



EGUsphere, author comment AC4  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-577-AC4>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on RC3

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, EGU sphere, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-577-AC4>, 2022

---

Also in this case, I tend to agree with the general critique of the reviewer. It is a brief essay, and it could contain many more details and specific arguments. But, this essay is a summary of a body of knowledge, written in the tradition of physical sciences, which asks for a compact presentation – with guidance where to find deepening material. As such, I would accept a verdict of rejection without complaint.

The reviewer complains that the work of a number of scholars has not been considered. This is true; instead, I have limited myself to the small group of social sciences scholars, who dared to submerge into the culture of the Max-Planck Institut für Meteorologie, to see, how climate science is done. Nowadays, after the Nobel Prize in Physics, that this workshop of Klaus Hasselmann was indeed one of the few driving climate science centers.

The reviewer's assertion that geography is connoted negatively in the article is correct. Geography has contributed little to the progress of understanding how the system climate functions, and could have been much more proactive to bring in genuinely social sciences aspects (such as the role of cultural constructions) into the climate debate. When the reviewer asks why a re-entry of geography would imply a tacit determinism, then she/he has misread the text. Such a causal implication has not been made and is not intended.

The transgression of some climate scientists into policy-prescribing is obvious for anybody reading consuming mass media. In particular during times of COPs.

"Determining political needs" is reformulated to "determining needed political measures".

The last point, what my "proposal to cope with this situation" would be, is well taken. I have no proposal apart of accepting it as it is but having in mind the possible implications. The sentence "That the scientific progress is conditioned by social dynamics, that it is in a post-normal phase, is nothing "bad", but should be kept in mind, when scientists communicate with society." is added.