

Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2005-01/0593.html>

From: Michael Davis (mdavis19_at_ix.netcom.com)

Date: 01/21/05

Date: Fri, 21 Jan 2005 06:43:07 -0500

G. R. L. Cowan wrote:

> *Michael Davis wrote:*

>

>>*Dan Bloomquist wrote:*

>>

>>>

>>>*Michael Davis wrote:*

>>>

>>>

>>>>*Read the caption on the chart, dummy...*

>>>

>>>

>>>*You win. I'm not interested in your derogatory style.*

>>>

>>><http://www.usgcrp.gov/usgcrp/seminars/990514FO.html>

>>>

>>>*Best, Dan.*

>>

>>*Guess you didn't learn from your first mistake. Here you are providing*

>>*another link to an alleged 1000 year climate history that doesn't have*

>>*any more real data backing it than the last one. They do have better*

>>*disclaimers on that page though. I particularly liked this part:*

>>

>>*"it would be difficult to argue that the 1990s were as anomalous when*

>>*viewed in the context of the temperature history of the entire*

>>*millennium, were it not for the record warmth of 1998. The year 1998 was*

>>*observed to have been significantly warmer (by about 0.2 degrees C) than*

>>*any other year in the instrumental record. In the context of the last*

>>*1,000 years, one can say with a high degree of confidence that 1998 was*

>>*the warmest year for the Northern Hemisphere."*

>>

>>*So the myth of global warming seems to be based on one only hot year,*

>>*and hot by only 0.2 degrees at that. Keep in mind that they aren't*

>>*talking about the hottest year in the last millennia here, ...*

>

>

> *They say they are talking about the last 1,000 years.*

> *That's one millennium, so as you say,*

sci.energy: Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

- > *they aren't talking about millennia.*
- >
- >
- >>... *but only the*
- >>*hottest year during the *instrumental* record ...*
- >
- >
- > *You think they can't validly go beyond the instrumental record,*

Correct.

- > *cannot say 1998 was the hottest year in the northern hemisphere*
- > *in the last 1,000, but they don't agree, and do say that,*
- > *"with a high degree of confidence".*

Great. They say it, but that doesn't make it true. Look at the data and apply a little common sense. There simply is no way of knowing what the temperature of any point on the Earth was, to sub-degree accuracy, for anytime before the period when we have good instrumental records. If you don't know it to that level of accuracy, then you can't claim to see a sub-degree trend over the last thousand years. Period.

- >
- >
- >>... *which means only the last*
- >>*century or so. Realistically though, only the last thirty or forty*
- >>*years of instrumental data is really useful.*
- >>
- >>*Sheesh! This isn't science.*
- >
- >
- > *What do you think *would* be science?*

Some actual hard evidence and reproducible results not based on dubious at best "reconstructions" of nonexistent data.

- >
- > *Since Arrhenius, or was it Tyndall, we've had a sensible-looking*
- > *theory of CO2-driven global warming. Do you think it never can*
- > *be tested, or just that the methods tried so far are flawed?*

Models are nice. The Earth is a lot more complex than any model though. I remember the models that predicted the coming "population bomb" disaster back in the 70s, the coming ice age disaster back in the 80s and the coming Y2K disaster back in the 90s. I'd like to see some actual hard evidence of some CO2 driven global warming before buying into this end of the world scenario du jour. Is that really too much to ask?

--

Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

sci.energy: Re: But There Ain't No Global Warming.

The Evil Michael Davis™

<http://www.mdpub.com/scopeworks/>

<http://skepticult.org> Member #264-70198-536

Member #33 1/3 of The "I Have Been Killfiled By Tommy" Club

"There's a sucker born every minute" - David Hannum (often erroneously attributed to P. T. Barnum)