

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-09/msg01345.html>

- *From:* bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Fri, 07 Sep 2007 23:53:56 -0700
-

On Sep 8, 8:11 am, PeteS <axk...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Eeyore wrote:

In a thread here some time back I mentioned a climate researcher who I'd heard was approached with respect to 'getting rid of the medieval warm period' in order to make the IPCC case for AGW more compelling.

At the time I didn't have a cite but I just found it again.

http://www.epw.senate.gov/hearing_statements.cfm?id=266543

Statement of Dr. David Deming
University of Oklahoma
College of Earth and Energy
Climate Change and the Media

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, and distinguished guests, thank you for inviting me to testify today. I am a geologist and geophysicist. I have a bachelor's degree in geology from Indiana University, and a Ph.D in geophysics from the University of Utah. My field of specialization in geophysics is temperature and heat flow. In recent years, I have turned my studies to the history and philosophy of science. In 1995, I published a short paper in the academic journal Science. In that study, I reviewed how borehole temperature data recorded a warming of about one degree Celsius in North America over the

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

last 100 to 150 years. The week the article appeared, I was contacted by a reporter for National Public Radio. He offered to interview me, but only if I would state that the warming was due to human activity. When I refused to do so, he hung up on me.

I had another interesting experience around the time my paper in Science was published. I received an astonishing email from a major researcher in the area of climate change. He said, "We have to get rid of the Medieval Warm Period."

The Medieval Warm Period (MWP) was a time of unusually warm weather that began around 1000 AD and persisted until a cold period known as the "Little Ice Age" took hold in the 14th century. Warmer climate brought a remarkable flowering of prosperity, knowledge, and art to Europe during the High Middle Ages.

The existence of the MWP had been recognized in the scientific literature for decades. But now it was a major embarrassment to those maintaining that the 20th century warming was truly anomalous. It had to be "gotten rid of."

In 1769, Joseph Priestley warned that scientists overly attached to a favorite hypothesis would not hesitate to "warp the whole course of nature." In 1999, Michael Mann and his colleagues published a reconstruction of past temperature in which the MWP simply vanished. This unique estimate became known as the "hockey stick," because of the shape of the temperature graph.

Normally in science, when you have a novel result that appears to overturn previous work, you have to demonstrate why the earlier work was wrong. But the work of Mann and his colleagues was initially accepted uncritically, even though it contradicted the results of more than 100 previous studies. Other researchers have since reaffirmed that the Medieval Warm Period was both warm and global in

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

its extent.

There is an overwhelming bias today in the media regarding the issue of global warming. In the past two years, this bias has bloomed into an irrational hysteria. Every natural disaster that occurs is now linked with global warming, no matter how tenuous or impossible the connection. As a result, the public has become vastly misinformed on this and other environmental issues.

Earth's climate system is complex and poorly understood. But we do know that throughout human history, warmer temperatures have been associated with more stable climates and increased human health and prosperity. Colder temperatures have been correlated with climatic instability, famine, and increased human mortality.

The amount of climatic warming that has taken place in the past 150 years is poorly constrained, and its cause—human or natural—is unknown. There is no sound scientific basis for predicting future climate change with any degree of certainty. If the climate does warm, it is likely to be beneficial to humanity rather than harmful. In my opinion, it would be foolish to establish national energy policy on the basis of misinformation and irrational hysteria.

It's interesting (and predictable) that the same lobby that excoriates scientists for 'junk science' [i.e. disagreeing with it's political stance on global warming'] is itself generating lots of hot air. Perhaps the so-called scientists (because they don't seem to be using the scientific method) who advocate the draconian measures and taxes should actually provide real scientific evidence; I haven't seen any truly scientific evidence of global warming with a direct causal link to people.

You may have to wait a while before the evidence for global warming is less circumstantial.

Of course if we wait too long, we may already be into thermal runaway. The Permian mass extinction, some 251 million years ago, seems to have been brought on by the expulsion of lots of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere from volcanoes, rather than factory chimney's and car

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

exhaust pipes, but it didn't get to be catastrophic until the warming had gone far enough that the methane hydrates had started breaking down and injecting megatonnes of methane into the atmosphere – enough to produce a negative spike in the carbon isotope ratios for carbonates deposited at the time.

Only two land animals survived that extinction – one was a reptile the size of a pig, so we might not be too big to survive a comparable event, but we are probably too slow-breeding.

Obviously, we are changing the way the planet works, but that could be said of any species over the last couple of billion years, where admittedly we have the ability to change it more per capita; but my stance remains that I want to see *real* scientific research, not a political agenda dressed in a faux scientific lab coat.

Of the kind presented by Deming in the address Eeyore posted?

—

Bill Sloman, Nijmegen

.