

# UN's Climate Panic is more Politics than Science > Climate etc

Posted on March 28, 2023 *The Australian* by curryja | 330 Comments

by **Judith Curry**

I have a new op-ed published in [The Australian](#), here is the complete text.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued a new Synthesis Report, with fanfare from the UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres:

“The climate time-bomb is ticking but the latest IPCC report shows that we have the knowledge & resources to tackle the climate crisis. We need to act now to ensure a livable planet in the future.”

The new IPCC Report is a synthesis of the three reports that constitute the Sixth Assessment Report, plus three special reports. This Synthesis Report does not introduce any new information or findings.

While the IPCC Reports include some good material, the Summary for Policy Makers for the Synthesis Report emphasizes weakly justified findings on climate impacts driven by extreme emission scenarios, and politicized policy recommendations on emissions reductions.

The most important finding of the past 5 years is that the extreme emissions scenarios RCP8.5 and SSP5-8.5, commonly referred to as “business-as-usual” scenarios, are now widely recognized as implausible.

These extreme scenarios have been dropped by UN Conference of the Parties to the UN Climate Agreement.

However, the new Synthesis Report continues to emphasize these extreme scenarios, while this important finding is buried in a footnote:

“Very high emission scenarios have become less likely but cannot be ruled out.”

The extreme emissions scenarios are associated with alarming projections of 4-5 C of warming by 2100.

The most recent Conference of the Parties (COP27) is working from a baseline temperature projection based on a medium emissions scenario of 2.5 C by 2100.

Since 1.2 C of warming has already occurred from the baseline period in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the amount of warming projected for the remainder of the 21<sup>st</sup> century under the medium emissions scenario is only about one third of the warming projections under the extreme emissions scenario.

The Synthesis Report emphasizes “loss and damage” as a central reason why action is needed.

It is therefore difficult to overstate the importance of the shift in expectations for future extreme weather events and sea level rise, that is associated with rejection of the extreme emissions scenarios.

Rejecting these extreme scenarios has rendered obsolete much of the climate impacts literature and assessments of the past decade, that have focused on these scenarios. In particular, the extreme emissions scenario dominates the impacts that are featured prominently in the new Synthesis Report.

Clearly, the climate “crisis” isn’t what it used to be. Rather than acknowledging this fact as good news, the IPCC and UN officials are doubling down on the “alarm” regarding the urgency of reducing emissions by eliminating fossil fuels. You might think that if warming is less than we thought, then the priorities would shift away from emissions reductions and towards reducing our vulnerability to weather and climate extremes. However, that hasn’t been the case.

The IPCC has been characterized as a “knowledge monopoly,” with its dominant authority in the UN climate deliberations. The IPCC claims that it is “policy-neutral” and “never policy-prescriptive.”

However, the IPCC has strayed far from its chartered role of assessing the scientific literature in support of policy making. The entire framing of the IPCC Reports is now around the mitigation of climate change through emissions **reductions**.

# UN's Climate Panic is more Politics than Science > Climate etc

Posted on March 28, 2023 by curryja | [330 Comments](#)

Not only has the IPCC increasingly taken on a stance of explicit political advocacy, but it is misleading policy makers by its continued emphasis on extreme climate outcomes driven by the implausible extreme emissions scenarios. With its explicit political advocacy, combined with misleading information, the IPCC risks losing its privileged position in international policy debates.

The impact of these alarming IPCC reports and rhetoric by UN officials is this.

Climate change has become a grand narrative in which human-caused climate change has become a dominant cause of societal problems.

Everything that goes wrong reinforces the conviction that there is only one thing we can do to prevent societal problems—stop burning fossil fuels.

This grand narrative leads us to think that if we solve the problem of burning fossil fuels, then these other problems would also be solved.

This belief leads us away from a deeper investigation of the true causes of these other problems.

The end result is a narrowing of the viewpoints and policy options that we are willing to consider in dealing with complex issues such as energy systems, water resources, public health, weather disasters, and national security.

The IPCC Reports have become “bumper sticker” climate science – making a political statement while using the overall reputation of science to give authority to a politically manufactured consensus.

JC note: h/t to Dan Hughes for the “bumper sticker” line

# UN's Climate Panic is more Politics than Science > Climate etc

Posted on March 28, 2023 *The Australian* by curryja | 330 Comments

by **Judith Curry**

I have a new op-ed published in [The Australian](#), here is the complete text.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has issued a new Synthesis Report, with fanfare from the UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres:

“The climate time-bomb is ticking but the latest IPCC report shows that we have the knowledge & resources to tackle the climate crisis. We need to act now to ensure a livable planet in the future.”

The new IPCC Report is a synthesis of the three reports that constitute the Sixth Assessment Report, plus three special reports. This Synthesis Report does not introduce any new information or findings.

While the IPCC Reports include some good material, the Summary for Policy Makers for the Synthesis Report emphasizes weakly justified findings on climate impacts driven by extreme emission scenarios, and politicized policy recommendations on emissions reductions.

The most important finding of the past 5 years is that the extreme emissions scenarios RCP8.5 and SSP5-8.5, commonly referred to as “business-as-usual” scenarios, are now widely recognized as implausible.

These extreme scenarios have been dropped by UN Conference of the Parties to the UN Climate Agreement.

However, the new Synthesis Report continues to emphasize these extreme scenarios, while this important finding is buried in a footnote:

“Very high emission scenarios have become less likely but cannot be ruled out.”

The extreme emissions scenarios are associated with alarming projections of 4-5 C of warming by 2100.

The most recent Conference of the Parties (COP27) is working from a baseline temperature projection based on a medium emissions scenario of 2.5 C by 2100.

Since 1.2 C of warming has already occurred from the baseline period in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, the amount of warming projected for the remainder of the 21<sup>st</sup> century under the medium emissions scenario is only about one third of the warming projections under the extreme emissions scenario.

The Synthesis Report emphasizes “loss and damage” as a central reason why action is needed.

It is therefore difficult to overstate the importance of the shift in expectations for future extreme weather events and sea level rise, that is associated with rejection of the extreme emissions scenarios.

Rejecting these extreme scenarios has rendered obsolete much of the climate impacts literature and assessments of the past decade, that have focused on these scenarios. In particular, the extreme emissions scenario dominates the impacts that are featured prominently in the new Synthesis Report.

Clearly, the climate “crisis” isn’t what it used to be. Rather than acknowledging this fact as good news, the IPCC and UN officials are doubling down on the “alarm” regarding the urgency of reducing emissions by eliminating fossil fuels. You might think that if warming is less than we thought, then the priorities would shift away from emissions reductions and towards reducing our vulnerability to weather and climate extremes. However, that hasn’t been the case.

The IPCC has been characterized as a “knowledge monopoly,” with its dominant authority in the UN climate deliberations. The IPCC claims that it is “policy-neutral” and “never policy-prescriptive.”

However, the IPCC has strayed far from its chartered role of assessing the scientific literature in support of policy making. The entire framing of the IPCC Reports is now around the mitigation of climate change through emissions **reductions**.

# UN's Climate Panic is more Politics than Science > Climate etc

Posted on March 28, 2023 by curryja | [330 Comments](#)

Not only has the IPCC increasingly taken on a stance of explicit political advocacy, but it is misleading policy makers by its continued emphasis on extreme climate outcomes driven by the implausible extreme emissions scenarios. With its explicit political advocacy, combined with misleading information, the IPCC risks losing its privileged position in international policy debates.

The impact of these alarming IPCC reports and rhetoric by UN officials is this.

Climate change has become a grand narrative in which human-caused climate change has become a dominant cause of societal problems.

Everything that goes wrong reinforces the conviction that there is only one thing we can do to prevent societal problems—stop burning fossil fuels.

This grand narrative leads us to think that if we solve the problem of burning fossil fuels, then these other problems would also be solved.

This belief leads us away from a deeper investigation of the true causes of these other problems.

The end result is a narrowing of the viewpoints and policy options that we are willing to consider in dealing with complex issues such as energy systems, water resources, public health, weather disasters, and national security.

The IPCC Reports have become “bumper sticker” climate science – making a political statement while using the overall reputation of science to give authority to a politically manufactured consensus.

JC note: h/t to Dan Hughes for the “bumper sticker” line

## UN's climate panic is more politics than science

Posted on [March 28, 2023](#) by [curryja](#) | [330 Comments](#)

by [Judith Curry](#)

o o st th

### 330 RESPONSES TO “UN’S CLIMATE PANIC IS MORE POLITICS THAN SCIENCE”

This entry was posted in [Uncategorized](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

[David Palmer](#) | [March 28, 2023 at 6:56 pm](#) |

Nice to read Judith in [The Australian](#) this morning. Big change in focus of the Blog past 10 years or so.

Liked by 1 person

[Rob Starkey](#) | [March 28, 2023 at 7:52 pm](#) |

Her position has evolved greatly since I 1st visited this site in 2007. It has

Liked by 1 person

[David Palmer](#) | [March 28, 2023 at 8:46 pm](#) |

Prection, I visited this blog from 2007. Never commented before, technically incompetent to do so, mere engineer, but interested in Judith’s opinion.

Like

[Harold Angel](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 12:56 pm](#) |

[Grant Quinn](#) |

Liked by 1 person

[March 30, 2023 at 7:43 pm](#) |

I agree. The education system has been taken over by women of the left persuasion and all the kids are b rainwashed and poorly educated. The people have been dumbed down by the the woke syllabus’.

You can actually graduate from high school and not Bne able to read or write to a reasonable degree.

[Russell Seitz](#) | [April 14, 2023 at 3:39 pm](#)

You might consider offering Donald Trump political asylum to raise the tone?

**Curious George** | [March 28, 2023 at 6:57 pm](#) |

“a politically manufactured consensus.”  
Consensus is a tool of politics. It directly discredits science.

**Bruce Hall** | [March 29, 2023 at 1:53 pm](#) |

I refer back to this notion: <https://www.aei.org/carpe-diem/michael-crichton-explains-why-there-is-no-such-thing-as-consensus-science/>

“I want to pause here and talk about this notion of consensus, and the rise of what has been called consensus science. I regard consensus science as an extremely pernicious development that ought to be stopped cold in its tracks. Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

Let's be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politicians. The contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has reported a result that is the greatest scientific achievement in the history of the world. In great precise basis, they don't know what is the consensus. There is no such thing as consensus science. If it's consensus, it isn't science. If it's science, it isn't consensus. Period.”

Liked by 3 people

**Russell** | [March 29, 2023 at 3:34 pm](#) |

“If it's consensus, it isn't science. If it's science, it isn't consensus. Period.”  
Compounding as it does tautology with a terminal appeal to authority, this may be the worst thing Mike ever wrote, including the speech Steve Koonin invited him to make at Cal Tech.

Liked by 1 person

**Franktoo**

| [April 11, 2023 at 1:42 am](#) |

Bruce and Russell: In his great book “A Constitution of Knowledge. In Defense of Truth.” Jonathan Rauch explains where knowledge comes from. Science can be done by a single individual, but knowledge is the

Rauch says that we need groups because the human brain is lousy at reasoning. For most of us, reasoning is dominated by emotion. Most non-scientists (and many scientists) would rather be wrong than publicly disagree with important beliefs of their peer group. For example, since the lab leak hypothesis for the origin of COVID first became known as a conspiracy theory promoted by Trump for political reasons, there wasn't a compelling reason for most scientists to discuss this hypothesis until we failed to find infected animals connected with the Seafood

Market. For scientists, confirmation bias is a more serious problem. Even the greatest scientists find it easier to find mistakes in the work of others than in their own work. Even the brilliant Einstein never accepted the

**JJBraccili** | [April 11, 2023 at 9:18 am](#) |

“Now, the IPCC consensus is not generating knowledge because they aren't interested in having a continuing conversation with skeptical experts. They aren't interested in learning why they might be wrong, because they can't afford to be seen questioning the consensus.”

What skeptical experts? You mean those that scour the IPCC report looking for discrepancies so they can make a mountain out of a mole hill? How about those with crackpot theories? Recently, someone claiming to be an expert in this venue insisted that greenhouse gases have no impact on the earth's temperature. You think he should be taken seriously?

How about the guy who says CO2 has no impact on climate. It's SO2 that's the problem. His “proof” is that SO2 is decreasing and temperature is increasing and during periods of decreasing CO2 emissions the temperature doesn't go down. He has no direct evidence for the former and direct evidence contradicts the latter. You think he should be taken seriously?

Most skeptics don't want a conversation with real climate scientists because they know they'll be exposed as frauds. They place their “papers” in “pay to publish” journals where the peer review is inferior. Then they troll sites like this one trying to drum up support from those predisposed to accept anything in opposition to consensus science on climate change.

The skeptics are few in number and their ranks are shrinking.

Loading...

**UK-Weather Lass** | [April 11, 2023 at 4:52 am](#) |

Intelligence is the ability to understand something so well you can explain it to a child or an academic of high esteem, often even at the same moment in time. A consensus can have no intelligence other than that of the individual whose idea is being aped by that consensus over and over again.

There was once an enormous consensus that the Earth was centre of the universe and that proved a lot of I am curious though. When was the science “settled”? On what date did we know everything there was to know about the climate and there was nothing left to learn?  
And how did we know there was nothing left to learn?

The scientists 30 years ago seemed pretty certain that we had 10 years left to act and that if we didn't the Caribbean would be gone by now, the Arctic free of ice, Egypt flooded and the American mid-west a dustbowl.

It was all in the UN Environmental Programme's 1989 report. Compiled by climate experts. Scientists no less. But we didn't act and none of that has happened. Now scientists seem pretty certain that we have 10 years left to act and that if we don't the Caribbean will go, the Arctic will be free of ice, Egypt will flood and the American mid-west become a dustbowl.

Loading... Russell Seitz | April 14, 2023 at 3:45 pm |

"Now, the IPCC consensus is not generating knowledge because they aren't interested in having a continuing conversation with skeptical experts."

Molecular biologists and viral epidemiologists in Wuhan aren't much interested in a continuing conversation with Ivermectin salesmen either.

Loading... dpy6629 |

March 28, 2023 at 7:52 pm |

The good news is that the public is starting to catch on to the narratives. The bad news is that young people are increasingly depressed and unable to distinguish fancy from reality because they spend all their time in the on-line world.

Loading...  
jungletrunks |

March 29, 2023 at 3:10 pm |

But young Marxists aren't having kids! Out of fear apparently. It's a thin silver lining when the promise of consensus is anticipated to depreciate, eventually.

Loading...  
JJBraccili |

March 29, 2023 at 5:55 pm |

Really wrong. Hollywood, you can't help yourself, you're a B actor who only knows how to recite cheap manifesto woke script. Please peruse:

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/nov/27/climate-apocalypse-fears-stopping-peoplehavingchildren-study>

Climate 'apocalypse' fears stopping people having children – study  
Survey of 600 people finds some parents regret having offspring for same reason <http://www.theguardian.com>  
<https://www.independent.co.uk/climate-change/news/birth-rate-decline-ipcc-report-forecast-b1901490.html>

Grim forecast on the climate crisis is putting people off having children, financial analysts warn  
Morgan Stanley cited research that number of births in the US fell in the nine months after an extreme heat event <http://www.independent.co.uk>

Loading...  
JJBraccili |

March 29, 2023 at 10:23 pm |

I'd say people having less children is a good thing. They are right to worry about what future generations will have to endure if we don't do something about climate change.

Loading... Grant Quinn | March 29, 2023 at 10:48 pm |

Have you got no understanding of the temperature variation over the last 10k years? 1850 was chosen because it was the coldest period in the last 10k years. So we are now 1 degree above the coldest period in the last 10k years and 2 degrees below the hottest period. Man, such as for example the Australian Aborigine, lived through the whole period and they say +50k years before that, when it was 6 degrees above what it is now. We are still recovering from the last glacial period when the sea was 100m lower than now as proven by aboriginal middens found 30k to the east of Australia. That survived all of that with only fire and furs. And you talk of catastrophe?  
Are you completely mad?

Loading...  
JJBraccili | March 29, 2023 at 11:19 pm |

The thermometer wasn't invented until the 17th century. Measurements before then were just guesstimates based on inference. All your saying is that man managed to survive a warm period. Do you know the percentage of people who made it through? Unless a nuclear war is triggered, I suspect some of humanity will survive AGW. The question is what percentage and at what cost. There are 8 billion people on the planet now that need to be fed. Things will be a lot different.

Loading...  
Bill Fabrizio |

March 29, 2023 at 7:53 pm |

JJ ...

JJBraccili |

[March 29, 2023 at 8:16 pm](#) |

LOL! The Republican Party has lost the popular vote in 7 of the last 8 presidential elections. The only way the Republicans can control the House is by extreme gerrymandering. The only way they can control the Senate is because the Senate represents geography and not people. The Party has no policies that benefit the average American. What they've been selling since the 60's is racism, homophobia, xenophobia, and white supremacy. That's not working as well as it used to. Their current position on abortion and guns is a loser. They're heading toward becoming a permanent minority party.

Loading...[Bill Fabrizio](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 9:57 am](#) |

JJ ... The Democrats have had a numerical affiliation advantage over Republicans for decades. However, even

[Loading Wolfi](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 12:50 pm](#) |

@JJBraccili  
The Democrats win the popular vote primarily because of California. California, because it is both "all or nothing" electoral votes" and dominated by 2 large urban areas – the Republican/conservatives in that state barely vote at all.

You are furthermore thinking the Democrat party of today is the Democrat party of say, pre-Bill Clinton. Sorry, but that ain't so.

The Democrat party today is the party of the PMC – professional managerial class. The tenured professors, the mainstream media and Hollywood personalities, the CEOs and diversity/management consultants. No t saying the Republicans are perfect – there are far too many dino-Republicans agitating for war and other such nonsense. But there's no question whatsoever that the Republicans via Trump, JD Vance and others is far more populist than the Democrats are.

Loading...[catweazle666](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 3:06 pm](#) |

"Slavery could still make a comeback."

Given the Democrats – the party of the KKK and that fought tooth and nail to prevent the emancipation in the 1960s – are currently in power, that wouldn't surprise me.

Loading...  
[catweazle666](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 3:27 pm](#) |

You reckon?

You just keep right on telling yourself that, Sunshine!

Loading...[jim2](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 3:15 pm](#) |

JJB can't seem to get anything right, nothing!!

So uthern states wanted all the slaves counted as population so they could have more representatives. This was a huge point of contention. The 3/5th compromise actually diluted the power of slave holding states. The idea of it institutionalized slavery is just that, idiotic.

Loading...[Joe - the non climate scientist](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 3:28 pm](#) |

JJB's comment – "The Party has no policies that benefit the average American. What they've been selling since the 60's is racism,"

JJB – How can we believe you have the intellectual capacity to understand the complexities of climate science when you are unable to grasp the political party consumed with racism and sees everything through the prism of racism is the real racist party.

MLK wouldnt tolerate the racism that permeates throughout the current democrat/socialist party.

This is a science blog, not a racist – socialist blog – take your race baiting arguments someplace else.

Loading...[Bill Fabrizio](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 4:16 pm](#) |

JJ ... Yes you did. Everyone of your comments is laced with politics. Which is fine, but own it. And the only racist I see on here is you. No one gives a second thought to race, except those possessed by it. And you are possessed by it. No? Then why are you the only one to bring it up? My guess is you're some privileged, self-hating white guy. Well, as they say, it takes all kinds to make a world.

Loading...  
[JJBraccili](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 4:30 pm](#) |

No, I am one of the few on this venue who talks about the actual science and not pseudo-science laced with conspiracy theories.

Unfortunately, politics has infected climate science. It wasn't the climate scientists who caused that, it was the fossil fuel industry to prevent any action on climate change. Until recently, they have been wildly successful. It is why we find ourselves in the position we are in – between a rock and a hard place.

Loading...  
[jim2](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 8:53 pm](#) |



The fossil fuel industry decided to fight back. They went on a disinformation campaign to attack the science. They sponsored “research” and paid any “scientist” willing to take issue with climate science. They paid front organizations like the Heartland Institute and GWPF to literally make up stuff to discredit the science. To this day they are pushing the BS that we are going to be able to adapt to what’s coming. Don’t worry — be happy. The fossil fuel industry is at fault — not because they produced a product to meet a demand, but because when they found out that product was an existential threat to humanity, they tried to cover that up so that they could continue to profit.

Loading...[jim2](#) | [March 31, 2023 at 8:58 am](#) |

JJB – the information oil companies had was highly speculative. Fortunately, they did fight the perception. It likely added trillions to the cumulative US GDP and enabled much progress and a higher standard of living. In fact, the evidence for catastrophic global warming is still speculative as there is no falsifiable evidence for it. I will add I do believe CO2 will increase the temperature of the atmosphere. I don’t believe it will result in a catastrophe. And I don’t believe any weather phenomena today can be traced to the extra CO2. There is no evidence. If you think the evidence exists, provide links. The warming so far amounts to about 0.5% from preindustrial times. How can you seriously believe it’s having much of an effect on weather?

Loading...  
[JJBraccili](#) |

[March 31, 2023 at 12:57 pm](#) |

In the case of Climate Change, Exxon had a team of climate scientists who developed their own climate model. You can read about it here:

“I will add I do believe CO2 will increase the temperature of the atmosphere.”

This is more climate denier BS — CO2 only heats the atmosphere. It’s true, under the right circumstances, CO2 can warm the atmosphere, but the energy provided by CO2 is tiny compared to the energy CO2 exports as electromagnetic energy. That energy is absorbed by the earth and is what causes climate change.

See the “pink” area under the CO2 label. That’s the amount of the earth’s radiant energy that CO2 is preventing from escaping the planet. That energy is about 8% of the solar energy the earth absorbs.

That energy is more than enough to cause climate change and the rise in the earth’s temperature we are seeing. That spectrograph ends the debate. BTW there never was a real debate. The science of climate change was settled decades ago.

Loading...[jim2](#) | [March 31, 2023 at 9:28 pm](#) |

JJB – Thanks for that Climate Doomer sciency BS. Not proof of anything other than run-of-the mill spectroscopy. It doesn’t prove there will be a CO2 driven catastrophe. Nice try, though.

Loading...

[catweazle666](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 9:49 am](#) |

*“The thermometer wasn’t invented until the 17th century.”*

Never heard of proxies, JJ?

Dear me!

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 11:47 am](#) |

Proxies are never as good as the real thing.

Loading...[Chris Morris](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 3:20 pm](#) |

The real things aren’t much good either when the historic temperatures get readjusted at regular intervals because they don’t tell the story activists want.

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 4:40 pm](#) |

Since there is no spot on the earth marked “average temperature insert thermocouple here.” Temperature data have to be statistically sampled and weighted — a degree rise in the ocean involves more energy than a degree rise in the atmosphere. There are always arguments over how this is done, and it leads to corrections. That the corrections have some ulterior motive is another conspiracy theory and fodder for the climate denialists.

Loading...[Chris Morris](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 8:58 pm](#) |

Your comments get more and more ridiculous JJ as you defend the impossible with stupid statements. Stop living in that fantasy world if you want to stop shredding what little credibility you have left. Currently you are only just a little below Mr Appell.

The historical data from individual stations has continually been adjusted downwards over the years. Recent years have been elevated. This is often when there has been no station moves or other influences. But they don’t make a correction for UHI which has raised many temperatures without a climate change. The rural/urban unadjusted comparison is getting wider.

That adjustment is why there are two data sets maintained. From these adjusted stations, they then calculate the “global” temperature.

The reason that the alarmist analysts went to anomalies is that the different models gave a wide spread of actual “global” temperatures (over 2°C if IIRC) that they were ridiculous. By going to anomalies, they could hide the embarrassing evidence.

Loading...

[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 9:57 pm](#) |

You do know that they also use satellite data to determine planetary temperatures? I presented a graph that had 5 or 6 sources for planetary temperature. You mean they are all in on the scam? If you want the gold standard on temperature data, check out Berkeley Earth. It's run by a former skeptic.

Loading...Joe - the non climate scientist |

March 31, 2023 at 8:53 am |

As Chris Morris states – “The reason that the alarmist analysts went to anomalies is that the different models gave a wide spread of actual “global” temperatures (over 2°C if IIRC) that they were ridiculous. By going to anomalies, they could hide the embarrassing evidence.”

Chris – My issue with anomalies is it creates difficulties in determining whether adjustments have been made to the prior year anomalies. If using actual temp, I can go back to prior year reports to see if the prior year temps have been adjusted, Cant do that with anomalies, at least not easily. Your point is valid

Loading...  
The reason they use anomalies is because if you used actual temperatures the curve would be flat.”  
Just how stupid is that. Have you never heard of scaling?

Berkeley Earth is not considered one of the 5 temperature series.

Loading...JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 4:13 pm |

Where would you like to start? How about economic policy. The modern conservative movement started with the Harding administration. Until recently, the most corrupt and inept administration. He had Andrew Mellon of the banking Mellons as his Secretary of the Treasury. Mellon was the father of “supply side” economics. It was called laissez-faire back in the day. Mellon continued as Secretary of the Treasury under Coolidge and Hoover. His policy of low taxes and loose financial regulation led directly to the stock market crash of 1929, He advised Hoover after the crash to do nothing and let it all burn. That turned what should have been a bad recession into the Great Depression. His economic policies are still the bedrock of conservative economic policy. Saint Ronnie resurrected them as “supply-side” economics. It took 20 years for the conservatives to unwind all the regulations put in during the 1930s to prevent another Great Depression. By 1999 they succeeded. With the Shrub administration and Alan Greenspan refusing to enforce what little regulation was left, the stage was set for the Great Recession. We were lucky that Shrub was at the end of his term because he and the Republicans in Congress would have done what Hoover did and we would have been in Great Depression II. Guess what? Those economic principles are still the bedrock of conservative economic ideology. Why? Because the policies don't just cause economic instability, they result in massive income inequality which is the point. Protecting and promoting the interests of the wealthy has always been the organizing principle of the conservative movement. In fact, it is the only principle they always honor. You think what I said is a good thing? Good luck with that!

Loading...Bill Fabrizio | March 30, 2023 at 6:55 pm |

JJ ... What you, and the left, refuse to acknowledge concerning the Great Compromise, and all the other compromises, was that they enabled the Constitution to be ratified. If you read the Federalists' Papers you'll see that the Constitution was not a perfect document, but rather perfect for the time. As to slavery, the ratification of the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, was one large step towards the end of slavery. About 75 years afterwards the Civil War was fought where over 600,000 white men died resulting in the end of slavery. The Constitution has always had issues, yet it seems to handle each in the due course of time.

Enjoy your evening.

Loading...Dave Fair | March 28, 2023 at 7:57 pm |

Dr. Curry, it is good that you were able to present some facts countering the UN IPCC (and Western governments') Leftist propaganda in a publication with general circulation. Was there any opposition in publishing it and has there been negative feedback to your op ed? Positive feedback?

Its not so much that governmental bodies shade the truth on climate science (although that's criminal in and of itself) it is the fact that they publish and allow others to publish outright lies about worsening extreme weather events. We are bombarded on a daily basis with obvious and outrageous lies concerning extreme weather. Those, like Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr. trying to publicize the truth are shouted down and de-platformed by Leftist politicians, Deep State bureaucrats, academics, NGO activists and media, and crony capitalist profiteers. I'm hopeful that (soon) an International Truth and Reconciliation Tribunal will convene to name and shame all of the CliSciFi liars.

Loading...catweazle666 | March 28, 2023 at 8:05 pm |

“In sum, a strategy must recognise what is possible. In climate research and modelling, we should recognise that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore that the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.” IPCC Working Group I: The Scientific Basis, Third Assessment Report (TAR), Chapter 14 (final para., 14.2.2.2), p774.

Loading...GlenM | March 28, 2023 at 8:06 pm |

Glad I read it here as I refuse to buy “The Australian”, which is turning out like the Sydney Morning Herald and other publications that take a soft and poor intellectual stance on many issues.

Loading...Dave Fair | March 28, 2023 at 8:14 pm |

When first beginning to follow Dr. Curry's blog, I thought SMH was “Smashing My Head” (against the wall). The usage of SMH by the commentors implied that meaning. It was only later that I realized it referred to a Leftist newspaper.

Loading...jungletrunks | March 28, 2023 at 8:19 pm |

Very well stated, Dr. Curry.

You nailed it with, “Everything that goes wrong reinforces the conviction that there is only one thing we can do to prevent societal problems—stop burning fossil fuels. This grand narrative leads us to think that if we solve the problem of burning fossil fuels, then these other problems would also be solved.”

You can substitute “burning fossil fuels” with “racism,” “guns,” or any other of a long list of leftist talking points. The public, led by the mass media, consistently swallows it hook, line, and sinker!

Loading...**Dave Fair** | [March 28, 2023 at 8:56 pm](#) |

Its called “intersectionality,” Lynn. The Leftists like to tie all grievances (Marxist Critical Theory) together so that if somebody supports/agitates for one grievance they support all the other causes. If you support one Leftist cause, you automatically support all the others. Neat trick.

Loading...**Skiergardener** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:49 pm](#) |Yup! Loading...  
**beththeserf** | [March 28, 2023 at 8:41 pm](#) |“

However, the IPCC has strayed far from its chartered role of assessing the scientific literature in support of policy making.” Mission creep, as with the U.N.And NASA.

Loading...**Clyde Spencer** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:12 pm](#) |  
Loading...**ianalexs** | [March 28, 2023 at 8:59 pm](#) |

Quoting here from J.C.'s article above:

“... the Summary for Policy Makers for the Synthesis Report emphasizes weakly justified findings on climate impacts driven by extreme emission scenarios, and politicized policy recommendations on emissions reductions.”

What I'm picking up on is the emphasis on weakly justified findings feeding into politicised recommendations. How extremely depressing, that this is how our elites abuse their positions of responsibility.

I guess it's the same as we've seen over and over again for the past few years: a new, disorientating, total-control moral righteousness with its confected “narratives” supplanting the older generation's liberal intellectual quest for truth. Their hubris will take us all down.

Loading...**Grant Quinn** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:44 pm](#) |

Great article titled ( ) “UN report is bumper sticker climate science”.

As an Aussie geologist who follows your blog I feel privileged that you have written this article in our flagship paper. Mind you, I still think you give too much credence to man-made climate change but I sense you have to be careful not to be completely cancelled by the powers that be.

Loading...**Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:59 pm](#) |

Judith, 246 comments on your article so far, all positive last time I checked. And you were cited in the lead editorial as well.

Loading...**Ross Porter** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:59 pm](#) |

Delighted to read Dr Curry's assessment of the reports in The Australian. Her balanced articles are refreshing in a pool of representations in most OZ Media.

Loading...**Luís Cristovao** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:09 pm](#) |

Very good article trying to demistify the global warming climate change narrative. For many years I work on environmental side in industry and clearly for me we have a resources problem and a pollution problem. To me I read some book like Freakonomics and I was not comfortable with this climate change growing voices and the super importance of CO2.

I have heard some years ago a Brazilian scientist criticizing climate models, he said there were lots of scientists from former nuclear industry that had no jobs and develop these models...

In the last year I've seen John Christy videos and clear position about climate facts using satellite temp data sets and... last but not least today I found about Judith Curry ...and I was totally convinced my gut feeling was correct. This is all a political hidden agenda led by UN and by Antonio Guterres which by the way is Portuguese like me. He had a good position against Russia and Putin recently but on climate issues he is totally wrong trying to impose near true and scientific facts into an absolutely insane movement that ... thank god some people are opposing and fighting against it !

Loading...**Clyde Spencer** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:09 pm](#) |

Judith, You wrote, “This Sythesis Report does not introduce any new information or findings.” Shouldn't that be the “Sisyphus Report?” :-)

Loading...**Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:12 pm](#) |  
Judith, here is one of my comments on your article and one in the Letters section replying to a rabid warmist: “Judith is one of the best-informed, most honest and open of climate scientists. She doesn't have an idea fixed to promote, and is driven by the facts rather than the partisanship and scare-mongering which so dominates debate on allegedly dangerous warming. I strongly recommend her blog Climate Etc to all interested in this vital topic in order to get a balanced view rather than one driven by vested interests.”

“Amy Hiller, I'm delighted to see an article by climate scientist Judith Curry in The Australian, and strongly recommend her Climate Etc blog to you if you have a genuine desire to understand the warming issue and the impact of alternative approaches. I first came across Judith around 2008. As an impeccable scientist, she accepted the global warming story told by other scientists and was puzzled as to why Steven McIntyre and Ross McKittrick argued that it had no sound basis. McIntyre's Climate Audit blog opened her eyes, and led her to investigate further (her specialities being Arctic ice and North Atlantic hurricanes), then to start her blog in 2010. If you are open to facts and science, you should read her blog posts and those of many well-informed contributors to it, particularly those by energy industry experts.”

o  
f one  
devoted  
to  
science,  
open  
to  
scrutiny  
and

Loading...

**Rob Starkey** |

March 29, 2023 at 11:09 am |

Alarmist dribble highlight worries about what could happen without reliable evidence that they will occur.

Loading...

**Richard S Courtney** |

March 29, 2023 at 12:08 pm |

JJBdaccili,

You are misinformed.

Global temperature rises 4.8C from January to June and falls by the same amount from June to January each and every year. This is because

- (1) it is winter in one hemisphere when it is summer in the other,
- (2) the N hemisphere is mostly covered in land and the S hemisphere is mostly covered in water,
- (3) land changes temperature more than water with the seasons,
- (4) so, the N hemisphere temperature varies more than the S hemisphere temperature with the seasons,
- (5) and global temperature is the average of the N and S hemisphere temperatures at all times.

Nobody notices the variation of global temperature within each year and the smaller rises which worry you are not in global temperature, but are in global temperature ANOMALY which is an arithmetic construct with no physical reality.

Richard

Loading...

**ChrisH** |

March 30, 2023 at 6:06 am |

Good answer! It is a sure sign that a person does not know what they are talking about when they refer to the global temperature anomaly (GTA) as average temperature.

Maybe you can help me with this: I work as a statistician (not in climate). I struggle to understand the rationale behind GTA; many statistical methods can analyze grouped time series data much more efficiently. GTA seems archaic and ad hoc. For example, as you alluded to, choosing a baseline period in the 1800s seems speculative. Why is it not discarded as the standard measure for temperature changes? Is it just too convenient?!

Loading...

**JJBraccili** |

March 30, 2023 at 11:37 am |

Another rocket scientist!

GTA is the deviation of the global average temperature from some fixed point. Why 1880 was chosen?

It had to be some point in the near past where humans weren't burning a significant amount of fossil fuels.

At the beginning of the industrial revolution is as good a point as any.

PPM is a relative concentration and a bad measure of the greenhouse effect of CO<sub>2</sub>. Absolute concentration is a better measure. It just so happens that at current conditions PPM can be a proxy for absolute concentration. People understand what PPM means and changing now would be confusing. Nobody is going to change how we determine GTA for similar reasons.

Loading...

**Jim Gorman**

| April 2, 2023 at 7:18 am |

JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 11:37 am |

You are sadly mistaken. There are two statistical distributions that make up a GTA anomaly. One is a monthly average at a station. The other is an average of a baseline at that station.

No tice the word "average" as in an arithmetic mean of a distribution. Each of those distributions are random variables having both a mean AND A VARIANCE. You never see the variance quoted. When adding or subtracting random variable means, the variance add. That is,  $\text{Var}(X \pm Y) = \text{Var}(X) + \text{Var}(Y)$ . Why is this never quoted, addressed, or mentioned? Instead, climate science finds an average of the anomalies and then calculates the standard deviation of the anomalies. What a great method to hide the actual temperature variation that make up the number. Figures lie, and liars figure!

dpy6629 | [March 30, 2023 at 11:18 am](#) |

This NASA page is classic pseudo-science and narrative promotion. And what they do say is probably wrong. Severe weather will decrease in a warmer world because of lower temperature gradients. There is zero evidence that warming so far has impacted crop yields. Plants do better with more CO2 and become more drought tolerant.

Loading...JJBraccili |

[March 30, 2023 at 11:53 am](#) |

Where at the beginning of the impact of climate change.

If you think more energy sloshing around on the planet is not going to cause more extreme weather events, I have a bridge for sale that I would like to talk to you about.

Loading...dpy6629

[April 18, 2023 at 8:39 pm](#) |

It is provably true that the Navier Stokes equations have no forcing terms involving the temperature itself, only the gradient of temperature. Thus lower gradients imply lower velocity solutions.

Loading...burlhenry | [April 18, 2023 at 9:55 pm](#) |DPY6629;

Your statement that severe weather will decrease in a warmer world is historically incorrect. See "El Nino in History" (subtitled "Storming through the Ages"), by Cesar N. Caviedes (2001), University Press of Florida

Loading...

Paul-G | [March 29, 2023 at 1:17 am](#) |

Pingback: [UN's climate panic is more politics than science - Climate- Science.press](#)

CKid | [March 29, 2023 at 6:13 am](#) |

The IPCC lost me when they ignored studies in IPCC5 that I had read but were against the preferred narrative. They did it again in IPCC6 by censoring any reference to contemporary and substantial literature about geothermal activity in Antarctica. A case could be made that those dynamics are not significant nor the crucial driver of WAIS instability. A scientific document would

Just like the Kremlin, maybe they don't want independent thought.

Loading...jim2 | [March 29, 2023 at 8:27 am](#) |

Another evidence-free claim ...Vanuatu, leading a core group of 18 nations, wants the International Court of Justice to issue its assessment of what countries are obliged to do in order to make sure that global temperature rise is kept below the Paris Agreement target of 1.5 degrees Celsius. While those who breach their official pledges will not be taken to court directly, the ruling would be the most authoritative legal voice on where they are falling short both in terms of emissions cuts and finance to poorer nations.

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-03-28/climate-vulnerable-vanuatu-takes-world-tocourt-overemissions> Loading...jim2 | [March 29, 2023 at 8:30 am](#) |

I'm thinking it's the "finance of poorer nations" Vanuatu is actually interested in, not global warming. It's just a chance to cash in for them. Just one more expense incurred based on a climate catastrophe Cimate Doomer nightmare. There's no way "green" energy is less expensive than fossil fuels when you factor in nonsense like this.

Pingback: [The Latest UN Climate Report Is Bumper-Sticker](#)

theliffclavenoffinance | [March 29, 2023 at 9:21 am](#) | FAILED TO MENTION

(1) Every climate prediction in the past 50 years was wrong, consistently predicting much faster global warming than actually happened, and

)2) The global average temperature failed to increase from 2015 to 2023, despite the largest eight year period of manmade emissions in history. No climate model predicted that.

[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 3:53 pm](#) |

More like, F+ in that the hypocrisy of what they do is so much in your face that it's obvious none of them actually believe anything they're saying... that's the politics of AGW, the science be damned!

Loading...

<https://th.bing.com/th/id/R.4c95f61f2cfba6bd0ab8fa2b3110de30?k=HCO%2F5S8iH%3F%2F2akkyahog%2Apoir%2Ipa%2018%20%20mpio%207m%8hk%0A%20%20d%20MY%20PH%20>

Scientists didn't make AGW political. That was the fossil fuel industry in the late 90s.

Loading...

[catweazle666](#) | March 29, 2023 at 5:40 pm |

Oh dear...

Loading...

[theliffclavenoffinance](#) | March 30, 2023 at 5:37 am |

Just in case I was misinterpreted: The "F" was for Ms. Curry's writing. She is a nice person — so nice she allows me to criticize here hee. That's really nice and unusual freedom of speech.

Ms. Curry thinks climate change is about science, and science is her strong point, so she has a focus on science. In fact, there is only a little science in climate change, about 10%, called AGW. Easily proven to exist and be totally harmless.

The other 90% is politics — the CAGW predictions of doom that have been wrong since 1979, along with every other long term climate prediction in history. Those CAGW predictions are used to create fear in the general public, People in fear allow their governments to seize more power, and control them. That is the politics of climate change.

O

ne can not refute predictions thgt are not based on science by arguing the science. Ms. Curry does not get that. That strategy has been tried since 1979, and has consistently failed. Using it again, and expecting different results, is a layman's definition of insanity,

O

ne can ONLY refute predictions by clearly showing every prediction in the past was wrong — discredit the "authorities" that make wrong predictions

CAGW = predictions = no data = imaginary future climate

AGW = real science = with data = real past climate

In addition to the gift of 100% wrong climate and other environmental doom predictions for over a century, we have another gift:

[Wagathon](#)

The global average temperature failed to increase since 2015 despite the LARGEST amount of manmade CO2 emissions in any eight year period in history. Just like the Politburos of Russia, China, VP- Ms Harris and the Western schoolteachers of America now believe ~~at their least that are contradicted by CO2 satellite measurements. It's a culture war between the suicidalists' collectivists~~ vs the Founders' individualism. It's government programs vs the hard work of free enterprise. It's Leftist Utopianism and hypocrisy vs self-actualization and the actual existentialism of overcoming superstition and ignorance through knowledge, respect for truth and personal responsibility. It's helplessness vs reasoned and rational self-interest.

Pingback: [Another "Final" Climate Change Warming Warning – Newsfeed Hasslefree Allsort](#)

[François Riverin](#) | March 29, 2023 at 11:15 am |

To me Vanuatu= Maldives. <https://tambonthongchai.com/2020/05/14/maldivessinking/>

Loading... [theliffclavenoffinance](#) | March 30, 2023 at 12:19 pm |

If the Maldives don't sink from the weight of all the new construction on the islands — resorts, buildings, airports and overweight tourists too — they will be lucky.

ha ha Loading... [Gary Wagner](#) | March 29, 2023 at 12:42 pm |

Guterres is becoming increasingly hysterical as fewer rational people believe the UN doomsayers. I fear for the man's sanity. His handlers should help him dial down the rhetoric, or he might blow a gasket. He reminds me of the stereotypical maiden aunt, afraid of everything, poorly informed by the media, and in a frenzy looking for her cat. The UN was created to keep the peace, and has clearly failed miserably to do so. They don't even try anymore. Now the UN lectures the world about every perceived crisis except the ones they are responsible for. Time to wind them up and spend those billions on hungry kids.

[Wagathon](#) | March 29, 2023 at 3:46 pm |

JJBraccili | [March 29, 2023 at 5:42 pm](#) |

AGW does exist and is being driven by the use of fossil fuels. There is too much evidence to deny it. Ms Curry spends her time looking for anomalies and then literally makes a mountain out of a mole hill. Her current rant is on the accuracy of climate models. Climate modeling is like weather modeling — a work in progress. They'll get better as scientists better understand the processes involved. What's apparent is that AGW is occurring and increasing CO2 is the cause. When the atmosphere is treated like a toilet, there are going to be consequences. If you want to argue about the amount of warming in the future, you're on more solid ground. BTW A 2.5 C rise is a lot better than a 4.5 C rise but is still a catastrophe.

Loading...[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 7:39 pm](#) |

Not surprisingly, the fabrication of GCMs (General Circulation Models— the numerical models used by UN-approved global warming charlatans and climate change hoaxsters to simulate the laws of nature, the universe and everything to realize an ersatz digital reality they find useful to exaggerate the effects of CO2 on temperatures) to scare children, to stampede the superstitious and ignorant and to feather the nests of Leftist Western Academics in ivory towers who then spin prophecies of an impending Hot World catastrophe out of anti-science and hate-America babel, is not a productive activity in any economic sense. The global warming hysteria-Tower of Babel is useful only to help Leftists push their DC/Eurocommie political agenda.

Loading...JJBraccili |

What you're looking at is a composite IR spectrograph of the earth's radiant courtesy of NASA satellites. The blue area is earth's radiant energy. The pink area, under the CO2 label, is suppose to be blue. It represents the amount of the earth's radiant energy that CO2 is preventing from leaving the planet. That's what's causing climate change.

A picture is worth a thousand words.

Loading...[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 11:21 pm](#) |

Right now, at our current low levels of carbon dioxide, plants are paying a heavy price in water usage. Whether plants are C3 or C4, the way they get carbon dioxide from the air is the same: The plant leaves have little holes, or stomata, through which carbon dioxide molecules can diffuse into the moist interior for use in the plant's photosynthetic cycles.

The density of water molecules within the leaf is typically 60 times greater than the density of carbon dioxide in the air, and the diffusion rate of the water molecule is greater than that of the carbon-dioxide molecule. So depending on the relative humidity and temperature, 100 or more water molecules diffuse out of the leaf for every molecule of carbon dioxide that diffuses in. And not every carbon-dioxide molecule that diffuses into a leaf gets incorporated into a carbohydrate. As a result, plants require many hundreds of grams of water to produce one gram of plant biomass, largely carbohydrate.

Driven by the need to conserve water, plants produce fewer stomata openings in their leaves when there is more carbon dioxide in the air. This decreases the amount of water that the plant is forced to transpire and allows the plant to withstand dry conditions better. ~Harrison H. Schmitt and William Happer (In Defense of Carbon Dioxide)

Loading...

JJBraccili | [March 29, 2023 at 11:32 pm](#) |

That's got to be the dumbest reason ever for claiming we need to increase CO2 in the atmosphere. Plants seem to be getting along fine at lower concentrations of CO2,

Loading...[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 11:42 pm](#) |

evilincandescentbulbEmerson would have had great respect for George Bush

**The Prism of Reality and Perception** A holistic approach to global warming looks to manage our understanding of reality using our minds to put all of the pieces together into some kind of meaningful whole. To look at nature objectively, making sense of reality is a scientific endeavor and one of humanity's greatest challenges and its purest attempt at valuing truth for its own sake; and, the holistic perception of climate change to the modern mind is wholly irrelevant to that endeavor. Looking at the scientific evidence, Daniel Botkin (Article) challenges all of our perceptions about global warming. Climate is changing. Is it our fault? (See provenance of graph above, Here) As is well-known, we are blamed for causing a global warming mainly because our burning of fossil fuels is increasing the carbon dioxide (CO2) concentration in the atmosphere. Since this is a greenhouse gas, we must be warming the climate. ~Daniel Botkin (Ibid.) What we actually know to be true about humanity's impact on the world is not alarming. Only the allegations about humanity's disastrous impact on the world is alarming. "What is the evidence," Botkin asks, "that sea level is rising, that wildfires, drought, and episodes of very high temperatures are increasing, and what is the evidence that such changes are our fault?" What we're learning is being skeptical about what we think is reality is not natural at all. Scientific thinking is not holistic thinking. Thinking holistically has its virtues but its also an excuse for sloppy thinking, like adding shades of gray between the pencil lines to form a picture. Sure, sure, temperatures may be warmer in an area where humans chop down shade trees, blacktop streets, park cars and barbeque sides of beef over a mesquite fire. But, that is not global warming. The heat resulting from that sort of human-contribution is known as the urban heat island (UHI) effect —e.g., the heat from tailpipes, from motors that run air conditioners, heat generated by computers, fires in water heaters and fireplaces, blacktop streets that collect instead of reflect solar heat, buildings that block cooling breezes, etc. Heat due to UHI is only a local not a global phenomenon, despite a faintly irrational impulse to see examples of UHI and then label every inconvenient weather-related event an act of man, not God (especially for those who believe men are oil-driven evil doers whereas God is nothing more than a Judeo-Christian illusion).

Looking at something holistically is our touchy-feely way of viewing reality.

When, however, significant consequences are associated with our views, the holism concept with its bottom-up, sideways and backwards view of reality should not prevent us from taking on the rigorous and more skeptical approach of a scientific inquiry, beginning with a serious look at the facts. But we can always start by looking at the world holistically –e.g.,

Now, how about the facts. Let us leave the world of the mind. If we want to do more than just speculate, we must consider the history of the physical world around us before we can know the significance of our part in it. Depending on our holistic views you may not be happy with an objective evaluation of the facts if you secretly want humanity to have a starring role in climate change.

No chemical compound in the atmosphere has a worse reputation than CO<sub>2</sub>, thanks to the single-minded demonization of this natural and essential atmospheric gas by advocates of government control...

The incredible list of supposed horrors that increasing carbon dioxide will bring the world is pure belief disguised as science.

~Dr. Will Happer

Loading...

**ianl** | March 29, 2023 at 9:11 pm |

Coal, oil and natural gas (methane) are \*not\* fossils

You repeat this “fossil fuel” label purely as a propaganda point – and you know you do.

So far, about a 1C increase in 150 years. Which molehill was it again ?

Loading...**JJBraccili** | March 29, 2023 at 9:25 pm |

They are referred to as fossil fuels. I didn't invent the term. How is using the term “fossil fuel” propaganda? If I didn't use the term would that make them any less an existential threat?

It's actually a 1.1 degree increase. Yes, that's a big deal.

Loading...

**Swenson** |

March 29, 2023 at 10:56 pm |

No doubt you can explain why the planet cooled for four and a half billion years – up to now?

GHE not working properly?

Loading...

**JJBraccili** |

March 29, 2023 at 11:08 pm |

Since the planet started out as molten magma, it understandable that it would cool down.

CO<sub>2</sub> isn't the only thing that can control planetary temperature. During the history of the planet there were other sources that impacted the earth's climate more than CO<sub>2</sub>. Over the last 150 years CO<sub>2</sub> was mostly a bit player. In the aftermath of WWII, we started dumping ever increasing amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere and CO<sub>2</sub> became the driver of planetary temperature.

Loading...

**jim2** | March 30, 2023 at 5:30 am |

Plants start to die at 200 ppm. I'm sure they are better off with the 400+ we have now.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** |

March 30, 2023 at 11:19 am |

We were doing just fine with CO<sub>2</sub> at 280 ppm.

Loading...

**jim2** | March 30, 2023 at 5:31 am |

JJB seems to believe making life easy for plants is dumb. What's dumb is killing plants. Our very lives depend on plants. So who's the dumb person here?

Loading...

**jungletrunks** |

March 30, 2023 at 8:32 am |

JJ Hollywood: “During the history of the planet there were other sources that impacted the earth's climate more than CO<sub>2</sub>”

Our erudite actor speaks. But really, like water?

Water vapor is the largest GHG. Water vapor and CO<sub>2</sub> are two of the most essential ingredients for life. I'm surprised the woke community hasn't labeled CO<sub>2</sub> as racist yet. Oops, intellectually inbred wokers like JJ have already done this.



This is a situation where if you wait too long nothing can be done about the consequences. It's like being on the Titanic, seeing the iceberg, knowing it can't be avoided.

No model I use doesn't have uncertainty involved. You have to accept it and deal with it.

Loading...[jim2](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 9:37 pm](#) |

JJB has an unending list of unsupported claims.

[aaron](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 8:24](#)

[Chris Morris](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 1:43 am](#) |

I notice Roger Pielke in his substack has specifically called out IPCC for its mis-information. He details and references the bad science. Another politics trumping science example

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 11:13 am](#) |

I never heard of Roger Pielke. I looked up what he has to say about climate change.

As I have summarized on the Climate Science weblog, humans activities do significantly alter the heat content of the climate system, although, based on the latest understanding, the radiative effect of CO<sub>2</sub> has contributed, at most, only about 28% to the human-caused warming up to the present. The other 72% is still a result of human activities!"

He tries to minimize the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> and attributes the lion's share of global warming to other "human activities".

What other human activities? He does not say. What could it possibly be? The only major source of energy that could be a cause of climate change by human activity is energy production.

When you burn fossil fuels you don't just release CO<sub>2</sub> you also release energy that can warm the planet.

Here are all the possible source of energy that could warm the planet.

Solar Energy – 120,000 TW (Terrawatts)

Human Production of Energy – 20 TW

Geothermal Energy – 50 TW

Greenhouse gases prevent energy from the planet to radiate into outer space. There are not technically a source. The amount of energy that CO<sub>2</sub> prevents radiating into space is 10,000 TW.

Energy from burning fossil fuels is too small to matter. So is energy from human activities."

We now know, however, that the natural variations of atmospheric and ocean circulation features within the climate system produces global average heat changes that are substantially larger than what was known in 2005. The IPCC models have failed to adequately simulate this effect."

These are internal energy transfer that have no impact on planetary temperature. How do I know. Because from 1880 to 1960 planetary temperature tracked solar radiation. There is no indication that atmospheric and ocean circulation had any impact. If these were important, it would have shown up in the data.

Loading...[beththeserf](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 1:43 am](#) |

Carbon dioxide is definitely continuing to increase in the atmosphere, but Earth's surface and atmospheric temperatures aren't tracking it. ~Daniel Botkin (Ibid.)"

Isn't this a Popper/falsification of the CAGW theory?

Loading...[theciffclavenoffinance](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 5:44 am](#) |

You can't falsify the CAGW "religious" belief. Do n't worry, any flat trend of the global average temperature will later be "revised away", just like the 1940 to 1975

global cooling was revised away decades later

Inconvenient data always "disappear".

Climate change is a leftist propaganda strategy to gain more government power and control, and truth is not a leftist value,

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 11:16 am](#) |

I already presented a graph that shows this statement is BS.

Loading...[beththeserf](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 2:48 am](#) |

Here's Tony Brown's Long Slow Thaw CET temperature record showing 1940s' 50s' 60s' – post WW 2 and post 1980s' El Ninos. <https://io.wp.com/judithcurry.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/slide1.png?ssl=1>

[jim2](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 7:47 am](#) |

It's probably a good idea to avoid ESG ETFs and other ESG funds.

*If BlackRock Inc.'s largest ESG-labeled exchange-traded fund is a bellwether for the sustainable investing industry, it's fair to say the US sector may be in for a bumpy ride.*

*The assets of the iShares ESG Aware MSCI USA ETF (ticker ESGU) have dropped to \$13.8 billion from a high of \$25 billion as recently as a year ago. The slump occurred as shareholders pulled money from the ETF, but also as its investment performance trailed benchmark indexes, including the S&P 500, over the past two years.*

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-03-30/why-esg-in-america-may-face-a-rough-road-ahead-this-year>

Pingback: [UN's climate panic is more politics than science – Watts Up With That? – The Insight Post](#)

Gary H | March 30, 2023 at 12:01 pm |

Now you went and done it Judith. Imagine what Sen Whitehouse would say to you now!

Loading...thecliffclavenoffinance

| March 30, 2023 at 12:21 pm |

Senator Outhouse Loading...Jay | March 30, 2023 at 12:09 pm |

Trying to reason with Braccili is fundamentally a waste of time and effort. He takes the position that all temperature measurements prior to the seventeenth century are merely "guesstimates based on inference". This stance allows him to disregard any historical information that does not suit his conclusions. For example, he is free to question any suggestions that there even were ice ages.

He also makes the claim that the models are steadily improving, but once again offers nothing to support his position.

He speaks about the dangers of warming, but doesn't seem to realize that the 1.5 degree number has no scientific basis, but was pulled out of thin air.

In short, there is no point in arguing with someone who seems to be working backward from conclusions.

Loading...JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 12:28 pm |

You and the others don't get it.

Climate change is all cause and effect. It doesn't matter what happened in the distant past. It doesn't matter what happened 10 minutes ago. The planet has no memory.

If solar radiation suddenly began decreasing significantly, the temperature of the planet would start falling regardless of what CO2 was doing. Right now, CO2 is the driving force, but it doesn't always have to be. The 1.5-degree C increase was a limit determined by experts as an amount of warming that the planet could tolerate without significant damage. The models predict how much warming will occur under different scenarios. Right now, it looks like we are going to blow through the 1.5-degree C limit without drastic action.

If you think you and the other knuckleheads know better than the experts, then go right ahead and keep making yourself look foolish. The science and the evidence are all on the side of the climate scientists.

Loading...thecliffclavenoffinance | March 30, 2023 at 12:47 pm |

Mr. Broccoli thinks always wrong wild guesses about the future climate are science. They become science to him because the predictions were made by scientists. That makes them the gospel. Never mind that every climate prediction has been wrong since 1979. And never mind there has been no global warming for eight years, from 2015 to 2023, despite the largest amount of manmade CO2 emissions in any eight year period in history. Inconvenient data, Mr. Broccoli? Interferes with your coming climate emergency fantasy? If so, just ignore anything that does not confirm your leftist beliefs.

Loading...catweazle666 | March 30, 2023 at 2:30 pm |

Oh dear... You really haven't the first clue what you're wittering about, have you?

Loading...thecliffclavenoffinance | March 30, 2023 at 12:42 pm |

Leftists represent half of the population.

The dumb half, brainwashed to fear the future climate.

With no understanding that today's climate is the best climate in the past 5000 years.

And that from 5,000 to 9,000 years ago, the climate was better because it was at least +1 degree warmer than today. That +1 degree C. warmer climate was called an Optimum.

An Optimum, because it was good news.

Today the Climate Howler Global Whiner's are claiming that if the average temperature rises +1 degrees C. AND GETS BACK TO the Holocene Climate Optimum level, that would NOT be another Optimum

It would be a Climate Emergency.

A Climate Optimum temperature has morphed into a Climate Emergency Temperature.

An amazing leap of non-logic.

To repeat, if there are any leftists reading this, who didn't get it the first time:

A +1 degree warmer than today climate is called a Holocene Climate Optimum, because it was in the past.

And the CO2 level in the atmosphere was at least 25% lower than today.

A +1 degree warmer than today climate is claimed to be Climate Emergency, because it is in the future.

That can only make sense to leftists, because leftists have no sense.

Pingback: [UN's local weather panic is extra politics than science – Watts Up With That? - news page](#)

Jay | March 30, 2023 at 1:00 pm |

Although I'm no doubt wasting my time, I note that invective is easier than reason. Perhaps you can give me the scientific references behind the 1.5 number.

By saying that what happened in the past is irrelevant, you are in fact declaring that there is nothing to be learned from looking at what might have caused temperature changes before 1850.

Very shortsighted.

You might want to take a look at Vaclav Smil's book "How the World Really Works", although you no doubt would quickly call him a knuckle head even though he believes in AGW. In this book he makes the statement that "noncarbon energies could completely displace fossil carbon in a matter of one to three decades ONLY if we were

take substantial cuts to the standard of living in all affluent countries and deny the modernizing nations of Asia and Africa improvements in their collective lots by even a fraction of what China has done since 1980". Is this your preferred route?

Loading...**JJBraccili** | March 30, 2023 at 1:52 pm | Perhaps you can give me the scientific references behind the 1.5 number."

<https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2865/a-degree-of-concern-why-global-temperatures-matter/>

Not that hard to find. You could have easily done it yourself if you had cared to look. By saying that what happened in the past is irrelevant, you are in fact declaring that there is nothing to be learned from looking at what might have caused temperature changes before 1850. Very shortsighted." It's not shortsighted at all. Unless you know all the conditions that existed at a past time, you can't draw any conclusions as to what the contribution of CO2 may or may not have been. Yet, you have idiots who do precisely that. They look at graphs with 1000-year tics and divine what role CO2 played back then. Then they use that to try to refute the role CO2 is playing now. It's ridiculous. Yes, without a scientific miracle, there will be a substantial upheaval in the status quo that will require sacrifice. It a "pay me now or pay me a lot more later" scenario. The "it's too much trouble" argument is not a very good one considering the consequences.

Loading...**morfu03** | April 1, 2023 at 2:09 am |

Aww, your link (<https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2865/a-degree-of-concern-why-global-temperatures-matter/>) is related to CMIP5 models, we know that those did not get the clouds right .. however we cannot be sure that the CMIP6 models, which seem better are good enough.

Either way, the conditions projected in that might have quite possibly because that type of projection is not science. It is belief in the wisdom of experts." Whose wisdom should we believe in? Yours? LMAO!!!!

Loading...**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:00 pm | Loading...**Ron Graf** | April 1, 2023 at 4:30 pm |

That paper was to show where the 1.5 deg C warming limit came from. It wasn't something that was pulled out of thin air. Unless you know all the conditions that existed at a past time, you can't draw any conclusions as to what the contribution of CO2 may or may not have been."

Loading...**Geoff Sherrington** |

April 1, 2023 at 4:52 am |

JJB,  
That NASA report that you linked is merely a what if? exercise.  
A report with rigour would chart the changes that have actually happened by now.  
There is little value in projecting what might have happened, because that type of projection is not science. It is belief in the wisdom of experts.  
Would you care to show a report that shows only the changes to date, with evidence for whether they are anthropogenic or natural, or a split of the two?  
My bet is that you cannot, because there is no alarm to be seen in events to date.

This is exactly what the senior climate scientists like Chris Folland and Phil Jones, representing the IPCC in 1999, set out to do by influencing a young eager newcomer to do with the science. Here is the story that followed.

Loading...**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:14 pm |

You want absolute proof that increases in CO2 will causes the changes that are being predicted. I can tell you one thing raising the temperature of the planet is not a good thing. That means there is a lot more energy sloshing around on the planet to cause mischief and it will.

By the time it becomes evident to someone like you that Armageddon is at hand, it will be too late to do anything about it.  
The chance of a scientific miracle that will get us out of this mess is slim to none.

There is plenty of evidence that the planet is warming, and CO2 is the cause. Even the fossil fuel industry admits it. The problem is people like you won't accept it. That's how it works with climate deniers. The only thing they

are waiting to believe is junk science and conspiracy that affirm their beliefs.  
**jim2** | April 1, 2023 at 5:17 pm |

Awesome video @Ron Graf.

Loading...**CKid** | April 1, 2023 at 6:19 pm |

What an indictment of the IPCC and all others involved. I've read a lot about this sorry episode in climate science but this little video is the most concise and most damning. The IPCC is still doing backflips to not dilute the message. person has to be brain dead to believe the hockey stick scam.

Loading...**Rob Starkey** | April 1, 2023 at 7:22 pm |

Yet the term climate change brings fear to most of the world's population and has captured the fancy of our president

Loading...**Joe - the non climate scientist**

Smil book [s] are excellent reads on basic history background on a variety of subjects , especially energy.

One significant point is that human life expectancy took a quantum leap starting in the late 1800's/early 1900's . The conventional wisdom is that improvements in sanitation and medicine were responsible. What is overlooked is the significant increase in productivity which began with the use of fossil fuels. As a result of the massive improvements in productivity, farming, manufacturing, etc, the industrialized world was able to shift from a subsistence existence to creation and innovation, including improvements in sanitation and medicine. It was the fossil fuels and energy that gave mankind the free time to make those improvements. In early 1800's it took 20+ minutes of human time to plant, weed, harvest, mill the grain, bake the bread, to make a single loaf of bread. 10 minutes in 1900 and today approx 2 secs to make one loaf of bread.

Loading...jim2 | March 30, 2023 at 2:33 pm |

California drowns in Global Warming!!

Severe storms that battered California this winter are set to continue into spring.

Atmospheric rivers and cold fronts have brought near-record rain and snow to areas that have been battling drought-like conditions for many years. More storms are predicted to make landfall in coming weeks. The storms have led to flooding, road closures, power outages and fatalities. They have caused billions of dollars in damages.

loading...burlhenry | March 31, 2023 at 9:06 am |

Gov. Gavin Newsom last week eased some drought restrictions after the three driest years on record.

He didn't declare the drought to be over because water shortages remain in parts of densely populated Southern California.

You might be interested in my article "The Cause of Atmospheric Rivers"

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/california-as-winter-storms-25-atmospheric-rivers-near-record-snow-billions>

Our current drought began in 2000, and there have been no periods of 4-5 years, or more, between eruptions since then..Since droughts are caused by a decrease in SO2 moisture nucleation sites, their decrease was largely due to those that are currently afflicting California a man-made global "Clean Air" efforts to reduce industrial SO2 aerosol pollution, and more recently, Net-Zero efforts to ban the burning of fossil fuels, which also produce SO2 aerosols.

It appeared that the 1990-1991 recession and others that followed, CO2 emissions fell but it reduced even further, more can be expected.

This was approved very quickly Burl. Reading the abstract you appear to be suggesting that these rivers are

loading...JJBraccili | April 1, 2023 at 4:57 pm |

made due to LACK of industrial activity by man. Is that correct?

I looked at your bibliography of papers. You have produced 11 papers. All your papers are about the impact of tonyb

Loading...

burlhenry | March 31, 2023 at 10:32 pm |

Tonyb

You said that reading the abstract I appear to be saying that the current atmospheric rivers are due to a LACK of

industrial activity <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/>

That is essentially correct.

They are normally caused by an absence of volcanic SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere, due to an absence of volcanic eruptions, for a period of 4-5 years, or more. This leads to a drought because of the absence of SO2 impact of global temperatures. What you missed is that CO2 emissions can fall and the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere can rise. The reason is the "fall" in CO2 emissions is not enough to decrease CO2 emissions below In that paper you claim that during the 1990-1991 recession and others that followed, CO2 emissions fell but it the CO2 removal rate. CO2 in the atmosphere actually increased during these periods. Warming will slow but it will not decrease.

Analysis of the impact of CO2 before 1960 is meaningless. From 1880 to 1960 planetary temperature tracked solar irradiance — not CO2 or SO2 concentrations. After 1960 it closely tracks CO2 ppm. I have already posted graphs showing this earlier in this thread.

As for the "CA SO2 atmospheric river theory." It's complete BS. Wildfires release significant quantities of SO2 into the atmosphere. CA has had a continuous string of large wildfires over the last several years. I doubt the atmosphere was lacking aerosols from SO2 over that period.

Early in this thread I post IR spectrographs of the earth's radiant energy. The impact of CO2 is clear. To say that it has no impact is nonsense.

SO2 aerosols is a regional phenomenon. That because the aerosols don't last in the atmosphere very long. CO2 is a global phenomenon because CO2 stays in the atmosphere a very long time and the concentration is fairly constant worldwide. Another reason this theory is BS.

It has been proposed to combat global warming that SO2 based aerosols be sprayed into the atmosphere. That will have to be done continuously by a large fleet of plane. That because the aerosols don't last in the atmosphere for long. Another crackpot idea along with these theories.

Loading...burlhenry | April 2, 2023 at 10:01 am |

JJBRACCILLI;

You say that my CA SO2 Atmospheric river is complete BS.

No, it is 100% correct. The problem is that you appear to be incapable of understanding what I have written. WHENEVER SO2 aerosol moisture nucleation sites decrease, the air becomes drier and temperatures rise. This is especially observed during stalled high pressure weather systems, where temperatures soar to disastrous levels, after a week or less, because all of the dimming atmospheric SO2 aerosols within the stalled area have settled out, cleansing the air, and increasing the intensity of the Sun's rays striking the Earth's surface within that area. Read my article "Stalled High Pressure Weather Systems" What is BS is your unprovable theory of climate change

Loading...

Did you take into account the release of SO2 by the wildfires in CA. By your lack of addressing it, the answer is NO

You have no idea if the levels of SO2 in CA are increasing or decreasing, but you are sure SO2 is responsible for the atmospheric rivers in CA. GIVE ME A BREAK!!!

I have to assume you are unaware that you can reduce CO2 emissions and still have CO2 increase in the atmosphere because the remaining CO2 emissions are above the CO2 removal rate. That destroys your rationale for CO2 emissions being benign.

Your "theory" is not gaining traction in the scientific community — not because they're trying to hide something it's because your theory is junk science. If you believe your "theory" is true, take it to a company like ExxonMobil

and see what they say. I'm sure their scientists could use a good laugh.

<https://chaamjamal.files.wordpress.com/2019/10/quora-5.png>

The pink area under the CO2 label is the amount of earth's radiant energy CO2 is preventing from leaving earth.

That about 9000 TW or 8% of the radiant energy of the sun that earth absorbs. To say that increasing CO2 has no effect on climate defies reality.

Do you something similar for your BS theory? NO!

Loading...burlhenry | April 2, 2023 at 6:34 pm | JJBRACCILI:

There is a long article on Google titled "What is in the air after a wildfire depends on exactly exactly what is burned"

The major components are CO2 and black carbon, with NO mention of SO2 anywhere in the article, which negates your assertion that I ignored SO2 emissions from the CA fires. There were none!

All that I am saying is that the reduction in the amount of SO2 aerosol moisture nucleating sites in the atmosphere results in drier air, which leads to droughts, wildfires, Atmospheric Rivers, heat waves, more intense tornados, etc. And there is nothing special about CA, these weather events are occurring around the world. Atmospheric Rivers are very real, and have been around for centuries. What alternate explanation do you have for their existence? With respect to my theory not getting any traction, it was only published on March 1 of this year..

And in light of my findings, the graph which you provided HAS to be BS .

Loading...JJBraccili | April 2, 2023 at 11:06 pm |

[Impacts-from-FireActivity#:~:text=Smoke%20plumes%20from%20wildfires%20and%20other%20biomass%20burning,and%20affect%20air%20quality%2C%20human%20health%2C%20and%20climate.](#)

What is this amateur hour?

How convenient! Atmospheric rivers is in the news lately and here you are. It's all caused by a lack of SO2 aerosols. You've "published" 10 papers on this subject before this one. None of them gained any traction. Newsflash! This one isn't going anywhere either. Take a hint. What's causing that is the massive amount of CO2 in the atmosphere. Your theory doesn't work on Venus and it doesn't work here because it's BS.

My only logic is BS? Here's where CO2 had to be declining and temperature was increasing. Then there

was the bogus argument about CO2. What direct evidence of you have? NONE! There is direct evidence of what increasing CO2 can do.

Consider Venus that has clouds of sulfuric acid that are highly reflective. They reflect 90% of incident solar radiation. The only thing that smells of BS around here is your theory

should

Loading... burlhenry | April 3, 2023 at 3:56 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

You are making a fool of yourself, ranting that I haven't considered the effects of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols from the CA wildfires (your first reference).

I am speaking of DECREASES in global SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions that lead to temperature increases. As stated in the abstract, Atmospheric Rivers occur when there are droughts preceding them. (And quite probably, also during the droughts).

In the Discussion section, I identify the cause of the droughts as being due to a decrease in the amount SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere, due to extended periods without any volcanic eruptions.

[Because of the lack of preceding volcanic inactivity, the current global 23 year drought HAS to have been due to global "Clean Air" efforts to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions. (That is, man made)].

You say that I have no evidence. I have abundant historical evidence where Atmospheric Rivers occurred during or after drought conditions.

Again, as a result of my findings, the GISS/NASA graph that you refer to HAS to be pure BS.

Loading...

[Tonyb](#) | April 1, 2023 at 11:23 am |

Burl

I am not saying I agree or disagree with your hypothesis. However "Deluges", "Cloudbursts" "raining cats and dogs", (aka Atmospheric rivers) are all apparent in the English records of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Century when industrial activity was also noticeable by its absence.

tonyb

Loading...

[burlhenry](#) | April 1, 2023 at 12:54 pm |

Tonyb:

As I observed in my article, Atmospheric Rivers are NORMALLY caused by a near absence of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere, due to periods of 4-5 years or more between volcanic eruptions. No industrial activity required.

For the 13th-15th centuries, I count 25 such instances, so it is not surprising that some appear in the

The letter reads...

"I assume Thursday's letter writers ("Curry injects much-needed realism into climate debate", 30/3) have done their research to match that of thousands of scientists around the world who contribute to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports. This work is done on a voluntary basis. None of them is paid by the IPCC, unlike Judith Curry, who receives funding from a fossil fuel company. If you are prescribed

<https://www.theaustralian.com.au/commentary/letters/voice-opposition-points-out-the-fears-of->

Loading...

[Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn](#) | March 31, 2023 at 6:20 am |

My post in the Oz today. There were several more pro-Judith posts:

Fiona Colin, Judith Curry's hurricane forecasting company CFAN is not dependent on commercial funding. Her clients include many major US government bodies such as NASA and NOAA, and state and local authorities, because CFAN is the best in the field. I've been in contact with Judith for about 15 years, and she is one of the most upright and honest people I have ever encountered. She entered the warming field because, being totally honest and upright herself, she wondered why people queried the claims in that field; and her eyes were opened.

Loading...

[Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn](#) | March 31, 2023 at 6:21 am |

Oops, online, not in the paper.

Loading...

[Marc Hendrickx](#) | March 30, 2023 at 7:14 pm |

My letter to the Australian... Dear Editor,

The accusation that Dr Curry's views on climate change are shaped by payments from fossil fuel interests is a nasty slur on her character, completely baseless and highly defamatory (Letters 31/3). Using similar reasoning those promoting alarm and fear and "action" on climate change must only be doing so on the basis of continuing their financial gains and privilege through government grants and funding from the so-called

Braccili offers me a bulletin from NASA as an authoritative scientific response about the 1.5 degree increase. NASA is a government agency bound to reflect the policy of its master, the US government. As such, it is as far from a peer reviewed scientific article as it is possible to be. I have to assume that it is the best he can offer. I did note while looking at this reference that it suggests a significant increase in special weather events. This is pure speculation, as there have no increases over the last century.

I would also note that, while he is completely dismissive of any temperature or other data prior to 1800, he seems happy to accept US temperature data, notwithstanding that the vast majority of their sites have been compromised for many years.

us

Turbulence plays an essential role in weather and climate, and correctly representing its effects in numerical models is crucial for accurate weather forecasts and climate projections. However, the theory describing the effect of turbulence has not changed since its conception in 1950s, despite the fact that it is not representative

<https://phys.org/news/2023-03-turbulence-theory-complex-atmospheric-conditions.html>

Loading...

JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 10:08 pm |

Turbulence may play a role in weather, but it doesn't impact climate in any significant way.

How do I know? Because the temperature data tracks changes in solar radiation until 1960 and then it tracks changes in CO2 ppm. If turbulence were a significant factor that wouldn't be the case. Internal energy flows have zero impact on the energy on the planet.

Loading...

Curious George | March 31, 2023 at 1:33 pm |

After 1960 the temperature data also tracks the Dow Jones Industrial Average.

Loading...

[Wolf1](#) | March 31, 2023 at 1:58 pm |

Sorry bud, but your ignorance is extreme.

There can not possibly have been any type of global turbulence data prior to satellites; it is debatable just how much the satellites can capture it today.

Equally, the notion that CO2 tracks temperature is nonsense – there was global cooling in the 1970s to mid 1980s even as CO2 continued to increase.

But the biggest part of the nonsense beliefs that you have clearly not critiqued are the economic models postulating climate doom if X is not done by Y date – X and Y constantly changing over time. The reality is that the temperature shifts every 24 hour period by far more than the amount of the worst case global warming. There can be no tipping points, the net negative impact is very unclear (i.e. climate doomers discount the positive impacts of CO2 and temperature on things like food production) and therefore the reasons to implement draconian policies to fight very murky outcomes are extremely weak.

Loading...

Bill Fabrizio | March 30, 2023 at 11:28 pm |

The UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on Wednesday requesting that the International Court of

[Christos Vournas](#) | March 31, 2023 at 9:08 am |

It has been calculated by Milankovitch.

–

The Milankovitch cycle shows for current time Earth being in a slow cooling trend.

–

Milankovitch simply assumed the glacial periods should be associated with North Hemisphere's cooler summers. Which what happens in our time.

–

Actually when North Hemisphere is in cool summers, the South Hemisphere is in very Hot Summers.

–

Earth's surface thermal energy reservoir are Earth's oceans. There are much more oceanic waters in Southern Hemisphere, compared to the North Hemisphere.

Loading...

[Christos Vournas](#) | April 2, 2023 at 4:45 am |

Earth's atmosphere greenhouse effect is some +0,4 oC.

–

Earth's atmosphere greenhouse effect was very mistakenly estimated as being +33 oC which is very much wrong !

–

The +1,5 oC rise is due to orbital forcing, the additional CO2 cannot be considered as warming Earth's surface by +1,5 oC, because the entire atmosphere warms surface only by some +0,4 oC !

–

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**Bill Fabrizio** | March 31, 2023 at 9:39

<https://quillette.com/2023/03/29/the-state-of-nature/>

> If scientists are sidelined in policy decisions that get the science wrong, then correcting the record would be a matter of merely sticking to science, and would fall cleanly within the ambit of scientific expertise.

Alternatively, if scientists are sidelined in policy decisions because they have some reason not to express moral or political views overtly, or aren't given an opportunity to do so, that doesn't seem to "sideline" them any more than it would sideline an ordinary citizen.

> Further, scientists don't have any special expertise on questions of values and policy. "Sticking to the science" keeps scientists speaking on issues precisely where they ought to be trusted by the public. Mucking

Proposed House Resolution calls for offshore wind moratorium

The beginning: "A proposed Resolution in the US House calls for the Congressional investigation of a comprehensive list of potential liabilities arising from offshore wind development. Offshore wind work is to stop as the probe proceeds. The broad scope of the inquiry is clearly stated in the resolution's summary statement:

The long list of offshore wind liabilities that the Biden Administration ignores is well worth investigating.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:19 pm |

The track record of investigations by House Republicans is not good. It looks like the Keystone Cops are running things. It will go nowhere, and they will look like the fools they are. The Democrats are going to move forward with renewables and you and them can do nothing about it. The money has already been allocated.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 3, 2023 at 8:04 am |

Those off-shore wind projects need an extended environmental impact study!!

Loading...

**Quondam** | April 1, 2023 at 8:51 am |

The problem with climate models isn't that they're wrong, all models are approximations. It's that they aren't even wrong (w.p.)! For the climate scientist, it is a tenet of canonical faith that temperature gradients are induced in gases at equilibrium by gravitational fields. This notion was launched by Kelvin in 1862, scuttled by both Maxwell (kinetic gas theory) and Boltzmann (statistical mechanics) shortly thereafter, only to resurface a century later, unheralded, within the U.S. Weather Dept. By definition, equilibrium systems are non-dissipative and thermal gradients imply entropy creation and the dissipation of energy fluxes.

The academe appears to have painted itself into a corner of no escape save by refutation of the 2nd Law. It's perhaps about time to heed Eddington's admonition, "... if your theory is found to be against the Second Law of Thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for it but to collapse in deepest humiliation."

April 1 – RR THE WORLD WONDERS

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:33 pm |

That was mostly a word salad that says nothing.

CO2 induced Climate Change does not violate the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics. How charlatans usually make the argument that the law is violated is by saying the atmosphere is colder than the planet therefore, heat cannot flow from the atmosphere to planet only the other way around. BTW the one-way direction of the heat flow is why entropy change is either 0 or increasing.

Sounds plausible. Here's what the frauds aren't saying. The 2nd Law applies to the net flow of heat. In the case of Climate Change, it's still outward to space. CO2 recycles a fraction of the energy the earth is radiating into space. The 2nd Law is not violated.

Here's another example the earth radiates energy to the sun and the sun radiates energy to the earth. According to the fraud's logic, that's impossible because the earth is colder than the sun. The sun radiates a lot more energy to the earth than the earth radiates energy to the sun. The 2nd Law is not violated.

Loading...

**Franktoo** | April 2, 2023 at 2:12 am |

Quondam: Even after one averages the annual cycle, the Earth may have a steady-state temperature, but is not in equilibrium. Some energy from a 5800K sun's surface makes a detour through the Earth's atmosphere on its way to empty space at about 3.5 K. There is nothing "equilibrium" about this flow of energy.



Now a researcher has discovered that the same samples that contain SARS2 RNA also contain DNA from a number of animals known to have been sold in the Market, especially raccoon dogs. This observation might be meaningless if it weren't for the fact that infected animals (and people) shed large amounts of virus in their feces, which might also help protect the viral RNA from degradation. If it can be demonstrated that raccoon dog DNA and SARS2 RNA were found co-localized because both were originally in feces, then that adds up to infected animals in the market – the missing smoking gun. If animal DNA and SARS2 RNA can co-located

Loading...

[Ron Clutz](#) | April 3, 2023 at 1:58 pm |

Testing comment lost in moderation.

Loading...

[Ron Clutz](#) | April 3, 2023 at 2:10 pm |

According to Rutgers University professor of chemical biology Richard Ebright, the claim that humans contracted the virus from raccoon dogs sold for consumption in a Wuhan wet market is “pseudoscientific nonsense,” peddled by “stooges who have been peddling pseudoscientific nonsense for three years.” The researchers based their claim on data from Chinese scientists, which they have not made available for independent or peer review. Nor have they published the text of their study, choosing instead to send their findings to the Atlantic, which on Thursday declared the unvetted study “the strongest evidence yet that an animal started the pandemic.”

Former National Security Council official Jamie Metzl told Yahoo News that there's a “zero percent chance that the evidence released so far constitutes a smoking gun proving a market origin of the pandemic,” and that anyone pushing the raccoon dog claim as proof of such “is engaging in fraud.”

The trio of lead researchers on the study —Scripps Research Institute virologist Kristian Andersen, University of Arizona evolutionary biologist Michael Worobey, and University of Sydney biologist Edward Holmes—have a history of pushing sensational claims to the media designed to detract from the lab leak theory.

Loading...

[Franktoo](#) | April 4, 2023 at 7:06 am |

Ron: I said that we would have a “smoking gun” IF experiments demonstrated that SARS2 RNA and animal DNA were found together because they were deposited together in fecal matter. That would demonstrate infected animals were present in the Seafood Market just like infected palm civets showed us how the SARS1 began. However, if aerosols or sprayed droplets from infected humans could have been deposited on top of fecal contamination and preserved virus until testing, then there will be no smoking gun.

Ebright has been sounding off on the risks of lab experiments with potentially pathogenic viruses for years. Metzl has been a broken record on the lab leak hypothesis since 2020. I doubt any evidence would change their minds on this subject. The best evidence of the lab leak hypothesis is that SARS2 was found first in Wuhan, far from bat infested Southern China. However, SARS2 traveled around the world to France at the end of 2019, infected two patients and apparently died out, without anyone knowing how it got to France. SARS2 traveled from China to the West Coast of the US several times in January 2020 without anyone noticing EVEN THOUGH DOCTORS KNEW WHAT SYMPTOMS TO LOOK FOR. And it crossed the Atlantic to the East Coast a number of times in February without being detected. The failure of SARS2 to be identified first in bat-infested Southern China is relatively meaningless when we know it has traveled UNNOTICED much further than a few hundred miles to Wuhan when we were alert and knew what to look for.

I presume you are aware all of the first 150 cases in Wuhan were clustered within a few miles the Seafood Market and half of them patronized the Market. The non-patrons could have caught COVID from their neighbors who did patronize the Market. None of the cases clustered around the WIV which is about 10 miles away. RaTG13 apparently isn't close enough to have served as the precursor to SARS2. I

If the Chinese government were willing to open the WIV's lab notebooks to inspection by foreign scientists and let them supervise re-sequencing of all of the viral samples in their collection, the world would have proof that COVID was or was not the result of a lab leak. I'm not sure such international scrutiny would take place if a pandemic began in the US, especially given the threat of litigation. Worse given popular disdain for experts these days (especially among Republicans), would a thorough investigation actually make a difference to public opinion? Most people believe what their social group believes and would be ostracized for listening to heresy.

Of course, the Chinese government is worse; the only truth allowed there is the “truth” that benefits the Communist Party, and that is all the people are likely to hear. The Communist Party looks bad whether the pandemic started in what should have been a highly safe laboratory or in wild animal markets that should have been closed or better regulated after SARS1. So China claims SARS2 came from outside their country. Advocates of the zoonosis hypothesis claim that all of the animals were gone from the Market when scientists came to sample them and that wild animal farms have been closed or placed off limits.

and consensus epidemiologists and replace them with others who were mostly proven wrong during the pandemic. IMO, we have become spoiled by a success at defeating many pandemic diseases (thanks to mandatory or coerced vaccination). Historically, more people have died of pandemic disease than war and we have given our government sweeping police power to fight both.

You might want to remember that the origin controversies BEGAN with Dr. Andersen bringing concerns that the genome of SARS2 might have been engineered to Fauci, who organized a Zoom conference with a dozen experts. Those discussions changed Andersen's mind and he and several other participants rushed out a scientific paper, but it wasn't "commissioned" by

Fauci or Collins. The scientific method is based on trying to disprove hypotheses and that is what I see Andersen doing. The opinion piece in Lancet originated by the conflicted Daszac is a different story.

Loading...

[Ron Clutz](#) | April 5, 2023 at 3:04 pm |

Thanks for that additional information. I am not as forgiving as you regarding Fauci's role in all this. As you say, Fauci doesn't "commission" studies. But there is evidence that he rewarded researchers afterward.

Johns Hopkins professor and surgeon Dr. Marty Makary testified before Congress on Tuesday, (Feb. 28, 2023) saying that two top virologists who initially supported the lab leak theory changed their stances before receiving major grant funding.

Dr. Martin Makary testified before the House Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis, claiming it was a "no brainer" that COVID-19 originated in the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV). He was responding to a question about grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to EcoHealth Alliance, the nonprofit organization that funneled American taxpayer dollars to the WIV.

Makary eventually focused on an early 2020 exchange between Dr. Anthony Fauci, then-Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and two leading virologists in the United States — Scripps' Institute immunologist Dr. Michael Farzan and Tulane University's Dr. Robert Garry. Both men raised a high level of concern about a potential lab leak to Fauci, but soon changed their stories, since-revealed

"...

<https://www.news-medical.net/news/20210217/The-origin-of-SARS-CoV-2-furin-cleavage-site->

Loading...

Yes, CDC Director Robert Redfield also had reasons to suspect a Wuhan lab leak

Redfield began criticizing gain-of-function research, saying, "I think it probably caused the greatest pandemic our world has seen." He then explained what the lab did months before the virus began rapidly spreading.

"In September of 2019, three things happened in that lab. One is they deleted the sequences. That is highly irregular, researchers don't usually like to do that. Second thing they did was they changed the command and

<https://dailycaller.com/2023/03/08/former-cdc-director-lays-out-three-red-flags-point-lab-leak-robertredfield/>

Loading...

[Rob Starkey](#) | April 5, 2023 at 6:21 pm |

Cat- excellent points succulently stated.

Loading...

[jim2](#) | April 5, 2023 at 9:00 pm |

*The spike protein is a focused target of COVID-19, a pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2. A 12-nt insertion at S1/S2 in the spike coding sequence yields a furin cleavage site, which raised controversy views on origin of the virus. Here we analyzed the phylogenetic relationships of coronavirus spike proteins and mapped furin recognition motif on the tree. Furin cleavage sites occurred independently for multiple times in the evolution of the coronavirus family, supporting the natural occurring hypothesis of SARS-CoV-2.*

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33340798/>

Correction: Three of the four major families of coronaviruses have some members with a furin cleavage sites between the S1 and S2 subunits of their spike proteins. SARS2 was the first member of the beta-coronavirus family to have one. The presence of furin cleavage sites in the other three families proves that families can gain furin cleavage sites by: a) recombination between major families (assumed to be harder than within a family) or b) by independent evolution of a novel function – ability to be cleaved by furin – multiple times. This is called "convergent evolution": Random mutations converged on the same new function three (and now possibly four) different times. IMO, the furin cleavage site is NOT an "almost certain indicator" of gain-of-function modification.

The furin cleavage site is provided by a 12 nucleotide/4 amino acid insert. Normally this would occur by

One the other hand, the furin cleavage site found in the early variants of SARS2 was not an optimal sequence that would be chosen by a genetic engineer. And the furin site has mutated to a more easily cleaved consensus site in later variants including Delta and Omicron. So the furin site doesn't look properly engineered or easily produced by evolution.

A furin cleavage site has been genetically engineered into a number of coronaviruses, including the deadly, but marginally transmissible SARS1 around 2010 in the US.

Frank, I am not as forgiving of Fauci as you. For example:

The paper, later published in Nature Medicine, argued that Covid had "mutations" that supported the explanation that it had been transmitted to humans from animals.

One of the four authors, Dr. Kristin Andersen, admits in a cover email sent to Nature that Fauci "prompted" the paper's drafting in order to "disprove" the lab-leak theory.

Loading...

Franktoo | April 6, 2023 at 5:25 am |

Thanks for alerting me to the testimony of Dr. Makary. I find his assertions that Andersen and Garry (and Farman?) were paid off for changing or suppressing their views about the origin of COVID with \$9M grants absolutely absurd. Teams of younger professors discuss and rate research grants on the basis of merit and track-record and they are normally funded from best to worst until all available funds have been allocated.

<https://www.factcheck.org/2023/03/scicheck-no-evidence-scientists-received-grant-for-changing-opinion->

Thank you too for Redfield's testimony. Deleting sequences is suspicious, but there is nothing earth shattering in the sequences that have been recovered so far. Putting the facility under military control also sounds suspicious. Finally I think there were need to be a major interruption and decontamination if the entire ventilating system were being replaced. I suppose we will hear more when the IC reports.

However, as best I can tell, September is too early for Patient Zero and the virus we know of as SAR2 beginning in January of 2020 with a reproduction rate of about 4. This produces a doubling of cases every 2.5 days, about 4000-fold a month. If the pandemic started in September, there would be 1,000 to 1,000,000 times too many cases by 2020 – unless the virus then was a less-transmissible, less deadly precursor to SARS2 that would be hard to distinguish from a common cold. Furthermore, donated blood has been thoroughly tested for the earlier signs of SARS2 and non were detected until late December? Finally if there were a crisis big enough to bring in military supervisors and take these other steps, I can't see the authorities not warning local hospitals about what to be alert for. SARS1 was barely contained the two times it crossed over (and the six lab leaks). One mutation could have made it more easily transmitted. I don't see the Chinese making such an enormous error when containment was essential to success with SARS1.

Best

Loading...

Franktoo | April 7, 2023 at 3:31 am |

Ron: The Chinese paper reporting on the swabs from the Wuhan Seafood Market finally appeared and resolved by confusion over whether any animals from he market had or had not been tested. The answer is both! The Market was closed on January 1 and scientists were testing and disinfecting for 2 months. All the live animals for sale had been removed, but they found meat from 18 different kinds of animals in freezers

Frank, yes it's out, and as you suggest more questions than answers, even as media jumps the shark to the preferred conclusion.

<https://arstechnica.com/science/2023/04/chinas-flawed-covid-analysis-bizarrely-suggests-pandas-were-inwuhan-market/>

'The analysis cannot determine if the animals were infected with the pandemic virus, or, if they were, whether any animal-to-human or human-to-animal transmission occurred. Thus, it can't conclusively determine how the pandemic began. However, as many virologists and infectious disease experts have since noted, if a natural spillover event did spark the pandemic, this close mingling of genetic material in a suspect market at the epicenter of early cases is exactly the type of genetic evidence scientists would expect to find after the fact. Such markets, with a menagerie of wildlife in close, crowded conditions with humans, are known to act as hotbeds of risk for viral adaption and spillovers.'

Loading...

dpy6629 | April 7, 2023 at 12:10 pm |

For Ron and Frank I'll relate an experience in CFD that shows how the scientific "system" can distort findings and results in scores of at the best misleading and biased papers remaining uncorrected.

Tony Jameson was one of the founders of modern aeronautical CFD and made many very strong contributions in the 1970's and 1980's. However, he became embittered by Boeing's paid use of his codes

adjoint” method. In this method, Tony developed the adjoint operator in continuous space and then separately discretized it. Every numerical optimization expert realized that they had tried this in the 1970's and it was a poor method, plagued by non-convergence and a tendency to get “stuck” far from the optimum. The vast majority of methods and codes used the discrete adjoint method in which the discrete operator was simply transposed.

Yet, there was only a single paper contrasting the two methods and finding the usual result. It was by Frank and Shubin and was correct even though having some issues. No one else dared to publish their findings even though scores of researchers initially tried the continuous method and universally found it wanting. Meanwhile Jameson has perhaps 40 papers out there advocating the flawed method with demonstrably false claims about its efficiency and robustness.

We finally published a paper for the AIAA Design Optimization Workshop where we ran off Jameson's codes (run by one of his apostles) against our more traditional methods. Our codes clearly won by a wide margin. However Jameson's apostle who I won't name late in the process claimed he had a “new” design that he wanted to appear. I began plotting up results and it became clear that this “new” design was essentially identical to one of our earlier designs. I confronted him about this and he admitted that his “new” design used our design as a starting point. Our paper did have a very clear and repeated discussion of this and that the later design was not a good test for comparison, but our co-author insisted it appear.

A couple of years later Jameson gave a big invited talk on his method and he presented these designs (omitting the key fact about the last minute design) and appearing to show his code gave a better design. That was a lie.

In any case, for at least 20 years, progress was impeded by Jameson's influence and fear of him by junior researchers. To this day, none of the incorrect papers have been retracted or corrected.

Loading...

**Franktoo** | April 8, 2023 at 4:51 am |

Thanks for the sad story about CFD. Biology faced a similar problem for several decades: Predicting the three-dimensional structure a protein would adopt from the sequence of the amino acids it contains (ie the DNA sequence). Getting crystals of proteins with high enough resolution to solve by X-ray crystallography was a huge bottleneck. With at least two rotatable single bonds in each amino acid residue (usually with three local minima) and perhaps 100 amino acids, trying all of the possible conformations one at a time was impractically slow. If proteins folded by randomly trying all of the possibilities and settling on the best one, folding would take longer than the lifetime the universe. This meant there must have been a rational path by which proteins folded. Every year or two, a competition was held to see whose methodology would give the best 3D structure for 5-10? new proteins whose structures were being solved by X-Ray crystallography. The results were pretty bad for a long time, with at best half of the structures having some resemblance to the real thing. Then one year, the alpha-fold(?) program got every structure correct. And did so the next year. Google has produced it own version of this software and recently produced folded structures for all known proteins. Cyro-electron

It is a little reported fact that the palm civet theory for the origin of SARS1 was on the ropes in the years leading up to the SARS2 outbreak. The first problem with the theory was uncovered by Daszak's EHA,

*To trace the possible geographical origin of SARS-CoV-like virus, we sampled 1,107 palm civets from the provinces the market vendors claimed that market animals had been traded from. These provinces included Anhui, Beijing, Fujian, Guangxi, Henan, Hebei, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangsu, Jiangxi, Shanxi, and Shaanxi. Surprisingly, for the period of January to September 2004, all of the 1,107 civets sampled in other parts of China tested negative for SARS-CoV-like virus.*

Ralph Baric, the most noted coronavirus expert in the world, by <https://www.microbe.tv/twiv/>

Loading...

**Ron Graf** | April 8, 2023 at 9:17 pm |

The reason Anderson attached the paper was because it NIH funded experiments in Wuhan were making viruses to infect mice engineered with human ACE2 receptors in their lung tissue, viruses very much like SARS2. But one of the specific research aims was to confirm that civet cats and racoon dogs were infected by a

This theory was further supported by EHA authored [2018 study, where individuals living near a Yunnan bat](#)

*Our study provides the first serological evidence of likely human infection by bat SARSr-CoVs or, potentially, related viruses. The lack of prior exposure to SARS patients by the people surveyed, their lack of prior travel to areas heavily affected by SARS during the outbreak, and the rapid decline of detectable antibodies to SARS-CoV in recovered patients within 2–3 years after infection strongly suggests that positive serology obtained in this study is not due to prior infection with SARS-CoV (Wu et al. 2007).*

Loading...

organized and expedition to the Yunnan town 1000 miles south of Wuhan and collected samples from the mine, repeating this trip six more times over the next 5 years. Shi withheld from the outside world the atypical pneumonia, and we only found out about it in June 2020 when a Twitter persona pointed to the discovery of a translated China masters thesis outlining the case. (Oddly, the head of the China CDC, George Gao, the one who ordered the Wuhan market samples taken, did his doctoral thesis on the same sick miners 2012 incident.) When SARS2 broke out and Shi published the viral sequence and that of 96% similar RaTG13, she forgot to mention that this closest known cousin of SARS2 was collected in 2013 from that same copper mine where the miners got atypical pneumonia and George Gao's these speaks of strangely opaque chest scans, very familiar with the China doctors treating atypical pneumonia in Jan 2020.

Would anyone's mind be changed if we did have proof? The origin of COVID is now a political issue and deeply held political beliefs aren't changed by scientific "proof". We've had Jim Jordan bring in a highly respected doctor to testify that Fauci bribed two scientists with large grants so they would publicly oppose the lab leak hypothesis.

Fast Eddy continued: "two Wuhan labs experimenting similar viruses.

The Wuhan Institute of Virology specializes in viruses that cause disease, especially coronaviruses (the biggest pandemic threat to China). The Wuhan Center for Disease Control deals with all kinds of infectious AND NON-infectious diseases. They aren't doing the cutting-edge virus research that the WIV does. This is why all of the attention is focused on the WIV, even though the Wuhan CDC is only a mile from the Seafood Market.

Fast Eddy continued: "But we do have proximity."

The Seafood Market is about 10 miles from the WIV across the Yangtze River. One analogy might be that the Seafood Market is in Newark, NJ and the WIV is in Manhattan. All of the first 150 cases lived in New Jersey and half of them patronized the Seafood Market. This is an imperfect analogy, since the Yangtze was halfway between the two and some cases were on the far side of the river from the Seafood Market but not closer to the WIV. Wuhan (11M) and NYC (9M) are roughly the same size cities.

Many don't understand what kind of place the Huanan "Seafood Market" was: A shopping emporium with 678 stalls with goods from all around China that has the floor space of 10 US Supermarkets including a thriving wild animal trade. Meat from 18 different species (including snake and crocodile) was found in the freezers when scientists arrived, but none of the live animals that were known to be sold there remained when scientists arrived. The appropriate question probably not: "Did ANY animals for sale come from bat-infested Southern China, but HOW MANY did?" For centuries, Chinese and Asian cuisine has included many exotic foods. Korean "H-Marts" in the US have vastly more things for sale than a US Supermarket.

Fast Eddy continues: [There is a] plausible theory ( lab leak).

BOTH the lab leak hypothesis and the zoonosis hypothesis ASSUME the existence of a naturally-occurring coronavirus more similar to SARS2 than any we know about today (RaTG13 or BANAL-52). In the zoonosis hypothesis, this coronavirus had become adapted to mammals in some intermediate species and then spilled over to humans from the intermediate species or from bats. (At least one naturally-occurring coronavirus isolated from bats was able to invade cells through the ACE2 receptor that is not used in bats, so bats have become infected with mammal-adapted viruses. Spillover can be a two-way street.)

Likewise, the lab-leak hypothesis requires an unknown coronavirus much closer SARS2, because there are 1000 nucleotide changes between RaTG13 and SARS2. That many changes would normally take about 50

<https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.abf8003>

If so, all the suspicious September events cited by Redfield occurred too early to be associated with the index infection. Furthermore, if these events were in response to a known lab leak, it would take time for officials to investigate, figure out what had happened, make decisions and implement those decisions. For example, the military wouldn't be able to take over control of the lab in a few days. That decision would be made in Beijing and it would take time to identify, approve, and transfer an officer capable of running the WIV. A mid-August accident might result in a mid-September takeover by the military, a replacement ventilation system and removal of sequence data. And if they were doing all that in response to an accident or leak, why wouldn't they be alerting and surveilling all nearby hospitals for pneumonias of unknown cause? Redfield's aversion to GoF experiments may be distorting his judgement

Loading...

Franktoo | April 9, 2023 at 6:58 am |

Thanks for the references Ron Graf. I was aware of the possibility that the palm civets could have been

Shi obviously kept back critical information about RaTG13 (which was claimed to have been identified by sequence fragments, but never isolated so that it could be used in experiments) and the miners.

The Republicans are making a big deal out of the fact that Andersen "changed" his mind about features inconsistent with evolution after the Feb 1 Zoom call. Groupthink, confirmation bias and party loyalty mean politicians immediately know what they believe about new information. Scientists should work that way. The

he would rush out a paper, but I can't independently evaluate the quality of his reasoning. As I read the paper, a lab leak was the least favored three scenarios – scenarios we still think are viable today.

As for Fauci and Collins, they may have hoped that China would be more cooperative in investigating the origins of SARS2 if US scientists weren't unnecessarily supporting the conspiracy theories of the orange blowhard about the "Chinese Virus". A discussion among a dozen experts might keep Andersen or others from rushing out to publish something unsound. Fauci claims that half the participant shared concerns that the virus looked engineered. One person took notes during the meeting, but they weren't declassified.

Loading...

[Ron Graf](#) | April 9, 2023 at 12:52 pm |

Frank wrote: "Both the lab leak hypothesis and zoonosis absolutely require starting with a coronavirus much closer to SARS2 than any we know today."

Nobody is disputing the natural threat of pandemic potential viruses. In fact, virologists widely accept that bats are the ultimate source of all coronaviruses, including one that causes the common cold. But crossover events are very rare. Viruses are very host specific. When zoonosis does occur from large exposure with an infected animal a virus unadopted to the new host cannot then propagate without learning to turn off immune responses and gaining the genetic key codes for easy cell entry. As far as finding the virus precursor to SARS2, we know the China military were using the WIV and collecting SARS viruses. Two of SARS2's closest cousins after RaTG13 were collected by the PLA in 2018. These are the published ones but we know that even the civilian Chinese virologists were not publishing everything they found. It was not until 11 months after the pandemic outbreak before Shi admitted there were 8 more SARS strains that came from the same mine related to the 2012 incident that had been submitted for publishing just prior to the outbreak and would appear soon. This is at a time when all journals had lifted their sequesters on any SARS relating publishing yet these remained unknown to the world until 2021. Shi claimed that RaTG13 had remained sitting in her lab unsequenced for years because she lacked the equipment. But she did not publish when it got sequenced either, which we can see was 2018 from the raw reads. When she published it in Feb 2020 the paper said that it had just been sequenced in review of viruses similar to SARS2. Again, no mention was made of the atypical pneumonia that brought her to the location to find the virus and its cousins 2012-2018.

Frank: "Nature cranked out SARS1 in 2002 and SARS2 or its "lab-leak-precursor" in 2019."

We don't know where SARS1 came from. That mystery re-opened and was under investigation and debate

*The earliest sample with evidence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was from September 12, 2019, and the positive patient was also positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (IgG and IgM). Mutations typical of B.1 strains previously reported to have emerged in January 2020 (C3037T, C14408T,*

frank, how do you and Fauci's virologist square your logic that cases connected to visiting a Wuhan live animal market in December explain cases in Italy in September?

Loading...

[dpy6629](#) | April 9, 2023 at 8:08 pm |

My concern here is that we will never know for sure how Covid19 started due to the fact that the CCP has created in China the kind of totalitarian state control of "information" that many of our elites not to mention Putin only dream of. We do know that China's travel restrictions inside China while allowing international flights to leave virtually guaranteed this would become a worldwide pandemic. Likewise given what we now know about the Twitter files and the Russiagate hoax thanks to Musk and Gerth, I don't trust much that I read in the American corrupt media. It's a real problem if citizens are not allowed to see all the information and make up their own minds. That is the end of Democracy, not a President disputing the results of an election.

On a side note, Matt Tiabbi has a great muckraking post on substack about MSNBC where he gives all the quotes from that network that reference the fraudulent Hamilton 68 dashboard over many years. It is literally a couple of hundred!! How can anyone trust anything said on that network given that they have not corrected the record or apologized? They are now well known propagandists for massive disinformation campaigns in collusion with the deep state and big Tech. They don't even try to hide it or explain themselves. They just hope most people won't go to substack and read about their utterly shameful lies.

Be very very skeptical of anything you read in the media or see on social media. Even worse, Ioannidis has several great essays going through how corrupt and full of fraud and bias science became during the pandemic. Hopefully, Judith and I will have a post soon with all the references. For now just google Tablet and Ioannidis

We know now that the Chinese were not sharing the most important clues relating to SARS1 and they were using the missing links to string the NIH and Pasteur Institute along to give more bioengineering technology and money in exchange for answers they were never going to supply.

Frank and the Fauci virologists are correct that SARS was poised for natural spillover. As Frank pointed out, the WIV had found SARS viruses that could utilize the human ACE2 receptor even though this did not come from bat host evolution.

A plausible explanation could be infected bat fecal contamination on crops and infected human manure used as crop fertilizer that then fed bats contaminated dung beetles, a favorite food for horseshoe bats, including the

lone pangolin to have its own uniquely adapted SARS virus that could only occur outside of a lab in a very rare circumstance of multiple recombination events.

Though after must searching in 2020, EHA was unable to find any corona viruses of any type in any pangolins in the wild or on farms, only smuggled ones. Alina Chan of Harvard and MIT, noticed that the multiple cases reported of pangolin cov were in fact falsifications using the same “raw reads” sequencing data from the lone, original case from March 2019. I recommend her 2022 book, *Viral*, coauthored with Matt Ridley.

This fact pattern would lead a reasonable investigator to ask the questions that could quickly solve this mystery if that were allowed.

I don't understand why scientists haven't commented more on the early positives in Italy and possibly elsewhere. In the case of PCR, there is always the possibility of contamination from current infections while handling these older samples, especially when PCR is run to high cycles (not mentioned). (The CDC contaminated their early tests before shipment.) However, PCR plus antibodies seems pretty solid. However, without sequencing data to put these samples on an evolutionary tree Italy can't tell us anything.

First, I've been recently reminded that superspreaders are critical to pandemic spread and IIRC most infected people don't pass the disease on to anyone. That means that there are a lot of dead ends on the evolutionary tree of SARS2, which are important early in the pandemic. And if we are dealing with a pre-SARS2 that is less transmissible between humans, there could be a half-dozen dead end before the pandemic finally got started for good.

Second, we don't expect zoonosis to result in a single crossover to humans. If it happened once in a place like a wet market, it can happen again. There were at least two independent crossovers with SARS1, the second two years after the first and after the first had finally been stamped out. MERS has crossed over multiple times. I've read the same is true for various influenzas.

Now let's postulate a wild animal farm with raccoon dogs infected with SARS2 or, if you prefer, a sample of feces with SARS2 in the WIV. The virus infects a few people without causing a superspreader event and the chain of transmission dies out in less than a month. One branch ends up in Italy in September and dies out. Perhaps, this pre-SARS2 needs one more mutation to become as transmissible as the December 2019 SARS2. Now another batch of infected wild animals leaves the farm and end up in the Wuhan Seafood Market. By this time there is an A and a B lineage and both crossover to humans. Or you can postulate multiple lab leaks. Then the Chinese government goes around shutting down all of the wild animal farms that sent animals to Wuhan and kills destroys all of the animals. No more crossovers to man, though SARS2 may survive in the vicinity in squirrels or cats or...

Obviously, there is some wild speculation above. However, what we do know for sure is that half of the first 150 cases were patrons of the Seafood Market, lived relatively nearby and not near the WIV. The other half were neighbors of those who patronized the Seafood Market. In the case of SARS1, the first human cases handled wild animal in markets and were likely first infected by the animals they handled, even if we can't be sure which animal infected people first and which animals were infected by people second. Now the wife of an infected

<https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2022/03/03/1083751272/striking-new-evidence-points->

Best

Loading...

Franktoo | April 11, 2023 at 5:23 pm |

Ron Graf wrote: “Nobody is disputing the natural threat of pandemic potential viruses. In fact, virologists widely accept that bats are the ultimate source of all coronaviruses, including one that causes the common

I'd say that crossover events are threatening to occur all of the time, but rarely succeed in causing pandemics. In the paper below, 12% of people in Myanmar working in logging, hunting and forests tested positive for antibodies to sarbecoviruses. I've read that American pig and chicken farmer (and presumably their Chinese counterparts) are screened every so often for antibodies to influenza and occasionally test positive to a new strain that can infect a human who has been exposed to large quantities of virus, but which can't replicate to

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1201971233000644>

To successfully break out, a virus needs genes for: a spike protein that can gain entry to cells in a new host, a series of “non-structural proteins” (nsp's) needed to “take over” host cell machinery and devote it to viral replication, and another set of non-structure protein to neutralize the innate immune system (interferons). Some of these genes work better in different species than others. When bats (or animals or even people) are co-infected with multiple coronaviruses, they can swap these genes by genetic recombination and try many more possibilities than any lab in Wuhan. I read one paper where scientists in the US made a chimeric virus that incorporated the spike protein from Omicron (which is faster at transmission) into the original variant (which is more deadly). Oh no, GoF! This chimera was more deadly in mice expressing the ACE2 receptor. At the same time, they were looking for such chimeric viruses among the hundreds of thousands of SARS2 samples we have sequenced – and finding candidate chimeras.

compatible with politically acceptable narratives. All should make a point *not* to discard inconvenient facts. Are you unhappy with the scientific peers that remain silent when they see misleading narratives reported to the public because they are fearful they will be blamed for undermining public trust in their institutions? I assume that's a yes. Then I think you agree there is no good reason for the lab leak origin possibility to have been labeled a conspiracy theory by the scientists who admittedly privately felt there was a very good chance of it. Do you also agree that the science reporters had no good reason to go along with a fake narrative? For example, the NYT justifies their reporting by being forced, like all respectable people, to naturally claim the opposite of Trump the racist.

When you talk about the frequency of SARS spill overs you are assuming that China was completely open when we know that's not true. We know the science was not settled on civet origin of SARS1 but the science is pretty much settled on the date of appearance of SARS2 as being most likely in the summer of 2019. Yet

OTOH, Nov. 2022, Neil Harrison and Jeffrey Sachs replied to Garry claim of natural SARS 2

<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2215826119>

There is no consensus on the origin of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (1). We recently called for an independent inquiry (2). Garry has commented (3), as quoted, and we respond briefly here.

“No accusation was made (2). EcoHealth Alliance (EHA)–WIV–UNC have had a strong interest in protease cleavage in enhancing coronavirus infectivity (7), as expressed in the DEFUSE proposal (8) to insert FCS into novel viruses (2).”

“We know little about unreported viruses available to EHA–WIV–UNC (2). Concerns about these should be

Further to Ron Graf's comment above April 11

Loading...

**Bill Fabrizio** | April 16, 2023 at 12:05 pm |

Just wanted to thank Frank and Ron, and all the others, for the great back and forth on the covid origin issue.

*After a boom in wind and solar generation, regulators in the nation's top energy-producing state are pushing ahead with a plan that would incentivize more natural gas plants on the power grid.*

*The new framework could remake Texas' electricity mix for years to come, clouding the outlook for renewable energy even as federal incentives are pushing those sources onto the grid.*

Loading...

<https://www.eenews.net/articles/how-texas-electricity-plan-could-change-the-grid/>

**Christos Vournas** | April 2, 2023 at 1:32 pm |

### What is the greenhouse effect?

“Scientists have determined that carbon dioxide's warming effect helps stabilize Earth's atmosphere. Remove carbon dioxide, and the terrestrial greenhouse effect would collapse. Without carbon dioxide, Earth's surface would be some 33°C (59°F) cooler.”

**“Remove carbon dioxide, and the terrestrial greenhouse effect would collapse.”**

Loading...

**Ulric Lyons** | April 2, 2023 at 5:00 pm |

The UN's climate panic focuses entirely on the least important part of the science, and portrays it as controlling heatwaves which the Sun discretely drives. And it lets CO2 take certain credit for global warming driven by

CNN Technical director, Charlie Chester, in undercover video reveals what to expect from CNN for their next big push once they are rid of Trump. It will be climate change. “The climate thing is going to take years so we are probably going to milk that quite a bit.”

Loading...

**Rob Starkey** | April 2, 2023 at 6:25 pm |

Pure propaganda. The good news is that few watch CNN.



I listened to a Brookings Panel on the Social Cost of Carbon with some people who were working with the administration. A higher price for the SCC is going to be given to all

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' - The Daily Sceptic](#)

Pingback: [The Latest UN Climate Report Is Bumper-Sticker Climate Science - Menopausal Mother Nature](#)

Richard Copnall | [April 3, 2023 at 8:00 am](#) |

So disappointing to see the comments drift off into name calling about Republicans and Democrats – there is a world outside American political partisanship. It's also disappointing to see so many points made without really providing a solid basis – for example when somebody says the oil companies knew about CO2 in the 70s and covered it up – as if he was making some profound point that settles

Loading...

jim2 | [April 3, 2023 at 8:14 am](#) |

Right! It's as if the left believes the oil companies held Arrhenius hostage in the basement. Whatever knowledge the oil companies had was already public.

This entire effort to smear the oil companies is just one more example of "lawfare," where the left utilizes its people in power to abuse the legal system to criminalize or otherwise hobble opponents.

Loading...

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' | FREE the WORDS](#)

Dan Hughes | [April 3, 2023 at 5:42 pm](#) |

"Mother Earth gets angry from time to time, and this legislation will help us address all of that."

Loading...

Dan Hughes | [April 3, 2023 at 5:45 pm](#) |

IPCC Climate Science has been precisely summarized by Nancy Pelosi:

"Mother Earth gets angry from time to time, and this legislation will help us address all of that."

Loading...

Rhys Jaggar | [April 3, 2023 at 6:59 pm](#) |

I have to say that I don't think that 'climate scientists' are regarded as rigorous scientists by many any longer. There are of course the sheep who believe everything they are told in church on Sundays, which is remarkably similar to what CNN and the BBC tell you all about climate every day of the week.

My prediction for 2030 is that the reputation of scientists will drop precipitously, which will lead to a fundamental shake out of pseudo-science, science engaging in 'pay to play' politicsetc etc. It's not just climate, it's all the Covid fiasco and the attempts to use gene editing, mRNA vaccines in food etc etc. People have had enough of it all and although it may take a few years for that exasperation to achieve organised resistance, I don't think science has a chance to redeem itself in several branches.

I can foresee several Silicon Valley 'investors' being regarded as climate terrorists before the decade is out and they may be lucky to escape with their lives. The climate is not for sale and nor should weather engineering be the domain of risk-capital-backed unaccountable ventures, nor should it be the domain of the military.

As for the prostitutes in Western politics, their reputation was pretty much never there to be lost in the first place. They are pork bellies bought and paid for by commodities traders trading in political decision-making.

Loading...

Your "conclusion" is drawn from your observation that temperatures increased when SO2 in the atmospheric decreased. You have no direct evidence of this except for the lack of volcanic activity. Then you come to the idiotic conclusion that because during recessions CO2 emissions fell but global temperatures didn't, CO2 is benign. It never occurred to you that you could drop the CO2 emission rate and still increase the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere because the reduced emission rate is still greater than the CO2 removal rate. That's exactly what happened. That blows a gigantic hole in your theory from which there is no recovery.

Then there is the situation on Venus which destroys your idiotic theory. Funny that you failed to mention that.

"I have abundant historical evidence where Atmospheric Rivers occurred during or after drought

<https://ceres.larc.nasa.gov/science/>

Who to believe? You or NASA? Not a hard choice is it? NASA!!!

Loading...

**catweazle666** | April 4, 2023 at 1:59 pm |

More argumentum ad verecundiam\*...

Credulous little person, aren't you?

Have you ever tried thinking for yourself?

\* Description: Insisting that a claim is true simply because a valid authority or expert on the issue said it was true, without any other supporting evidence offered.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 4, 2023 at 4:49 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

You say that "Your "conclusion" is drawn from your observation that temperatures increased when SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere decreased. You have no direct evidence of this except for the lack of volcanic activity"

You need to Google NASA's fact sheet on on Atmospheric aerosols "Atmospheric Aerosols: What are they and why are they so important". They state that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols (fine droplets of Sulfuric Acid) are reflective and cool the Earth's surface by reflecting away some of the incoming solar radiation.

If there are fewer of them, temperatures will naturally increase.

Also, during stalled weather high pressure systems, after a week or less, temperatures soar to disastrous levels because all of the atmospheric SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols within the stalled area have had time to settle out, leaving no moisture nucleation sites, and dry, cloud-free conditions (nicely shown on maps showing relative humidity levels)

So, I have abundant proof that decreased SO<sub>2</sub> levels DO cause temperatures to rise.

Regarding the CO<sub>2</sub> comments, they were not mentioned in this paper, which is all about the effects of changing levels of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere

"Between 1880 and 1960 global temperature tracked solar irradiance. They could easily be the cause of atmospheric rivers".

Not so. The mechanism is the decrease in the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere, which leads to increased temperatures and increased evaporation and loads up the atmosphere with water vapor, which would normally rain out, otherwise, not in occasional torrents around the world.

And your NASA/GISS IR spectrograph chart is BS because it totally excludes any of the major effects of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 5, 2023 at 10:02 am |

Your theory is based on two premises. That SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols reflect sunlight. That's true. The second

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' - David Icke](#)

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' - All View News](#)

Pingback: [BBC Goes into Antarctica Climate Meltdown - But Ignores Data Showing No Loss of Ice - The Daily Sceptic](#)

**burlhenry** | April 5, 2023 at 11:28 am |

JJBRACCILI:

I looked up information on the atmosphere of Venus, which you say destroys my theory.

Quoting: "The atmosphere of Venus is mostly carbon dioxide, 96.5% by volume. Most of the remaining 3.5% is nitrogen. Early evidence pointed to the sulfuric acid content in the atmosphere, but we now know that it is a rather minor constituent of the atmosphere".

With only trace amounts of SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, the amount of the intense solar radiation that it reflects away is incapable of making much difference, if any, in the temperature of Venus.

"As you yourself said, increasing temperature means more water vapor in the atmosphere. That means more clouds and a higher albedo"

“Even if it did, it would be impossible to distinguish the SO<sub>2</sub> effect from the albedo effect”).

Possibly true, if your measurements were not made under drought conditions, with their low albedo.

And you agree that your CO<sub>2</sub> spectrographic chart does not include the huge effect of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, , which makes it both misleading and useless.

You had better duck, your little green men are shooting at you constituent of the atmosphere.”

Do you just make this stuff up?

“Venusian clouds are thick and are composed mainly (75–96%) of sulfuric acid droplets.[48] These clouds obscure

[e%20composed%20mainly%20of%20any%20planet%20in%20the%20Solar%20System.](#)

The sulfuric acid clouds blanket the planet. It rains sulfuric acid on Venus. Hardly a “minor constituent.”

“With only trace amounts of SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, the amount of the intense solar radiation that it reflects away is

<https://www.epa.gov/air-trends/sulfur-dioxide-trends>

From the chart, the concentration of SO<sub>2</sub> in earth’s atmosphere is currently about 20 ppb. That’s right parts per

BILLION. So how is that in the Venusian atmosphere the 150 ppm of SO<sub>2</sub> is too small to matter but in the earth’s atmosphere 20 ppb of SO<sub>2</sub> has a significant impact?

Next time check this stuff out before you stick your foot in your mouth.

“No, I said that temperatures increased BECAUSE there were fewer clouds in the atmosphere. This was because of the reduction in the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere at higher temperatures (those of El Ninos and business recessions)”

I thought the reason clouds form is because of particulate matter. That dust, soot, smoke, etc. I suspect there is a lot more of that in the atmosphere than SO<sub>2</sub>. I doubt SO<sub>2</sub> reduction has any impact on cloud formation.

“And you agree that your CO<sub>2</sub> spectrographic chart does not include the huge effect of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, , which makes it both misleading and useless.”

No, the spectrographic chart proves CO<sub>2</sub> is a major player in climate change. It is not benign as you have claimed.

Loading...

burlhenry | April 5, 2023 at 11:23 pm |

I gave you a direct quote from my reference, and the percentages are the same as those listed in the Encyclopedia Britannica.

It said that “Early evidence pointed to the sulfur dioxide content in the atmosphere, but we NOW know that Britannica.”

Please provide a link to your reference.

You should have read further into what the Encyclopedia Britannica had to say about the Venusian atmosphere.

It says clouds mostly composed of sulfuric acid droplets at least 30 miles thick envelop the planet. Those clouds

SO<sub>2</sub> is 150 ppm of the Venusian atmosphere. On earth it’s 20 ppb. The effect, whether it’s the CO<sub>2</sub> or SO<sub>2</sub> effect is dependent on the absolute — not relative — concentration. They depend on the actual amount of CO<sub>2</sub> or SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere. Since there is much more mass in the Venusian atmosphere than the earth’s. The difference in relative concentration understates the difference in the actual amount of SO<sub>2</sub> in the Venusian

Do you have a source for that? The only thing I could find was that dust and sea salt aerosols are mostly responsible for cloud formation. The “fluid maps” show SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are regional and are mostly around the source of SO<sub>2</sub>. I seriously doubt that SO<sub>2</sub> has the impact you claim.

“The spectrographic chart proves NOTHING. It would be totally different if it also included SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols.”

No, it would not. Whether SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are included or not, it would have no impact on showing that CO<sub>2</sub> and greenhouse house gases are a significant player in climate change. The spectrograph PROVES CO<sub>2</sub> is not benign. That destroys one of the pillars of your idiotic theory.

Speaking of your CO<sub>2</sub> theory, there is another reason why you can reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and the temperature will continue rising. There is a lag between when energy is absorbed by the planet and when the planet responds by increasing the temperature. If you cut emissions, and even if emissions are less than the

The reference was “The Environment of Venus”, on Google

You say that the CO<sub>2</sub> is causing a massive greenhouse effect on Venus, but that is just a hypothesis. It is much closer to the sun than the Earth, and if its atmosphere were all Nitrogen, it might still be just as hot.

You mentioned that I have 11 papers on Research Gate. All of them support my claim that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are the Control Knob for our Climate. In none of them do I find any evidence of any warming from CO<sub>2</sub>, outside of the

<https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.17.1.0124>

All temperature changes associated with them are due to increasing or decreasing levels of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in our atmosphere. Four causes of warming due to their decrease are identified. They are proof that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are the control knob of our climate.

Nasa’s “Fluid” maps, which are derived from multiple satellite inputs, are a bit difficult to find. If you haven’t found them, go to the GMAO Modelling and Assimilation Home page. Select Reanalysis. Go to GMAO Reanalysis. Select Reanalysis visual. At left select Chem Analysis. Then “global total column SO<sub>2</sub>”, or other pollutants.

SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols (small droplets of sulfuric acid) are probably the major cause of cloud formation, since they strongly attract moisture. Among other uses, H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> is used as a desiccant.

As I have observed, when their concentration in the atmosphere decreases enough, clouds disappear, evaporation increases, and we are subjected to Atmospheric Rivers, droughts, heat waves, floods, etc. And as I mentioned earlier, the high temperatures associated with stalled high-pressure systems are also due to the settling out of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols within the stalled area, providing proof that my analysis is correct..

<http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/Solar/venusenv.html>

I found it! Some reference. It looks like the work of a college freshman. I saw where it said sulfuric acid was a “minor constituent” It doesn’t say that “minor constituent” is responsible for reflecting 75% of the incident solar radiation.

“You say that the CO<sub>2</sub> is causing a massive greenhouse effect on Venus, but that is just a hypothesis. It is much closer to the sun than the Earth, and if its atmosphere were all Nitrogen, it might still be just as hot.”

The greenhouse effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on Venus is fact. It is closer to the sun than the earth, but absorbs less solar radiation. Because the sulfuric acid clouds reflect most of the solar radiation away.

N<sub>2</sub> doesn't absorb solar radiation. It can't heat anything. Here's a spectrograph of the sun showing the various absorption bands of atmospheric gases:

<https://images.topperlearning.com/topper/tinymce/imagemanager/files/dd656228b6f87d2f5ca14ad0031408f35cod892aa69486.54491060fig2.png>

N<sub>2</sub> is nowhere to be found.

“All of them support my claim that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are the Control Knob for our Climate. In none of them do I find any evidence of any warming from CO<sub>2</sub>, outside of the Laboratory and Greenhouses. I am not aware of any evidence that it actually warms our planet. That, too, is just a hypothesis. Apart from your questionable spectrographic chart, can you provide any other actual PROOF?”

So, your “papers” support your claims? Really? I don’t see direct evidence of anything. All you have is data that shows temperature declining as SO<sub>2</sub> declines. That could be a coincidence. SO<sub>2</sub> may have some effect, but that doesn’t mean it’s the dominate effect. Then you have data that shows during recessions CO<sub>2</sub> emissions decline, but temperature does not. I already proved that is a bogus conclusion for two reasons.

So, you aren’t aware of any evidence that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions don’t warm the planet? Take your head out of the sand. They do experiments in high school science class that show the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> when exposed to sunlight. My spectrograph is only questionable to you because it disproves your idiotic theory.

Your papers don’t prove a damn thing because you provide no direct evidence. It’s just inference from the fact

You say that CO<sub>2</sub> is responsible for the high temperatures on Venus, without providing any direct evidence, it

inconceivable that it is the cause of the high Venusian temperatures.

I don't understand why you provided a spectrograph of the Sun. I just said that IF the atmosphere on Venus were Nitrogen, it could be just as hot, because of its closer proximity of the Sun, than Earth, meaning that there is no additional "back-radiation" warming from CO2.

I (and NASA) do agree with your comment that "sulfuric acid clouds reflect most of the solar radiation away".

This means that you are in agreement with me, since the foundation of my conclusions regarding Earth's climate is that it is controlled by changing levels of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere from volcanic eruptions and industrial activity.

You said "All you have is data that shows temperatures declining as SO2 declines"

NO, I said temperatures INCREASE as SO2 declines.

And "This could be a coincidence". I have looked at hundreds of instances where SO2 levels have decreased, and have NEVER found an exception, decreases always cause warming.

"Then you have data that shows during recessions CO2 emissions decline, but temperature does not" This is exactly what one would expect if CO2 has no climatic effect.

You also say that at 20 ppb in the atmosphere, SO2 can have little effect. It is NOT its concentration in the atmosphere that matters, it is its reflection from diffuse layers of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere from volcanic eruptions and industrial activity (as shown in the Fluid maps).

The scientific philosopher, Karl Popper, held that any scientific theory must be falsifiable (that is, empirically testable) and that predictability was the gold standard for its acceptance.

Warming and cooling episodes due to changing levels of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere have been verified

Want direct evidence? How about a spectrograph of Venus.

<https://scholarsandrogues.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/venus-co2-spectrum-1g.jpg>

There CO2 has 3 IR absorption bands. They correspond to the 3 highest peaks shown on the spectrograph. Notice that all 3 absorption bands are fully saturated. That means they are absorbing all the IR available in the band. Notice how the two absorption bands on the left straddle the peak of Venus's radiant energy curve. That's exactly what you would expect to happen if CO2 were driving Venus's temperature.

What now? Are you going to call it questionable? You don't accept any evidence that disproves your idiotic theory. That means you are in a constant state of denial.

You have found no evidence? Really? What makes you an expert? I love your circular logic where you quote yourself as proof of your idiotic theory. You have NO direct evidence that SO2 is the dominant source of temperature change on the planet. There is evidence that CO2 is the dominant source of temperature change.

"I don't understand why you provided a spectrograph of the Sun. I just said that IF the atmosphere on Venus were Nitrogen, it could be just as hot, because of its closer proximity of the Sun, than Earth, meaning that there is no additional "back-radiation" warming from CO2."

The purpose of the spectrograph is to show N2 doesn't absorb solar radiation or the earth's IR radiation. It can't possibly be the cause of the temperatures on Venus. I already addressed your clueless proximity to the sun argument and provided references. Let me repeat myself. The sulfuric acid clouds on Venus reflect 75% of the incident solar radiation. VENUS ABSORBS LESS SOLAR ENERGY THAN THE EARTH DOES. Even if that were not true, Venus's proximity to the sun could only drive the temperature of Venus to 60 C — not the actual temperature of 460 C. If not CO2, what's causing the excessive temperature on Venus? If you don't have an answer, it proves your theory is junk science.

"I (and NASA) do agree with your comment that "sulfuric acid clouds reflect most of the solar radiation away". This means that you are in agreement with me, since the foundation of my conclusions regarding Earth's climate is that it is controlled by changing levels of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere from volcanic eruptions and industrial activity."

I'm not arguing that SO2 aerosols reflect solar radiation. What I'm arguing is that currently SO2 aerosols are not the dominant force behind climate change — CO2 is.

"You said "All you have is data that shows temperatures declining as SO2 declines"

NO, I said temperatures INCREASE as SO2 declines."

My bad!!!

"And "This could be a coincidence". I have looked at hundreds of instances where SO2 levels have decreased, and have NEVER found an exception, decreases always cause warming."

Really? On Venus SO2 levels aren't decreasing. In fact, I would say that SO2 aerosols are at their maximum

“Warming and cooling episodes due to changing levels of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere have been verified countless times, as predicted, thus meeting the gold standard for its acceptance. as being correct.”

SO<sub>2</sub> can impact climate. It's not the dominant factor right now. Just like it's not the dominant factor on Venus.

“None of the above can be accomplished for CO<sub>2</sub> in Earth's atmosphere. Consequently, the theory of planetary warming due to the accumulation of “Greenhouse Gasses” is just “Junk Science””

Your analysis is the junk science. CO<sub>2</sub> and its impact on climate have been well known for decades. Spectrographs show its impact.

“JJ, you seem to be intelligent, but confused. Why not switch sides and deny the Greenhouse Gas hoax?”

Because it's not a hoax. Why not try publishing your theory in a widely accepted journal which has rigorous peer review and see what happens? Who knows? You may win a Nobel prize next year. I wouldn't get my hopes up.

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 12, 2023 at 3:52 pm |

JJ:

I see that I was not as clear as I meant to be. I was not questioning the fact that the major component of the atmosphere of Venus is CO<sub>2</sub>. What I was questioning was whether it was responsible for the high Venusian temperatures, and whether Venus's temperature would be just as high if its atmosphere were Nitrogen, instead, both being transparent gasses.

And the answer is “YES”

We have black metal patio furniture, and on a hot, sunny, summer day, it becomes too hot to touch, for an hour or two after noon. And, of course, you have heard of frying eggs on concrete sidewalks.

Venus rotates very slowly, once every 243 Earth days, so that anything on its surface would be exposed to its blistering sunshine for about half of that time. And this has been going on for probably a billion years, or more. No wonder Venus is so hot!

Furthermore, its SO<sub>2</sub> clouds undoubtedly have their origin in volcanic eruptions (one recently observed on Venus). On Earth, volcanic SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols settle out within 24-36 months, and they should also settle out on Venus, resulting in periods with no reflective SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in its atmosphere, and more intense surface warming.

So, CO<sub>2</sub> is NOT driving Venus's temperature. It is its slow rotation rate. (My answer proving that my theory is not junk science)

You say that I have no direct evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> is the dominant source of temperature change on Earth. or two after noon. And, of course, you have heard of frying eggs on concrete sidewalks.”

Let me say this again. Apparently, it hasn't sunk in. Between the sulfuric acid clouds and the surface, Venus reflects 90% of incident solar radiation. IT ABSORBS LESS SOLAR ENERGY THAN THE EARTH. Without the CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse effect, it would be cooler than the earth.

“Venus rotates very slowly, once every 243 Earth days, so that anything on its surface would be exposed to its blistering sunshine for about half of that time. And this has been going on for probably a billion years, or more. No wonder Venus is so hot!”

LOL!!! Spinning a planet does not change the amount of energy the sun radiates to it. Spinning a planet cannot create energy. There is a poster on this board who had a planet rotation theory along the same lines. You can disprove the planet rotation mathematically. Here's how I did it:

“When I use the symbol T. Take it to mean. T to the 4th power. Let the sun's temp be Ts. let the hot side surface temperature of the planet be Th. Let the cold side surface temperature of the planet is Tc. k is the Stefan-Boltzmann x emissivity x area. Assume the sun irradiates half the planet so the hot side, cold side areas are the same. Start with a non-spinning planet with no atmosphere and at steady state.

Heat absorbed by the planet =  $k(T_s - T_h)$

Heat emitted by the planet =  $kT_c$  ( no energy is being radiated to the cold side of the planet).

At steady state heat absorbed by the planet is the same as the heat emitted by the planet.  $k(T_s - T_h) = kT_c$  or

temperatures will be identical to the value they were before rotation. Take the ultimate case where you spin the planet so fast that surface temperature is uniform. That what we assume when we calculate an average temperature for a planet by making spherical corrections. There will be no change in planetary temperature as a result.

The only effect of rotating the planet will be to speed the return to steady state. Double the rotational speed of the planet, it will lower surface temperature and speed up the absorption of heat. There will no change in the final steady state."

BTW Venus rotates in the opposite direction of the Earth. That doesn't impact planetary temperature either.

"Furthermore, its SO<sub>2</sub> clouds undoubtedly have their origin in volcanic eruptions (one recently observed on Venus). On Earth, volcanic SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols settle out within 24-36 months, and they should also settle out on Venus, resulting in periods with no reflective SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in its atmosphere, and more intense surface warming."

Even if that BS is true, and you took all the SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols out of the atmosphere, based on its distance from the sun, Venus would be at a temperature of 60 C — not its current temperature — 460 C.

"So, CO<sub>2</sub> is NOT driving Venus's temperature. It is its slow rotation rate. (My answer proving that my theory is not junk science)"

The slow rotation rate is not causing Venus's temperature. Your theory is still junk science.

"Temperatures are always changing, and every TEMPORARY change (due to volcanic eruptions, El Ninos, La Ninas, industrial activity, etc) can be correlated with an increase or decrease in the

<https://th.bing.com/th/id/R.c7026e30a59f548716f0f2667ee5d51b?k=DKKDsZ5N08iHt%3a%2f%2fchmsinecom%2fwpdr%2fpat%2017%20%2f%2fAtmospheric+atm+clde+conertns+and+tbl+and+aga+ge+temperatures+over+the+years+1880+to+2009.png&ehk=IAY3zSftbUrnFWUctayvNNd5yAfxntmPDiEAWZm>

You should read your own sources. From woodfortrees.org under the heading Personal Note:

"I started this site in 2008 because I wanted to dig underneath what seemed like extreme claims and counterclaims in the "Global Warming Debate". Ten years on, it now seems clear to me that CO<sub>2</sub> is indeed the primary driver of global warming, which is proceeding at roughly 1.5°C per century, but with some interesting short and long-term cycles overlaid. These cycles can produce shorter-term periods of both flatline and rapid increase, which get both 'sides' over-excited." LMAO!!

"You say that most of Earth's albedo effect in the atmosphere is made up of clouds that are NOT made up of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols. No, but they are made up of moisture attracted to SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites. When enough of those sites decrease enough, clouds disappear, and temperatures rise, leading to Atmospheric Rivers, heat waves, etc."

I don't think clouds are disappearing. Dust and sea salt are perfectly capable of supplying nucleation sites.

"Regarding publishing in more widely accepted Journals, I have gone that route, but anything contrary to the greenhouse gas meme is rejected by the editors, and never sent out for peer review."

The reason your papers are rejected are because they are bad junk science. Good junk science sometimes gets through peer review, but never gets widely accepted. Eventually, even good junk science gets exposed for what it is.

Loading...

Grant Quinn | April 12, 2023 at 7:11 pm |

I must say that graph makes me scratch my head. First of all it's in Fahrenheit which magnifies the "anomalies".

Most science uses the metric system for obvious reasons. Second, "temperature anomaly" is plotted against CO<sub>2</sub> in ppm. They don't use temperature because anomalies scale more to their liking. The start date is about 1880? Which is about the beginning of the Industrial Revolution? when mean earth temperature was guessed to be about 57.6? and supposedly the base from which we should start to panic if it is surpassed. Between 1880 and say 1910, the negative anomalies are increasing so temperature is falling, while CO<sub>2</sub> is rising, so damn, it was getting colder during the Industrial Revolution until it managed to claw its way back up to the base temperature in about 1960, give or take a decade or so, cooling by a half a degree during the IR and regaining it around about WW2. Since then it's risen a half a degree Fahrenheit and we are carrying on like pork chops

[https://climate.nasa.gov/internal\\_resources/2167/](https://climate.nasa.gov/internal_resources/2167/)

We didn't start dumping CO huge amounts until after WWII. There is some capacity for the CO<sub>2</sub> removal processes to adapt to this dumping. You see the CO<sub>2</sub> ppm slowly rise until 1960 when it accelerates. That when CO<sub>2</sub> becomes the dominant force in driving temperature and solar irradiance becomes a secondary influence.

The temperature scale is irrelevant. Sometimes the graphs use F other times they use C. It doesn't make a difference. The point is that the temperature is rising.

If you know how to get in touch with this cabal of climate scientists, please let me know how. Being part of a cabal that wants to dominate the world is on my bucket list.

BTW if you live long enough, you're going to wish you lived in medieval times when climate change gets through with the planet.

Loading...

**Grant Quinn** | April 13, 2023 at 4:06 am |

You guys fool around with ppm's of a trace gas to explain temperature change of a fraction of a degree over a century but blissfully ignore the enormous change of temperature between summer and winter due mainly to a minuscule change in distance from the sun due to Earth's axis tilt. Talk about can't see the wood for the trees. I thought it was now proven CO<sub>2</sub> rise follows temperature rise?

You also happily ignore the fact temperature has been higher in reasonably recent times, like a couple of thousands years, and mankind thrived. So in your last post you really put your credibility on line forecasting climate doom for me within my lifetime. You're more deranged than I thought. Not one of Al Gores or Hansens et al predictions has come to pass in the timeframe they predicted. Not one! And you still believe that rubbish? I've lived long enough to see your type come and go from predicting ice ages in the 70s to the earth cooking by 2020. You are one of the Cabal of doom whether you are aware of it or know the others. I've had too much experience with researchers to give them the credit for being good guys as you do. After all it's their career at stake and they need a job. Any one of them who doesn't toe the peer line will lose their job and career. It's despicable imo.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 10:16 am |

The change in temperature between summer and winter has zero impact on planetary average temperature. Neither does the temperature difference between the sunny and dark sides of the earth.

What happens in the past has zero impact on what is happening now.

I didn't predict climate doom in your lifetime. What I said if you live long enough you'll wish you'd lived in medieval times. If we keep dumping CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere at the current rate, that's an understatement.

Global cooling was put forward in the 70s by a small group of crackpots. It was never consensus science. Climate denial is put forward by small group of crackpots and charlatans.

All you proved is that you are clueless.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 13, 2023 at 10:54 pm |

Your inane analysis of Venus's temperatures does not change anything that I have said.

"Between the sulfuric clouds and the surface, Venus reflects 90% of its incident solar radiation"

You have NO way of knowing how much solar radiation is reflected from the SO<sub>2</sub>. What you say might have been true at the time of the last visit, but between the reported sulfuric acid rain reducing the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, and the high winds whipping around the planet, SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols could even be absent until the next volcanic eruption replaces them.

"The slow rotation rate is not causing Venus's temperature"

The surface of Venus facing the Sun bakes constantly under the incoming solar radiation for months, getting hotter and hotter as time goes by, thus maintaining its current elevated temperature.

Again, it doesn't matter whether its atmosphere is CO<sub>2</sub> or nitrogen, the results will be identical.

"The slow rotation rate is not causing Venus's temperature". In your dreams!

"What I'm arguing is that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are not the dominant force behind climate change—CO<sub>2</sub> is "

CO<sub>2</sub> is obviously NOT the cause of Climate Change. It is climbing at one rate at Mauna Loa, and average anomalous global temperatures are rising at another rate, as I have mentioned before. A good graph showing the differing slopes can be viewed at Climate4you. The best one is the center of 3, 7th row down.

"Your inane analysis of Venus's temperatures does not change anything that I have said."

Let's face it science is not your thing. You have no idea what I did. Trust me. It's correct and it proves a spinning planet can't increase planetary temperature. Think about it. If spinning an object in the sun can heat it up past what the sun can do without spinning, you've found a new source of energy. Does that make sense?

"You have NO way of knowing how much solar radiation is reflected from the SO<sub>2</sub>. What you say might have been true at the time of the last visit, but between the reported sulfuric acid rain reducing the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, and the high winds whipping around the planet, SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols could even be absent until the next volcanic eruption replaces them."



hits the ground. It evaporates in the lower atmosphere rise to where it condenses and feeds the cloud cover.

<https://sciencing.com/planet-acid-rain-fall-3700.html>

“CO

2 is obviously NOT the cause of Climate Change. It is climbing at one rate at Mauna Loa, and average anomalous global temperatures are rising at another rate, as I have mentioned before. A good graph showing the differing slopes can be viewed at Climate4you. The best one is the center of 3, 7th row down.”

I did find this graph on Climate4you:

That's pretty good agreement. If you vertically displace the temperature plot. It's excellent agreement. Do you have a similar plot for SO2. I think that's a NO. You just assume SO2 is having an impact.

“NO, instead it shows the relationship between DECREASES in SO2 aerosol levels and global temperature increases.”

You can't read!

“You CANNOT show how CO2 caused temperatures to increase in the 30's and 40's, and other intervals up to 1975, so that had to be due to another cause.”

You're right, I can't. That because CO2 wasn't driving temperatures at that time — solar radiation was. CO2 started driving temperatures higher around 1960.

The rest of it is your standard BS. You have no direct evidence that SO2 is doing anything. There is direct evidence that CO2 is currently warming the planet.

BTW SO2 stands at 20 ppb. How much lower does it have to go for the warming to stop?

Loading...

burlhenry | April 14, 2023 at 5:30 pm |

I NEVER said that spinning a planet would cause its temperature to rise. That is a product of YOUR fevered brain.

I said that slowly rotating a planet under constant solar radiation will inevitably cause its surface temperature to rise (just as constant heat applied to a bar of iron will eventually cause it to glow, or a rotating spit will cook food)

This is just basic physics, and has probably been going on for the life of the planet.

You are probably correct that the SO2 rain never reaches the surface of the planet. At least not during current temperatures. I had not considered that.

Regarding the Climate4you graph, you say that there is excellent agreement if the temperature curve is displaced upward. Not so. the curves still have different slopes.

For the NOAA/NCDC graph from your previous post, I gave you factual information showing that the isolated temperature rises in the 1930's, and later, were due to decreased atmospheric SO2 aerosol levels (13 million tons between 1929 and 1932) during those intervals. You say that solar radiation was the cause.

In a way, that is true. There was increased surface heating because of less SO2 aerosol pollution of the atmosphere (just as constant heat applied to a bar of iron will eventually cause it to glow, or a rotating spit will cook food)

This is just basic physics, and has probably been going on for the life of the planet.”

The problem is you don't understand basic physics or, for that matter, any physics.

That is 2611 W/m<sup>2</sup>. We need to apply the spherical correction to get the energy Venus must radiate into space to be in energy balance with the solar radiation it's absorbing. That value is 652.75 W/m<sup>2</sup>. To calculate the temperature of Venus, use the Stefan – Boltzmann equation:

$$652.75 = 5.6697E-8 \times T^{**4}$$

The temperature of Venus (T) is 328 K or 55 C

Now let's use an albedo of 0.75 to simulate Venus's atmosphere.

What your next explanation? Are we at your fallback position? Little green men firing a heat ray at Venus? It's as good as any of your other explanations.

"You are probably correct that the SO<sub>2</sub> rain never reaches the surface of the planet. At least not during current temperatures. I had not considered that."

Not "probably." Throwing something out and then insisting its right does nothing for your credibility.

"Regarding the Climate4you graph, you say that there is excellent agreement if the temperature curve is displaced upward. Not so. the curves still have different slopes."

That graph has better resolution than the ones I normally use. The differences you are seeing are the result of the earth's inertia causing a lag in the temperature response to changes in CO<sub>2</sub> ppm. The temperature will rise more slowly than the temperature.

"For the NOAA/NCDC graph from your previous post, I gave you factual information showing that the isolated temperature rises in the 1930's, and later, were due to decreased atmospheric SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol levels (13 million tons between 1929 and 1932) during those intervals. You say that solar radiation was the cause."

What I said is that from the period from 1880 – 1960 temperature tracked solar irradiance. That does mean other factors during that period could have a short-term impact on temperature. You have no direct evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> impacted anything during that period. You can't just assume that because SO<sub>2</sub> goes down while temperatures go up that is proof that SO<sub>2</sub> is causing the temperature change.

JJ:

Temperatures on Mars can reach 35 Deg. C. at its equator during its

The highest temperature ever recorded on Earth (57 Deg. C.) occurred at Death Valley on July 10, 1913, during the 1913 Jan 10-1914 Dec American business recession, which lowered SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions and enabled the record temperature increase.

In your post, you state that "the temperature of Venus (T) is 232 K or -41 C.

I find it difficult to believe that Venus could be colder than Mars or Earth. I would appreciate clarification of your statement.

Regarding your comments4you graph, you say that "you are seeing the result of earth's inertia causing a lag in the temperature response to changes in CO<sub>2</sub> ppm. The temperature will rise more than the (sic) temperature."

Utter nonsense! Both points are fixed data points, measured CO<sub>2</sub> level for Jan 2023, and the temperature estimate, also for Jan 2023. There can be no lag involved.

"What happened in the past means nothing. You have no evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> caused anything. Correlation does not prove causation"

Here are some instances of SO<sub>2</sub> causation:

Warming during the MWP, and prior warm periods, occurred because there were very few SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, due to a lack of volcanic eruptions. For example, there were only 31 VEI4, or larger, eruptions during the 300 year MWP. The clean air resulted in higher temperatures.

Decreased temperatures during the LIA correlate exactly with the injection of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols into the atmosphere from known VEI4 or > volcanic eruptions.

Up until about 1980, there was excellent correlation with the rising slopes of CO2 and temperatures, but after then, their slopes began to diverge, destroying the correlation..

Paraphrasing JJ, only a fool would not cause the greenhouse gas hypothesis "junk science".

"Temperatures on Mars can reach 35 Deg. C. at its equator during its summer. <http://www.Planetary-science.org/mars-research/martian-climate>

The highest temperature ever recorded on Earth (57 Deg. C.) occurred at Death Valley on July 10, 1913,

So what? We are not talking about energy maldistribution that occurs across a planet. We are talking about AVERAGE planetary temperature. Right know the dark side of the moon is a lot colder than the sunny side of the moon. It means nothing.

"In your post, you state that "the temperature of Venus (T) is 232 K or -41 C.

I find it difficult to believe that Venus could be colder than Mars or Earth. I would appreciate clarification of your statement."

I said no such thing. The current temperature of Venus is 460 C. I did two calculations. The first was the temperature of Venus without the albedo effect of sulfuric acid clouds and no CO2 greenhouse effect. That temperature is 55 C. The second was Venus with an albedo of 0.75 caused by sulfuric acid clouds and no CO2 greenhouse effect. That temperature is -41 C.

What? you don't understand your own theory? Let me explain it to you. SO2 aerosols reflect solar radiation and cool off the planet. That's exactly what would happen on Venus sans a CO2 greenhouse effect.

You are CLUELESS on how a planet's temperature is set. It's easier to explain it in terms of energy. Temperature is a measure of molecular kinetic energy. All planets radiate energy into space and the amount of energy radiated into space is a function of its temperature. The higher the temperature, the more energy a planet radiates into space.

Let's start with a planet hovering around absolute zero and suddenly a star radiates energy toward it. The planet absorbs the energy and the energy of the planet increases. The temperature of the planet increases because temperature is a measure of the energy of the planet. The planet increases the energy it's radiating into space. The temperature of the planet continues to rise and the amount of energy it radiates into space also continues to rise. Eventually, the planet attains a temperature where the amount of energy it radiates into space is equal to what it absorbs from the star. The planet stops accumulating energy and the temperature stops rising. The planet is now in energy balance and will continue to maintain a constant temperature until the energy balance is disturbed.

Let's disturb the energy balance. The star starts radiating half the energy it was radiating to the planet. What happens? Initially, nothing. The planet radiates energy into space based on its temperature, but now it is receiving half the energy from the star. There is an energy imbalance and energy starts draining from the planet lowering its temperature which causes it to radiate less energy. Eventually the temperature of the planet is low enough that the energy it radiates into space is equal to the energy it absorbs from the star. The planet is in energy balance and the temperature of the planet is constant until the energy balance is disturbed.

If you don't understand that, you have no business writing papers on the source of climate change.

"Utter nonsense! Both points are fixed data points, measured CO2 level for Jan 2023, and the temperature estimate, also for Jan 2023. There can be no lag involved."

Your lack of understanding of science has no bounds. Of course, there is a lag. You have oceans storing energy, water evaporating at constant temperature and ice melting at constant temperature. That is part of what makes up the inertia of the earth to temperature change. The lag will be nonlinear.

"Here are some instances of SO2 causation: ..."

Joke! You have no direct evidence that SO2 aerosols caused any of that or how much it contributed to what did occur. None of that has anything to do with what is happening right now. At 20 ppb in the atmosphere, it is doubtful SO2 is having any impact.

LMAO! The article you cite is by YOU! Do you have any source other than by you, published in journal that does rigorous peer reviews, that make your claims? I don't think so.

"Temperatures have risen since circa 1980 due to the Clean Air efforts noted above to reduce industrial SO2 aerosol pollution."

Once again, you have no direct evidence of that.

"SO, I have provided proofs of the MAJOR role of SO2 aerosols in Earth's climate, which you said did not exist."

What you have provided does not rise to the level of scientific proof. Not even the climate deniers on this board

What are you doing writing papers about the causes of climate change when you are CLUELESS about the

The sun radiates energy to Venus. Venus absorbs some of this energy. That causes the temperature of Venus to rise, and Venus radiates energy into space. As the temperature of Venus continues to rise, it radiates more and more energy into space. Eventually the energy the planet absorbs is equal to the energy it radiates into space. Venus's temperature stops rising. The planet can sit there for centuries, and the temperature won't change unless the energy balance is disturbed. We can calculate what the temperature would be for Venus with no atmosphere based on its distance from the sun. That temperature is 60 C. Venus has a large albedo. That would cause the temperature of Venus to be less than 60 C. Venus absorbs less solar energy than the earth. That means the temperature of Venus should be less than the temperature of the earth — not its current temperature of 460 C.

A planet surface in radiative equilibrium with the sun has NOT any resemblance with the radiative equilibrium in the cavity with a small hole.

The planet average surface temperature (Tmean) is not a blackbody's temperature.

Planet does not have a blackbody temperature, because planet has not a uniform temperature, and because planet is not a blackbody.

When based on the blackbody-planet theory, it was wrongly calculated:

“The earth's surface uniformly absorbs 240 W/m² from the sun.”

Also it was very much wrongly concluded:

“Without greenhouse effect, Earth's surface would be some 33°C (59°F) cooler.”

No, the Earth does not uniformly absorb 240 W/m² from the sun. Earth is a planet. A planet is irradiated from one direction only, and a planet rotates.

No, without greenhouse effect, Earth's surface would NOT be some 33°C (59°F) cooler.

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 12, 2023 at 9:18 pm |

[https://www.google.com/search?sxsr=APwXEdduXmJonaHoZfPpJl1\\_ix7xtonN7A:1681348058135&q=total+solar+irradiance+graph&tbm=isch&source=un&f=AGDhQOxRiM%252COPM6GM%252C%25BmM6cmKjM%252CQOXQFVKID8iM%252C%25BAG\\_EWRSDCM%252CX7Q-bv5G4WvkM%252C\\_%253BRki7Jn8NdLT31M%252CHGMEOXOD1T6\\_5M%252C\\_%253BxYnMwTFZD-s2-M%252COQ6gIxIjBe6X6yM%252C\\_%253BLPd4u-Equ9UPsM%252C7VSCWfXDpis8iM%252C\\_%253BXb2Ps7eSoAnELM%252CPYM0lthfatOmKM%252C\\_%253BEKed\\_OT8O5M%252CqPCbrZxMM%252C\\_%253Bh5RXWwRfnoEM%252CWEnC9AHKnlM%252C\\_%253BMLQLFhmlBwliM%252CH\\_ypgx4DLISHKM%252C\\_%253BupwYtN2jnbPjOM%252CHfbRNmyvUq7zwM%252C\\_%253B5OEmHJonM](https://www.google.com/search?sxsr=APwXEdduXmJonaHoZfPpJl1_ix7xtonN7A:1681348058135&q=total+solar+irradiance+graph&tbm=isch&source=un&f=AGDhQOxRiM%252COPM6GM%252C%25BmM6cmKjM%252CQOXQFVKID8iM%252C%25BAG_EWRSDCM%252CX7Q-bv5G4WvkM%252C_%253BRki7Jn8NdLT31M%252CHGMEOXOD1T6_5M%252C_%253BxYnMwTFZD-s2-M%252COQ6gIxIjBe6X6yM%252C_%253BLPd4u-Equ9UPsM%252C7VSCWfXDpis8iM%252C_%253BXb2Ps7eSoAnELM%252CPYM0lthfatOmKM%252C_%253BEKed_OT8O5M%252CqPCbrZxMM%252C_%253Bh5RXWwRfnoEM%252CWEnC9AHKnlM%252C_%253BMLQLFhmlBwliM%252CH_ypgx4DLISHKM%252C_%253BupwYtN2jnbPjOM%252CHfbRNmyvUq7zwM%252C_%253B5OEmHJonM)

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 13, 2023 at 8:06 am |

Let me answer you. Before 1960 planetary temperature change tracked solar

Which one is correct –

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 9:51 am |

They're pretty much the same thing. On the one I use, the bright yellow line is an 11 year moving average to smooth out the solar cycle. The light yellow line is the raw data. If you compare the light yellow line on my graph with the data on the other graph, they are about the same.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 10:30 am |

Genius,

Your graph doesn't go out as far, The trends are the same. Both plots would show temperature tracking solar radiation before 1960 and not tracking solar radiation after 1960. That was the point that you didn't get.

They're pretty much the same thing. On the one I use, the bright yellow line is an 11 year moving average to smooth out the solar cycle. The light yellow line is the raw data. If you compare the light yellow line on my graph with the data on the other graph, they are about the same.

Loading...

Joe - the non climate scientist | April 13, 2023 at 11:11 am |

JJBraccili | April 13, 2023 at 10:30 am |

Genius,

Your graph doesn't go out as far, The trends are the same. Both plots would show temperature tracking solar radiation before 1960 and not tracking solar radiation after 1960. That was the point that you didn't get. DUH!!!

JJB –

No – the graphs are not the same,  
No the graphs dont show the same trend

Here are the graphs I found of TSI by year:

[https://climate.nasa.gov/internal\\_resources/1896](https://climate.nasa.gov/internal_resources/1896)

[https://th.bing.com/th/id/R\\_d2290b220b0b74b77363ea5ae708cbb?rik=wFMjiv2%2f2UvVcg&pid=ImgRaw&r=0](https://th.bing.com/th/id/R_d2290b220b0b74b77363ea5ae708cbb?rik=wFMjiv2%2f2UvVcg&pid=ImgRaw&r=0)

There aren't numerous graphs of TSI. Most of the graphs are the same data plotted on different scales or oriented differently.

If you plot temperature change on any of those plots you get the same result. Which was the point,

Loading...

Joe - the non climate scientist | April 13, 2023 at 1:22 pm |

JJB –

The graphs conflict

Graph #1 – is the same one you keep showing  
Graphs #2 & #3 are the graphs that I previously linked

Note\*

Graph #1 has a negative long term slope from 1880's  
Graphs #2 & #3 remain positive since the 1880's

Also note worthy is how the Nasa Graph #1 conflicts with the NASA graph #2 (several sources with the same graph #2)

Loading...

JJBraccili | April 13, 2023 at 2:09 pm |

Let me get this straight. You drew a straight line from 1880 to 2020 on graph #1 and a straight line from 1880 to 2010 on graph #2. One line slopes up and the other slopes down and that's your basis

“That says that something else other than solar irradiance is driving temperature change.”

–

I think it is the Milankovitch Cycle which describes the Earth's Global Warming trend. (The original Milankovitch Cycle shows a Global Cooling trend), but what I insist on is that Milankovitch Cycle to be read REVERSED!

–

Loading...

Pingback: [La BBC habla sobre el derretimiento de la Antártida mientras ignora los datos que no muestran pérdida de hielo - Trikooba](#)

Pingback: [On RCP 8.5 IPCC Exaggeration - Master Resource](#)

CKid | April 12, 2023 at 5:37 am |

“ Only 38% of Americans would be willing to pay \$1 per month to address climate change, according to new polling released Tuesday.” According to a Time magazine twitter release.

<https://twitter.com/TIME/status/1646015789277880323>

Loading...

Grant Quinn | April 12, 2023 at 6:09 am |

The silent majority. Not the noisy ones.

Loading...

Loading...

**Rob Starkey** | April 12, 2023 at 4:47 pm |

In the USA Joe Biden and democrats have control of government and the nearly baseless fear mongering on AGW is the norm. Republicans keep shooting themselves in the foot so we may have 5 more years of the same type of government implementing the climate change agenda.

Loading...

Pingback: [No, Antarctica Ice Isn't Melting Into Oblivion; + Shiveluch Erupts \(Again\) - Electrower](#)

Pingback: [Lessons of the energy crisis - Invito Energy Partners](#)

**jim2** | April 12, 2023 at 6:10 pm |

Katrina wiped out low-lying homes, only to have the id eee of Brad Pitt rebuild them in the same place. Guess he isn't worried about sea level rise.

*For the impacted homeowners of New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward, the August 2022 announcement that they were one step closer to being made whole – with relief coming in the form of a \$20.5 million settlement – was long past due.*

*Hurricane Katrina made landfall 17 years earlier, devastating their neighborhood. But that was just the opening chapter of their misfortune. Their homes had been rebuilt, only to give way to rot, mold and structural defects. Their 2018 class-action lawsuit seeking damages against their original benefactors, the Make It Right Foundation and its leading man, Brad Pitt, languished in Orleans Parish court for years as their properties decayed.*

<https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/business-news/brad-pitt-charity-mess-katrina-victims-stranded-1235371222/>

Loading...

**rhosilliboy** | April 12, 2023 at 7:08 pm |

The lies from the ICCP just get worse !

Loading...

**rhosilliboy** | April 12, 2023 at 7:33 pm |

In my comment above, I meant 'IPCC' .. memory problems ha! ha!

Loading...

**jim2** | April 12, 2023 at 9:04 pm |

I think JJB makes a great point about Venus. It has a much, much bigger problem than Earth. The IPCC should move there and solve that bigger problem first.

Loading...

**JJBracci** | April 12, 2023 at 10:05 pm |

It would be a lot easier to solve earth's CO2 problem.

Probably not a good idea to send people to a planet that's at 460 C and 90 atmospheres and rains sulfuric acid. If you want to volunteer to go, I'll whole-heartily support your efforts.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 7:27 am |

Earth doesn't have a CO2 "problem." It has a CO2 blessing. CO2 – it's a good thing.

Loading...

**JJBracci** | April 13, 2023 at 9:55 am |

If believing that makes you happy, you keep believing it. Leave dealing with reality to the rest of us.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 10:28 am |

You got a big wad of nothing to support your hysterical climate beliefs, JJB.

Loading...

**JJBracci** | April 13, 2023 at 10:34 am |

That's a great example of your typical response.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 11:01 am |

If believing that makes you happy, you keep believing it. Leave dealing with reality to the rest of us.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 12:06 pm |

If JJB would check all the evidence before he spouts off, he would see that a reduction in SO2 probably caused the increase in temperature. His beloved NASA states SO2 cools the atmosphere, so there's that. Maybe he could check up on that and report back.

SO2 began to decline around 1975.

[https://www.pnnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\\_reports/PNNL-14537.pdf](https://www.pnnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-14537.pdf)

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 13, 2023 at 12:19 pm |

Following up on Jim2's comment – JJB presents a NASA graph of TSI which declines below the 1880's average tsi starting circa 1960. Convenient that it matches the CO2 is the primary (sole) cause of the warming post 1960.

On the other hand, multiple other sources show the TSI increasing through the 1960's and beginning a slow decline, though still above the 1880's level by large margins (large margin by TSI change levels)

the point being that there is a legitimate scientific debate on the level of TSI while JJB picks the one that suits his bias.

Loading...

**JJBracci** | April 13, 2023 at 1:24 pm |

"On the other hand, multiple other sources show the TSI increasing through the 1960's and beginning a slow decline, though still above the 1880's level by large margins (large margin by TSI change levels)"

What all the graphs show is that from 1880 to 1960 solar irradiance mostly increases and so does temperature change. After 1960, solar radiation declines then levels out. My graph shows a further decline in solar irradiance after 2010. Your graph stops at 2010. Regardless, temperature continues to rise and no longer tracks solar radiation. It's tracking something else. There is a very small possibility it's a coincidence, but it closely tracks the increasing CO2 ppm in the atmosphere.

You're trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill and are doing it badly.

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 13, 2023 at 1:41 pm |

JJB – you still cant grasp the inconsistencies in your beliefs

- A) even though there has been a decline since the 1960's, the trend remains positive (with the exception of the one NASA graph)
- B) you make the false assumption that the TSI is a near instantaneous thermostat/heating mechanism.
- C) you ignore the other natural mechanisms such as the oceans and the related storage of heat. The TSI graph depicted in the NASA graph ignores (or pretends) the oceans play no role with respect to TSI, with is in direct conflict with the theory espoused for co2 increases.

Consistent theories have not been the forte of climate activists.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 2:52 pm |

A. Stars get hotter and emit more radiant energy as they age. That the long term trend trend in solar irradiance is positive is not relevant. After 1960, solar irradiance is not the driving force of temperature change.

B. I make no such assumption. Before 1960 temperature change lags changes in solar irradiance. Nothing can be said after 1960 because solar irradiance is not driving temperature change.

C. Irrelevant. Are you seriously saying that the rise in temperature over the last 60 years is due to a temperature lag due to retained heat in the oceans? The lag is not that long.

All those graphs prove is that currently solar irradiance is not the driver of temperature change. They don't prove that CO2 is. Solar irradiance has to be eliminated because it is the earth's largest source of energy.

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 14, 2023 at 9:47 am |

JJB – the theory you are relying on or indirectly implying ( at least the warmist version theory) is that the TSI has near immediate effect and that the ocean heat sink lack doesnt exist for the TSI – where as the ocean sink lag is prominent with co2.

Back to your links of the three tsi graphs.

The first shows a very pronounced negative decline after 1960 with a decline falling below the 1880's

The second two graphs show a modest decline after 1960's yet still well above the 1880's either way you cut it – smoothing averaging etc.

cross your your math – the second two graphs dont reflect what you claim they reflect –

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 14, 2023 at 11:07 am |

I'm relying on no such thing.

Chose any graph you like. They all say the same thing. After 1960, TSI is flat or declining. Planetary temperature is rising. For the temperature to continue to rise, there must be an increasing source of energy. The graph shows TSI is not it. It's something else that on the increase. That's the point.

BTW over 60 years is not an instantaneous response.

How many times do I have to say that this phenomenon is all cause and effect? What happened 10 minutes ago doesn't matter. What happened in 1880 definitely doesn't matter. You can't go back and say that 200 years ago CO2 was decreasing, and temperatures were rising therefore, CO2 can never impact temperature. That phenomenon occurred because CO2 was not the driving force at that time. A more powerful driver was impacting temperature.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 12:45 pm |

I never said SO2 aerosols didn't cool the planet. What I said was that SO2 is not the dominant factor in climate change right now. Neither is the sun, which is much more important in setting the temperature of the planet.

The poster who started this nonsense proof is based on his claims that CO2 has NO effect on planetary temperature. That is complete BS.

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 14, 2023 at 3:54 pm |

CO2 is a GHG, to what "degree" is the question. Does water effect climate, JJ Hollywood? Can you provide the conclusive esposé between both CO2 and H2O's relative effects on climate?

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 14, 2023 at 11:42 pm |

You can figure it out from the IR spectrograph of the earth's radiant energy that I have already provided numerous times.

H2O is the most powerful greenhouse gas, but it is temperature limited. As CO2 increases, temperature of the atmosphere increases and it can hold more water vapor which increases the greenhouse effect of H2O.

CO2 indirectly controls the greenhouse effect of H2O.

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 16, 2023 at 8:51 am |

What about albedo; snow, clouds? Oceanic circulation? Even the ebb and flow of algal blooms. Blooms not only pull CO2 from the atmosphere, sequestering it upon death, but blooms also effect the proportional footprint of oceanic albedo, between dark water/bright water, they can be immense. Consider that volcanic activity not only creates cooling from aerosols, but volcanoes also create albedo by promoting algal blooms.

<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/article/kilauea-lava-phytoplankton-bloom/> Imagine a period when volcanic activity increases, creating a timing point. These are just the "tip" of the proverbial iceberg, touching on certain natural climate variability influences effecting episodic causation of cooling and warming. Your problem is that climate moves much slower than your ideologically paranoid imagination.

Infrared spectroscopy doesn't measure tipping points, JJ Hollywood, it provides an IR snapshot of a micro period in geologic time. It's relatively new technology that provides inferences of proof to climate surfing showboaters, such as yourself, that the world is coming to an end.

There remains more questions than answers about climate. BTW, most people on CE acknowledge that humans have contributed to some portion of global warming over the last 150 years, but most scientists don't believe that CAGW is the future, JJ; perhaps you need to school the worlds scientists about IR spectrographs.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 16, 2023 at 10:55 am |

Your one of those people that takes the "let's throw whatever we can think of against the wall and see if any of it sticks."

If any of the things you mention has any impact, it is small. Maybe, someday, if the stars align, something could happen is not an argument. It's a prayer.

Do you have any evidence that any of what you talk about is having a significant impact on planetary temperature right now? The answer is NO!!!

"... but most scientists don't believe that CAGW is the future,"

That should say "few scientists" -- not most.

BTW infrared spectroscopy is not a "new" technology.

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 16, 2023 at 6:45 pm |

JJ, you conflate the understanding of AGW to mean CAGW.

And I said spectroscopy was "relatively" new, first used on a satellite about 50 years ago, but satellites were first used to take precise measurements of climate only about 20 years ago.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 16, 2023 at 8:50 pm |

If AGW continues, CAGW is inevitable.

Twenty years ago is not "new."

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 17, 2023 at 8:10 am |

Hollywood just keeps spattering about in his showboat.

Climate is measured in decadal increments, 20 years doesn't make a trend in climate; therefore the data gathered by IR spectroscopy for climate is "relatively" new.

Loading...

**Christos Vournas** | April 13, 2023 at 3:30 pm |

JJBraccili:

"Rotation doesn't impact planetary temperature no matter how fast you rotate it."

-

There is the POWERFUL "Planet Surface **Rotational Warming** Phenomenon".

-

Please visit my site,

Link:

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**Christos Vournas** | April 14, 2023 at 3:48 am |

JJBraccili:

"Think about it. If spinning an object in the sun can heat it up past what the sun can do without spinning, you've found a new source of energy. Does that make sense?"

-

"you have found a **new** source of energy."

-

No, it is not a new source of energy. It is not a source of energy either.

It is the way a faster spinning planet "manages" to accumulate by far **larger** amounts of the incident solar energy, than a slower rotating one.

-

I am explaining all about it in my site.

Link:

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**Christos Vournas** | April 16, 2023 at 1:56 pm |

When a planet rotates faster something **very interesting** happens! When faster rotating the temperatures on the dayside are lower and temperatures on the dark side are higher.

Example

A planet for N1 rot/day has dayside temperature 200K and nightside temperature 100K.

So the Tave = (200K+100K) / 2 = **150K**

The same planet for N2 > N1 rot/day has dayside temperature 199K and nightside temperature 107K.

So the Tave = (199K+107K) / 2 = **153K**

Thus when rotating faster the planet average (mean) surface temperature is higher.

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 16, 2023 at 11:20 pm |

JJ:

Thank you for your detailed explanation of Venusian temperatures. I have never considered planetary temperatures, have just been trying to make sense of what is happening on Earth.

So, I had to a bit of research regarding them.

An important consideration regarding a planet's temperature is the amount of solar radiation received at its surface.

According to NASA, the incident solar radiation at the surface of Venus is 2,601.3 Watts per square meter. (This compares with Earth, which is given as 1,361 Watts per square meter)..

For Venus, the length of its day is 2,802 hours.



With its high incident solar radiation, and 1,401 hours of "bake" time each day, over millions of years, a high surface temperature is exactly what would be expected.

So, my initial explanation turns out to be correct.

"Of course there is a lag"

Your thinking is wrong. There may have been lags prior to making the measurements, but the reported data is what it is at the time of the measurement.

Here are some instances of SO<sub>2</sub> causation:

"Joke!" You have no direct evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols caused any of that or how much of it contributed to what did occur".

Actually, I DO know how much SO<sub>2</sub> was involved for many of the instances. For much of the warming, there were little or no dimming SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, as for the earlier warming periods, locally, during stalled high pressure weather systems, and when there are periods of 4-5 years between eruptions.

For cooling, the amount of volcanic SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions injected into atmosphere has been measured by satellites since late 1979 or the early 1980's. Prior to the satellite data, the annual tonnage of industrial SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions were available from the Community Emissions Data System (CEDS), of the University of Maryland, and are available through at least 2016.

"None of that has anything to do with what is happening right now"

What IS happening right now is that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions are decreasing because of Net Zero activities to ban the burning of fossil fuels, and continued global "Clean Air" efforts to lower industrial SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols, and the expected warming is taking off, rising 0.34 Deg. C. since January.

See: "Net Zero Catastrophe Beginning?"

<https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2022.16.1.1035>

And: "The Cause of Atmospheric Rivers"

<https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.17.2.0323>

"You think that whatever you say must be scientific fact. It is anything but."

I try to have data to support everything that I say, and my conclusions regarding SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols meet Karl Popper's criteria for a validated scientific fact.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 17, 2023 at 12:18 am |

"With its high incident solar radiation, and 1,401 hours of "bake" time each day, over millions of years, a high surface temperature is exactly what would be expected. So, my initial explanation turns out to be correct."

LMAO!!! You still don't understand. You have the mistaken idea that energy just keeps accumulating on the planet. "Bake time" has nothing to do with it. It's all about what Venus absorbs from the sun and what it radiates into space.

You don't even understand your own theory. Only 25% of incident solar radiation is absorbed by the planet because of the reflecting sulfuric acid clouds. That reduces the amount of solar energy absorbed by the planet to 653 W/m<sup>2</sup>. Then there is the problem that the sun radiates to the surface of a circle — not a sphere. If you take that the sun radiates to half the planet at any time, you have to divide by two. That means the surface of Venus is absorbing 326 W/m<sup>2</sup>. Compare that with the earth. The earth absorbs 70% of incident solar radiation. That reduces the amount of solar radiation absorbed by the planet to 953 W/m<sup>2</sup>. Dividing that by two for the spherical correction and the surface of the earth is absorbing 476 W/m<sup>2</sup>. The earth is absorbing more solar radiation than Venus. Do you see anywhere on earth that is at a temperature of 460 C.

Don't start that BS about Venus is rotating slower. Rotating a planet has NO impact on the planet's average temperature. For some reason, you can't comprehend the fact that as Venus or any other planet is absorbing energy from the sun, it is simultaneously radiating energy to space.

Let's face it, you can't admit that the high temperature on Venus is due to the CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse effect. If it did, your theory is wrong because it relies on CO<sub>2</sub> having no impact on temperature. I suspect every source you checked says that CO<sub>2</sub> is causing the 460 C temperature on Venus. That means you have to make up some BS that proves everybody else wrong.

"Your thinking is wrong. There may have been lags prior to making the measurements, but the reported data is what it is at the time of the measurement."

That's ridiculous there is always a lag. They account for it in climate models.

The rest of your post is your standard BS. Your "sources" are your own papers. Do you have anything written by anybody else to back up your claims? I suspect the answer is NO.

It's one thing to make an honest mistake and be wrong. It's quite another to insist your right and makeup whatever you need to "prove" it — science be damned.

Unless you have something new to contribute, this conversation is over. I hate to repeat myself.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 18, 2023 at 11:45 pm |

JJBraccili:

I am confused.

NASA reports that the solar irradiance at the surface of Venus is 2,601.3 watts per square meter.

You say "that reduces the amount of solar energy absorbed by the planet to 653 watts per square meter". WHO am I to believe? Ha Ha

On Earth, when a warm El Nino occurs, it raises temperatures around the world.

But you deny that the hot Venusian surface causes any warming of its atmosphere. Instead you claim that all of the warming is caused by the magic molecule CO<sub>2</sub>.

What a dim bulb you are!

I checked Google Scholar, and as expected, I found no papers by JJ Braccili.

I have 11 papers on various aspects of our climate, all of which show NO evidence of any warming by CO<sub>2</sub> (and if not on Earth, what matters what happens on Venus?)

You classify my papers as "BS" without pointing out any errors that I may have made, as any competent scientist would.(probably because you are incapable of doing so, having a closed mind)

When I asked you for proof that CO2 actually causes any planetary warming, you provided a plot that proved that the warming was actually due to decreased levels of SO2 in the atmosphere.

You also offered as proof a spectrograph of our atmosphere, , but one that totally omitted the effect of millions of tons of dimming industrial SO2 aerosols circulating in our atmosphere, making it useless and misleading.

You claimed that I had no idea how much SO2 was involved in instances of climate change that I attributed to SO2. When I identified the amounts of most of the instances, you said that it did not arise to the level of scientific proof, which was a lie.

You are obviously desperate to defend the "greenhouse gas warming" hoax , and as a result have lost all credibility.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 19, 2023 at 11:01 am |

"You say "that reduces the amount of solar energy absorbed by the planet to 653 watts per square meter". WHO am I to believe?"

Both of us. The sun radiates to the surface of a circle. The earth radiates from the surface of a sphere. To find out how much energy the earth has to radiate to space to be in energy balance. The solar irradiance must be divided by the ratio of the area of a sphere to the area of a circle of the same radius. The ratio of the area of a sphere to the area of a circle of the same radius is 4. The solar irradiance must be divided by four.

Here's a video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w0T179YxLo8>

"On Earth, when a warm El Nino occurs, it raises temperatures around the world."

It doesn't change climate. The only thing that can change planetary temperature is an energy imbalance at TOA. That's from the First Law of Thermodynamics.

"I have 11 papers on various aspects of our climate, all of which show NO evidence of any warming by CO2 (and if not on Earth, what matters what happens on Venus?) You classify my papers as "BS" without pointing out any errors that I may have made, as any competent scientist would.(probably because you are incapable of doing so, having a closed mind) "

None of which have been published in a journal that does actual peer review. Any competent scientist wouldn't be spreading manure that couldn't pass rigorous peer review.

You're BS theory has to work on Venus. It doesn't.

"When I asked you for proof that CO2 actually causes any planetary warming, you provided a plot that proved that the warming was actually due to decreased levels of SO2 in the atmosphere."

I already answered this and I'm tired of repeating myself.

"You also offered as proof a spectrograph of our atmosphere, , but one that totally omitted the effect of millions of tons of dimming industrial SO2 aerosols circulating in our atmosphere, making it useless and misleading."

It omits nothing. if there were any SO2 effect — there isn't — it wouldn't show up on an IR spectrograph. It wouldn't show up in any spectrograph because it couldn't be distinguished from the general albedo effect. At 20 ppb SO2 isn't capable of influencing climate.

"You claimed that I had no idea how much SO2 was involved in instances of climate change that I attributed to SO2. When I identified the amounts of most of the instances, you said that it did not arise to the level of scientific proof, which was a lie."

Saying that SO2 goes down and temperatures go up is not scientific proof. That's why your BS will never pass rigorous peer review. What a surprise! You don't get it.

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 22, 2023 at 10:13 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

WHO am I to believe.

"Both of us"

This shows a complete lack of critical thinking on your part. It is IMPOSSIBLE for any surface to receive different amounts of watts per square meter at the same time.

"The only thing that can change planetary temperatures is an energy imbalance at TOA"

More of your BS! All that it takes is an intervening layer of some dimming substance, such as SO2 aerosols, to change the amount of watts per square meter striking the planet's surface.

If that layer is removed, or decreased, then the amount of watts per square meter at the surface is increased. And if that layer is increased, then the amount of watts per square meter are decreased.

Which is ALL that I have been saying with respect to my claim that SO2 aerosols are the Control Knob for Earth's temperatures.

I have looked at multiple instances of our changing climate, and I have never found an instance that could not be explained by a change in SO2 aerosol levels.

This includes the Minoan Warm Period, the Roman Warm Period, the Medieval Warm Period

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 22, 2023 at 10:15 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 22, 2023 at 10:42 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

WHO am I to believe?

"Both of us"

This shows a complete lack of critical thinking on your part. It is IMPOSSIBLE for any surface to receive different amounts of watts per square meter at the same time.

"The only thing that can change planetary temperature is an energy imbalance at TOA"

True, but all that it takes is an intervening layer of some dimming substance, such as SO2 aerosols, to change the amount of watts per square meter striking the planet's surface, and to change its temperature.

Which is ALL that I have been saying with respect to my claim that SO2 aerosols are the Control Knob for Earth's climate.

I have looked at multiple instances of our changing climate, and I have never found an instance that could not be explained by a change in SO2 aerosol levels.

This includes the Minoan Warm Period, the Roman Warm Period, the Medieval Warm Period, the Little Ice Age, American Business recessions, Stalled High Pressure Weather Systems, La Ninas and El Ninos, Heat waves, Atmospheric Rivers, the cause of the high temperatures of the 1930's, Etc., Etc.

And nowhere do I see any evidence of any additional warming due to CO2. Temperatures quickly respond to changes in SO2 aerosol levels, but large changes in CO2 levels, such as during the COVID lock-downs, or during business recessions, have no climatic effect.

Give it up, JJ. Your CO2 horse is dead. Stop flogging it,

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 19, 2023 at 3:19 pm |

I don't know why the link from the video didn't make it. I'll try again:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w0T170YxLo8>

It does appear on the JC site.

Loading...

**buckspace** | April 22, 2023 at 3:16 pm |

Dear Professor Curry,

Thank you for being a voice for truth and reason in today's often misinformed and hostile climate debates.

Am eagerly anticipating the publication of your book Climate Uncertainty and Risk, which I pre-ordered months ago.

Also thought you might appreciate a copy of my recently published article "Climate Change and National Security" that appeared in the journal Comparative Strategy last month.

The article is available but behind a paywall here: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01495933.2023.2182108>

Wanted to send you a PDF and link to a free copy of the article, but did not have an email address for you.

I do hope you will be doing a book tour once your book is out.

With sincere respect and congratulations on your forthcoming book,

Mark A. Bucknam, PhD  
Rm 143 Roosevelt Hall  
National War College  
Ft McNair, Washington, DC  
[mark.bucknam@ndu.edu](mailto:mark.bucknam@ndu.edu)

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 22, 2023 at 11:55 pm |

"This shows a complete lack of critical thinking on your part. It is IMPOSSIBLE for any surface to receive different amounts of watts per square meter at the same time."

You didn't understand a thing I said. This is why people like you should not be commenting on climate change pretending to be an expert.

When NASA reports a solar irradiance of 1200 W/m2 at TOA. The m2 is the area of a circle. That's what the sun is radiating to. To determine how many watts the earth is absorbing, multiply the 1200 W/m2 by the area of a circle with the earth's radius. The earth is radiating this energy into space from the area of a sphere. To get the W/m2 the earth is radiating into space, divide the watts we calculated by the area of a sphere. The ratio of the area of a sphere to the area of a circle is 4. That means to get the W/m2 that earth is radiating to space divide the 1200 W/m2 by 4. The earth is radiating 300 W/m2 to space. The problem is the sun is radiating to the surface of a circle and the earth is radiating from the surface of a sphere. Both numbers are correct.

"More of your BS! All that it takes is an intervening layer of some dimming substance, such as SO2 aerosols, to change the amount of watts per square meter striking the planet's surface."

Say the earth is at steady state. That means the energy the earth is absorbing is equal to what it radiates into space. Use a mirror to reflect some of the energy the earth is absorbing into space. The earth is at the same temperature and is radiating the same energy into space but it is absorbing less energy. There is an energy imbalance and the earths energy will drop causing the earth's temperature to drop until the earth is radiating into space what it is absorbing.

"I have looked at multiple instances of our changing climate, and I have never found an instance that could not be explained by a change in SO2 aerosol levels."

TRY HARDER!!

I'm not here to give you science lessons. Before you keep pontificating on climate change, try learning the basics.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 23, 2023 at 7:35 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

"You can't see the forest for the trees"

The real issue is not what is happening on Venus, or the amount of solar radiance striking the Earth's surface, Etc.

The issue is WHY are Earth's temperatures rising?

And the answer is very simple. EVERY instance that I have examined has been due to a decrease in the amount of SO2 aerosol emissions in the atmosphere, with no hint of any additional warming due to the accumulation of "Greenhouse Gasses". With less pollution of the atmosphere, temperatures will naturally rise.

Warming due to increased levels of CO2 in the atmosphere is an obvious HOAX. A CO2-warmed atmosphere is akin to an oven, with no fluctuations of temperatures inside. And yet, our temperatures, apart from daily and seasonal

changes, are constantly changing up and down, with no corresponding changes in CO2 levels, as would be necessary, if they were related.

Instead, observed temperature changes are in total agreement with changing atmospheric SO2 aerosol levels, from volcanic eruptions, or industrial activity.

See, for example, "The Definitive Causes of La Nina and El Nino Events"

<https://doi.org/10.39574/wjarr.2023.17.1.0124>

QED

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 24, 2023 at 9:42 pm |

"The real issue is not what is happening on Venus, or the amount of solar radiance striking the Earth's surface, Etc.

The issue is WHY are Earth's temperatures rising?"

Not winning? Time to change the subject? That not going to work.

Venus is important because a scientific theory has to work everywhere. Your "theory" doesn't work on Venus. In fact, if I use the same line of reasoning you employ, I could argue that Venus at 460 C instead of 60 C, with a large amount of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere, proves that SO2 aerosols do not impact temperature.

"Warming due to increased levels of CO2 in the atmosphere is an obvious HOAX. A CO2-warmed atmosphere is akin to an oven, with no fluctuations of temperatures inside. And yet, our temperatures, apart from daily and seasonal changes, are constantly changing up and down, with no corresponding changes in CO2 levels, as would be necessary, if they were related."

Really? then why is the temperature on Venus 400 C higher than it should be? it's not due to solar or SO2 aerosols. Maybe, it's the energy fairy who magically appears when a climate denial theory falls apart.

"Instead, observed temperature changes are in total agreement with changing atmospheric SO2 aerosol levels, from volcanic eruptions, or industrial activity.  
See, for example, "The Definitive Causes of La Nina and El Nino Events""

Using your own paper as a reference again? You can't find anyone who believes in your theory? That is AMAZING!!

"BTW how low does the SO2 aerosol concentration have to be before the SO2 aerosol effect is trivial? It's at 20 ppb right now. Twenty parts per trillion?

I think if just two molecules of SO2 aerosols existed in the atmosphere you still attribute any warming to SO2 aerosols.

"QED" LMAO!!!!!!!

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 26, 2023 at 12:35 pm |

JJBraccili:

You say that a scientific theory has to work everywhere.

My claim is simply that, on Earth, if atmospheric SO2 levels are reduced, temperatures will rise because the cleansed air allows solar radiation to strike the Earth's surface with greater intensity, causing increased warming.

It would also work on Venus, except that, as you pointed out, because of Venus's high temperatures, the descending SO2 aerosols can never reach the surface, because they evaporate and return to the clouds.

"I think that if just two molecules of SO2 aerosols existed in the atmosphere you still attribute any warming to SO2 aerosols".

You are pathetic! I have NEVER attributed any warming to SO2 aerosols. The warming is caused by DECREASES in the amount of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere.

NASA's "Fluid" maps show the amount of SO2 aerosols currently in our atmosphere. Decreases in those amounts will inexorably cause temperatures to rise, as I have observed for every instance examined (listed in my April 22 post).

Again, Q.E.D.

Loading...

**shedrackamy** | April 25, 2023 at 3:41 pm |

So true and well written 🙌🙌. A relation of mine is working on a research project on climate change and the UN security council and she wants your opinion on whether it should be regarded as a security issue and if the council should handle it. Please would you like to get in contact with her?

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 25, 2023 at 3:56 pm |

Shedrackamy - GW a security issue?

The global warming advocates and the current woke military have global warming rated as one of the primary causes of the next global and regional war conflicts.

Victor Hanson has a excellent book on the second WW. the first chapter goes into quite a bit of detail on the history of the geopolitical causes of war. A basis understanding of the geo political history demonstrates the belief that GW will be a factor in future wars is a delusional woke joke

Loading...

Pinback: [IPCC Admits Many of its Gloomy Climate Forecasts Are of "Low Likelihood" - The Daily Scientific](#)

Pinback: [IPCC Admits Many of its Gloomy Climate Forecasts Are of "Low Likelihood" - The Truth Central](#)

## UN's climate panic is more politics than science

Posted on [March 28, 2023](#) by [curryja](#) | [330 Comments](#)

by [Judith Curry](#)

o o st th

### 330 RESPONSES TO “UN’S CLIMATE PANIC IS MORE POLITICS THAN SCIENCE”

This entry was posted in [Uncategorized](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

[David Palmer](#) | [March 28, 2023 at 6:56 pm](#) |

Nice to read Judith in [The Australian](#) this morning. Big change in focus of the Blog past 10 years or so.

Liked by 1 person

[Rob Starkey](#) | [March 28, 2023 at 7:52 pm](#) |

Her position has evolved greatly since I 1st visited this site in 2007. It has

Liked by 1 person

[David Palmer](#) | [March 28, 2023 at 8:46 pm](#) |

Prection, I visited this blog from 2007. Never commented before, technically incompetent to do so, mere engineer, but interested in Judith’s opinion.

Like

[Harold Angel](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 12:56 pm](#) |

[Grant Quinn](#) |

Liked by 1 person

[March 30, 2023 at 7:43 pm](#) |

I agree. The education system has been taken over by women of the left persuasion and all the kids are b  
rainwashed and poorly educated. The people have been dumbed down by the the woke syllabus’.

You can actually graduate from high school and not Bne able to read or write to a reasonable degree.

[Russell Seitz](#) | [April 14, 2023 at 3:39 pm](#)

You might consider offering Donald Trump political asylum to raise the tone?

**Curious George** | [March 28, 2023 at 6:57 pm](#) |

“a politically manufactured consensus.”  
Consensus is a tool of politics. It directly discredits science.

**Bruce Hall** | [March 29, 2023 at 1:53 pm](#) |

I refer back to this notion: <https://www.aei.org/carpe-diem/michael-crichton-explains-why-there-is-no-such-thing-as-consensus-science/>

“I want to pause here and talk about this notion of consensus, and the rise of what has been called consensus science. I regard consensus science as an extremely pernicious development that ought to be stopped cold in its tracks. Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, reach for your wallet, because you’re being had.

Let’s be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politicians. The contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has reported a result that the greatest scientist in the real world has agreed to consider as a result. It is the consensus. There is no such thing as consensus science. If it’s consensus, it isn’t science. If it’s science, it isn’t consensus. Period.”

Liked by 3 people

**Russell** | [March 29, 2023 at 3:34 pm](#) |

“If it’s consensus, it isn’t science. If it’s science, it isn’t consensus. Period.”  
Compounding as it does tautology with a terminal appeal to authority, this may be the worst thing Mike ever wrote, including the speech Steve Koonin invited him to make at Cal Tech.

Liked by 1 person

**Franktoo**

| [April 11, 2023 at 1:42 am](#) |

Bruce and Russell: In his great book “A Constitution of Knowledge. In Defense of Truth.” Jonathan Rauch explains where knowledge comes from. Science can be done by a single individual, but knowledge is the

Rauch says that we need groups because the human brain is lousy at reasoning. For most of us, reasoning is dominated by emotion. Most non-scientists (and many scientists) would rather be wrong than publicly disagree with important beliefs of their peer group. For example, since the lab leak hypothesis for the origin of COVID first became known as a conspiracy theory promoted by Trump for political reasons, there wasn’t a compelling reason for most scientists to discuss this hypothesis until we failed to find infected animals connected with the Seafood

Market. For scientists, confirmation bias is a more serious problem. Even the greatest scientists find it easier to find mistakes in the work of others than in their own work. Even the brilliant Einstein never accepted the

**JJBraccili** | [April 11, 2023 at 9:18 am](#) |

“Now, the IPCC consensus is not generating knowledge because they aren’t interested in having a continuing conversation with skeptical experts. They aren’t interested in learning why they might be wrong, because they can’t afford to be seen questioning the consensus.”

What skeptical experts? You mean those that scour the IPCC report looking for discrepancies so they can make a mountain out of a mole hill? How about those with crackpot theories? Recently, someone claiming to be an expert in this venue insisted that greenhouse gases have no impact on the earth’s temperature. You think he should be taken seriously?

How about the guy who says CO2 has no impact on climate. It’s SO2 that’s the problem. His “proof” is that SO2 is decreasing and temperature is increasing and during periods of decreasing CO2 emissions the temperature doesn’t go down. He has no direct evidence for the former and direct evidence contradicts the latter. You think he should be taken seriously?

Most skeptics don’t want a conversation with real climate scientists because they know they’ll be exposed as frauds. They place their “papers” in “pay to publish” journals where the peer review is inferior. Then they troll sites like this one trying to drum up support from those predisposed to accept anything in opposition to consensus science on climate change.

The skeptics are few in number and their ranks are shrinking.

Loading...

**UK-Weather Lass** | [April 11, 2023 at 4:52 am](#) |

Intelligence is the ability to understand something so well you can explain it to a child or an academic of high esteem, often even at the same moment in time. A consensus can have no intelligence other than that of the individual whose idea is being aped by that consensus over and over again.

There was once an enormous consensus that the Earth was centre of the universe and that proved a lot of I am curious though. When was the science “settled”? On what date did we know everything there was to know about the climate and there was nothing left to learn?  
And how did we know there was nothing left to learn?

The scientists 30 years ago seemed pretty certain that we had 10 years left to act and that if we didn’t the Caribbean would be gone by now, the Arctic free of ice, Egypt flooded and the American mid-west a dustbowl.

It was all in the UN Environmental Programme's 1989 report. Compiled by climate experts. Scientists no less. But we didn't act and none of that has happened. Now scientists seem pretty certain that we have 10 years left to act and that if we don't the Caribbean will go, the Arctic will be free of ice, Egypt will flood and the American mid-west become a dustbowl.

Loading... Russell Seitz | April 14, 2023 at 3:45 pm |

"Now, the IPCC consensus is not generating knowledge because they aren't interested in having a continuing conversation with skeptical experts."

Molecular biologists and viral epidemiologists in Wuhan aren't much interested in a continuing conversation with Ivermectin salesmen either.

Loading... dpy6629 |

March 28, 2023 at 7:52 pm |

The good news is that the public is starting to catch on to the narratives. The bad news is that young people are increasingly depressed and unable to distinguish fancy from reality because they spend all their time in the on-line world.

Loading...  
jungletrunks |

March 29, 2023 at 3:10 pm |

But young Marxists aren't having kids! Out of fear apparently. It's a thin silver lining when the promise of consensus is anticipated to depreciate, eventually.

Loading...  
JJBraccili |

March 29, 2023 at 5:55 pm |

Really wrong. Hollywood, you can't help yourself, you're a B actor who only knows how to recite cheap manifesto woke script. Please peruse:

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/nov/27/climate-apocalypse-fears-stopping-peoplehavingchildren-study>

Climate 'apocalypse' fears stopping people having children – study  
Survey of 600 people finds some parents regret having offspring for same reason <http://www.theguardian.com>  
<https://www.independent.co.uk/climate-change/news/birth-rate-decline-ipcc-report-forecast-b1901490.html>

Grim forecast on the climate crisis is putting people off having children, financial analysts warn  
Morgan Stanley cited research that number of births in the US fell in the nine months after an extreme heat event <http://www.independent.co.uk>

Loading...  
JJBraccili |

March 29, 2023 at 10:23 pm |

I'd say people having less children is a good thing. They are right to worry about what future generations will have to endure if we don't do something about climate change.

Loading... Grant Quinn | March 29, 2023 at 10:48 pm |

Have you got no understanding of the temperature variation over the last 10k years? 1850 was chosen because it was the coldest period in the last 10k years. So we are now 1 degree above the coldest period in the last 10k years and 2 degrees below the hottest period. Man, such as for example the Australian Aborigine, lived through the whole period and they say +50k years before that, when it was 6 degrees above what it is now. We are still recovering from the last glacial period when the sea was 100m lower than now as proven by aboriginal middens found 30k to the east of Australia. That survived all of that with only fire and furs. And you talk of catastrophe?  
Are you completely mad?

Loading...  
JJBraccili | March 29, 2023 at 11:19 pm |

The thermometer wasn't invented until the 17th century. Measurements before then were just guesstimates based on inference. All your saying is that man managed to survive a warm period. Do you know the percentage of people who made it through? Unless a nuclear war is triggered, I suspect some of humanity will survive AGW. The question is what percentage and at what cost. There are 8 billion people on the planet now that need to be fed. Things will be a lot different.

Loading...  
Bill Fabrizio |

March 29, 2023 at 7:53 pm |

JJ ...

JJBraccili |

[March 29, 2023 at 8:16 pm](#) |

LOL! The Republican Party has lost the popular vote in 7 of the last 8 presidential elections. The only way the Republicans can control the House is by extreme gerrymandering. The only way they can control the Senate is because the Senate represents geography and not people. The Party has no policies that benefit the average American. What they've been selling since the 60's is racism, homophobia, xenophobia, and white supremacy. That's not working as well as it used to. Their current position on abortion and guns is a loser. They're heading toward becoming a permanent minority party.

Loading...[Bill Fabrizio](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 9:57 am](#) |

JJ ... The Democrats have had a numerical affiliation advantage over Republicans for decades. However, even Loading [Wolff](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 12:50 pm](#) |

@JJBraccili

The Democrats win the popular vote primarily because of California. California, because it is both "all or nothing" electoral votes" and dominated by 2 large urban areas – the Republican/conservatives in that state barely vote at all.

You are furthermore thinking the Democrat party of today is the Democrat party of say, pre-Bill Clinton. Sorry, but that ain't so.

The Democrat party today is the party of the PMC – professional managerial class. The tenured professors, the mainstream media and Hollywood personalities, the CEOs and diversity/management consultants.

Not saying the Republicans are perfect – there are far too many dino-Republicans agitating for war and other such nonsense. But there's no question whatsoever that the Republicans via Trump, JD Vance and others is far more populist than the Democrats are.

Loading...[catweazle666](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 3:06 pm](#) |

"Slavery could still make a comeback."

Given the Democrats – the party of the KKK and that fought tooth and nail to prevent the emancipation in the 1960s – are currently in power, that wouldn't surprise me.

Loading...

[catweazle666](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 3:27 pm](#) |

You reckon?

You just keep right on telling yourself that, Sunshine!

Loading...[jim2](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 3:15 pm](#) |

JJB can't seem to get anything right, nothing!!

So uthern states wanted all the slaves counted as population so they could have more representatives. This was a huge point of contention. The 3/5th compromise actually diluted the power of slave holding states. The idiotic idea it institutionalized slavery is just that, idiotic.

Loading...[Joe - the non climate scientist](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 3:28 pm](#) |

JJB's comment – "The Party has no policies that benefit the average American. What they've been selling since the 60's is racism,"

JJB – How can we believe you have the intellectual capacity to understand the complexities of climate science when you are unable to grasp the political party consumed with racism and sees everything through the prism of racism is the real racist party.

MLK wouldn't tolerate the racism that permeates throughout the current democrat/socialist party.

This is a science blog, not a racist – socialist blog – take your race baiting arguments someplace else.

Loading...[Bill Fabrizio](#) |

[March 30, 2023 at 4:16 pm](#) |

JJ ... Yes you did. Everyone of your comments is laced with politics. Which is fine, but own it.

And the only racist I see on here is you. No one gives a second thought to race, except those possessed by it. And you are possessed by it. No? Then why are you the only one to bring it up?

My guess is you're some privileged, self-hating white guy. Well, as they say, it takes all kinds to make a world.

Loading...

[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 4:30 pm](#) |

No, I am one of the few on this venue who talks about the actual science and not pseudo-science laced with conspiracy theories.

Unfortunately, politics has infected climate science. It wasn't the climate scientists who caused that, it was the fossil fuel industry to prevent any action on climate change. Until recently, they have been wildly successful. It is why we find ourselves in the position we are in – between a rock and a hard place.

Loading...

[jim2](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 8:53 pm](#) |



The fossil fuel industry decided to fight back. They went on a disinformation campaign to attack the science. They sponsored “research” and paid any “scientist” willing to take issue with climate science. They paid front organizations like the Heartland Institute and GWPF to literally make up stuff to discredit the science. To this day they are pushing the BS that we are going to be able to adapt to what’s coming. Don’t worry — be happy. The fossil fuel industry is at fault — not because they produced a product to meet a demand, but because when they found out that product was an existential threat to humanity, they tried to cover that up so that they could continue to profit.

Loading...[jim2](#) | [March 31, 2023 at 8:58 am](#) |

JJB – the information oil companies had was highly speculative. Fortunately, they did fight the perception. It likely added trillions to the cumulative US GDP and enabled much progress and a higher standard of living. In fact, the evidence for catastrophic global warming is still speculative as there is no falsifiable evidence for it. I will add I do believe CO<sub>2</sub> will increase the temperature of the atmosphere. I don’t believe it will result in a catastrophe. And I don’t believe any weather phenomena today can be traced to the extra CO<sub>2</sub>. There is no evidence. If you think the evidence exists, provide links. The warming so far amounts to about 0.5% from preindustrial times. How can you seriously believe it’s having much of an effect on weather?

Loading...  
[JJBraccili](#) |

[March 31, 2023 at 12:57 pm](#) |

In the case of Climate Change, Exxon had a team of climate scientists who developed their own climate model. You can read about it here:

“I will add I do believe CO<sub>2</sub> will increase the temperature of the atmosphere.”

This is more climate denier BS — CO<sub>2</sub> only heats the atmosphere. It’s true, under the right circumstances, CO<sub>2</sub> can warm the atmosphere, but the energy provided by CO<sub>2</sub> is tiny compared to the energy CO<sub>2</sub> exports as electromagnetic energy. That energy is absorbed by the earth and is what causes climate change.

See the “pink” area under the CO<sub>2</sub> label. That’s the amount of the earth’s radiant energy that CO<sub>2</sub> is preventing from escaping the planet. That energy is about 8% of the solar energy the earth absorbs.

That energy is more than enough to cause climate change and the rise in the earth’s temperature we are seeing. That spectrograph ends the debate. BTW there never was a real debate. The science of climate change was settled decades ago.

Loading...[jim2](#) | [March 31, 2023 at 9:28 pm](#) |

JJB – Thanks for that Climate Doomer sciency BS. Not proof of anything other than run-of-the mill spectroscopy. It doesn’t prove there will be a CO<sub>2</sub> driven catastrophe. Nice try, though.

Loading...

[catweazle666](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 9:49 am](#) |

*“The thermometer wasn’t invented until the 17th century.”*

Never heard of proxies, JJ?

Dear me!

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 11:47 am](#) |

Proxies are never as good as the real thing.

Loading...[Chris Morris](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 3:20 pm](#) |

The real things aren’t much good either when the historic temperatures get readjusted at regular intervals because they don’t tell the story activists want.

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 4:40 pm](#) |

Since there is no spot on the earth marked “average temperature insert thermocouple here.” Temperature data have to be statistically sampled and weighted — a degree rise in the ocean involves more energy than a degree rise in the atmosphere. There are always arguments over how this is done, and it leads to corrections. That the corrections have some ulterior motive is another conspiracy theory and fodder for the climate denialists.

Loading...[Chris Morris](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 8:58 pm](#) |

Your comments get more and more ridiculous JJ as you defend the impossible with stupid statements. Stop living in that fantasy world if you want to stop shredding what little credibility you have left. Currently you are only just a little below Mr Appell.

The historical data from individual stations has continually been adjusted downwards over the years. Recent years have been elevated. This is often when there has been no station moves or other influences. But they don’t make a correction for UHI which has raised many temperatures without a climate change. The rural/urban unadjusted comparison is getting wider.

That adjustment is why there are two data sets maintained. From these adjusted stations, they then calculate the “global” temperature.

The reason that the alarmist analysts went to anomalies is that the different models gave a wide spread of actual “global” temperatures (over 2°C if IIRC) that they were ridiculous. By going to anomalies, they could hide the embarrassing evidence.

Loading...

[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 9:57 pm](#) |

You do know that they also use satellite data to determine planetary temperatures? I presented a graph that had 5 or 6 sources for planetary temperature. You mean they are all in on the scam? If you want the gold standard on temperature data, check out Berkeley Earth. It's run by a former skeptic.

Loading...Joe - the non climate scientist |

March 31, 2023 at 8:53 am |

As Chris Morris states – “The reason that the alarmist analysts went to anomalies is that the different models gave a wide spread of actual “global” temperatures (over 2°C if IIRC) that they were ridiculous. By going to anomalies, they could hide the embarrassing evidence.”

Chris – My issue with anomalies is it creates difficulties in determining whether adjustments have been made to the prior year anomalies. If using actual temp, I can go back to prior year reports to see if the prior year temps have been adjusted, Cant do that with anomalies, at least not easily. Your point is valid

Loading...  
The reason they use anomalies is because if you used actual temperatures the curve would be flat.”  
Just how stupid is that. Have you never heard of scaling?

Berkeley Earth is not considered one of the 5 temperature series.

Loading...JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 4:13 pm |

Where would you like to start? How about economic policy. The modern conservative movement started with the Harding administration. Until recently, the most corrupt and inept administration. He had Andrew Mellon of the banking Mellons as his Secretary of the Treasury. Mellon was the father of “supply side” economics. It was called laissez-faire back in the day. Mellon continued as Secretary of the Treasury under Coolidge and Hoover. His policy of low taxes and loose financial regulation led directly to the stock market crash of 1929. He advised Hoover after the crash to do nothing and let it all burn. That turned what should have been a bad recession into the Great Depression. His economic policies are still the bedrock of conservative economic policy. Saint Ronnie resurrected them as “supply-side” economics. It took 20 years for the conservatives to unwind all the regulations put in during the 1930s to prevent another Great Depression. By 1999 they succeeded. With the Shrub administration and Alan Greenspan refusing to enforce what little regulation was left, the stage was set for the Great Recession. We were lucky that Shrub was at the end of his term because he and the Republicans in Congress would have done what Hoover did and we would have been in Great Depression II. Guess what? Those economic principles are still the bedrock of conservative economic ideology. Why? Because the policies don't just cause economic instability, they result in massive income inequality which is the point. Protecting and promoting the interests of the wealthy has always been the organizing principle of the conservative movement. In fact, it is the only principle they always honor. You think what I said is a good thing? Good luck with that!

Loading...Bill Fabrizio | March 30, 2023 at 6:55 pm |

JJ ... What you, and the left, refuse to acknowledge concerning the Great Compromise, and all the other compromises, was that they enabled the Constitution to be ratified. If you read the Federalists' Papers you'll see that the Constitution was not a perfect document, but rather perfect for the time. As to slavery, the ratification of the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, was one large step towards the end of slavery. About 75 years afterwards the Civil War was fought where over 600,000 white men died resulting in the end of slavery. The Constitution has always had issues, yet it seems to handle each in the due course of time.

Enjoy your evening.

Loading...Dave Fair | March 28, 2023 at 7:57 pm |

Dr. Curry, it is good that you were able to present some facts countering the UN IPCC (and Western governments') Leftist propaganda in a publication with general circulation. Was there any opposition in publishing it and has there been negative feedback to your op ed? Positive feedback?

It's not so much that governmental bodies shade the truth on climate science (although that's criminal in and of itself) it is the fact that they publish and allow others to publish outright lies about worsening extreme weather events. We are bombarded on a daily basis with obvious and outrageous lies concerning extreme weather. Those, like Dr. Roger Pielke, Jr. trying to publicize the truth are shouted down and de-platformed by Leftist politicians, Deep State bureaucrats, academics, NGO activists and media, and crony capitalist profiteers. I'm hopeful that (soon) an International Truth and Reconciliation Tribunal will convene to name and shame all of the CliSciFi liars.

Loading...catweazle666 | March 28, 2023 at 8:05 pm |

“In sum, a strategy must recognise what is possible. In climate research and modelling, we should recognise that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore that the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.” IPCC Working Group I: The Scientific Basis, Third Assessment Report (TAR), Chapter 14 (final para., 14.2.2.2), p774.

Loading...GlenM | March 28, 2023 at 8:06 pm |

Glad I read it here as I refuse to buy “The Australian”, which is turning out like the Sydney Morning Herald and other publications that take a soft and poor intellectual stance on many issues.

Loading...Dave Fair | March 28, 2023 at 8:14 pm |

When first beginning to follow Dr. Curry's blog, I thought SMH was “Smashing My Head” (against the wall). The usage of SMH by the commentators implied that meaning. It was only later that I realized it referred to a Leftist newspaper.

Loading...jungletrunks | March 28, 2023 at 8:19 pm |

Very well stated, Dr. Curry.

You nailed it with, “Everything that goes wrong reinforces the conviction that there is only one thing we can do to prevent societal problems—stop burning fossil fuels. This grand narrative leads us to think that if we solve the problem of burning fossil fuels, then these other problems would also be solved.”

You can substitute “burning fossil fuels” with “racism,” “guns,” or any other of a long list of leftist talking points. The public, led by the mass media, consistently swallows it hook, line, and sinker!

Loading...**Dave Fair** | [March 28, 2023 at 8:56 pm](#) |

Its called “intersectionality,” Lynn. The Leftists like to tie all grievances (Marxist Critical Theory) together so that if somebody supports/agitates for one grievance they support all the other causes. If you support one Leftist cause, you automatically support all the others. Neat trick.

Loading...**Skiergardener** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:49 pm](#) |Yup! Loading...  
**beththeserf** | [March 28, 2023 at 8:41 pm](#) |“

However, the IPCC has strayed far from its chartered role of assessing the scientific literature in support of policy making.” Mission creep, as with the U.N.And NASA.

Loading...**Clyde Spencer** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:12 pm](#) |  
Loading...**ianalexs** | [March 28, 2023 at 8:59 pm](#) |

Quoting here from J.C.'s article above:

“... the Summary for Policy Makers for the Synthesis Report emphasizes weakly justified findings on climate impacts driven by extreme emission scenarios, and politicized policy recommendations on emissions reductions.”

What I'm picking up on is the emphasis on weakly justified findings feeding into politicised recommendations. How extremely depressing, that this is how our elites abuse their positions of responsibility.

I guess it's the same as we've seen over and over again for the past few years: a new, disorientating, total-control moral righteousness with its confected “narratives” supplanting the older generation's liberal intellectual quest for truth. Their hubris will take us all down.

Loading...**Grant Quinn** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:44 pm](#) |

Great article titled ( ) “UN report is bumper sticker climate science”.

As an Aussie geologist who follows your blog I feel privileged that you have written this article in our flagship paper. Mind you, I still think you give too much credence to man-made climate change but I sense you have to be careful not to be completely cancelled by the powers that be.

Loading...**Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:59 pm](#) |

Judith, 246 comments on your article so far, all positive last time I checked. And you were cited in the lead editorial as well.

Loading...**Ross Porter** | [March 28, 2023 at 9:59 pm](#) |

Delighted to read Dr Curry's assessment of the reports in The Australian. Her balanced articles are refreshing in a pool of representations in most OZ Media.

Loading...**Luís Cristovao** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:09 pm](#) |

Very good article trying to demistify the global warming climate change narrative. For many years I work on environmental side in industry and clearly for me we have a resources problem and a pollution problem. To me I read some book like Freakonomics and I was not comfortable with this climate change growing voices and the super importance of CO2.

I have heard some years ago a Brazilian scientist criticizing climate models, he said there were lots of scientists from former nuclear industry that had no jobs and develop these models...

In the last year I've seen John Christy videos and clear position about climate facts using satellite temp data sets and... last but not least today I found about Judith Curry ...and I was totally convinced my gut feeling was correct. This is all a political hidden agenda led by UN and by Antonio Guterres which by the way is Portuguese like me. He had a good position against Russia and Putin recently but on climate issues he is totally wrong trying to impose near true and scientific facts into an absolutely insane movement that ... thank god some people are opposing and fighting against it !

Loading...**Clyde Spencer** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:09 pm](#) |

Judith, You wrote, “This Sythesis Report does not introduce any new information or findings.” Shouldn't that be the “Sisyphus Report?” :-)

Loading...**Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn** | [March 28, 2023 at 10:12 pm](#) |  
Judith, here is one of my comments on your article and one in the Letters section replying to a rabid warmist: “Judith is one of the best-informed, most honest and open of climate scientists. She doesn't have an idea fixed to promote, and is driven by the facts rather than the partisanship and scare-mongering which so dominates debate on allegedly dangerous warming. I strongly recommend her blog Climate Etc to all interested in this vital topic in order to get a balanced view rather than one driven by vested interests.”

“Amy Hiller, I'm delighted to see an article by climate scientist Judith Curry in The Australian, and strongly recommend her Climate Etc blog to you if you have a genuine desire to understand the warming issue and the impact of alternative approaches. I first came across Judith around 2008. As an impeccable scientist, she accepted the global warming story told by other scientists and was puzzled as to why Steven McIntyre and Ross McKittrick argued that it had no sound basis. McIntyre's Climate Audit blog opened her eyes, and led her to investigate further (her specialities being Arctic ice and North Atlantic hurricanes), then to start her blog in 2010. If you are open to facts and science, you should read her blog posts and those of many well-informed contributors to it, particularly those by energy industry experts.”

o  
f one  
devoted  
to  
science,  
open  
to  
scrutiny  
and

Loading...

**Rob Starkey** |

March 29, 2023 at 11:09 am |

Alarmist dribble highlight worries about what could happen without reliable evidence that they will occur.

Loading...

**Richard S Courtney** |

March 29, 2023 at 12:08 pm |

JJBdaccili,

You are misinformed.

Global temperature rises 4.8C from January to June and falls by the same amount from June to January each and every year. This is because

- (1) it is winter in one hemisphere when it is summer in the other,
- (2) the N hemisphere is mostly covered in land and the S hemisphere is mostly covered in water,
- (3) land changes temperature more than water with the seasons,
- (4) so, the N hemisphere temperature varies more than the S hemisphere temperature with the seasons,
- (5) and global temperature is the average of the N and S hemisphere temperatures at all times.

Nobody notices the variation of global temperature within each year and the smaller rises which worry you are not in global temperature, but are in global temperature ANOMALY which is an arithmetic construct with no physical reality.

Richard

Loading...

**ChrisH** |

March 30, 2023 at 6:06 am |

Good answer! It is a sure sign that a person does not know what they are talking about when they refer to the global temperature anomaly (GTA) as average temperature.

Maybe you can help me with this: I work as a statistician (not in climate). I struggle to understand the rationale behind GTA; many statistical methods can analyze grouped time series data much more efficiently. GTA seems archaic and ad hoc. For example, as you alluded to, choosing a baseline period in the 1800s seems speculative. Why is it not discarded as the standard measure for temperature changes? Is it just too convenient?!

Loading...

**JJBraccili** |

March 30, 2023 at 11:37 am |

Another rocket scientist!

GTA is the deviation of the global average temperature from some fixed point. Why 1880 was chosen?

It had to be some point in the near past where humans weren't burning a significant amount of fossil fuels.

At the beginning of the industrial revolution is as good a point as any.

PPM is a relative concentration and a bad measure of the greenhouse effect of CO<sub>2</sub>. Absolute concentration is a better measure. It just so happens that at current conditions PPM can be a proxy for absolute concentration. People understand what PPM means and changing now would be confusing. Nobody is going to change how we determine GTA for similar reasons.

Loading...

**Jim Gorman**

| April 2, 2023 at 7:18 am |

JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 11:37 am |

You are sadly mistaken. There are two statistical distributions that make up a GTA anomaly. One is a monthly average at a station. The other is an average of a baseline at that station.

No tice the word "average" as in an arithmetic mean of a distribution. Each of those distributions are random variables having both a mean AND A VARIANCE. You never see the variance quoted. When adding or subtracting random variable means, the variance add. That is,  $\text{Var}(X \pm Y) = \text{Var}(X) + \text{Var}(Y)$ . Why is this never quoted, addressed, or mentioned? Instead, climate science finds an average of the anomalies and then calculates the standard deviation of the anomalies. What a great method to hide the actual temperature variation that make up the number. Figures lie, and liars figure!

dpy6629 | [March 30, 2023 at 11:18 am](#) |

This NASA page is classic pseudo-science and narrative promotion. And what they do say is probably wrong. Severe weather will decrease in a warmer world because of lower temperature gradients. There is zero evidence that warming so far has impacted crop yields. Plants do better with more CO2 and become more drought tolerant.

Loading...JJBraccili |

[March 30, 2023 at 11:53 am](#) |

Where at the beginning of the impact of climate change.

If you think more energy sloshing around on the planet is not going to cause more extreme weather events, I have a bridge for sale that I would like to talk to you about.

Loading...dpy6629

[April 18, 2023 at 8:39 pm](#) |

It is provably true that the Navier Stokes equations have no forcing terms involving the temperature itself, only the gradient of temperature. Thus lower gradients imply lower velocity solutions.

Loading...burlhenry | [April 18, 2023 at 9:55 pm](#) |DPY6629;

Your statement that severe weather will decrease in a warmer world is historically incorrect. See "El Nino in History" (subtitled "Storming through the Ages"), by Cesar N. Caviedes (2001) , University Press of Florida

Loading...

Paul-G | [March 29, 2023 at 1:17 am](#) |

[Judith](#) [Pingback: UN's climate panic is more politics than science - Climate- Science.press](#)

CKid | [March 29, 2023 at 6:13 am](#) |

The IPCC lost me when they ignored studies in IPCC5 that I had read but were against the preferred narrative. They did it again in IPCC6 by censoring any reference to contemporary and substantial literature about geothermal activity in Antarctica. A case could be made that those dynamics are not significant nor the crucial driver of WAIS instability. A scientific document would

Just like the Kremlin, maybe they don't want independent thought.

Loading...jim2 | [March 29, 2023 at 8:27 am](#) |

Another evidence-free claim ...Vanuatu, leading a core group of 18 nations, wants the International Court of Justice to issue its assessment of what countries are obliged to do in order to make sure that global temperature rise is kept below the Paris Agreement target of 1.5 degrees Celsius. While those who breach their official pledges will not be taken to court directly, the ruling would be the most authoritative legal voice on where they are falling short both in terms of emissions cuts and finance to poorer nations.

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-03-28/climate-vulnerable-vanuatu-takes-world-tocourt-overemissions> Loading...jim2 | [March 29, 2023 at 8:30 am](#) |

I'm thinking it's the "finance of poorer nations" Vanuatu is actually interested in, not global warming. It's just a chance to cash in for them. Just one more expense incurred based on a climate catastrophe Cimate Doomer nightmare. There's no way "green" energy is less expensive than fossil fuels when you factor in nonsense like this.

Pingback: [The Latest UN Climate Report Is Bumper-Sticker](#)

theciffclavenoffinance | [March 29, 2023 at 9:21 am](#) | FAILED TO MENTION

(1) Every climate prediction in the past 50 years was wrong, consistently predicting much faster global warming than actually happened, and

)2) The global average temperature failed to increase from 2015 to 2023, despite the largest eight year period of manmade emissions in history. No climate model predicted that.

[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 3:53 pm](#) |

More like, F+ in that the hypocrisy of what they do is so much in your face that it's obvious none of them actually believe anything they're saying... that's the politics of AGW, the science be damned!

Loading...

<https://th.bing.com/th/id/R.4c95f61f2cfba6bd0ab8fa2b3110de30?k=HCO%2F5g8iH%3f%2/2teyadng%2Aprt%21tas%2018%20%20mpa%207mg&th=0pAnCaU%20gXDMY%21HJ>

Scientists didn't make AGW political. That was the fossil fuel industry in the late 90s.

Loading...

[catweazle666](#) | March 29, 2023 at 5:40 pm |

Oh dear...

Loading...

[thecriffclavenoffinance](#) | March 30, 2023 at 5:37 am |

Just in case I was misinterpreted: The "F" was for Ms. Curry's writing. She is a nice person — so nice she allows me to criticize here hee. That's really nice and unusual freedom of speech.

Ms. Curry thinks climate change is about science, and science is her strong point, so she has a focus on science. In fact, there is only a little science in climate change, about 10%, called AGW. Easily proven to exist and be totally harmless.

The other 90% is politics — the CAGW predictions of doom that have been wrong since 1979, along with every other long term climate prediction in history. Those CAGW predictions are used to create fear in the general public, People in fear allow their governments to seize more power, and control them. That is the politics of climate change.

O

One can not refute predictions that are not based on science by arguing the science. Ms. Curry does not get that. That strategy has been tried since 1979, and has consistently failed. Using it again, and expecting different results, is a layman's definition of insanity,

O

One can ONLY refute predictions by clearly showing every prediction in the past was wrong — discredit the "authorities" that make wrong predictions

CAGW = predictions = no data = imaginary future climate

AGW = real science = with data = real past climate

In addition to the gift of 100% wrong climate and other environmental doom predictions for over a century, we have another gift:

[Wagathon](#) |

The global average temperature failed to increase since 2015 despite the LARGEST amount of manmade CO2 emissions in any eight year period in history.

Just like the Politburo of Russia, China, VP- Ms Harris and the Western schoolteachers of America now believe ~~at their least that are contradicted by CO2 misbehavior in America. It's a culture war, between the Socialists' collectivism vs the Founders' individualism. It's government programs vs the hard work of free enterprise. It's Leftist Utopianism and hypocrisy vs self-actualization and the actual existentialism of overcoming superstition and ignorance through knowledge, respect for truth and personal responsibility. It's helplessness vs reasoned and rational self-interest.~~

Pingback: [Another "Final" Climate Change Warming Warning – Newsfeed Hasslefree](#)

[Allsort](#)

[François Riverin](#) | March 29, 2023 at 11:15 am |

To me Vanuatu= Maldives. <https://tambonthongchai.com/2020/05/14/maldivessinking/>

Loading... [thecriffclavenoffinance](#) | March 30, 2023 at 12:19 pm |

If the Maldives don't sink from the weight of all the new construction on the islands — resorts, buildings, airports and overweight tourists too — they will be lucky.

ha ha Loading... [Gary Wagner](#) | March 29, 2023 at 12:42 pm |

Guterres is becoming increasingly hysterical as fewer rational people believe the UN doomsayers. I fear for the man's sanity. His handlers should help him dial down the rhetoric, or he might blow a gasket. He reminds me of the stereotypical maiden aunt, afraid of everything, poorly informed by the media, and in a frenzy looking for her cat. The UN was created to keep the peace, and has clearly failed miserably to do so. They don't even try anymore. Now the UN lectures the world about every perceived crisis except the ones they are responsible for. Time to wind them up and spend those billions on hungry kids.

[Wagathon](#) | March 29, 2023 at 3:46 pm |

JJBraccili | [March 29, 2023 at 5:42 pm](#) |

AGW does exist and is being driven by the use of fossil fuels. There is too much evidence to deny it. Ms Curry spends her time looking for anomalies and then literally makes a mountain out of a mole hill. Her current rant is on the accuracy of climate models. Climate modeling is like weather modeling — a work in progress. They'll get better as scientists better understand the processes involved. What's apparent is that AGW is occurring and increasing CO2 is the cause. When the atmosphere is treated like a toilet, there are going to be consequences. If you want to argue about the amount of warming in the future, you're on more solid ground. BTW A 2.5 C rise is a lot better than a 4.5 C rise but is still a catastrophe.

Loading...[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 7:39 pm](#) |

Not surprisingly, the fabrication of GCMs (General Circulation Models— the numerical models used by UN-approved global warming charlatans and climate change hoaxsters to simulate the laws of nature, the universe and everything to realize an ersatz digital reality they find useful to exaggerate the effects of CO2 on temperatures) to scare children, to stampede the superstitious and ignorant and to feather the nests of Leftist Western Academics in ivory towers who then spin prophecies of an impending Hot World catastrophe out of anti-science and hate-America babel, is not a productive activity in any economic sense. The global warming hysteria-Tower of Babel is useful only to help Leftists push their DC/Eurocommie political agenda.

Loading...JJBraccili |

What you're looking at is a composite IR spectrograph of the earth's radiant courtesy of NASA satellites. The blue area is earth's radiant energy. The pink area, under the CO2 label, is suppose to be blue. It represents the amount of the earth's radiant energy that CO2 is preventing from leaving the planet. That's what's causing climate change.

A picture is worth a thousand words.

Loading...[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 11:21 pm](#) |

Right now, at our current low levels of carbon dioxide, plants are paying a heavy price in water usage. Whether plants are C3 or C4, the way they get carbon dioxide from the air is the same: The plant leaves have little holes, or stomata, through which carbon dioxide molecules can diffuse into the moist interior for use in the plant's photosynthetic cycles.

The density of water molecules within the leaf is typically 60 times greater than the density of carbon dioxide in the air, and the diffusion rate of the water molecule is greater than that of the carbon-dioxide molecule. So depending on the relative humidity and temperature, 100 or more water molecules diffuse out of the leaf for every molecule of carbon dioxide that diffuses in. And not every carbon-dioxide molecule that diffuses into a leaf gets incorporated into a carbohydrate. As a result, plants require many hundreds of grams of water to produce one gram of plant biomass, largely carbohydrate.

Driven by the need to conserve water, plants produce fewer stomata openings in their leaves when there is more carbon dioxide in the air. This decreases the amount of water that the plant is forced to transpire and allows the plant to withstand dry conditions better. ~Harrison H. Schmitt and William Happer (In Defense of Carbon Dioxide)

Loading...

JJBraccili | [March 29, 2023 at 11:32 pm](#) |

That's got to be the dumbest reason ever for claiming we need to increase CO2 in the atmosphere. Plants seem to be getting along fine at lower concentrations of CO2,

Loading...[Wagathon](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 11:42 pm](#) |

evilincandescentbulbEmerson would have had great respect for George Bush

**The Prism of Reality and Perception** A holistic approach to global warming looks to manage our understanding of reality using our minds to put all of the pieces together into some kind of meaningful whole. To look at nature objectively, making sense of reality is a scientific endeavor and one of humanity's greatest challenges and its purest attempt at valuing truth for its own sake; and, the holistic perception of climate change to the modern mind is wholly irrelevant to that endeavor. Looking at the scientific evidence, Daniel Botkin (Article) challenges all of our perceptions about global warming. Climate is changing. Is it our fault? (See provenance of graph above, Here) As is well-known, we are blamed for causing a global warming mainly because our burning of fossil fuels is increasing the carbon dioxide (CO2) concentration in the atmosphere. Since this is a greenhouse gas, we must be warming the climate. ~Daniel Botkin (Ibid.) What we actually know to be true about humanity's impact on the world is not alarming. Only the allegations about humanity's disastrous impact on the world is alarming. "What is the evidence," Botkin asks, "that sea level is rising, that wildfires, drought, and episodes of very high temperatures are increasing, and what is the evidence that such changes are our fault?" What we're learning is being skeptical about what we think is reality is not natural at all. Scientific thinking is not holistic thinking. Thinking holistically has its virtues but its also an excuse for sloppy thinking, like adding shades of gray between the pencil lines to form a picture. Sure, sure, temperatures may be warmer in an area where humans chop down shade trees, blacktop streets, park cars and barbeque sides of beef over a mesquite fire. But, that is not global warming. The heat resulting from that sort of human-contribution is known as the urban heat island (UHI) effect —e.g., the heat from tailpipes, from motors that run air conditioners, heat generated by computers, fires in water heaters and fireplaces, blacktop streets that collect instead of reflect solar heat, buildings that block cooling breezes, etc. Heat due to UHI is only a local not a global phenomenon, despite a faintly irrational impulse to see examples of UHI and then label every inconvenient weather-related event an act of man, not God (especially for those who believe men are oil-driven evil doers whereas God is nothing more than a Judeo-Christian illusion).

Looking at something holistically is our touchy-feely way of viewing reality.

When, however, significant consequences are associated with our views, the holism concept with its bottom-up, sideways and backwards view of reality should not prevent us from taking on the rigorous and more skeptical approach of a scientific inquiry, beginning with a serious look at the facts. But we can always start by looking at the world holistically –e.g.,

Now, how about the facts. Let us leave the world of the mind. If we want to do more than just speculate, we must consider the history of the physical world around us before we can know the significance of our part in it. Depending on our holistic views you may not be happy with an objective evaluation of the facts if you secretly want humanity to have a starring role in climate change.

No chemical compound in the atmosphere has a worse reputation than CO<sub>2</sub>, thanks to the single-minded demonization of this natural and essential atmospheric gas by advocates of government control...

The incredible list of supposed horrors that increasing carbon dioxide will bring the world is pure belief disguised as science.

~Dr. Will Happer

Loading...

**ianl** | March 29, 2023 at 9:11 pm |

Coal, oil and natural gas (methane) are \*not\* fossils

You repeat this “fossil fuel” label purely as a propaganda point – and you know you do.

So far, about a 1C increase in 150 years. Which molehill was it again ?

Loading...**JJBraccili** | March 29, 2023 at 9:25 pm |

They are referred to as fossil fuels. I didn't invent the term. How is using the term “fossil fuel” propaganda? If I didn't use the term would that make them any less an existential threat?

It's actually a 1.1 degree increase. Yes, that's a big deal.

Loading...

**Swenson** |

March 29, 2023 at 10:56 pm |

No doubt you can explain why the planet cooled for four and a half billion years – up to now?

GHE not working properly?

Loading...

**JJBraccili** |

March 29, 2023 at 11:08 pm |

Since the planet started out as molten magma, it understandable that it would cool down.

CO<sub>2</sub> isn't the only thing that can control planetary temperature. During the history of the planet there were other sources that impacted the earth's climate more than CO<sub>2</sub>. Over the last 150 years CO<sub>2</sub> was mostly a bit player. In the aftermath of WWII, we started dumping ever increasing amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere and CO<sub>2</sub> became the driver of planetary temperature.

Loading...

**jim2** | March 30, 2023 at 5:30 am |

Plants start to die at 200 ppm. I'm sure they are better off with the 400+ we have now.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** |

March 30, 2023 at 11:19 am |

We were doing just fine with CO<sub>2</sub> at 280 ppm.

Loading...

**jim2** | March 30, 2023 at 5:31 am |

JJB seems to believe making life easy for plants is dumb. What's dumb is killing plants. Our very lives depend on plants. So who's the dumb person here?

Loading...

**jungletrunks** |

March 30, 2023 at 8:32 am |

JJ Hollywood: “During the history of the planet there were other sources that impacted the earth's climate more than CO<sub>2</sub>”

Our erudite actor speaks. But really, like water?

Water vapor is the largest GHG. Water vapor and CO<sub>2</sub> are two of the most essential ingredients for life. I'm surprised the woke community hasn't labeled CO<sub>2</sub> as racist yet. Oops, intellectually inbred wokers like JJ have already done this.



This is a situation where if you wait too long nothing can be done about the consequences. It's like being on the Titanic, seeing the iceberg, knowing it can't be avoided.

No model I use doesn't have uncertainty involved. You have to accept it and deal with it.

Loading...[jim2](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 9:37 pm](#) |

JJB has an unending list of unsupported claims.

[aaron](#) | [March 29, 2023 at 8:24](#)

[Chris Morris](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 1:43 am](#) |

I notice Roger Pielke in his substack has specifically called out IPCC for its mis-information. He details and references the bad science. Another politics trumping science example

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 11:13 am](#) |

I never heard of Roger Pielke. I looked up what he has to say about climate change.

As I have summarized on the Climate Science weblog, humans activities do significantly alter the heat content of the climate system, although, based on the latest understanding, the radiative effect of CO<sub>2</sub> has contributed, at most, only about 28% to the human-caused warming up to the present. The other 72% is still a result of human activities!"

He tries to minimize the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> and attributes the lion's share of global warming to other "human activities".

What other human activities? He does not say. What could it possibly be? The only major source of energy that could be a cause of climate change by human activity is energy production.

When you burn fossil fuels you don't just release CO<sub>2</sub> you also release energy that can warm the planet.

Here are all the possible source of energy that could warm the planet.

Solar Energy – 120,000 TW (Terrawatts)

Human Production of Energy – 20 TW

Geothermal Energy – 50 TW

Greenhouse gases prevent energy from the planet to radiate into outer space. There are not technically a source. The amount of energy that CO<sub>2</sub> prevents radiating into space is 10,000 TW.

Energy from burning fossil fuels is too small to matter. So is energy from human activities."

We now know, however, that the natural variations of atmospheric and ocean circulation features within the climate system produces global average heat changes that are substantially larger than what was known in 2005. The IPCC models have failed to adequately simulate this effect."

These are internal energy transfer that have no impact on planetary temperature. How do I know. Because from 1880 to 1960 planetary temperature tracked solar radiation. There is no indication that atmospheric and ocean circulation had any impact. If these were important, it would have shown up in the data.

Loading...[beththeserf](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 1:43 am](#) |

Carbon dioxide is definitely continuing to increase in the atmosphere, but Earth's surface and atmospheric temperatures aren't tracking it. ~Daniel Botkin (Ibid.)"

Isn't this a Popper/falsification of the CAGW theory?

Loading...[theciffclavenoffinance](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 5:44 am](#) |

You can't falsify the CAGW "religious" belief. Do n't worry, any flat trend of the global average temperature will later be "revised away", just like the 1940 to 1975

global cooling was revised away decades later

Inconvenient data always "disappear".

Climate change is a leftist propaganda strategy to gain more government power and control, and truth is not a leftist value,

Loading...[JJBraccili](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 11:16 am](#) |

I already presented a graph that shows this statement is BS.

Loading...[beththeserf](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 2:48 am](#) |

Here's Tony Brown's Long Slow Thaw CET temperature record showing 1940s' 50s' 60s' – post WW 2 and post 1980s' El Ninos. <https://io.wp.com/judithcurry.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/slide1.png?ssl=1>

[jim2](#) | [March 30, 2023 at 7:47 am](#) |

It's probably a good idea to avoid ESG ETFs and other ESG funds.

*If BlackRock Inc.'s largest ESG-labeled exchange-traded fund is a bellwether for the sustainable investing industry, it's fair to say the US sector may be in for a bumpy ride.*

*The assets of the iShares ESG Aware MSCI USA ETF (ticker ESGU) have dropped to \$13.8 billion from a high of \$25 billion as recently as a year ago. The slump occurred as shareholders pulled money from the ETF, but also as its investment performance trailed benchmark indexes, including the S&P 500, over the past two years.*

<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-03-30/why-esg-in-america-may-face-a-rough-road-ahead-this-year>

Pingback: [UN's climate panic is more politics than science – Watts Up With That? – The Insight Post](#)

Gary H | March 30, 2023 at 12:01 pm |

Now you went and done it Judith. Imagine what Sen Whitehouse would say to you now!

Loading...thecliffclavenoffinance

| March 30, 2023 at 12:21 pm |

Senator Outhouse Loading...Jay | March 30, 2023 at 12:09 pm |

Trying to reason with Braccili is fundamentally a waste of time and effort. He takes the position that all temperature measurements prior to the seventeenth century are merely "guesstimates based on inference". This stance allows him to disregard any historical information that does not suit his conclusions. For example, he is free to question any suggestions that there even were ice ages.

He also makes the claim that the models are steadily improving, but once again offers nothing to support his position.

He speaks about the dangers of warming, but doesn't seem to realize that the 1.5 degree number has no scientific basis, but was pulled out of thin air.

In short, there is no point in arguing with someone who seems to be working backward from conclusions.

Loading...JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 12:28 pm |

You and the others don't get it.

Climate change is all cause and effect. It doesn't matter what happened in the distant past. It doesn't matter what happened 10 minutes ago. The planet has no memory.

If solar radiation suddenly began decreasing significantly, the temperature of the planet would start falling regardless of what CO2 was doing. Right now, CO2 is the driving force, but it doesn't always have to be. The 1.5-degree C increase was a limit determined by experts as an amount of warming that the planet could tolerate without significant damage. The models predict how much warming will occur under different scenarios. Right now, it looks like we are going to blow through the 1.5-degree C limit without drastic action.

If you think you and the other knuckleheads know better than the experts, then go right ahead and keep making yourself look foolish. The science and the evidence are all on the side of the climate scientists.

Loading...thecliffclavenoffinance | March 30, 2023 at 12:47 pm |

Mr. Broccoli thinks always wrong wild guesses about the future climate are science. They become science to him because the predictions were made by scientists. That makes them the gospel. Never mind that every climate prediction has been wrong since 1979. And never mind there has been no global warming for eight years, from 2015 to 2023, despite the largest amount of manmade CO2 emissions in any eight year period in history. Inconvenient data, Mr. Broccoli? Interferes with your coming climate emergency fantasy? If so, just ignore anything that does not confirm your leftist beliefs.

Loading...catweazle666 | March 30, 2023 at 2:30 pm |

Oh dear... You really haven't the first clue what you're wittering about, have you?

Loading...thecliffclavenoffinance | March 30, 2023 at 12:42 pm |

Leftists represent half of the population.

The dumb half, brainwashed to fear the future climate.

With no understanding that today's climate is the best climate in the past 5000 years.

And that from 5,000 to 9,000 years ago, the climate was better because it was at least +1 degree warmer than today. That +1 degree C. warmer climate was called an Optimum.

An Optimum, because it was good news.

Today the Climate Howler Global Whiner's are claiming that if the average temperature rises +1 degrees C. AND GETS BACK TO the Holocene Climate Optimum level, that would NOT be another Optimum

It would be a Climate Emergency.

A Climate Optimum temperature has morphed into a Climate Emergency Temperature.

An amazing leap of non-logic.

To repeat, if there are any leftists reading this, who didn't get it the first time:

A +1 degree warmer than today climate is called a Holocene Climate Optimum, because it was in the past.

And the CO2 level in the atmosphere was at least 25% lower than today.

A +1 degree warmer than today climate is claimed to be Climate Emergency, because it is in the future.

That can only make sense to leftists, because leftists have no sense.

Pingback: [UN's local weather panic is extra politics than science – Watts Up With That? - news page](#)

Jay | March 30, 2023 at 1:00 pm |

Although I'm no doubt wasting my time, I note that invective is easier than reason. Perhaps you can give me the scientific references behind the 1.5 number.

By saying that what happened in the past is irrelevant, you are in fact declaring that there is nothing to be learned from looking at what might have caused temperature changes before 1850.

Very shortsighted.

You might want to take a look at Vaclav Smil's book "How the World Really Works", although you no doubt would quickly call him a knuckle head even though he believes in AGW. In this book he makes the statement that "noncarbon energies could completely displace fossil carbon in a matter of one to three decades ONLY if we were

take substantial cuts to the standard of living in all affluent countries and deny the modernizing nations of Asia and Africa improvements in their collective lots by even a fraction of what China has done since 1980". Is this your preferred route?

Loading...**JJBraccili** | March 30, 2023 at 1:52 pm | Perhaps you can give me the scientific references behind the 1.5 number."

<https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2865/a-degree-of-concern-why-global-temperatures-matter/>

Not that hard to find. You could have easily done it yourself if you had cared to look. By saying that what happened in the past is irrelevant, you are in fact declaring that there is nothing to be learned from looking at what might have caused temperature changes before 1850. Very shortsighted." It's not shortsighted at all. Unless you know all the conditions that existed at a past time, you can't draw any conclusions as to what the contribution of CO2 may or may not have been. Yet, you have idiots who do precisely that. They look at graphs with 1000-year tics and divine what role CO2 played back then. Then they use that to try to refute the role CO2 is playing now. It's ridiculous. Yes, without a scientific miracle, there will be a substantial upheaval in the status quo that will require sacrifice. It a "pay me now or pay me a lot more later" scenario. The "it's too much trouble" argument is not a very good one considering the consequences.

Loading...**morfu03** | April 1, 2023 at 2:09 am |

Aww, your link (<https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2865/a-degree-of-concern-why-global-temperatures-matter/>) is related to CMIP5 models, we know that those did not get the clouds right .. however we cannot be sure that the CMIP6 models, which seem better are good enough.

Either way, the conditions projected in that might have quite possibly because that type of projection is not science. It is belief in the wisdom of experts." Whose wisdom should we believe in? Yours? LMAO!!!!

Loading...**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:00 pm | Loading...**Ron Graf** | April 1, 2023 at 4:30 pm |

That paper was to show where the 1.5 deg C warming limit came from. It wasn't something that was pulled out of thin air. Unless you know all the conditions that existed at a past time, you can't draw any conclusions as to what the contribution of CO2 may or may not have been."

Loading...**Geoff Sherrington** |

April 1, 2023 at 4:52 am |

JJB,  
That NASA report that you linked is merely a what if? exercise.  
A report with rigour would chart the changes that have actually happened by now.  
There is little value in projecting what might have happened, because that type of projection is not science. It is belief in the wisdom of experts.  
Would you care to show a report that shows only the changes to date, with evidence for whether they are anthropogenic or natural, or a split of the two?  
My bet is that you cannot, because there is no alarm to be seen in events to date.

This is exactly what the senior climate scientists like Chris Folland and Phil Jones, representing the IPCC in 1999, set out to do by influencing a young eager newcomer to do with the science. Here is the story that followed.

Loading...**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:14 pm |

You want absolute proof that increases in CO2 will causes the changes that are being predicted. I can tell you one thing raising the temperature of the planet is not a good thing. That means there is a lot more energy sloshing around on the planet to cause mischief and it will.

By the time it becomes evident to someone like you that Armageddon is at hand, it will be too late to do anything about it.  
The chance of a scientific miracle that will get us out of this mess is slim to none.

There is plenty of evidence that the planet is warming, and CO2 is the cause. Even the fossil fuel industry admits it. The problem is people like you won't accept it. That's how it works with climate deniers. The only thing they

are waiting to believe is junk science and conspiracy that affirm their beliefs.  
**jim2** | April 1, 2023 at 5:17 pm |

Awesome video @Ron Graf.

Loading...**CKid** | April 1, 2023 at 6:19 pm |

What an indictment of the IPCC and all others involved. I've read a lot about this sorry episode in climate science but this little video is the most concise and most damning. The IPCC is still doing backflips to not dilute the message. person has to be brain dead to believe the hockey stick scam.

Loading...**Rob Starkey** | April 1, 2023 at 7:22 pm |

Yet the term climate change brings fear to most of the world's population and has captured the fancy of our president

Loading...**Joe - the non climate scientist**

Smil book [s] are excellent reads on basic history background on a variety of subjects , especially energy.

One significant point is that human life expectancy took a quantum leap starting in the late 1800's/early 1900's . The conventional wisdom is that improvements in sanitation and medicine were responsible. What is overlooked is the significant increase in productivity which began with the use of fossil fuels. As a result of the massive improvements in productivity, farming, manufacturing, etc, the industrialized world was able to shift from a subsistence existence to creation and innovation, including improvements in sanitation and medicine. It was the fossil fuels and energy that gave mankind the free time to make those improvements. In early 1800's it took 20+ minutes of human time to plant, weed, harvest, mill the grain, bake the bread, to make a single loaf of bread. 10 minutes in 1900 and today approx 2 secs to make one loaf of bread.

Loading...jim2 | March 30, 2023 at 2:33 pm |

California drowns in Global Warming!!

Severe storms that battered California this winter are set to continue into spring.

Atmospheric rivers and cold fronts have brought near-record rain and snow to areas that have been battling drought-like conditions for many years. More storms are predicted to make landfall in coming weeks. The storms have led to flooding, road closures, power outages and fatalities. They have caused billions of dollars in damages.

loading...burlhenry | March 31, 2023 at 9:06 am |

Gov. Gavin Newsom last week eased some drought restrictions after the three driest years on record.

He didn't declare the drought to be over because water shortages remain in parts of densely populated Southern California.

You might be interested in my article "The Cause of Atmospheric Rivers"

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/california-as-winter-storms-25-atmospheric-rivers-near-record-snow-billions>

Our current drought began in 2000, and there have been no periods of 4-5 years, or more, between eruptions since then..Since droughts are caused by a decrease in SO2 moisture nucleation sites, their decrease was largely due to those that are currently afflicting California are man-made global "Clean Air" efforts to reduce industrial SO2 aerosol pollution, and more recently, Net-Zero efforts to ban the burning of fossil fuels, which also produce SO2 aerosols.

It appeared that the 1990-1991 recession and others that followed, CO2 emissions fell but it reduced even further, more can be expected.

This was approved very quickly Burl. Reading the abstract you appear to be suggesting that these rivers are

loading...JJBraccili | April 1, 2023 at 4:57 pm |

made due to LACK of industrial activity by man. Is that correct?

I looked at your bibliography of papers. You have produced 11 papers. All your papers are about the impact of tonyb

Loading...

burlhenry | March 31, 2023 at 10:32 pm |

Tonyb

You said that reading the abstract I appear to be saying that the current atmospheric rivers are due to a LACK of

industrial activity <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/>

That is essentially correct.

They are normally caused by an absence of volcanic SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere, due to an absence of volcanic eruptions, for a period of 4-5 years, or more. This leads to a drought because of the absence of SO2 impact of global temperatures. What you missed is that CO2 emissions can fall and the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere can rise. The reason is the "fall" in CO2 emissions is not enough to decrease CO2 emissions below In that paper you claim that during the 1990-1991 recession and others that followed, CO2 emissions fell but it the CO2 removal rate. CO2 in the atmosphere actually increased during these periods. Warming will slow but it will not decrease.

Analysis of the impact of CO2 before 1960 is meaningless. From 1880 to 1960 planetary temperature tracked solar irradiance — not CO2 or SO2 concentrations. After 1960 it closely tracks CO2 ppm. I have already posted graphs showing this earlier in this thread.

As for the "CA SO2 atmospheric river theory." It's complete BS. Wildfires release significant quantities of SO2 into the atmosphere. CA has had a continuous string of large wildfires over the last several years. I doubt the atmosphere was lacking aerosols from SO2 over that period.

Early in this thread I post IR spectrographs of the earth's radiant energy. The impact of CO2 is clear. To say that it has no impact is nonsense.

SO2 aerosols is a regional phenomenon. That because the aerosols don't last in the atmosphere very long. CO2 is a global phenomenon because CO2 stays in the atmosphere a very long time and the concentration is fairly constant worldwide. Another reason this theory is BS.

It has been proposed to combat global warming that SO2 based aerosols be sprayed into the atmosphere. That will have to be done continuously by a large fleet of plane. That because the aerosols don't last in the atmosphere for long. Another crackpot idea along with these theories.

Loading...burlhenry | April 2, 2023 at 10:01 am |

JJBRACCILLI;

You say that my CA SO2 Atmospheric river is complete BS.

No, it is 100% correct. The problem is that you appear to be incapable of understanding what I have written. WHENEVER SO2 aerosol moisture nucleation sites decrease, the air becomes drier and temperatures rise. This is especially observed during stalled high pressure weather systems, where temperatures soar to disastrous levels, after a week or less, because all of the dimming atmospheric SO2 aerosols within the stalled area have settled out, cleansing the air, and increasing the intensity of the Sun's rays striking the Earth's surface within that area. Read my article "Stalled High Pressure Weather Systems" What is BS is your unprovable theory of climate change

Loading...

Did you take into account the release of SO2 by the wildfires in CA. By your lack of addressing it, the answer is NO

You have no idea if the levels of SO2 in CA are increasing or decreasing, but you are sure SO2 is responsible for the atmospheric rivers in CA. GIVE ME A BREAK!!!

I have to assume you are unaware that you can reduce CO2 emissions and still have CO2 increase in the atmosphere because the remaining CO2 emissions are above the CO2 removal rate. That destroys your rationale for CO2 emissions being benign.

Your "theory" is not gaining traction in the scientific community — not because they're trying to hide something it's because your theory is junk science. If you believe your "theory" is true, take it to a company like ExxonMobil

and see what they say. I'm sure their scientists could use a good laugh.

<https://chaamjamal.files.wordpress.com/2019/10/quora-5.png>

The pink area under the CO2 label is the amount of earth's radiant energy CO2 is preventing from leaving earth.

That about 9000 TW or 8% of the radiant energy of the sun that earth absorbs. To say that increasing CO2 has no effect on climate defies reality.

Do you something similar for your BS theory? NO!

Loading...burlhenry | April 2, 2023 at 6:34 pm | JJBRACCILI:

There is a long article on Google titled "What is in the air after a wildfire depends on exactly exactly what is burned"

The major components are CO2 and black carbon, with NO mention of SO2 anywhere in the article, which negates your assertion that I ignored SO2 emissions from the CA fires. There were none!

All that I am saying is that the reduction in the amount of SO2 aerosol moisture nucleating sites in the atmosphere results in drier air, which leads to droughts, wildfires, Atmospheric Rivers, heat waves, more intense tornados, etc. And there is nothing special about CA, these weather events are occurring around the world. Atmospheric Rivers are very real, and have been around for centuries. What alternate explanation do you have for their existence? With respect to my theory not getting any traction, it was only published on March 1 of this year..

And in light of my findings, the graph which you provided HAS to be BS .

Loading...JJBraccili | April 2, 2023 at 11:06 pm |

[Impacts-from-FireActivity#:~:text=Smoke%20plumes%20from%20wildfires%20and%20other%20biomass%20burning,and%20affect%20air%20quality%2C%20human%20health%2C%20and%20climate.](#)

What is this amateur hour?

How convenient! Atmospheric rivers is in the news lately and here you are. It's all caused by a lack of SO2 aerosols. You've "published" 10 papers on this subject before this one. None of them gained any traction. Newsflash! This one isn't going anywhere either. Take a hint. What's causing that is the massive amount of CO2 in the atmosphere. Your theory doesn't work on Venus and it doesn't work here because it's BS.

My only logic is BS? Here's where CO2 had to be declining and temperature was increasing. Then there

was the bogus argument about CO2. What direct evidence of you have? NONE! There is direct evidence of what increasing CO2 can do.

Consider Venus that has clouds of sulfuric acid that are highly reflective. They reflect 90% of incident solar radiation. The only thing that smells of BS around here is your theory

should

Loading... burlhenry | April 3, 2023 at 3:56 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

You are making a fool of yourself, ranting that I haven't considered the effects of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols from the CA wildfires (your first reference).

I am speaking of DECREASES in global SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions that lead to temperature increases. As stated in the abstract, Atmospheric Rivers occur when there are droughts preceding them. (And quite probably, also during the droughts).

In the Discussion section, I identify the cause of the droughts as being due to a decrease in the amount SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere, due to extended periods without any volcanic eruptions.

[Because of the lack of preceding volcanic inactivity, the current global 23 year drought HAS to have been due to global "Clean Air" efforts to reduce SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions. (That is, man made)].

You say that I have no evidence. I have abundant historical evidence where Atmospheric Rivers occurred during or after drought conditions.

Again, as a result of my findings, the GISS/NASA graph that you refer to HAS to be pure BS.

Loading...

[Tonyb](#) | April 1, 2023 at 11:23 am |

Burl

I am not saying I agree or disagree with your hypothesis. However "Deluges", "Cloudbursts" "raining cats and dogs", (aka Atmospheric rivers) are all apparent in the English records of the 13th, 14th, and 15th Century when industrial activity was also noticeable by its absence.

tonyb

Loading...

[burlhenry](#) | April 1, 2023 at 12:54 pm |

Tonyb:

As I observed in my article, Atmospheric Rivers are NORMALLY caused by a near absence of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere, due to periods of 4-5 years or more between volcanic eruptions. No industrial activity required.

For the 13th-15th centuries, I count 25 such instances, so it is not surprising that some appear in the

The letter reads...

"I assume Thursday's letter writers ("Curry injects much-needed realism into climate debate", 30/3) have done their research to match that of thousands of scientists around the world who contribute to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports. This work is done on a voluntary basis. None of them is paid by the IPCC, unlike Judith Curry, who receives funding from a fossil fuel company. If you are prescribed

<https://www.theaustralian.com.au/commentary/letters/voice-opposition-points-out-the-fears-of->

Loading...

[Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn](#) | March 31, 2023 at 6:20 am |

My post in the Oz today. There were several more pro-Judith posts:

Fiona Colin, Judith Curry's hurricane forecasting company CFAN is not dependent on commercial funding. Her clients include many major US government bodies such as NASA and NOAA, and state and local authorities, because CFAN is the best in the field. I've been in contact with Judith for about 15 years, and she is one of the most upright and honest people I have ever encountered. She entered the warming field because, being totally honest and upright herself, she wondered why people queried the claims in that field; and her eyes were opened.

Loading...

[Michael Cunningham aka Faustino aka Genghis Cunn](#) | March 31, 2023 at 6:21 am |

Oops, online, not in the paper.

Loading...

[Marc Hendrickx](#) | March 30, 2023 at 7:14 pm |

My letter to the Australian... Dear Editor,

The accusation that Dr Curry's views on climate change are shaped by payments from fossil fuel interests is a nasty slur on her character, completely baseless and highly defamatory (Letters 31/3). Using similar reasoning those promoting alarm and fear and "action" on climate change must only be doing so on the basis of continuing their financial gains and privilege through government grants and funding from the so-called

Braccili offers me a bulletin from NASA as an authoritative scientific response about the 1.5 degree increase. NASA is a government agency bound to reflect the policy of its master, the US government. As such, it is as far from a peer reviewed scientific article as it is possible to be. I have to assume that it is the best he can offer. I did note while looking at this reference that it suggests a significant increase in special weather events. This is pure speculation, as there have no increases over the last century.

I would also note that, while he is completely dismissive of any temperature or other data prior to 1800, he seems happy to accept US temperature data, notwithstanding that the vast majority of their sites have been compromised for many years.

us

Turbulence plays an essential role in weather and climate, and correctly representing its effects in numerical models is crucial for accurate weather forecasts and climate projections. However, the theory describing the effect of turbulence has not changed since its conception in 1950s, despite the fact that it is not representative

<https://phys.org/news/2023-03-turbulence-theory-complex-atmospheric-conditions.html>

Loading...

JJBraccili | March 30, 2023 at 10:08 pm |

Turbulence may play a role in weather, but it doesn't impact climate in any significant way.

How do I know? Because the temperature data tracks changes in solar radiation until 1960 and then it tracks changes in CO2 ppm. If turbulence were a significant factor that wouldn't be the case. Internal energy flows have zero impact on the energy on the planet.

Loading...

Curious George | March 31, 2023 at 1:33 pm |

After 1960 the temperature data also tracks the Dow Jones Industrial Average.

Loading...

[Wolf1](#) | March 31, 2023 at 1:58 pm |

Sorry bud, but your ignorance is extreme.

There can not possibly have been any type of global turbulence data prior to satellites; it is debatable just how much the satellites can capture it today.

Equally, the notion that CO2 tracks temperature is nonsense – there was global cooling in the 1970s to mid 1980s even as CO2 continued to increase.

But the biggest part of the nonsense beliefs that you have clearly not critiqued are the economic models postulating climate doom if X is not done by Y date – X and Y constantly changing over time. The reality is that the temperature shifts every 24 hour period by far more than the amount of the worst case global warming. There can be no tipping points, the net negative impact is very unclear (i.e. climate doomers discount the positive impacts of CO2 and temperature on things like food production) and therefore the reasons to implement draconian policies to fight very murky outcomes are extremely weak.

Loading...

Bill Fabrizio | March 30, 2023 at 11:28 pm |

The UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on Wednesday requesting that the International Court of

[Christos Vournas](#) | March 31, 2023 at 9:08 am |

It has been calculated by Milankovitch.

–

The Milankovitch cycle shows for current time Earth being in a slow cooling trend.

–

Milankovitch simply assumed the glacial periods should be associated with North Hemisphere's cooler summers. Which what happens in our time.

–

Actually when North Hemisphere is in cool summers, the South Hemisphere is in very Hot Summers.

–

Earth's surface thermal energy reservoir are Earth's oceans. There are much more oceanic waters in Southern Hemisphere, compared to the North Hemisphere.

Loading...

[Christos Vournas](#) | April 2, 2023 at 4:45 am |

Earth's atmosphere greenhouse effect is some +0,4 oC.

–

Earth's atmosphere greenhouse effect was very mistakenly estimated as being +33 oC which is very much wrong !

–

The +1,5 oC rise is due to orbital forcing, the additional CO2 cannot be considered as warming Earth's surface by +1,5 oC, because the entire atmosphere warms surface only by some +0,4 oC !

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**Bill Fabrizio** | March 31, 2023 at 9:39

<https://quillette.com/2023/03/29/the-state-of-nature/>

> If scientists are sidelined in policy decisions that get the science wrong, then correcting the record would be a matter of merely sticking to science, and would fall cleanly within the ambit of scientific expertise.

Alternatively, if scientists are sidelined in policy decisions because they have some reason not to express moral or political views overtly, or aren't given an opportunity to do so, that doesn't seem to "sideline" them any more than it would sideline an ordinary citizen.

> Further, scientists don't have any special expertise on questions of values and policy. "Sticking to the science" keeps scientists speaking on issues precisely where they ought to be trusted by the public. Mucking

Proposed House Resolution calls for offshore wind moratorium

The beginning: "A proposed Resolution in the US House calls for the Congressional investigation of a comprehensive list of potential liabilities arising from offshore wind development. Offshore wind work is to stop as the probe proceeds. The broad scope of the inquiry is clearly stated in the resolution's summary statement:

The long list of offshore wind liabilities that the Biden Administration ignores is well worth investigating.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:19 pm |

The track record of investigations by House Republicans is not good. It looks like the Keystone Cops are running things. It will go nowhere, and they will look like the fools they are. The Democrats are going to move forward with renewables and you and them can do nothing about it. The money has already been allocated.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 3, 2023 at 8:04 am |

Those off-shore wind projects need an extended environmental impact study!!

Loading...

**Quondam** | April 1, 2023 at 8:51 am |

The problem with climate models isn't that they're wrong, all models are approximations. It's that they aren't even wrong (w.p.)! For the climate scientist, it is a tenet of canonical faith that temperature gradients are induced in gases at equilibrium by gravitational fields. This notion was launched by Kelvin in 1862, scuttled by both Maxwell (kinetic gas theory) and Boltzmann (statistical mechanics) shortly thereafter, only to resurface a century later, unheralded, within the U.S. Weather Dept. By definition, equilibrium systems are non-dissipative and thermal gradients imply entropy creation and the dissipation of energy fluxes.

The academe appears to have painted itself into a corner of no escape save by refutation of the 2nd Law. It's perhaps about time to heed Eddington's admonition, "... if your theory is found to be against the Second Law of Thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for it but to collapse in deepest humiliation."

April 1 – RR THE WORLD WONDERS

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 1, 2023 at 5:33 pm |

That was mostly a word salad that says nothing.

CO2 induced Climate Change does not violate the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics. How charlatans usually make the argument that the law is violated is by saying the atmosphere is colder than the planet therefore, heat cannot flow from the atmosphere to planet only the other way around. BTW the one-way direction of the heat flow is why entropy change is either 0 or increasing.

Sounds plausible. Here's what the frauds aren't saying. The 2nd Law applies to the net flow of heat. In the case of Climate Change, it's still outward to space. CO2 recycles a fraction of the energy the earth is radiating into space. The 2nd Law is not violated.

Here's another example the earth radiates energy to the sun and the sun radiates energy to the earth. According to the fraud's logic, that's impossible because the earth is colder than the sun. The sun radiates a lot more energy to the earth than the earth radiates energy to the sun. The 2nd Law is not violated.

Loading...

**Franktoo** | April 2, 2023 at 2:12 am |

Quondam: Even after one averages the annual cycle, the Earth may have a steady-state temperature, but is not in equilibrium. Some energy from a 5800K sun's surface makes a detour through the Earth's atmosphere on its way to empty space at about 3.5 K. There is nothing "equilibrium" about this flow of energy.



Now a researcher has discovered that the same samples that contain SARS2 RNA also contain DNA from a number of animals known to have been sold in the Market, especially raccoon dogs. This observation might be meaningless if it weren't for the fact that infected animals (and people) shed large amounts of virus in their feces, which might also help protect the viral RNA from degradation. If it can be demonstrated that raccoon dog DNA and SARS2 RNA were found co-localized because both were originally in feces, then that adds up to infected animals in the market – the missing smoking gun. If animal DNA and SARS2 RNA can co-located

Loading...

[Ron Clutz](#) | April 3, 2023 at 1:58 pm |

Testing comment lost in moderation.

Loading...

[Ron Clutz](#) | April 3, 2023 at 2:10 pm |

According to Rutgers University professor of chemical biology Richard Ebright, the claim that humans contracted the virus from raccoon dogs sold for consumption in a Wuhan wet market is “pseudoscientific nonsense,” peddled by “stooges who have been peddling pseudoscientific nonsense for three years.” The researchers based their claim on data from Chinese scientists, which they have not made available for independent or peer review. Nor have they published the text of their study, choosing instead to send their findings to the Atlantic, which on Thursday declared the unvetted study “the strongest evidence yet that an animal started the pandemic.”

Former National Security Council official Jamie Metzl told Yahoo News that there's a “zero percent chance that the evidence released so far constitutes a smoking gun proving a market origin of the pandemic,” and that anyone pushing the raccoon dog claim as proof of such “is engaging in fraud.”

The trio of lead researchers on the study —Scripps Research Institute virologist Kristian Andersen, University of Arizona evolutionary biologist Michael Worobey, and University of Sydney biologist Edward Holmes—have a history of pushing sensational claims to the media designed to detract from the lab leak theory.

Loading...

[Franktoo](#) | April 4, 2023 at 7:06 am |

Ron: I said that we would have a “smoking gun” IF experiments demonstrated that SARS2 RNA and animal DNA were found together because they were deposited together in fecal matter. That would demonstrate infected animals were present in the Seafood Market just like infected palm civets showed us how the SARS1 began. However, if aerosols or sprayed droplets from infected humans could have been deposited on top of fecal contamination and preserved virus until testing, then there will be no smoking gun.

Ebright has been sounding off on the risks of lab experiments with potentially pathogenic viruses for years. Metzl has been a broken record on the lab leak hypothesis since 2020. I doubt any evidence would change their minds on this subject. The best evidence of the lab leak hypothesis is that SARS2 was found first in Wuhan, far from bat infested Southern China. However, SARS2 traveled around the world to France at the end of 2019, infected two patients and apparently died out, without anyone knowing how it got to France. SARS2 traveled from China to the West Coast of the US several times in January 2020 without anyone noticing EVEN THOUGH DOCTORS KNEW WHAT SYMPTOMS TO LOOK FOR. And it crossed the Atlantic to the East Coast a number of times in February without being detected. The failure of SARS2 to be identified first in bat-infested Southern China is relatively meaningless when we know it has traveled UNNOTICED much further than a few hundred miles to Wuhan when we were alert and knew what to look for.

I presume you are aware all of the first 150 cases in Wuhan were clustered within a few miles the Seafood Market and half of them patronized the Market. The non-patrons could have caught COVID from their neighbors who who did patronize the Market. None of the cases clustered around the WIV which is about 10 miles away. RaTG13 apparently isn't close enough to have served as the precursor to SARS2. I

If the Chinese government were willing to open the WIV's lab notebooks to inspection by foreign scientists and let them supervise re-sequencing of all of the viral samples in their collection, the world would have proof that COVID was or was not the result of a lab leak. I'm not sure such international scrutiny would take place if a pandemic began in the US, especially given the threat of litigation. Worse given popular disdain for experts these days (especially among Republicans), would a thorough investigation actually make a difference to public opinion? Most people believe what their social group believes and would be ostracized for listening to heresy.

Of course, the Chinese government is worse; the only truth allowed there is the “truth” that benefits the Communist Party, and that is all the people are likely to hear. The Communist Party looks bad whether the pandemic started in what should have been a highly safe laboratory or in wild animal markets that should have been closed or better regulated after SARS1. So China claims SARS2 came from outside their country. Advocates of the zoonosis hypothesis claim that all of the animals were gone from the Market when scientists came to sample them and that wild animal farms have been closed or placed off limits.

and consensus epidemiologists and replace them with others who were mostly proven wrong during the pandemic. IMO, we have become spoiled by a success at defeating many pandemic diseases (thanks to mandatory or coerced vaccination). Historically, more people have died of pandemic disease than war and we have given our government sweeping police power to fight both.

You might want to remember that the origin controversies BEGAN with Dr. Andersen bringing concerns that the genome of SARS2 might have been engineered to Fauci, who organized a Zoom conference with a dozen experts. Those discussions changed Andersen's mind and he and several other participants rushed out a scientific paper, but it wasn't "commissioned" by

Fauci or Collins. The scientific method is based on trying to disprove hypotheses and that is what I see Andersen doing. The opinion piece in Lancet originated by the conflicted Daszac is a different story.

Loading...

[Ron Clutz](#) | April 5, 2023 at 3:04 pm |

Thanks for that additional information. I am not as forgiving as you regarding Fauci's role in all this. As you say, Fauci doesn't "commission" studies. But there is evidence that he rewarded researchers afterward.

Johns Hopkins professor and surgeon Dr. Marty Makary testified before Congress on Tuesday, (Feb. 28, 2023) saying that two top virologists who initially supported the lab leak theory changed their stances before receiving major grant funding.

Dr. Martin Makary testified before the House Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis, claiming it was a "no brainer" that COVID-19 originated in the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV). He was responding to a question about grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to EcoHealth Alliance, the nonprofit organization that funneled American taxpayer dollars to the WIV.

Makary eventually focused on an early 2020 exchange between Dr. Anthony Fauci, then-Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and two leading virologists in the United States — Scripps' Institute immunologist Dr. Michael Farzan and Tulane University's Dr. Robert Garry. Both men raised a high level of concern about a potential lab leak to Fauci, but soon changed their stories, since-revealed

"...

<https://www.news-medical.net/news/20210217/The-origin-of-SARS-CoV-2-furin-cleavage-site->

Loading...

Yes, CDC Director Robert Redfield also had reasons to suspect a Wuhan lab leak

Redfield began criticizing gain-of-function research, saying, "I think it probably caused the greatest pandemic our world has seen." He then explained what the lab did months before the virus began rapidly spreading.

"In September of 2019, three things happened in that lab. One is they deleted the sequences. That is highly irregular, researchers don't usually like to do that. Second thing they did was they changed the command and

<https://dailycaller.com/2023/03/08/former-cdc-director-lays-out-three-red-flags-point-lab-leak-robertredfield/>

Loading...

[Rob Starkey](#) | April 5, 2023 at 6:21 pm |

Cat- excellent points succulently stated.

Loading...

[jim2](#) | April 5, 2023 at 9:00 pm |

*The spike protein is a focused target of COVID-19, a pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2. A 12-nt insertion at S1/S2 in the spike coding sequence yields a furin cleavage site, which raised controversy views on origin of the virus. Here we analyzed the phylogenetic relationships of coronavirus spike proteins and mapped furin recognition motif on the tree. Furin cleavage sites occurred independently for multiple times in the evolution of the coronavirus family, supporting the natural occurring hypothesis of SARS-CoV-2.*

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33340798/>

Correction: Three of the four major families of coronaviruses have some members with a furin cleavage sites between the S1 and S2 subunits of their spike proteins. SARS2 was the first member of the beta-coronavirus family to have one. The presence of furin cleavage sites in the other three families proves that families can gain furin cleavage sites by: a) recombination between major families (assumed to be harder than within a family) or b) by independent evolution of a novel function – ability to be cleaved by furin – multiple times. This is called "convergent evolution": Random mutations converged on the same new function three (and now possibly four) different times. IMO, the furin cleavage site is NOT an "almost certain indicator" of gain-of-function modification.

The furin cleavage site is provided by a 12 nucleotide/4 amino acid insert. Normally this would occur by

One the other hand, the furin cleavage site found in the early variants of SARS2 was not an optimal sequence that would be chosen by a genetic engineer. And the furin site has mutated to a more easily cleaved consensus site in later variants including Delta and Omicron. So the furin site doesn't look properly engineered or easily produced by evolution.

A furin cleavage site has been genetically engineered into a number of coronaviruses, including the deadly, but marginally transmissible SARS1 around 2010 in the US.

Frank, I am not as forgiving of Fauci as you. For example:

The paper, later published in Nature Medicine, argued that Covid had "mutations" that supported the explanation that it had been transmitted to humans from animals.

One of the four authors, Dr. Kristin Andersen, admits in a cover email sent to Nature that Fauci "prompted" the paper's drafting in order to "disprove" the lab-leak theory.

Loading...

Franktoo | April 6, 2023 at 5:25 am |

Thanks for alerting me to the testimony of Dr. Makary. I find his assertions that Andersen and Garry (and Farman?) were paid off for changing or suppressing their views about the origin of COVID with \$9M grants absolutely absurd. Teams of younger professors discuss and rate research grants on the basis of merit and track-record and they are normally funded from best to worst until all available funds have been allocated.

<https://www.factcheck.org/2023/03/scicheck-no-evidence-scientists-received-grant-for-changing-opinion->

Thank you too for Redfield's testimony. Deleting sequences is suspicious, but there is nothing earth shattering in the sequences that have been recovered so far. Putting the facility under military control also sounds suspicious. Finally I think there were need to be a major interruption and decontamination if the entire ventilating system were being replaced. I suppose we will hear more when the IC reports.

However, as best I can tell, September is too early for Patient Zero and the virus we know of as SARS2 beginning in January of 2020 with a reproduction rate of about 4. This produces a doubling of cases every 2.5 days, about 4000-fold a month. If the pandemic started in September, there would be 1,000 to 1,000,000 times too many cases by 2020 – unless the virus then was a less-transmissible, less deadly precursor to SARS2 that would be hard to distinguish from a common cold. Furthermore, donated blood has been thoroughly tested for the earlier signs of SARS2 and non were detected until late December? Finally if there were a crisis big enough to bring in military supervisors and take these other steps, I can't see the authorities not warning local hospitals about what to be alert for. SARS1 was barely contained the two times it crossed over (and the six lab leaks). One mutation could have made it more easily transmitted. I don't see the Chinese making such an enormous error when containment was essential to success with SARS1.

Best

Loading...

Franktoo | April 7, 2023 at 3:31 am |

Ron: The Chinese paper reporting on the swabs from the Wuhan Seafood Market finally appeared and resolved by confusion over whether any animals from he market had or had not been tested. The answer is both! The Market was closed on January 1 and scientists were testing and disinfecting for 2 months. All the live animals for sale had been removed, but they found meat from 18 different kinds of animals in freezers

Frank, yes it's out, and as you suggest more questions than answers, even as media jumps the shark to the preferred conclusion.

<https://arstechnica.com/science/2023/04/chinas-flawed-covid-analysis-bizarrely-suggests-pandas-were-inwuhan-market/>

'The analysis cannot determine if the animals were infected with the pandemic virus, or, if they were, whether any animal-to-human or human-to-animal transmission occurred. Thus, it can't conclusively determine how the pandemic began. However, as many virologists and infectious disease experts have since noted, if a natural spillover event did spark the pandemic, this close mingling of genetic material in a suspect market at the epicenter of early cases is exactly the type of genetic evidence scientists would expect to find after the fact. Such markets, with a menagerie of wildlife in close, crowded conditions with humans, are known to act as hotbeds of risk for viral adaption and spillovers.'

Loading...

dpy6629 | April 7, 2023 at 12:10 pm |

For Ron and Frank I'll relate an experience in CFD that shows how the scientific "system" can distort findings and results in scores of at the best misleading and biased papers remaining uncorrected.

Tony Jameson was one of the founders of modern aeronautical CFD and made many very strong contributions in the 1970's and 1980's. However, he became embittered by Boeing's paid use of his codes

adjoint” method. In this method, Tony developed the adjoint operator in continuous space and then separately discretized it. Every numerical optimization expert realized that they had tried this in the 1970's and it was a poor method, plagued by non-convergence and a tendency to get “stuck” far from the optimum. The vast majority of methods and codes used the discrete adjoint method in which the discrete operator was simply transposed.

Yet, there was only a single paper contrasting the two methods and finding the usual result. It was by Frank and Shubin and was correct even though having some issues. No one else dared to publish their findings even though scores of researchers initially tried the continuous method and universally found it wanting. Meanwhile Jameson has perhaps 40 papers out there advocating the flawed method with demonstrably false claims about its efficiency and robustness.

We finally published a paper for the AIAA Design Optimization Workshop where we ran off Jameson's codes (run by one of his apostles) against our more traditional methods. Our codes clearly won by a wide margin. However Jameson's apostle who I won't name late in the process claimed he had a “new” design that he wanted to appear. I began plotting up results and it became clear that this “new” design was essentially identical to one of our earlier designs. I confronted him about this and he admitted that his “new” design used our design as a starting point. Our paper did have a very clear and repeated discussion of this and that the later design was not a good test for comparison, but our co-author insisted it appear.

A couple of years later Jameson gave a big invited talk on his method and he presented these designs (omitting the key fact about the last minute design) and appearing to show his code gave a better design. That was a lie.

In any case, for at least 20 years, progress was impeded by Jameson's influence and fear of him by junior researchers. To this day, none of the incorrect papers have been retracted or corrected.

Loading...

**Franktoo** | April 8, 2023 at 4:51 am |

Thanks for the sad story about CFD. Biology faced a similar problem for several decades: Predicting the three-dimensional structure a protein would adopt from the sequence of the amino acids it contains (ie the DNA sequence). Getting crystals of proteins with high enough resolution to solve by X-ray crystallography was a huge bottleneck. With at least two rotatable single bonds in each amino acid residue (usually with three local minima) and perhaps 100 amino acids, trying all of the possible conformations one at a time was impractically slow. If proteins folded by randomly trying all of the possibilities and settling on the best one, folding would take longer than the lifetime the universe. This meant there must have been a rational path by which proteins folded. Every year or two, a competition was held to see whose methodology would give the best 3D structure for 5-10? new proteins whose structures were being solved by X-Ray crystallography. The results were pretty bad for a long time, with at best half of the structures having some resemblance to the real thing. Then one year, the alpha-fold(?) program got every structure correct. And did so the next year. Google has produced it own version of this software and recently produced folded structures for all known proteins. Cyro-electron

It is a little reported fact that the palm civet theory for the origin of SARS1 was on the ropes in the years leading up to the SARS2 outbreak. The first problem with the theory was uncovered by Daszak's EHA,

*To trace the possible geographical origin of SARS-CoV-like virus, we sampled 1,107 palm civets from the provinces the market vendors claimed that market animals had been traded from. These provinces included Anhui, Beijing, Fujian, Guangxi, Henan, Hebei, Hubei, Hunan, Jiangsu, Jiangxi, Shanxi, and Shaanxi. Surprisingly, for the period of January to September 2004, all of the 1,107 civets sampled in other parts of China tested negative for SARS-CoV-like virus.*

Ralph Baric, the most noted coronavirus expert in the world, by <https://www.microbe.tv/twiv/>

Loading...

**Ron Graf** | April 8, 2023 at 9:17 pm |

The reason Anderson attached the paper was because it NIH funded experiments in Wuhan were making viruses to infect mice engineered with human ACE2 receptors in their lung tissue, viruses very much like SARS2. But one of the specific research aims was to confirm that civet cats and racoon dogs were infected by a

This theory was further supported by EHA authored [2018 study, where individuals living near a Yunnan bat](#)

*Our study provides the first serological evidence of likely human infection by bat SARSr-CoVs or, potentially, related viruses. The lack of prior exposure to SARS patients by the people surveyed, their lack of prior travel to areas heavily affected by SARS during the outbreak, and the rapid decline of detectable antibodies to SARS-CoV in recovered patients within 2–3 years after infection strongly suggests that positive serology obtained in this study is not due to prior infection with SARS-CoV (Wu et al. 2007).*

Loading...

organized and expedition to the Yunnan town 1000 miles south of Wuhan and collected samples from the mine, repeating this trip six more times over the next 5 years. Shi withheld from the outside world the atypical pneumonia, and we only found out about it in June 2020 when a Twitter persona pointed to the discovery of a translated China masters thesis outlining the case. (Oddly, the head of the China CDC, George Gao, the one who ordered the Wuhan market samples taken, did his doctoral thesis on the same sick miners 2012 incident.) When SARS2 broke out and Shi published the viral sequence and that of 96% similar RaTG13, she forgot to mention that this closest known cousin of SARS2 was collected in 2013 from that same copper mine where the miners got atypical pneumonia and George Gao's these speaks of strangely opaque chest scans, very familiar with the China doctors treating atypical pneumonia in Jan 2020.

Would anyone's mind be changed if we did have proof? The origin of COVID is now a political issue and deeply held political beliefs aren't changed by scientific "proof". We've had Jim Jordan bring in a highly respected doctor to testify that Fauci bribed two scientists with large grants so they would publicly oppose the lab leak hypothesis.

Fast Eddy continued: "two Wuhan labs experimenting similar viruses.

The Wuhan Institute of Virology specializes in viruses that cause disease, especially coronaviruses (the biggest pandemic threat to China). The Wuhan Center for Disease Control deals with all kinds of infectious AND NON-infectious diseases. They aren't doing the cutting-edge virus research that the WIV does. This is why all of the attention is focused on the WIV, even though the Wuhan CDC is only a mile from the Seafood Market.

Fast Eddy continued: "But we do have proximity."

The Seafood Market is about 10 miles from the WIV across the Yangtze River. One analogy might be that the Seafood Market is in Newark, NJ and the WIV is in Manhattan. All of the first 150 cases lived in New Jersey and half of them patronized the Seafood Market. This is an imperfect analogy, since the Yangtze was halfway between the two and some cases were on the far side of the river from the Seafood Market but not closer to the WIV. Wuhan (11M) and NYC (9M) are roughly the same size cities.

Many don't understand what kind of place the Huanan "Seafood Market" was: A shopping emporium with 678 stalls with goods from all around China that has the floor space of 10 US Supermarkets including a thriving wild animal trade. Meat from 18 different species (including snake and crocodile) was found in the freezers when scientists arrived, but none of the live animals that were known to be sold there remained when scientists arrived. The appropriate question probably not: "Did ANY animals for sale come from bat-infested Southern China, but HOW MANY did?" For centuries, Chinese and Asian cuisine has included many exotic foods. Korean "H-Marts" in the US have vastly more things for sale than a US Supermarket.

Fast Eddy continues: [There is a] plausible theory ( lab leak).

BOTH the lab leak hypothesis and the zoonosis hypothesis ASSUME the existence of a naturally-occurring coronavirus more similar to SARS2 than any we know about today (RaTG13 or BANAL-52). In the zoonosis hypothesis, this coronavirus had become adapted to mammals in some intermediate species and then spilled over to humans from the intermediate species or from bats. (At least one naturally-occurring coronavirus isolated from bats was able to invade cells through the ACE2 receptor that is not used in bats, so bats have become infected with mammal-adapted viruses. Spillover can be a two-way street.)

Likewise, the lab-leak hypothesis requires an unknown coronavirus much closer SARS2, because there are 1000 nucleotide changes between RaTG13 and SARS2. That many changes would normally take about 50

<https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.abf8003>

If so, all the suspicious September events cited by Redfield occurred too early to be associated with the index infection. Furthermore, if these events were in response to a known lab leak, it would take time for officials to investigate, figure out what had happened, make decisions and implement those decisions. For example, the military wouldn't be able to take over control of the lab in a few days. That decision would be made in Beijing and it would take time to identify, approve, and transfer an officer capable of running the WIV. A mid-August accident might result in a mid-September takeover by the military, a replacement ventilation system and removal of sequence data. And if they were doing all that in response to an accident or leak, why wouldn't they be alerting and surveilling all nearby hospitals for pneumonias of unknown cause? Redfield's aversion to GoF experiments may be distorting his judgement

Loading...

Franktoo | April 9, 2023 at 6:58 am |

Thanks for the references Ron Graf. I was aware of the possibility that the palm civets could have been

Shi obviously kept back critical information about RaTG13 (which was claimed to have been identified by sequence fragments, but never isolated so that it could be used in experiments) and the miners.

The Republicans are making a big deal out of the fact that Andersen "changed" his mind about features inconsistent with evolution after the Feb 1 Zoom call. Groupthink, confirmation bias and party loyalty mean politicians immediately know what they believe about new information. Scientists should work that way. The

he would rush out a paper, but I can't independently evaluate the quality of his reasoning. As I read the paper, a lab leak was the least favored three scenarios – scenarios we still think are viable today.

As for Fauci and Collins, they may have hoped that China would be more cooperative in investigating the origins of SARS2 if US scientists weren't unnecessarily supporting the conspiracy theories of the orange blowhard about the "Chinese Virus". A discussion among a dozen experts might keep Andersen or others from rushing out to publish something unsound. Fauci claims that half the participant shared concerns that the virus looked engineered. One person took notes during the meeting, but they weren't declassified.

Loading...

[Ron Graf](#) | April 9, 2023 at 12:52 pm |

Frank wrote: "Both the lab leak hypothesis and zoonosis absolutely require starting with a coronavirus much closer to SARS2 than any we know today."

Nobody is disputing the natural threat of pandemic potential viruses. In fact, virologists widely accept that bats are the ultimate source of all coronaviruses, including one that causes the common cold. But crossover events are very rare. Viruses are very host specific. When zoonosis does occur from large exposure with an infected animal a virus unadopted to the new host cannot then propagate without learning to turn off immune responses and gaining the genetic key codes for easy cell entry. As far as finding the virus precursor to SARS2, we know the China military were using the WIV and collecting SARS viruses. Two of SARS2's closest cousins after RaTG13 were collected by the PLA in 2018. These are the published ones but we know that even the civilian Chinese virologists were not publishing everything they found. It was not until 11 months after the pandemic outbreak before Shi admitted there were 8 more SARS strains that came from the same mine related to the 2012 incident that had been submitted for publishing just prior to the outbreak and would appear soon. This is at a time when all journals had lifted their sequesters on any SARS relating publishing yet these remained unknown to the world until 2021. Shi claimed that RaTG13 had remained sitting in her lab unsequenced for years because she lacked the equipment. But she did not publish when it got sequenced either, which we can see was 2018 from the raw reads. When she published it in Feb 2020 the paper said that it had just been sequenced in review of viruses similar to SARS2. Again, no mention was made of the atypical pneumonia that brought her to the location to find the virus and its cousins 2012-2018.

Frank: "Nature cranked out SARS1 in 2002 and SARS2 or its "lab-leak-precursor" in 2019."

We don't know where SARS1 came from. That mystery re-opened and was under investigation and debate

*The earliest sample with evidence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA was from September 12, 2019, and the positive patient was also positive for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies (IgG and IgM). Mutations typical of B.1 strains previously reported to have emerged in January 2020 (C3037T, C14408T,*

frank, how do you and Fauci's virologist square your logic that cases connected to visiting a Wuhan live animal market in December explain cases in Italy in September?

Loading...

[dpy6629](#) | April 9, 2023 at 8:08 pm |

My concern here is that we will never know for sure how Covid19 started due to the fact that the CCP has created in China the kind of totalitarian state control of "information" that many of our elites not to mention Putin only dream of. We do know that China's travel restrictions inside China while allowing international flights to leave virtually guaranteed this would become a worldwide pandemic. Likewise given what we now know about the Twitter files and the Russiagate hoax thanks to Musk and Gerth, I don't trust much that I read in the American corrupt media. It's a real problem if citizens are not allowed to see all the information and make up their own minds. That is the end of Democracy, not a President disputing the results of an election.

On a side note, Matt Tiabbi has a great muckraking post on substack about MSNBC where he gives all the quotes from that network that reference the fraudulent Hamilton 68 dashboard over many years. It is literally a couple of hundred!! How can anyone trust anything said on that network given that they have not corrected the record or apologized? They are now well known propagandists for massive disinformation campaigns in collusion with the deep state and big Tech. They don't even try to hide it or explain themselves. They just hope most people won't go to substack and read about their utterly shameful lies.

Be very very skeptical of anything you read in the media or see on social media. Even worse, Ioannidis has several great essays going through how corrupt and full of fraud and bias science became during the pandemic. Hopefully, Judith and I will have a post soon with all the references. For now just google Tablet and Ioannidis

We know now that the Chinese were not sharing the most important clues relating to SARS1 and they were using the missing links to string the NIH and Pasteur Institute along to give more bioengineering technology and money in exchange for answers they were never going to supply.

Frank and the Fauci virologists are correct that SARS was poised for natural spillover. As Frank pointed out, the WIV had found SARS viruses that could utilize the human ACE2 receptor even though this did not come from bat host evolution.

A plausible explanation could be infected bat fecal contamination on crops and infected human manure used as crop fertilizer that then fed bats contaminated dung beetles, a favorite food for horseshoe bats, including the

lone pangolin to have its own uniquely adapted SARS virus that could only occur outside of a lab in a very rare circumstance of multiple recombination events.

Though after must searching in 2020, EHA was unable to find any corona viruses of any type in any pangolins in the wild or on farms, only smuggled ones. Alina Chan of Harvard and MIT, noticed that the multiple cases reported of pangolin cov were in fact falsifications using the same "raw reads" sequencing data from the lone, original case from March 2019. I recommend her 2022 book, *Viral*, coauthored with Matt Ridley.

This fact pattern would lead a reasonable investigator to ask the questions that could quickly solve this mystery if that were allowed.

I don't understand why scientists haven't commented more on the early positives in Italy and possibly elsewhere. In the case of PCR, there is always the possibility of contamination from current infections while handling these older samples, especially when PCR is run to high cycles (not mentioned). (The CDC contaminated their early tests before shipment.) However, PCR plus antibodies seems pretty solid. However, without sequencing data to put these samples on an evolutionary tree Italy can't tell us anything.

First, I've been recently reminded that superspreaders are critical to pandemic spread and IIRC most infected people don't pass the disease on to anyone. That means that there are a lot of dead ends on the evolutionary tree of SARS2, which are important early in the pandemic. And if we are dealing with a pre-SARS2 that is less transmissible between humans, there could be a half-dozen dead end before the pandemic finally got started for good.

Second, we don't expect zoonosis to result in a single crossover to humans. If it happened once in a place like a wet market, it can happen again. There were at least two independent crossovers with SARS1, the second two years after the first and after the first had finally been stamped out. MERS has crossed over multiple times. I've read the same is true for various influenzas.

Now let's postulate a wild animal farm with raccoon dogs infected with SARS2 or, if you prefer, a sample of feces with SARS2 in the WIV. The virus infects a few people without causing a superspreader event and the chain of transmission dies out in less than a month. One branch ends up in Italy in September and dies out. Perhaps, this pre-SARS2 needs one more mutation to become as transmissible as the December 2019 SARS2. Now another batch of infected wild animals leaves the farm and end up in the Wuhan Seafood Market. By this time there is an A and a B lineage and both crossover to humans. Or you can postulate multiple lab leaks. Then the Chinese government goes around shutting down all of the wild animal farms that sent animals to Wuhan and kills destroys all of the animals. No more crossovers to man, though SARS2 may survive in the vicinity in squirrels or cats or...

Obviously, there is some wild speculation above. However, what we do know for sure is that half of the first 150 cases were patrons of the Seafood Market, lived relatively nearby and not near the WIV. The other half were neighbors of those who patronized the Seafood Market. In the case of SARS1, the first human cases handled wild animal in markets and were likely first infected by the animals they handled, even if we can't be sure which animal infected people first and which animals were infected by people second. Now the wife of an infected

<https://www.npr.org/sections/goatsandsoda/2022/03/03/1083751272/striking-new-evidence-points->

Best

Loading...

Franktoo | April 11, 2023 at 5:23 pm |

Ron Graf wrote: "Nobody is disputing the natural threat of pandemic potential viruses. In fact, virologists widely accept that bats are the ultimate source of all coronaviruses, including one that causes the common

I'd say that crossover events are threatening to occur all of the time, but rarely succeed in causing pandemics. In the paper below, 12% of people in Myanmar working in logging, hunting and forests tested positive for antibodies to sarbecoviruses. I've read that American pig and chicken farmer (and presumably their Chinese counterparts) are screened every so often for antibodies to influenza and occasionally test positive to a new strain that can infect a human who has been exposed to large quantities of virus, but which can't replicate to

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1201971233000644>

To successfully break out, a virus needs genes for: a spike protein that can gain entry to cells in a new host, a series of "non-structural proteins" (nsp's) needed to "take over" host cell machinery and devote it to viral replication, and another set of non-structure protein to neutralize the innate immune system (interferons). Some of these genes work better in different species than others. When bats (or animals or even people) are co-infected with multiple coronaviruses, they can swap these genes by genetic recombination and try many more possibilities than any lab in Wuhan. I read one paper where scientists in the US made a chimeric virus that incorporated the spike protein from Omicron (which is faster at transmission) into the original variant (which is more deadly). Oh no, GoF! This chimera was more deadly in mice expressing the ACE2 receptor. At the same time, they were looking for such chimeric viruses among the hundreds of thousands of SARS2 samples we have sequenced – and finding candidate chimeras.

compatible with politically acceptable narratives. All should make a point *not* to discard inconvenient facts. Are you unhappy with the scientific peers that remain silent when they see misleading narratives reported to the public because they are fearful they will be blamed for undermining public trust in their institutions? I assume that's a yes. Then I think you agree there is no good reason for the lab leak origin possibility to have been labeled a conspiracy theory by the scientists who admittedly privately felt there was a very good chance of it. Do you also agree that the science reporters had no good reason to go along with a fake narrative? For example, the NYT justifies their reporting by being forced, like all respectable people, to naturally claim the opposite of Trump the racist.

When you talk about the frequency of SARS spill overs you are assuming that China was completely open when we know that's not true. We know the science was not settled on civet origin of SARS1 but the science is pretty much settled on the date of appearance of SARS2 as being most likely in the summer of 2019. Yet

OTOH, Nov. 2022, Neil Harrison and Jeffrey Sachs replied to Garry claim of natural SARS 2

<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2215826119>

There is no consensus on the origin of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (1). We recently called for an independent inquiry (2). Garry has commented (3), as quoted, and we respond briefly here.

“No accusation was made (2). EcoHealth Alliance (EHA)–WIV–UNC have had a strong interest in protease cleavage in enhancing coronavirus infectivity (7), as expressed in the DEFUSE proposal (8) to insert FCS into novel viruses (2).”

“We know little about unreported viruses available to EHA–WIV–UNC (2). Concerns about these should be

Further to Ron Graf's comment above April 11

Loading...

**Bill Fabrizio** | April 16, 2023 at 12:05 pm |

Just wanted to thank Frank and Ron, and all the others, for the great back and forth on the covid origin issue.

*After a boom in wind and solar generation, regulators in the nation's top energy-producing state are pushing ahead with a plan that would incentivize more natural gas plants on the power grid.*

*The new framework could remake Texas' electricity mix for years to come, clouding the outlook for renewable energy even as federal incentives are pushing those sources onto the grid.*

Loading...

<https://www.eenews.net/articles/how-texas-electricity-plan-could-change-the-grid/>

**Christos Vournas** | April 2, 2023 at 1:32 pm |

### What is the greenhouse effect?

“Scientists have determined that carbon dioxide's warming effect helps stabilize Earth's atmosphere. Remove carbon dioxide, and the terrestrial greenhouse effect would collapse. Without carbon dioxide, Earth's surface would be some 33°C (59°F) cooler.”

**“Remove carbon dioxide, and the terrestrial greenhouse effect would collapse.”**

Loading...

**Ulric Lyons** | April 2, 2023 at 5:00 pm |

The UN's climate panic focuses entirely on the least important part of the science, and portrays it as controlling heatwaves which the Sun discretely drives. And it lets CO2 take certain credit for global warming driven by

CNN Technical director, Charlie Chester, in undercover video reveals what to expect from CNN for their next big push once they are rid of Trump. It will be climate change. “The climate thing is going to take years so we are probably going to milk that quite a bit.”

Loading...

**Rob Starkey** | April 2, 2023 at 6:25 pm |

Pure propaganda. The good news is that few watch CNN.



I listened to a Brookings Panel on the Social Cost of Carbon with some people who were working with the administration. A higher price for the SCC is going to be given to all

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' - The Daily Sceptic](#)

Pingback: [The Latest UN Climate Report Is Bumper-Sticker Climate Science - Menopausal Mother Nature](#)

Richard Copnall | [April 3, 2023 at 8:00 am](#) |

So disappointing to see the comments drift off into name calling about Republicans and Democrats – there is a world outside American political partisanship. It's also disappointing to see so many points made without really providing a solid basis – for example when somebody says the oil companies knew about CO2 in the 70s and covered it up – as if he was making some profound point that settles

Loading...

jim2 | [April 3, 2023 at 8:14 am](#) |

Right! It's as if the left believes the oil companies held Arrhenius hostage in the basement. Whatever knowledge the oil companies had was already public.

This entire effort to smear the oil companies is just one more example of "lawfare," where the left utilizes its people in power to abuse the legal system to criminalize or otherwise hobble opponents.

Loading...

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' | FREE the WORDS](#)

Dan Hughes | [April 3, 2023 at 5:42 pm](#) |

"Mother Earth gets angry from time to time, and this legislation will help us address all of that."

Loading...

Dan Hughes | [April 3, 2023 at 5:45 pm](#) |

IPCC Climate Science has been precisely summarized by Nancy Pelosi:

"Mother Earth gets angry from time to time, and this legislation will help us address all of that."

Loading...

Rhys Jaggar | [April 3, 2023 at 6:59 pm](#) |

I have to say that I don't think that 'climate scientists' are regarded as rigorous scientists by many any longer. There are of course the sheep who believe everything they are told in church on Sundays, which is remarkably similar to what CNN and the BBC tell you all about climate every day of the week.

My prediction for 2030 is that the reputation of scientists will drop precipitously, which will lead to a fundamental shake out of pseudo-science, science engaging in 'pay to play' politicsetc etc. It's not just climate, it's all the Covid fiasco and the attempts to use gene editing, mRNA vaccines in food etc etc. People have had enough of it all and although it may take a few years for that exasperation to achieve organised resistance, I don't think science has a chance to redeem itself in several branches.

I can foresee several Silicon Valley 'investors' being regarded as climate terrorists before the decade is out and they may be lucky to escape with their lives. The climate is not for sale and nor should weather engineering be the domain of risk-capital-backed unaccountable ventures, nor should it be the domain of the military.

As for the prostitutes in Western politics, their reputation was pretty much never there to be lost in the first place. They are pork bellies bought and paid for by commodities traders trading in political decision-making.

Loading...

Your "conclusion" is drawn from your observation that temperatures increased when SO2 in the atmospheric decreased. You have no direct evidence of this except for the lack of volcanic activity. Then you come to the idiotic conclusion that because during recessions CO2 emissions fell but global temperatures didn't, CO2 is benign. It never occurred to you that you could drop the CO2 emission rate and still increase the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere because the reduced emission rate is still greater than the CO2 removal rate. That's exactly what happened. That blows a gigantic hole in your theory from which there is no recovery.

Then there is the situation on Venus which destroys your idiotic theory. Funny that you failed to mention that.

"I have abundant historical evidence where Atmospheric Rivers occurred during or after drought

<https://ceres.larc.nasa.gov/science/>

Who to believe? You or NASA? Not a hard choice is it? NASA!!!

Loading...

**catweazle666** | April 4, 2023 at 1:59 pm |

More argumentum ad verecundiam\*...

Credulous little person, aren't you?

Have you ever tried thinking for yourself?

\* Description: Insisting that a claim is true simply because a valid authority or expert on the issue said it was true, without any other supporting evidence offered.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 4, 2023 at 4:49 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

You say that "Your "conclusion" is drawn from your observation that temperatures increased when SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere decreased. You have no direct evidence of this except for the lack of volcanic activity"

You need to Google NASA's fact sheet on on Atmospheric aerosols "Atmospheric Aerosols: What are they and why are they so important". They state that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols (fine droplets of Sulfuric Acid) are reflective and cool the Earth's surface by reflecting away some of the incoming solar radiation.

If there are fewer of them, temperatures will naturally increase.

Also, during stalled weather high pressure systems, after a week or less, temperatures soar to disastrous levels because all of the atmospheric SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols within the stalled area have had time to settle out, leaving no moisture nucleation sites, and dry, cloud-free conditions (nicely shown on maps showing relative humidity levels)

So, I have abundant proof that decreased SO<sub>2</sub> levels DO cause temperatures to rise.

Regarding the CO<sub>2</sub> comments, they were not mentioned in this paper, which is all about the effects of changing levels of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere

"Between 1880 and 1960 global temperature tracked solar irradiance. They could easily be the cause of atmospheric rivers".

Not so. The mechanism is the decrease in the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere, which leads to increased temperatures and increased evaporation and loads up the atmosphere with water vapor, which would normally rain out, otherwise, not in occasional torrents around the world.

And your NASA/GISS IR spectrograph chart is BS because it totally excludes any of the major effects of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 5, 2023 at 10:02 am |

Your theory is based on two premises. That SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols reflect sunlight. That's true. The second

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' - David Icke](#)

Pingback: [The IPCC is Promoting a Left-Wing Political Agenda Masquerading as 'Science' - All View News](#)

Pingback: [BBC Goes into Antarctica Climate Meltdown - But Ignores Data Showing No Loss of Ice - The Daily Sceptic](#)

**burlhenry** | April 5, 2023 at 11:28 am |

JJBRACCILI:

I looked up information on the atmosphere of Venus, which you say destroys my theory.

Quoting: "The atmosphere of Venus is mostly carbon dioxide, 96.5% by volume. Most of the remaining 3.5% is nitrogen. Early evidence pointed to the sulfuric acid content in the atmosphere, but we now know that it is a rather minor constituent of the atmosphere".

With only trace amounts of SO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, the amount of the intense solar radiation that it reflects away is incapable of making much difference, if any, in the temperature of Venus.

"As you yourself said, increasing temperature means more water vapor in the atmosphere. That means more clouds and a higher albedo"

"Even if it did, it would be impossible to distinguish the SO2 effect from the albedo effect").

Possibly true, if your measurements were not made under drought conditions, with their low albedo.

And you agree that your CO2 spectrographic chart does not include the huge effect of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere, , which makes it both misleading and useless.

You had better duck, your little green men are shooting at you constituent of the atmosphere."

Do you just make this stuff up?

"Venusian clouds are thick and are composed mainly (75–96%) of sulfuric acid droplets.[48] These clouds obscure

[e%20composed%20mainly%20of%20any%20planet%20in%20the%20Solar%20System.](#)

The sulfuric acid clouds blanket the planet. It rains sulfuric acid on Venus. Hardly a "minor constituent."

"With only trace amounts of SO2 in the atmosphere, the amount of the intense solar radiation that it reflects away is

<https://www.epa.gov/air-trends/sulfur-dioxide-trends>

From the chart, the concentration of SO2 in earth's atmosphere is currently about 20 ppb. That's right parts per

BILLION. So how is that in the Venusian atmosphere the 150 ppm of SO2 is too small to matter but in the earth's atmosphere 20 ppb of SO2 has a significant impact?

Next time check this stuff out before you stick your foot in your mouth.

"No, I said that temperatures increased BECAUSE there were fewer clouds in the atmosphere. This was because of the reduction in the amount of SO2 moisture nucleation sites in the atmosphere at higher temperatures (those of El Ninos and business recessions)"

I thought the reason clouds form is because of particulate matter. That dust, soot, smoke, etc. I suspect there is a lot more of that in the atmosphere than SO2. I doubt SO2 reduction has any impact on cloud formation.

"And you agree that your CO2 spectrographic chart does not include the huge effect of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere, , which makes it both misleading and useless."

No, the spectrographic chart proves CO2 is a major player in climate change. It is not benign as you have claimed.

Loading...

burlhenry | April 5, 2023 at 11:23 pm |

I gave you a direct quote from my reference, and the percentages are the same as those listed in the Encyclopedia Britannica.

It said that "Early evidence pointed to the sulfur dioxide content in the atmosphere, but we NOW know that Britannica."

Please provide a link to your reference.

You should have read further into what the Encyclopedia Britannica had to say about the Venusian atmosphere.

It says clouds mostly composed of sulfuric acid droplets at least 30 miles thick envelop the planet. Those clouds

SO2 is 150 ppm of the Venusian atmosphere. On earth it's 20 ppb. The effect, whether it's the CO2 or SO2 effect is dependent on the absolute — not relative — concentration. They depend on the actual amount of CO2 or SO2 in the atmosphere. Since there is much more mass in the Venusian atmosphere than the earth's. The difference in relative concentration understates the difference in the actual amount of SO2 in the Venusian

Do you have a source for that? The only thing I could find was that dust and sea salt aerosols are mostly responsible for cloud formation. The “fluid maps” show SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are regional and are mostly around the source of SO<sub>2</sub>. I seriously doubt that SO<sub>2</sub> has the impact you claim.

“The spectrographic chart proves NOTHING. It would be totally different if it also included SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols.”

No, it would not. Whether SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are included or not, it would have no impact on showing that CO<sub>2</sub> and greenhouse house gases are a significant player in climate change. The spectrograph PROVES CO<sub>2</sub> is not benign. That destroys one of the pillars of your idiotic theory.

Speaking of your CO<sub>2</sub> theory, there is another reason why you can reduce emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> and the temperature will continue rising. There is a lag between when energy is absorbed by the planet and when the planet responds by increasing the temperature. If you cut emissions, and even if emissions are less than the

The reference was “The Environment of Venus”, on Google

You say that the CO<sub>2</sub> is causing a massive greenhouse effect on Venus, but that is just a hypothesis. It is much closer to the sun than the Earth, and if its atmosphere were all Nitrogen, it might still be just as hot.

You mentioned that I have 11 papers on Research Gate. All of them support my claim that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are the Control Knob for our Climate. In none of them do I find any evidence of any warming from CO<sub>2</sub>, outside of the

<https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.17.1.0124>

All temperature changes associated with them are due to increasing or decreasing levels of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in our atmosphere. Four causes of warming due to their decrease are identified. They are proof that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are the control knob of our climate.

Nasa’s “Fluid” maps, which are derived from multiple satellite inputs, are a bit difficult to find. If you haven’t found them, go to the GMAO Modelling and Assimilation Home page. Select Reanalysis. Go to GMAO Reanalysis. Select Reanalysis visual. At left select Chem Analysis. Then “global total column SO<sub>2</sub>”, or other pollutants.

SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols (small droplets of sulfuric acid) are probably the major cause of cloud formation, since they strongly attract moisture. Among other uses, H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> is used as a desiccant.

As I have observed, when their concentration in the atmosphere decreases enough, clouds disappear, evaporation increases, and we are subjected to Atmospheric Rivers, droughts, heat waves, floods, etc. And as I mentioned earlier, the high temperatures associated with stalled high-pressure systems are also due to the settling out of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols within the stalled area, providing proof that my analysis is correct..

<http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/Solar/venusenv.html>

I found it! Some reference. It looks like the work of a college freshman. I saw where it said sulfuric acid was a “minor constituent” It doesn’t say that “minor constituent” is responsible for reflecting 75% of the incident solar radiation.

“You say that the CO<sub>2</sub> is causing a massive greenhouse effect on Venus, but that is just a hypothesis. It is much closer to the sun than the Earth, and if its atmosphere were all Nitrogen, it might still be just as hot.”

The greenhouse effect of CO<sub>2</sub> on Venus is fact. It is closer to the sun than the earth, but absorbs less solar radiation. Because the sulfuric acid clouds reflect most of the solar radiation away.

N<sub>2</sub> doesn't absorb solar radiation. It can't heat anything. Here's a spectrograph of the sun showing the various absorption bands of atmospheric gases:

<https://images.topperlearning.com/topper/tinymce/imagemanager/files/dd656228b6f87d2f5ca14ad0031408f35cod892aa69486.54491060fig2.png>

N<sub>2</sub> is nowhere to be found.

“All of them support my claim that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are the Control Knob for our Climate. In none of them do I find any evidence of any warming from CO<sub>2</sub>, outside of the Laboratory and Greenhouses. I am not aware of any evidence that it actually warms our planet. That, too, is just a hypothesis. Apart from your questionable spectrographic chart, can you provide any other actual PROOF?”

So, your “papers” support your claims? Really? I don’t see direct evidence of anything. All you have is data that shows temperature declining as SO<sub>2</sub> declines. That could be a coincidence. SO<sub>2</sub> may have some effect, but that doesn’t mean it’s the dominate effect. Then you have data that shows during recessions CO<sub>2</sub> emissions decline, but temperature does not. I already proved that is a bogus conclusion for two reasons.

So, you aren’t aware of any evidence that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions don’t warm the planet? Take your head out of the sand. They do experiments in high school science class that show the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> when exposed to sunlight. My spectrograph is only questionable to you because it disproves your idiotic theory.

Your papers don’t prove a damn thing because you provide no direct evidence. It’s just inference from the fact

You say that CO<sub>2</sub> is responsible for the high temperatures on Venus, without providing any direct evidence, it

inconceivable that it is the cause of the high Venusian temperatures.

I don't understand why you provided a spectrograph of the Sun. I just said that IF the atmosphere on Venus were Nitrogen, it could be just as hot, because of its closer proximity of the Sun, than Earth, meaning that there is no additional "back-radiation" warming from CO2.

I (and NASA) do agree with your comment that "sulfuric acid clouds reflect most of the solar radiation away".

This means that you are in agreement with me, since the foundation of my conclusions regarding Earth's climate is that it is controlled by changing levels of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere from volcanic eruptions and industrial activity.

You said "All you have is data that shows temperatures declining as SO2 declines"

NO, I said temperatures INCREASE as SO2 declines.

And "This could be a coincidence". I have looked at hundreds of instances where SO2 levels have decreased, and have NEVER found an exception, decreases always cause warming.

"Then you have data that shows during recessions CO2 emissions decline, but temperature does not" This is exactly what one would expect if CO2 has no climatic effect.

You also say that at 20 ppb in the atmosphere, SO2 can have little effect. It is NOT its concentration in the atmosphere that matters, it is its reflection from diffuse layers of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere from volcanic eruptions and industrial activity (as shown in the Fluid maps).

The scientific philosopher, Karl Popper, held that any scientific theory must be falsifiable (that is, empirically testable) and that predictability was the gold standard for its acceptance.

Warming and cooling episodes due to changing levels of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere have been verified

Want direct evidence? How about a spectrograph of Venus.

<https://scholarsandrogues.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/venus-co2-spectrum-lg.jpg>

There CO2 has 3 IR absorption bands. They correspond to the 3 highest peaks shown on the spectrograph. Notice that all 3 absorption bands are fully saturated. That means they are absorbing all the IR available in the band. Notice how the two absorption bands on the left straddle the peak of Venus's radiant energy curve. That's exactly what you would expect to happen if CO2 were driving Venus's temperature.

What now? Are you going to call it questionable? You don't accept any evidence that disproves your idiotic theory. That means you are in a constant state of denial.

You have found no evidence? Really? What makes you an expert? I love your circular logic where you quote yourself as proof of your idiotic theory. You have NO direct evidence that SO2 is the dominant source of temperature change on the planet. There is evidence that CO2 is the dominant source of temperature change.

"I don't understand why you provided a spectrograph of the Sun. I just said that IF the atmosphere on Venus were Nitrogen, it could be just as hot, because of its closer proximity of the Sun, than Earth, meaning that there is no additional "back-radiation" warming from CO2."

The purpose of the spectrograph is to show N2 doesn't absorb solar radiation or the earth's IR radiation. It can't possibly be the cause of the temperatures on Venus. I already addressed your clueless proximity to the sun argument and provided references. Let me repeat myself. The sulfuric acid clouds on Venus reflect 75% of the incident solar radiation. VENUS ABSORBS LESS SOLAR ENERGY THAN THE EARTH DOES. Even if that were not true, Venus's proximity to the sun could only drive the temperature of Venus to 60 C — not the actual temperature of 460 C. If not CO2, what's causing the excessive temperature on Venus? If you don't have an answer, it proves your theory is junk science.

"I (and NASA) do agree with your comment that "sulfuric acid clouds reflect most of the solar radiation away". This means that you are in agreement with me, since the foundation of my conclusions regarding Earth's climate is that it is controlled by changing levels of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere from volcanic eruptions and industrial activity."

I'm not arguing that SO2 aerosols reflect solar radiation. What I'm arguing is that currently SO2 aerosols are not the dominant force behind climate change — CO2 is.

"You said "All you have is data that shows temperatures declining as SO2 declines"

NO, I said temperatures INCREASE as SO2 declines."

My bad!!!

"And "This could be a coincidence". I have looked at hundreds of instances where SO2 levels have decreased, and have NEVER found an exception, decreases always cause warming."

Really? On Venus SO2 levels aren't decreasing. In fact, I would say that SO2 aerosols are at their maximum

“Warming and cooling episodes due to changing levels of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere have been verified countless times, as predicted, thus meeting the gold standard for its acceptance. as being correct.”

SO<sub>2</sub> can impact climate. It's not the dominant factor right now. Just like it's not the dominant factor on Venus.

“None of the above can be accomplished for CO<sub>2</sub> in Earth's atmosphere. Consequently, the theory of planetary warming due to the accumulation of “Greenhouse Gasses” is just “Junk Science””

Your analysis is the junk science. CO<sub>2</sub> and its impact on climate have been well known for decades. Spectrographs show its impact.

“JJ, you seem to be intelligent, but confused. Why not switch sides and deny the Greenhouse Gas hoax?”

Because it's not a hoax. Why not try publishing your theory in a widely accepted journal which has rigorous peer review and see what happens? Who knows? You may win a Nobel prize next year. I wouldn't get my hopes up.

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 12, 2023 at 3:52 pm |

JJ:

I see that I was not as clear as I meant to be. I was not questioning the fact that the major component of the atmosphere of Venus is CO<sub>2</sub>. What I was questioning was whether it was responsible for the high Venusian temperatures, and whether Venus's temperature would be just as high if its atmosphere were Nitrogen, instead, both being transparent gasses.

And the answer is “YES”

We have black metal patio furniture, and on a hot, sunny, summer day, it becomes too hot to touch, for an hour or two after noon. And, of course, you have heard of frying eggs on concrete sidewalks.

Venus rotates very slowly, once every 243 Earth days, so that anything on its surface would be exposed to its blistering sunshine for about half of that time. And this has been going on for probably a billion years, or more. No wonder Venus is so hot!

Furthermore, its SO<sub>2</sub> clouds undoubtedly have their origin in volcanic eruptions (one recently observed on Venus). On Earth, volcanic SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols settle out within 24-36 months, and they should also settle out on Venus, resulting in periods with no reflective SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in its atmosphere, and more intense surface warming.

So, CO<sub>2</sub> is NOT driving Venus's temperature. It is its slow rotation rate. (My answer proving that my theory is not junk science)

You say that I have no direct evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> is the dominant source of temperature change on Earth. or two after noon. And, of course, you have heard of frying eggs on concrete sidewalks.”

Let me say this again. Apparently, it hasn't sunk in. Between the sulfuric acid clouds and the surface, Venus reflects 90% of incident solar radiation. IT ABSORBS LESS SOLAR ENERGY THAN THE EARTH. Without the CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse effect, it would be cooler than the earth.

“Venus rotates very slowly, once every 243 Earth days, so that anything on its surface would be exposed to its blistering sunshine for about half of that time. And this has been going on for probably a billion years, or more. No wonder Venus is so hot!”

LOL!!! Spinning a planet does not change the amount of energy the sun radiates to it. Spinning a planet cannot create energy. There is a poster on this board who had a planet rotation theory along the same lines. You can disprove the planet rotation mathematically. Here's how I did it:

“When I use the symbol T. Take it to mean. T to the 4th power. Let the sun's temp be Ts. let the hot side surface temperature of the planet be Th. Let the cold side surface temperature of the planet is Tc. k is the Stefan-Boltzmann x emissivity x area. Assume the sun irradiates half the planet so the hot side, cold side areas are the same. Start with a non-spinning planet with no atmosphere and at steady state.

Heat absorbed by the planet =  $k(T_s - T_h)$

Heat emitted by the planet =  $kT_c$  ( no energy is being radiated to the cold side of the planet).

At steady state heat absorbed by the planet is the same as the heat emitted by the planet.  $k(T_s - T_h) = kT_c$  or

temperatures will be identical to the value they were before rotation. Take the ultimate case where you spin the planet so fast that surface temperature is uniform. That what we assume when we calculate an average temperature for a planet by making spherical corrections. There will be no change in planetary temperature as a result.

The only effect of rotating the planet will be to speed the return to steady state. Double the rotational speed of the planet, it will lower surface temperature and speed up the absorption of heat. There will no change in the final steady state."

BTW Venus rotates in the opposite direction of the Earth. That doesn't impact planetary temperature either.

"Furthermore, its SO<sub>2</sub> clouds undoubtedly have their origin in volcanic eruptions (one recently observed on Venus). On Earth, volcanic SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols settle out within 24-36 months, and they should also settle out on Venus, resulting in periods with no reflective SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in its atmosphere, and more intense surface warming."

Even if that BS is true, and you took all the SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols out of the atmosphere, based on its distance from the sun, Venus would be at a temperature of 60 C — not its current temperature — 460 C.

"So, CO<sub>2</sub> is NOT driving Venus's temperature. It is its slow rotation rate. (My answer proving that my theory is not junk science)"

The slow rotation rate is not causing Venus's temperature. Your theory is still junk science.

"Temperatures are always changing, and every TEMPORARY change (due to volcanic eruptions, El Ninos, La Ninas, industrial activity, etc) can be correlated with an increase or decrease in the

<https://th.bing.com/th/id/R.c7026e30a59f548716f0f2667ee5d51b?k=DKKDsHZN08iHtP%3a%2f%2fchmsinecom%2fwpot%2fpat%2017%20%2f%2fAtmospheric+atm+clde+conertms+and+tbl+and+aga+ge+temperatures+over+the+years+1880+to+2009.png&ehk=IAY3zSftbUrnFWUctayvNNd5yAfxntmPDiEAWZm>

You should read your own sources. From woodfortrees.org under the heading Personal Note:

"I started this site in 2008 because I wanted to dig underneath what seemed like extreme claims and counterclaims in the "Global Warming Debate". Ten years on, it now seems clear to me that CO<sub>2</sub> is indeed the primary driver of global warming, which is proceeding at roughly 1.5°C per century, but with some interesting short and long-term cycles overlaid. These cycles can produce shorter-term periods of both flatline and rapid increase, which get both 'sides' over-excited." LMAO!!

"You say that most of Earth's albedo effect in the atmosphere is made up of clouds that are NOT made up of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols. No, but they are made up of moisture attracted to SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol moisture nucleation sites. When enough of those sites decrease enough, clouds disappear, and temperatures rise, leading to Atmospheric Rivers, heat waves, etc."

I don't think clouds are disappearing. Dust and sea salt are perfectly capable of supplying nucleation sites.

"Regarding publishing in more widely accepted Journals, I have gone that route, but anything contrary to the greenhouse gas meme is rejected by the editors, and never sent out for peer review."

The reason your papers are rejected are because they are bad junk science. Good junk science sometimes gets through peer review, but never gets widely accepted. Eventually, even good junk science gets exposed for what it is.

Loading...

Grant Quinn | April 12, 2023 at 7:11 pm |

I must say that graph makes me scratch my head. First of all it's in Fahrenheit which magnifies the "anomalies".

Most science uses the metric system for obvious reasons. Second, "temperature anomaly" is plotted against CO<sub>2</sub> in ppm. They don't use temperature because anomalies scale more to their liking. The start date is about 1880? Which is about the beginning of the Industrial Revolution? when mean earth temperature was guessed to be about 57.6? and supposedly the base from which we should start to panic if it is surpassed. Between 1880 and say 1910, the negative anomalies are increasing so temperature is falling, while CO<sub>2</sub> is rising, so damn, it was getting colder during the Industrial Revolution until it managed to claw its way back up to the base temperature in about 1960, give or take a decade or so, cooling by a half a degree during the IR and regaining it around about WW2. Since then it's risen a half a degree Fahrenheit and we are carrying on like pork chops

[https://climate.nasa.gov/internal\\_resources/2167/](https://climate.nasa.gov/internal_resources/2167/)

We didn't start dumping CO huge amounts until after WWII. There is some capacity for the CO<sub>2</sub> removal processes to adapt to this dumping. You see the CO<sub>2</sub> ppm slowly rise until 1960 when it accelerates. That when CO<sub>2</sub> becomes the dominant force in driving temperature and solar irradiance becomes a secondary influence.

The temperature scale is irrelevant. Sometimes the graphs use F other times they use C. It doesn't make a difference. The point is that the temperature is rising.

If you know how to get in touch with this cabal of climate scientists, please let me know how. Being part of a cabal that wants to dominate the world is on my bucket list.

BTW if you live long enough, you're going to wish you lived in medieval times when climate change gets through with the planet.

Loading...

**Grant Quinn** | April 13, 2023 at 4:06 am |

You guys fool around with ppm's of a trace gas to explain temperature change of a fraction of a degree over a century but blissfully ignore the enormous change of temperature between summer and winter due mainly to a minuscule change in distance from the sun due to Earth's axis tilt. Talk about can't see the wood for the trees. I thought it was now proven CO<sub>2</sub> rise follows temperature rise?

You also happily ignore the fact temperature has been higher in reasonably recent times, like a couple of thousands years, and mankind thrived. So in your last post you really put your credibility on line forecasting climate doom for me within my lifetime. You're more deranged than I thought. Not one of Al Gores or Hansens et al predictions has come to pass in the timeframe they predicted. Not one! And you still believe that rubbish? I've lived long enough to see your type come and go from predicting ice ages in the 70s to the earth cooking by 2020. You are one of the Cabal of doom whether you are aware of it or know the others. I've had too much experience with researchers to give them the credit for being good guys as you do. After all it's their career at stake and they need a job. Any one of them who doesn't toe the peer line will lose their job and career. It's despicable imo.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 10:16 am |

The change in temperature between summer and winter has zero impact on planetary average temperature. Neither does the temperature difference between the sunny and dark sides of the earth.

What happens in the past has zero impact on what is happening now.

I didn't 'predict climate doom in your lifetime. What I said if you live long enough you'll wish you'd lived in medieval times. If we keep dumping CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere at the current rate, that's an understatement.

Global cooling was put forward in the 70s by a small group of crackpots. It was never consensus science. Climate denial is put forward by small group of crackpots and charlatans.

All you proved is that you are clueless.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 13, 2023 at 10:54 pm |

Your inane analysis of Venus's temperatures does not change anything that I have said.

"Between the sulfuric clouds and the surface, Venus reflects 90% of its incident solar radiation"

You have NO way of knowing how much solar radiation is reflected from the SO<sub>2</sub>. What you say might have been true at the time of the last visit, but between the reported sulfuric acid rain reducing the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, and the high winds whipping around the planet, SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols could even be absent until the next volcanic eruption replaces them.

"The slow rotation rate is not causing Venus's temperature"

The surface of Venus facing the Sun bakes constantly under the incoming solar radiation for months, getting hotter and hotter as time goes by, thus maintaining its current elevated temperature.

Again, it doesn't matter whether its atmosphere is CO<sub>2</sub> or nitrogen, the results will be identical.

"The slow rotation rate is not causing Venus's temperature". In your dreams!

"What I'm arguing is that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols are not the dominant force behind climate change—CO<sub>2</sub> is "

CO<sub>2</sub> is obviously NOT the cause of Climate Change. It is climbing at one rate at Mauna Loa, and average anomalous global temperatures are rising at another rate, as I have mentioned before. A good graph showing the differing slopes can be viewed at Climate4you. The best one is the center of 3, 7th row down.

"Your inane analysis of Venus's temperatures does not change anything that I have said."

Let's face it science is not your thing. You have no idea what I did. Trust me. It's correct and it proves a spinning planet can't increase planetary temperature. Think about it. If spinning an object in the sun can heat it up past what the sun can do without spinning, you've found a new source of energy. Does that make sense?

"You have NO way of knowing how much solar radiation is reflected from the SO<sub>2</sub>. What you say might have been true at the time of the last visit, but between the reported sulfuric acid rain reducing the amount of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, and the high winds whipping around the planet, SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols could even be absent until the next volcanic eruption replaces them."



hits the ground. It evaporates in the lower atmosphere rise to where it condenses and feeds the cloud cover.

<https://sciencing.com/planet-acid-rain-fall-3700.html>

“CO2 is obviously NOT the cause of Climate Change. It is climbing at one rate at Mauna Loa, and average anomalous global temperatures are rising at another rate, as I have mentioned before. A good graph showing the

That's pretty good agreement. If you vertically displace the temperature plot. It's excellent agreement. Do you have a similar plot for SO2. I think that's a NO. You just assume SO2 is having an impact.

“NO, instead it shows the relationship between DECREASES in SO2 aerosol levels and global temperature increases.”

You can't read!

“You CANNOT show how CO2 caused temperatures to increase in the 30's and 40's, and other intervals up to 1975, so that had to be due to another cause.”

You're right, I can't. That because CO2 wasn't driving temperatures at that time — solar radiation was. CO2 started driving temperatures higher around 1960.

The rest of it is your standard BS. You have no direct evidence that SO2 is doing anything. There is direct evidence that CO2 is currently warming the planet.

BTW SO2 stands at 20 ppb. How much lower does it have to go for the warming to stop?

Loading...

burlhenry | April 14, 2023 at 5:30 pm |

I NEVER said that spinning a planet would cause its temperature to rise. That is a product of YOUR fevered brain.

I said that slowly rotating a planet under constant solar radiation will inevitably cause its surface temperature to rise (just as constant heat applied to a bar of iron will eventually cause it to glow, or a rotating spit will cook food)

This is just basic physics, and has probably been going on for the life of the planet.

You are probably correct that the SO2 rain never reaches the surface of the planet. At least not during current temperatures. I had not considered that.

Regarding the Climate4you graph, you say that there is excellent agreement if the temperature curve is displaced upward. Not so. the curves still have different slopes.

For the NOAA/NCDC graph from your previous post, I gave you factual information showing that the isolated temperature rises in the 1930's, and later, were due to decreased atmospheric SO2 aerosol levels (13 million tons between 1929 and 1932) during those intervals. You say that solar radiation was the cause.

In a way, that is true. There was increased surface heating because of less SO2 aerosol pollution of the rise (just as constant heat applied to a bar of iron will eventually cause it to glow, or a rotating spit will cook food)

This is just basic physics, and has probably been going on for the life of the planet.”

The problem is you don't understand basic physics or, for that matter, any physics.

That is 2611 W/m2. We need to apply the spherical correction to get the energy Venus must radiate into space to be in energy balance with the solar radiation it's absorbing. That value is 652.75 W/m2. To calculate the temperature of Venus, use the Stefan – Boltzmann equation:

$$652.75 = 5.6697E-8 \times T^{**4}$$

The temperature of Venus (T) is 328 K or 55 C

Now let's use an albedo of 0.75 to simulate Venus's atmosphere.

What your next explanation? Are we at your fallback position? Little green men firing a heat ray at Venus? It's as good as any of your other explanations.

"You are probably correct that the SO<sub>2</sub> rain never reaches the surface of the planet. At least not during current temperatures. I had not considered that."

Not "probably." Throwing something out and then insisting its right does nothing for your credibility.

"Regarding the Climate4you graph, you say that there is excellent agreement if the temperature curve is displaced upward. Not so. the curves still have different slopes."

That graph has better resolution than the ones I normally use. The differences you are seeing are the result of the earth's inertia causing a lag in the temperature response to changes in CO<sub>2</sub> ppm. The temperature will rise more slowly than the temperature.

"For the NOAA/NCDC graph from your previous post, I gave you factual information showing that the isolated temperature rises in the 1930's, and later, were due to decreased atmospheric SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol levels (13 million tons between 1929 and 1932) during those intervals. You say that solar radiation was the cause."

What I said is that from the period from 1880 – 1960 temperature tracked solar irradiance. That does mean other factors during that period could have a short-term impact on temperature. You have no direct evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> impacted anything during that period. You can't just assume that because SO<sub>2</sub> goes down while temperatures go up that is proof that SO<sub>2</sub> is causing the temperature change.

JJ:

Temperatures on Mars can reach 35 Deg. C. at its equator during its

The highest temperature ever recorded on Earth (57 Deg. C.) occurred at Death Valley on July 10, 1913, during the 1913 Jan 10-1914 Dec American business recession, which lowered SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions and enabled the record temperature increase.

In your post, you state that "the temperature of Venus (T) is 232 K or -41 C.

I find it difficult to believe that Venus could be colder than Mars or Earth. I would appreciate clarification of your statement.

Regarding your comments4you graph, you say that "you are seeing the result of earth's inertia causing a lag in the temperature response to changes in CO<sub>2</sub> ppm. The temperature will rise more than the (sic) temperature."

Utter nonsense! Both points are fixed data points, measured CO<sub>2</sub> level for Jan 2023, and the temperature estimate, also for Jan 2023. There can be no lag involved.

"What happened in the past means nothing. You have no evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> caused anything. Correlation does not prove causation"

Here are some instances of SO<sub>2</sub> causation:

Warming during the MWP, and prior warm periods, occurred because there were very few SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, due to a lack of volcanic eruptions. For example, there were only 31 VEI4, or larger, eruptions during the 300 year MWP. The clean air resulted in higher temperatures.

Decreased temperatures during the LIA correlate exactly with the injection of SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols into the atmosphere from known VEI4 or > volcanic eruptions.

Up until about 1980, there was excellent correlation with the rising slopes of CO2 and temperatures, but after then, their slopes began to diverge, destroying the correlation..

Paraphrasing JJ, only a fool would not cause the greenhouse gas hypothesis "junk science".

"Temperatures on Mars can reach 35 Deg. C. at its equator during its summer. <http://www.Planetary-science.org/mars-research/martian-climate>

The highest temperature ever recorded on Earth (57 Deg. C.) occurred at Death Valley on July 10, 1913,

So what? We are not talking about energy maldistribution that occurs across a planet. We are talking about AVERAGE planetary temperature. Right know the dark side of the moon is a lot colder than the sunny side of the moon. It means nothing.

"In your post, you state that "the temperature of Venus (T) is 232 K or -41 C.

I find it difficult to believe that Venus could be colder than Mars or Earth. I would appreciate clarification of your statement."

I said no such thing. The current temperature of Venus is 460 C. I did two calculations. The first was the temperature of Venus without the albedo effect of sulfuric acid clouds and no CO2 greenhouse effect. That temperature is 55 C. The second was Venus with an albedo of 0.75 caused by sulfuric acid clouds and no CO2 greenhouse effect. That temperature is -41 C.

What? you don't understand your own theory? Let me explain it to you. SO2 aerosols reflect solar radiation and cool off the planet. That's exactly what would happen on Venus sans a CO2 greenhouse effect.

You are CLUELESS on how a planet's temperature is set. It's easier to explain it in terms of energy. Temperature is a measure of molecular kinetic energy. All planets radiate energy into space and the amount of energy radiated into space is a function of its temperature. The higher the temperature, the more energy a planet radiates into space.

Let's start with a planet hovering around absolute zero and suddenly a star radiates energy toward it. The planet absorbs the energy and the energy of the planet increases. The temperature of the planet increases because temperature is a measure of the energy of the planet. The planet increases the energy it's radiating into space. The temperature of the planet continues to rise and the amount of energy it radiates into space also continues to rise. Eventually, the planet attains a temperature where the amount of energy it radiates into space is equal to what it absorbs from the star. The planet stops accumulating energy and the temperature stops rising. The planet is now in energy balance and will continue to maintain a constant temperature until the energy balance is disturbed.

Let's disturb the energy balance. The star starts radiating half the energy it was radiating to the planet. What happens? Initially, nothing. The planet radiates energy into space based on its temperature, but now it is receiving half the energy from the star. There is an energy imbalance and energy starts draining from the planet lowering its temperature which causes it to radiate less energy. Eventually the temperature of the planet is low enough that the energy it radiates into space is equal to the energy it absorbs from the star. The planet is in energy balance and the temperature of the planet is constant until the energy balance is disturbed.

If you don't understand that, you have no business writing papers on the source of climate change.

"Utter nonsense! Both points are fixed data points, measured CO2 level for Jan 2023, and the temperature estimate, also for Jan 2023. There can be no lag involved."

Your lack of understanding of science has no bounds. Of course, there is a lag. You have oceans storing energy, water evaporating at constant temperature and ice melting at constant temperature. That is part of what makes up the inertia of the earth to temperature change. The lag will be nonlinear.

"Here are some instances of SO2 causation: ..."

Joke! You have no direct evidence that SO2 aerosols caused any of that or how much it contributed to what did occur. None of that has anything to do with what is happening right now. At 20 ppb in the atmosphere, it is doubtful SO2 is having any impact.

LMAO! The article you cite is by YOU! Do you have any source other than by you, published in journal that does rigorous peer reviews, that make your claims? I don't think so.

"Temperatures have risen since circa 1980 due to the Clean Air efforts noted above to reduce industrial SO2 aerosol pollution."

Once again, you have no direct evidence of that.

"SO, I have provided proofs of the MAJOR role of SO2 aerosols in Earth's climate, which you said did not exist."

What you have provided does not rise to the level of scientific proof. Not even the climate deniers on this board

What are you doing writing papers about the causes of climate change when you are CLUELESS about the

The sun radiates energy to Venus. Venus absorbs some of this energy. That causes the temperature of Venus to rise, and Venus radiates energy into space. As the temperature of Venus continues to rise, it radiates more and more energy into space. Eventually the energy the planet absorbs is equal to the energy it radiates into space. Venus's temperature stops rising. The planet can sit there for centuries, and the temperature won't change unless the energy balance is disturbed. We can calculate what the temperature would be for Venus with no atmosphere based on its distance from the sun. That temperature is 60 C. Venus has a large albedo. That would cause the temperature of Venus to be less than 60 C. Venus absorbs less solar energy than the earth. That means the temperature of Venus should be less than the temperature of the earth — not its current temperature of 460 C.

A planet surface in radiative equilibrium with the sun has NOT any resemblance with the radiative equilibrium in the cavity with a small hole.

—

The planet average surface temperature ( $T_{\text{mean}}$ ) is not a blackbody's temperature.

—

Planet does not have a blackbody temperature, because planet has not a uniform temperature, and because planet is not a blackbody.

\*\*\*\*\*

When based on the blackbody-planet theory, it was wrongly calculated:

“The earth's surface uniformly absorbs 240 W/m<sup>2</sup> from the sun.”

—

Also it was very much wrongly concluded:

“Without greenhouse effect, Earth's surface would be some 33°C (59°F) cooler.”

\*\*\*\*\*

No, the Earth does not uniformly absorb 240 W/m<sup>2</sup> from the sun. Earth is a planet. A planet is irradiated from one direction only, and a planet rotates.

—

No, without greenhouse effect, Earth's surface would NOT be some 33°C (59°F) cooler.

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 12, 2023 at 9:18 pm |

[https://www.google.com/search?sxsr=APwXEduXmJonaHoZfPpJl1\\_ix7xtonN7A:1681348058135&q=total+solar+irradiance+graph&tbm=isch&source=unif&f=AGdJQOxRiM%252COPM6GM%252C%25BmV6fmqjM%252CXOXQWkiD8iM%252C%25BAGBWRSDCM%252CXkZbv5G4WvkM%252C\\_%253BRki7Jn8NdLT31M%252CHGMEOXOD1T6\\_5M%252C\\_%253BxYnMwTFZD-s2-M%252CQQ6gIxIBe6X6yM%252C\\_%253BLPd4u-Equ9UPsM%252C7VSCWfXDpis8iM%252C\\_%253BXb2Ps7eSoAnELM%252CPYMoLthfatQmKM%252C\\_%253BEkd\\_OJ8O5M%252CqPCbrZiMM%252C\\_%253Bh5RiXWwRfnoEM%252CWeyCqAHKnIM%252C\\_%253BMLOLFmBwMiM%252CH\\_ypgx4DLISHKM%252C\\_%253BupwYtN2jnbPjOM%252CHfbRNmyvUq7zwM%252C\\_%253B5OEmHJonM](https://www.google.com/search?sxsr=APwXEduXmJonaHoZfPpJl1_ix7xtonN7A:1681348058135&q=total+solar+irradiance+graph&tbm=isch&source=unif&f=AGdJQOxRiM%252COPM6GM%252C%25BmV6fmqjM%252CXOXQWkiD8iM%252C%25BAGBWRSDCM%252CXkZbv5G4WvkM%252C_%253BRki7Jn8NdLT31M%252CHGMEOXOD1T6_5M%252C_%253BxYnMwTFZD-s2-M%252CQQ6gIxIBe6X6yM%252C_%253BLPd4u-Equ9UPsM%252C7VSCWfXDpis8iM%252C_%253BXb2Ps7eSoAnELM%252CPYMoLthfatQmKM%252C_%253BEkd_OJ8O5M%252CqPCbrZiMM%252C_%253Bh5RiXWwRfnoEM%252CWeyCqAHKnIM%252C_%253BMLOLFmBwMiM%252CH_ypgx4DLISHKM%252C_%253BupwYtN2jnbPjOM%252CHfbRNmyvUq7zwM%252C_%253B5OEmHJonM)

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 13, 2023 at 8:06 am |

Let me answer you. Before 1960 planetary temperature change tracked solar

Which one is correct —

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 9:51 am |

They're pretty much the same thing. On the one I use, the bright yellow line is an 11 year moving average to smooth out the solar cycle. The light yellow line is the raw data. If you compare the light yellow line on my graph with the data on the other graph, they are about the same.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 10:30 am |

Genius,

Your graph doesn't go out as far, The trends are the same. Both plots would show temperature tracking solar radiation before 1960 and not tracking solar radiation after 1960. That was the point that you didn't get.

They're pretty much the same thing. On the one I use, the bright yellow line is an 11 year moving average to smooth out the solar cycle. The light yellow line is the raw data. If you compare the light yellow line on my graph with the data on the other graph, they are about the same.

Loading...

Joe - the non climate scientist | April 13, 2023 at 11:11 am |

JJBraccili | April 13, 2023 at 10:30 am |

Genius,

Your graph doesn't go out as far, The trends are the same. Both plots would show temperature tracking solar radiation before 1960 and not tracking solar radiation after 1960. That was the point that you didn't get. DUH!!!

JJB –

No – the graphs are not the same,  
No the graphs dont show the same trend

Here are the graphs I found of TSI by year:

[https://climate.nasa.gov/internal\\_resources/1896](https://climate.nasa.gov/internal_resources/1896)

[https://th.bing.com/th/id/R\\_d2290b220b0b74b77363ea5ae708cbb?rik=wFMjiv2%2f2UvVcg&pid=ImgRaw&r=0](https://th.bing.com/th/id/R_d2290b220b0b74b77363ea5ae708cbb?rik=wFMjiv2%2f2UvVcg&pid=ImgRaw&r=0)

There aren't numerous graphs of TSI. Most of the graphs are the same data plotted on different scales or oriented differently.

If you plot temperature change on any of those plots you get the same result. Which was the point,

Loading...

Joe - the non climate scientist | April 13, 2023 at 1:22 pm |

JJB –

The graphs conflict

Graph #1 – is the same one you keep showing  
Graphs #2 & #3 are the graphs that I previously linked

Note\*

Graph #1 has a negative long term slope from 1880's  
Graphs #2 & #3 remain positive since the 1880's

Also note worthy is how the Nasa Graph #1 conflicts with the NASA graph #2 (several sources with the same graph #2)

Loading...

JJBraccili | April 13, 2023 at 2:09 pm |

Let me get this straight. You drew a straight line from 1880 to 2020 on graph #1 and a straight line from 1880 to 2010 on graph #2. One line slopes up and the other slopes down and that's your basis

“That says that something else other than solar irradiance is driving temperature change.”

–

I think it is the Milankovitch Cycle which describes the Earth's Global Warming trend. (The original Milankovitch Cycle shows a Global Cooling trend), but what I insist on is that Milankovitch Cycle to be read REVERSED!

–

Loading...

Pingback: [La BBC habla sobre el derretimiento de la Antártida mientras ignora los datos que no muestran pérdida de hielo - Trikooba](#)

Pingback: [On RCP 8.5 IPCC Exaggeration - Master Resource](#)

CKid | April 12, 2023 at 5:37 am |

“ Only 38% of Americans would be willing to pay \$1 per month to address climate change, according to new polling released Tuesday.” According to a Time magazine twitter release.

<https://twitter.com/TIME/status/1646015789277880323>

Loading...

Grant Quinn | April 12, 2023 at 6:09 am |

The silent majority. Not the noisy ones.

Loading...

Loading...

**Rob Starkey** | April 12, 2023 at 4:47 pm |

In the USA Joe Biden and democrats have control of government and the nearly baseless fear mongering on AGW is the norm. Republicans keep shooting themselves in the foot so we may have 5 more years of the same type of government implementing the climate change agenda.

Loading...

Pingback: [No, Antarctica Ice Isn't Melting Into Oblivion; + Shiveluch Erupts \(Again\) - Electrower](#)

Pingback: [Lessons of the energy crisis - Invito Energy Partners](#)

**jim2** | April 12, 2023 at 6:10 pm |

Katrina wiped out low-lying homes, only to have the id eee of Brad Pitt rebuild them in the same place. Guess he isn't worried about sea level rise.

*For the impacted homeowners of New Orleans' Lower Ninth Ward, the August 2022 announcement that they were one step closer to being made whole – with relief coming in the form of a \$20.5 million settlement – was long past due.*

*Hurricane Katrina made landfall 17 years earlier, devastating their neighborhood. But that was just the opening chapter of their misfortune. Their homes had been rebuilt, only to give way to rot, mold and structural defects. Their 2018 class-action lawsuit seeking damages against their original benefactors, the Make It Right Foundation and its leading man, Brad Pitt, languished in Orleans Parish court for years as their properties decayed.*

<https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/business-news/brad-pitt-charity-mess-katrina-victims-stranded-1235371222/>

Loading...

**rhosilliboy** | April 12, 2023 at 7:08 pm |

The lies from the ICCP just get worse !

Loading...

**rhosilliboy** | April 12, 2023 at 7:33 pm |

In my comment above, I meant 'IPCC' .. memory problems ha! ha!

Loading...

**jim2** | April 12, 2023 at 9:04 pm |

I think JJB makes a great point about Venus. It has a much, much bigger problem than Earth. The IPCC should move there and solve that bigger problem first.

Loading...

**JJBraccoli** | April 12, 2023 at 10:05 pm |

It would be a lot easier to solve earth's CO2 problem.

Probably not a good idea to send people to a planet that's at 460 C and 90 atmospheres and rains sulfuric acid. If you want to volunteer to go, I'll whole-heartily support your efforts.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 7:27 am |

Earth doesn't have a CO2 "problem." It has a CO2 blessing. CO2 – it's a good thing.

Loading...

**JJBraccoli** | April 13, 2023 at 9:55 am |

If believing that makes you happy, you keep believing it. Leave dealing with reality to the rest of us.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 10:28 am |

You got a big wad of nothing to support your hysterical climate beliefs, JJB.

Loading...

**JJBraccoli** | April 13, 2023 at 10:34 am |

That's a great example of your typical response.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 11:01 am |

If believing that makes you happy, you keep believing it. Leave dealing with reality to the rest of us.

Loading...

**jim2** | April 13, 2023 at 12:06 pm |

If JJB would check all the evidence before he spouts off, he would see that a reduction in SO2 probably caused the increase in temperature. His beloved NASA states SO2 cools the atmosphere, so there's that. Maybe he could check up on that and report back.

SO2 began to decline around 1975.

[https://www.pnnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical\\_reports/PNNL-14537.pdf](https://www.pnnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-14537.pdf)

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 13, 2023 at 12:19 pm |

Following up on Jim2's comment – JJB presents a NASA graph of TSI which declines below the 1880's average tsi starting circa 1960. Convenient that it matches the CO2 is the primary (sole) cause of the warming post 1960.

On the other hand, multiple other sources show the TSI increasing through the 1960's and beginning a slow decline, though still above the 1880's level by large margins (large margin by TSI change levels)

the point being that there is a legitimate scientific debate on the level of TSI while JJB picks the one that suits his bias.

Loading...

**JJBraccoli** | April 13, 2023 at 1:24 pm |

"On the other hand, multiple other sources show the TSI increasing through the 1960's and beginning a slow decline, though still above the 1880's level by large margins (large margin by TSI change levels)"

What all the graphs show is that from 1880 to 1960 solar irradiance mostly increases and so does temperature change. After 1960, solar radiation declines then levels out. My graph shows a further decline in solar irradiance after 2010. Your graph stops at 2010. Regardless, temperature continues to rise and no longer tracks solar radiation. It's tracking something else. There is a very small possibility it's a coincidence, but it closely tracks the increasing CO2 ppm in the atmosphere.

You're trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill and are doing it badly.

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 13, 2023 at 1:41 pm |

JJB – you still cant grasp the inconsistencies in your beliefs

- A) even though there has been a decline since the 1960's, the trend remains positive (with the exception of the one NASA graph)
- B) you make the false assumption that the TSI is a near instantaneous thermostat/heating mechanism.
- C) you ignore the other natural mechanisms such as the oceans and the related storage of heat. The TSI graph depicted in the NASA graph ignores (or pretends) the oceans play no role with respect to TSI, with is in direct conflict with the theory espoused for co2 increases.

Consistent theories have not been the forte of climate activists.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 2:52 pm |

A. Stars get hotter and emit more radiant energy as they age. That the long term trend trend in solar irradiance is positive is not relevant. After 1960, solar irradiance is not the driving force of temperature change.

B. I make no such assumption. Before 1960 temperature change lags changes in solar irradiance. Nothing can be said after 1960 because solar irradiance is not driving temperature change.

C. Irrelevant. Are you seriously saying that the rise in temperature over the last 60 years is due to a temperature lag due to retained heat in the oceans? The lag is not that long.

All those graphs prove is that currently solar irradiance is not the driver of temperature change. They don't prove that CO2 is. Solar irradiance has to be eliminated because it is the earth's largest source of energy.

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 14, 2023 at 9:47 am |

JJB – the theory you are relying on or indirectly implying ( at least the warmist version theory) is that the TSI has near immediate effect and that the ocean heat sink lack doesnt exist for the TSI – where as the ocean sink lag is prominent with co2.

Back to your links of the three tsi graphs.

The first shows a very pronounced negative decline after 1960 with a decline falling below the 1880's

The second two graphs show a modest decline after 1960's yet still well above the 1880's either way you cut it – smoothing averaging etc.

cross your your math – the second two graphs dont reflect what you claim they reflect –

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 14, 2023 at 11:07 am |

I'm relying on no such thing.

Chose any graph you like. They all say the same thing. After 1960, TSI is flat or declining. Planetary temperature is rising. For the temperature to continue to rise, there must be an increasing source of energy. The graph shows TSI is not it. It's something else that on the increase. That's the point.

BTW over 60 years is not an instantaneous response.

How many times do I have to say that this phenomenon is all cause and effect? What happened 10 minutes ago doesn't matter. What happened in 1880 definitely doesn't matter. You can't go back and say that 200 years ago CO2 was decreasing, and temperatures were rising therefore, CO2 can never impact temperature. That phenomenon occurred because CO2 was not the driving force at that time. A more powerful driver was impacting temperature.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 13, 2023 at 12:45 pm |

I never said SO2 aerosols didn't cool the planet. What I said was that SO2 is not the dominant factor in climate change right now. Neither is the sun, which is much more important in setting the temperature of the planet.

The poster who started this nonsense proof is based on his claims that CO2 has NO effect on planetary temperature. That is complete BS.

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 14, 2023 at 3:54 pm |

CO2 is a GHG, to what "degree" is the question. Does water effect climate, JJ Hollywood? Can you provide the conclusive esposé between both CO2 and H2O's relative effects on climate?

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 14, 2023 at 11:42 pm |

You can figure it out from the IR spectrograph of the earth's radiant energy that I have already provided numerous times.

H2O is the most powerful greenhouse gas, but it is temperature limited. As CO2 increases, temperature of the atmosphere increases and it can hold more water vapor which increases the greenhouse effect of H2O.

CO2 indirectly controls the greenhouse effect of H2O.

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 16, 2023 at 8:51 am |

What about albedo; snow, clouds? Oceanic circulation? Even the ebb and flow of algal blooms. Blooms not only pull CO2 from the atmosphere, sequestering it upon death, but blooms also effect the proportional footprint of oceanic albedo, between dark water/bright water, they can be immense. Consider that volcanic activity not only creates cooling from aerosols, but volcanoes also create albedo by promoting algal blooms.

<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/article/kilauea-lava-phytoplankton-bloom/> Imagine a period when volcanic activity increases, creating a timing point. These are just the "tip" of the proverbial iceberg, touching on certain natural climate variability influences effecting episodic causation of cooling and warming. Your problem is that climate moves much slower than your ideologically paranoid imagination.

Infrared spectroscopy doesn't measure tipping points, JJ Hollywood, it provides an IR snapshot of a micro period in geologic time. It's relatively new technology that provides inferences of proof to climate surfing showboaters, such as yourself, that the world is coming to an end.

There remains more questions than answers about climate. BTW, most people on CE acknowledge that humans have contributed to some portion of global warming over the last 150 years, but most scientists don't believe that CAGW is the future, JJ; perhaps you need to school the worlds scientists about IR spectrographs.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 16, 2023 at 10:55 am |

Your one of those people that takes the "let's throw whatever we can think of against the wall and see if any of it sticks."

If any of the things you mention has any impact, it is small. Maybe, someday, if the stars align, something could happen is not an argument. It's a prayer.

Do you have any evidence that any of what you talk about is having a significant impact on planetary temperature right now? The answer is NO!!!

"... but most scientists don't believe that CAGW is the future,"

That should say "few scientists" -- not most.

BTW infrared spectroscopy is not a "new" technology.

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 16, 2023 at 6:45 pm |

JJ, you conflate the understanding of AGW to mean CAGW.

And I said spectroscopy was "relatively" new, first used on a satellite about 50 years ago, but satellites were first used to take precise measurements of climate only about 20 years ago.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 16, 2023 at 8:50 pm |

If AGW continues, CAGW is inevitable.

Twenty years ago is not "new."

Loading...

**jungletrunks** | April 17, 2023 at 8:10 am |

Hollywood just keeps spattering about in his showboat.

Climate is measured in decadal increments, 20 years doesn't make a trend in climate; therefore the data gathered by IR spectroscopy for climate is "relatively" new.

Loading...

**Christos Vournas** | April 13, 2023 at 3:30 pm |

JJBraccili:

"Rotation doesn't impact planetary temperature no matter how fast you rotate it."

-

There is the POWERFUL "Planet Surface **Rotational Warming** Phenomenon".

-

Please visit my site,

Link:

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**Christos Vournas** | April 14, 2023 at 3:48 am |

JJBraccili:

"Think about it. If spinning an object in the sun can heat it up past what the sun can do without spinning, you've found a new source of energy. Does that make sense?"

-

"you have found a **new** source of energy."

-

No, it is not a new source of energy. It is not a source of energy either.

It is the way a faster spinning planet "manages" to accumulate by far **larger** amounts of the incident solar energy, than a slower rotating one.

-

I am explaining all about it in my site.

Link:

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**Christos Vournas** | April 16, 2023 at 1:56 pm |

When a planet rotates faster something **very interesting** happens! When faster rotating the temperatures on the dayside are lower and temperatures on the dark side are higher.

Example

A planet for N1 rot/day has dayside temperature 200K and nightside temperature 100K.

So the Tave = (200K+100K) / 2 = **150K**

The same planet for N2 > N1 rot/day has dayside temperature 199K and nightside temperature 107K.

So the Tave = (199K+107K) / 2 = **153K**

Thus when rotating faster the planet average (mean) surface temperature is higher.

<https://www.cristos-vournas.com>

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 16, 2023 at 11:20 pm |

JJ:

Thank you for your detailed explanation of Venusian temperatures. I have never considered planetary temperatures, have just been trying to make sense of what is happening on Earth.

So, I had to a bit of research regarding them.

An important consideration regarding a planet's temperature is the amount of solar radiation received at its surface.

According to NASA, the incident solar radiation at the surface of Venus is 2,601.3 Watts per square meter. (This compares with Earth, which is given as 1,361 Watts per square meter)..

For Venus, the length of its day is 2,802 hours.



With its high incident solar radiation, and 1,401 hours of "bake" time each day, over millions of years, a high surface temperature is exactly what would be expected.

So, my initial explanation turns out to be correct.

"Of course there is a lag"

Your thinking is wrong. There may have been lags prior to making the measurements, but the reported data is what it is at the time of the measurement.

Here are some instances of SO<sub>2</sub> causation:

"Joke!" You have no direct evidence that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols caused any of that or how much of it contributed to what did occur".

Actually, I DO know how much SO<sub>2</sub> was involved for many of the instances. For much of the warming, there were little or no dimming SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols in the atmosphere, as for the earlier warming periods, locally, during stalled high pressure weather systems, and when there are periods of 4-5 years between eruptions.

For cooling, the amount of volcanic SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions injected into atmosphere has been measured by satellites since late 1979 or the early 1980's. Prior to the satellite data, the annual tonnage of industrial SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions were available from the Community Emissions Data System (CEDS), of the University of Maryland, and are available through at least 2016.

"None of that has anything to do with what is happening right now"

What IS happening right now is that SO<sub>2</sub> aerosol emissions are decreasing because of Net Zero activities to ban the burning of fossil fuels, and continued global "Clean Air" efforts to lower industrial SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols, and the expected warming is taking off, rising 0.34 Deg. C. since January.

See: "Net Zero Catastrophe Beginning?"

<https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2022.16.1.1035>

And: "The Cause of Atmospheric Rivers"

<https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2023.17.2.0323>

"You think that whatever you say must be scientific fact. It is anything but."

I try to have data to support everything that I say, and my conclusions regarding SO<sub>2</sub> aerosols meet Karl Popper's criteria for a validated scientific fact.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 17, 2023 at 12:18 am |

"With its high incident solar radiation, and 1,401 hours of "bake" time each day, over millions of years, a high surface temperature is exactly what would be expected.  
So, my initial explanation turns out to be correct."

LMAO!!! You still don't understand. You have the mistaken idea that energy just keeps accumulating on the planet. "Bake time" has nothing to do with it. It's all about what Venus absorbs from the sun and what it radiates into space.

You don't even understand your own theory. Only 25% of incident solar radiation is absorbed by the planet because of the reflecting sulfuric acid clouds. That reduces the amount of solar energy absorbed by the planet to 653 W/m<sup>2</sup>. Then there is the problem that the sun radiates to the surface of a circle — not a sphere. If you take that the sun radiates to half the planet at any time, you have to divide by two. That means the surface of Venus is absorbing 326 W/m<sup>2</sup>. Compare that with the earth. The earth absorbs 70% of incident solar radiation. That reduces the amount of solar radiation absorbed by the planet to 953 W/m<sup>2</sup>. Dividing that by two for the spherical correction and the surface of the earth is absorbing 476 W/m<sup>2</sup>. The earth is absorbing more solar radiation than Venus. Do you see anywhere on earth that is at a temperature of 460 C.

Don't start that BS about Venus is rotating slower. Rotating a planet has NO impact on the planet's average temperature. For some reason, you can't comprehend the fact that as Venus or any other planet is absorbing energy from the sun, it is simultaneously radiating energy to space.

Let's face it, you can't admit that the high temperature on Venus is due to the CO<sub>2</sub> greenhouse effect. If it did, your theory is wrong because it relies on CO<sub>2</sub> having no impact on temperature. I suspect every source you checked says that CO<sub>2</sub> is causing the 460 C temperature on Venus. That means you have to make up some BS that proves everybody else wrong.

"Your thinking is wrong. There may have been lags prior to making the measurements, but the reported data is what it is at the time of the measurement."

That's ridiculous there is always a lag. They account for it in climate models.

The rest of your post is your standard BS. Your "sources" are your own papers. Do you have anything written by anybody else to back up your claims? I suspect the answer is NO.

It's one thing to make an honest mistake and be wrong. It's quite another to insist your right and makeup whatever you need to "prove" it — science be damned.

Unless you have something new to contribute, this conversation is over. I hate to repeat myself.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 18, 2023 at 11:45 pm |

JJBraccili:

I am confused.

NASA reports that the solar irradiance at the surface of Venus is 2,601.3 watts per square meter.

You say "that reduces the amount of solar energy absorbed by the planet to 653 watts per square meter". WHO am I to believe? Ha Ha

On Earth, when a warm El Nino occurs, it raises temperatures around the world.

But you deny that the hot Venusian surface causes any warming of its atmosphere. Instead you claim that all of the warming is caused by the magic molecule CO<sub>2</sub>.

What a dim bulb you are!

I checked Google Scholar, and as expected, I found no papers by JJ Braccili.

I have 11 papers on various aspects of our climate, all of which show NO evidence of any warming by CO<sub>2</sub> (and if not on Earth, what matters what happens on Venus?)

You classify my papers as "BS" without pointing out any errors that I may have made, as any competent scientist would.(probably because you are incapable of doing so, having a closed mind)

When I asked you for proof that CO2 actually causes any planetary warming, you provided a plot that proved that the warming was actually due to decreased levels of SO2 in the atmosphere.

You also offered as proof a spectrograph of our atmosphere, , but one that totally omitted the effect of millions of tons of dimming industrial SO2 aerosols circulating in our atmosphere, making it useless and misleading.

You claimed that I had no idea how much SO2 was involved in instances of climate change that I attributed to SO2. When I identified the amounts of most of the instances, you said that it did not arise to the level of scientific proof, which was a lie.

You are obviously desperate to defend the "greenhouse gas warming" hoax , and as a result have lost all credibility.

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 19, 2023 at 11:01 am |

"You say "that reduces the amount of solar energy absorbed by the planet to 653 watts per square meter". WHO am I to believe?"

Both of us. The sun radiates to the surface of a circle. The earth radiates from the surface of a sphere. To find out how much energy the earth has to radiate to space to be in energy balance. The solar irradiance must be divided by the ratio of the area of a sphere to the area of a circle of the same radius. The ratio of the area of a sphere to the area of a circle of the same radius is 4. The solar irradiance must be divided by four.

Here's a video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w0T179YxLo8>

"On Earth, when a warm El Nino occurs, it raises temperatures around the world."

It doesn't change climate. The only thing that can change planetary temperature is an energy imbalance at TOA. That's from the First Law of Thermodynamics.

"I have 11 papers on various aspects of our climate, all of which show NO evidence of any warming by CO2 (and if not on Earth, what matters what happens on Venus?) You classify my papers as "BS" without pointing out any errors that I may have made, as any competent scientist would.(probably because you are incapable of doing so, having a closed mind) "

None of which have been published in a journal that does actual peer review. Any competent scientist wouldn't be spreading manure that couldn't pass rigorous peer review.

You're BS theory has to work on Venus. It doesn't.

"When I asked you for proof that CO2 actually causes any planetary warming, you provided a plot that proved that the warming was actually due to decreased levels of SO2 in the atmosphere."

I already answered this and I'm tired of repeating myself.

"You also offered as proof a spectrograph of our atmosphere, , but one that totally omitted the effect of millions of tons of dimming industrial SO2 aerosols circulating in our atmosphere, making it useless and misleading."

It omits nothing. if there were any SO2 effect — there isn't — it wouldn't show up on an IR spectrograph. It wouldn't show up in any spectrograph because it couldn't be distinguished from the general albedo effect. At 20 ppb SO2 isn't capable of influencing climate.

"You claimed that I had no idea how much SO2 was involved in instances of climate change that I attributed to SO2. When I identified the amounts of most of the instances, you said that it did not arise to the level of scientific proof, which was a lie."

Saying that SO2 goes down and temperatures go up is not scientific proof. That's why your BS will never pass rigorous peer review. What a surprise! You don't get it.

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 22, 2023 at 10:13 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

WHO am I to believe.

"Both of us"

This shows a complete lack of critical thinking on your part. It is IMPOSSIBLE for any surface to receive different amounts of watts per square meter at the same time.

"The only thing that can change planetary temperatures is an energy imbalance at TOA"

More of your BS! All that it takes is an intervening layer of some dimming substance, such as SO2 aerosols, to change the amount of watts per square meter striking the planet's surface.

If that layer is removed, or decreased, then the amount of watts per square meter at the surface is increased. And if that layer is increased, then the amount of watts per square meter are decreased.

Which is ALL that I have been saying with respect to my claim that SO2 aerosols are the Control Knob for Earth's temperatures.

I have looked at multiple instances of our changing climate, and I have never found an instance that could not be explained by a change in SO2 aerosol levels.

This includes the Minoan Warm Period, the Roman Warm Period, the Medieval Warm Period

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 22, 2023 at 10:15 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 22, 2023 at 10:42 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

WHO am I to believe?

"Both of us"

This shows a complete lack of critical thinking on your part. It is IMPOSSIBLE for any surface to receive different amounts of watts per square meter at the same time.

"The only thing that can change planetary temperature is an energy imbalance at TOA"

True, but all that it takes is an intervening layer of some dimming substance, such as SO2 aerosols, to change the amount of watts per square meter striking the planet's surface, and to change its temperature.

Which is ALL that I have been saying with respect to my claim that SO2 aerosols are the Control Knob for Earth's climate.

I have looked at multiple instances of our changing climate, and I have never found an instance that could not be explained by a change in SO2 aerosol levels.

This includes the Minoan Warm Period, the Roman Warm Period, the Medieval Warm Period, the Little Ice Age, American Business recessions, Stalled High Pressure Weather Systems, La Ninas and El Ninos, Heat waves, Atmospheric Rivers, the cause of the high temperatures of the 1930's, Etc., Etc.

And nowhere do I see any evidence of any additional warming due to CO2. Temperatures quickly respond to changes in SO2 aerosol levels, but large changes in CO2 levels, such as during the COVID lock-downs, or during business recessions, have no climatic effect.

Give it up, JJ. Your CO2 horse is dead. Stop flogging it,

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 19, 2023 at 3:19 pm |

I don't know why the link from the video didn't make it. I'll try again:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w0T170YxLo8>

It does appear on the JC site.

Loading...

**buckspace** | April 22, 2023 at 3:16 pm |

Dear Professor Curry,

Thank you for being a voice for truth and reason in today's often misinformed and hostile climate debates.

Am eagerly anticipating the publication of your book Climate Uncertainty and Risk, which I pre-ordered months ago.

Also thought you might appreciate a copy of my recently published article "Climate Change and National Security" that appeared in the journal Comparative Strategy last month.

The article is available but behind a paywall here: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01495933.2023.2182108>

Wanted to send you a PDF and link to a free copy of the article, but did not have an email address for you.

I do hope you will be doing a book tour once your book is out.

With sincere respect and congratulations on your forthcoming book,

Mark A. Bucknam, PhD  
Rm 143 Roosevelt Hall  
National War College  
Ft McNair, Washington, DC  
[mark.bucknam@ndu.edu](mailto:mark.bucknam@ndu.edu)

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 22, 2023 at 11:55 pm |

"This shows a complete lack of critical thinking on your part. It is IMPOSSIBLE for any surface to receive different amounts of watts per square meter at the same time."

You didn't understand a thing I said. This is why people like you should not be commenting on climate change pretending to be an expert.

When NASA reports a solar irradiance of 1200 W/m2 at TOA. The m2 is the area of a circle. That's what the sun is radiating to. To determine how many watts the earth is absorbing, multiply the 1200 W/m2 by the area of a circle with the earth's radius. The earth is radiating this energy into space from the area of a sphere. To get the W/m2 the earth is radiating into space, divide the watts we calculated by the area of a sphere. The ratio of the area of a sphere to the area of a circle is 4. That means to get the W/m2 that earth is radiating to space divide the 1200 W/m2 by 4. The earth is radiating 300 W/m2 to space. The problem is the sun is radiating to the surface of a circle and the earth is radiating from the surface of a sphere. Both numbers are correct.

"More of your BS! All that it takes is an intervening layer of some dimming substance, such as SO2 aerosols, to change the amount of watts per square meter striking the planet's surface."

Say the earth is at steady state. That means the energy the earth is absorbing is equal to what it radiates into space. Use a mirror to reflect some of the energy the earth is absorbing into space. The earth is at the same temperature and is radiating the same energy into space but it is absorbing less energy. There is an energy imbalance and the earths energy will drop causing the earth's temperature to drop until the earth is radiating into space what it is absorbing.

"I have looked at multiple instances of our changing climate, and I have never found an instance that could not be explained by a change in SO2 aerosol levels."

TRY HARDER!!

I'm not here to give you science lessons. Before you keep pontificating on climate change, try learning the basics.

Loading...

**burlhenry** | April 23, 2023 at 7:35 pm |

JJBRACCILI:

"You can't see the forest for the trees"

The real issue is not what is happening on Venus, or the amount of solar radiance striking the Earth's surface, Etc.

The issue is WHY are Earth's temperatures rising?

And the answer is very simple. EVERY instance that I have examined has been due to a decrease in the amount of SO2 aerosol emissions in the atmosphere, with no hint of any additional warming due to the accumulation of "Greenhouse Gasses". With less pollution of the atmosphere, temperatures will naturally rise.

Warming due to increased levels of CO2 in the atmosphere is an obvious HOAX. A CO2-warmed atmosphere is akin to an oven, with no fluctuations of temperatures inside. And yet, our temperatures, apart from daily and seasonal

changes, are constantly changing up and down, with no corresponding changes in CO2 levels, as would be necessary, if they were related.

Instead, observed temperature changes are in total agreement with changing atmospheric SO2 aerosol levels, from volcanic eruptions, or industrial activity.

See, for example, "The Definitive Causes of La Nina and El Nino Events"

<https://doi.org/10.39574/wjarr.2023.17.1.0124>

QED

Loading...

**JJBraccili** | April 24, 2023 at 9:42 pm |

"The real issue is not what is happening on Venus, or the amount of solar radiance striking the Earth's surface, Etc.

The issue is WHY are Earth's temperatures rising?"

Not winning? Time to change the subject? That not going to work.

Venus is important because a scientific theory has to work everywhere. Your "theory" doesn't work on Venus. In fact, if I use the same line of reasoning you employ, I could argue that Venus at 460 C instead of 60 C, with a large amount of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere, proves that SO2 aerosols do not impact temperature.

"Warming due to increased levels of CO2 in the atmosphere is an obvious HOAX. A CO2-warmed atmosphere is akin to an oven, with no fluctuations of temperatures inside. And yet, our temperatures, apart from daily and seasonal changes, are constantly changing up and down, with no corresponding changes in CO2 levels, as would be necessary, if they were related."

Really? then why is the temperature on Venus 400 C higher than it should be? it's not due to solar or SO2 aerosols. Maybe, it's the energy fairy who magically appears when a climate denial theory falls apart.

"Instead, observed temperature changes are in total agreement with changing atmospheric SO2 aerosol levels, from volcanic eruptions, or industrial activity.  
See, for example, "The Definitive Causes of La Nina and El Nino Events""

Using your own paper as a reference again? You can't find anyone who believes in your theory? That is AMAZING!!

"BTW how low does the SO2 aerosol concentration have to be before the SO2 aerosol effect is trivial? It's at 20 ppb right now. Twenty parts per trillion?"

I think if just two molecules of SO2 aerosols existed in the atmosphere you still attribute any warming to SO2 aerosols.

"QED" LMAO!!!!!!!

Loading...

**burhenry** | April 26, 2023 at 12:35 pm |

JJBraccili:

You say that a scientific theory has to work everywhere.

My claim is simply that, on Earth, if atmospheric SO2 levels are reduced, temperatures will rise because the cleansed air allows solar radiation to strike the Earth's surface with greater intensity, causing increased warming.

It would also work on Venus, except that, as you pointed out, because of Venus's high temperatures, the descending SO2 aerosols can never reach the surface, because they evaporate and return to the clouds.

"I think that if just two molecules of SO2 aerosols existed in the atmosphere you still attribute any warming to SO2 aerosols".

You are pathetic! I have NEVER attributed any warming to SO2 aerosols. The warming is caused by DECREASES in the amount of SO2 aerosols in the atmosphere.

NASA's "Fluid" maps show the amount of SO2 aerosols currently in our atmosphere. Decreases in those amounts will inexorably cause temperatures to rise, as I have observed for every instance examined (listed in my April 22 post).

Again, Q.E.D.

Loading...

**shedrackamy** | April 25, 2023 at 3:41 pm |

So true and well written 🌟🌟. A relation of mine is working on a research project on climate change and the UN security council and she wants your opinion on whether it should be regarded as a security issue and if the council should handle it. Please would you like to get in contact with her?

Loading...

**Joe - the non climate scientist** | April 25, 2023 at 3:56 pm |

Shedrackamy - GW a security issue?

The global warming advocates and the current woke military have global warming rated as one of the primary causes of the next global and regional war conflicts.

Victor Hanson has a excellent book on the second WW. the first chapter goes into quite a bit of detail on the history of the geopolitical causes of war. A basis understanding of the geo political history demonstrates the belief that GW will be a factor in future wars is a delusional woke joke

Loading...

Pingback: [IPCC Admits Many of its Gloomy Climate Forecasts Are of "Low Likelihood" - The Daily Scientific](#)

Pingback: [IPCC Admits Many of its Gloomy Climate Forecasts Are of "Low Likelihood" - The Truth Central](#)