

## Re: When London is submerged and New York is awash...

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2005-01/4949.html>

---

**From:** Jonathan Kirwan ([jkirwan\\_at\\_easystreet.com](mailto:jkirwan_at_easystreet.com))

**Date:** 01/19/05

Date: Wed, 19 Jan 2005 00:46:00 GMT

On Tue, 18 Jan 2005 21:59:15 +0000, Guy Macon  
<[\\_see.web.page\\_@\\_www.guymacon.com\\_](mailto:_see.web.page_@_www.guymacon.com_)> wrote:

>Jonathan Kirwan wrote:

>>

>>Guy Macon wrote:

>>>

>>>Jonathan Kirwan wrote:

>>>>

>>>>I don't really wish to address myself to the web site you mentioned.

>>>>

>>>>I won't bother to address the page.

>>>>

>>>>You dismiss what you cannot refute.

>>>>

>>>>The web page mentioned is NOT peer-reviewed, nor is it science.

>>>>

>>>>Like I said, you dismiss what you cannot refute.

I simply won't waste time unless my points and objections can be met squarely.  
There is no profit in it.

>>I'll debate you if you will support points you believe you can.

>>

>>I fail to see why you would be willing to do that. Are you under  
>>the impression that my posts are peer reviewed? Or is it only  
>>\*some\* things that you dismiss on the grounds of lack of peer  
>>review?

It's not necessary, Guy. We should \*use\* peer-reviewed science in our debate,  
should we be bothered to have one. But we can make our arguments as lay people,  
just fine. I happen to have some contacts in several areas and I can ask for  
help in understanding the science, when I need that.

I won't dismiss \*your\* arguments, Guy. I'll deal with quantitative points you  
make. But there is no point in my trying to go tilting after a web page. It's

like talking to a door. No response is possible.

>>*But I've learned a long time ago that there is no point in debating  
>>an opinion on a web page.  
>  
>In other words, you learned a long tome ago to dimiss what you  
>cannot refute.*

That's not what I said, and you know it.

>>*As I also said, if you want to make its arguments your own and  
>>are willing to defend the points yourself  
>  
>I am willing to defend that web page at  
>[http://www.clearlight.com/~mhieb/WVFossils/ice\\_ages.html](http://www.clearlight.com/~mhieb/WVFossils/ice_ages.html)  
>which you dismiss. I have checked many of the references and  
>confirmed that they say what is claimed. I have done the math  
>and it appears to be correct. I have analysed the logic of  
>the arguments and they appear to be sound.*

Then make the arguments here, Guy. If you really believe they are sound and if you really feel you understand the various issues behind the points well enough, then you should able to expose your knowledge to challenge, yes?

Otherwise, all you are doing is arguing from the authority of the web page. Silly, I think.

>>*I will not debate a web page.  
>  
>Your choice.*

Of course it is.

>>*My point isn't about what that web page references, Guy.  
>>It's what the web page concludes and what it pieces together.  
>  
>Surely you are able to state what argument you found to be unsound.*

I could. But I'd like to know what you feel is sound about it. And like I said, there is no profit in tilting at web pages.

>>*And \*that\* part isn't peer-reviewed.  
>  
>Neither are Usenet posts, yet you don't dismiss them for not being  
>peer-reviewed.*

I didn't say they needed to be, Guy. I never said that you or I need to have our utterances reviewed by anyone. You can, of course. I won't mind. I will probably run some of what I may say here by some others I respect to help make sure of what I'm saying, too.

But you are just bringing up a strawman. I didn't say you had to be reviewed, nor would I expect you to ask me to have my utterances reviewed, either. We can take things point by point, where we feel we are able to make the arguments ourselves, and deal with that. I didn't say you or I had to be experts in this — we don't have to be. We just need to be able to read good science and understand it and try and convey points and then deal with the challenges to them. The only thing I'd ask is that we don't throw the opinion of Rush or the opinion of our neighbor out as being science. We should base our arguments or points upon good science. That's all.

But we ourselves don't have to be experts in these fields. As we debate the points, each of us would learn as we had to dig more to deal with challenges or to improve our statements.

>>*Any idiot can pull out a bunch of numbers, without understanding,  
>>and put them together in some fashion and then arrive at conclusions  
>>and top it all off with references to "peer reviewed" sources and  
>>none of that makes any of the web site's methods or conclusions  
>>any better.*  
>  
>*Yawn. Let me know if you ever have a specific argument other than  
>"Web page bad!".*

I'm not going to debate the page, Guy.

>>*I'll debate you*  
>  
>*You seem to have confused me with someone who is interested in  
>debating you. I am not. I strongly suspect that if I were to  
>take the time to post points that you are unable to refute, you  
>would dismiss them for not being peer reviewed.*

I'm able to refute some things; I'm able to support some points, too. And there is a lot I don't fully apprehend, as well.

But your strawman argument is wrong-minded. I won't dismiss your claims, if you feel that you are informed adequately to make them and wish to do so, I'll be happy to deal with those points squarely.

But what I see here is your unwillingness to even bother getting informed in the first place. Which is fine. I've no reason to expect anything else from you. But if you ever *\*DO\** try and study this subject a little and have something you feel disagrees with the IPCC TAR, I'd honestly be happy to read your perspective on the subject. *\*IF\** you make your arguments based on science, of course. I'm not really interested in mythical thinking.

>>*If all you are doing is arguing from the authority of that web page,*  
>  
>*I am not. I am arguing from my conclusion that the arguments  
>on that web page are sound.*

sci.electronics.design: Re: When London is submerged and New York is awash...

No, you are flatly SAYING they are sound. That's not argument. It's fiat.

Make an argument and be prepared to support it and deal with the issues I bring up. Or just admit you haven't a clue. Or whatever.

You get the idea.

>>*I won't participate or care.*

>

>*Your choice.*

I care about the subject, of course. But I don't care to debate a web page. On that score, yes it is my choice.

But if you ever feel you have a shred of serious knowledge about any of it and feel that you can make a clear case that disagrees with the IPCC TAR conclusions without just stating things by fiat, let's dig into it. I'd actually be interested. The IPCC TAR isn't the final story and I've not said it is — but it is the better consensus for now and on the specific case of CO2, there is a great deal of very solid science there.

Until then, I'll just have to assume that you cannot make such a case on your own.

Jon