

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/msg02763.html>

- *From:* Joerg <notthisjoergsch@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 15 Aug 2008 13:02:23 -0700
-

Kris Krieger wrote:

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

Kris Krieger wrote:

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

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

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

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 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).

It's a matter of ethics. In the same way I design my circuits for clients with the same amount of diligence, regardless of whether this will have to pass agency muster or not. If a scientist published letters or what IEEE calls "rapid communications" it better be good or the reputation will have a rather serious dent. And rightfully so.

[...]

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

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.

Ok, I have a different opinion. If you publish you must answer requests, no matter what. I have never, ever failed to reply to someone after I published and yes, sometimes there were a lot of requests and questions and it was work.

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...

In my cases it was stuff where fancy graphs had been created from and were published. If that was based on such non-computerized data that would raise a serious warning flag.

Re: OT: interesting global warming quote found elsewhere

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 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.

I am an inquiring mind. If I think something could be wrong or if nobody around me understands it either I do ask. Always have, always will.

--

Regards, Joerg

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

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

.