCC report paints bleak picture of war, famine and pestilence: 'Climate... http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/ipcc-report-...
Arguing with AGW deniers is very similar to arguing with fundamentalist believers in some arcane religion; well-informed criticism of their beliefs seems to infuriate them beyond measure. This column is consequently not worth reading - except maybe for anyone who enjoys walking barefoot through a bed of nettles!

Nod Gldnig 20 hours ago
"well-informed criticism" perhaps you could try some?

Harpo 17 hours ago
'fundamentalist believers in some arcane religion; well-informed criticism of their beliefs seems to infuriate them beyond measure.'

Anyone looking for a text-book example of projection?

FrankSW 24 hours ago
This may be it - the CO2 based Climate alarmists finally "jumped the shark".

So much of what they say is utter nonsense at a vary basic level, for instance increasing plant food and warmer climate reduces food production so alarmingly that there will be famines or that there are virtually no beneficial effects anywhere to a warmer wetter climate.

Desperation has set in the face of the current reality of static temperatures and declining rates sea level rises.

FrankSW 24 hours ago
I take it back about warmer growing environments actually reducing plant growth

At the end of the article we learn that the idiots - there is no other word for them actually want to deliberately cut food production.

It's not climate that is the major threat to humanity but the religious zealots who believe that it is their moral duty to effectively plan to murder and destroy human life by cutting off their future food supply - all in the cause to save the world for humanity! (well those that are left anyway)

Tom Scott 1 days ago
As any sensible person can see, it's now time to abolish the IPCC, the Met Office, the Royal Society and all the other 'august' scientific bodies pushing the idea that anthropogenic climate change exists, or is any sort of problem.

Climate science is much too important to be left to scientists - especially scientists bent on causing alarm and despondency in
their pursuit of grant funding and communistic world government.

Instead, there should be a single body appointed to give Sound and Sensible Advice on So-Called Climate Change (I can feel an acronym coming on already).

Ideally, this would be made up of:

- Retired conservative politicians
- Leading figures from the right-wing blogosphere
- Public relations consultants to the energy industry
- Amateur meteorologists
- Selected economists (Richard Tol springs to mind - the only IPCC author worth keeping)
- Conspiracy theorists
- Proponents of 'alternative' but very valid branches of climate science such as sunspot theory, vulcanism and the 'gay marriage causes flooding' hypothesis

Experts of this calibre would soon dispel any notion that we have anything to worry about whatsoever!

---

**Freerider** 1 days ago

Water vapour is a more powerful greenhouse gas than CO2 and it has a much bigger influence on weather and climate than CO2 as it combines with dust particles to form cirrus cloud. Cirrus cloud allows solar radiation through but does not allow infrared radiation (heat) from the earth’s surface to escape. There is more cirrus cloud about today due to increased air travel. CO2 emissions propaganda is hiding the real cause of extreme weather.

---

**Tom Scott** 1 days ago

Well said Freerider! You are just the sort of under-recognised expert who should be on the Panel for Sound and Sensible Advice on So-Called Climate Change (see my proposal above).

---

**Nod Glodnig** 20 hours ago

Time for your mantra soon isn't it? Sea levels rise, ice recedes, temperature rises, species go northward and oceans become more acidic. Almost poetic if it wasn't wrong in every detail but why should that spoil it eh?
Very funny Tom
But what I’m waiting for is one of you smug experts or even the IPCC itself to come up with a solution rather than keep issuing repeated warnings of doom.
How are you actually going to get the temperature down?
How are you going to get China, USA and Australia who between them account for over half of global CO2 emissions to even come to the table to talk about a global solution?
The UK on its own, whilst setting a good example by what it is already doing, is merely playing gesture politics and our reductions will not stop warming happening.
So what's the plan Tom?

Stop burning fossil fuels.

Harry55, the first part of dealing with a problem is to acknowledge that it actually exists. There is indeed little hope of concerted action until this happens.
You, ‘Nod Glodnig’ and co. are doing your level best to make sure that the problem is not even recognised, let alone addressed. Which means that it’s hard to take your suggestion that I provide you with a ‘plan’ very seriously.

But Bob_T’s suggestion (above) that we should ‘stop burning fossil fuels’ is of course the starting point of any such plan. There are a thousand and one ways in which we can begin to do this, but I really don’t believe you are seriously interested in these. If you don’t see climate change as a problem, or as one that is connected with human CO2 emissions, why would you be?

Your kind of gallows humour is perhaps the only response possible in this situation. Despite having no research grant at stake, or shares in a wind-farm company, it feels like a descent into some sort of mass insanity.

More shroud waving by people obsessed with protecting their grants. We are entering a mini Ice Age and need all the carbon dioxide we can produce.
Tom Scott 1 days ago
Mr Ball, your Ice Age theory has much to recommend it.

May I suggest you consider applying for membership of the Panel for Sound and Sensible Advice on So-Called Climate Change when this is formed (see my proposal above)?

It will have need of talents such as yours!

Nod Glodnig 20 hours ago
Yes it’s him I would recognize that smarmy oily sarcasm anywhere - it’s like a bad smell he can’t wash off.

Pescadorean 1 days ago
I dislike climate change deniers. I mean, why on earth should the climate suddenly stand still? Climate change has been going on for billions of years. Now, if it didn’t happen, that would really be worth worrying about.

And I really want to agree with the consensus that its man made. I really do. So can someone please tell me why CO2 levels have been historically up to 100 times higher than they are now - and life thrived. Why was it ok then, but not now?. It a really curious thing, it is. Please forgive my curiosity about this.

Onmebike 1 days ago
Were not scientists warning us recently that rather than causing UK heatwaves global warming will turn off the Gulf stream and plunge us into an ice age?

Please make your minds up as I need to decide whether to stockpile lager or soup.

Marsinah Jawa 19 hours ago
No, they weren’t. Only about 6% of scientific papers ever forecast global cooling, whereas at the same time the rest were already forecasting global warming

Harpo 5 hours ago
Tosh, the dominant meme back in the 70s was global cooling, which is why all the media got excited about it. It never quite got the legs of Global Warming, but it was the ‘consensus’ of the time.

IPCC report paints bleak picture of war, famine and pestilence: ‘Climate... http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/ipcc-report-...
gsingh85 1 days ago
No one denies climate change has happened ever since the Earth came into being. You’ve not really made much of a point.

REPLY + -3 -

harry55 24 hours ago
It is a good point well made by Pesc. And one that is certainly not made clear in schools where climate change is taught to our children as being a new process caused only by mankind and his industrialised society.
Your statement that "No one denies climate change has happened ever since the Earth came into being" would be viewed as very non PC

+ 4 -

gsingh85 23 hours ago
@harry55 "Your statement that "No one denies climate change has happened ever since the Earth came into being" would be viewed as very non PC"

What are you talking about? You really are a stupid person.

+ -2 -

ravichavali 23 hours ago
Climate has been changing constantly over the eons and life has been changing accordingly. There were a lot of species that went extinct due to climatic shifts and lot of species that flourished because of these changes. Right now, the problem is the pace at which it is changing and the selfish idea of self preservation. From this report, we see that Russia and Canada are going to be winners if the climate warms. But the population centers in Asia and Europe are going to loose. With most of worlds population getting affected, we can’t afford the nature’s way of adjusting things.... As George Carlin said, the earth is going to be fine, but humanity will be F@#ked!

REPLY + 1 -

plutonium 1 days ago
Here is one for the proponents of "energy conservation," presumably to mitigate climate change:
Today on www.caiso.com, it shows the California electric load and solar power production. Solar PV starts at 07:00 AM local time. Problem is that by 7:00 AM the electrical load is well on its way to reaching its daytime plateau. Solar PV arrives roughly one hour too late. So backup airplane motors have to run to pick up the load, shut down ~3 hours later, and then restart to pick up the after-dark peak. Under these conditions, backup airplane motor thermal efficiency probably is ~35% efficient. Versus ~50% efficient CCGT or 45% efficient ultrasupercritical coal running continuously.
But we went on Daylight Savings time to save energy. If California was not on daylight savings time, morning load would arrive 1 hour later and load increase would roughly match solar...
PV generation. Here is the result of knee-jerk political agenda to "conserve energy:" The combination of daylight savings time and solar PV are worse than doing nothing. Except perhaps the entire purpose of daylight saving time and solar energy are disrupt everyone's lives and make electricity more expensive. All to "save the planet."

---

**Nod Glodnig** 1 days ago

Is this is a repeat of the last report, and the one before that, and the one before that? "We're all gonna die, the world is burning up!" Funny how that never happened - but now we have "the negative effects of climate change" - but it's all going to happen later "if we don't mend our ways".

There is diddly-squat evidence that man-made CO2 causes extreme weather events. There is a very weak correlation that caused the atmosphere to warm but that is broken. This is just jumping on the band wagon of well publicised extreme weather events (which we have always had, it just wasn’t on CNN) and try to blame it on that evil poison gas CO2. What we are seeing is climate as she has been for the last billion years, since we’ve had an atmosphere.

---

**gsingh85** 1 days ago

I agree the amount of reports coming out are a bit stupid but you’re simply wrong by saying "There is diddly-squat evidence that man-made CO2 causes extreme weather events". Look at the average global temperatures since the industrial revolution.

---

**harry55** 1 days ago

They have gone up by 0.8 of one degree. Did global temperatures remain constant before that?

---

**gsingh85** 23 hours ago

@harry55. You don’t understand the basic facts. Do some research.
gsingh85 1 days ago
I will answer your first question:

Is there an ideal temperature for the planet and if so what is it?

No there is no ideal temperature for the planet but there is an ideal temperature for us humans. If the temperatures changes it could mean 2 things. (1) an end to our way of life or (2) an end to the human race.

REPLY + 0 -

harry55 1 days ago
Well that can't be right gs85 because humans have lived on this planet for thousands of years in climates ranging from zero to 30 degrees average temperatures and have manged to survive.

Plainly we have a best temperature perhaps in the area of 65 degrees F ?
But if we are to halt and reverse the rise first we need to agree on a temperature to return to.

REPLY + -1 -

gsingh85 1 days ago
Did I not say 2 things? I said either our way of life will be affected or the human race would die out. Listen to what I am saying.

+ -4 -

Right Field Ball 1 days ago
Indeed, if it's too warm you turn black - apparently.

REPLY + 0 -

harry55 1 days ago
I think GS85 has got all possibilities covered with his warning of either "the human race will die out" or "our way of life will be affected". That last one could be applied to anything that happens in the future to anyone in any nation.

+ 2 -

Marsinah Jawa 19 hours ago
Humans did not turn black. We all began as black

+ -5 -

harry55 1 days ago
I am not a scientist nor even an expert like many on here, so please don’t shout at me when I ask a few simple questions:-

Is there an ideal temperature for the planet and if so what is it?
Do all or any of the nations agree on this?

Won’t there be a cooler temperature that starts to cause similar
but different problems too?

Are we capable of reducing the temperature of the Earth and then keeping it at that new perfect lower level for evermore?

**donB** 1 days ago

Poppycock and balderdash.

**plutonium** 1 days ago

As long as nobody offers up a viable solution to the problem, it is just another report. 50 TWe nukes will probably mitigate CO2, but none of this research models the effect of deploying nukes. All we get is energy "wedgies" and useless talk of "renewable energy" and "energy conservation." Invariably that creates a suspicion that there is a underlying agenda to reign in capitalism. Result: people making these reports are not to be trusted.

**SimonPHinchley** 1 days ago

This is very analagous to Noah and the flood, people laughing at him when he built the ark, until the rains came. The problem with the ICPP reports are that they are'nt empirical to the vast majority of man-kind. Scientists are the only observers, who build statistical models that translate as nothing to the 'average joe'. Until the nature of the evidence is more observable for the mass global population i'm afraid that we will continue to remain in a state of Climate Change Denial. Just like in Noah's day (and no I am not religious, it's just an analogy!!).

**donB** 1 days ago

Do you believe that crap about an Ark?
gsingh85 1 days ago
@HARGO. You obviously don’t know what the affect is on an average global temperature increase of 0.8°C within just 160 years. This is not "hardly-noticeable". When they scientists say "negative impact" they don’t mean negative impact on the Earth per say they are referring to the impact on the human life and human way of life. You need to do some research.

REPLY  + | -5 | -

wandler 1 days ago
I say! Is that per said and done?

REPLY  + | 1 | -

gsingh85 1 days ago
It will be said and done when we are all dead from global warming. I say that is said and done.

REPLY  + | -5 | -

wandler 1 days ago
Is it GM per say [sic] that’s going to bring about your demise? Or, do the odds perchance favour your being brained by a wheel falling-off a passing plane?

REPLY  + | 1 | -

gsingh85 1 days ago
Ah. Very funny Wandler. You really are an idiot.

REPLY  + | -2 | -

Scrofula 1 days ago
street lights. 2000 street lights = 1.2 megawatt hours. maybe its time to move away from sodium lights, and use something a little more efficient. they could be replaced as they fail to make the transition easier

REPLY  + | -1 | -

MightyDrunken 22 hours ago
The problem with using something more efficient than sodium lighting is there isn’t a more efficient form of lighting!
Low pressure sodium lights produce 200 lm/W.
White LEDs 86 lm /W
Sometimes they report LEDs with higher efficiency like CREE with a 300 lm /W but this is not in normal usage conditions. I say turn the street lights off.

REPLY  + | 0 | -

Tom Scott 1 days ago
It’s hard to say what effects climate change will have on you (one would have to know quite a lot more about your life, and even then there would be quite a large element of chance involved).

http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/ipcc-report-...
Harpo 1 days ago

How can the negative effects of global warming be felt in 'every part of the world' when the global temperature has increased a hardly-noticeable 0.8°C in 160 years and not at all in the last 17 and a half?

Magical thinking at its most bizarre.

REPLY + | -1 | -

Scrofula 1 days ago

ask Groucho to explain it to you. just because you are incapable of understanding something does not make it untrue

REPLY + | -1 | -

davide 1 days ago

If a graph of the data proves that those who proved half a century ago that the climate scientists were talking trash now shows precisely the flattening predicted at exactly the time predicted decency alone should allow them a fair hearing with reasonable publicity.

Just because you are rather inadequately educated and cannot do a simple first year undergrad level Fourier analysis of a signal does not mean that the results of that analysis method are wrong either, does it?

Sorry but it is you that is the dull witted one and undereducated, not those who disbelieve a now clearly rubbish proposition. One that a simple rolling five year averaging filter that can be done by even a near simleton adult with a netbook power computer proves the escalation predicted is not only failing to occur but the graph is following the natural normal climate patterns it has done for centuries and now is on the flat part of the normal sine wave. Unless you are very thick it is mere idleness on your part not to have done this to see I am right.

Harpo 1 days ago

But it is already having quite major impact on many people's lives, in the UK and in many other countries. Among these impacts are flooding and all the misery that causes, disrupted transport systems (something that has impacted on me recently), loss of livelihood (particularly for farmers in regions struck by extreme conditions). These and other impacts are likely to get a lot more severe and widespread over the next decades.

In the long run we'll all be dead and past caring - but for many people it is not all about us personally (though we'd be foolish to think we'll be immune from climate impacts). Even more important, to me at least, is to make a difference to people who come after us.

Of course you may not have children, and you may not give a hoot about whether other people's children live in a world racked by famine, flood, pestilence and war.

In that case, you're absolutely right not to worry in the slightest
about climate change, and there's really no point in entering into debate about it with you.

natly 1 days ago
Declining to procreate is the best thing you can do for the planet and those who will inherit it. I don't see the majority of people with children doing anything but playing at being eco friendly.

davide 1 days ago
With a decent honest media the fact that this is a totally documented and provable historically repeated cycle with a predictable flooding probability of near a hundred percent rather than an abnormal event would have made headlines. The side effect would probably have been a demand for the heads of those who plugged climate change.

Tom Scott 1 days ago
Davide - can I suggest that you volunteer to be a one-man replacement for the Met Office? And, while you're about it, the IPCC too?

With your expertise, we would no doubt have a much better grasp of any upcoming climate events than we do from those two bodies. And you would surely be a great deal cheaper to boot.

gsingh85 1 days ago
It baffles me why after such a strong consensus that the world seems too lazy to tackle the issue of climate change. The UK Chief Scientist said it is the biggest threat to human civilisation.

pete_1 1 days ago
Here's a simple question. I'm here, in the UK. By 2050, given my current age, I'll almost certainly be dead - and by then I'll definitely be beyond caring about climate change. So tell me this:

What affects will climate change have on me?

Not what affects might happen to the planet as a whole. Or to other people in other countries. But to me, here, over the next 30-40 years. Once there is a definitive answer to that, the next question will be:

What would I have to do, as an individual, to reduce the worst affects of this?

I've been waiting years for an unequivocal answer to these questions and it seems that I'll have to wait longer. But don't take too long in getting back to me.
Harpo 1 days ago
The reason is that it's perceived as a useful excuse to tax us. No-one in power with half a brain has believed in this for over a decade.

REPLY

+ 4 -

Scrofula 1 days ago
you are taxed on what you consume. in what way can the message "consume less" be a ploy to tax you more? perhaps it takes a whole brain to work that one out

+ -2 -

gsingh85 1 days ago
What are you talking about? This is nothing to do with taxation.

+ -1 -

DissidentLackingMotivation 1 days ago
My impression is that you don’t really care. But I wonder to myself, when you reach that age when you'll be near death, will you look at your children and grandchildren and think, "we should have done something when we had the chance."

REPLY

+ 1 -

pete_l 1 days ago
"don't really care?" - how can a person "care" when we aren't told what we should be caring about - or how much caring will be enough (the answer to that one is easy: caring means nothing, it's only actions that have any significance).

In that respect I am very prepared to do my bit, but so far there is no agreement about what that should be as all the climate researchers are too busy arguing amongst themselves and stabbing each other in the back (metaphorically) to try and win more grant money.

Once they start to behave professionally and can actually agree on what needs to be done, then I'll be up there doing it. But until that time, when there is agreement and leadership, it's impossible to know who needs to do what. Until that time when the scientists start to agree on a course of action, I'll do my "caring" about the impending extinction of bananas - at least that's real, immediate and will make a well-defined difference to peoples' lives.

+ 0 -

FWKirkham 1 days ago
By 2050 ... I'll almost certainly be dead, So... What affects will climate change have on me?

"... on me" - is this your most pressing question?

"What would I have to do, as an individual, to reduce the worst affects of this?"

Your implication is that any effort you may make "as an individual" would have a negligible effect, so why bother.

There are very few "unequivocal" answers to anything, so waiting until you receive one before taking action is an easy (and often used) getout.

So what should you do? Do what you can as an individual to reduce your carbon footprint (emphasis on "reduce" - not necessarily eliminate) and press governments to act on a national and international scale. What else did you think?

And why should you worry enough to bother?

Because, based upon a large body of evidence in addition to scientific principles, the balance of probability is very heavily weighted towards the conclusion that severe outcomes are in prospect without inaction.

And because you should be concerned about the welfare of others, including of future generations, and not just about your own.

---

Do what you can as an individual

Imagine this situation: You live in a village and it's the day before the annual fair. That morning a huge boulder mysteriously appears in the middle of the village green - right where the fair would be. You can either muster all the able-bodied people in the village to "do what they can" and push the boulder away: risking hernias and heart attacks and making no significant progress, no matter how hard you all push. Or you can bring in someone with the right skills and equipment and have them bulldoze the boulder away in no time.

That's where we are with climate change. Nobody (well, nobody with any credibility) is denying there is a problem - but they are all arguing about what to do about it.
It might give some people a nice warm, touchy-feely feeling that they're contributing by taking their plastic bags to be recycled and installing low-energy lightbulbs. But what you really need is someone who knows - REALLY knows - what the size of the problem is and what, in detail, needs to be done to fix it. Sadly for us, all those climate-change "bulldozer drivers" are spending all their time coming out with conflicting and contradictory messages about the size of the boulder and arguing about where, exactly, to push the it to - and who should drive. That's the problem: the people who are qualified to provide information and suggestions can't even agree amongst themselves what should be done.

---

gliffothewisp 1 days ago

It's amazing how, every time there is any Report on the effects of global warming, out come the apologists for the Status quo, and the supporters of big energy Business. It depends who you want to listen to, the scientists who actually measure the visible signs of climate Change, or those who are paid to rubbish their findings. If climate Change, whether man-made or not, was just some Abstract intellectual game, I could just dismiss it, but climate Change has been observed and measured in so many places and in so many ways, that it is incontrovertable.

---

wandler 1 days ago

There are so many reports in the Indy, mainly because they stir-up mugs like you, gliffy! The Indy knows that its all harmless fun - the serious things are kept out of bounds! And that is, probably "incontrovertable" as well....By-the-way, what does it mean?

---

michaelpm 1 days ago

I'm receiving e-mail notifications of responses to my post but they are not appearing on this page. Why is this?

---

Spitefuel 1 days ago

So is the sudden influx of scientifically illiterate conspiracy theorists who crop up under articles like this correlation or causation?

More importantly if there is a conspiracy it is to divert people with how to slow/stop global warming rather than how to deal...
The new comment system is very bad. There is a limit of 2 replies to a post after which no more are displayed on the webpage. However you still get the email notifications.

Agreed, it is a crap system.

A large proportion of the CO2 emitted by China is a result of the manufacture of the huge amount of goods they export, including to the UK and other countries whose own emissions are much lower than China.

No one but a fool expects that efforts made within our own national borders can solve the problem on their own, and nobody but a fool would think that anyone is arguing that they can. But you can’t expect to persuade others to reduce emissions unless one is prepared to do so oneself - and a lot of 2 percents add up to a significant effort in the right direction.

And yet the EU contributes 13%, which we are still a part of. Tackling global warming should be perceived as a collaborative effort from everybody, not perception refined to individual nations.

The UK emits below 2% of global CO2

Although CO2/capita is lower in China and India they emit 25% and 5% respectively. The US emits 18%. There is not much we can do about reducing global CO2.

Maybe Ed Davey, Caroline Lucas and Marsinah Jawa could go to China and inflict their persuasive magic on them.
with it. We should be looking at building more resilient infrastructure to cope with the changes and a social structure that can survive crisis.

Based on that Britain is screwed as it grinds to a half when there is more than 2mm of snow. Take a look at the recent floods and realise that the country couldn't survive a real environmental crisis.

Then again if the criss destroy Westminster and Whitehall and all the vermin therein maybe the nation would have a chance?

---

**max stavros 1 days ago**

Marsinah Jawa is not a conspiracy theorist. He's the real thing!

**REPLY**  
+ | -2 | -

**wandler 1 days ago**

I believe that MJ claims to be a she...an Amazon in the jungle, no less!

**REPLY**  
+ | -2 | -

**DissidentLackingMotivation 1 days ago**

I'm surprised you can even read this article with your head so far in the sand.

**REPLY**  
+ | 1 | -

**Mac Foon 1 days ago**

Not in the sand, in another place

**REPLY**  
+ | 1 | -

**Marsinah Jawa 1 days ago**

Explain why 13 of the 14 hottest years on record have been this century

**REPLY**  
+ | -6 | -
Did not the many released emails with the IPCC show the phony science of climategate? (see http://climategate.com)

FWKirkham 1 days ago

No.

And even if they had, nobody denies the trends in average global temperatures over the last century or so.

Remember that these trends were confirmed (to their own disappointment and surprise) by the climate-sceptic financed BEST project.

So Marsinah Jawas's statement that 13 of the 14 hottest years on record have been recorded this century is not seriously disputed, even if the cause is (though only by a very small proportion of scientists).

Navier Stokes 1 days ago

Mean temperatures increased by a measly 0.75 degrees C between 1850 and around 2000, then they stopped increasing.

It follows that recent years will be slightly warmer than not so recent ones.

FWKirkham 1 days ago

Year-to-year variation in global mean temperatures is high, so the fact that 13 out of the last 14 years were the highest recorded - and not, say 8 or 9 of the last 14 - is a very significant indication of a warming world.

Navier Stokes 1 days ago

To FWKirkham.

Year to year variation is not high you liar. Any mean temperature chart thrown up by an internet search shows that the variation year to year throughout any given decade is only about 0.2 degrees C.

Go and turn off some pensioner's heating, you murderous troll, and peddle your disgusting lies elsewhere.

Nexus789 1 days ago

The amusing thing about this is that we humans live such a short
time and our civilisation has only been around for a mere blink in time. Given this there are probably long run cycles that we are not aware of in terms of what impacts the Earth’s climate - solar energy output is obviously a contributing factor. We are merely adding in our pollution to the mix.

FWKirkham 1 days ago
"... probably long run cycles that we are not aware of in terms of what impacts the Earth’s climate - solar energy output is obviously a contributing factor"

The "amusing thing" is that you seem to imply that these "long run cycles" aren’t taken into account, and even more so that we don’t know about them.

"We are merely adding in our pollution to the mix"

Well, yes ... this is what all these widely slagged off computer models take into account. Did you not know this?

On a geological scale the time during which our species has and will exist may be a blink of an eye in relative terms. But how is this relevant (or "amusing") in relation to our concern for the here and now and the (relatively speaking) near future - and what we can do to avoid or mitigate problems for ourselves and for future generations - just because our existence on this planet may be finite anyway on this potentially much longer scale?

Marsinah Jawa 1 days ago
M Jawa, you think Marx & Engels wrote 'a lot' on eco issues? Go on then, tell us. Certainly - I personally know of two books.

Cleeboy 1 days ago
MJ knows PERSONALLY of two books

Wow! Everybody bow down low.

ObVinoir 1 days ago
Unfortunately we are in a capitalist's dream where there are more people buying Kim Kardashian merchandise every minute in the UK than there are wild gorillas left in the world. There are more people on the second floor of Oxford Street's Primark on any given weekday lunch time than there are tigers in the wild.

We focussed more attention and energy to gay marriage and fox-hunting in parliament over the last 24 months than we did addressing climate change. Badger massacres provided Tories more pleasure than exploring biodiversity.

This is Britain today under Cameron and Paterson. Banks get assistance, commercially minded farmers who apparently run the country, so too the elite, but our green policies are ridiculed.
and urinated on.

wandler 1 days ago
Where is that pissoir situated? I'd like to join in the fun!

lab5b@yahoo.com 1 days ago
Did not the many released emails with the IPCC show the phony science of climategate? (see http://climategate.com).

A real scientist at least carefully looks at both sides of a story before drawing a conclusion.
A real scientist does not base his conclusion by pop culture (peer pressure) nor the need for budget funds in his university department. A real scientist should filter out pride, fear, lust and greed from their method of reasoning! A real scientist does his best to walk in the truth at all times. A real scientist uses the scientific method and not driven by a personal agenda. If you fall at anyone of the above mentioned points, then let's face it: YOU ARE NOT A REAL SCIENTIST.
And that's a fact no matter how many letters are after your name...

Spitefuel 1 days ago
"A real scientist at least carefully looks at both sides of a story before drawing a conclusion."
Lot's of real scientists *did* look at both sides.
You're not one of them.

lab5b@yahoo.com 1 days ago
Top MIT Prof. (Ethos here does not get any greater)
Speaking in regards to Massachusetts’ new $50 million climate change proposal, MIT Professor Richard Lindzen, a leading figure in the climate change movement, pointed out the absurdity of blaming every weather event on global warming and climate change.
"The changes that have occurred due to global warming are too small to account for. It has nothing to do with global warming, it has to do with where we live." Although supporting the theory of man-made global warming, Lindzen admitted that rhetoric from the political class and green movement has been nothing more than over-the-top "catastrophism." Even many of the people who are supportive of sounding the global warning alarm, back off from catastrophism," Lindzen said. "It's the politicians and the green movement that like to portray catastrophe." Even more surprising, Lindzen goes on to point out the government's obvious use of climate change alarmism to push greater state control, even warning over politicians' use of "crony capitalism."
"Global warming, climate change, all these things are just a dream come true for politicians. The opportunities for taxation, for policies, for control, for crony capitalism are just immense, you can see their eyes bulge," Lindzen said. Lindzen has

IPCC report paints bleak picture of war, famine and pestilence: ‘Climat... http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/ipcc-report-...
"Did not the many released emails with the IPCC"

The hacked emails were not from the IPCC but from Climatic Research Unit, University of East Anglia.

"show the phony science of climategate"

No.

"I've been told that IPCC is above national FOI Acts. One way to cover yourself and all those working on AR5 would be to delete all e-mails at the end of the process. Any work we have done in the past is done on the back of the research grants we get – and has to be well hidden. I've discussed this with the main funder (U.S. Department of Energy) in the past and they are happy about not releasing the original station data."

Now, why would he want to do that?

The second lot of emails, "climategate 2" was from the same source and hack as the first lot in 2009. So it was from CRU and the people who had emailed them.

So yeah Dr Jones was trying to got out of FOI requests, not good but nothing to do with bad science. The reason why he was trying to dodge them was a concerted campaign to his department to get station data which they thought they didn't have the rights to release as they were from other institutions.

Courtney you seemed to have mixed up two different emails in your post...

"My belief is that three, four years from now, the globe will start to cool"

"belief" based upon what?
Why not base your ideas on the 1000’s of scientists who accept the principle findings of climatologists?

This is what some climatologists think of Dr Gray’s ideas.


Anyway the prediction for the effect of global warming on hurricanes is mixed and not really the main concern people have in regard to our future.

---

Father of Hurricane Prediction Dr. William M. Gray (ouch this gotta hurt!)

Gray is skeptical of current theories of human-induced global warming, which he says is supported by scientists afraid of losing grant funding and promoted by government leaders and environmentalists seeking world government. He believes that humans are not responsible for the warming of the earth and has stated that "We're brainwashing our children." He asked, "How can we trust climate forecasts 50 and 100 years into the future (that can't be verified in our lifetime) when they are not able to make shorter seasonal or yearly forecasts that could be verified?"

Gray said those who had linked global warming to the increased number of hurricanes in recent years were in error. He cites statistics showing that there were 101 hurricanes from 1900 to 1949, in a period of cooler global temperature, compared to 83 from 1957 to 2006 when the earth warmed. Gray does not say there has not been any warming, but states "I don't question that. And humans might have caused a very slight amount of this warming. Very slight. But this warming trend is not going to keep on going. My belief is that three, four years from now, the globe will start to cool again, as it did from the middle '40s to the middle '70s."
frequently been attacked by climate alarmists for refusing to give into political pressures regarding climate. The growing number of failed predictions from the global warming crowd has only cooled the public's belief in recent years.

Nobody except a fool attributes every single weather event to climate change. One has to look at long-term trends and these are suggestive of an increase, though not conclusive.

But Lindzen (whose past research has reputedly been financed by petrochemical industries, though I can't vouched for the veracity of this) is sore because his research on climate change - showing only a small influence of greenhouse gases - has been successfully refuted.

The term "catastrophe" is emotive and largely subjective in interpretation. If one person says that the consequences of a particular phenomenon are likely to be "very serious", others who disagree with this conclusion will often accuse them a predicting a catastrophe - a "catastrophe" being much easier to refute than "very serious consequences".

One also wonders why, if climate change represents such a heaven-sent opportunity to increase taxation, governments such as the last US Republican administration took so long to acknowledge the existence of climate change, let alone the probability of man's responsibility for a significant proportion of it.

The fact is that right wing individuals (including Lindzen) and politicians are averse to taxation, so that they apply reverse logic in attributing socialist/democratic motives to those who espouse the AGW concept.

I'd have stuck with something more plausible like the four horsemen.

On the other hand, it's always interesting to watch the regurgitated narrative from a vested interest pose as news.

I was reading another article about this report, it said it has been deliberately sexed up to make their doomsday prophecy more severe, we know the planet is going through change, the paper by Milutin Milankovitch back in the thirties showing a one hundred thousand year cycle, was laughed at by scientists like these, it took ten years to prove the paper was right, we have always had to adapt to changes in our environment, something we have neglected over the last 50yrs, and virtually everything that has happened in the last 30yrs, is on record of happening before, we
have to look after our sea and flood defences, and we have to make better use of the land we now leave uncultivated.

Marsinah Jawa 1 days ago
13 out of 14

Tell us the total temperature increase from 2000 MJ

harry55 1 days ago

And with all this coming down the road, the government is still continuing to over-populate the UK with more and more third world migrants, even as we lose between 2 and 300,000 native Brits every year to Canada, Australia and NZ.

Scott Tompson 1 days ago

What has the total population of Britain got to do with global warming?

gliftothewisp 1 days ago

Absolutely b*gger all.

 gsingh85 1 days ago

Quite a lot actually. Britain was the first industrialised country because you obviously don’t know that it pioneered the industrial revolution. If you look at the curve it shows average global temperatures are about steady but since the 19th century temperatures and increased sharply. Britain can lead by example and should lead by example.

Milestone 1 days ago

Agenda21: if you believe the human race needs to be downsized, lead by example and kill yourself.

SeaBee 1 days ago

The Malthusians shall inherit the Earth.
Scott Tompson 1 days ago
Better than the Muslims.

mlewis3178 1 days ago
Maybe an overly simple set of questions to those of you who think this is rubbish but:

1. What happens to all the chemicals, gases, etc. we release into the environment?

2. Are you 100% certain that this will never have a negative effect on us or our world.

3. Where does your evidence come from for this certainty?

4. If you are not 100% in your view point surely you agree when it comes to something as important as us all staying alive then why take the risk of producing these chemical, gases, etc. and should we not take action to reduce them.

FWKirkham 1 days ago
"If you are not 100% in your view"

You have under-powered your point number 4 - does one have to be 100% certain about something before you take action, or decide against an action?

If we only ever acted on 100% certainty we would never dare to get out of bed in the morning (in fact 75% of accidents occur in bed - but only if you count unplanned pregnancies).

What minimum level of probability (likelihood) that man is going to seriously jeopardise our future do we require to justify action? Surely much less than 100%.

Another_Pragmatist 1 days ago
Time to dig out my old 'The End Is Nigh' sandwich board and go annoy a few people in the High street.

Jack_FT 1 days ago
We're NOT immune ? Utter tosh ! We're Anglo-Saxons, best people on the planet. We will prevail, we will not be smeared by insane climate hysterics !

Debbie Prehn 1 days ago
The biggest lie ever, anthropogenic? well pollution yes, deforestation yes what about bill gates he uses his microsoft/cia billions to spray us with chemtrails,aluminium particulate is destroying the ph balance in the soil, so nothing will grow, how
many nuclear tests in space did the u.s explode, trying to ignite the atmosphere, blowing holes in the ozone layer, what about the haarp array, lifting the lid off the ionosphere, and weather modification microwave radiation, nuclear radiation, gmos, agent orange still floating around after all this time, wake up this is depopulation, they are gonna kill you, climate change is a front for depopulation, they are poisoning your food, your water, your medications are full of toxic substances, abortions, killing the animals, killing the old and the weak, they are turning organic humans into synthetic, they are dumbing you down with fluoride. they let china pollute and 150 other countries where they have their smart money in slave labour, wake up before it's too late, stop watching tv, most of it is mind numbing crap and brainwashing, wake up fight back, learn the truth, choose life.

Jack_FT 1 days ago
What would YOU do with folks 80% of whom are unable to understand medium complex facts? It's all for the best.

Milestone 1 days ago
Lead by example, or do you not have the cajones?

Pragmatist 1 days ago
As marches on, these warnings become more and more hysterical! The most significant issue is the decline in 'science' to the level of numerous individuals searching on the internet and 'scientists' are to blame.

We have seen too many scandals, reports with ludicrous support data, falsified research, pandemic myths supported by secret WHO panels with links to big pharma, contradictory predictions, conflicting research heavily sponsored by competing financial interests, endless 'we have a cure for x' but you won't see it for 20 years etc etc etc...

Science has sold its soul again and again and now few take it seriously. Those who condemn the 'deniers' i.e. those who don't agree with them, have created the conditions whereby alternative views have similar validity. I recently treated myself to a fried breakfast in a transport cafe, some truck drivers were discussing the latest 'scientific research in paper. A couple piped up, 'who is paying for this report?'

So called 'scientists' are reaping the whirlwind and this one is man made!
13 of the 14 hottest years on record are this century. The facts, the irrefragible facts

Pragmatist 1 days ago
Despite your 98 languages, 43 PhDs and endless days in the deepest jungles discussing Wittgenstein with indigenous natives, you keep making yourself look extremely foolish by these silly pronouncements.

FWKirkham 1 days ago
@Pragmatist - “you keep making yourself look extremely foolish by these silly pronouncements”

Then refute them - with evidence.
IPCC report paints bleak picture of war, famine and pestilence: ‘Climat...