This document presents the jury's analysis to evaluate the original claim: 'Global warming is not progressing as predicted by climate models. This is because plant photosynthesis is absorbing more CO_2 than expected. Climate change is a lie.'

May 1, 2025

Classification: Unsupported

0. Executive Summary

The client claims that global warming is not progressing as predicted because of enhanced plant photosynthesis absorbing more CO than expected, leading to the assertion that climate change is a lie. The prosecution challenges this claim by pointing out weaknesses in the evidence provided and emphasizing the multifaceted nature of climate modeling and anthropogenic influences. The defense relies on a specific study to support their argument.

1. Claim

The defense argues that increased plant photosynthesis impacting CO absorption is causing global warming to deviate from predictions, while the prosecution challenges this claim by highlighting the limitations of the evidence and the broader factors affecting climate change. The defense's argument focuses on a specific study, while the prosecution emphasizes the complexity of climate modeling and the role of human activities.

2. Original Excerpt

> This document presents the jury's analysis to evaluate the original claim: 'Global warming is not progressing as predicted by climate models. This is because plant photosynthesis is absorbing more CO than expected. Climate change is a lie.'

Source: jury“¨analysis“¨document.pdf , p. 1

3. Background

- **Forkel et al. 2016 Study** — Identified enhanced seasonal CO exchange caused by amplified plant productivity in northern ecosystems, supporting the claim of increased CO absorption by plants.
(Global˙Warming˙of˙1.5.pdf , p. 100)

4. Defense's Argument & Rebuttal

4.1 Original Defense Argument

- The specific evidence to support the claim that plant photosynthesis is absorbing more CO than expected is a study by Forkel et al. in 2016. This study identified enhanced seasonal CO exchange caused by amplified plant productivity in northern ecosystems, as published in the journal Science. (jury˙analysis˙document.pdf , p. 1)

4.2 Defense's Rebuttal

- **Defense's Focus on Plant Photosynthesis** : The defense emphasizes the impact of enhanced plant photosynthesis on CO absorption, neglecting the broader context of climate modeling and other factors influencing global warming trends. (ar4˙syr.pdf , p. 50)

- **Limitations of Climate Models** : The defense's argument does not consider the limitations of climate models in replicating warming trends using only natural forcings, pointing to the comprehensive nature of climate modeling. (SYR˙AR5˙FINAL˙full˙wcover.pdf , p. 137)

5. Prosecution's Argument & Rebuttal

5.1 Original Prosecution Argument

- The evidence provided does not directly connect increased plant photosynthesis to a slowdown in global warming. (Global˙Warming˙of˙1.5.pdf , p. 234)

5.2 Prosecution's Rebuttal

- **Lack of Direct Evidence** : The evidence fails to establish a direct link between plant photosynthesis and a slowdown in global warming, weakening the client's argument. (Global˙Warming˙of˙1.5.pdf , p. 234)

- **Absence of Disproving Data on Climate Change** : The document lacks any sources or data supporting the assertion that climate change is a lie, contradicting the client's claim. (Global˙Warming˙of˙1.5.pdf , p. 180)

- **Neglect of Anthropogenic Influences in Climate Models** : The statement neglects the significant influence of anthropogenic factors on continental warming trends, weakening the client's claim of plant photosynthesis as the primary cause. (SYR˙AR5˙FINAL˙full˙wcover.pdf , p. 17)

6. Sources

- Global˙Warming˙of˙1.5.pdf — pages: 100, 234, 180
- SYR˙AR5˙FINAL˙full˙wcover.pdf — pages: 137, 17
- ar4˙syr.pdf — pages: 50, 18, 19

7. Conclusion

The claim that global warming is not progressing as predicted due to enhanced plant photosynthesis absorbing more CO than expected and the assertion that climate change is a lie lack substantial evidence and fail to consider the complex interplay of factors influencing climate change. Therefore, the claim is unsupported.