

Re: Runaway Global Warming Possible!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2005-01/2668.html>

From: oðin (oðin_at_ragnarok.com)

Date: 01/30/05

Date: Sun, 30 Jan 2005 15:35:22 -0800

>> *Yes. Fix the broken model. If the model causes you to through out cold
>> results, you should not trust the warm results either. A model should be
>> taken all or nothing. A model that is broken is a waste of CPU cycles.*
>
> *So a model of say... The uniform Keplerian orbits of the planets should
> be
> thrown out because we know there are perturbations caused by
> interplanetary
> attractions?*

No. Kepler is good. Perturbations, as you point out, and mercury is a bit off, due to relativity considerations. But for the most part, it all fits close enough to actual use. The same cannot be said for global warming, and you know it.

> *Is it also your view that the model clockpiece on the wall beside me
> should be thrown out because the minute hand does not move linearly over
> the
> face and can be off by up to 1 minute? Or that it should be discarded
> because it doesn't tell the correct time for objects that are moving
> relative to itself? Or because it doesn't tell the correct time for
> India?*

No. Your clock is just fine. IPCC models are not as good as your clock yet! I said "If the model causes you to through out cold results, you should not trust the warm results either." So using your analogy, if I had a clock that sometimes went backwards in time (i.e. cold results) and sometimes went slowly forward in time (i.e. 1 or 2 C warmer over 100 years), and other times it went very fast (10 or 11 C warmer) then I would throw out the model (clock). See? If I had a clock that was as erratic and untested as IPCC climate models, I would trash it.

> *Ultimately all modern science is statistical modeling and therefore
> subject
> to variance from reality in specific measurement regimes.*

Variation is fine, if it is moderate. I am not asking for perfection.