Ice Core Reconstructions Cannot See Spikes
[So don’t duct-tape it to recent precision measurements]
Or ... Slamming Slapshots with Slushy Ice
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Charts like this never cease to be reposted, reblogged, and re-valorized every place “Climate Change” is considered “Alarming.”

We see the Mauna Loa Keeling Slope shooting up. It looks scary. But with that long, straight, low graph of CO2 “attached” to it ... that is terrifying.

The Keeling Slope has been rising (not accelerating) steadily for 60 years. We worry. Some people do more than worry, they scream "Alarm!"

What if the Keeling Slope is nothing more than one segment of a natural, organic sine wave for CO2 concentration – which normally oscillates between 250ppm and 350ppm, with outliers down to 170 and up to 420, throughout the Holocene? If we can't see the sine curve, because there is no measurement prior to 1960, the default assumption, per Occam, is just such an oscillating curve. That is nature.

But wait ... we are at 417ppm+ at Mauna Loa, right? My hypothetical still stands, because I’ll add this element: what if the Keeling Slope is a segment on the natural sine wave, but human-release CO2 is extending its duration and/or boosting it beyond the expected normal organic turn down. In other words, a ‘kicker.’
Still, we don’t know how long Late Holocene CO2 sine waves last. We only have 60 years of evidence. What if the frequency is 160 years, up and down with an amplitude of 150ppm? Repeating: we have never seen the CO2 sine wave as plotted from direct measurement.

A 2012 study, by Margret Steinthorsdottir et al, looked into this issue.

Here is an overlay graph derived from that study that shows a 244ppm +/- 10ppm ice core CO2 reconstruction over 2200 years (it’s the red line) in the Early Holocene. Those extolling the low level, the flatness, and the constancy of CO2 champion this worldview as fact. Emphasis: 2200 years with only a swing of 20ppm – really? Even through both the meltdown and the Younger Dryas churn?

I will not type what the other plot is. See for yourself. also linked here
https://theearthintime.com/co2graph1.jpg

David Middleton raised this point in 2010 with extensive analysis, and defended attacks at Skeptical Science. He raised this analysis in 2019 at the following links:
I am not trying to deny human addition to the volume of CO2. My motive is a rational destruction of the totalizing represented by hockey-stick graphs. You would think there would be a retreat from showing/extolling those CO2 graphs, but no... they persist in the culture.

Yes, there is a human element acknowledged. However, the underlying baseline is not a flat 244ppm or 280ppm +/- 10ppm for the entire Holocene, followed by a rocket to the moon, per Al Gore. Ms. Steinthorsdottir (I like that name) et. al. made a study with the [begin conjecture] intent [end conjecture] to simply compare ice with stomata, but the unintended consequence – once you overlay her two graphs and normalize the scale – is the disclosure of and rejection of the IceToKeeling Duct Tape fallacy.

https://www.academia.edu/2949675

Link to the 2012 Steinthorsdottir paper, with the following graph (note: differing scales)