

# Re: OT: Next decade 'may see no warming'

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-06/msg01342.html>

---

- *From:* [bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx](mailto:bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx)
  - *Date:* Sun, 8 Jun 2008 02:31:28 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On 8 jun, 04:47, Eeyore <rabbitsfriendsandrelati...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

On 8 jun, 01:49, Eeyore <rabbitsfriendsandrelati...@xxxxxxxxxxxx>  
wrote:

bill.slo...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

Eeyore wrote:

"J.A. Legris" wrote:

Eeyore  
wrote:

p.s.  
interesting  
comment  
there  
about  
"natural  
climate  
cycles"  
!  
Isn't  
that  
what  
us  
'deniers'  
have  
been  
talking  
about  
all  
along?

Re: OT: Next decade 'may see no warming'

No, not at all. Idiots like you start with an immutable conclusion and then go looking for snippets of "supporting" evidence.

You've got me confused with the AGWists. That's what THEY do.

No. that's what you think they do.

It IS what they do.

Mann's hockey stick is the perfect example. No further proof is required.

Your imperfect understanding of the controversy about Mann's hockey stick is a perfect example of your habit of starting with an immutable conclusion and then misinterpreting the evidence to fit your conclusion.

Mann got into trouble about the statistical techniques he used to average noisy temperature data to create a graph that illustrated the recent rise in global temperature. The rise is real enough, and not controversial, but the graph illustrated the point more clearly than it should have done.

It was an outright FRAUD.

Re: OT: Next decade 'may see no warming'

An intentional perversion of truth in order to induce another to part with something of value or to surrender a legal right?

Mann was using a scheme of short term averaging that he thought was appropriate; expert statisticians corrected his misapprehension, so he was mistakenly made his data look better than he should have done.

This was an unintentional error, so you can't legitimately accuse him of fraud. The point that he was trying to get across isn't controversial – the global temperature went up unusually quickly in the last decades of the twentieth century – so he can't even be said to have perverted the truth.

This could make your claim of fraud itself fraudulent – you are perverting the truth to induce your audience to part with something of value (their faith in the integrity of the IPCC), which would be fraud if it could be established that you were intentionally perverting the truth, but since you are depressingly ignorant about the whole climate change question, and prone to elementary faults in logic, you are probably no more guilty of fraud than Mann is.

There is one difference – nobody would have been worse off if they had taken Mann's graphs at face value, whereas your enthusiastically propagated misapprehensions could slow down popular acceptance of the need to do something about rising CO2 levels, if anybody took them seriously. Happily, your credibility is now negative (check out Parkinson's "the man who is always wrong"), so your virulent anti-global-warming propaganda could be expected to persuade your readers that anthropogenic global warming is real, though this would be a strictly marginal effect.

Nobody is going to take you seriously enough to say "That idiot Eeyore doesn't believe in anthropogenic global warming, so it must be real".

—

Bill Sloman, Nijmegen

.