

Interactive comment on “Agnotology: learning from mistakes” by R. E. Benestad et al.

N. Scafetta

nicola.scafetta@gmail.com

Received and published: 2 July 2013

Benestad response to the C. Loehle objections is quite vague.

In my extended response I uncover numerous math and physical errors present in Benestad et al. (2013). So I do not repeat. Herein I just highlight a couple of issues.

1) About the quasi 60-year cycle observed in the global surface temperature and used in Loehle and Scafetta (2011) and in other Scafetta's papers, Benestad states "For noisy geophysical data, it is hazardous trying to identify cycles when you only have a small number of them (2), and from such a curve-*fit*, you cannot really attribute much physical significance."

It is evident that Benestad's statement does not demonstrate anything. Benestad cannot disprove that the global surface temperature since 1850 is characterized by a major

C318

pattern with a quasi 60-year oscillation, which is evident at naked eyes to any unbiased person and extensively demonstrated in Scafetta's papers many times.

Benestad's statement is severely misleading because it gives the impression that Loehle and Scafetta did not consider longer sequences than the global surface temperature records which cover only 160 years. On the contrary, Loehle and Scafetta referenced numerous papers using climate proxies covering several centuries that demonstrate that a quasi 60-year oscillation is one of the common patterns that characterize climate records. This is also clearly shown in Figure 4 of our paper

Loehle C. and N. Scafetta, 2011. Climate Change Attribution Using Empirical Decomposition of Climatic Data. The Open Atmospheric Science Journal 5, 74-86. <http://benthamscience.com/open/openaccess.php?toascj/articles/V005/74TOASCJ.htm>

that shows (A) G. Bulloides abundance variation record found in the Cariaco Basin sediments in the Caribbean sea since 1650 [Black et al., 1999]. B) tree-ring chronologies from Pinus Flexilis [MacDonald and Case, 2005] as an index to the PDO. Both records show five large quasi 60-year cycles since 1650.

Other more advanced figures are present in more recent papers published by Scafetta which also include the solution of the secular trending problem.

It is unclear whether Benestad's failure to properly understand Loehle and Scafetta (2011) about the quasi 60-year oscillation is due to the fact that he did not read our manuscript or he is explicitly trying to misrepresent our paper for the purpose of misleading the readers of the journal.

2) About the Soon and Baliunas case and ClimateGate emails. Contrary to what BHDCN2013 lets a reader to believe, cases such as Soon and Baliunas (2003) are very complex, as documented for example here:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soon_and_Baliunas_controversy

<http://newzealandclimatechange.wordpress.com/2011/11/27/climategate-2-and->

C319

corruption-ofpeer-review/

For example, the Wikipedia article says that "Jones replied Mann that "I think the sceptics will use this paper to their own ends and it will set paleo back a number of years if it goes unchallenged. I will be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor", referring to de Freitas." And "By May the journal's editors Hans von Storch and Clare Goodess were receiving numerous complaints and critiques of the paper from other scientists, to such an extent tht they raised the issues with de Freitas and the journal's publisher Otto Kinne. In reply, de Freitas said they were "a mix of a witch-hunt and the Spanish Inquisition". Note that the accusations against de Freitas (the editor handling Soon and Baliunas (2003)) were unjustified, as demonstrated by Otto Kinne (the director of the journal) here <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/11/28/a-response-from-chris-de-freitas/>

Other comments are present in my full response to Benestad et al. (2013).

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 4, 451, 2013.