

## I must be an Anthropogenic Global Warmist

- I believe that the planet has warmed (roughly 1 °C over the Modern Temperature Record (MTR)).
- I believe that atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> increases led to global temperature increases (subject to CO<sub>2</sub>'s Climate Sensitivity).
- I believe that atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> has been increasing at an accelerated rate over the MTR.
- I believe that humans are responsible for a significant portion of that atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> rise.

I am actually a Climate Realist. Solar Activity, Ocean Cycles and CO<sub>2</sub> combined made me a historical Warmist (over the MTR). Solar Activity and Ocean Cycles make me a Coolist going forward. And based on the historical implications of Grand Solar Minimums (GSMs), the GSM we just entered makes me lean towards being a Catastrophic Global Coolist (with no significant Anthropogenic contribution).

The **The evidence is very clear I believe in Anthropogenic Global Warming.**

Anthropogenic forcings may have been significant (40 – 50% but probably lower) over the MTR, but solar, ocean cycles, etc. combined were still dominant

## So, why would a confirmed AGW (just not 100% Anthropogenic) speak out against the Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming (CAGW) alarmist Narrative?

The first hint is the word “**Catastrophic**”. There is **NO EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE** that the “projected” IPCC temperature increases will be catastrophic. Computer “projections” are not empirical evidence! Regardless, the computer models have not been able to model recent global temperatures (they’re running hot), which is not surprising since the positive water vapour feedbacks built into the models are unsubstantiated.

The second hint is the word “**Narrative**”. A CAGW alarmist might be more inclined to call Anthropogenic Global Warming a Theory rather than a Narrative. The descriptor is irrelevant. There is **NO EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE** backing up the CAGW alarmist premise that Anthropogenic forcings are the primary climate driver. I have a standard request for anyone (scientist or not) to put forward an empirical Temperature/CO<sub>2</sub> data set that shows CO<sub>2</sub> driving the climate on any statistically significant historical time scale. That request can never be met since that data set doesn’t exist!

The roughly 1 °C temperature rise over the MTR is neither unusual or unprecedented. Refer to my combined looks at the Holocene and MTR (OPS-26 and 27 (Simplified) and CSS-1, 2 and 4). There is a lot of data/analysis there, but it can be summarized in a few sentences. The MTR temperature rise (out of the Little Ice Age) looks like every other Holocene temperature fluctuations (which were driven by natural (solar) forcings, with virtually no CO<sub>2</sub> contribution). The computer models have been incorrectly programmed to respond to anthropogenic forcings almost exclusively (refer to OPS-22) and they have been calibrated to the MTR (which makes them useless to hindcast the Holocene temperature and therefore useless to forecast future temperatures since they are ignoring the natural (solar) forcings that haven’t suddenly stopped just because the IPCC programmers have decreed it to be so.

CO<sub>2</sub>'s climate sensitivity is not settled science. Historically, the value is somewhere around 1 °C (i.e.: a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub> will raise the global temperature 1 °C). The IPCC uses a value of roughly 1.2 °C (and uses a fudge factor (I mean positive water feedback) to project temperatures that are already up to 3 or 4 times higher than observed temperatures). The positive water feedback is a non-starter since like CO<sub>2</sub> driving the climate, there is **NO EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE** backing up the theory. Judith Curry et al have estimated that the maximum CO<sub>2</sub> sensitivity (based on the MTR temperature rise) is roughly 1.35 °C. That number assumed (for simplicity) that all the warming was anthropogenic in nature (ignoring the simple fact that 80%+ of human emissions occurred post 1950, yet roughly half of the temperature rise (even using the “over-homogenized” surface temperature data) occurred pre-1950. Regardless of which sensitivity is chosen, the temperature rise due to human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will never be dangerous and will in fact be beneficial. That analysis assumes that the sensitivity does not decline as the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations rise. Many prominent scientists believe that the very narrow CO<sub>2</sub> absorption band has become saturated and future CO<sub>2</sub> warming capacity has and will become increasingly less effective (almost negligible above current CO<sub>2</sub> levels). Refer to CSS-3 for a discussion on CO<sub>2</sub>'s Climate Sensitivity.

Confessions  
Of An AGW

The historical data backs up solar, NOT CO<sub>2</sub>.