

Re: Category 4 Charley Strikes Fla. Mainland

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.meteorology/2004-08/0503.html>

From: Psalm 110 (SwiftMoonies_at_LiarVets.US)

Date: 08/16/04

Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 03:47:44 GMT

On Sun, 15 Aug 2004 22:30:09 -0400, "Ian St. John"
<istjohn@noemail.ca> wrote:

>Psalm 110 wrote:

>> On Sun, 15 Aug 2004 19:13:34 -0500, David Ball

>> <wraith7@mb.sympatico.ca> wrote:

>>

>>> *There's a big difference between saying something is
>>> going to happen and PROVING it. Kindly offer some proof that the
>>> category 4 storm that pounded Florida had as its proximate cause GW.
>>> Something detailed would be nice.*

>>> *BTW, the storm that pounded Edmonton occurred at a time when
>>> temperatures have been among the lowest on record. Kind of escaped
>>> your notice didn't it?*

>>

>> *You fail to distinguish between data, which is information, and
>> deductive reasoning, which is examination of data to tease out
>> causalities.*

>

>*His point was that you had presented the former and done none of the latter.
>Does this indicate you have suddenly clued in to your own idiocy?*

Are you taking the position that David Ball is too incompetent to make his own arguments, therefore you will explain and interpret for him?

Presenting data is an act whole in itself. It is reporting data. It does not follow that every report of data also contains explanation of the data. It is two distinct acts, each of which can occur separately without prior permission from either of you. Don't get your bra pulled too tight, deary, it makes you shrewish.

>> *Data is not causality.*

>

>*Exactly, so stop claiming that two points of data form a proof.*

I claimed two data points prove that there were two data points. Show me where I said anything different than that.

>> *It is information for functional thinking beings to ponder.*
> *And when do you anticipate becoming a 'thinking being'? or pondering the*
> *implications or lack of implications of weather reports.*

I post on a permanent archives which is jointly my property. Fuck off if you don't like me using my property as I choose. You are not my intended audience. The fact that you are here I overlook for the most part because I have never learned anything useful from your verbiage voluminosity. Your postering and prima donna act has been noted and dismissed.

>> *Sorry you never learned the difference.*
>
> *The difference between David and you is that David does know the difference*
> *and called you on it.*

No. He changed the subject from data reporting to drawing conclusions. I did data reporting. I owe him nothing — Lincoln freed the slaves. If I feel like donating I do. I need not meet demands from persons whom have previously and currently acted in disrespect. Especially I don't have to comply with a person on internet record published as incompetent in the field he gets paid to work in.

> *To which you have made several inane statements that*
> *show that you do not recognise your own mistake even though it is the*
> *principle behind your rhetoric.*

There is no "mistake" in not complying with a request to produce anything I never promised to produce. I used my freedom of speech to post a report of data. Beyond that I own him or you nothing. If you want something from me, learn to ask in a manner conducive to encouraging favor for your requests.

>> *Yeah, sure, spin you failures. The newspapers quote you as not having*
>> *a clue. You didn't study data enough to learn the hidden causalities.*

He's the weather guy the newspapers asked him to explain why they got no warning when a massive storm beat down a major city bristling with weather instruments on HIS WATCH. He gets paid the salary – he spun off his failure with a quip "What are the ODDS?"

The odds of something change considerably after the fact — they are 100% that it did happen. At the beginning of the event they were 100% that it would happen because it did happen. He gets the salary. He failed his job. He lost the right to get hoity toity with me like he understands stuff when in fact the record is published he failed.

> *Since you have not presented any 'hidden causalities' you cannot claim that*
> *he missed them. In fact, his post was calling you to provide some causality*
> *instead of pulling it fresh and steaming from your anal orifice.*

He missed the ones on his watch, where he was surrounded by the best equipment his country saw fit to buy him. It is science that produces data, then science which evaluates data, then science which hypothesizes meanings of principles governing the forces producing the data, then science concocts experiments which confirms or disproves the principles which in turn generates more data.

Ball discourages using a science forum to post data. Not a very scientific thing for him to do. He bullies people with his posting style that implies all questions can be answered in 25 words or less but he never answers complex questions in 25 words or less himself.

He butts into any explanation you begin before you have finished trying to comply with his demands. He presents himself as somebody who knows mysterious stuff, but when the facts are published about his job performance he fails to live up to the standard he demands others exceed.

>> *You just surround yourself with lots of taxpayer's instruments and put
>> a "knowing expression" on your face to hide the fact you can't predict
>> the most powerful storm on the prairie 10 minutes before it starts.*
>
>[www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>RTGAM.20040712.wxedmon0712/BNStory/National/](http://www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20040712.wxedmon0712/BNStory/National/)
>*"... In the capital, where there was a severe weather warning last night,
>the West
>Edmonton Mall's drains gave way, causing the shopping centre to flood"*
>
>*My my. Such a pile of shit. Of course, they can only predict severe weather,
>not exactly where and when.*

Well then, that would be because they don't understand every force in play, and don't have explanations for everything that is operative. Strange he would demand others make answers beyond his skills and grasp of science?

The record is clear. Ball can't do what he demands of others.

>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/
>*There were areas a few miles away that got
>nothing but some rain. However, I am sure that all of the residents were
>grateful for the warning that gave them time to prepare for whatever came.
>Why are you not complaining about how the Hurricane down in Floriad missed
>it's intended target of Tampa by moving inland too early? You expect wild*

>weather to be totally predictable do you?

For the omniscient all things are known. For those claiming closer omniscience than I, they have a requirement to demonstrate that.

Out of studying data more will be known. I posted data. PERIOD. He demanded omniscience, and I demanded he needs to be omniscient before disparaging others for not being so. He gets the paycheck, defrauding his employers that he knows more than a bump on a log.

>

>

>>

>> *When the newspapers come asking what did the public buy with all that equipment expenditures and your salary, you quip "What are the Odds?"*

>

>Pretty good. When they give a severe storm warning you can be pretty sure >that *SOMEONE* will get a show.

They didn't give any warning. Not ten minutes warning. They didn't have a clue that the most powerful storm on the prairie was on top of Edmonton. Somebody got a show, but Ball didn't give them warning. You are rewriting history, but you can't rewrite the newspaper DATA preserved in the archives:

>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/

>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/

>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/

>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/

>www.globeandmail.com/servlet/story/

>> *The odds of something that has already happened must have been 100% at the beginning of the event, and you are claiming you know what does and doesn't cause these things, so the ODDS are 100% that you don't know what causes these things.*

>

>Which is meaningless since they predict severe weather before hand which >saved billions in lives, property and crop losses.

>

>>

>> *THEREFORE, you are just one of the bozos on this bus, nothing special.*

>

>*THEREFORE, you are a turd with delusions of fertiliserdom.*

Been here done that.

Will not respond further to the JOHN