

Folks,

Today Richard Allen's letter taking me to task for failing to adhere to the "well-established" global warming "science" was published in the Sun News, at this link: <http://www.lcsun-news.com/story/opinion/letters/2018/02/09/letters-polite-chat-likely-not-possible/325599002/>

Poor Richard.

Here is the full text of Richard's Letter and my reply in case the sun News has it behind a paywall for you.

**Letters: Polite chat likely not possible**

<http://www.lcsun-news.com/story/opinion/letters/2018/02/09/letters-polite-chat-likely-not-possible/325599002/>

Polite chat likely wouldn't be possible

I was pleasantly surprised to read Robin Hastings' thoughtful letter about my response to one of Robert Endlich's many letters to the Sun-News on climate change, global warming, and sea level rise. It is critically important that serious issues we confront as individuals and members of the larger community involve civil dialogue and engagement. Honest exploration of established facts and evidence is essential to achieving progress in dealing with matters so fraught with disinformation and misinformation. Disagreement should not be a bar to communication. That is why I seriously considered following through on the Hastings' offer. After all, who could be against coffee and conversation?

Well Mr. Endlich wrote another letter. He told us in the context of weather forecasting, including longer term outlooks, because the first week of 2018 was listed by the Weather Channel as the "coldest on record" in many eastern cities, it "belies the notion of anthropogenic CO2 "trapping heat." Does it really?

The National Climate Assessment released by the Trump Administration a few months ago states "It is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century. For the warming over the last century, there is no convincing alternative explanation supported by the extent of the observational evidence." Further, "When it comes to rapidly escalating levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, there is no climate analog for this century at any time in the last 50 million years."

It continues, "Global mean atmospheric CO2 concentration has now passed 400 ppm, a level that last occurred about 3 million years ago..." This statutorily mandated report contains much more solid information.

Mr. Endlich's flip dismissal of the impact of greenhouse gases on our world and apparent detachment from well-established science belies a polite chat over coffee.

Richard S. Allan

Anthony, NM

^^^

Richard Allen,

You forgot some of the words Robin Hastings used, specifically about critical thinking. Let's do some critical thinking about my letter. I am a scientist, and scientists deal with facts, measurements, observations and data.

The impact of greenhouse gasses is supposed to lie in the supposed "trapped heat" caused by the increasing amounts of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.

Well, if the increasing <CO<sub>2</sub>> is trapping heat, then that should show up in temperature data. Please examine my hypothesis

[http://casf.me/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PDF\\_Examining-the-Hypothesis\\_with-all-of-the-carbon-dioxide-in-the-air-today\\_Surface-Temperatures-are-at-a-high-in-New-Mexico\\_10\\_Jul\\_2017.pdf](http://casf.me/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/PDF_Examining-the-Hypothesis_with-all-of-the-carbon-dioxide-in-the-air-today_Surface-Temperatures-are-at-a-high-in-New-Mexico_10_Jul_2017.pdf)

The data show that in New Mexico, if you examine long term rural stations unaffected by the Urban Heat Island, you find that the hottest temperatures were in the Dust Bowl years or before. You might gain some knowledge by looking at the Las Cruces Urban Heat Island measurements we made in 2013. Please look at the entire post, and watch Peter and his Dad at the video,

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player\\_embedded&v=F\\_G\\_-SdAN04](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=F_G_-SdAN04)

The two most important greenhouse gases are water vapor and carbon dioxide. When it gets very cold, the water vapor content gets vanishingly small, so the main greenhouse effect is with the carbon dioxide, so a good place to look for the "trapped heat" is in mid-winter when temperatures are coldest for the year.

So, with all the CO<sub>2</sub> in the air today, why has not this shown up in the minimum temperature records?

Specifically, how could the stations I mention in my 26 January letter, New York City, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Baltimore, Charleston and Tallahassee, have an entire week with coldest temperatures on record if that over 400 parts per million CO<sub>2</sub> was trapping much heat? The answer is, clearly, that the 400 PPM CO<sub>2</sub> is not trapping much heat.

Nor is this an isolated instance.

Doyle Rice's 18 January 2018 story in USA Today mentioned reports in Oymyakon, Siberia that temperatures fell to minus 88.6F, close to coldest ever reported in a permanently-settled northern hemisphere location. When temperatures get that cold it's impossible, on the face of it, to say that Carbon Dioxide from fossil fuels use is "trapping heat," because, based on the observation itself, it's obvious the heat has been lost to space.

Richard Allen, you are resorting to the logical fallacy of appeal to authority when you refer to the National Climate Assessment.

Here are some facts and observations that demolish the NCA's assertions:

From 1910 to 1940 temperatures rose 0.6C according to NASA's scientists in 1981, and at the time, 1910-1940, use of fossil fuels yielded 1 Gigaton of Carbon in the CO<sub>2</sub>, and now with fossil fuel production at 10 Gigatons Carbon, the temperature rate of rise is the same, and temperatures have not exceeded those in the Medieval Warm Period a thousand years ago, when use of fossil fuels was miniscule.

Why a thousand years ago? Because Greenland Ice Core Records, Paleoclimate Records from the Alps, and sediments in the north Atlantic all point to the existence of the 1000-1500 year cycles, Bond Cycles as described by Bond et al here:

[http://www.essc.psu.edu/essc\\_web/seminars/spring2006/Mar1/Bond%20et%20al%202001.pdf](http://www.essc.psu.edu/essc_web/seminars/spring2006/Mar1/Bond%20et%20al%202001.pdf)

The NCA screams that the days with the heaviest rainfall are increasing because of the greenhouse effect, but this simply is not true. The recorded rainfall amounts ARE increasing, but it is because of the improved collection efficiency of rain gages as I describe in my post,

<http://casf.me/recent-downpours-increasing-never-mind-its-another-alarmist-claim-demolished-by-careful-observation/#more-1497>

Richard Allen, if the science is so well-established, why is it possible, by simply examining some data, which I have posted on our web site and referenced in this reply, to show that your assertions and the NCA assertions are plainly not credible.

I am perfectly willing to sit down with you, Robin Hastings, and whoever might choose to join us. I will not use appeals to authority, other logical fallacies, snide remarks or emotion, only facts, measurements, observations and data.

Come join our monthly meetings which are posted on our climate study group's web site at <http://casf.me/>

ROBERT W. ENDLICH