

?VI?. CONCLUSIONS

The Kyoto Premise is yet another example of a very large "scientific cult" involving an incredible diversity of scientists around the world, and which became the "scientific consensus" in spite of very flagrant flaws in its rational. I believe that there are several key lessons to be drawn from this, although most points below are not :

1. History shows that the potential impacts of "natural Climate Change" can be devastating, so it should definitely be followed closely.
2. Historical and current scientific analysis indicate that anthropogenic GHGs have at best a very minor, and probably insignificant, effect on climate change, as compared to the large and rapid changes that have always occurred throughout geological history as well as in recent times. Furthermore, there is no certainty that the net man-made effects will produce higher or lower temperatures or other non-temperature climate changes. While the issue is worth some research, funding really needs to be removed from most of the current areas of emphasis so that it can be re-applied to areas that have a far better chance of advancing our understanding of the climate. Where there is little cost to society and potential side effects are felt to be insignificant, then some actions may be justified. However, there is no justification for funding and efforts to come anywhere close to the levels that are put into research on natural climate systems and drivers, and current impacts and adaptation thinking completely fails to recognize the benefits of climate change. New scientists, new institutions, new funding organisations, new non-governmental policy making organisations, and new leadership in the civil service and academia are desperately needed.
3. The general public is well justified in its skepticism with regards to scientific and policy pronouncements and scientific consensus or fashions. In spite of incredible scientific achievements and progress over the last half millenium, many fashion trends in science have clearly gone terribly wrong. Pronouncements in "politically correct" areas of interest may be especially suspicious, much more than areas of important economic or personal gain.
4. We must recognize that "dysfunction and/or delinquent and/or dishonest" (D-cubed) thinking remains prevalent in the scientific community in spite of the very advanced education and experience of scientists. How we are trained to think, how we like to think that we think, and how we actually think may differ greatly.

These lessons are not new, but have been stated in various forms for several millenia. Perhaps we are doing better than a thousand years ago in developing society and science, but as humans (including science) education does not seem to change the basic ways that we think, nor perhaps even the quality of the best thinking,

at least not anywhere close to the extent that we would like to think we think....

endpage

Definitions

“rational, logical, scientific” thinking:

epistemology -

endIntro