

What drives the current obsession to end fossil fuel production, to transform our electrical grids off cheap, high density, reliable fossil fuels to expensive, low density, unreliable wind and solar, to drastically reduce fertilizer production and therefore food production, to wean us off normal proteins (beef, chicken, fish) and replace that with insect protein, to borrow and/or pick pocket obscene amounts of money from the taxpayer and our future generations to fund this energy transition?

The answer is simple. The Catastrophic Anthropogenic “Global Warming” (i.e.: Climate Change, along with an appropriate descriptive and alarming adjective) alarmist narrative. The CAGW narrative is simple. The planet has been warming since the mid-1800s, our greenhouse gas emissions along with their respective atmospheric concentrations (primarily CO₂) have also been rising. Ergo, we, humanity are responsible for that temperature rise and unless we stop our emissions, the planet is doomed to overheat, leading to our extinction.

So, what drives the CAGW alarmist narrative? Again, the answer is easy, “the science”. Defining “the science” is subjective but we can go with the IPCC’s version since they, like the rest of the UN departments apparently “own” their branch of science. Note, the science they own does not appear to include the sun. For this purpose, we will just look at a few key points.

1. The IPCC (whether they “own” the science or not) still must adhere to the principles of the Scientific Method. The Scientific Method requires empirical data for validation. The CAGW alarmist narrative (our CO₂ emissions are responsible for the recent temperature rise) does not have that empirical data. There is no empirical CO₂/Global Temperature data showing CO₂ driving the climate on any statistically significant historical time scale. But we can put this one aside, since the IPCC (who “owns” “the science”) has chosen to do just that.
2. While there is no empirical data showing CO₂ driving the climate, CO₂ concentration changes will contribute to temperature change. So, how much do those changes contribute? That depends on the CO₂ climate sensitivity (i.e.: the temperature increase associated with a doubling of CO₂). Cue the IPCC science, who use a range of sensitivities (1.8 to 5.7 °C) in their climate models. I find that range somewhat unsettling, since “the science” is supposedly settled.
3. That brings us to the climate models, the underlying justification for every projection of catastrophic temperature rise, extreme weather and “green” initiatives. Enter the elephant in the room. The climate models run too hot. That fact is very apparent when you take the imitative to get their projection runs and plot them against the measured Lower Tropospheric temperatures. But you do not have to take my word or do the work yourself. The programmers have self-acknowledged that their models run too hot!
4. What the modelers do not tell you is how much hotter the models run. There are several different emission scenarios used in the models (ssp1-2.6, ssp2-4.5, ssp3-7.0 and ssp5-8.5). For a full description, go to the [DKRZ website](#). The IPCC has declared that the two high emission scenarios (ssp3-7.0 and ssp5-8.5) have a low likelihood of occurring. Most other researchers declare them as implausible. Yet these high emission scenarios are still routinely used. Which is strange (and I might add stupid), since the ssp2-4.5, the most likely scenario, still runs too hot in all (I repeat all) the IPCC models.

GW Proof Summary

[Open Letter Addendum](#)

- [CSS-7 – CO₂ – The FECKLESS Greenhouse Gas](#)
- [CSS-21 – CO₂ Visualized Temperature Contribution](#)
- [CSS-25 – Incremental Homogenization – HadCRUT4-5](#)
- [CSS-27 – Is CO₂ Really the Primary Climate Driver?](#)
- [CSS-29 – Climate Model – TSI-AMO-CO₂](#)
- [CSS-30 – CMIP6 Climate Models](#)
- [CSS-40 – Satellite Temperature Comparisons](#)
- [OPS-8 – Basic Climate Model](#)
- [OPS-52 – Solar Activity – NOAA Forecast](#)
- [OPS-55 – The State of Climate Science](#)

5. How do they produce their best guesstimate Temperature? They average all their incorrect runs. Not what I would call scientific.
6. The models ignore the solar forcings that are programmed (with the new CMIP6 protocol) into the IPCC models. Solar forcings recognized by many astro/solar physicists from around the world (including NOAA).
7. The IPCC typically ignores the satellite temperature data (specifically the data set from the University of Alabama, Huntsville). The UAH data was always considered an outlier (despite agreeing with the radiosonde (i.e.: weather balloon) data. The NOAA STAR dataset has recently been recalibrated and now corroborates the UAH data, leaving the CAGW alarmist friendly RSS data as the outlier.

The CAGW alarmists are operating on a narrative that has no scientific proof behind the premise, they are using computer models that run too hot and emission scenarios that are implausible, all to justify “green” initiatives that offer no economic, societal, or even environmental gain!

GSM – Grand Solar Minimum. The real “Climate Change” existential threat is right around the corner. Do the Research!