


GSM - Grand Solar Minimum. The real "Climate Change" existential threat is right around the corner. Do the Research!



CO₂ is obviously not the primary climate driver!

The plot to the right obliterates the CAGW alarmist narrative. Sea levels are tied closely to global temperatures. The responses are muted (due to the sheer size of the oceans) but they are there. If CO₂ is responsible for virtually all the warming since the pre-industrial period, CO₂ should correlate to this entire seal level dataset. Obviously, that is not the case. The CO₂ data has been correlated to the post-1950 period since 86% of humanity's emissions occurred over that period. Just because the CO₂ correlates does not mean that CO₂ was responsible for all the warming/ sea level rise. There are accelerations and decelerations throughout the sea level data, but the long-term trend (since 1856) is linear. The 60-year acceleration/deceleration cycle is most likely due to ocean cycles (primarily the AMO), not CO₂ and will decelerate sea level rise again bringing the sea levels back to the linear trend. The pre-1856 declining sea levels are a major problem for the alarmist narrative, given that CO₂ levels were virtually flat over that period. Ocean cycles can affect sea level, but they cannot change the direction sea levels are trending on these time scales. That leaves other natural forcings (i.e.: solar related activity). Strange how the sea level declines began during the Dalton Minimum. CO₂ has little effect on sea level.

No CO₂ Sea Level Correlation

OPS-74 CO₂ and Sea Level – 1807 to 2010

More detail, climatechangeandmusic.com

The Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming (CAGW) alarmist narrative is simple (and insidious). The basic premise tells us that we (humanity) are responsible for virtually all the warming since the pre-industrial period (primarily through our CO₂ emissions) and continued CO₂ emissions will lead to dangerously high temperatures and accelerated extreme weather events. Regardless of what they tell us, they have no empirical CO₂/Temperature datasets that show CO₂ driving the climate on any statistically significant historical time scale. Combine that with their computer model projections that they self-acknowledge run way too hot and use low likelihood, implausible emission scenarios and you must question their science.

