OPS-14

So Let's Talk About The "97%" CONSENSUS"

Consensus Studies claiming ±97% Consensus →

Oreskes (2004)/Peiser (2005) – Position on AGW Consensus based on 1,117 papers
34 (3%) reject, only 13 (1.1%) explicitly endorse and 322 (28.8%) implicitly endorse.
Cook et al (2013) - Position on AGW Consensus based on 11,944 papers
41 (0.3%) actually endorsed the consensus, 3,896 (32.6%) agreed we cause some warming.
Doran & Zimmerman (2009) - Position on AGW Consensus based on 3,146 respondents
Self selected only 79 respondents, 76 (96.2%) of which responded yes to the question below

Firstly, we have to establish what the consensus applies to!!!

If the consensus is that the planet has warmed since the mid-1800's, then I'm 100% with the consensus[1].
If the consensus is that CO_2 concentrations have been increasing steadily and faster since the 1950's, then I'm 100% with the consensus[2].
If the consensus is that a significant percentage of the recent CO_2 increase is manmade, then I'm 100% with the consensus[3].
If the consensus is that atmospheric CO_2 increases can increase the global temperature, then I'm 100% with the consensus[4].
If the consensus is that CO_2 increases have contributed significantly to rising global temperatures, then I'm 100% with the consensus[5].
If the consensus is that CO_2 is absolutely vital to life on this planet, then I'm 100% with the consensus[6].
If the consensus is that atmospheric CO_2 concentrations are still close to plant starvation levels, then I'm 100% with the consensus[7].

Oreskes (2004)/Peiser(2005) – scientists that agree with the IPCC on AGW, "that Earth's climate is being affected by human activities"
Cook et al (2013) – "Human activity is very likely causing most of the current GW (anthropogenic global warming or AGW)"
Doran & Zimmerman (2009) – "Is human activity a significant factor in global warming?"

But I'm not with the consensus if it's based on the alarmist viewpoint that CO_2 increases will lead to catastrophic temperature increases for a variety of reasons (shown below).

More detail? Google "Ronald Davison climate"

97% Consensus (???)

1. **Very, very little evidence exists that CO_2 is a primary driver of Climate Change. Computer models and unproven theories are not proof.**
2. **Climate models use an unrealistically high emission scenario (RCP8.5) to project catastrophic temperature rises. High emissions are due to slow economic development rates, rapidly rising population, slow paced technological change and an energy mix dominated by fossil fuels (Coal use is increased by a factor of 10 and requires unconventional hydrocarbon resource extraction well beyond presently extractable reserves)[1].**
3. **Historically, CMIP5 was used as the protocol for the General Circulation Models (GCM). The CMIP6 protocol will incorporate proton, electron and Cosmic Ray solar forcing along with CMIP5's spectral solar irradiance (SSI) and total solar irradiance (TSI)[2]. Beta testing suggests that global temperatures can be modeled with very little CO_2 forcing (Hmmm…).**
4. **The CO_2 climate sensitivities used in the IPCC models are too high and are augmented with unsubstantiated positive feedbacks.**
5. **The "consensus studies" themselves show very little explicit endorsement for catastrophic, human caused warming (Peiser - 13/1117 = 1.1%, Cook et al 41/11944 = 0.3% and Doran & Zimmerman – 76/3146 = 2.4%)**

The sun (not CO_2) is the primary climate driver!

1. **The planet is roughly 0.9 °C warmer now than the mid 1800's.**
2. **Pre-industrial levels were around 275 ppm compared to today's 410 ppm.**
3. **Given that the planet has warmed, the oceans will have released some of their CO_2 along with the manmade releases (allocations(??)).**
4. **CO_2 has a climate sensitivity associated with it. The IPCC uses 1.2 °C per CO_2 doubling (probably closer to 1 °C).**
5. **Based on CO_2's climate sensitivity, CO_2 is responsible for 40-50% of the warming (significant but not dangerous). The IPCC is attributing virtually all the warming to CO_2 (which is hard to justify since half of the temperature increase occurred prior to when most of the manmade CO_2 emissions occurred). My faith in this "consensus" is dependent on the meaning of significant. I'm seeing more peer-reviewed articles/papers minimizing the role of CO_2. An example (posted today, Sep. 7th, 2019) is highlighted below[3]. Worth a read regardless of which side of the discussion you sit on.**
6. **CO_2 is plant food, without CO_2, plants die. And so do all organisms that rely on them for sustenance and oxygen.**
7. **Plants die off at 150 ppm. At current levels (410 ppm), plants are still stressed. That is why greenhouses raise their CO_2 levels to 1200 – 1500 ppm range. Levels were at 180 ppm in the last ice age.**

1. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10584-011-0149-y
2. https://www.wcrp-climate.org/images/modelling/WGCM/CMIP/CMIP6Forcings_SolarForcing_InitialDescription_150213.pdf
3. https://wattsupwiththat.com/2019/09/07/propagation-of-error-and-the-reliability-of-global-air-temperature-projections-mark-ii/