

## Re: OT: sea level 'rise' hmmmmm....

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-07/msg02587.html>

---

- *From:* Jonathan Kirwan <[jkirwan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jkirwan@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 16 Jul 2008 00:50:18 GMT
- 

On Tue, 15 Jul 2008 13:02:54 +0100, Eeyore  
<[rabbitsfriendsandrelations@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:rabbitsfriendsandrelations@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Jonathan Kirwan wrote:

Eeyore

In comparison Loehle accepted a little peer review criticism of his work virtually instantly and republished with minor corrections inside ~ 6 months. The interesting thing is that the criticism of Loehle's work was in minor detail only and did not affect its basic premise, whereas Mann's work fell totally on its head.

No, he didn't deal with several other serious objections. Just one, if I recall.

CITE !

Not for you. One of the web sites (which you are well aware of, but don't seriously read) discusses it, informally but in an informed way.

If you were interested in having someone actually address themselves to Loehle's paper through a quality peer-reviewed periodical, Loehle will need to actually get it published in a respectable periodical first, peer-reviewed. No one needs formally deal with something that is just tossed out into the public, without informed review even.

His proxies show a record that matches the historical record brilliantly. something that Mann totally failed to do.

Re: OT: sea level 'rise' hmmmmm....

Without admitting anything one way or another on your point... Hell, an idiot with a least square linear fitting program and nothing more than that, including ZERO skill at climate, could get a better fit to some selected historical record than realistic, physical science, modern global climate model ensembles can manage. The reason should be dead obvious to you. The terribly sad thing is that it isn't.

You actually think you are making a point, when it's just the opposite.

Jon

.