

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2007-10/msg00153.html>

- *From:* Jonathan Kirwan <jkirwan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 01 Oct 2007 19:55:03 GMT
-

On Mon, 01 Oct 2007 18:11:30 GMT, Richard The Dreaded Libertarian <null@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Sat, 29 Sep 2007 04:59:35 +0000, Jonathan Kirwan wrote:

Just one. If you do that, and if I haven't read it yet, I'll go ask the author for a copy and do so. Either way, I will prepare myself from it and then we can discuss it and see where you are coming from.

Here's two:

<http://www.ncpa.org/globalwarming/GlobalWarmingPrimer.pdf>

Nope. I asked:

"Provide me with just one peer-reviewed paper on some technical and quantitative facet relating to climate science that you have actually read thoroughly yourself, with good understanding, and which well supports some conclusion you've made here on the topic that disagrees with the IPCC AR4. Just one."

You replied with something at a web site that is about "seeking innovative private sector solutions to public policy problems." That is not a citation of a peer-reviewed paper, Rich. It's a "primer" prepared for a 'public policy' purpose.

Caution: 184 MB video:

<http://en.sevenload.com/videos/ha4PoKY/The-Great-Global-Warming-Swindle>

I already watched the whole thing, long before. One of the scientists who was interviewed on the program insisted that he was lied to by the producers before appearing, that his responses, as edited, were grossly misleading and didn't present his perspective, and demanded to have his presence removed. In later showings, they did that much.

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

Re: Global Warming: Junk science at it's [best] worst

Another scientist in England, prepared an analysis of the program for his undergraduate science class, which essentially pointed out that at least one of the graphs presented in the show had to have been doctored up -- and he was able to show how and with which data, they most likely did it.

Again. And I repeat myself, sadly. Provide me with just one peer-reviewed paper on some technical and quantitative facet relating to climate science that you have actually read thoroughly yourself, with good understanding, and which well supports some conclusion you've made here on the topic that disagrees with the IPCC AR4. Just one.

Jon

.