EGUsphere, author comment AC3
https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-577-AC3, 2022


# Reply on RC2

Hans von Storch

Author comment on "Brief communication: Climate science as a social process – history, climatic determinism, Mertonian norms and post-normality" by Hans von Storch, EGUsphere, https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-577-AC3, 2022

The reviewer is entirely right: the claim of climate science being a social process is indeed trivial – in social science milieus. The paper is NOT presenting any new ideas and evidence. It is a short essay aimed at natural scientists who all too often make claims about presenting "truth" as opposed to the correct understanding of "for the time being best explanations".

The opening caveat has been expanding, making this aspect explicit: *The material presented in this paper, as well as the conclusions, are not new. Instead, it is a compact compilation of what the author, as a natural scientist, has learned in the past 30 years. The paper does not claim to cover the wealth of discussions in social science studies, but insists that two key issues, the reanimation of climatic determinism and the post-normal character of contemporary climate sciences, have been identified in cooperations involving the author. One could rightly argue that the claim of climate science being a social process is a trivial assertion – but among many natural scientists and in the public discourse, which treats scientific knowledge claims as "truth", climate science is usually not perceived as such. Thus, it makes sense, in particular in a journal aiming at physical scientists, to make this trivial assertion.*

I welcome the suggestion to go deeper into specific aspects, but I am unable to do so in a reasonable time, but the forthcoming anthology with Nico Stehr will hopefully be an opportunity to go into further detail.

The title – yes, but how? Please let me have a suggestion.

"Explanatory factor" in the abstract – has been qualified.

Humboldt was part of the geographical tradition of climate science, but he was an "early quantitative geographer", who worked with numbers (quantities) but not with equations. Also Huntington worked with quantities, even with correlations and the like, but not with a dynamic understanding of the system.

Thanks for pointing our writing errors.