Totally OT - Climate Change

Not to defend Monckton (who is perfectly capable of defending himself on any climate related technical subject) but rejecting the current climate "consensus" doesn't necessarily require a deep understanding of climate related scientific disciplines. Just a bit of understanding of chaos theory and maybe some statistics thrown in.

All of the "bad" consequences of warming are the long range predictions of about 20 major climate models. None of these models agree between themselves and none has ever been shown to make an accurate hindcast let alone a forecast. If you believe (as I do) that the earth's climate is a chaotic system then trying to forecast climate 50 or 100 years into the future is a futile exercise. Also, if you have ever tried to make even a simple forecasting system (as I did in my foolish youth) you soon learn that you can force fit almost anything in the universe with a polynomial having enough degrees of freedom. The problem is that such fancy fitting is senseless in a chaotic system since such a model's ability to predict anything with any degree of certainty is really non-existent. Climate models have hundreds or thousands of parameters... all tunable by the model builder... and still very incomplete. Of course, the model builder doesn't believe that climate is a chaotic system. If it is chaotic his reason for existence goes away. And, of course, he doesn't have to stand behind his predictions of 100 years into the future since he won't be here.

Here's noted Princeton physicist Freeman Dyson on climate modeling:
<http://www.edge.org/3rd_culture/dysonf07/dysonf07_index.html>

On the subject of statistics, climate science depends very heavily on statistical manipulation of raw data. The video I pointed out recently from Berkeley physics professor Richard Muller
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/03/18/you%E2%80%99re-not-allowed-to-do-this-in-science/>
shows that Muller is extremely upset with the "hockey stick" graph by the chicanery employed at the juncture of paleoclimate temperature reconstructions (mostly from tree rings) and the modern thermometer based temperature records. But that is hardly all that's wrong with that graph. The paleoclimate temperature reconstructions are highly suspect and the statistical methods used to do the analysis (Principal Components) have been declared invalid by several prominent statisticians. Michael Mann (the author) has never revealed the details of his analysis and has (despite repeated requests over years) never disclosed the correlation values he previously claimed to have computed. Little wonder because, now that the data is available (like pulling teeth) the correlation values with temperature are shown to be so low that he would have gotten better results by choosing random "red noise" numbers. If you'd like a detailed analysis you might like to read this.

<http://www.uoguelph.ca/~rmckitri/research/McKitrick-hockeystick.pdf>
This is a 12 page PDF. A little statistical training would be helpful but not necessary to at least understand the gist of the situation. Muller is also mentioned in this paper since it was studying this data that convinced Muller that he had been deceived. Unfortunately, it's not only Muller who has been deceived. This graph has been and continues to be the posterchild of the IPCC's claims of dangerous global warming. If you value the truth in scientific method you'll take the time to read these 12 pages.

Chuck Norcutt