Volume IV, Perspectives - A Peer-Reviewed, Bilingual, Interdisciplinary E-Journal
https://perspectives-jdmc.in/
eISSN – 2583 4762

It's Not Happening? Understanding the Reality of Climate change sceptics

Sana Rehman, Ph.D

Assistant Professor

Department of Environmental Studies

Janki Devi Memorial College, University of Delhi

&

Anju Gupta, Ph.D

Assistant Professor

Department of Physics

Rajdhani College, University of Delhi

Volume IV, Perspectives - A Peer-Reviewed, Bilingual, Interdisciplinary E-Journal
https://perspectives-jdmc.in/
eISSN – 2583 4762

It's Not Happening? Understanding the Reality of Climate change sceptics

Abstract

Even if misperceptions and false information persist in clouding the public's comprehension of this intricate problem, climate change continues to rank among humanity's most pressing issues. Global warming, the gradual increase in Earth's average surface temperature, has become one of the most pressing environmental challenges of our time. Despite overwhelming scientific evidence supporting its existence and human causes, there are still misconceptions and myths perpetuated by sceptics and contrarians. In this article, we will address some of the most common myths surrounding global warming and provide scientific evidence to debunk them. This study looks at consensus, the most recent research, and scientific evidence to dispel popular misunderstandings and misconceptions about climate change. We address common misunderstandings and highlight the enormous body of scientific evidence supporting the fact of climate change, from the denial of human-induced warming to false beliefs about climate models and the role of carbon dioxide. Our goal is to improve people's comprehension of climate science and provide them with the tools they need to make educated decisions and take action to address this urgent global issue by providing simple explanations and scientific data.

Keywords: Climate Change, Global Warming, anthropogenic causes, scepticism, myths and misconceptions

Introduction

The history of understanding global warming spans several centuries, from early observations of the greenhouse effect to the contemporary recognition of its anthropogenic causes. In the 19th century, scientists like Joseph Fourier and John Tyndall first proposed the concept of the greenhouse

effect, demonstrating how certain gases trap heat in Earth's atmosphere (Weart, 2003). Swedish scientist Svante Arrhenius further quantified the greenhouse effect's potential impact on global climate in 1896, hypothesizing that increased CO2 concentrations from fossil fuel combustion could lead to global warming (Arrhenius, 1896). Throughout the early to mid-20th century scientific understanding of the greenhouse effect continued to advance with researchers like Guy Stewart Callendar demonstrating correlations between rising CO2 levels and global temperature increases (Callendar, 1938). However, the scientific consensus on climate change was not firmly established during this time, and public awareness remained limited. It wasn't until the late 20th century that climate science began to emerge as a distinct field driven by advances in technology and increased environmental awareness. The establishment of organisations like the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988 provided a platform for international collaboration and the synthesis of climate research (IPCC, 1990). Landmark reports from the IPCC, such as the First Assessment Report in 1990, highlighted the scientific consensus on anthropogenic global warming and its potential consequences. Despite the growing body of scientific evidence supporting the reality of global warming, skepticism and denial persisted into the late 20th century and continue to the present day, fueled by factors such as political ideology, economic interests, and misinformation campaigns. However, in the early 21st century, there was a notable shift towards widespread acceptance of the reality of anthropogenic global warming, driven by increasingly compelling scientific evidence and growing public awareness. International agreements like the Kyoto Protocol (1997) and the Paris Agreement (2015) demonstrated global recognition of the need for collective action on climate change, leading to the implementation of measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, promote renewable energy, and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

Despite the vast body of scientific evidence supporting the reality of global warming, a minority of sceptics persist in disputing its existence (Cook et al. 2013). One argument often presented is the notion that global warming is a natural phenomenon rather than a result of human activities. Some

sceptics point to historical climate data and geological records to argue that the Earth has experienced periods of warming and cooling throughout its history, independent of human influence. They suggest that the current warming trend may be part of a natural cycle and not necessarily indicative of anthropogenic causes. Additionally, they may highlight instances of localised cooling or fluctuations in temperature as evidence against the overarching trend of global warming. However, these arguments overlook the comprehensive scientific research that has demonstrated the significant role of human activities, particularly the emission of greenhouse gases, in driving the observed warming trend.

Scepticism towards the climate crisis may be due to the perception that international climate policies and agreements are often biased in favour of developed nations. This scepticism is fuelled by concerns that such policies might impose unfair constraints on developing countries (Narain 2017). The debate over carbon budgets and emission reduction targets is particularly contentious.

In the early twentieth century, carbon emissions were quite low, due mostly to industrial activities and deforestation. However, with the fast industrialisation and urbanisation that followed World War II, carbon emissions began to slowly rise. The postwar economic boom caused a considerable increase in carbon emissions, notably in industrialised countries. During this time fossil fuel-based technologies were widely used and energy production expanded. Carbon dioxide emissions continued to increase in the second half of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century due to population growth, industrial expansion, and increased energy use. Rapid economic development in emerging economies, especially China and India, has significantly increased global carbon dioxide emissions. In recent years, the need to address climate change has grown leading to efforts to reduce carbon emissions through policy measures, technological innovation and the deployment of renewable energy sources.

While some regions have made progress in decoupling economic growth from carbon emissions, global carbon emissions have remained persistently high with fluctuations influenced by factors such as economic recession, energy policy and technological developments. A hypothetical graph illustrating global trends in carbon dioxide emissions over the past century might show a sharp upward trend from the early 20th century to the present, with fluctuations reflecting periods of economic growth, recession, and political intervention. At first, the graph shows a gradual increase in emissions, followed by a sharp increase after World War II during a period of rapid industrialization. The graph may show a more moderate increase in emissions in recent years, indicating efforts to limit emissions through various initiatives. Despite these efforts, the overall trend still shows a continued increase in carbon dioxide emissions, albeit at a slower rate than in previous decades.

It is critical to note that the overwhelming opinion among climate scientists is that climate change is occurring and is mostly caused by human activity, particularly the release of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO2) from the combustion of fossil fuels. However, there are individuals and groups who oppose this consensus, known as climate change sceptics or contrarians. They present diverse reasons to counter the dominant scientific viewpoint. In this hypothetical scenario, our study over some of these arguments, emphasising that they are not backed by the preponderance of scientific data. In this article, we aim to debunk common myths and misconceptions. From the denial of human-induced warming to misconceptions about climate models.

Never Happened

"Other" Natural Causes sceptics may present various arguments against scientific observations. Some argue that observed changes in climate could be attributed to natural variability rather than human-caused factors. They suggest that phenomena such as solar radiation, volcanic activity, and natural cycles like the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO) may be responsible for fluctuations in temperature and other climate indicators. Phenomena such as solar radiation, volcanic

activity, and natural cycles can indeed influence fluctuations in temperature on Earth. Solar radiation, especially changes in solar energy production, play an important role in driving Earth's climate. Solar energy production is not constant and can vary over time due to solar cycles, solar eclipses, and solar flares. Changes in solar irradiance (the amount of solar energy reaching the Earth's surface) affect both short- and long-term weather patterns. For example, during periods of increased solar activity, such as during the solar maximum of the 11-year solar cycle, the Earth warms slightly due to increased solar radiation. However, periods of reduced solar activity, such as when the sun is at its lowest point, tend to be warmer. Studies using climate models and satellite observations suggest that changes in solar radiation may explain some of the observed warming in recent decades (IPCC 2013). Secondly, volcanic eruptions can have significant but short-term effects on Earth's climate patterns. When a volcano erupts, large amounts of ash, Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) and other aerosols are released into the atmosphere. These aerosols can reflect solar radiation back into space, producing a cooling effect on the Earth's surface known as volcanic cooling. In addition, sulphur emissions from volcanoes react with water vapour in the atmosphere to form sulphate aerosols, which increase solar radiation. Historical records and paleoclimate data show that large volcanic eruptions cause short-term cooling called volcanic winter that lasts months to years. One of the most famous examples is the 1991 eruption of Mount Pinatubo, which cooled global temperatures by 0.5 to 0.6 degrees Celsius in the years following the eruption (Robock 2000).

Earth's climate is also subjected to various natural cycles and oscillations that operate on different timescales, ranging from months to thousands of years. These natural cycles can influence temperature patterns regionally and globally. One prominent example is the El Niño-Southern Oscillation (ENSO), a climate phenomenon characterised by periodic fluctuations in sea surface temperatures and atmospheric pressure in the equatorial Pacific Ocean. During El Niño events, warmer-than-average sea surface temperatures in the central and eastern Pacific Ocean can lead to changes in atmospheric circulation patterns, affecting weather patterns around the world. El Niño

events are associated with increased rainfall in some regions, droughts in others, and shifts in temperature patterns. Conversely, La Niña events, characterised by cooler-than-average sea surface temperatures in the equatorial Pacific, can have the opposite effects. Other natural climate cycles include the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO), the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO), and the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), among others. These natural cycles can modulate climate variability and contribute to fluctuations in temperature over years to decades.

While these factors play a role in shaping climate variability, scientific research indicates that human activities, particularly the emission of greenhouse gases, are the primary drivers of long-term warming trends observed in recent decades. Notably, while solar variability can affect climate variability, scientific studies show that the effect is small compared to human factors such as greenhouse gas emissions. The cooling effects of volcanic eruptions are temporary and typically dissipate within a few years as the aerosols gradually settle out of the atmosphere. Scientists use climate models to simulate the Earth's climate under different scenarios, including natural and human-induced forcing. These models consistently show that the observed warming cannot be explained by natural variability alone and that human activities particularly the burning of fossil fuels and deforestation are the dominant drivers of recent climate change (Allen 2007).

Unreliability of Climate Models

Another argument by the ‘contrarians’ is that there are several uncertainties in the Climate Models. Critics often point to precariousness in Climate Models and argue that our understanding of climate processes is incomplete. They claim that climate models may not accurately represent the complexities of the Earth's climate system and its responses to various traits. Climate models, while powerful tools for simulating Earth's climate system, have inherent limitations that can affect their accuracy in representing the complexities of the climate system and its responses to various factors (Randall et al. 2007). One significant challenge is the difficulty of incorporating all relevant physical,

chemical, and biological processes into a single model, since Earth's climate is governed by a multitude of interconnected factors operating at different spatial and temporal scales. Additionally, uncertainties in model inputs, parameterisations, and feedback mechanisms can further impact model performance.

An example illustrating one such challenge is the representation of ocean currents. These currents play a crucial role in redistributing heat around the globe, influencing regional climates and weather patterns (Srokosz & Bryden 2015). However, ocean currents are highly dynamic and influenced by various factors such as wind patterns, topography, and ocean-atmosphere interactions. These currents are like rivers in the ocean, carrying warm and cold water around the globe and affecting weather patterns. But they're really complex, influenced by things like wind, the shape of the ocean floor, and how the ocean and atmosphere interact. Climate models find it difficult to capture all these details because they're so small and changeable. This means they might not always get ocean currents right, leading to uncertainties in their predictions, especially for specific regions. Representing these processes accurately in climate models is difficult due to computational constraints and limited understanding of small-scale ocean dynamics. As a result, climate models may oversimplify or poorly simulate the behaviour of ocean currents, leading to uncertainties in climate projections, especially at regional scales. Despite ongoing efforts to improve ocean model representations, such as increasing model resolution and incorporating more comprehensive parameterisations, challenges persist in accurately capturing the complex interactions driving ocean circulation patterns (Griffies 2015). Scientists are working hard to improve how models represent ocean currents, but it's a challenging task.

While it's true that climate models have limitations and uncertainties (Knutti & Sedláček 2013), they have improved significantly over time and are based on fundamental physical principles. Multiple lines of evidence, including observations, experiments, and paleo-climate data (information derived from natural sources and proxies, such as ice cores, sediment cores, and fossil records, used to

reconstruct past climate conditions on Earth), support the robustness of climate models in simulating past and present climate trends. Climate models are complex mathematical representations of the Earth's climate system that incorporate physical, chemical, and biological processes. Model simulations that include human-induced greenhouse gas emissions closely match observed temperature trends, providing confidence in their predictive capabilities (Flato et al. 2013). Moreover, ensemble modelling techniques allow scientists to quantify uncertainty and assess the range of possible outcomes under different emission scenarios.

Unreliability of Historical Climate Data

Sceptics may also question the reliability of historical climate data, suggesting that temperature records may be biased due to factors such as urbanisation, changes in measurement methods, and the location of weather stations which can introduce biases into the data and affect the accuracy of climate assessments. Urbanisation is a significant factor that can lead to the urban heat island (UHI) effect. Urban areas typically experience higher temperatures compared to surrounding rural areas due to the presence of buildings, roads, and other infrastructure that absorb and retain heat. As cities grow and expand, nearby weather stations may record higher temperatures due to this localised warming effect, leading to an overestimation of temperature trends if not properly accounted for.

Changes in measurement methods over time can also introduce biases into temperature records. For example, the transition from older mercury thermometers to electronic sensors may lead to discrepancies in temperature readings. Additionally, changes in the location or height of weather stations, as well as alterations in the surrounding environment (such as the construction of buildings or deforestation), can impact temperature measurements.

The setting up of weather stations is another important factor to consider. Stations located near heat sources such as asphalt pavement, air conditioning exhausts, or industrial facilities may record higher

temperatures compared to stations in more natural or rural settings. This can result in a warming bias in the temperature record if these factors are not taken into account during data analysis.

An example of bias in temperature records due to urbanisation can be seen in studies comparing temperature trends in urban versus rural areas. For instance, a study published in the journal Nature Climate Change in 2013 by Benjamin et al. titled "Urbanisation effects in large-scale temperature records, with an emphasis on China" found that temperature records from urban areas in China exhibited more warming compared to rural areas over the past several decades. This discrepancy highlighted the importance of accounting for urbanisation effects when analysing temperature trends to obtain a more accurate picture of regional and global climate change.

While it's essential to account for potential biases and uncertainties in climate data, numerous studies have rigorously assessed these factors and found that they do not significantly alter the overall picture of global warming. While urbanisation can lead to localised warming trends known as the urban heat island (UHI) effect, studies have shown that this effect does not significantly alter broader climate trends. For instance, a study by Wickham et al. (2013) examined temperature records from urban and rural areas across multiple regions and found that after appropriate adjustments, urbanisation had minimal influence on long-term temperature trends. Advancements in measurement techniques, such as transitioning from traditional mercury thermometers to electronic sensors, have been carefully calibrated to ensure data accuracy. Studies evaluating the impact of these changes on climate records, such as the work by Peterson et al. (1998), have concluded that while there may be minor discrepancies during transitions, rigorous quality control measures mitigate any long-term biases introduced by such changes. Independent temperature records from various sources, including satellites and ocean buoys, corroborate the warming trend observed in surface temperature measurements. While urbanisation and changes in measurement techniques can introduce localised biases, rigorous scientific methodologies and adjustments ensure the integrity of climate data for broader climate trend analysis and policy-making.

Nothing to worry about

One of the most common arguments of the sceptics is that, historically, the climate of the Earth has always changed, so current warming is nothing to worry about. Claiming this idea, oversimplifies the complexity and severity of contemporary global warming. While it's true that Earth's climate has undergone natural fluctuations over geological time scales, the current rate and magnitude of warming are unprecedented and largely attributed to human activities, primarily the emission of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels.

One commonly cited example of historical climate change is the glacial-interglacial cycles, where Earth's climate oscillated between ice ages and warmer interglacial periods lasting over tens of thousands of years. These natural variations in climate occurred due to changes in Earth's orbit and axial tilt, leading to fluctuations in solar radiation received by the planet (Shakun et al. 2012). However, comparing these natural cycles to current warming trends is misleading. The rate of temperature increase over the past century is much faster than anything observed in the geological record. Furthermore, the correlation between rising greenhouse gas concentrations and global temperature rise is well-established through multiple lines of evidence, including direct measurements, ice core data, and computer models.

It's crucial to recognise that the consequences of current warming, such as sea-level rise, extreme weather events, and biodiversity loss, pose significant risks to ecosystems, economies, and human well-being. Ignoring these risks under the pretext of natural climate variability overlooks the urgent need for mitigation and adaptation measures to address anthropogenic climate change. Proxy data from ice cores, tree rings, and sediment records provide evidence of past climate changes, but none match the rapidity of recent warming (Solomon et al. 2009). Moreover, human-induced warming is accompanied by other observable changes, such as melting glaciers, rising sea levels, and shifts in precipitation patterns, which have far-reaching consequences for ecosystems and human societies.

Politics in climate

Some sceptics argue that the emphasis on climate change is driven by political agendas or economic interests rather than scientific evidence. They suggest that policies aimed at addressing climate change may have adverse economic consequences or infringe upon individual freedoms. While political and economic factors undoubtedly influence public discourse and policymaking on climate change, the scientific consensus on human-induced climate change is based on empirical evidence and peer-reviewed research conducted by thousands of scientists worldwide, independent of political or economic motivations. While most sceptics acknowledge the role of greenhouse gases like CO2 in warming the planet, some dispute the extent of their contribution to recent warming trends. They may argue that other factors, such as variations in solar activity or natural cycles, play a more significant role in determining Earth's temperature.

Of course, the vast majority of scientific evidence supports global warming. However, some world leaders deny or minimise the reality or importance of global warming. There are several reasons for this denial or scepticism. For example, some leaders represent industries or sectors of the economy that currently benefit from fossil fuels, such as mining and manufacturing. Adopting global warming could require expensive measures to shift to renewable energy or implement emissions regulation, which could run counter to the short-term economic interests of some industries.

Ideological beliefs can influence how individuals perceive and interpret scientific evidence. One such specific example can be observed in the United States, particularly regarding political divisions over climate policy and the role of fossil fuels in the economy. In the United States, there is a stark divide between political ideologies regarding climate change and environmental policy. This ideological split often influences how individuals, policymakers, and interest groups perceive and interpret scientific evidence related to climate. It has become a deeply polarised issue in the United States, with Democrats and Republicans holding starkly different views on the severity of the problem and the appropriate policy responses. Partisan polarisation can lead individuals to interpret scientific

evidence through a partisan lens, with Democrats more likely to accept mainstream climate science and Republicans more likely to express scepticism or denial.

Leaders who espouse free-market ideologies or are sceptical of government intervention may be inclined to reject or minimise the significance of global warming, viewing it as a pretext for expanded government regulation and control (Oreskes and Conway 2010). Fossil fuel companies and other vested interests often engage in lobbying and advocacy efforts to shape public opinion and influence policy decisions. They may fund research, think tanks, and campaigns aimed at sowing doubt about the reality or severity of global warming, thus exerting influence on policymakers and public discourse. Politicians may tailor their rhetoric and policy positions to align with the beliefs and preferences of their voter base. In regions where scepticism about climate change is prevalent or where economic dependence on fossil fuels is significant, leaders may downplay or deny the reality of global warming to maintain political support (Jacques 2008).

Some leaders may view international efforts to address climate change, such as the Paris Agreement, as encroachments on national sovereignty or as unfair burdens imposed by developed countries on developing ones. This perspective can lead to resistance or scepticism regarding global climate agreements and commitments. Misinformation and pseudoscientific narratives propagated by certain media outlets, interest groups, and online platforms can contribute to public confusion and scepticism about climate change. Leaders who endorse or propagate such misinformation may themselves become sceptical or deny the scientific consensus on global warming. However, extensive scientific research, including climate modelling, attribution studies, and analyses of isotopic signatures, consistently points to human activities, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, as the dominant driver of recent global warming.

It's not happening anymore

Sceptics may also suggest that Global warming has now stopped or is not happening anymore. They argue that there has been a pause or hiatus in global warming in recent years, citing short-term

fluctuations in temperature data. However, this claim ignores the long-term trend of rising temperatures. Multiple datasets from reputable scientific organisations, such as NASA and NOAA, consistently show that the Earth's surface temperature has been increasing over the past century. Furthermore, analyses of temperature records reveal that the rate of warming has accelerated in recent decades. Contrary to popular belief, there is an overwhelming consensus among climate scientists that global warming is happening and is primarily caused by human activities. Surveys of scientific literature and peer-reviewed studies consistently show that approximately 97% of climate scientists agree with this consensus. This agreement is reflected in the assessments of major scientific organisations, including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Global warming is a scientifically established phenomenon supported by overwhelming evidence from multiple lines of research. While scepticism and misconceptions persist, it is crucial to rely on peer-reviewed scientific literature and authoritative sources for accurate information about climate change. Addressing these myths is essential for fostering informed public discourse and taking meaningful action to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of global warming.

Certainly, industries may deny or downplay climate change for various reasons, often related to economic interests, regulatory concerns, and public relations strategies. They may do so because of vested economic interests. Industries heavily reliant on fossil fuels, such as oil, gas, and coal, have a significant financial stake in maintaining the status quo. Acknowledging the reality of climate change could lead to calls for stricter regulations on carbon emissions, which may impact their profitability. By denying or downplaying climate change, these industries aim to forestall regulatory action and maintain their current operating practices. Some industries may view climate change as a threat to their business models and long-term viability. However, rather than proactively addressing these risks, they may choose to deny or minimise the significance of climate change to avoid alarming investors, shareholders, and consumers (Dunlap & McCright 2015). This approach allows them to

delay costly investments in adaptation and mitigation measures. Industries may engage in climate change denial to sway public opinion and create doubt about the need for action. By casting doubt on climate science, they seek to undermine public support for policies that could impact their bottom line. They may be concerned about the reputation damage associated with being perceived as contributors to climate change. Denying or downplaying climate change allows them to maintain a positive public image and avoid association with environmental harm. This strategy is particularly prevalent in industries with strong consumer-facing brands.

Numerous studies utilising climate models, paleo-climate data, and observational evidence have consistently reaffirmed the influence of human-induced greenhouse gas emissions on the Earth's climate system. Furthermore, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and other leading scientific organisations have repeatedly emphasised the anthropogenic origins of global warming in their assessments and reports. There is a cultural dimension to this as well. Ghosh (2016) links the current climate crisis to the legacy of colonialism, pointing out how colonial exploitation of natural resources and the imposition of Western industrial practices on colonised regions have significantly contributed to environmental degradation. This historical context is crucial for understanding the disproportionate impacts of climate change on formerly colonised countries, now among the most vulnerable. He discusses how traditional narrative forms and cultural expressions have historically included elements of environmental consciousness, which modern literature's preference for realism has sidelined.

India's perspective on climate change is multifaceted, with scepticism stemming from various socio-economic and political factors. This scepticism can be observed in debates over responsibility, economic development priorities, and the perceived fairness of international climate agreements. The argument is that countries like India, which are still in the process of developing and have relatively low per capita emissions, should not be held to the same stringent standards as developed nations. This stance was evident in India's negotiations during international climate talks, including the Paris

Agreement. India emphasises the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities (CBDR), arguing that developed countries should take greater responsibility due to their historical emissions. India advocates for a fair distribution of carbon space and financial resources (Dubash 2019). It also calls for enhanced international cooperation and increased financial support from developed nations. India along with China have also cooperated on initiatives like the International Solar Alliance (ISA), which aims to promote solar energy deployment in countries with abundant sunlight. Mechanisms like the Green Climate Fund (GCF) are crucial for supporting India's mitigation and adaptation efforts.

Despite the persistence of scepticism, the scientific consensus remains overwhelmingly in favour of the reality of human-induced global warming affecting specially the third world countries. Finally, while there are dissenting voices within the scientific community regarding the causes and consequences of climate change, the overwhelming majority of climate scientists agree that climate change is happening and is primarily driven by human activities. It is crucial to critically evaluate the evidence and arguments put forth by sceptics while recognising the robust scientific consensus supporting the reality of anthropogenic climate change.

References:

Allen, M. R., & Frame, D. J. 2007. Call off the quest. *Science*, 318(5850), 582-583.

Benjamin, L., Zhang, R., Yan, Z., and Brasseur, G. 2013. Urbanization effects in large-scale temperature records, with an emphasis on China. *Nature Climate Change*, 4(4), 279-282. https://www.nature.com/articles/nclimate2126

Callendar, G. S. 1938. The artificial production of carbon dioxide and its influence on temperature. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, 64(275), 223-240.

Cook, J., Nuccitelli, D., Green, S. A., Richardson, M., Winkler, B., Painting, R., ...& Skuce, A. 2013. Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature. *Environmental Research Letters*, 8(2), 024024.

Dubash, N. K. (Ed.). 2019. *India in a Warming World: Integrating Climate Change and Development*. Oxford University Press.

Dunlap, R. E., & McCright, A. M. 2015. Challenging climate change: The denial countermovement. In *Climate change and society: Sociological perspectives* (pp. 300-332). Oxford University Press.

Flato, G., Marotzke, J., Abiodun, B., Braconnot, P., Chou, S. C., Collins, W., ... & Rummukainen, M. 2013. Evaluation of climate models. In *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Ghosh, A. 2016. The great derangement: climate change and the unthinkable. Chicago ; London, The University of Chicago Pres. Pp 22

Griffies, S. M., Winton, M., Donner, L. J., Horowitz, L. W., Downes, S. M., Farneti, R., ... & Yang, H. 2015. The GFDL CM3 coupled climate model: Characteristics of the ocean and sea ice simulations. *Journal of Climate*, 24(13), 3520-3544.

IPCC. 2013. Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the *Fifth Assessment Report* of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.

Jacques, P. J., Dunlap, R. E., & Freeman, M. 2008. The organisation of denial: Conservative think tanks and environmental scepticism. *Environmental Politics*, 17(3), 349-385.

Knutti, R., & Sedláček, J. 2013. Robustness and uncertainties in the new CMIP5 climate model projections. *Nature Climate Change*, 3(4), 369-373.

Narain, S. 2017, *Conflict of Interest: My Journey through India's Green Movement*. Penguin Random House.

Peterson, T. C., et al. 1998. Homogeneity adjustments of in situ atmospheric climate data: A review. *International Journal of Climatology*, 18(13), 1493-1517.

Oreskes, N., & Conway, E. M. 2010. *Merchants of doubt: How a handful of scientists obscured the truth on issues from tobacco smoke to global warming*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). (n.d.). Climate Change: How Do We Know? Retrieved from https://climate.nasa.gov/evidence/

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). (n.d.). Global Surface Temperature Anomalies. Retrieved from https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cag/global/time-series/globe/land_ocean/ytd/12/1880-2021

Randall, D. A., Wood, R. A., Bony, S., Colman, R., Fichefet, T., Fyfe, J., ... & Zhang, M. 2007. Climate models and their evaluation. In *Climate change 2007: The physical science basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (pp. 589-662). Cambridge University Press.

Robock, A. 2000. Volcanic eruptions and climate. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 38(2), 191-219.Shakun, J. D., Clark, P. U., He, F., Marcott, S. A., Mix, A. C., Liu, Z., ... & Carlson, A. E. (2012). Global warming preceded by increasing carbon dioxide concentrations during the last deglaciation. *Nature*, 484(7392), 49-54.

Solomon, S., Plattner, G. K., Knutti, R., & Friedlingstein, P. 2009. Irreversible climate change due to carbon dioxide emissions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(6), 1704-1709.

Srokosz, M. A., & Bryden, H. L. 2015. Observing the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation yields a decade of inevitable surprises. *Science*, 348(6241), 1255575.

Weart, S. 2003. *The discovery of global warming*. Harvard University Press.

Wickham, C., et al. 2013. Urbanization effects in large-scale temperature records, with an emphasis on China. *Nature Climate Change*, 4(4), 279-282.