

Fact Check #1

From the IPCC's own documents,

*“The climate system is a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore **the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.**”*

Every study (like this one) uses a computer model that has been programmed to ignore the natural forcings (primarily solar) and amplify the historical theoretical CO₂ warming (using unsubstantiated positive water vapour feedbacks) to conform to the Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming (CAGW) alarmist narrative. Forecasting our future climate is impossible (in the IPCC's own words). To then use computer models that essentially ignore the natural forcings (forcings that have been active for billions of years) to focus on one small component of the climate system (CO₂), is stupid, simplistic and unscientific (go to Fact Check #2). Computer models are subject to their programming. I have shown (in the Addendum to my Open Letter and OPS-8 – Basic Climate Model) that the Modern Temperature Record (MTR) can be modelled with just the Total Solar Irradiance (TSI, as a proxy) and the Atlantic Multi-decadal Oscillation (AMO). Is my simple model definitive? Absolutely not, but that simple (zero cost) model would recognize the dangerous cooling associated with the Grand Solar Minimum we just entered, when the taxpayer funded (to the tune of billions) IPCC models are programmed to ignore.

Fact Check #2

There is no empirical Temperature/CO₂ data set that shows CO₂ driving the climate on any statistically significant historical time scale.

For a theory (or in this case, the Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming (CAGW) narrative) to become an accepted scientific principle, that theory must be supported by empirical data. Since there is NO EMPIRICAL DATA available to support the CAGW narrative, the belief in the CAGW narrative is much closer to a religious belief than a scientific principle.

A challenge to present that empirical data is the first statement on my website (climatechangeandmusic.com). That challenge has never been (and can never be) met. A representative cross section of the data (with links, from NASA, NOAA, Hadley Center, UAH and a variety of academic and scientific associations) is available on the website. I have offered my opinion on what that empirical data is telling us, but I strongly encourage the reader to come to their own opinion. Unfortunately, for the CAGW alarmist crowd, the empirical data does not support their narrative (that is not an opinion, that is a fact).

Fact Check #3

The Scientific Method from Britannica,

[Scientific Method / Definition, Steps, & Application / Britannica](#)

“In a typical application of the scientific method, a researcher develops a hypothesis, tests it through various means, and then modifies the hypothesis on the basis of the outcome of the tests and experiments. The modified hypothesis is then retested, further modified, and tested again, until it becomes consistent with observed phenomena and testing outcomes.”

What is really happening in “climate science”, in the CAGW alarmist virtual reality?

Scientific Method - Climate Alarmist's Adaptation

“In a typical application of the CAGW scientific method, a “climate scientist” develops a hypothesis, programs a computer model to get the results they want, and then modifies the “data” on the basis of the outcome of the computer models. The “data” is further modified, as new unconforming data becomes available, until the “data” again becomes consistent with the “hypothesis”. Add on - never change the hypothesis and ignore all dissenting information.” [OPS-47 – Fact Checking](#)