

## Re: More proof that global warming is a hoax ...

---

*Source:* <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2007-03/msg01292.html>

---

- *From:* "Dr. Dweeb" <[spam@xxxxxxxxx](mailto:spam@xxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 21 Mar 2007 00:23:42 +0100
- 

Bill Todd wrote:

Dr. Dweeb wrote:

Bill Todd wrote:

Dr. Dweeb wrote:

Bill Todd wrote:

Dr. Dweeb wrote:

...

Heck,  
they  
can't  
even  
explain  
precisely  
why  
electrical  
currents  
occur  
in  
a  
generator.

No,  
but  
they  
have  
an  
\*excellent\*  
record  
of  
being  
able

Re: More proof that global warming is a hoax ...

not  
only  
to  
predict  
them  
but  
to  
use  
these  
predictions  
to  
make  
significant  
improvements.

Unlike  
climatologists,  
who are  
batting 0 for  
14, or  
worse.

I consider it rather unlikely  
that you have any clue  
whatsoever  
what they are batting – it  
certainly sounds as if you  
are merely  
regurgitating the most recent  
specific result that you  
heard  
about. But by all means feel  
free to come up with the  
kind of  
comprehensive review of  
climatological predictions  
that could  
justify that rather sweeping  
generalization:  
demonstrating that  
kind of discipline would be  
a unique event for your side  
of the  
discussion.

Why don't you just come up with one?

Because I'm not the one disputing the widely-accepted  
scientific  
conclusions drawn from these studies and offering up  
completely

Re: More proof that global warming is a hoax ...

unsupported conspiracy theories about why that high level of acceptance should be discounted.

I have not been able to find one reference suggesting that any current models are able to predict the present from the known past. There are plenty of scientists observing this fact. Some of my previous references contain such observations.

So, yet again, instead of coming up with actual data to support your generalization above, all you trot out are equally–nebulous generalizations from other sources which you choose to find credible.

I referred to previous references made in this thread, and made the observation that I had found none suggesting that any significant predictability (ie. concordance with empirical evidence).

I think that both are reasoned and reasonable.

You didn't merely suggest that climate projections were sometimes (even often) far from perfect: you trotted out actual numbers and

0 for 14 was, I admit an attempt at levity.  
The actual value is 0 for 19, see reference below.

suggested they constituted an upper limit on success (without even getting into \*qualitative\* assessments regarding how close projections came in various aspects – you know, the pesky fact that they don't have to be perfect in order to provide significant valid insight). \*That\* requires similarly–quantitative substantiation (or,

Wrong != "significant valid insight" – see reference below.

of course, retraction if you're unwilling to step up to the plate and provide some).  
Don't you get tired of (in fact, I'd be downright embarrassed by) writing content–free posts and studiously ignoring direct challenges to provide something better?

This one is pretty thorough at debunking AIT – which is, after all is said and done the most obvious popular mouthpiece of your position at this time.

Re: More proof that global warming is a hoax ...

Re: More proof that global warming is a hoax ...

<http://ff.org/centers/csspp/pdf/skepticguide.pdf>

It takes a while to get through, but most of the bad science in AIT and the whole AGW movement comes in for quite careful treatment.

Knock yourself out.

Can I expect a 200 page counter document ?

Dweeb

– bill

.