



Cosmic Rays and Global Warming

T. SLOAN¹, A.W. WOLFENDALE²

¹*Physics Department, University of Lancaster, Lancaster, UK*

²*Physics Department, Durham University, Durham, UK*

t.sloan@lancaster.ac.uk

Abstract: It has been claimed by others that observed temporal correlations of terrestrial cloud cover with 'the cosmic ray intensity' are causal. The possibility arises, therefore, of a connection between cosmic rays and Global Warming. If true, the implications would be very great.

We have examined this claim to look for evidence to corroborate it. So far we have not found any and so our tentative conclusions are to doubt it. Such correlations as appear are more likely to be due to the small variations in solar irradiance, which, of course, correlate with cosmic rays. We estimate that less than 15% of the 11-year cycle warming variations are due to cosmic rays and less than 2% of the warming over the last 35 years is due to this cause.

Introduction

A phenomenon with strong politico-social implications is the apparent correlation of cosmic ray (CR) intensity with low level cloud cover (CC) - and thereby with mean global temperature [1, 2]. Insofar as there is a possible link of clouds with CR via ionization the correlation cannot be dismissed out of hand. It is not sufficient to say that the energy content of CR is minute in comparison with solar irradiance (SI) and therefore the effect must not be causal; the atmosphere is a highly complex system with subtle properties and the idea must be tested.

CR and Cloud Cover

In reference [1] a correlation was demonstrated for 'low clouds' (<3.2 km in altitude) between the changes in CC (the CC anomaly), and CR count rate as measured by the Hunacayo neutron monitor (see figure 1 of reference [1]). The CC anomaly was derived from the ISCCP D2 analysis using the infrared data[3]. It was then implied in [1] that the CR variation caused that in the CC. Since this may not be the case if both effects are correlated to a third variable, it is prudent to look for further

evidence of such a causal connection.

The first problem that arises is that the correlation is absent in the data for two other atmospheric depths: 'middle levels' (3.2 - 6.5 km) and 'high levels' (>6.5 km altitude). This result is surprising in view of the fact that the CR ionization (mainly from muons and electrons) increases with height. Specifically the rate of production of ions, in $\text{cm}^{-3}\text{s}^{-1}$, for the 3 levels is estimated to be: high, 130(50); middle, 30(13) and low, 4(3) where the values are for 60°N (the equator).

A possibility, and one needed by the proponents of the CR-CC causal connection, is that the efficiency of the conversion from CR ions to cloud droplets (presumably by way of aerosols) falls with increasing height above sea level. Such behaviour cannot be ruled out but seems rather ad hoc. The implication would be that even in the low region the efficiency is not 100% and, as will be shown, there are already problems in this respect.

Efficiency of ions for cloud production

An important aspect is that of the likely efficiency of CR ions for initiating cloud droplets and we start by estimating the density of cloud droplets

that could be produced by CR (muons) at the lowest level. With a rate of ions, of $4 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and assuming they all give ‘small ions’ the rate of production of small ions will be the same, giving, for a mean lifetime of 50 s [4] 200 cm^{-3} . To produce significant nucleation rates much larger ion densities than this were required [5]. Hence the ionisation rate in CR could be too small to produce significant numbers of water droplets such as would be necessary in a cloud.

Latitude dependence of ‘the effect’

It is well known that the magnitude of the CR time variation, due to the 11 year solar cycle, varies with latitude. More accurately, it is a function of the vertical rigidity cut-off (VRCO), the reason being the effect of the geomagnetic field deflecting away more low energy particles as the geomagnetic equator (highest VRCO) is approached. Since this variation falls with increasing primary CR energy, the solar modulation is most severe in the polar regions. Hence one would expect larger changes in CC in the polar regions than at the Equator. Furthermore it is known that there is a delay of 6-14 months between the decrease in the CR intensity and the increase in the sun spot (SS) number with even numbered solar cycles showing smaller delays than the odd numbered [7]. Note that the CR count rate is anticorrelated to the SS number.

We have studied this effect in some detail by plotting the CC for different VRCO bands and the results are given in Figure 1. The smooth curves in figure 1 show the best fit of the CC anomaly to the mean daily SS number (inverted) with a linearly changing background. We observe the same dip in CC as seen in [1] between the years 1985 and 1995. However, the expected rise in amplitude of this dip with increasing VRCO is not apparent. Furthermore, the dip in CC seen in solar cycle 22 (peaking in 1990) is not evident in solar cycle 23 (peaking in 2000) except in the equatorial region (high VRCO) where the solar modulation is least. To investigate this effect further and to check that the above result was not due to a latitude dependent ‘efficiency’ the CC was determined in three strips of latitude and the amplitude of the dip in solar cycle 22 was measured for each as a function of VRCO. This was

achieved by fitting the SS number variation to the observed CC again with a linearly decreasing background. The delay between the onset of the dip in CC and that of the SS number was also a free parameter in the fit. Figure 2 (upper panel) shows that the amplitude of the dip appears to be constant with VRCO rather than changing in an analogous manner to the observed CR modulation [6]. The measured value of the delay between the onset of the dip and the change in SS number fluctuates randomly rather than concentrates around a fixed delay (expected to be -7 months for solar cycle 22). Hence there is an imperfect time correlation between the start of the dip and the change in the CR rate. Thus the data in figure 2 do not corroborate the claim of a causal connection between CR and CC.

To identify the parts of the distribution in the upper panel of figure 2 which correlate with the CR modulation a fit was performed of the shape of the neutron modulation curve (the correlated part) and a constant term (the uncorrelated part) to the measurements. This fit showed that less than 15% of the distribution at 95% confidence level belonged to the correlated part.

The Chernobyl Nuclear Accident

On the 26 April 1986 there was a nuclear reactor accident at Chernobyl ($51.4^\circ \text{ N } 30.1^\circ \text{ E}$) which released large amounts of radioactivity into the atmosphere. A correlation between CC and ionization from the radioactivity would be expected to produce an increase in CC in the vicinity of Chernobyl following the accident if [1] were correct. Figure 3 shows the CC anomaly as a function of time for various regions in the vicinity of Chernobyl. There is no evident increase in the CC following the accident. From the data in figure 3 95% confidence level upper limits on the increase in the CC in the month following the accident are 9.3% (3.6%) in the range $50-52.5\text{N}, 30-32.5\text{E}$ ($45-60 \text{ N}, 20-35 \text{ E}$).

We estimate that the increase in ionization from this radioactivity relative to that produced by CR is a factor of ~ 15 in the immediate vicinity of Chernobyl ($50-52.5^\circ \text{ N}, 30-32.5^\circ \text{ E}$) and a factor ~ 3 in the fallout region $45-60^\circ \text{ N}, 20-35^\circ \text{ E}$.




Figure 1: CC anomaly as a function of time for various ranges of VRCO. The smooth curve shows a fit of the monthly mean of the daily sun spot (SS) rate with an assumed linearly falling background. VRCO is the vertical cut-off rigidity. The SSN is anticorrelated with the CR count rate with a lead time of several months.

The globally averaged modulation in the neutron monitor count rate is 8%. The modulation due to charged CR particles is roughly 1/3 of this. If the observed dip in CC of $\sim 1\%$ [1] is due to such modulation then the increase in CC due to the ionization from Chernobyl should have been much greater than the upper limits quoted above and close to 100% CC anomaly. Hence the data from the Chernobyl accident do not corroborate the claim of a causal connection between CR and CC.

Alternative explanation

It seems likely that the origin of the solar cycle modulation of the CC seen in Figures 1 and 2, and quantified in Figure 2, is the 11-year cycle in solar irradiance, SI (e.g. ref. [8]) or possibly lightning. The slow droop in CC with time, most evident in Figure 1 for the period after 1997, is possibly due to anthropic factors although it has been suggested that this may be due to instrumental drift [9]. This




Figure 2: The observed CC modulation (upper panel) as measured from the fit to solar cycle 22 only (see figure 1). The 'modulations' are expressed by the dip amplitude per SS number at the time of solar maximum (1991). The smooth curve shows the modulation observed in neutron monitors around the World [6] arbitrarily normalised. The lower panel shows the fitted delay between the onset of the dip and that of the SS number in months. The dashed line shows the expected delay if a correlation existed between the changes in CR and CC. The delay between the CR and SS number increases is 7 months[7]. NB positive delay means CC precedes the SS number increase.

reduction is greater than adopted by us, in linear form, and applied to the SS variation, suggesting an accelerating 'global warming'.

The contribution of SI to global warming is estimated by us as having a peak to peak (SS cycle) magnitude of about 10% of the observed rise in mean global temperature over the last 25 y. The CR contribution appears to be much less than 10%.

Finally, it is instructive to examine the energetics of the various processes. The ratio of energy input from the sun (SI) to that from CR is $\sim 2.10^8$. Of order 50% of the CR energy appears as ionization in the atmosphere, thus an 'efficiency' as low as 10^{-8} for SI in converting to ionization in the atmosphere - or in other ways and resulting in cloud cover - is all that is needed for SI to domi-




Figure 3: CC against time in 3 regions in the vicinity of Chernobyl. The arrow shows the date of the nuclear accident. The upper panel is in the extended region where the fallout was greatest and the lower panels are smaller regions around Chernobyl.

nate. Haigh [10] has, in fact, proposed such a mechanism involving solar-UV-ozone induced dynamical feedback.

Conclusions

The dip in amplitude 1.3% of the low altitude CC noted in reference [1] in solar cycle 22 has been seen also in this analysis. This dip correlates well in amplitude and shape with the observed mean daily SS number. A number of attempts are described here to find evidence to corroborate the causal connection between the dip and changes in ionization levels due to CR as suggested in [1]. The depth of the dip in solar cycle 22 is not a function of the increase in ionization as VRCO decreases. Nor is the onset of the dip well correlated with the arrival time of the increase in the CR rate. The dip in the following solar cycle, cycle 23, is only evident in the equatorial regions of the Earth. The atmospheric ionization produced by the nuclear accident at Chernobyl produced no observable increase in the CC. In summary, no corroboration of the

claim of a causal connection between the changes in ionization from CR and CC was found in this investigation. From the distribution of the change in solar cycle 22 with VRCO we find that less than 15% of the CC change comes from the CR modulation at 95% confidence level. In reference [1] it is estimated that if all the CC change in cycle 22 were due to CR modulation then the radiative forcing produced by long term changes in the CR rate would be 1.4 Wm^{-2} i.e. the major portion of that necessary to produce the global warming we observe. The upper limit on the effect of CR forcing of CC determined here implies that the radiative forcing due to CR is less than 0.2 Wm^{-2} at 95% confidence level. This can be used to set a limit on the global temperature rise from CR. Here we assume that 15% of the observed dip in CC for cycle 22 is from the solar modulation of CR, taken to be 2.7% for muons. We use the observation of a downward trend in the CR intensity [11] of $\sim 2\%$ in the last 35 years and the observation that the solar modulation of the average global temperature is $\sim 0.1^\circ\text{C}$ [8]. From this the temperature rise due to CR must be less than $\sim 0.01^\circ\text{C}$.

References

- [1] Marsh, N. and Svensmark, H., Phys. Rev. Lett., **85**, 5004 (2000).
- [2] Svensmark, H., News and Reviews in Astronomy and Geophysics, **48**, 18. (2007).
- [3] <http://isccp.giss.nasa.gov/>
- [4] Chalmers, J.A., 'Atmospheric Electricity' Oxford, Clarendon press, 1949
- [5] Svensmark et al, 2006, Proc. Roy. Soc., A463 (2006) 385.
- [6] I. Braun et al., ICRC 2005 **2** 135-138
- [7] We are grateful to K. Kudela for the measurement of this.
- [8] Lean, J.L., Ann. Rev. Astron. and Astrophys. **35** 33 (1997); Geophys. Res. Lett., **33**, L15701 (2006) and Lean et al., Solar Physics (2005) 230, 27-53.
- [9] Kristjansson, J.E., Staple, A., Kristiansen, J. and Kaas, E., Geophysical Research letters vol. 29, no. 23, 2107 (2002).
- [10] Haigh, J.D., Nature, **370**, 544, 1994.
- [11] Moraal, H., private communication.



Cosmic Rays and Global Warming

T. SLOAN¹, A.W. WOLFENDALE²

¹*Physics Department, University of Lancaster, Lancaster, UK*

²*Physics Department, Durham University, Durham, UK*

t.sloan@lancaster.ac.uk

Abstract: It has been claimed by others that observed temporal correlations of terrestrial cloud cover with ‘the cosmic ray intensity’ are causal. The possibility arises, therefore, of a connection between cosmic rays and Global Warming. If true, the implications would be very great.

We have examined this claim to look for evidence to corroborate it. So far we have not found any and so our tentative conclusions are to doubt it. Such correlations as appear are more likely to be due to the small variations in solar irradiance, which, of course, correlate with cosmic rays. We estimate that less than 15% of the 11-year cycle warming variations are due to cosmic rays and less than 2% of the warming over the last 35 years is due to this cause.

Introduction

A phenomenon with strong politico-social implications is the apparent correlation of cosmic ray (CR) intensity with low level cloud cover (CC) - and thereby with mean global temperature [1, 2]. Insofar as there is a possible link of clouds with CR via ionization the correlation cannot be dismissed out of hand. It is not sufficient to say that the energy content of CR is minute in comparison with solar irradiance (SI) and therefore the effect must not be causal; the atmosphere is a highly complex system with subtle properties and the idea must be tested.

CR and Cloud Cover

In reference [1] a correlation was demonstrated for ‘low clouds’ (<3.2 km in altitude) between the changes in CC (the CC anomaly), and CR count rate as measured by the Hunacayo neutron monitor (see figure 1 of reference [1]). The CC anomaly was derived from the ISCCP D2 analysis using the infrared data[3]. It was then implied in [1] that the CR variation caused that in the CC. Since this may not be the case if both effects are correlated to a third variable, it is prudent to look for further

evidence of such a causal connection.

The first problem that arises is that the correlation is absent in the data for two other atmospheric depths: ‘middle levels’ (3.2 - 6.5 km) and ‘high levels’ (>6.5 km altitude). This result is surprising in view of the fact that the CR ionization (mainly from muons and electrons) increases with height. Specifically the rate of production of ions, in $\text{cm}^{-3}\text{s}^{-1}$, for the 3 levels is estimated to be: high, 130(50); middle, 30(13) and low, 4(3) where the values are for 60°N (the equator).

A possibility, and one needed by the proponents of the CR-CC causal connection, is that the efficiency of the conversion from CR ions to cloud droplets (presumably by way of aerosols) falls with increasing height above sea level. Such behaviour cannot be ruled out but seems rather ad hoc. The implication would be that even in the low region the efficiency is not 100% and, as will be shown, there are already problems in this respect.

Efficiency of ions for cloud production

An important aspect is that of the likely efficiency of CR ions for initiating cloud droplets and we start by estimating the density of cloud droplets

that could be produced by CR (muons) at the lowest level. With a rate of ions, of $4 \text{ cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and assuming they all give ‘small ions’ the rate of production of small ions will be the same, giving, for a mean lifetime of 50 s [4] 200 cm^{-3} . To produce significant nucleation rates much larger ion densities than this were required [5]. Hence the ionisation rate in CR could be too small to produce significant numbers of water droplets such as would be necessary in a cloud.

Latitude dependence of ‘the effect’

It is well known that the magnitude of the CR time variation, due to the 11 year solar cycle, varies with latitude. More accurately, it is a function of the vertical rigidity cut-off (VRCO), the reason being the effect of the geomagnetic field deflecting away more low energy particles as the geomagnetic equator (highest VRCO) is approached. Since this variation falls with increasing primary CR energy, the solar modulation is most severe in the polar regions. Hence one would expect larger changes in CC in the polar regions than at the Equator. Furthermore it is known that there is a delay of 6-14 months between the decrease in the CR intensity and the increase in the sun spot (SS) number with even numbered solar cycles showing smaller delays than the odd numbered [7]. Note that the CR count rate is anticorrelated to the SS number.

We have studied this effect in some detail by plotting the CC for different VRCO bands and the results are given in Figure 1. The smooth curves in figure 1 show the best fit of the CC anomaly to the mean daily SS number (inverted) with a linearly changing background. We observe the same dip in CC as seen in [1] between the years 1985 and 1995. However, the expected rise in amplitude of this dip with increasing VRCO is not apparent. Furthermore, the dip in CC seen in solar cycle 22 (peaking in 1990) is not evident in solar cycle 23 (peaking in 2000) except in the equatorial region (high VRCO) where the solar modulation is least. To investigate this effect further and to check that the above result was not due to a latitude dependent ‘efficiency’ the CC was determined in three strips of latitude and the amplitude of the dip in solar cycle 22 was measured for each as a function of VRCO. This was

achieved by fitting the SS number variation to the observed CC again with a linearly decreasing background. The delay between the onset of the dip in CC and that of the SS number was also a free parameter in the fit. Figure 2 (upper panel) shows that the amplitude of the dip appears to be constant with VRCO rather than changing in an analogous manner to the observed CR modulation [6]. The measured value of the delay between the onset of the dip and the change in SS number fluctuates randomly rather than concentrates around a fixed delay (expected to be -7 months for solar cycle 22). Hence there is an imperfect time correlation between the start of the dip and the change in the CR rate. Thus the data in figure 2 do not corroborate the claim of a causal connection between CR and CC.

To identify the parts of the distribution in the upper panel of figure 2 which correlate with the CR modulation a fit was performed of the shape of the neutron modulation curve (the correlated part) and a constant term (the uncorrelated part) to the measurements. This fit showed that less than 15% of the distribution at 95% confidence level belonged to the correlated part.

The Chernobyl Nuclear Accident

On the 26 April 1986 there was a nuclear reactor accident at Chernobyl ($51.4^\circ \text{ N } 30.1^\circ \text{ E}$) which released large amounts of radioactivity into the atmosphere. A correlation between CC and ionization from the radioactivity would be expected to produce an increase in CC in the vicinity of Chernobyl following the accident if [1] were correct. Figure 3 shows the CC anomaly as a function of time for various regions in the vicinity of Chernobyl. There is no evident increase in the CC following the accident. From the data in figure 3 95% confidence level upper limits on the increase in the CC in the month following the accident are 9.3% (3.6%) in the range $50-52.5\text{N}, 30-32.5\text{E}$ ($45-60 \text{ N}, 20-35 \text{ E}$).

We estimate that the increase in ionization from this radioactivity relative to that produced by CR is a factor of ~ 15 in the immediate vicinity of Chernobyl ($50-52.5^\circ \text{ N}, 30-32.5^\circ \text{ E}$) and a factor ~ 3 in the fallout region $45-60^\circ \text{ N}, 20-35^\circ \text{ E}$.




Figure 1: CC anomaly as a function of time for various ranges of VRCO. The smooth curve shows a fit of the monthly mean of the daily sun spot (SS) rate with an assumed linearly falling background. VRCO is the vertical cut-off rigidity. The SSN is anticorrelated with the CR count rate with a lead time of several months.

The globally averaged modulation in the neutron monitor count rate is 8%. The modulation due to charged CR particles is roughly 1/3 of this. If the observed dip in CC of $\sim 1\%$ [1] is due to such modulation then the increase in CC due to the ionization from Chernobyl should have been much greater than the upper limits quoted above and close to 100% CC anomaly. Hence the data from the Chernobyl accident do not corroborate the claim of a causal connection between CR and CC.

Alternative explanation

It seems likely that the origin of the solar cycle modulation of the CC seen in Figures 1 and 2, and quantified in Figure 2, is the 11-year cycle in solar irradiance, SI (e.g. ref. [8]) or possibly lightning. The slow droop in CC with time, most evident in Figure 1 for the period after 1997, is possibly due to anthropic factors although it has been suggested that this may be due to instrumental drift [9]. This




Figure 2: The observed CC modulation (upper panel) as measured from the fit to solar cycle 22 only (see figure 1). The ‘modulations’ are expressed by the dip amplitude per SS number at the time of solar maximum (1991). The smooth curve shows the modulation observed in neutron monitors around the World [6] arbitrarily normalised. The lower panel shows the fitted delay between the onset of the dip and that of the SS number in months. The dashed line shows the expected delay if a correlation existed between the changes in CR and CC. The delay between the CR and SS number increases is 7 months[7]. NB positive delay means CC precedes the SS number increase.

reduction is greater than adopted by us, in linear form, and applied to the SS variation, suggesting an accelerating ‘global warming’.

The contribution of SI to global warming is estimated by us as having a peak to peak (SS cycle) magnitude of about 10% of the observed rise in mean global temperature over the last 25 y. The CR contribution appears to be much less than 10%.

Finally, it is instructive to examine the energetics of the various processes. The ratio of energy input from the sun (SI) to that from CR is $\sim 2.10^8$. Of order 50% of the CR energy appears as ionization in the atmosphere, thus an ‘efficiency’ as low as 10^{-8} for SI in converting to ionization in the atmosphere - or in other ways and resulting in cloud cover - is all that is needed for SI to domi-




Figure 3: CC against time in 3 regions in the vicinity of Chernobyl. The arrow shows the date of the nuclear accident. The upper panel is in the extended region where the fallout was greatest and the lower panels are smaller regions around Chernobyl.

nate. Haigh [10] has, in fact, proposed such a mechanism involving solar-UV-ozone induced dynamical feedback.

Conclusions

The dip in amplitude 1.3% of the low altitude CC noted in reference [1] in solar cycle 22 has been seen also in this analysis. This dip correlates well in amplitude and shape with the observed mean daily SS number. A number of attempts are described here to find evidence to corroborate the causal connection between the dip and changes in ionization levels due to CR as suggested in [1]. The depth of the dip in solar cycle 22 is not a function of the increase in ionization as VRCO decreases. Nor is the onset of the dip well correlated with the arrival time of the increase in the CR rate. The dip in the following solar cycle, cycle 23, is only evident in the equatorial regions of the Earth. The atmospheric ionization produced by the nuclear accident at Chernobyl produced no observable increase in the CC. In summary, no corroboration of the

claim of a causal connection between the changes in ionization from CR and CC was found in this investigation. From the distribution of the change in solar cycle 22 with VRCO we find that less than 15% of the CC change comes from the CR modulation at 95% confidence level. In reference [1] it is estimated that if all the CC change in cycle 22 were due to CR modulation then the radiative forcing produced by long term changes in the CR rate would be 1.4 Wm^{-2} i.e. the major portion of that necessary to produce the global warming we observe. The upper limit on the effect of CR forcing of CC determined here implies that the radiative forcing due to CR is less than 0.2 Wm^{-2} at 95% confidence level. This can be used to set a limit on the global temperature rise from CR. Here we assume that 15% of the observed dip in CC for cycle 22 is from the solar modulation of CR, taken to be 2.7% for muons. We use the observation of a downward trend in the CR intensity [11] of $\sim 2\%$ in the last 35 years and the observation that the solar modulation of the average global temperature is $\sim 0.1^\circ\text{C}$ [8]. From this the temperature rise due to CR must be less than $\sim 0.01^\circ\text{C}$.

References

- [1] Marsh, N. and Svensmark, H., Phys. Rev. Lett., **85**, 5004 (2000).
- [2] Svensmark, H., News and Reviews in Astronomy and Geophysics, **48**, 18. (2007).
- [3] <http://isccp.giss.nasa.gov/>
- [4] Chalmers, J.A., 'Atmospheric Electricity' Oxford, Clarendon press, 1949
- [5] Svensmark et al, 2006, Proc. Roy. Soc., A463 (2006) 385.
- [6] I. Braun et al., ICRC 2005 **2** 135-138
- [7] We are grateful to K. Kudela for the measurement of this.
- [8] Lean, J.L., Ann. Rev. Astron. and Astrophys. **35** 33 (1997); Geophys. Res. Lett., **33**, L15701 (2006) and Lean et al., Solar Physics (2005) 230, 27-53.
- [9] Kristjansson, J.E., Staple, A., Kristiansen, J. and Kaas, E., Geophysical Research letters vol. 29, no. 23, 2107 (2002).
- [10] Haigh, J.D., Nature, **370**, 544, 1994.
- [11] Moraal, H., private communication.