

Climate science and knowledge of a coupled planet

Juan Segurola

Core question

How did climate science become able to treat atmosphere, ocean, ice, land, radiation and human emissions as parts of a coupled planetary system whose changes could be measured, modelled and tested across decades?

Historical and evolutionary context

Climate knowledge grew from several lines that were initially separate. Nineteenth-century physics established that atmospheric gases interact selectively with radiation. In 1896 Svante Arrhenius calculated how changes in atmospheric carbon dioxide could alter surface temperature. In 1938 Guy Stewart Callendar combined combustion estimates, radiative arguments and temperature records to argue that anthropogenic carbon dioxide was already affecting climate. These claims remained uncertain because observations were sparse, carbon cycling was incompletely constrained and early calculations simplified the atmosphere and oceans.

A second transition came from sustained measurement. Charles David Keeling's 1958 onward monitoring programme and his 1960 analysis showed that atmospheric carbon dioxide varied systematically by season and latitude while also rising over time. A third came from numerical modelling. In 1967 Syukuro Manabe and Richard Wetherald used a radiative-convective model to calculate atmospheric thermal equilibrium with water-vapour feedback. By 1979 the National Research Council's *Carbon Dioxide and Climate: A Scientific Assessment* treated carbon dioxide, feedbacks and model uncertainty as an integrated scientific assessment problem. The IPCC's 1990 First Assessment Report then organised observations, forcing, modelling, impacts and uncertainty at an international scale.

What could communities know before this transition?

Meteorologists could record local weather, construct climatological averages and identify broad seasonal and geographic patterns. Spectroscopy and thermodynamics could explain portions of atmospheric heat transfer. Oceanography, glaciology and geology supplied evidence of slower environmental change, while PIO-088 made repeated planetary observation from satellites possible. The limitation was integration: no single observational or computational framework yet linked atmospheric composition, radiative transfer, circulation, ocean heat uptake, ice, land and human emissions with quantified uncertainty.

What changed?

Greenhouse forcing became a quantitative physical problem

Arrhenius in 1896 and Callendar in 1938 connected carbon dioxide to planetary temperature through radiative physics. Their calculations were incomplete by modern standards, but they made climate sensitivity a numerical question rather than only a qualitative speculation.

Atmospheric composition became a continuous planetary record

Keeling's 1960 work showed that carefully calibrated measurements could separate seasonal cycling from a persistent increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Long time series transformed an invisible gas into a traceable planetary variable whose trend could be compared with emissions, ocean exchange and biospheric processes.

Models became laboratories for coupled processes

Manabe and Wetherald's 1967 radiative-convective calculations showed how feedbacks could be incorporated into a physically constrained model. Later general-circulation models coupled atmosphere, ocean, cryosphere and land more explicitly. Simulation, developed as a general epistemic practice in PIO-090, became central because the climate system cannot be experimentally duplicated at planetary scale.

Assessment became a scientific institution

The 1979 National Research Council assessment and the IPCC process from 1988 onward created structured methods for comparing observations, models, uncertainty and competing lines of evidence. Assessment did not replace primary research; it made the state of distributed evidence itself an object of disciplined synthesis.

Why could this capability emerge?

The transition required precision spectroscopy, thermodynamics, global meteorological networks, ocean observations, ice and sediment records, satellites, digital computers and numerical methods. PIO-088 supplied repeated remote observation of Earth; PIO-090 supplied executable simulation. It also required calibration standards, international data exchange and long-duration institutional commitments, because climate signals often emerge only through records sustained across decades.

At longer geological timescales, the plate-tectonic synthesis described in PIO-089 supplied an indirect framework for understanding climate boundary conditions: changing continental configurations and ocean gateways alter circulation, while volcanism, uplift and rock weathering participate in the long-term carbon cycle. This relationship is deliberately classified as indirect. Plate tectonics is not an explanation for the modern anthropogenic warming discussed here; it is part of the geological framework used to interpret climate change over deep time.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Coupled climate science enabled attribution of observed change, projections under alternative forcing pathways, regional risk assessment, carbon-budget reasoning, detection of ocean heat uptake and systematic comparison of mitigation and adaptation scenarios. More broadly, it established a model for studying Earth as an interacting system rather than as separate atmospheric, oceanic and geological compartments.

New limits and risks

A global model can conceal local uncertainty, unresolved processes and unequal observational coverage. Ensembles quantify some uncertainty but do not guarantee that every structural error has been sampled. Long-term records can be disrupted by instrument changes, station moves and calibration shifts. Model output can also be mistaken for direct observation, while politically important summaries can encourage false precision or selective quotation. Climate knowledge therefore depends on preserving provenance, uncertainty ranges, model-observation comparisons and independent measurement systems.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

The planet became a **coupled, instrumented and computationally testable system**. Knowledge no longer consisted only of weather records or isolated mechanisms. It emerged from consistency among physical theory, long time series, satellite observations, palaeoclimate evidence and numerical models operating across interacting components and timescales.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

Climate history is sometimes reduced either to a single prediction or to a single institution. The actual transition was distributed across physics, meteorology, oceanography, geochemistry, computing and global observing networks. Early contributions from Arrhenius and Callendar should not be described as complete modern climate models, and later assessments should not be treated as sources of primary data. Observational coverage has also been geographically unequal, with substantial dependence on national infrastructures and sustained public funding. The distinction between measured trend, modelled mechanism, attribution and projected scenario must remain explicit.

Dependency map

- DIRECT ← PIO-088 Satellites and the planetary point of view
- INDIRECT ← PIO-089 Plate tectonics: mechanism, synthesis and converging evidence
- INDIRECT ← PIO-090 Networks, simulation and machine learning

References

1. Arrhenius, S. "On the Influence of Carbonic Acid in the Air upon the Temperature of the Ground." *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* 41(251), 237-276 (1896). DOI: 10.1080/14786449608620846.
2. Callendar, G. S. "The Artificial Production of Carbon Dioxide and Its Influence on Temperature." *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 64(275), 223-240 (1938). DOI: 10.1002/qj.49706427503.
3. Keeling, C. D. "The Concentration and Isotopic Abundances of Carbon Dioxide in the Atmosphere." *Tellus* 12(2), 200-203 (1960). DOI: 10.1111/j.2153-3490.1960.tb01300.x.
4. Manabe, S. & Wetherald, R. T. "Thermal Equilibrium of the Atmosphere with a Given Distribution of Relative Humidity." *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences* 24(3), 241-259 (1967). DOI: 10.1175/1520-0469(1967)024<0241:TEOTAW>2.0.CO;2.
5. National Research Council. *Carbon Dioxide and Climate: A Scientific Assessment*. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, DC (1979).
6. Houghton, J. T., Jenkins, G. J. & Ephraums, J. J. (eds.). *Climate Change: The IPCC Scientific Assessment*. Cambridge University Press for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (1990).