

## COMMENT 1

Robert Endlich ·

Advanced Weather Officer at USAF Retired

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/.../PDF\\_Examining-the-Hypothesis\\_with-all...](http://casf.me/.../PDF_Examining-the-Hypothesis_with-all...)

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...](https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded...)

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/.../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.../...](http://casf.me/recent-downpours-increasing-never-mind.../)

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

Reply: Lynn Carol ·

Paris, France

Try getting your climate science from publications that use peer-reviewed climate science papers, like Scientific American, the website of The American Association for the Advancement of Science (Google "What We Know," The National Academy of Sciences, National Geographic, NASA, NOAA, the National Science Foundation, etc.

Reply: Robert Endlich ·

Advanced Weather Officer at USAF Retired

Lynn Carol,

This is another appeal to authority. When I was in High School I used to depend on Scientific American a lot, because it dealt with science, but, sadly, now it has gone off the deep end into politics, specifically this climate hysteria driven by politics.

National Geographic? Look at the November 2015 issue on Global Warming “COOL IT.” They use Germany as the poster child for its energy transformation, but fail to give the bad news, electricity prices have more than doubled, but mining lignite to account for Germany’s loss of nuclear power, a self-inflicted wound, has actually INCREASED Germany’s CO2 output. Since you are in Europe, please consult Pierre Gosselin’s Blog No Trick Zone, you might start here: [http://notrickszone.com/.../europe-cooling-weather.../...](http://notrickszone.com/.../europe-cooling-weather.../)

Nat Geo’s “Melting Away” section beginning on Page 98 talks about melting of Greenland’s Ice, but temperatures today are clearly cooler than those of the Medieval Warm Period when Eric the Red first sailed to Greenland in 985 AD; the Greenland colonies were lost to starvation and freezing during the Little Ice Age. Please read again the section here about the 1000-1500 year Bond Cycles.

My Sea Level Comments are in the Sun News, next comment down. The Nat Geo section on Tarawa beginning at page 123 spreads scare stories of sea level rise flooding coral reefs and islands, clearly ignorant of the facts of coral reefs first established by the careful observation by the Beagle’s Chief Scientist Charles Darwin in CORAL REEFS published in 1842. That Nat Geo can be ignorant of this, known to the world since then is stunning ignorance, or deliberate deception, take your choice, but an indication of the poor scholarship which has infected this once great magazine which I read voraciously in my youth

Let me give a couple of more specifics, the first, about the National Academy of Sciences. On 9 April 2010 Dr Ralph Cicerone, then President of the National Academy of Sciences published a letter in the Financial Times the subject of which was, “What’s Happening to the Climate is Unprecedented.” However, if he had looked at the literature, specifically, Ljungqvist, F.C. 2010. A new reconstruction of temperature variability in the extra-tropical Northern Hemisphere during the last two millennia. Geografiska Annaler Series A 92: 339-351, he would have seen that temperatures in the Roman and Medieval Warm Periods and those of today are about the same, clearly not “Unprecedented.” Sorry, but Cicerone was either deliberately deceptive or stunningly ignorant, in any event he poisoned the well of truthfulness for me to use NAS as an authoritative source.

NASA GISS? Please read what I wrote about them here <http://casf.me/.../Fraud-in-Global-Warming-Data-is...>

And in this sequence here <http://casf.me/.../Fraud-in-Global-Warming-Data-is...>

NOAA? My first thought was, "Surely you jest." But surely you are ignorant of the facts I presented in my UTEP Class, Week Five, here: [http://casf.me/.../PDF\\_Three-Lessons-in-Surface..](http://casf.me/.../PDF_Three-Lessons-in-Surface..)

Peer Review? Sorry, it has often turned into "Pal Review." Please look at these articles which show that there is a replication crisis in science, that is, what often has passed peer review has found to be unreliable.

[https://www.ida.liu.se/.../Why\\_science\\_is\\_not\\_necessarily...](https://www.ida.liu.se/.../Why_science_is_not_necessarily...)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Replication\\_crisi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Replication_crisi)

These show me and should show you that peer review is no substitution for the scientific method.

So, please, Lynn Carol, you should read critically what I have written here and on our group web page, <http://casf.me/>

Perhaps you will understand why I no longer look to Peer Review as an authoritative source, why NASA, NOAA, Nat Geo, National Academy of Sciences, and my old professional society, the American Meteorological Society are somewhere between stunningly ignorant or deeply involved in fraud. Look at the references in this post and you might understand why I write.

ROBERT W. ENDLICH

## COMMENT 2

Robert Endlich ·

Advanced Weather Officer at USAF Retired

Since Richard Allen mentions sea level rise, let's look at a recent article, some history and facts.

Here is an article from the Daily Mail that mentions Tuvalu, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/.../Sinking-Pacific-nation..>

In the early 1800s, the British Admiralty established the Hydrographer's Office to create maritime charts and conduct maritime explorations. The Beagle's second voyage chief scientist was Charles Darwin, budding naturalist and geologist.

Darwin observed coral reefs consist of tiny animals and their exoskeletons. His reasoned if seamounts in tropical seas surrounded by fringing reefs experienced subsidence or rising seas, over thousands of years the seamount would disappear below the waves, leaving a nearly circular coral atoll.

Darwin's CORAL REEFS, was published in 1842. A little over a century later, seismic explorations accompanying US Pacific atomic tests showed Darwin's deductions were correct:

atolls are structures built by corals, as sea levels rose above seamounts, the corals' growth kept pace.

However, sea levels were actually higher than today in the recent historic past, a subject explored in my post <https://wattsupwiththat.com/.../history-falsifies.../> and in graphic terms in my lesson on this very subject at my class page: [http://casf.me/.../PDF\\_Climate-History-2-and-History...](http://casf.me/.../PDF_Climate-History-2-and-History...)

beginning at slide 35, although the earlier pages show climate history and numerous journal articles which put the lie to Richard Allen's and the NCA's claims that today's benign climate is somehow wildly different from the climates of the past.

Slide 50 shows sea levels significantly higher than today during the Battle of Thermopylae in 480 BC.

Slides 57-71 show sea levels higher than today during the Roman Empire and the Roman Warm Period.

I have personally visited Ostia Antica and Pisa and walked these grounds; these events occurred during historic times when we have the documents from the Roman Warm period from which I derived many of these graphics. Click on the embedded links!

Are you familiar with the Notitia Dignatum a historic document from the late Roman Empire which describes the Saxon Sea Forts of present day England? Those forts are present today and clearly show that sea levels were higher than today over much of present day England, France, and Belgium as you can see from slides 85 – 106.

There are numerous journal articles from the geologic literature from graphics 119-133.

Sea levels are lower today than in the recent past, and the present sea level rate of rise has not changed from when the first tide gages were installed before the US Civil War.

ROBERT W. ENDLICH

Reply Lynn Carol

Paris, France

The National Academy of Sciences and every other scientific body of national or international standing beg to differ. So does every climate scientist, worldwide, publishing in peer-reviewed science journals, where you'll find actual climate science.

Reply Robert Endlich ·

Advanced Weather Officer at USAF Retired

Lynn Carol,

As I wrote in my previous reply to your previous comment, Peer Review is no substitute for the scientific method. Clearly you are unaware of the replication crisis in the peer-reviewed literature, but if not, the examples here might educate you.

[https://fabiusmaximus.com/.../replication-crisis-in...](https://fabiusmaximus.com/.../replication-crisis-in.../)This talk about 'all of the major scientific institutions of the developed world' is more puffery and appeal to authority, you should consider the stunning failures I cite here: [http://casf.me/.../PDF\\_Climate-Short\\_Settled-Science\\_12...](http://casf.me/.../PDF_Climate-Short_Settled-Science_12...)

I have cited actual data and actual measurement flaws and fraudulent manipulation of data especially here; [http://casf.me/.../PDF\\_Three-Lessons-in-Surface...](http://casf.me/.../PDF_Three-Lessons-in-Surface...)

It appears as if you have much more faith in peer review and the scientific elites you cite than is warranted; I have provided numerous specific examples, and you have provided none. That is telling.

ROBERT W. ENDLICH