

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

dr. Rypdal

kristoffer.rypdal@uit.no

Received and published: 5 July 2013

I know very well Scafetta's past in complex-system theory, and I am sorry that he over the last years has converted to a mode of thinking which is more reminiscent of astrology.

Scafetta writes: "The problem with Rypdal's comment is that claiming that a system is "random" although a complex random signal is not a physical explanation of what is regulating climate system. The climate system represents clear fingerprints of astronomical oscillations. These fingerprints are complex, but they can be recognized."

I believe these sentences (although grammatically flawed) describe very clearly the difference in our scientific outlook, and how Scafetta misconceives what I write.:

1. I don't CLAIM that the climate system is random. What I write is that we cannot a

C338

priority exclude that this is a possibility. Actually I am only talking about the randomness of the phase of a climate oscillation, not the climate system per se. If the randomness (unpredictability) of phase is true, then any theory that predicts the phase must be wrong. This is my claim.

2. Scafetta believes a physical theory needs to EXPLAIN Nature, and he believes that all aspects of the climate system are regulated by external influences. I believe the purpose of physics is to DESCRIBE Nature, and that some aspects of Nature's dynamics are unpredictable. Chaos theory has taught us that this is true.

3. There are some relatively clear, but very weak, fingerprints in the climate system of some astronomical oscillations, but it is my opinion that Scafetta's conviction about their omnipresence and importance is not based on objective and critical examination of the evidence, and does not give proper weight to alternative descriptions.

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

C339