

*A Rational Discussion of Climate Change: The Science, the Evidence, the Response**

Benjamin D. Santer, Ph.D.

Introduction

In 1988, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was jointly established by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme. The goals of this panel were threefold: to assess available scientific information on climate change, to evaluate the environmental and societal impacts of climate change, and to formulate response strategies. The IPCC's first major scientific assessment, published in 1990, concluded that "unequivocal detection of the enhanced greenhouse effect from observations is not likely for a decade or more."¹

In 1996, the IPCC's second scientific assessment made a more definitive statement regarding human impacts on climate, and concluded that "the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate."² This cautious sentence marked a paradigm shift in our scientific understanding of the causes of recent climate change. The shift arose for a variety of reasons. Chief amongst these was the realization that the cooling effects of sulfate aerosol particles (which are produced by burning fossil fuels that contain sulfates) had partially masked the warming signal arising from increasing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases.³

A further major area of progress was the increasing use of "fingerprint" studies.^{4,5,6} The strategy in this type of research is to search for a "fingerprint" (the climate change pattern predicted by a computer model) in observed climate records. The underlying assumption in fingerprinting is that each "forcing" of climate – such as changes in the sun's energy output, volcanic dust, sulfate aerosols, or greenhouse gas concentrations – has a unique pattern of climate response (see figure 1, pg. 130). Fingerprint studies apply signal processing techniques very similar to those used in electrical engineering.⁷ They allow researchers to make rigorous tests of competing hypotheses regarding the causes of recent climate change.

*This is the first public presentation, in abbreviated form, of the author's subsequent testimony to the U.S. Congress, prepared for the House Committee on Science and Technology, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, at a hearing entitled "A Rational Discussion of Climate Change: The Science, the Evidence, the Response," on November 17, 2010. The testimony primarily focuses on rigorous "fingerprint" studies that compare observed spatial patterns of climate change with results from computer model simulations. For the complete report, including the "Response to Questions for the Record," see <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-111hhr62618/pdf/CHRG-111hhr62618.pdf>.

*In keeping with the format followed in this publication, all the original footnotes from the GPO version were reformatted as 'endnotes'. The author also made some recent minor revisions to this paper.




FIGURE 1 Climate simulations of the vertical profile of temperature change due to five different factors, and the effect due to all factors taken together. The panels above represent a cross-section of the atmosphere from the North Pole to the South Pole, and from the surface up into the stratosphere. The black lines show the approximate location of the tropopause, the boundary between the lower atmosphere (the troposphere) and the stratosphere.

SOURCE: T.R. Karl, J.M. Melillo, and T.C. Peterson. *Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States*. (Cambridge University Press, 2009), 21.

The third IPCC assessment was published in 2001, and went one step further than its predecessor. The third assessment reported on the magnitude of the human effect on climate. It found that “there is new and stronger evidence that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities.”⁸ This conclusion was based on improved estimates of natural climate variability, better reconstructions of temperature fluctuations over the last millennium, continued warming of the climate system, refinements in fingerprint methods, and the use of results from more (and improved) climate models, driven by more accurate and complete estimates of the human and natural “forcings” of climate.

This gradual strengthening of scientific confidence in the reality of human influences on global climate continued in the fourth IPCC assessment report (AR4) report, which stated that “warming of the climate system is unequivocal,” and that “most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations” (where “very likely” signified >90 percent probability that the statement is correct). The AR4 report justified this increase in scientific confidence on the basis of “...longer and improved records, an expanded range of observations, and improvements in the simulation of many aspects of climate and its variability.”¹⁰ In its contribution to the AR4, IPCC Working Group II concluded that anthropogenic warming has had a discernible influence not only on the physical climate system, but also on a wide range of biological systems which respond to climate.¹¹

Extraordinary claims require extraordinary proof.¹² The IPCC’s extraordinary claim that human activities significantly altered both the chemical composition of Earth’s atmosphere and the climate system has received extraordinary scrutiny. This claim has been independently corroborated by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences,¹³ the Science Academies of 11 nations,¹⁴ and the Synthesis and Assessment Products of the U.S. Climate Change Science Plan.¹⁵ Many of our professional scientific organizations have also affirmed the reality of a human influence on global climate.¹⁶

Despite the overwhelming evidence of pronounced anthropogenic effects on climate, important uncertainties remain in our ability to quantify the human influence. The experiment that we are performing with the Earth’s atmosphere lacks a suitable control: we do not have a convenient “undisturbed Earth,” which would provide a reference against which we could measure the anthropogenic contribution to climate change. We must therefore rely on numerical models and paleoclimate evidence^{17,18,19} to estimate how the Earth’s climate might have evolved in the absence of any human intervention. Such sources of information will always have significant uncertainties.

In the following testimony, I provide a personal perspective on recent developments in the field of detection and attribution (D&A) research. Such research is directed towards detecting significant climate change, and then attributing some portion of the detected change to a specific cause or causes.^{20,21,22,23} I also make some brief remarks about openness and data sharing in the climate modeling community, and accommodation of “alternative” views in the IPCC.

Recent Progress in Detection and Attribution Research

Fingerprinting

The IPCC and National Academy findings that human activities are affecting global-scale climate are based on multiple lines of evidence:

1. Our continually improving physical understanding of the climate system and of the human and natural factors that cause climate to change;
2. Evidence from paleoclimate reconstructions, which enables us to place the warming of the 20th century in a longer-term context;^{24,25}
3. The qualitative consistency between observed changes in different aspects of the climate system and model predictions of the changes that should be occurring in response to human influences;^{26,27} and
4. Evidence from rigorous quantitative fingerprint studies, which compare observed patterns of climate change with results from computer model simulations.

Most of my testimony will focus on the fingerprint evidence, since this is within my own area of scientific expertise.

As noted above, fingerprint studies search for some pattern of climate change (the “fingerprint”) in observational data. The fingerprint can be estimated in different ways, but is typically obtained from a computer model experiment in which one or more human factors are varied according to the best-available estimates of their historical changes. Different statistical techniques are then applied to quantify the level of agreement between the fingerprint and observations and between the fingerprint and estimates of the natural internal variability of climate. This enables researchers to make rigorous tests of competing hypotheses²⁸ regarding the possible causes of recent climate change.^{29,30,31,32}

While early fingerprint work dealt almost exclusively with changes in near-surface or atmospheric temperature, more recent studies have applied fingerprint methods to a range of different variables, such as changes in ocean heat content,^{33,34} Atlantic salinity,³⁵ sea-level pressure,³⁶ tropopause height,³⁷ rainfall patterns,^{38,39} surface humidity,⁴⁰ atmospheric moisture,^{41,42} continental river runoff,⁴³ and Arctic sea ice extent.⁴⁴ The general conclusion is that for each of these variables, natural causes alone cannot explain the observed climate changes over the second half of the 20th century. The best statistical explanation of the observed climate changes invariably involves a large human contribution. These fingerprint results are robust to the processing choices made by different groups, and show a high level of physical consistency across different climate variables. For example, observed atmospheric water vapor increases⁴⁵ are physically consistent with increases in ocean heat content^{46,47} and near-surface temperature.^{48,49}

There are a number of popular misconceptions about fingerprint evidence. One misconception is that fingerprint studies consider global-mean temperatures only, and thus provide a very poor constraint on the relative contributions of human and natural factors to observed changes.⁵⁰ In fact, fingerprint studies rely on information about the detailed spatial structure (and often the combined space and time structure) of observed and simulated climate changes. Complex patterns provide much stronger constraints on the possible contributions of different factors to observed climate changes.^{51,52,53}

Another misconception is that computer model estimates of natural internal climate variability (“climate noise”) are accepted uncritically in fingerprint studies, and are never tested against observations.⁵⁴ This is demonstrably untrue. Many fingerprint studies test whether model estimates of climate noise are realistic. Such tests are routinely performed on year-to-year and decade-to-decade timescales, where observational data are of sufficient length to obtain reliable estimates of observed climate variability.^{55,56,57,58}

Because regional-scale climate changes will determine societal impacts, fingerprint studies are increasingly shifting their focus from global to regional scales.⁵⁹ Such regional studies face a number of challenges. One problem is that the noise of natural internal climate variability typically becomes larger when averaged over increasingly finer scales,⁶⁰ so that identifying regional and local climate signals becomes more difficult.

Another problem relates to the climate “forcings” used in computer model simulations of historical climate change. As scientific attention shifts to ever smaller spatial scales, it becomes more important to obtain reliable information about these forcings. Some forcings are both uncertain and highly variable in space and time.^{61,62} Examples include human-induced changes in land surface properties⁶³ or in the concentrations of carbon-containing aerosols.^{64,65} Neglect or inaccurate specification of these factors complicates D&A studies.

Despite these problems, numerous researchers have now shown that the climate signals of greenhouse gases and sulfate aerosols are identifiable at continental and sub-continental scales in many different regions around the globe.^{66,67,68,69} Related work^{70,71} suggests that a human-caused climate signal has already emerged from the background noise at spatial scales at or below 500 km,⁷² and may be contributing to regional changes in the distributions of plant and animal species.⁷³

In summarizing this section of my testimony, I note that the focus of fingerprint research has evolved over time. Its initial emphasis was on global-scale changes in Earth’s surface temperature. Subsequent research demonstrated that human fingerprints were identifiable in many different aspects of the climate system – not in surface temperature only. We are now on the verge of detecting human effects on climate at much finer regional scales of direct relevance to policymakers, and in variables tightly linked to climate change impacts.^{74,75,76,77,78}

Assessing Risks of Changes in Extreme Events

We are now capable of making informed scientific statements regarding the influence of human activities on the likelihood of extreme events.^{79,80,81} As noted previously, computer models can be used to perform the control experiment (no human effects on climate) that we cannot perform in the real world. Using the “unforced” climate variability from a multi-century control run, it is possible to determine how many times an extreme event of a given magnitude should have been observed in the absence of human interference. The probability of obtaining the same extreme event is then calculated in a perturbed climate – for example, in a model experiment with historical or future increases in greenhouse gases, or under some specified change in mean climate.⁸² Comparison of the frequencies of extremes in the control and perturbed experiments allows climate scientists to make probabilistic statements about how human-induced climate change may have altered the likelihood of the extreme event.^{83,84,85} This is sometimes referred to as an assessment of “fractional attributable risk.”⁸⁶

Recently, a “fractional attributable risk” study of the 2003 European summer heat wave concluded that “*there is a greater than 90% percent chance that over half the risk of European summer temperatures exceeding a threshold of 1.6 K is attributable to human influence on climate.*”⁸⁷ This study (and related work) illustrates that the D&A community has moved beyond analysis of changes in the mean state of the climate. We now apply rigorous statistical methods to the problem of estimating how human activities may alter the probability of occurrence of extreme events. The demonstration of human culpability in changing these risks is likely to have significant implications for the debate on policy responses to climate change.

Summary of Detection and Attribution Evidence

In evaluating how well a novel has been crafted, it is important to look at the internal consistency of the plot. Critical readers examine whether the individual storylines are neatly woven together, and whether the internal logic makes sense. We can ask similar questions about the “story” contained in observational records of climate change. The evidence from numerous sources (paleoclimate data, rigorous fingerprint studies, and qualitative comparisons of modeled and observed climate changes) shows that the climate system is telling us an internally consistent story about the causes of recent climate change.

Over the last century, we have observed large and coherent changes in many different aspects of Earth’s climate. The oceans and land surface have warmed.^{88,89,90,91,92,93,94,95} Atmospheric moisture has increased.^{96,97,98,99} Rainfall patterns have changed.^{100,101} Glaciers have retreated over most of the globe.^{102,103,104} The Greenland Ice Sheet has lost some of its mass.¹⁰⁵ Sea level has risen.¹⁰⁶ Snow and sea-ice extent have decreased in the Northern Hemisphere.^{107,108,109,110} The stratosphere has cooled,¹¹¹ and there are now reliable indications that the troposphere has warmed.^{112,113,114,115,116,117,118,119,120,121,122} The height of the tropopause has increased.¹²³ Individually, all of these changes are consistent with our scientific understanding of how the climate system

should be responding to anthropogenic forcing. Collectively, this behavior is inconsistent with the changes that we would expect to occur due to natural variability alone.

There is now compelling scientific evidence that human activity has had a discernible influence on global climate. However, there are still significant uncertainties in our estimates of the size and geographical distribution of the climate changes projected to occur over the 21st century. These uncertainties make it difficult for us to assess the magnitude of the mitigation and adaptation problem that faces us and our descendants. The dilemma that confronts us, as citizens and stewards of this planet, is how to act in the face of both hard scientific evidence that our actions are altering global climate and continuing uncertainty in the size of the planetary warming that faces us.

Openness and Data Sharing in the Climate Modeling Community

Recently, concerns have been expressed about ease of access to the information produced by computer models of the climate system. Climate modeling is sometimes portrayed as a secretive endeavor. This is not the case. In the 1970s and 1980s, the evaluation and intercomparison of climate models was largely qualitative, mostly performed by modelers themselves. It often involved purely visual examination of maps from a single model and observations (or from several different models). There were no standard benchmark experiments, and there was little or no community involvement in model diagnosis. It was difficult to track changes in model performance over time.¹²⁴

This situation changed dramatically with the start of the Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP) in the early 1990s. AMIP involved running different Atmospheric General Circulation Models (AGCMs) with observed sea-surface temperatures and sea-ice changes over 1979 to 1988. Approximately 30 modeling groups from 10 different countries participated in the design and diagnosis of the AGCM simulations. Subsequent “revisits” of AMIP enabled the climate community to track changes in model performance over time.¹²⁵

The next major Model Intercomparison Project (MIP) began in the mid-1990s. In phase one of the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP-1), over a dozen fully-coupled Atmosphere/Ocean General Circulation Models (A/OGCMs) were used to study the response of the climate system to an idealized climate-change scenario – a 1 percent per year (compound interest) increase in levels of atmospheric CO₂.¹²⁶ The key aspect here was that each modeling group performed the same benchmark simulation, allowing scientists to focus their attention on the task of quantifying (and understanding) uncertainties in computer model projections of future climate change.

AMIP and CMIP have spawned literally dozens of other international Model Intercomparison Projects. MIPs are now a *de facto* standard in the climate science community. They have allowed climate scientists to:

- identify systematic errors common to many different models;
- track changes in model performance over time (in individual models and collectively);
- make informed statements about the relative quality of different models; and
- quantify uncertainties in model projections of future climate change.

Full community involvement in MIPs has led to more thorough model diagnosis, and to improved climate models. Perhaps the best-known model intercomparison is phase three of CMIP. The CMIP-3 project was a valuable resource for the Fourth Assessment Report (FAR) of the IPCC.¹²⁷ In the course of CMIP-3, simulation output was collected from 25 different A/OGCMs. The models used in these simulations were from 17 modeling centers and 13 countries. Twelve different types of simulation were performed with each model. The simulations included so-called “climate of the 20th century” experiments (with estimated historical changes in greenhouse gases, various aerosol particles, volcanic dust, solar irradiance, etc.), pre-industrial control runs (with no changes in human or natural climate forcings), and scenarios of future changes in greenhouse gases. All of the simulation output was stored at LLNL’s Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison (PCMDI).

At present, 35 Terabytes of CMIP-3 data are archived at PCMDI, and nearly one Petabyte of model output (1 Petabyte = 10^{15} bytes) has been distributed to over 4,300 users in several dozen countries. The CMIP-3 multi-model archive has transformed the world of climate science. As of November 2010, over 560 peer-reviewed publications used CMIP-3 data. These publications formed the scientific backbone of the IPCC FAR. The CMIP-3 archive provided the basis for roughly 75 percent of the figures in Chapters 8-11 of the Fourth Assessment Report, and for four of the seven figures in the IPCC “Summary for Policymakers.”¹²⁸

The CMIP-3 database can be used by anyone, free of charge. It is one of the most successful data-sharing models in any scientific community – not just the climate science community.

Accommodation of “alternative” views in the IPCC

Some parties critical of the IPCC have claimed that it does not accommodate the full range of scientific views on the subject of the nature and causes of climate change. In my opinion, such claims are specious. I would contend that all four previous IPCC Assessments^{129,130,131,132} have dealt with “alternative viewpoints” in a thorough and comprehensive way. The IPCC reports have devoted extraordinary scientific attention to a number of highly-publicized (and incorrect) claims.

Examples include the following claims that: 1) the tropical lower troposphere cooled over the satellite era; 2) that the water vapor feedback is zero or negative; and 3) that variations in the sun’s energy output explain all observed climate change. The climate and science community has not dismissed these claims out of hand. Scientists have done the research necessary to determine whether these “alternative viewpoints” are scientifically credible, and have shown that they are not.

Concluding Thoughts

My job is to evaluate climate models and improve our scientific understanding of the nature and causes of climate change. I chose this profession because of a deep and abiding curiosity about the world in which we live. The same intellectual curiosity motivates virtually all climate scientists I know. As my testimony indicates, the scientific evidence is compelling. We know, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that human activities have changed the composition of Earth's atmosphere. And we know that these human-caused changes in the levels of greenhouse gases make it easier for the atmosphere to trap heat. This is simple, basic physics. While there is legitimate debate in the scientific community about the size of the human effect on climate, there is really no serious scientific debate about the scientific finding that our planet warmed over the last century, and that human activities are implicated in this warming.

Notes

1. John Theodore Houghton et al., *Climate Change, the IPCC Scientific Assessment* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1990), xxix.
2. John Theodore Houghton et al., *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 4.
3. Tom Wigley, "Possible climatic change due to SO²-derived cloud condensation nuclei," *Nature* 339 (1989): 365-367.
4. Klaus Hasselmann, "On the signal-to-noise problem in atmospheric response studies," in *Meteorology of Tropical Oceans*, ed. D.B. Shaw (London, U.K.: Royal Meteorological Society of London, 1979), 251-259.
5. Klaus Hasselmann, "Optimal fingerprints for the detection of time dependent climate change," *Journal of Climate* 6 (1993): 1957-1971.
6. Gerald R. North et al., "Detection of forced climate signals, Part I: Filter theory," *Journal of Climate* 8 (1995): 401-408.
7. Hasselmann, "On the signal-to-noise problem," 251-259.
8. John Theodore Houghton et al., *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 4.
9. IPCC, "Summary for Policymakers," in *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. S. Solomon et al. (Cambridge, UK and New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
10. Ibid.
11. IPCC, "Summary for Policymakers," in *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. M. Parry et al. (Cambridge, UK and New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
12. This phrase is often attributed to the late sociologist Marcello Truzzi (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marcello_Truzzi).
13. National Research Council, *Climate Change Science. An Analysis of Some Key Questions* (Washington D.C.: National Academy Press, 2001), 29.
14. Prior to the Gleneagles G8 summit in July 2005, the Science Academies of 11 nations issued a joint statement on climate

change (<http://www.nasonline.org/site>). The statement affirmed the IPCC finding that “most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities” (ref. 8). The signatories were from the Academia Brasileira de Ciências, the Royal Society of Canada, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Académie des Sciences, France, the Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher, the Indian National Science Academy, the Accademia dei Lincei, Italy, the Science Council of Japan, the Russian Academy of Sciences, the United Kingdom Royal Society, and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.

15. Thomas R. Karl et al., eds. *Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences* (Asheville, NC: National Climatic Data Center, 2006), 164.

16. See, for example, the position statements on climate change issued by the American Geophysical Union (AGU), the American Meteorological Society (AMS), and the American Statistical Association (ASA). These can be found at: http://www.agu.org/sci_pol/positions/climate_change2008.shtml (AGU); <http://www.ametsoc.org/amsnews/2007/climatechangerelease.pdf> (AMS); and <http://www.amstat.org/news/climatechange.cfm> (ASA).

17. Michael E. Mann and Philip D. Jones, “Global surface temperatures over the past two Millennia,” *Geophysical Research Letters* 30, 1820, (2003), doi:10.1029/2003GL017814.

18. Michael E. Mann et al., “Proxy-based reconstructions of hemispheric and global surface temperature variations over the past two millennia,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105 (2008): 13252-13257.

19. David S. Chapman and Michael G. Davis, “Climate change: Past, present, and future,” *Eos* 91 (2010): 325-326.

20. John F.B. Mitchell et al., “Detection of climate change and attribution of causes,” in *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. J.T. Houghton (Cambridge, UK and New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 695-738.

21. International Detection and Attribution Group, “Detecting and attributing external influences on the climate system: A review of recent advances,” *Journal of Climate* 18 (2005): 1291-1314.

22. Benjamin R. Santer, J. E. Penner and P. W. Thorne, “How well can the observed vertical temperature changes be reconciled with our understanding of the causes of these changes?,” in *Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere: Steps for Understanding and Reconciling Differences*, ed. T. R. Karl et al. (Asheville, NC: National Climatic Data Center, 2006), 89-108.

23. Gabriele C. Hegerl et al., “Understanding and Attributing Climate Change,” in *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. S. Solomon et al. (Cambridge, UK and New York, USA; Cambridge University Press, 2007), 663-745.

24. A recent assessment of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences concluded that “It can be said with a high level of confidence that global mean surface temperature was higher during the last few decades of the 20th century than during any comparable period during the preceding four centuries” (ref. 25, page 3). The same study also found “it plausible that the Northern Hemisphere was warmer during the last few decades of the 20th century than during any comparable period over the preceding millennium” (ref. 25, pages 3-4).

25. National Research Council, *Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last 2,000 Years* (Washington D.C.: National Academies Press, 2006), 196.

26. IPCC, “Summary for Policymakers,” *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*.

27. Examples include increases in surface and tropospheric temperature, increases in atmospheric water vapor and ocean heat content, sea-level rise, widespread retreat of glaciers, etc.

28. An example includes testing the null hypothesis that there has been no external forcing of the climate system against the alternative hypothesis that there has been significant external forcing. Currently, all such hypothesis tests rely on model-based estimates of “unforced” climate variability (also known as natural internal variability). This is the variability that arises solely from processes internal to the climate system, such as interactions between the atmosphere and ocean. The El Niño phenomenon is a well-known example of internal climate noise.

29. Mitchell et al., “Detection of climate change and attribution of causes,” 695-738.

30. International Detection and Attribution Group, "Detecting and attributing external influences," 1291-1314.
31. Santer, Penner and Thorne, "Observed vertical temperature changes," 89-108.
32. Hegerl et al., "Understanding and Attributing Climate Change," 663-745.
33. Barnett et al., "Penetration of human-induced warming into the world's oceans," *Science* 309 (2005): 284-287.
34. Pierce et al., "Anthropogenic warming of the oceans: Observations and model results," *Journal of Climate* 19 (2006): 1873-1900.
35. Peter A. Stott, Rowan T. Sutton and Doug M. Smith, "Detection and attribution of Atlantic salinity changes," *Geophysical Research Letters* 35 (2008), L21702, doi:10.1029/2008GL035874.
36. Nathan P. Gillett et al., "Detection of human influence on sea level pressure," *Nature* 422 (2003): 292-294.
37. Benjamin D. Santer et al., "Contributions of anthropogenic and natural forcing to recent tropopause height changes," *Science* 301 (2003): 479-483.
38. Xuebin Zhang et al., "Detection of human influence on 20th century precipitation trends," *Nature* 448 (2007): 461-465.
39. Seung Ki Min, Xuebin Zhang and Francis Zwiers, "Human-induced Arctic moistening," *Science* 320 (2008): 518-520.
40. Katherine M. Willett et al., "Attribution of observed surface humidity changes to human influence," *Nature* 449 (2007), doi:10.1038/nature06207.
41. Benjamin D. Santer et al., "Identification of human-induced changes in atmospheric moisture content," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104 (2007): 15248-15253.
42. Benjamin D. Santer et al., "Incorporating model quality information in climate change detection and attribution studies," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (2009): 14778-14783.
43. Nicola Gedney et al., "Detection of a direct carbon dioxide effect in continental river runoff records" *Nature* 439 (2006): 835-838.
44. Seung Ki Min et al., "Human influence on Arctic sea ice detectable from early 1990s onwards," *Geophysical Research Letters* 35 (2008), L21701, doi:10.1029/2008GL035725.
45. Kevin E. Trenberth, John Fasullo and Lesley Smith, "Trends and variability in column-integrated atmospheric water vapor," *Climate Dynamics* 24 (2005), doi:10.1007/s00382-005-0017-4.
46. Sydney Levitus, John I. Antonov, Timothy P. Boyer and Cathy Stephens, "Warming of the world ocean, 1955-2003," *Geophysical Research Letters* 32 (2005), L02604, doi:10.1029/2004GL021592.
47. Catia M. Domingues et al., "Rapid upper-ocean warming helps explain multi-decadal sea-level rise," *Nature* 453 (2008): 1090-1093.
48. P.D. Jones et al., "Surface air temperature and its changes over the past 150 years," *Reviews of Geophysics* 37 (1999): 173-199.
49. Philip Brohan et al., "Uncertainty estimates in regional and global observed temperature changes: A new dataset from 1850," *Journal of Geophysical Research* 111 (2006), D12106, doi:10.1029/2005JD006548.

50. The argument here is that some anthropogenic “forcings” of climate (particularly the so-called indirect forcing caused by the effects of anthropogenic aerosols on cloud properties) are highly uncertain, so that many different combinations of these factors could yield the same global-mean changes. While this is a valid concern for global-mean temperature changes, it is highly unlikely that different combinations of forcing factors could produce the same complex space-time patterns of climate change (see figure 1).

51. Some researchers have argued that most of the observed near-surface warming over the 20th century is attributable to an overall increase in the Sun’s energy output. The effect of such an increase would be to warm most of the atmosphere (from the Earth’s surface through the stratosphere; see figure 1, lower left panel). Such behavior is not seen in observations. While temperature measurements from satellites and weather balloons do show warming of the troposphere, they also indicate that the stratosphere has cooled over the past 2-4 decades (ref. 15). Stratospheric cooling is fundamentally inconsistent with a ‘solar forcing only’ hypothesis of observed climate change, but is consistent with simulations of the response to anthropogenic greenhouse gas increases and ozone decreases (see figure 1, top left and middle left panels). The possibility of a large solar forcing effect has been further weakened by recent research indicating that changes in solar luminosity on multi-decadal timescales are likely to be significantly smaller than previously thought (refs. 52, 53).

52. Peter Foukal, Gerald North and Tom M.L. Wigley, “A stellar view on solar variations and climate,” *Science* 306 (2004): 68-69.

53. Peter Foukal et al., “Physical mechanisms of solar luminosity variation, and its effect on climate,” *Nature* 443 (2006): 161-166.

54. In order to assess whether observed climate changes over the past century are truly unusual, we require information on the amplitude and structure of climate noise on timescales of a century or longer. Unfortunately, direct instrumental measurements are of insufficient length to provide such information. This means that detection and attribution studies must rely on decadal- to century-timescale noise estimates from computer model control runs.

55. Myles R. Allen and Simon F.B. Tett, “Checking for model consistency in optimal fingerprinting,” *Climate Dynamics* 15 (1999): 419-434.

56. Peter W. Thorne et al., “Probable causes of late twentieth century tropospheric temperature trends,” *Climate Dynamics* 21 (2003): 573-591.

57. Benjamin D. Santer et al., “Causes of ocean surface temperature changes in Atlantic and Pacific tropical cyclogenesis regions,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103 (2006): 13905-13910.

58. Krishna M. AchutaRao et al., “Simulated and observed variability in ocean temperature and heat content,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104 (2007): 10768-10773.

59. Peter A. Stott et al., “Detection and attribution of climate change: A regional perspective,” *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews*, doi: 10.1002/WCC.34.

60. T.M.L. Wigley and P.D. Jones, “Detecting CO²-induced climatic change,” *Nature* 292 (1981): 205-208.

61. V. Ramaswamy et al., “Radiative forcing of climate change,” in *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. J. T. Houghton et al. (Cambridge, UK and New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 349-416.

62. National Research Council, *Radiative Forcing of Climate Change: Expanding the Concept and Addressing Uncertainties*, (Washington D.C.: National Academy Press, 2005), 168.

63. Johannes Feddema et al., “A comparison of a GCM response to historical anthropogenic land cover change and model sensitivity to uncertainty in present-day land cover representations,” *Climate Dynamics* 25 (2005): 581-609.

64. Joyce E. Penner et al., “Aerosols, their direct and indirect effects,” in *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Third Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. J.T. Houghton et al. (Cambridge, UK and New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 289-348.

65. Surabi Menon et al., "Climate effects of black carbon aerosols in China and India," *Science* 297 (2002), 2250-2253.
66. Peter A. Stott, "Attribution of regional-scale temperature changes to anthropogenic and natural causes," *Geophysical Research Letters* 30 (2003), doi: 10.1029/2003GL017324.
67. Francis W. Zwiers and Xuebin Zhang, "Towards regional-scale climate change detection," *Journal of Climate* 16 (2003): 793-797.
68. David J. Karoly et al., "Detection of a human influence on North American climate," *Science* 302 (2003): 1200-1203.
69. Seung-Ki. Min, Andreas Hense and Won-Tae Kwon, "Regional-scale climate change detection using a Bayesian detection method," *Geophysical Research Letters* 32 (2005), doi: 10.1029/2004GL021028.
70. David J. Karoly and Qigang Wu, "Detection of regional surface temperature trends," *Journal of Climate* 18 (2005): 4337-4343.
71. Thomas R. Knutson et al., "Assessment of twentieth-century regional surface temperature trends using the GFDL CM2 coupled models," *Journal of Climate* 19 (2006): 1624-1651.
72. Ibid. Knutson et al. state that their "regional results provide evidence for an emergent anthropogenic warming signal over many, if not most, regions of the globe."
73. Terry L. Root et al., "Human-modified temperatures induce species changes: Joint attribution," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 102 (2005): 7465-7469.
74. Examples include snowpack depth (refs. 75, 76), maximum and minimum temperatures in mountainous regions of the western U.S. (refs. 75, 77), and the timing of streamflow in major river basins (refs. 75, 78).
75. Tim P. Barnett et al., "Human-induced changes in the hydrology of the western United States," *Science* 319 (2008): 1080-1083.
76. David W. Pierce et al., "Attribution of declining western U.S. snowpack to human effects," *Journal of Climate* 21 (2008): 6425-6444.
77. Céline Bonfils et al., "Detection and attribution of temperature changes in the mountainous Western United States," *Journal of Climate* 21 (2008): 6404-6424.
78. Hugo Hidalgo et al., "Detection and attribution of streamflow timing changes to climate change in the western United States," *Journal of Climate* 22 (2009): 3838-3855.
79. Myles R. Allen, "Liability for climate change," *Nature* 421 (2003): 891-892.
80. Tom M.L. Wigley, "The effect of changing climate on the frequency of absolute extreme events," *Climate Monitor* 17 (1988): 44-55.
81. Gerald A. Meehl and Claudia Tebaldi, "More intense, more frequent, and longer lasting heat waves in the 21st century," *Science* 305 (2004): 994-997.
82. Peter A. Stott, Dáithí A. Stone and Myles R. Allen, "Human contribution to the European heatwave of 2003," *Nature* 423 (2004): 610-614.
83. Santer et al., "Causes of ocean surface temperature changes," 13905-13910.
84. Stott, Stone and Allen, "Human contribution," 610-614.
85. Claudia Tebaldi et al., "Going to the extremes: An intercomparison of model-simulated historical and future changes in extreme events," *Climatic Change* 79 (2006): 185-211.

86. Stott, Stone and Allen, "Human contribution," 610-614.
87. Ibid.
88. Barnett et al., "Penetration of human-induced warming," 284-287.
89. Pierce et al., "Anthropogenic warming of the oceans," 1873-1900.
90. Levitus et al., "Warming of the world ocean," L02604, doi:10.1029/2004GL021592.
91. Domingues et al., "Rapid upper-ocean warming," 1090-1093.
92. Jones et al., "Surface air temperature," 173-199.
93. Brohan et al., "Uncertainty estimates," D12106, doi:10.1029/2005JD006548.
94. Philip D. Jones and Anders Moberg, "Hemispheric and large scale surface air temperature variations: an extensive revision and an update to 2001," *Journal of Climate* 16 (2003): 206-223.
95. Nathan P. Gillett et al., "Attribution of polar warming to human influence," *Nature Geoscience* 1 (2008): 750-754.
96. Willett et al., "Attribution of observed surface humidity changes," doi:10.1038/nature06207.
97. Santer et al., "Identification of human-induced changes," 15248-15253.
98. Santer et al., "Incorporating model quality information," 14778-14783.
99. Trenberth, Fasullo and Smith, "Trends and variability," doi:10.1007/s00382-005-0017-4.
100. Zhang et al., "Detection of human influence," 461-465.
101. S.K. Min, Zhang and Zwiers, "Human-induced Arctic moistening," 518-520.
102. Anthony A. Arendt et al., "Rapid wastage of Alaska glaciers and their contribution to rising sea level," *Science* 297 (2002): 382-386.
103. Frank Paul et al., "Rapid disintegration of Alpine glaciers observed with satellite data," *Geophysical Research Letters* 31 (2004), L21402, doi:10.1029/2004GL020816.
104. Mark F. Meier et al., "Glaciers dominate eustatic sea-level rise in the 21st century," *Science* 317 (2007): 1064-1067.
105. Scott B. Luthcke et al., "Recent Greenland ice mass loss by drainage system from satellite gravity observations," *Science* 314 (2006): 1286-1289.
106. Anny Cazenave and Robert S. Nerem, "Present-day sea level change: Observations and causes," *Reviews of Geophysics* 42 (2004), RG3001, doi:10.1029/2003RG000139.
107. S.K. Min et al., "Human influence on Arctic sea ice," L21701, doi:10.1029/2008GL035725.
108. Konstantin Y. Vinnikov et al., "Global warming and Northern Hemisphere sea ice extent," *Science* 286 (1999): 1934-1937.
109. Julienne Stroeve et al., "Arctic sea ice plummets in 2007," *EOS*, 89 no. 2, (2008): 13-14.
110. Julienne Stroeve et al., "Arctic sea ice decline: Faster than forecast," *Geophysical Research Letters* 34 (2007), L09501, doi:10.1029/2007GL029703.
111. V. Ramaswamy et al., "Anthropogenic and natural influences in the evolution of lower stratospheric cooling," *Science* 311 (2006): 1138-1141.

112. Karl et al., eds. *Temperature Trends in the Lower Atmosphere*, 164.
113. Kevin E. Trenberth et al., *Observations: Surface and atmospheric climate change. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, ed. S. Solomon et al. (Cambridge, U.K. and New York, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2007): 235-336
114. Frank J. Wentz and Matthias Schabel, "Effects of orbital decay on satellite-derived lower-tropospheric temperature trends," *Nature* 394 (1998): 661-664.
115. Carl A. Mears, Matthias C. Schabel and Frank W. Wentz, "A reanalysis of the MSU channel 2 tropospheric temperature record," *Journal of Climate* 16 (2003): 3650-3664.
116. Qiang Fu et al., "Contribution of stratospheric cooling to satellite-inferred tropospheric temperature trends," *Nature* 429 (2004): 55-58.
117. Cheng-Zhi Zou, Mei Gao and Mitchell D. Goldberg, "Error structure and atmospheric temperature trends in observations from the Microwave Sounding Unit," *Journal of Climate* 22 (2009): 1661-1681.
118. Steven Sherwood, John Lanzante and Cathryn Meyer, "Radiosonde daytime biases and late 20th century warming," *Science* 309 (2005): 1556-1559.
119. Carl A. Mears and Frank W. Wentz, "The effect of diurnal correction on satellite-derived lower tropospheric temperature," *Science* 309 (2005): 1548-1551.
120. Robert J. Allen and Steven C. Sherwood, "Warming maximum in the tropical upper troposphere deduced from thermal winds," *Nature Geoscience* 1 (2008): 399-403.
121. Steven C. Sherwood, Cathryn L. Meyer and Robert J. Allen, "Robust tropospheric warming revealed by iteratively homogenized radiosonde data," *Journal of Climate* 21 (2008): 5336-5350.
122. Holly A. Titchner et al., "Critically reassessing tropospheric temperature trends from radiosondes using realistic validation experiments," *Journal of Climate* 22 (2008): 465-485.
123. Santer et al., "Contributions of anthropogenic and natural forcing," 479-483.
124. W. Lawrence Gates, "AMIP: The Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project," *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 73 (1992): 1962-1970.
125. W. Lawrence Gates et al., "An overview of the Atmospheric Model Intercomparison Project (AMIP)," *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 80 (1999): 29-55.
126. Gerald A. Meehl et al., "The WCRP CMIP-3 multi-model dataset: A new era in climate change research," *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 88 (2007): 1383-1394.
127. IPCC, "Summary for Policymakers," *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*.
128. Ibid.
129. Houghton et al., *Climate Change, The IPCC Scientific Assessment*, xxix.
130. Houghton et al., *Climate Change 1995: The Science of Climate Change*, 4.
131. Houghton et al., *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis*, 4.
132. IPCC, "Summary for Policymakers," *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*.