

NZCLIMATE TRUTH NEWSLETTER NO 232  
DECEMBER 12TH 2009

THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM

Modern science began when Galileo and Newton showed that it was possible to provide a mathematical model for the motion of solid objects. As a result we are able to predict the motions of the planets, provide tables of the tides and predict forthcoming eclipses . We can send vehicles to the moon and to the planets. Einstein was able to modify the model to make it even more successful.

All this despite the fact that the motion of individual atoms in every solid is currently unpredictable. Yet the public still believe that everything else can be predicted by means of mathematical models.

Unfortunately, this is not so. There is no mathematical model which can predict the behaviour of fluids; gases and liquids. This is why it is not possible to model the climate. There is also no mathematical model which can predict the behaviour of irregular events or of irregular surfaces. I was surprised recently that "Consumer" magazine stated that there was no way that we can measure the sharpness of a knife, because of this difficulty. I encountered it in my past professional life from the impossibility of defining or measuring the roughness of a surface.

Although the general public is ignorant of these facts scientists know they are true. They can only cope with these problems by using various levels of guesswork called "parameterization" where levels of reliability are unknown without rigorous testing for success of prediction.

When the Rio "Earth Summit" conference of 1992 decided that they must seek evidence that the earth was warming the scientists knew that this was an impossible dream. There is no way that one could provide an average quantity for the temperature of the earth's surface with an estimate for its accuracy. .

Let me illustrate the problem. My last Newsletter (No 231) provided you with two spreadsheets showing the hourly temperatures measured at 24 New Zealand weather stations I wonder whether any of you have tried plotting them out. I attach what happens if you plot the hourly figures for single stations (Wellington, Mt Cook,) and for averages for all the stations (NZ winter, NZ Summer). The question is what is the "average" of any of these plots? There is no answer you can give. You cannot find a mathematical model which can give you any acceptable average in such a way that you can estimate the variability. If you use the measurements taken every minute, it would be worse.

Meteorologists know that an overall daily average, however obtained, is meaningless and useless. We do have a day and a night, all of us, and it is not very interesting to know what happens in between these. We would like to know how warm it will be in daytime and how cold at night. The easiest way the meteorologists can guide us is to measure the maximum and minimum temperature every day. They have a very convenient instrument

that does this; a double thermometer with an indicator that stays put for the maximum on one side and at the minimum on the other side. This need only be measured once a day, when a magnet will restore the indicator for the next time, and the rest of the day is free..

The "raw temperature data" from meteorological stations thus consists of daily records of maximum and minimum temperature. Often the maximum refers to a day previous to the minimum, and the time the measurement is made varies from one place and one time to another. It is good enough for a rough guide. It is useless as a means of measuring global temperature to any level of accuracy.

All meteorologists know this, and so did the people at Rio. The only way to persuade the world that it was warming was to fake it. Jim Hansen volunteered for the job. I keep pointing out that he has told us all that it is a fake in this statement on his website

[http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/abs\\_temp.html](http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/abs_temp.html)

But nobody believes it. Nobody wants to believe it. Recently, the climategate scandal has shown how it is done. They even say the computer programme is "fudged"

They have the arrogance to continue to dominate our TV news with tales how the "globe is warming" based on this fraudulent system.

But the fraud is necessary. The end justifies the means. The "precautionary principle" applies even more strongly when there is no genuine evidence.

Cheers

Vincent Gray