

This one from the UK

Gavin Schmidt's reply to Michael Duffy's *op ed* piece is a predictable attack from one of the architects of the anthropogenic theory of global warming. When I first set out to investigate the predictions of GCM computer models I downloaded the thousands of lines of GCM code from NASA, much of which was written by Schmidt himself! It was through this investigation that I came to the opinion that the current computer models are both extraordinarily primitive and inherently inaccurate. The reasons are many and complex but not the least of which was included as comments within the source code which indicated that reducing the cell or step size would cause the model to deteriorate. As anyone who understands integro-differential equations will verify, this failure is an incontrovertible signal that the model is inherently broken. But the real tell-tale sign of failure of the computer models is their inability to predict the single biggest peak exchange event on the planet which involves the transfer of almost half the energy on Earth: El Nino! Combine this with the alarmist's ability to produce fraudulent data such as the now infamous "hockey stick" graph and perhaps Mr Schmidt will understand why many scientists like myself have serious and very reasonable doubts about the alarmist propaganda.

And another letter

Note to the *letters* Editor -

I note that though your guidelines specify a limit of 200 words for letters the reply by Gavin Schmidt was over 400 words. In view of the importance of this matter I hope you will give similar consideration to the following, if not as a letter then perhaps as an opinion piece.

The Schmidt reply may be seen at: <http://www.smh.com.au/letters/?page=fullpage#content>

The original Duffy article is at: <http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2008/11/07/1225561134617.html>

A number of statements in the reply by Gavin Schmidt of realclimate.org deserve comment.

His being "*...fed up with disinformation about climate science.*" is entirely understandable but this is not restricted to one side. Climate sceptics feel equally frustrated by the ignoring or facile dismissal of vast quantities of evidence from peer reviewed studies which conflicts with or raises serious doubt about the existence, magnitude and consequences of Anthropogenic Global Warming.

His frustration with accusations regarding sources of support are also shared by sceptics who receive an even greater portion of such irrelevant, often even blatantly false, criticism. Support on both sides often comes from those who agree; but, in the real world of real science the totality of evidence and its validity ultimately decides, not authority or sources of funding. The denigration of conflicting evidence because of its provenance is a tactic favoured overwhelmingly by AGW proponents, not sceptics.

Schmidt says, "*... that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas and that its concentration is rising rapidly due to human activities may be alarming, but it is not alarmist.*" It is only alarming if one claims that the consequence will be catastrophic. It becomes alarmist when such claims are only speculations predicated on projections by complex computer models that are themselves simplified attempts to represent an even more complex natural system where both modelled and real outputs are highly sensitive to small differences in numerous parameters which cannot be accurately determined.

He also says, "*Rajendra Pachauri's assessment of the temperature record is in line with the assessment in the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, so it is unsurprising that he should repeat what the organisation he heads has concluded.*" It is,

however, surprising that as a scientist he would continue to propagate without qualification, findings that a high level peer review by the U.S. National Academy of Sciences has found to be seriously flawed and to ignore conflicting evidence of past climate from hundreds of other peer reviewed studies from all over the world. He further says, *"A simple look at the budget for climate change research in the US (or globally) reveals that the vast majority of the funds go on satellite and in-situ observations, with only a tiny fraction devoted to the complex modelling efforts needed to understand climate."* This accounting fails to recognise that most or all of the monitoring of climate referred to would still be taking place even without AGW concerns, but much, if not most, of the funding specifically directed at the study of climate change has gone into modelling not into investigation aimed at better understanding of the magnitude and balance of natural and anthropogenic effects.

This statement would also seem to imply that the modelling is far from complete as it has only received a "tiny fraction" of the support required for *"the complex modelling efforts needed to understand climate."* One might therefore presume he would then have to agree that any current projections from modelling are far from certain. On the other hand if the modelling is now thought to be highly reliable the considerable funding which is still being devoted to modelling might better be directed toward determining the real world consequences of projected changes not just competing for attention with speculation over how dire they might be.

Schmidt goes on to say that, *"Duffy's claim that published research is biased towards sensationalism may be partly correct for a few high-profile journals (though this is not dominant, nor does it lead to bias towards any specific conclusion)."* This argument asserts that high-profile journals have little influence. If so, one then wonders what gives them such a high-profile. It also denies a well documented record of demonstrable bias in such journals against conclusions that refute research they have already published, especially when it has received widespread attention.

He concludes with, *"...the correct response... is...to base policy and decisions on heavily peer-reviewed and sober assessment processes such as the IPCC or the National Academies reports."*, and *"Duffy clings to short-term irrelevancies that have not stood up to peer review,"* and *"So should judgments about science be based on assessments of decades of work that has survived multiple levels of scientific review,...."*. The repeated appeal by AGW advocates to peer review as the final arbiter of scientific validity totally ignores the absolute pre-eminence of evidence over authority as the bedrock foundation of science. Peer review has become a fetish of AGW. Its legitimate purpose was never intended to determine truth but simply as a tool for editorial assistance. Editors of technical journals cannot be experts in all they publish. Though the advice of other experts in a subject is desirable, such opinion is also subject to obvious bias. Findings that cast doubt on widely accepted ideas are unlikely to find ready acceptance, especially when the status and funding of those being asked to decide would themselves be adversely affected. The entirety of the response by Gavin Schmidt is a case in point.

Walter Starck
Townsville

And another letter

Gavin Schmidt's attack on Michael Duffy is not unexpected because the funding for his group at NASA depends upon creating and feeding global warming hysteria. In a report commissioned by the Energy and Commerce Committee of the US Congress, Edward Wegman, a past chairman of the Committee on Applied and Theoretical Statistics of the National Academy of Sciences, completely debunked the Mann "hockey stick" upon which so much global warming hype was based. Schmidt didn't dare attack Duffy for referring to Richard Lindzen, a professor of meteorology at MIT, who testified that: "It isn't just that the alarmists are trumpeting model results that we know must be wrong. It is that they are trumpeting catastrophes that couldn't happen even if the model results were right."

In his attack on Duffy, Schmidt ignores Hadley Centre data showing that the average temperature has not increased for seven years and is starting to decrease. This is in line with the observations of Dr. Habibullo Abdussamatov, head of the Space Research Laboratory of the Russian Academy of Science, who found that the sun has passed the warming peak of a 200 year solar cycle and predicts that the earth will undergo a century of cooling beginning in the upper layers of the oceans. Recent data from a flotilla of autonomous, underwater robots patrolling the world's oceans has shown that this cooling has already begun.

Despite an expected increase in personal attacks on investigative journalists like Duffy by scientists whose careers have depended upon promoting global warming hysteria, bad science will be outed eventually just as happened with the cold fusion and human cloning scams.

Art Raiche