

## Climate Debate Breakthrough

Those who watched *60 Minutes* on August 17 2008 had the opportunity to judge who was peddling myths or presenting facts about the climate debate, Prime Minister Kevin Rudd or Dr. David Evans. This is required information for those who are already questioning the political attempts to de-industrialize Australia, and their folly of taxing our way to recovery. We hope that Mr Rudd watches the program too, and notes the fragility of the "evidence" on which he is relying.

Three items for your consideration:-

1. *60 Minutes* program transcript.
  2. *60 Minutes* on-line question session.
  3. *Dr. David Evans* recent 2GB radio interview (Rocket Scientist Recants).
- 

### **60 Minutes Program Transcript – Crunch Time**

*60 Minutes*

*Sunday, August 17, 2008*

*Reporter: Tara Brown*

*Producer: Stephen Taylor*

It's the story of our lives, the most crucial issue, the most controversial. The very future of planet earth. For almost 20 years, we've heard the warnings about climate change, yet so many of us know so little about it. We're told we should prepare for the worst, more floods, more storms, more droughts. And of course, it's all our fault. If we don't act now, if we don't change our way of life, the world as we know it is finished. But is it really that bad, are we really doomed? The skeptics say no, not necessarily. But with so much at stake can we risk it? Can we afford to sit back, do nothing and hope for the best?

**TARA BROWN:** It's strange but true. The devastating effects of global warming are often best seen in the most spectacular parts of the world. A story on the melt-down of the Arctic ice cap could easily be a picture postcard luring tourists to Greenland. Just this sublime, stark landscape where you are a mere witness to nature at its most spectacular. Just as a look at polar bears facing an ever-warming environment can become a face-to-face adventure... Oh my God. Oh no. And even here at home, the beauty of this vast watery wilderness - South Australia's Coorong - blinds you to the fact this place is choking to death.

**DAVID PATON:** Where we are standing, there probably was almost 1 metre of water here, just a year ago.

**CHARLES WOOLEY:** This isn't a lake or a waterway, it's a desert.

**TARA BROWN:** For almost 20 ears now, we have traveled to these places. Places, which - if you believe the dire warnings of global warming - may be doomed. Certainly our Prime Minister Kevin Rudd believes them. How big a challenge is climate change to mankind in 2008?

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** I think it's probably one of the biggest if the not THE biggest challenge for the century and the reason's pretty clear - it affects everything.

**TARA BROWN:** So convinced is the Federal Government of the threat, it is about to introduce a controversial carbon tax that will not only change the way we live, but have a huge impact on our economy.

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** I'm not going to lie to you and say this is going to be cost free. This is a tough decision, we need to take it for the country's long-term future and its long-term economic future. But economic cost of not acting is massive, it's through the roof. Think about food production, the Murray, think about the impact on tourism in QLD, no more Barrier Reef, Kakadu, no more Kakadu. Think about the impact on jobs, it's huge.

**TARA BROWN:** How certain are you that mankind is the cause behind global warming?

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** Well, I just look at what the scientists say. There's a group of scientists called the International Panel on Climate Change - 4000 of them. Guys in white coats who run around and don't have a sense of humour. They just measure things. And what they say to us is it's happening and it's caused by human activity.

**TARA BROWN:** Man's desire to create great economic wealth has fuelled an unabashed lust for energy. It means we've treated the planet as a dump pumping whatever we wanted wherever we wanted. But increasingly, smoke stacks have become symbols of environmental embarrassment rather than industrial envy. For years, the experts have told us these emissions cause global warming.

**DR TIM FLANNERY:** That is the most important thing. Stop burning coal and other fossil fuels and stop putting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere because that is what is warming the atmosphere and that is what's driving the changes.

**TARA BROWN:** But we've also met the skeptics.

**PROF. RICHARD LINDZEN:** We need CO-2. It's not a poison, it's not a pollutant. It's essential for life on earth. I mean how much are we going to depend on people's ignorance in order to produce panic?

**TARA BROWN:** They may not be as well known but there are many scientists - in fact thousands around the world - who don't think carbon dioxide is the climate-change culprit. Scientist and mathematician, David Evans, says man is not to blame and so to cut carbon emissions is misguided.

**DAVID EVANS:** I think it's an utter waste of time and that's why I'm speaking out. The picture that our decision makers have is wrong. It's going to cost us a lot of time, effort and money and it's gonna make a lot of us a bit poorer and there's no evidence that carbon emissions cause any significant warming at all.

**TARA BROWN:** So, if nothing else, their hearts are in the right place?

**DAVID EVANS:** Yeah, sure, however their brains are in the wrong place and we didn't elect them for their hearts, they've got to use their brains as well.

**PROF. LONNIE THOMPSON:** The ice gives a very clear story I think it is our most visible evidence of global warming.

**TARA BROWN:** The science of climate change is relatively new but relies on some very old evidence, as Liz Hayes discovered when she met Professor Lonnie Thompson on the Athabasca Glacier in the Canadian Rockies.

**LIZ HAYES:** Now Lonnie, is this an example of what you were talking about - this glacier?

**PROF. LONNIE THOMPSON:** Yes, if you look at the history here as we know it, it has retreated about 1.5 km since 1844.

**LIZ HAYES:** Glaciers, according to scientists like Lonnie Thompson are the equivalent to the canary in the coal mine. When they start disappearing we are all in trouble. And just about every glacier on the planet is melting.

**PROF. LONNIE THOMPSON:** What we've been seeing in the last 20 years is that that rate is accelerating and it is becoming fast even for a glacier.

**TARA BROWN:** No doubt the ice is melting, but the big question is - are we to blame? The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate change reports it is 90% certain we are. But other equally eminent scientists believe what were seeing is just part of Nature's great cycle.

**DAVID EVANS:** Now since 1990, western governments have spent about \$50 billion looking for evidence that carbon causes global warming and they haven't found any.

**TARA BROWN:** Dr David Evans has six university degrees and once worked for the Australian Government's Greenhouse Office. But he no longer thinks global warming is caused by our carbon dioxide and so isn't concerned about his or any one else's carbon footprint. So does that mean don't give up your V8 cars? Does that mean continue flying, don't worry about changing light bulbs, don't worry about trying to capture carbon or shutting down coal-fired power stations? Is that what that means?

**DAVID EVANS:** Well, I'm just here to report on modern science and where it's up to, personally I don't worry about those things too much, no.

**TARA BROWN:** Perhaps nowhere in the world is there more compelling evidence against the man-made carbon dioxide argument than Greenland. Long before the Industrial Age, the Vikings lived here and happily grew wheat and vegetables. It was known as the 'Medieval Warm Period' and temperatures were even hotter than they are today. For 400 years the Vikings called Greenland home. No-one really understands why they suddenly disappeared but most historians believe there was a sudden, harsh cold snap and, unable to adapt, the Vikings became Greenland's early victims of climate

change. 1,000 years on, Greenland is enjoying another warm period and for the first time since then growing a variety of vegetables.

**KENNETH HOEGH:** Oh yes, that's sweet.

**TARA BROWN:** It's like you're in a lolly shop.

**KENNETH HOEGH:** Yeah, that's right.

**TARA BROWN:** While some believe this warming could simply be part of the world's natural cycle not so former US vice-president Al Gore. In his Oscar-winning documentary 'An Inconvenient Truth' he paints an apocalyptic picture of the future - rising seas, longer nastier droughts, more severe storms, more misery unless we make drastic cuts to our emissions.

**AL GORE:** When there is more carbon dioxide, the temperature gets warmer because it traps more heat from the sun inside.

**TARA BROWN:** Everyone agrees the solution to climate change is de-carbonisation. Stop the carbon emissions.

**DAVID EVANS:** Well with respect, Al Gore has been saying that the debate is over since 1991. We have learnt a great deal about the climate since 1991.

**TARA BROWN:** And what we should know, according to David Evans, is since 2001 temperatures around the world have stopped rising. And that's despite increasing levels of carbon dioxide in the air. So statistically, in the last seven years, the flattening and perhaps even slight cooling of temperatures - is that significant?

**DAVID EVANS:** Yes, yes it is significant. Once it gets up to five years or so it's really quite significant. Whatever was driving the temperatures up has taken a break for a while and meanwhile carbon emissions have continued and the level of carbon in the atmosphere has gone up about 5% since 2001, yet we see no more warming.

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** Here's a measurement which people should just sit back and pay a bit of attention to - the 12 hottest years in human history have occurred in the last 13 years. That's a fact.

**TARA BROWN:** It's not my position to correct you Prime Minister but I've been told that in fact during the middle ages the global temperatures were two to three degrees warmer than now. Certainly we've had the hottest 12 years in recent history but the planet's been a lot hotter.

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** Well, I stand by what the International Panel of Climate Change Scientists have had to say. There will always be argy-bargy about elements of the detail.

**TARA BROWN:** Global Warming certainly attracts lots of argy-bargy. But one thing climate scientists agree on - if global warming is caused by CO-2 emissions then the CO-2 will leave a distinct signature their computer models predict a big red hotspot above the equator. The problem is thousands of weather balloons equipped with some

very sophisticated thermometers have measured the temperatures in the atmosphere to test the theory, and guess what, no hotspots.

**DAVID EVANS:** There's no hotspot, there's no hotspot at all. It's not even a little hotspot and it's missing. We couldn't find it.

**TARA BROWN:** So, this is the crux for you, this is evidence?

**DAVID EVANS:** Yes. If this had come out the other way, if we'd measured it and we'd found a hotspot I'd be saying, "Cut back carbon emissions."

**TARA BROWN:** A very simple question, is there any chance you're looking in the wrong spot?

**DAVID EVANS:** No.

**TARA BROWN:** But still, carbon emissions are blamed for global warming. And in turn, global warming seems to be at the heart of every grim climate story we've reported in the last 20 years.

**CHARLES WOOLEY:** I've spent a life time reporting drought in Australia and this time even I'm surprised.

**TARA BROWN:** Certainly, Charles Wooley thought he had seen drastic climate change close up in country NSW.

**CHARLES WOOLEY:** Because, believe it or not, this is the reservoir for the city of Goulburn - now down to 8% of capacity. If it were full I should be 10 metres under water.

**JEFF PRELL:** The last 5.5 years of rainfall are 25% below the 100-year average, so this is not only a dry, it's a big dry.

**TARA BROWN:** That was June 2005 and thankfully since then, much of Australia has received rain.

**PROF. MARTIN THOMS:** This is an oasis in an otherwise dry landscape.

**PETER OVERTON:** You like talking about this stuff don't you?

**PROF. MARTIN THOMS:** Who bloody wouldn't?

**TARA BROWN:** But even when an 8-year-long drought breaks and the beauty of new life appears, the overwhelming question remains - how our land will cope with predicted bigger dries of the future.

**PROF. MARTIN THOMS:** Our concern is really that the timing between drinks is changing, it's getting longer because of climate change, because of development.

**PETER OVERTON:** If the water goes up or down just a little bit then their very survival, their existence, is on a knife's edge.

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** In Australia we are the hottest and driest continent on the planet now. We therefore stand to be hit hardest and earliest. Something's happening, it's very big and it's irresponsible not to act.

**TARA BROWN:** What to do is the megabillion-dollar question. There are alternatives to powering our world without the carbon fallout of coal and oil but all have their negatives. The great hope was to replace fossil fuels with biofuels like palm oil but the plantations are so vast in places like Indonesia entire jungles are being wiped out as are the precious orang-utans who live in them.

**LIAM BARTLETT:** Trouble is, the forest is getting harder and harder to find and it's not surprising when you take a look at this.

**TARA BROWN:** Then there's wind power. It might make us feel good but there's just not enough puff in it.

**DR JAMES LOVELOCK:** At the best, wind power cannot provide more than a tiny fraction of the energy needs of civilisation. I think it's one of those things politicians like because it can be seen that they're doing something.

**TARA BROWN:** And nuclear power may be embraced by France and Finland as a green and efficient energy source but who could ever forget Richard Carleton in the remnants of the Chernobyl reactor.

**RICHARD CARLETON:** A man sitting at one of these panels here pushed one of these buttons and set off the worst nuclear disaster the world has ever seen.

**TARA BROWN:** In Australia, the spectre of a nuclear melt-down is politically too hot to handle. Is that no to nuclear power?

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** Well our attitude is that this country has enormous energy sources, both traditional carbon-based energy as well as renewable in the forms of solar, wind, geothermal. And on coal we have a particular responsibility to pioneer and, if we can, perfect and if possible apply at commercially meaningful levels clean coal technology.

**TARA BROWN:** If we can clean up coal we can save a \$25 billion energy industry and 30 000 jobs. But that technology is still probably five years away and so, more immediately our Prime Minister wants to cut emissions by putting a cost on carbon. Mr Rudd calls it a carbon pollution reduction scheme. Big emitters will have to buy permits to pollute. It is hoped this will act as an incentive to make them cleaner, but of course they'll pass the costs on to us, and we'll end up paying more for everything. In the short term, the Government will compensate some industry and some householders, but ultimately our whole way of life will change. Is it going to wreck our economy?

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** The key thing is, how do you bring carbon pollution down in an economically responsible fashion? And having looked at all the detail this is the best way forward.

**TARA BROWN:** But if you believe the sceptics, and carbon dioxide isn't to blame for global warming then we face massive change for no good reason.

**DAVID EVANS:** Isn't it a bit dopey to wreck the economy for a purely theoretical reason when the alleged symptom, warming, stopped six years ago.

**TARA BROWN:** They perhaps would use the word prudent as opposed to dopey, that the risk of not doing something is too great?

**DAVID EVANS:** I urge them to look at the modern science, the evidence isn't there. There is no evidence that carbon emissions cause a significant amount of global warming.

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** I am not, myself, a qualified scientist. I'm elected as Prime Minister of Australia to act on the basis of the considered scientific advice.

**TARA BROWN:** But it's never too late to continue the debate is it?

**PM KEVIN RUDD:** Look at your kids in the eye tonight and ask yourself this question - "If we have this much evidence available to us now on climate change and just refuse to act, then what are the consequences for them?" The alternative, however, is to just stick your head in the sand and hope it all goes away.

---

## **60 Minutes on-line question session with Dr David Evans**

Monday, August 18, 2008

*60 Minutes presents a live interview with mathematician and scientist, Dr David Evans. David is here to talk to us tonight about global warming.*

**Interviewer:** Dr Evans, thank you for joining us tonight.

**Dr David Evans:** Thanks for listening to me, the skeptical case has been ignored by the press till now and I think you'll find it very strong. People are finally coming to terms with it now.

**BruceV asks:** David, we are about to have a terrible new tax imposed on us, surely if this government is interested in the truth they will listen to you? Thank you for speaking out and for having the courage to speak the truth.

**Dr David Evans:** Thank you, the reason I spoke out now is because it seemed the situation got beyond stupid and our decision makers need to be reminded that the science has changed since the last 10 years. Unfortunately, the public are also unaware of the science in the last few years and I think if they were aware there would be a public outcry that these taxes do not go ahead.

**finallysomesense asks:** Is the IPCC still a relevant body, or have the political considerations become such that the science is lost in the fallout for these 'scientists'?

**Dr David Evans:** The IPCC is a UN bureaucracy. Less than half of the 2500 involved are scientists, most are bureaucrats. The IPCC is reluctant to consider causes of global warming other than human ones. The fact that temperatures haven't risen since 2001 means that their politics are becoming untenable.

**Aussie asks:** Shouldn't the government be paying incentives to companies who produce a cleaner environment rather than charging them and allowing them to keep polluting it, anyway you put it we the taxpayer still pay.

**Dr David Evans:** There are many forms of pollution, CO<sub>2</sub> is not pollution. CO<sub>2</sub> is beneficial to plants and doesn't seem to have a significant effect on the earth's temperature. I agree that the government should be regulating the earth's pollution but it's a different question that global warming.

**Christopher asks:** Dr Evans would you say that the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> released into our atmosphere every day has no effect on the world climate?

**Dr David Evans:** Almost no effect. There is no evidence that it has a significant effect. The case that most scientists consider is what happens if CO levels double from a pre industrial level of 280ppm to 580ppm, which we will get to in 2100AD. Theoretical estimates range from 1/4 degree to 6 degrees. The most creditable theoretical calculation was performed by a Hungarian mathematician at NASA named Miskolczi. He took everything he could into account and updated the NASA calculation and his answer was 1/4 degree. NASA didn't like the answer and made him feel uncomfortable and he resigned shortly after. In any case, the best theory and the actual evidence suggest the influence of CO<sub>2</sub> to the earth is small to negligible.

**Buzzard asks:** Based on your calculations, how much further will sea levels have risen, especially around Melbourne within the next 10 years?

**Dr David Evans:** I don't know, sorry, I'm not involved with sea level calculations.

**BruceV asks:** Is it true that if there were high levels of CO<sub>2</sub> in there atmosphere the sky would be a red colour?

**Dr David Evans:** No, I don't think so. CO<sub>2</sub> is colourless. In commercial greenhouses the CO<sub>2</sub> level are pumped up quite high and it's still colourless.

**Zeus asks:** Has the decrease in temperature over the last 7 years or so corresponded with a decrease in sun spot activity?

**Dr David Evans:** The last 7 years has seen a period of flat temperatures with a small downward bias. It's too early to say temperatures are dropping even in the last year they have dropped a little. We're looking here for temperature trends which typically exhibit themselves over 5 years or so, so I think it's safer to say that temperatures have levelled out since 2001. The correlation with solar activities are very interesting, bare in mind that they are only correlation and nothing has been proven. However the late appearance solar cycle 24, suggest the next 24 years or so might be a little cooler.

**Hochie asks:** Dr Evans, do you know of any alternative theory for the changing global average temperatures over the past millennium, or over past ages? E.g. I heard something about solar output fluctuating over time and I wondered if there is any data on that.



**Dr David Evans:** The sun affects the earth's temperature in two ways. Firstly, there can be changes in solar radiation, meaning the amount of heat pumped out by the sun. People have observed slight variation over the decades. Secondly and probably more significantly, the sun affects cloud formation on earth through solar magnetic effects. High energy cosmic rays strike the earth and help create clouds. And those clouds had a cooling effect on the earth. But the sun's magnetic shields us from some of those high energy cosmic rays. So when the sun is active, the earth gets less high energy cosmic rays so there are fewer clouds and it gets warmer. The sun has been pretty active in the last few decades. This theory still hasn't been proven and is just at the stage of correlations. There are probably half a dozen likely influences on the global temperature and at this stage I don't know of any good evidence to know, which are the important ones except to say that because the signature is missing, we can pretty much rule out carbon emissions.

**listener asks:** Here is a question that concerns me in relation to the doom and gloom prediction. Given there is evidence that our earth has gone through this cycle over trillions of years, is it possible the observation is just that, observation, and there are no solutions?

**Dr David Evans:** Yes, it's quite possible that we humans have no effect on temperature. And all we're seeing is natural variation. Bear in mind that it was warmer in the medieval times 800 years ago and it was a couple of degrees cooler in the 17 hundreds when they had a mini ice age. Humanity generally flourish when it is hotter, so personally I regard a little bit of heating as a good thing.

**Susie asks:** Dr Evans, could you please explain what you believe to be the cause of global warming if it is not carbon emissions.

**Dr David Evans:** I don't know. Possible causes are solar magnetic effects (which influence cloud level and therefore the earth's temperature), ozone depletion, industrial pollution such as aerosols, changes in greenhouse gases and anything that influence the ozone layer including electromagnetic radiation. And there are quite a few others. At this stage we don't have enough evidence to know what is really causing it. However correlation with solar activities is pretty strong, so the answer probably involved the sun and the clouds.

**Cid asks:** Dr Evans would not enhancing electricity production be a more innovative path to thus take?

**Dr David Evans:** As an electrical engineer I think that electricity production is an exciting topics and I wish we had more diversity in the means of production. I encourage people to do research on solar and other renewables.

**mainst asks:** David..... Thank you for speaking out. The voices of reason have been swamped by Hansen, Gore & the IPCC et al recently. What are your thoughts on the current solar minimum & have you heard of any research being done on intergravitational waves and their potential effects on the forces that drive the core of our planet?

**Dr David Evans:** No I haven't heard anything about intergravitational waves, thank you for your kind comments. It's encouraging to see that journalists are finally paying attention to this fine issue.

**observer asks:** Dr Evens what are your thoughts on sun spots being the primary cause of global warming?

**Dr David Evans:** It's a good possibility, not proven but correlations right up till today are good. It's important to see that solar activity does not correlate with NASA GISS temperatures, because they come from land based thermometers and are corrupted by the urban land heat effects. However solar activities correlate very well with satellite temperatures right up to 2008.

**true asks:** I to have been wondering the truths or smoke and mirrors that governments often use to create taxes, but being a layperson and taught that our planet has had ice ages and warmed up many times what makes so different this time?

**Dr David Evans:** We don't know that it is any different this time. The alarmist want us to believe that our emission of CO are warming the planet and while that seems a reasonable proposition two decades ago, the evidence has changed in the last decade to indicate that is certainly not the case. We don't know what caused the recent global warming, but chances are the causes are natural.

**KevinM asks:** DR Evans, Thank you for being up front with this CO2 thing, We grow plants in elevated co2 atmospheres and when co2 increases the plants grow quicker which balance the co2 back to 280 ppm, this is what should happen in nature?

**Dr David Evans:** CO2 is good for plants. We humans have been digging CO2 out from under the desert in Saudi Arabia and efficiently distributing it across the planet. Plants need carbon to grow, in fact they need it more than water. Satellite data shows that over the last 2 decades the amount of plant biomass on the planet has increased by 6 percent. So increasing the CO2 levels is helping feed the planet. Not only is CO2 not pollution, but it is beneficial to all plants and most animals on the planet.

**Bo asks:** Dr Evens I believe that the planet has been and is always evolving with massive changes to the environment over many thousands of years. Why do we think as humans living for only a short time on this planet, that we can change things?

**Dr David Evans:** That's a philosophical and political question and I'd rather just stick to the Science questions, sorry.

**seeking asks:** if all things are considered is it true that any measures that we take now will not be strong enough to combat global warming.

**Dr David Evans:** Probably very little. We couldn't find the greenhouse signature in the last 2 decades and that tells us that increasing the amount of greenhouse gases is having very little effect on the global temperature. Even a big sustained release of methane probably won't affect the global temperature very much.

**nwo asks:** Dr Evens. Can you please give your opinion on studies that may suggest that the sun is actually getting hotter and attributing not only to global warming on earth but on other planets as well ?

**Dr David Evans:** I haven't seen any good evidence on this, but otherwise I don't know much about it.

**ord asks:** if all things are considered is it true that any measures that we take now will not be strong enough to combat global warming.

**Dr David Evans:** We don't know what causes global warming, except that we now are pretty sure that carbon emissions do not cause it. Therefore taking measures to decrease our carbon emissions won't have any significant effect.

**pete asks:** Dr Evans, our Prime Minister, who states that he, is no scientist, stated in the report that humans were to blame for increases in global temperature, which is wrong; as if we follow his point of view; we are only adding to a natural cycle, therefore we are not solely to blame (way to go Kevin). Do you get disheartened with peoples natural tendencies to follow what is being stated in popular press? Rather than looking at data which shows that the Earth's temperature has differentiated over its biographic life, at periods being above modern temperatures.

**Dr David Evans:** Many of the crucial issues in global warming are pretty simple. Well within the grasp of any educated citizen such as the Prime Minister. You only need a high school education to be able to read a temperature graph, and to see that the temperatures have been flat since 2001. You only have to be vaguely aware of the debate to notice that the alarmist are offering no actually evidence, only results from computer models. These are things that any political or journalist should feel confident in doing. I urge our Prime Minister to spend a little more time investigating the issue himself instead of just relying on the advice of people's whose jobs depend on the belief that carbon emission cause global warming.

**DJ asks:** Dr Evans, do you believe that animals such as Polar Bears etc will really become extinct as a result of the climatic changes being experienced? What do you believe will really happen with regard to future Australian weather patterns - are we in for more severe droughts/cyclones, etc?

**Dr David Evans:** Australian weather patterns are dominated by the pacific decadal oscillation (PDO), there are periods of about 40-50 years when El-Nino dominate and there are period of about 40 years or so when lanigo dominate. The result is that Australian's weather systems goes for about 40 years or so of drought, and then 40 years of so of floods. As far as I am aware, this pattern hasn't changed and will probably continue into the future. Satellite data since 1979 indicate that the Southern hemisphere has no existed any global warming, as it happens, global warming is a pheromone that only effects the Northern hemisphere. Global warming and weather are influence by clouds, rain and water vapour all these issues are very closely tied together. I don't think any one fully understands them yet.

**mattJ asks:** You mentioned that "it was warmer in medieval times", but do you accept the possibility that the medieval Warm Period may have been partly a regional

phenomenon, with the extremes reflecting a redistribution of heat around the planet rather than a big overall rise in the average global temperature?

**Dr David Evans:** Temperature records for that period are of course very sketchy. However what evidence we do have via proxy and historical records, suggest it wasn't just Greenland that was warm, that it was spread around the planet. Exactly how much warmer is certainly open to dispute. So in summary, it is possible though unlikely.

**Hunter asks:** I am concerned about the environment like most people, but I believe that we should react to accurate information. I am just as concerned that how the world is reacting about global warming scares now is similar to how we all were told that the millennium bug would stop society.

**Dr David Evans:** Yes, it's important to get our response right. If the alarmist are correct, then we should cut down our carbon emissions of the planet with overheat. If the alarmist are wrong, it's important not to cut back our carbon emissions or we'll create wide spread poverty unnecessary. There is no real substitute, except the get the real science right.

**x asks:** Weather models are notoriously unreliable due to the chaotic effects present in weather systems. What degree of confidence do the computer models on CO2 hotspots provide?

**Dr David Evans:** The hotspot due to enhance greenhouse is a central feature of all models. If the hotspot is not there, then either carbon emissions don't cause global warming or we completely misunderstand the climate system. The hot spot is something we except for theoretical reasons, but it's very central to our understanding.

**8.technical asks:** OK let's say that CO2 is not a problem. But is there added greenhouse effect due to airborne pollutants or would you say that has been overstated as well? It's hard to get the 'straight dope' on these issues.

**Dr David Evans:** On that issue, no one I know of has the 'straight dope'. The problem of industrial emission is normally called aerosols. It's not clear at this stage if aerosols increase the temperature of maybe lower the temperature. But we do know they are having some significant effect. At the moment the IPCC think they probably increase temperature, and I'm inclined to believe them.

**Interviewer:** Dr Evans unfortunately we are out of time tonight, do you have any final words for those who have come to the interview?

**Dr David Evans:** Thanks for your attention, this issue will get sorted out because it's an issue of science. No amount of human arguing and can affect the actual effects of global warming and it will be another 2-3 decades of research before we will probably have a definitive answer as to what causes global warming. Stay Tuned ... Dr Evan's website: [www.sciencespeak.com](http://www.sciencespeak.com)

**Interviewer:** This concludes our chat with Dr David Evans, Sunday August 17, 2008.

---

## ***Dr. David Evans recent 2GB radio interview***

*Rocket Scientist Recants*

Please click on the below link for the Jason Morrison's interview with scientist David Evans about the myth of global warming and the economic damage we'll suffer under a carbon emissions trading scheme:

[http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com\\_newsmanager&task=view&id=1748](http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=1748)