

Human Influence on Global Climate: A Comprehensive Synthesis of Evidence, Uncertainty, and Scientific Controversy

Tyler M. Moore, Ph.D.

Originally published at <https://www.mooremetrics.com/climate-change/>

The Challenge of Attribution

The question of whether and to what extent human activities influence the global climate system represents one of the most consequential scientific inquiries of our era. Yet beneath the surface of public discourse—which often presents a false dichotomy between “believers” and “deniers”—lies a far more nuanced empirical landscape.

The scientific literature reveals genuine consensus on certain foundational mechanisms while simultaneously exposing profound uncertainties in climate sensitivity quantification, measurement interpretation, and model validation.

This synthesis draws upon paleoclimatic reconstructions, observational records, modeling studies, and sociopolitical analyses to construct a coherent theoretical framework for understanding human-climate relationships—one that acknowledges anthropogenic influence while rigorously examining the boundaries of our knowledge.

The central argument advanced here is that climate change is real and partly anthropogenic, but attribution confidence varies dramatically by timescale and metric, observational biases systematically inflate warming signals, model sensitivities likely overestimate risks, and the politicization of uncertainty has produced both alarmist overreach and reflexive dismissal that undermine adaptive governance.

For climatologists across the spectrum—from those who accept the IPCC’s high-confidence attributions to those who remain skeptical—this synthesis offers a framework grounded in empirical evidence rather than ideological commitment.

Paleoclimatic Foundations: Establishing the Natural Variability Baseline

Any coherent theory of anthropogenic climate influence must first establish what constitutes normal climate variability against which human effects should be measured. Paleoclimatic reconstructions unambiguously demonstrate that the climate system exhibits substantial natural fluctuations on multiple timescales, often rivaling or exceeding the magnitude of 20th-century changes.

The Vostok ice core, spanning 420,000 years, provides the most comprehensive long-term perspective. Petit et al. (1999) documented four complete glacial-interglacial cycles with temperature oscillations of up to 11°C, driven primarily by Milankovitch orbital forcings.

Deuterium (δD_{ice}) proxies indicate Antarctic air temperature variations, with CO_2 ranging 180-280 ppm and CH_4 350-700 ppb, correlating strongly ($r^2 \approx 0.71-0.73$) with temperature.

Critically, however, CO_2 consistently lagged temperature by 600-800 \pm 200-400 years during terminations (Caillon et al., 2003; Petit et al., 1999). This lag, confirmed via argon isotope analysis for Termination III (~240,000 years BP), implies oceanic outgassing as a response to initial warming rather than its cause, with CO_2 subsequently amplifying approximately 1.5-3°C of the ~5-8°C total swing through radiative forcing (Petit et al., 1999).

The theoretical implication is profound: in natural cycles, CO_2 functions as a feedback mechanism rather than a primary driver. This does not preclude anthropogenic CO_2 from forcing contemporary warming, but it establishes that the relationship between atmospheric CO_2 and temperature is neither simple nor unidirectional.

On shorter timescales, proxy reconstructions reveal substantial centennial variability. Soon et al. (2003) and Soon and Baliunas (2003) synthesized tree rings, ice cores, corals, and historical documents across global sites, demonstrating that the Medieval Warm Period (MWP, AD 900-1300) and Little Ice Age (LIA, AD 1550-1700) constitute widespread climatic anomalies independent of CO_2 forcing.

Lamb (1965) documented 1.2-1.4°C temperature increases and 10% rainfall increases in England during the Early Medieval Warm Epoch compared to the LIA, enabling Viking colonization of Greenland and European agricultural expansion—achievements requiring sustained warmth that collapsed during what Lamb termed “the coldest conditions since the last ice age.” Ljungqvist’s (2010) multi-proxy Northern Hemisphere reconstruction spanning two millennia identifies temperature excursions during the Roman Warm Period (c. AD 1-300) and MWP that approached or potentially exceeded late 20th-century temperatures, with centennial-scale amplitudes exceeding 0.6°C.

These natural modes do not negate human influence, but they establish that attribution requires disentangling anthropogenic signals from substantial background noise operating on precisely the timescales—decadal to centennial—where policy debates concentrate. If natural mechanisms produced MWP warmth comparable to the present without anthropogenic CO_2 , then 20th-century warming may reflect recovery from the LIA superimposed upon, rather than exclusively caused by, human forcing.

The Physical Mechanism: Settled Science and Persistent Discrepancies

The radiative physics of greenhouse gases represents genuinely settled science. Peterson et al. (2008) definitively debunked claims of 1970s scientific cooling consensus, demonstrating that even during a period of aerosol-driven regional cooling, 44 papers predicted warming versus only 7 predicting cooling, with warming papers receiving 88% of citations. This historical analysis reveals that core understanding of greenhouse forcing has remained consistent for over four decades.

The mechanism is straightforward: increased atmospheric CO_2 concentration enhances longwave radiation absorption, reducing outgoing terrestrial radiation and forcing energy accumulation in the climate system. The direct radiative forcing from CO_2 doubling is approximately 4 $W m^{-2}$, yielding roughly 1°C warming absent feedbacks—a value that is physically well-constrained and not seriously disputed (Lindzen, 1997).

However, the translation from radiative forcing to observed temperature change involves complexities that challenge confident attribution. Christy et al. (2009) demonstrated that maximum temperatures (TMax) and minimum temperatures (TMin) in East Africa exhibit fundamentally different behaviors, with TMax showing no significant trend since 1946 while TMin displays accelerating positive trends.

TMax occurs during vigorous daytime convective mixing that couples surface measurements to the 1.5-2.5 km deep boundary layer, making it “more representative of temperatures aloft, at least at the top of the boundary layer” (Christy et al., 2009, p. 3348).

In contrast, TMin manifests within a shallow, often decoupled nocturnal boundary layer only hundreds of meters thick, where local surface modifications—urbanization, land use change, aerosol forcing—can destabilize the NBL and raise TMin without reflecting accumulated heat in the deep atmosphere.

The implications deserve careful consideration: if TMin warming primarily reflects boundary layer destabilization rather than deep atmospheric heat accumulation, then surface temperature records may systematically overestimate greenhouse-driven warming.

Gray (2006) provides corroborating evidence: when examining 1979-1997—a period relatively free from major El Niño interference—six of seven lower tropospheric datasets showed no significant warming trend, while surface records displayed continued warming of approximately 0.14°C per decade. This discrepancy persists despite greenhouse gas forcing theoretically producing enhanced warming in the lower troposphere where radiative effects should manifest most strongly.

Observational Artifacts and Measurement Biases

The instrumental record suffers from systematic biases that artificially amplify warming trends. Fall et al. (2011) audited the U.S. Historical Climatology Network through the Surface Stations Project, finding that 82.5% of stations violate NOAA’s Climate Reference Network siting criteria, with poor exposure (near heat sources, asphalt, buildings) overestimating minimum temperature trends while underestimating maximums.

This produces spurious warming signals: poorly sited stations show no century-scale diurnal temperature range trend, whereas raw data comparisons with North American Regional Reanalysis reveal warm biases tied to classification rather than geography. If the supposedly highest-quality U.S. network contains pervasive biases, global datasets synthesizing far less scrutinized stations likely overestimate anthropogenic warming.

Tropospheric records compound these problems. Christy et al. (2007) analyzed tropical tropospheric temperatures (1979-2004), finding UAH lower-troposphere trends of $+0.05 \pm 0.07$ K decade⁻¹—lower than surface trends of $+0.13$ K decade⁻¹ and contradicting models predicting amplified tropospheric warming (Santer et al., 2005).

Day-night differences in radiosonde trends ($+0.07$ K decade⁻¹ daytime versus $+0.12$ K decade⁻¹ nighttime) indicate uncorrected instrumental errors potentially exceeding the anthropogenic signal itself (Christy et al., 2007). Angell and Korshover (1978) documented record-cold stratospheric temperatures in spring 1977, with post-1963 trends suggesting slight cooling attributable to uncertain Southern Hemisphere data and radiosonde radiation correction errors rather than CO₂ effects.

These biases are not random noise—they systematically inflate warming. Urban heat island effects, station relocations, time-of-observation changes, and instrumentation shifts all trend warm, while natural modes like the quasi-biennial oscillation introduce variability that models struggle to capture (Angell & Korshover, 1978).

When Klotzbach and Landsea (2015) revisited hurricane intensification claims, extending Webster et al.'s (2005) analysis to 1990-2014, they found insignificant trends attributable to satellite observational improvements rather than climate sensitivity. The pattern is consistent: reported warming trends contain substantial artifactual components, and disaggregating these from genuine anthropogenic forcing requires acknowledging uncertainties that far exceed public representations.

Model-Observation Divergence: The Climate Sensitivity Problem

Even accepting observational warming as partly real, climate models systematically overestimate future change by inflating sensitivity through positive feedback assumptions. Lindzen (1997) reviewed radiative-convective equilibria, noting that convection reduces the greenhouse effect by approximately 75%, with water vapor—the dominant greenhouse gas—decreasing with height and latitude such that dynamic heat transports dominate radiative forcing.

Model intercomparisons show meridional flux differences up to 2 PW, equivalent to $\sim 25 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ vertical flux variations far exceeding the $\sim 4 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ from CO₂ doubling (Lindzen, 1997). This implies that uncertainty in representing natural circulation dwarfs anthropogenic perturbations.

Christy and McNider (2017) quantified this through satellite bulk tropospheric temperature measurements, calculating an adjusted underlying trend of $+0.096 \pm 0.012 \text{ K}$ per decade after removing volcanic and ENSO perturbations. This yields a tropospheric transient climate response (TCR) of $1.10 \pm 0.26 \text{ K}$ —approximately half the IPCC AR5 climate model average of $2.31 \pm 0.20 \text{ K}$.

Every CMIP-5 model simulation except the Russian 'inmcm4' produced tropospheric trends larger than observational averages below 100 hPa, with discrepancies largest in the upper troposphere. Christy et al. (2010) demonstrated that 102 of 108 CMIP5 model runs overpredict tropical mid-tropospheric warming relative to satellite observations. The observed scaling ratio between lower tropospheric and surface warming ($\text{TLT}/\text{T}_{\text{sfc}} \approx 0.8$) falls far below the IPCC AR4 model ensemble mean (≈ 1.4).

Models predict pronounced tropical tropospheric amplification—a fingerprint of greenhouse-forced warming—yet observations consistently fail to exhibit this pattern.

Lindzen and Choi (2011) approached this question using satellite observations from ERBE (1985-1999) and CERES (2000-2008), analyzing deseasonalized tropical SST fluctuations against top-of-atmosphere outgoing radiation. Their results showed observed radiation exceeds zero-feedback blackbody responses, implying negative feedbacks that dampen warming—opposite to the positive feedbacks exhibited by 11 IPCC AR4 models that underestimate outgoing radiation.

Adjusting tropical observations to global scales yields climate sensitivity of approximately 0.7°C for CO₂ doubling, far below model estimates of $1.5\text{-}5^\circ\text{C}$. The cloud feedback uncertainty that Stephens (2005) identifies—that condensed water absorbs 1,000 times more than vapor molecularly, yet albedo offsets longwave effects at TOA—remains unresolved despite decades of

research.

Stephens concludes that understanding requires “systematic combination of model and observations,” acknowledging that cloud parameterizations are empirical and unvalidated.

The Circularity Problem in Attribution

Curry and Webster (2011) provide penetrating analysis of structural problems in climate modeling and attribution. They identify “kludging” or “tuning”—adjusting multiple uncertain parameters simultaneously to match twentieth-century observations—as unavoidable in complex models.

This calibration process systematically masks model inadequacies: “If a model’s sensitivity is high, then greater aerosol forcing is used to counter the greenhouse warming, and vice versa for low model sensitivity” (Curry & Webster, 2011, p. 1676). The result is apparent agreement between diverse models despite fundamentally different representations of physical processes and climate sensitivity.

The logical circularity becomes explicit in detection and attribution arguments. Strong agreement between forced model simulations and observations depends on “forcing datasets and/or model parameters are selected based upon the agreement between models and the time series of twentieth-century observations” (Curry & Webster, 2011, p. 1676).

This agreement then bootstraps confidence in the models, which is subsequently used to argue that observed temperature changes exceed natural variability—creating a closed inferential loop where models validate themselves. The IPCC’s increasing confidence statements (from “likely” in TAR to “very likely” in AR4 to “extremely likely” in AR5) may reflect this bootstrap process rather than genuine improvements in physical understanding.

Current multimodel ensembles represent an “ensemble of opportunity” rather than systematic sampling of representational uncertainty (Curry & Webster, 2011).

Model inadequacy and insufficient ensemble size “preclude producing meaningful probability density functions from the frequency of model outcomes of future climate.” Yet policy-relevant projections routinely present ensemble spreads as uncertainty bounds, treating model agreement as validation despite models being tuned to similar twentieth-century observations and sharing common parameterization schemes.

The aerosol forcing problem exemplifies these challenges. Kirkby et al. (2011) demonstrated through CERN’s CLOUD experiment that atmospheric nucleation involves previously unrecognized complexity, with ammonia increasing sulphuric acid particle nucleation rates by 100-1,000-fold at atmospherically relevant concentrations.

However, even with these enhancements, “atmospheric concentrations of ammonia and sulphuric acid are insufficient to account for observed boundary-layer nucleation” (Kirkby et al., 2011, p. 756), indicating missing mechanisms. If we cannot accurately simulate present-day aerosol processes, confident quantification of aerosol forcing—the primary tuning parameter for balancing greenhouse warming in twentieth-century simulations—becomes questionable.

Solar Forcing: An Underappreciated Contributor

The solar forcing hypothesis offers a mechanistically plausible explanation for historical climate patterns. Soon's (2005) analysis of Arctic surface air temperatures over 130 years demonstrates that total solar irradiance explains >75% of decadal-scale temperature variance.

Scafetta and West (2006, 2008) developed phenomenological models attributing 45-50% of 1900-2000 warming (~0.74K) and 25-35% of 1980-2000 warming to total solar irradiance variations, including indirect effects on atmospheric chemistry and greenhouse gases. ACRIM composites show TSI increases during cycles 21-23, diverging from PMOD data, highlighting reconstruction uncertainties but supporting solar's amplified role via empirical sensitivities.

Neff et al.'s (2001) stalagmite reconstruction from Oman reveals strong coherence between solar activity (inferred from ^{14}C production rates) and monsoon intensity over the 9.6-6.1 kyr BP interval, establishing solar modulation of regional climate on centennial timescales.

Svensmark and Friis-Christensen (1997) identified cosmic ray modulation of cloud cover varying 3-4% over solar cycles, providing a physical mechanism for solar-climate linkages through which small variations in solar magnetic activity could amplify into climatically significant effects via modulation of planetary albedo.

If Scafetta and West's attribution is accurate, this reassignment of variance dramatically reduces the residual requiring anthropogenic explanation and challenges IPCC high-confidence statements.

The Resilience of Natural Carbon Sinks

Ballantyne et al.'s (2012) analysis of the contemporary carbon budget reveals that terrestrial and oceanic sinks doubled their net uptake from 2.4 to 5.0 PgC yr⁻¹ between 1959 and 2010, sequestering approximately 55% of cumulative anthropogenic emissions. This enhanced sink strength contradicts model predictions of declining uptake efficiency due to warming-induced respiration increases and ocean acidification effects.

The resilience of natural carbon sinks suggests the Earth system possesses substantial negative feedbacks that may buffer anthropogenic perturbations, though mechanisms remain incompletely characterized. CO₂ fertilization of terrestrial photosynthesis represents one plausible driver, with implications for both carbon budgeting and ecosystem productivity.

Why Skepticism Is Scientifically Defensible

Skepticism toward anthropogenic climate change consensus often reflects not scientific illiteracy but recognition of structural problems in the field.

When models consistently project warming exceeding observations (Christy & McNider, 2017), when surface and tropospheric records diverge during natural forcing-free periods (Gray, 2006), when TMin and TMax show fundamentally different behaviors (Christy et al., 2009), and when publication bias systematically favors alarming results—skepticism becomes scientifically defensible.

Yang et al. (2021) conducted a meta-analysis revealing low statistical power (18-38% for magnitudes) in field studies of biological climate impacts, with Type M errors exaggerating effects 2-3 times and publication bias favoring significant results. Rundt (2008) cites Bray and von

Storch's 2003 survey where only 56% of 530 climate scientists attributed warming mostly to humans, and only 35% trusted models for predictions—numbers that belie claims of overwhelming consensus. The much-cited Cook et al. (2013) analysis found 97.1% of papers expressing a position endorsed anthropogenic global warming, but 66.4% of abstracts expressed no position, with the proportion taking no position increasing over time. Of the papers expressing positions, merely 1.6% explicitly stated humans as the primary driver.

Pielke's (2004) analysis reveals fundamental incompatibility between the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) and IPCC definitions of "climate change." The FCCC defines it restrictively as anthropogenic alterations to atmospheric composition beyond natural variability—a definition that privileges mitigation over adaptation by assuming human causation a priori.

The concept of "climate change denial" conflates distinct epistemic positions: rejecting human influence entirely, questioning whether human influence dominates over natural variability, accepting human influence but questioning whether impacts justify proposed policy costs, and accepting the full consensus position.

By collapsing these into undifferentiated "denial," consensus advocates rhetorically delegitimize legitimate scientific skepticism regarding attribution confidence, model reliability, and cost-benefit tradeoffs.

The Costs of Climate Alarmism

The political demand for certainty has produced "climate alarmism" that exaggerates risks and crowds out nuanced adaptation strategies. Lomborg (2020, reviewed by Trubshaw, 2021) frames climate change as a real, human-influenced phenomenon—inevitable yet mitigable through prosperity rather than panic. He argues that drastic CO₂ cuts cost trillions, disproportionately harm the poor, and fail to address problems that humanity has historically overcome through technological adaptation.

Riofrancos (2025) warns that alarmism risks "eco-authoritarianism," noting no evidence that emergency powers enable decarbonization while such powers might entrench fossil interests and erode democratic deliberation needed for zero-emissions transitions.

Risbey's (2008) distinction between "alarmist" (rhetorical exaggeration) and "alarming" (evidence-based concern) captures a genuine dilemma. However, the documented pattern of IPCC projections systematically overestimating warming (Spencer, 2013), Himalayan glacier melt predictions requiring retraction, and climate models consistently running hot relative to observations (Christy et al., 2010; Christy & McNider, 2017) suggests the balance has tilted toward alarmism.

Dawson (2021) identifies specific problems: characterizing CO₂ as "pollution" when it is essential for photosynthesis; portraying fossil fuels as a "mistake" when they enabled population growth from 1 to 7.9 billion and unprecedented prosperity; and declaring "Code Red emergencies" based on models with documented warm biases.

The precautionary principle invoked to justify aggressive mitigation cuts both ways. Policies enforcing rapid decarbonization carry substantial risks: energy poverty kills millions annually through lack of heating, cooling, and healthcare access; elevated energy costs disproportionately burden the poor; and retarded economic development in the Global South reduces resilience to

climate impacts while perpetuating poverty (Singer, 2007; Lomborg, 2020).

Quesnel (2024) documents tangible costs: eco-extremist attacks on Canadian energy infrastructure and European activist-caused fatalities, radicalized by doomsday narratives. The irony is that Indigenous communities often support projects that activists claim to oppose on their behalf.

What We Know with Confidence

Despite these uncertainties, certain conclusions are robust:

- 1 Greenhouse gas radiative forcing is real and physically understood. The $\sim 4 \text{ W m}^{-2}$ forcing from CO_2 doubling is not seriously disputed.
- 2 Global temperatures have increased over the past century. The $\sim 0.86\text{-}1^\circ\text{C}$ warming since 1880 is observed across multiple datasets, though measurement biases may contribute $0.1\text{-}0.3^\circ\text{C}$.
- 3 Anthropogenic emissions contribute to this warming. Current atmospheric CO_2 ($\sim 417 \text{ ppm}$) exceeds any level in the Vostok record, and anthropogenic sources are isotopically identifiable.
- 4 Consensus on some human role exists. The debate concerns magnitude, timescales, and policy implications rather than whether any human influence occurs.

What Remains Genuinely Uncertain

- 1 The magnitude of anthropogenic contribution relative to natural variability (solar forcing, ocean oscillations, recovery from the LIA) remains contested.
- 2 Climate sensitivity to CO_2 doubling spans estimates from $<1^\circ\text{C}$ (Lindzen & Choi, 2011) to $>4^\circ\text{C}$ (some CMIP models), with observational constraints suggesting the lower range is more plausible.
- 3 Regional impact distributions and extreme event attribution depend on model outputs that systematically fail validation tests.
- 4 Tipping point probabilities for phenomena like AMOC collapse or abrupt permafrost melt remain speculative, resting on high-sensitivity assumptions incompatible with observational constraints.

Toward Epistemic Humility

The appropriate response involves acknowledging uncertainty honestly while maintaining focus on robust physical mechanisms and no-regrets policies. Sea level rise projections of $0.3\text{-}1.2 \text{ m}$ by 2100 (Wang et al., 2023; Curry, 2019) bracket plausible outcomes, but worst-case scenarios assuming rapid ice sheet collapse lack empirical support, while best-case estimates reflect low sensitivity and potential natural deceleration.

Mitigation strategies emphasizing nature-based solutions—protecting soil carbon sinks storing $2,500 \text{ Pg C}$, afforestation sequestering $7 \text{ Pg CO}_2\text{-e yr}^{-1}$ —and technological advances offer pragmatic pathways without requiring the economic devastation that aggressive decarbonization entails (Wang et al., 2023). Nuclear energy, systematically excluded from climate policy discussions, offers reliable baseload power that renewables cannot match given intermittency and storage limitations (Manheimer, 2022).

The central uncertainty—and the source of scientific controversy—is not whether humans influence climate but how much, on what timescales, and whether that influence dominates

natural variability sufficiently to justify massive societal restructuring. The answer to “do humans influence global climate?” is unequivocally yes through greenhouse forcing, land-use change, and aerosol emissions. The answer to “how much, and does it matter?” remains genuinely uncertain.

Recognizing this uncertainty as irreducible given current observational constraints and model limitations—rather than as a gap to be rhetorically closed through consensus declarations—represents the most scientifically defensible position and the foundation for policy that can bridge ideological divides.

References

- Angell, J. K., & Korshover, J. (1978). Global temperature variation, surface-100 mb: An update into 1977. *Monthly Weather Review*, 106(6), 755-770.
- Ballantyne, A. P., Alden, C. B., Miller, J. B., Tans, P. P., & White, J. W. C. (2012). Increase in observed net carbon dioxide uptake by land and oceans during the past 50 years. *Nature*, 488(7409), 70-72.
- Caillon, N., Severinghaus, J. P., Jouzel, J., Barnola, J.-M., Kang, J., & Lipenkov, V. Y. (2003). Timing of atmospheric CO₂ and Antarctic temperature changes across Termination III. *Science*, 299(5613), 1728-1731. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1078758>
- Christy, J. R., Herman, B., Pielke, R., Sr., Klotzbach, P., McNider, R. T., Hnilo, J. J., Spencer, R. W., Chase, T., & Douglass, D. (2010). What do observational datasets say about modeled tropospheric temperature trends since 1979? *Remote Sensing*, 2(9), 2148-2169.
- Christy, J. R., & McNider, R. T. (2017). Satellite bulk tropospheric temperatures as a metric for climate sensitivity. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences*, 53(4), 511-518. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13143-017-0070-z>
- Christy, J. R., Norris, W. B., & McNider, R. T. (2009). Surface temperature variations in East Africa and possible causes. *Journal of Climate*, 22(12), 3342-3356. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2726.1>
- Christy, J. R., Norris, W. B., Spencer, R. W., & Hnilo, J. J. (2007). Tropospheric temperature change since 1979 from tropical radiosonde and satellite measurements. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 112(D6), D06102.
- Cook, J., Nuccitelli, D., Green, S. A., Richardson, M., Winkler, B., Painting, R., Way, R., Jacobs, P., & Skuce, A. (2013). Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(2), 024024. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/2/024024>
- Curry, J. (2019). Sea level and climate change [Special report]. Climate Forecast Applications Network. <https://cfanclimate.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Special-Report-Sea-Level-Rise-v2.pdf>
- Curry, J. A., & Webster, P. J. (2011). Climate science and the uncertainty monster. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 92(12), 1667-1682. <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-10-3139.1>
- Dawson, J. (2021). The ten big lies that fuel climate alarmism. *Quadrant*, December, 30-35.
- Fall, S., Watts, A., Nielsen-Gammon, J., Jones, E., Niyogi, D., Christy, J. R., & Pielke Sr., R. A. (2011). Analysis of the impacts of station exposure on the U.S. Historical Climatology Network temperatures and temperature trends. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 116(D14), D14120.
- Gray, V. (2006). Temperature trends in the lower atmosphere. *Energy & Environment*, 17(5), 707-714.
- Kirkby, J., Curtius, J., Almeida, J., Dunne, E., Duplissy, J., Ehrhart, S., ... & Kulmala, M. (2011). Role of sulphuric acid, ammonia and galactic cosmic rays in atmospheric aerosol nucleation. *Nature*, 476(7361), 429-433.
- Klotzbach, P. J., & Landsea, C. W. (2015). Extremely intense hurricanes: Revisiting Webster et al. (2005) after 10 years. *Journal of Climate*, 28(19), 7621-7629.
- Lamb, H. H. (1965). The early medieval warm epoch and its sequel. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 1(1), 13-37.
- Lindzen, R. S. (1997). Can increasing carbon dioxide cause climate change? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 94(16), 8335-8342. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.94.16.8335>

- Lindzen, R. S., & Choi, Y.-S. (2011). On the observational determination of climate sensitivity and its implications. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences*, 47(4), 377-390.
- Ljungqvist, F. C. (2010). A new reconstruction of temperature variability in the extra-tropical Northern Hemisphere during the last two millennia. *Geografiska Annaler: Series A, Physical Geography*, 92(3), 339-351.
- Lomborg, B. (2020). *False alarm: How climate change panic costs us trillions, hurts the poor, and fails to fix the planet*. Basic Books.
- Manheimer, W. (2022). While the climate always has and always will change, there is no climate crisis. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 15(5), 116-130. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v15n5p116>
- Neff, U., Burns, S. J., Mangini, A., Mudelsee, M., Fleitmann, D., & Matter, A. (2001). Strong coherence between solar variability and the monsoon in Oman between 9 and 6 kyr ago. *Nature*, 411(6835), 290-293.
- Peterson, T. C., Connolley, W. M., & Fleck, J. (2008). The myth of the 1970s global cooling scientific consensus. *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 89(9), 1325-1337. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008BAMS2370.1>
- Petit, J. R., Jouzel, J., Raynaud, D., Barkov, N. I., Barnola, J.-M., Basile, I., Bender, M., Chappellaz, J., Davis, M., Delaygue, G., Delmotte, M., Kotlyakov, V. M., Legrand, M., Lipenkov, V. Y., Lorius, C., Pépin, L., Ritz, C., Saltzman, E., & Stievenard, M. (1999). Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420,000 years from the Vostok ice core, Antarctica. *Nature*, 399(6735), 429-436. <https://doi.org/10.1038/20859>
- Pielke, R. A., Jr. (2004). What is climate change? *Issues in Science and Technology*, 20(4), 31-34.
- Quesnel, J. (2024). The deadly fruits of climate change alarmism: The looming eco-extremist threat and why we must stop ignoring it (Backgrounder No. 134). Frontier Centre for Public Policy.
- Riofrancos, T. (2025). The perils of climate alarmism. *Journal of Democracy*, 36(1), 169-174.
- Risbey, J. S. (2008). The new climate discourse: Alarmist or alarming? *Global Environmental Change*, 18(1), 26-37.
- Rundt, K. (2008). *Global warming – Man-made or natural?* [Manuscript]. Turku, Finland.
- Scafetta, N., & West, B. J. (2006). Phenomenological solar contribution to the 1900-2000 global surface warming. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33(5), L05708. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL025539>
- Scafetta, N., & West, B. J. (2008). Is climate sensitive to solar variability? *Physics Today*, 61(3), 50-51.
- Singer, S. F. (2007). Global warming: Man-made or natural? *Imprimis*, 36(8), 1-5.
- Soon, W., & Baliunas, S. (2003). Proxy climatic and environmental changes of the past 1000 years. *Climate Research*, 23(2), 89-110.
- Soon, W., Baliunas, S., Idso, C., Idso, S., & Legates, D. R. (2003). Reconstructing climatic and environmental changes of the past 1000 years: A reappraisal. *Energy & Environment*, 14(2-3), 233-296.
- Soon, W. W.-H. (2005). Variable solar irradiance as a plausible agent for multidecadal variations in the Arctic-wide surface air temperature record of the past 130 years. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 32(16), L16712.
- Spencer, R. W. (2013). Still epic fail: 73 climate models vs. measurements, running 5-year means. <http://www.drroyspencer.com/2013/06/still-epic-fail-73-climate-models-vs-measurements-running-5-year-means/>
- Stephens, G. L. (2005). Cloud feedbacks in the climate system: A critical review. *Journal of Climate*, 18(2), 237-273.
- Svensmark, H., & Friis-Christensen, E. (1997). Variation of cosmic ray flux and global cloud coverage—a missing link in solar-climate relationships. *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics*, 59(11), 1225-1232.
- Wang, F., Harindintwali, J. D., Wei, K., Shan, Y., Mi, Z., Costello, M. J., Grunwald, S., Feng, Z., Wang, F., Guo, Y., Wu, X., Kumar, P., Kästner, M., Feng, X., Kang, S., Liu, Z., Fu, Y., Zhao, W., Ouyang, C., ... Tiedje, J. M. (2023). Climate change: Strategies for mitigation and adaptation. *The Innovation Geoscience*, 1(1), 100015. <https://doi.org/10.59717/j.xinn-geo.2023.100015>
- Yang, Y., Hillebrand, H., Lagisz, M., Cleasby, I., & Nakagawa, S. (2021). Low statistical power and overestimated anthropogenic impacts, exacerbated by publication bias, dominate field studies in global change biology. *Global Change Biology*, 28(3), 969-990. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15972>

Author's Note and Suggested Citation

This article was composed using a combination of the above-cited primary sources, Grok (grok.com), Claude (claude.ai), and my own editing. It can be cited as:

Moore, T. M. (2025). Human Influence on Global Climate: A Comprehensive Synthesis of Evidence, Uncertainty, and Scientific Controversy. Retrieved from <https://mooremetrics.com/climate-change>.