

If you don't regularly receive my reports, request a free subscription at steve_bakke@comcast.net !
Follow me on Twitter at <http://twitter.com/@BakkeSteve> and receive links to my posts and more!
Visit my website at <http://www.myslantonthings.com> !

 **PERMAFROST
WARMING ARTICLE
LEAVES READER
COLD!**

By "Doc"  August 24, 2017

Respectfully, and with considerable
admiration, borrowed by
Stephen L Bakke  September 12, 2017



Here's what provoked "Doc":

This is another offering from "Doc." You may remember some of his/her earlier contributions to "My Slant on Things." This time he/she is pointing out the absurd imprecision of many "expert" testimonials on climate change anecdotes. Predictions are always imprecise, but the objection arises when they are: 1) not based on sound scientific observations, 2) mostly speculative, and 3) intended to be the basis for spending billions, even trillions of dollars of resources on uncertain solutions. We can't pour good money after bad. This article ultimately was condensed a bit and submitted to the Minneapolis StarTribune as an editorial letter. As of this point in time "Doc" wishes to remain nameless because he/she is currently one of the pundits writing Al Gore's speeches. - SB

Here's "Doc's" response:

Permafrost Warming Article Leaves Reader Cold!

The Minneapolis StarTribune devoted considerable space and attention to an August 24 article, "Thawing permafrost could hasten warming." It demonstrated awe-inspiring scientific precision. We learned that all permafrost combined is "thought to" contain "about" twice as much carbon as is currently in the atmosphere. Then it was noted that it would take "millenniums" for this to thaw. (That was a close call!)

We discovered Alaska "may be" shifting from a storehouse of carbon to a net source, and that "estimates vary" on how much carbon is released from thawing permafrost worldwide. "By one calculation" the amount is slightly more than the U.S. emits annually from fossil fuel-burning. Was this "one calculation" by chance a worst-case scenario?

We were told that the total annual U.S. fossil fuel-burning, which was camouflaged as hard data, is an "average over the remainder of the century." Although the remaining 83% of this

century hasn't happened yet, I'm sure climate scientists have nailed this number down with the same precision as the rest of the article.

We learned that scientists have "estimated" the process of permafrost thawing "could" contribute "as much as" 1.7 degrees Fahrenheit to global warming over "the next several centuries." "Could" equally implies "could not." For you non-scientists, "as much as" implies the worst-case scenario. Perhaps an oversight omitted other scenarios. I found the prediction about "the next several centuries" fascinating since I doubt most global warming scientists can predict what they will have for dinner.

Finally, we were informed that the predicted rise in temperature due to thawing permafrost is "independent of what society does to reduce emissions from burning fossil fuels and other activities." I guess that means humans are blameless. I predict this astonishing statement will be repudiated by a consensus of the scientific community.

The article dutifully reported that there is "plenty of debate" about this topic, but apparently the author couldn't find another viewpoint to present. After all, global warming scientists are busy people. Grant-writing is time-consuming when you have to cleverly construct a study to prove what you already believe.