

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

CLIMATE DISRUPTION: REAL SCIENCE DEMANDS SKEPTICISM!



By Stephen L. Bakke  May 19, 2014

Here's what provoked me:

Recent letters to the Editor took on Marco Rubio's recent statements about climate change, and rebuke all of us who challenge certain proclamations about global warming/climate change/climate disruption – whatever the current terminology. Have you noticed how, as time passes, the nomenclature becomes less specific and more subjective?

A summary of Rubio's reasonable and balanced answers are included in my response below. Nevertheless, according to letter writers, Rubio and all of the rest of us skeptics are stupid, reject science, and belong to the flat earth society. I wanted to put in my "two cents worth."

Here's my response:

Climate disruption: real science demands skepticism!

Letters to the Editor have sarcastically criticized Marco Rubio's statements about climate change and rebuke others who challenge certain proclamations about global warming/climate change/climate disruption – whatever the current terminology. As time goes by, terminology becomes less specific and more subjective! Rubio's reasonable answer to the climate change question was: He doesn't accept unproven claims about the extent of humans' influence on climate; he won't support the funding of unproven solutions to problems which have not been fully analyzed as to cause and effectiveness of suggested solutions. HE IS NOT A DENIER! HE IS A SKEPTIC!

I have become increasingly skeptical as more and more actual observations of climate refute the harsh warnings. The fatal flaw, I've decided, is that the projections are based solely on forecasting models with bold and imperfect assumptions!

Briefly, we have good reason to be skeptics (not deniers) because:

- The Economist magazine noted: half of all published research cannot be replicated.
- Warming projections rely almost exclusively on models and very little on observational data.
- Projections are consistently contradicted by observations.
- Projections are consistently high – projections present "worst case" results using "iffy" assumptions.

- Disaster projections ignore our ability to respond to challenges.

