

## Re: OT: sea level 'rise' hmmm...m...

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-07/msg02673.html>

---

- *From:* Joerg <[notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 16 Jul 2008 09:14:46 -0700
- 

Jonathan Kirwan wrote:

On Tue, 15 Jul 2008 18:00:18 -0700, Joerg  
<[notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Jonathan Kirwan wrote:

[...]

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.

Now AFAIK Loehle's paper was peer-reviewed.

Actually, I'm just expressing my own opinion about it. It's not. I've been following the details about Energy and Environment for years. My conclusion is that it is NOT a quality publication that demands a response from anyone. About on the level of Popular Science, for example. If you want to conflate all periodicals into one single mush, you are welcome to do so. I don't.

Ok, our opinions here differ, big time.

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

If we all keep saying to the guys of the other opinion that all their sources, journals, papers, scientists etc. are not credible we will never get anywhere. Certainly not to any kind of middle-ground concensus.

There is a difference between informed opinion and plain opinion. I'll stop there and hold short of more inflammatory comments.

You are already proceeding with contacts. Keep at it, see where it takes you. If you find difficulties that would suggest a real problem, let me know and I'll see if I can't get more serious attention to the issue.

May I suggest you also write Dr. Steve Nerem?

I could start saying the same as you did above about IPCC scientists and publications, and with what I believe good reason, but right now I won't.

IPCC doesn't do basic research. It's charter is more along the lines of providing an informed digest.

BTW, no answer yet ...

Sorry to hear that. I think the longest I've had to wait is two months. In one case on plate tectonics, I'd tried to contact one of the primary researchers in Seattle. He called me back three weeks later. He'd been in Japan, personally going through records 300 years old, on the subject I'd called about. It was an enjoyable and lively discussion to have... but I had to wait a while for good reasons it turns out. I didn't press him beyond the single contact. No follow up, no pressure. Just the first message. Three weeks later, when he had a moment, he called back to someone he had no idea of. I find this not uncommon.

IMHO when an institute make a rather bold claim that has serious impact on policymakers there should be a backup for information requests. Either the researcher can read his/her email while traveling or designates a secretary or someone to monitor it. In industry you'd have a serious chat with El Capitan if you didn't put that in place before a trip.

--

Regards, Joerg

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

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

<http://www.analogconsultants.com/>

"gmail" domain blocked because of excessive spam.  
Use another domain or send PM.