

Climate Change Summary

Scott Crosby
25 May 2022

Influences on Earth's Climate

Earthly influences on its climate

The impact on the climate of the Earth's internal warmth is **unknown and cannot be predicted**.

The Earth's magnetic poles continually drift, and periodically swap. The most recent swap was 42,000 years ago, and had a substantial impact on Earth's climate.

The impact of the current drift of the north pole (from north Canada to north Russia) on climate is **unknown and cannot be predicted**.

The causes of changes in Earth's average temperatures and CO2 levels are unknown and cannot be predicted.

The impact of climate on the severity of hurricanes and the levels of precipitation and cloud cover are **unknown and cannot be predicted**.

Changes in the Earth's average temperature and CO2 levels cannot be correlated to each other, or to other factors, excepting large volcanic eruptions such as occurred during the Younger Dryas period, about 13,000 - 11,500 years ago.

CO2 levels have been particularly low for the past five million years, and (for plant life) dangerously low during the Ice Ages of the past million years.

There is a direct correlation between CO2 levels, plant growth, and food supply.

Likewise, temperatures have been unusually low for the past four million years.

Temperatures began dropping further for unknown reasons 700 years ago, hitting a minimum about 1650. Temperatures have been recovering since then, but are still colder than prior to 1300.

Due to natural perturbations and oscillations in the Earth's orbit in the last 1.5 million years, a

dozen ice ages have occurred, with the most recent ending about 11,000 years ago. Based on those orbital calculations, another ice age is somewhat imminent.

The result would be mile-thick layers of ice covering Canada, the northern U.S., northern Europe, and Russia, decimating human and animal populations and most plant life. Ocean levels would fall accordingly (13,000 years ago, you could walk between Siberia and Alaska). CO2 levels would fall precipitously, endangering the survival of plants world-wide, and thereby animal life as well.

Solar influences on Earth's climate

The impact on Earth's climate of the changes and perturbations of the Earth's orbit around the sun is **unknown and cannot be predicted**.

The Sun is a variable star. The impact on Earth's climate of the variations in the Sun's output of light, heat, and other radiation is **unknown and cannot be predicted**.

Cosmic influences on Earth's climate

The impact on Earth's climate of cosmic radiation (i.e., that from other suns, novas, supernovas, black holes, etc.) is **unknown and cannot be predicted**.

Cosmic events, from the most dramatic examples, such as the meteor impact that killed the dinosaurs 65 million years ago, the meteor impact at the start of the Younger-Dryas period about 12,000 years ago, and the supernova of 2.5 million years ago, have impacted Earth's climate and caused mass extinctions on a number of occasions.

Cosmic events of minor or minimal impact are constant or daily occurrences, but their combined

effect on the weather is **unknown and cannot be predicted.**

Forecasting Climate Change

"Climate has always varied on all time-scales" – U.N.'s IPCC

As noted, the causes of that variation are substantially unknown and the impacts cannot be predicted.

In this context, "climate change" and "climate variation" are synonymous.

The Accuracy of Weather Predictions

In 1963, meteorologist Edward Lorenz showed mathematically that, due to all the unknown sources of impacts on Earth's climate, reasonably accurate weather prediction beyond about three days is impossible.

You can easily and simply prove this for yourself: visit any website which provides a one-week (seven-day) forecast; e.g., see the five different week forecasts shown at:

http://www.scottcrosby.info/weather/week_forecast.html

Save a screen-shot of the forecast for the last day displayed, and compare that with the actual

weather on that day. The forecast will not match the actual weather which occurs.

All forecasts are statistically-based guesses, and are particularly prone to progressively more substantial error beyond three days. The weather / climate for one week out, for two weeks out, for the next month, for the next year, for the next ten years, for the next thirty years, or in the year 2100 cannot be predicted. The more distant the date, the less accurate is the forecast.

Those statistical guesses are based on computer models. Those models' parameters are set by the person running the model, based on his beliefs. As Edward Lorenz demonstrated, *the slightest, supposedly insignificant change to those parameters results in radically different forecasts.*

Statistics are not proof.

Statistics never establish causality. Statistics never prove anything.

Weather Forecasting and Statistically-based Modeling

All modeling used for weather forecasting, whether for near-term weather forecasting or for the climate in some more-distant future, is based on statistics.

Statistics are a record – a historical record – of what has already occurred.

Statistical modeling uses the past to forecast the future.

Statistical modeling looks for historical patterns and trends, and uses any it finds as a tool to forecast the future.

But the future is never just like the past. As the U.N.'s IPCC stated, "Climate has always varied on all time-scales."

"All time-scales" – Weather varies hour by hour; day to day; month to month; year to year; century to century; ad infinitum. Earth's climate is constantly changing.

That use of statistics to forecast the future is identical to trying to drive your car solely by looking in the rear-view mirror.

It is possible to drive that way for a very short period of time – maybe only a few feet, maybe

even for a hundred yards – if there are no sudden curves, no oncoming traffic, no kids on bicycles, no busy intersections – i.e., no unforeseen events – in front of you.

For both driving a car using only the rearview mirror, and for statistical modeling, the number of unpredictable events that could happen quickly pile up, becoming ever greater. Over time, an ever-greater number of those possible events – and others not foreseen – actually do occur.

The inability to anticipate an unexpected incident eventually and inevitably results in a failure – not only for statistical modeling, but in the consequences for the people affected.

The whole subject has an exciting-sounding name – **Chaos Theory** – and includes astounding amounts of complexity.

Mathematicians specializing in Chaos Theory have developed some extremely complex calculations, trying to increase the accuracy of not only their weather predictions, but also similar predictions in other fields of interest as well – with limited successes.

They keep on piling up complexities upon complexities – trying to build castles in the clouds.

If only they could get that first foundation laid and solidly attached to the clouds, the rest of building a castle would be easy. They could build

magnificent castles indeed. There is no doubt about it.

But it is getting that first layer of bricks and mortar attached to the clouds that is the problem. Those castles' foundations just cannot seem to be solidly attached in place by anyone – mathematicians included.

They have lots of extremely complex equations, far beyond what any of us mere mortals would want to try to understand. And yet, they just cannot seem to get that first layer of the foundation started for those castles in the clouds.

In the end, they are reduced to saying, "If we could change the problem a little, in just the right way, we could get an answer."

Well, of course. If only you could change the rules, the rules would be different.

If only you could build your castle's foundation on the ground, you could build your castle.

If only you could see what is in front of your car by looking through the windshield instead of looking in the rear-view mirror, you would know where you are going.

If only statistics could establish causality, statistically-based modeling would work.

Work-arounds and Seeing Through the Smokescreens

Ensemble Forecasting

Because the forecasting models invariably produce incorrect forecasts, the Chaos Theory mathematicians have developed a new forecasting technique: "Ensemble Forecasting".

With Ensemble Forecasting, multiple forecasting models are run, each with multiple sets of inputs, in the hope that one of them will produce a result close to what actually happens.

This is equivalent to rolling a pair of dice and, rather than predict the result will be "7" (the most

probable result), make the prediction that the result will be "5", "6", "7", "8", or "9". By giving more guesses, the chance that one of them will be right is increased.

The Ensemble Forecasting used for Hurricane Matthew in 2016 demonstrated the lack of validity of this technique: none of the forecasts got an answer that was even remotely close to the actual path of the hurricane.

Ensemble forecasting is an implicit admission that weather forecasting does not work.

Taking the Average

An alternative forecasting method mentioned by IPCC is taking a simple average of all of the results from a set of models.

Taking an average is never a scientifically-acceptable procedure to reach a definitive causal explanation.

Like ensemble forecasting, taking an average is an implicit admission that weather forecasting does not work.

Weather forecasting is barely precise within a few hours. We have all experienced isolated or scattered storms. They can generally be predicted ("There is a 60% chance ...") to occur somewhere

in an area, but predicting a specific location is virtually impossible.

Weather forecasting further into the future becomes increasingly imprecise so quickly that forecasting beyond three days – and as Hurricane Matthew proved, sometimes beyond a fraction of a day – must become progressively more vague to be even remotely close to what actually occurs.

The Big Lie

To claim to be able to predict the climate of a year or ten years from now, or in 2100, is laughably absurd nonsense, and the people doing so have the education to know that is true – making any prediction a **deliberate lie**.

Actual, Real, Truly Reliable, Truly Scientific Prediction of the Weather

While we know generally what causes the weather, we do not sufficiently understand the impact of each particular cause and the interaction of each cause with all the others sufficiently to establish causality and so accurately predict the weather.

We are so used to the current style of weather forecasts that our minds gloss over the disparities and issues.

Having a truly scientific means to predict the weather would result in forecasts something like this:

"You have requested the weather forecast for your backyard (based on your GPS location) on Saturday, the 8th of August, three months from today. A light rain will occur from 4:02am to 6:38am that morning, with the clouds dissipating to scattered, and clearing by 9:12am. Sunny skies can be expected for the rest of the day, with a few clouds in the evening. If needed, more detailed information is available on our website."

Mathematician - turned - meteorologist Edward Lorenz began his weather forecasting career during World War II, working for the Army Air Force.

From Wikipedia: *In 1961, Lorenz was using a simple digital computer to simulate weather patterns by modeling 12 variables, representing things like temperature and wind speed. He wanted to see a sequence of data again, and to save time he started the simulation in the middle of its course. He did this by entering a printout of the data that corresponded to conditions in the middle of the original simulation. To his surprise, the weather that the machine began to predict was completely different from the previous calculation. The culprit: a rounded decimal number on the computer printout. The computer worked with 6-digit precision, but the printout rounded variables off to a 3-digit number, so a value like 0.506127 printed as 0.506. This difference is tiny, and the consensus at the time would have been that it should have no practical effect. However, Lorenz discovered that **small changes in initial conditions produced large changes in long-term outcome.***

This issue ultimately led Lorenz to say, "An acceptable prediction of an instantaneous state in the distant future may well be impossible. In view of the inevitable inaccuracy and incompleteness of weather observations, precise very-long-range forecasting would seem to be nonexistent."

There is no scientific basis for weather prediction.

Climate, Chaos, and Politics: Follow the Money

Mathematicians who have staked their careers, reputations, and incomes on Chaos Theory naturally have a vested interest in convincing and assuring those who fund them that continued research will enable the development of substantially-improved means of the successful prediction of events through statistical modeling.

The same is true for the Meteorologists and Climatologists who adopt and use those models.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is a bureau of the United Nations. The climatologists who are employed by the IPCC applied for their jobs knowing who they would be

working for, and what its nominal position on climate change is. Their salaries depend on their research and resulting recommendations supporting the goals of their employer, making what those recommendations would be foregone.

Similarly, the Politicians who have based their rise to power and attempts to circumvent liberties and exert control on "fighting Climate Change" naturally have just as much of a vested interest in perpetuating the claims of that same coterie of Mathematicians, Meteorologists, and Climatologists.

Politics and Earth's climate

Unlike every other country in the world, the United States' Constitution is above the government, limiting it, and standing beyond politicians' ability to change it and act as they might like.

Politicians naturally work to circumvent that or any limitation on their political power, to subvert it, and to erode its control over them.

Politicians in other countries likewise work to subvert the U.S. Constitution. It stands as an affront to their desires, and their own power. It acts as a beacon and reminder to their own population, undermining those politicians' power over that subject population, and giving those people hope for a better future.

The United States and its population living in freedom are a lighthouse, a beacon, giving hope and yearning to the world's oppressed populations.

Imagine the exultant cheers of dictators, telling their subject populations that the United States was brought down by its own leaders, that freedom has failed, that it did not work, and that

it can never work – with no United States and no people living in freedom to contradict their claims.

Politicians – both in the U.S. and in other countries (and in the U.N.) – will seize on and utilize any tool which they believe can aid them in their quest for greater power and control over populations.

Politicians' Rule 1: "Never let a crisis go to waste."
Rule 2: "Manufacture the crisis."

Climate change is that kind of "crisis".

Climate as a path to control

Stoking fears of climate change to enact laws that limit freedoms under the guise of resolving those issues and fears provides an avenue to greater political power.

Politicians naturally believe they are better qualified to govern the actions of others than are those others themselves.

That belief is in direct opposition to that of America's Founding Fathers, who were convinced otherwise: that people generally are perfectly capable of handling their own affairs; that their

only requirement is a restraint and limiting of government to assigned and authorized responsibilities. That makes possible the freedom to act as they choose: **Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness**. History has shown that the Founding Fathers were right.

Politicians in countries which oppose the U.S. also see climate-based limitations placed upon the its people not only as justifications for their own actions, but also as a means of diminishing America's power, wealth, and influence, which means more power for them.

Politicians uniformly strive for more political power. The greater the political power at stake, the more ruthless the pursuit.

Politics is highly competitive, and politicians tend to be replaced by politicians who strive harder and are more ruthless than their predecessors.

The U.S. Constitution, with its Bill of Rights and separation of powers, disarms would-be dictators, and so remains the best defense ever developed to assure the greatest possible limitation and restraint of political power.

