

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/msg02762.html>

- *From:* Kris Krieger <me@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 15 Aug 2008 14:41:24 -0500
-

Joerg <notthisjoersch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
[news:dBhpk.4365\\$zv7.3450@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dBhpk.4365$zv7.3450@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx):

Kris Krieger wrote:

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

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

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

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 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.

My point was that I don't know that articles/letters are reviewed as rigorously, or are supposed to live up to the same format standards, as are actual papers. My impression is no, but I'd have to ask my friend who does R&D (and has published a number of papers over the past 20 or so years, and also co-authored several biotech patents).

(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 the body public (a.k.a.

voters).

Well, all I can say is that, from what I've read of their viewpoint, they acknowledged that some errors or oversights did exist, but didn't affect the overall curve.

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.

Again, I haven't personally seen enough that makes me think the conclusions have been disproven. All that means is simply, and precisely, what it says, nothing between the lines.

((Some people do have a doomsday mindset, that is quite true – simultaneously, others are like the grasshopper in the Aesop's Fable. My main concern is that things balance out and a sensible middle-road strategy is adopted which will combine conservation, new technologies, inventive/creative thinking, changes in our sociocultural values, et cetera, so as to lead to both a wiser useage of resources (with an emphasis on renewables), and a reduction in pollutants.))

At the same time, re: taxes, I've been a voter since 1978, which means I've heard a heck of a lot of partisan claptrap that raised spectres of the impending horrors of this or that projected tax scheme. The thing is that, really, if I'm not paying for Obama's alternative-energy research, I'll be paying for McCain's schemes – in either event, the past several years have FUBARed the national debt so much that there is no way anyone can promise "no new taxes" or "no tax increases". So, dire predictions of "higher taxes" will most likely be fulfilled to at least some degree *no matter who wins*. Yes, it sucks, but all I can do as an

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

individual is try to make the best of the situation (and engage in political action as I can). <shrug>

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.

That'd be polite, but the researchers I've known throughout the years probably don't have time or resources, given the paperwork they need to deal with in addition to things that are directly related to doing research. If it's another researcher in the field submitting the request, that's one thing – just blowing people off is like shooting oneself in the foot, given how scientific networking works. But if the request is from John Q. Public, it's unlikely that someone will invest the time in replying, never mind actually sending the data. Personally, given what I've seen and the people I've known, I would never impose upon a researcher with a request for their raw data.

b. It isn't available in an organized file format where it could be sent off with a few mouse clicks.

Which was a specific point I was trying to make, and received a reply about "little experiments" and an assertion (assumption) "this data has to be computerized to analyze it"...

That could be an indicator that the work done with such data may not be, ahem, based on much organization either.

unlikely. Unless I've just known a lot of really superior people...

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 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

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

my research with such data I'd probably hang up my job and brew beer or something.

Well, I could go on some more about what I've seen, and people I've known, in the R&D world, at least as it relates to chemistry, biochem, and biotechnology. But I suspect that would be to no avail. At the same time, I've never been associated with any climatologists or climatological research, so maybe that sector is vastly different.

Personally, as someone who is not a colleague in a given field, I wouldn't impose upon a researcher with requests for raw data, because of their time constraints, number and variety of records and data formats, individual methods of dealing with and analysing data, concerns about potential idea-theft, and so on. But, that's just me.