

Gleanings & Meanings –

The EIKE Munich Conference Aftermath 23.-24.11.2018

The magic of lines and hockey-sticks

One of the most striking impressions of Climate graphs mainly propagated by the IPCC crowd are the smart lines that they implant into the clouds of data points in all possible graphs. There is a real love to show where the voyage goes – up for the most of times following a straight line. A straight line has a big advantage: there is a start and an end and in between all is evenly straight. Even if data are scattered around in a big data field, even if they present a picture of a snake, even if there are skyscrapers and deep abyss on a continuing data field – a line is the means of choice. Is this a resort to dishonesty? Is there only one possible evolution in life – one that follows a straight line? Are there no curves like those of a road going uphill in the mountains or the water flowing out of your bathtub or the waves that create a rhythm that calms you down at the beach? They do not like sinus curves as there is a repeating effect and a downward movement after an upward period!

Well there is one other nice graph called “hockey-stick” – it’s an interesting variation of a straight line with a positive laps rate. First it goes down and then it goes up! The downward route is shorter though than the upward route and there is a clear turning

point. The hockey-stick is a nice culturally bound instrument coming out of the anglophone context where Hockey and Lacrosse are well known common games. Not so in other parts of the world where people play “boules” or “Fussball /soccer” and think in bowls and balls. The hockey-stick is in this respect already a cultural idea that predicts a development quite nicely without need for explaining why. Like the straight line it is a very common instrument to describe any phenomenon, be it climate change or the consequences of change management effects in strategic management consulting. Strange for not-Americans to see how this “image” returns in lots of completely different matters with the same logic: “First it’s getting worse – but then it turns out right!”

Cultural context and reflections

Nobody starts with nothing. All of us all around the world think in contexts with a contextually formed grid of reflection. That’s the origin of such ideas as “hockey-stick” and “lines” and “bowls” and “crowds” and a lot of images we use in our languages. And our main fields of thoughts are culturally bound, too. Especially if we are concerned with our world and what happens around us. In respect to climate I observe that climate issues are different from one region to the other depending on the cultural context within which we live. As our regions are different, we have different concerns about variations of what we realize and perceive. Habitants of the Alps are concerned about melting glaciers, habitants at the North-

Atlantic Coast are concerned about tides and storms and fish, mainlanders in Europe are concerned about the well-behaving cycle of seasons whereas people at the equator have no seasons at all! Germans care about the forest, French do not. Italians and Spanish, Arabians and Australians are used to heat and dry conditions, British and southern Swedes to mild climate and fog and rain. Swiss and Austrians are used to snow – others like Chinese and Africans are surprised by touching it. What if this is going to change? Then people start to worry and their habits get a little confused. Especially for holidays. What about skiing in the Alps in Winter? What about going to escape the warm conditions in northern spheres or getting the amount of sun we like to have in the North going south and so on. Agriculture is adapted to certain conditions to make the maximum out of them – what is happening if the grass is dry the cattle needs? what happens if there is not enough rain for corn to grow properly? what happens if the conditions get to warm for plants that are growing well in mild climate like a lot of European flowers and grapes and fruit?

No climate change at all?

People do not like change a lot. Although there is a lot of talking about changing habits and lifestyle and fashion all the time. It's like a fashion show in Paris where the spectators watch a presentation of freaky haute-couture and then continue to go to the theater in the most conservative tuxedo and long robes. Well in my observation in business and life change is a hard thing to do. That's why it

needs coaches, trainers, consultants and other professionals to bring it about if ever it works. A lot of time it doesn't and there is set-back. Now what if climate changes? Not weather alone but the conditions we are used for a long time since we were young or we know of from parents and books? Well, it's evident – we do not like it. Although we know from history that this is normal. Climate changed all over history everywhere. Storms at the Atlantic coastline claim back the land that has been “won” in the Netherlands and Northern Germany. In the Mediterranean there are port facilities to be discovered that are completely covered with water. Others are covered by sand like Ephesus. There are villages that have been covered by growing glaciers in the Alps and Greenland. There are records of a flourishing life in the midst of the deathly parts of the Sahara in Northern Africa. Our inner memory is getting shorter with expanding memory of our computers. Media sell weather events like crime events in big cities. Bad news sell – and change is bad. That's what people like to hear and that's how they live. With ever changing conditions in the working sphere due to IT and globalization one big area of equal conditions is lost. New workflows, new programs, new algorithms demand adaption. Companies change structures, owners, employees much faster. But as people dislike changes they opt for non-change in other contexts of their life, in the residential sphere, the social sphere, the weather sphere.

Who owns the climate?

People in Germany say “Fortunately we cannot change the weather!” and mean that

if that was possible, every country would try to optimize the weather conditions in favor for the national and economic agenda. But the same people like to “protect the climate” – is this a contradiction? Well I think so. Talking about “Climate protection” it seems to be the opposite of “Climate Change”. And as “Climate Change” is sold as “caused by humans – that is ‘anthropo-genic’ – people think that this change can be “done”. But what about all the historical changes of global climate? And what about the question “which” climate shall be “protected”? Is there anyone who “owns” the climate? Who would decide on that? Shall we protect climate to preserve the conditions we are used to thirty years ago if it is clear what these conditions were. Shall we protect the European Climate – if that exists? or the American – US – climate? The one in Chad or in Syria? the one in Greenland or on the Philippines? And what would happen if “we” did so? What would that mean for the “other” regional climates? getting better or worse – and what would be “better” or “worse”? warmer? more humid? less wind or more? less warm and more snow? snow at all? Is a world with a little more CO₂ worse or better – with better harvests and more vegetal food for the growing world population – or do we have to link development aid to countries with an obligation to reduce emissions? How would have European nations liked to be told how to develop after the middle ages? Human “Earth Ages” tell us a story of changing climate – and humanity did adapt to it. The Holocene left the last ice age behind us. The Minoan and Roman warm time spurred a flourishing of these cultures. The Little Ice Age decelerated societal expansion in Europe

by famines and poverty. There is no owner of any climate. The evolution of the climate is not linked to any culture nor dependent of it. It is the other way round. It seems a strange idea that “protection” of a “status ante quo” seems more attractive – although not defined clearly – than “adaption to ever changing conditions”. The Western / European idea of a “domination” of the world” seems as crazy as the idea of the “protection of the world”.

Climate is global – our perception is local-“ized”

Climate is global – the perception of most of the people on that is not. People live in a more or less limited regional sphere. There are few constant globe-trotters and few continuously globally informed people. Like there is no real “European” newspaper or TV-Channel there are no truly “global” ones. Information about climate is locally and regionally filtered – and more and more ideologically, too. News redactions sort out what is “important” news for them. And climate-related events are for them and for the public first of all “weather” events that derive from the “normal” expectation: more snow than “usual”, less rain than “usual”, more wind and storms than “usual”. The question is who defines what is “usual”: it can be the actual “memory” of “the” people – maybe of the last three or five years, getting shorter all the time – or it can be the meteorological agencies – or the “science” – whatever that may be, related to universities or independent. Or environmental groups, organizations or political parties of that color. In recent times there emerged a sort of

“common understanding” of what is a normal “climate”, neutrally said. This “understanding” is promoted by the IPCC and its papers released for “policy makers” that strangely appear before the corresponding scientific documentation is finished. This conglomerate of “IPCC-driven” statements and depending political conclusions created a sort of “public ideology” on climate that is almost ubiquitous. It is the leading paradigm in the public sphere and there is almost no discussion allowed to put this scientifically and argumentatively into question. This makes that the coverage of weather phenomena is even the more “selectively” brushed in favor of this “climate ideology”: events that “correspond” to it are covered, events that do not are ignored, on a local, regional and national even global scale. We “watch” “hungry polar bears”, “more frequent hurricanes”, “more devastating floods” and all that is related to humanly driven “climate change” and “global warming” to confirm this “perception”. Cooling events like cooler temperatures and more snow anywhere else in the world are not covered, better crops are not, less frequent storms are not. Selected “events” create an “artificial” frequency that is perceived as “worse” and in the line with the IPCC-driven and “predicted” climate evolution. The perception of “global” climate is “produced” locally by selection and by “missing out” the critical evidence. As this “climate ideology” is omnipresent now in media, politics and education any deviation from it is “punished” and a sort of social “self-censorship” is installed in combination with a highly emotional and an almost “religious” fanaticism. Non-compliance to this “end-of-the-world climate saving ideology”

is socially highly disregarded and leads to “inquisition-like” application of “banning” mechanisms to be observed by the practices of journalists, TV-people and politicians and “policy makers” as experienced in Munich Conference and by reactions of regional and national newspapers like NZZ, CH and others that were formerly known for their reputable journalism.

Forget the “truth” and focus on the “picture”

Truth is an absolute value. Measured values are not. Models are based on assumptions and measured values in nature. Nobody has direct access to “reality” as reality is not accessible without sensual experience. And to access data about nature through our senses there is an instrumentation necessary. Measuring depends on the instruments and the application of instruments. Same with climate data. If global climate is the topic then data have to be global, too. If there are no equally spread measurements of data of regions like the oceans and Africa and South-America, China and Russia, this is no statement about global climate but of a accidental mix of data. There are satellite data but satellites are a long way from what they measure and if the calibration-setting is larger than what you want to measure and data are processed by codes to “unify” them they are no relevant data. Furthermore measuring involves faults, for systematic or accidental or unknown reasons. The infinite increase of measuring data does not eliminate faults by itself. Any data used to create models that are not given with an

open description about the processing, “equalization” and “error”-correction, calibration-margins and collection-conditions are no relevant basis. All these hidden kinds of “practices” are found in the IPCC models.

Results in natural sciences as it is a practical science are always the result of the interpretation of data. There is an inductive and deductive way to get to results. The inductive way starts with found data and comes to a result by “following” their characteristics or structure. The deductive way starts with an assumption and then tries to “find” the data that confirm the assumption or hypothesis. In the first case you find wall paintings in a grotto in the midst of a deathly desert like in Chad and then “discover” that there was life and water and an impressing culture you would never imaging from todays perspective. In the second case you “assume a global warming” and you look for data in areas where it gets warmer and then postulate a “global effect”. We know that only the proceeding of the first case is valid as covered by appropriate data. The second is a possible attempt, but not covered by appropriate data as there is no true global data mining but only an extrapolation from local to global data as done in several IPCC models. This may work for selling washing machines globally – but doesn’t either if you look at the success of companies that tried to do that – but this is no way to do correct science nor pretending any reason to bring about costly changes in society or economy towards a so-called more sustainable future and prevent “the end of a habitable world”. Models on future are not

reality nor theories. Theories are based on validated hypotheses with valid data. But there are no data from future. That’s why models are completely irrelevant for the future. They would only assume that future is a prolongation of the interpretation of the past. Data reaching into the far past can tell us something about the “reality” as it is possible to access: There was already climate change in both directions, warmer and colder and humanity adapted to what they could not change even before there was any noticeable human influence.

The Great Awakening – Giga-effects

The time we talk about “giga” as a grade of any scale is not very long in our western society. We started maybe with Mega-Hertz as a scale of broad-cast radio in FM (Frequency Modulation Mode) – if we looked to the scale with precise interest. Then “we” started with “Kilos” in kilometers in the cars and airplanes. And from the eighties with kilobytes in the Commodore64. Then followed megabytes and megapixels, gigabytes and terabytes. Now looking at the industry built up in our societies we hear about megatons and recently concerning the climate debate the word “Gigaton” came into the vocabulary. Now in school people already fight with exponentiations. Talking about 70 Gigatons of CO₂ emitted in one year says as much as “a very huge amount” or “more than you can imagine”. Imagining the potential of megawatts of a power plant is difficult the more 70 thousand billion (Milliarden) of a gas you cannot see.

There was a notion and perception of the effects of industrialization for a longer time and most of it was accompanied with a feeling of proudness about the wealth it achieved. Nowadays there is a perception of the lateral effects of the industrialization and most of the times it is accompanied for a lot of people by a sense of worrying and maybe “shame” as environmentalists and “climate protectors” tell that this is “evil” (not maybe a “fault”). The “Giga”-language leads to an effect of awakening: “what?? – this is such a big effect? How come? Uhh, wow. We never imagined this unimaginably big!” The great awakening is made by figures, billions, trillions, quadrillions... But the other side is that these figures are rarely put into a valid relation to the other parts of the system. What is the mass of all the atmosphere of the earth? And related to that how big is the share of the CO₂ in one cubic meter or how big of one million parts? And how big the share of CO₂ emitted by human effects? And how big is the share of gaseous H₂O (invisible “water vapor” as popularly said – but not “steam” and not visible condensed water like fog and clouds) at the same time that has a larger effect in the climate game? Figures isolated from their context can be “used” to impress and distort and create a “reality” for those who do not “know” the other figures of the same context, for example the atmosphere. And psychologically spoken big, big figures can be used to seduce and confuse people – “earn one million a year! get 20 % return on your investment! be part of millions who took benefit out of this offer! Millions of us are ready to take the lead... And nobody asks

questions anymore not to show his ignorance or disinterest.

The great awakening is made by big figures given in isolated fashion to create negative emotions and bad conscience.

Anthropogenic CO₂ is 18 parts per one million parts – 0.000018. The mass of the atmosphere altogether is $5,15 \times 10^{18}$ – one gigaton is 1×10^9 . The relation of one gigaton to the whole atmosphere is 5.15×10^9 , five giga that is billion-times a gigaton! But who asks for the context of something he or she does not really understand? Who knows the mass of all the water of the oceans when talking about sea levels and warming of the oceans? Who knows that already 2.5m of water column in the ocean absorbs all the energy of 8000m upon it? What about the 4997.5 m below these 2.5m? What is the relation of the quantity of the ice melting on shore at the border of the ice in the Arctic to the amount of ice altogether of Arctic and the growing ice of the Antarctic? Who is asking that? Who knows that melting floating ice like icebergs and all the sea-ice of the Arctic where there is no ice on shore at all does not change sea level at all – like a melting ice-cube in a glass of whisky when it is already put in the glass! Thus do not accept figures without context!

False prophets and Sophists

In biblical times the kings like David and Solomon had their advisors, too. And as every other mighty human being like Presidents and CEO's and billionaires they liked to hear what they liked to be. Those advisors were called “prophets” especially when future was at stake. And as a matter of

facts even in those times future was a tricky business as nobody knew it – same as today. When future is looking positive as the present time is bright, no enemies, no famine, no revolts this is a fairly easy job. And so there are a lot of people around the king telling him a bright future without any worries. Although they had no appropriate source of knowledge at all. And then there were some rare guys and girls also who had a “special” direct knowledge telling them that though present time is bright there will be a major problem soon due to “misbehavior” or “unknown enemies”. As the king disliked to hear that, they had hard times to survive.

Today “climatology” tells what people like to hear: “we can prevent change”. This is the good message even if there is no evidence for that as there was change of climate in the length of history and nobody had means to stop that. The message involves huge efforts that will undermine the economic stability of households – of families and communities and national economies. Even given that the message is still en vogue: CO2 leads to warming air and oceans and their acidification and sea level rise and messing up the world. This is simple and repeatable and works like the catholic ideology of the middle ages that made people pay for their invisible sins and salvation and condemned the “sinners” to “hell”. Today “climatology” is the good message and those who think different are the “climate sinners” and “deniers” that have to be “banned” and “listed” as you can see in German Wikipedia and in the practices of political parties and environmental movements. The liberalism that allowed them to establish themselves is

now disregarded and tolerance of dissenters is cancelled.

Now you may think that it is the other way and that the climatologists are the right prophets and the dissenters the false ones. Well it depends how you look at it. Socrates in his time was engaged in a lot of discussions mostly with “well-respected” specialists like architects and other technicians and wise men in the eyes of the population. And he was sort of an “outsider”. He had the habit to ask questions – a lost virtue today -not only superficial questions but questions to really get to the point what we can know. And the more people answered the more they felt that they could not really give the answer and they felt that they were not the specialists they thought to be and particularly not the specialists the people thought they would be. They feared for their celebrity and position. Socrates – and Plato, the author – called them “sophists” – saying that they offered “knowledge” like merchandise – something they acquired from “somewhere” and selling to “someone” without appropriate relation to the origin of the goods – merchants of knowledge that not really want to know anymore where all these techniques are coming from and in what relation they are to the conditions in the world. The climatologists are of that sort – selling “knowledge” about climate without asking anymore if it corresponds to the origin of things, if the models correspond to measured validated data, if the way of measuring corresponds to scientific standards, if the way data are processed corresponds to transparent standards and equilibrated dispersion globally, if the

assumptions in the models are justified or not, if the interest to find “necessary” data “for climate change” (as included in the name of IPCC) does not corrupt the “research” of the data. Those who accept models without asking questions anymore are not better than those sophists that traded and made their life with “knowledge”.

Climate reloaded – about telling the right story

The climate will tell the “real” story – the coming events will do it. When I talk about the future of climate I do not like to say that it is natural. There is an effect of human contributions and emissions, locally and regionally – as erosion and intoxication teach us. There are regional variations in climate. There is a tendency in weather – summers getting warmer in Middle Europe, more dry periods, less fish in the North Sea, more or less sea ice. On the other hand there is a growing ice shield in the Antarctic, there are more humid regions in Equatorial regions, there is cooling in winter in Canada, there is decrease of sea level in certain regions. Climate 2.0 is about the “whole picture”, about interconnected phenomena, cyclical events, anticyclical variations, exo-terrestrial effects on climate coming from the solar variations and cosmic events. The “right” story is discovered when sober scientific methods are applied in an equilibrated research with respect to all concerned disciplines worldwide and validated. It is not in the way to play off regions against each other or ignoring “dissenting data” or amplifying data, or omitting extremes of

data-sets, or unifying data to “pleasing” lines or nice “images” like hockey-sticks. All these “techniques” are applied in various “models” of IPCC-driven press releases to influence politicians and CEOs to pursue a given course. The assumption that there are no economic interests behind “climatology” is naïve! You can make money with solar panels and windmills and e-cars, too. And competition is about cost of energy and production and national interests of competing world-regions! The weakness of one is the advantage of the other! Low cost is a driver for investing money! Capital is like water – it always flows to the lower point! If climatology tells a different story they show that they have a second blind spot!

Prophecying the future or sticking to what we can do

When people panic they like to do something to avoid helplessness. But is there something to do concerning climate? The question to ask first is: is there a reason to panic! Before raising hell we should maybe ask if there is a hell at all! As the catholic church and Dante painted the abyss of hell in dramatic colors and people panicked the Reformers like Calvin and Luther asked themselves the simple question: Is there hell? And the answer they discovered through a Christ-based view of the Bible was: No! This answer required a lot of basic science – language studies in Greek and Hebrew, knowledge of all the Bible, philosophical training, knowledge of the theological key issues and traditions, the knowledge of the catholic “press” that is printed texts like documents of the Fathers

and Mothers of the Church. Now in the climate debate it is the same. Some raise panic among the people and tell stories about the “climate hell” coming if they do not repent and pay indulgence or discharge by compensation of their long-distance flights or a higher energy-bill, stopping to eat meat and cutting trees like in Lenten season, burning no more coal, no more barbecue, to abdicate diesel cars and buy lithium-battery powered cars that are fed by omnipresent windmills, one might think of the Amish people who renounce to electricity at all.

The popularized lack of critical reflection and blunt astonishment about the giga-factory of industry combined with a naïve return to a sort of life-story – not to say religion – leads to a sort of fanaticism that contaminates all spheres of society. The same strange admiration people show versus foreign religion in their holidays – like the admiration of Buddhist celebrations for example – they show now for this sort of “Climatology” (remember Scientology?) that comes with “tuned scientific” results to get people “clear” their life-style. Dissenters are not welcome. Arguments neither. No dialogue. No tolerance. This is the opposite of a tolerant society in the tradition of Voltaire, Kant and Hume. It is the society of the Soviet Union where an almighty party-line (line!) decided on what to think, what to say and what to do. Why was there a fear of this type of society some thirty years ago still? Why was there an anti-communist position in society? The trick today is that censorship today comes from inside the society. No party-line necessary – the scissors are implemented in the head already – cutting out everything that does

not fit in the climatology-picture, journals included, sadly, as well as TV stations like BBC who tell that overtly, others tacitly by ignoring letters, emails, articles, conferences, as well as universities by sacking dissenters or suppressing conferences that would present the other side on climate variations.

It is time for a new thinking on climate in an open process of globally equilibrated science. It is time to come back to a tolerate society that allows all ideas and results to be presented. It is time to get together all over the globe and connect findings in a correct way in humble objectivity. It is time to stop those who disseminate panic and fear – even amongst children and teenagers without reason. It is time for promoting Climate 2.0. It is time to get that out anywhere on the globe in an alliance of all who share this perception!

Claus U. Rieth
M.Div., EMBA, Rev.
Mulhouse, France
www.carlosclimate.wordpress.com
26.11.2018