

meteoLCD Weblog

A weblog on climate, global change and climate measurements

« [Klima2009 on-line conference](#)

[Climate refugees](#) »

ClimateGate

Back from nearly 3 weeks spent in Florida, I will not comment in this blog on ClimateGate. There are many good sites working on this extraordinary event, like [Wattsupwiththat](#), [ClimateAudit](#), the [Global Warming Policy Foundation](#), [The Blackboard](#) and many more.

Here in Luxembourg this scandal has practically been passed over in silence by the main media. These concentrate on issuing ever more alarmist nonsense and real brainwashing before (and probably during) COP15. All prudence and non-certitude is meaningless for them: the world will smolder and burn in climate-hell, if we do not change rapidly not only our live-styles, but our most fundamental work society. The western world has sinned, and must completely change, be pardoned its climate-debt. On the way to these forced changes, democracy is more and more seen as a hindrance.

Comment added 13Dec09: Please read on this danger for democracy the excellent article in "Die Welt": [Die Allmachtsfantasien der Klimaforscher](#)

Share this:



Related

[A Vast Machine](#)
July 10, 2011

[The cloud pushers](#)
("Die Wolkenschieber")
March 31, 2010
In "1"

[The Real Global Warming Disaster](#)
July 9, 2010
In "1"

This entry was posted on December 6, 2009 at 22:42 and is filed under [1](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#) feed. You can [leave a response](#), or [trackback](#) from your own site.

One Response to "ClimateGate"

hkyson Says:

December 12, 2009 at 20:38 | [Reply](#)



"Climategate" started out when there appeared on the Internet a collection of e-mails of a group of climatologists who work in the University of East Anglia in England. These documents reveal that some climatologists of international preeminence have manipulated the data of their investigations and have strongly tried to discredit climatologists who are not convinced that the increasing quantities of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere are the cause of global warming.

It is true that a majority of the scientists who study climatic tendencies in our atmosphere have arrived at the conclusion that the world's climate is changing, and they have convinced a group of politicians, some of whom are politically powerful, of the truth of their conclusions.

A minority, however, is skeptical. Some believe that recent data that suggest that the average temperature of the atmosphere is going up can be explained by natural variations in solar radiation and that global warming is a temporary phenomenon. Others believe that the historical evidence indicating that the temperature of the atmosphere is going up at a dangerous rate is simply not reliable.

Such lacks of agreement are common in the sciences. They are reduced and eventually eliminated with the accumulation of new evidence and of more refined theories or even by completely new ones. Such debates can persist for a period of decades. Academics often throw invective at one another in these debates. But typically this does not mean much.

But the case of climate change is different. If the evidence indicates that global warming is progressive, is caused principally by our industrial processes, and will probably cause disastrous changes in our atmosphere before the end of the twenty-first century, then we do not have the time to verify precisely if this evidence is reliable. Such a process would be a question of many years of new investigations. And if the alarmist climatologists are right, such a delay would be tragic for all humanity.

The difficulty is that economic and climatologic systems are very complicated. They are not like celestial mechanics, which involves only the interaction of gravity and centrifugal force, and efforts to construct computerized models to describe these complicated systems simply cannot include all the factors that are influential in the evolution of these complicated systems.

All this does not necessarily indicate that the alarmist climatologists are not right. But it really means that if global warming is occurring, we cannot know exactly what will be the average temperature of our atmosphere in the year 2100 and what will be the average sea level of the world's ocean in that year.

It also means that we cannot be confident that efforts by the industrialized countries to reduce the amount of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere will have a significant influence on the evolution of the world's climate.

Alas, the reduction of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere would be very costly and would greatly change the lives of all the inhabitants of our planet—with the possibility (perhaps even the probability!) that all these efforts will be completely useless.

Harleigh Kyson Jr.

Leave a comment