



**daveburton** says:

June 27, 2018 at 8:50 pm

Ken and Rachel, why did you delete [my reply](#)?

edimbukvarevic wrote, “*Great comment daveburton!*”

Thank you, you’re very kind. But Ken or Rachel apparently didn’t think so.

---



**John Hartz** says:

June 27, 2018 at 8:51 pm

The url for Weart’s **General Circulation Models of Climate** is:

[https://history.aip.org/history/climate/GCM.htm#M\\_115\\_](https://history.aip.org/history/climate/GCM.htm#M_115_)

---



**...and Then There's Physics** says:

June 27, 2018 at 8:55 pm

Dave,

*That’s correct, Ken, but Hansen et al didn’t say that. They didn’t say “net change in anthropogenic forcing,” they said “emissions.”*

*Their three “scenarios” were emissions scenarios. They were described in terms of “emissions.”*

Figure 1 is entirely about the resulting forcings. The key point is that given that the change in forcing we actually experienced is somewhere between scenario B and scenario C, the predicted change in temperature is remarkably close to what we actually experienced.

---



**...and Then There's Physics** says:

June 27, 2018 at 8:57 pm

edimbukvarevic,

*At least Hansen noticed in 2013 that the airborne fraction is decreasing, in spite of the CO2 emissions ‘shot up’.*

The figure in that paper does not include emissions from land use change, which made up a bigger fraction of total emissions earlier in the period than later. If you correct for this, the airborne fraction has barely change (in fact, I think there are some indications that it might have increased slightly, but this is probably not statistically significant.

---

This site uses Akismet to reduce spam. [Learn how your comment data is processed.](#)

---