

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2008-08/msg02712.html>

- *From:* Joerg <notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 15 Aug 2008 08:51:26 -0700
-

Kris Krieger wrote:

bill.sloman@xxxxxxx wrote in
news:4abf5a30-3e87-43ed-8f21-8c76dad1226f@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx:

On Aug 13, 1:19 am, Joerg <notthisjoerg...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

[snip]

<snip>

Don't encourage McIntyre – he needs to be
persuaded to find
something constructive to do.

Ah, the usual. When arguments and evidence fails the person
gets
attacked

The evidence hasn't failed. McIntyre found a serious defect in Mann's
data-filtering procedure, which meant Mann's hockey stick curve should
have had more and bigger noise spikes down the handle, even though the
shape remained much the same.

Here are my questions.

(1) Why does the entire anti-GW argument always come down to two people, Mann and McIntyre? I don't know Mann but I did look at McIntyre's website, and it's just that – a website. I read the link to his criticism of something written by Hegerle?, but that wasn't a "paper", it was in the *letters* section of Nature. That makes it a very different animal – I personally found the article deficient, but that's what it was – an article. Not a full-blown paper. I don't recall that articles are reviewed, at least nowhere near as rigorously as are

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

papers, and any scientific professional knows that. So what's the big deal?

Letters and the like in magazines by scientists are to be taken as seriously as papers. After all, the scientist has put his/her name right above or under it. AGW and anti-AGW argumentation includes many other scientists, plus whole institutes.

(2) When did this fellow Mann make his "hockey stick"? If it was some years back, well, of course new data would have come out, and of course people would have looked at his data and discovered any problems with its interpretation – that is how science works. Someone does a study, other people read it, then go do their own studies, and then come back and confirm what can be confirmed, and correct that which cannot. So what's the big deal?

The big deal is: A scientist _and_ an organization must officially acknowledge "Yes, I/we are wrong on that issue". Anything less is IMHO not honest. Yeah, it'll result in a few black eyes and bruised egos but that is still better for an organization than being pointed at along the lines of "Here, see, that's just one example where they are dead wrong". Of course the latter will make it much easier for their adversaries to discredit them in the eyes of body public (a.k.a. voters).

Sorry but, as someone who formerly worked in a research lab (biochemistry), and who is in close contact with people doing ongoing R&D science, it seems to me that this stuff shouldn't even be an issue, and only is an issue because of pique.

It is an issue because:

- a. The old curve is still being used as a doomsday justification by influential people.
- b. Some politicians base their decisions on that. Decisions that can (and I am afraid will) cost you and I in terms of tax Dollars, big time. I am firmly opposed to that and will do whatever is legally in my might to counter. For example by explaining stuff to others.

And contrary to what Bill may believe, not releasing data can only mean three things:

- a. Too much was asked for. Then the right thing to do is to tell the requester. Not answering at all is usually seen as rude or suspicious, or both.
- b. It isn't available in an organized file format where it could be sent off with a few mouse clicks. That could be an indicator that the work done with such data may not be, ahem, based on much organization either.
- c. They don't want the requester to see that data. That would be highly suspicious.

For example, some of the data I requested was merely the same stuff as on web pages, just that I wanted the

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

Excel data instead of a way too small graph. Since the graph came from data it ought not to be hard to just fire that off to a requester. Or even go a step further, put it on the web site. Not too much to ask for, isn't it? If I can't back up my research with such data I'd probably hang up my job and brew beer or something.

--

Regards, Joerg

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

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

.