

From: "raymond s. bradley" <rbradley@geo.umass.edu>
To: Tim Osborn <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk>, p.jones@uea.ac.uk, k.briffa@uea.ac.uk
Subject: One way out....
Date: Thu, 30 Oct 2003 11:55:18 -0500
Cc: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu, mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu

<x-flowed>

Tim, Phil, Keef:

I suggest a way out of this mess. Because of the complexity of the arguments involved, to an unformed observer it all might be viewed as just scientific nit-picking by "for" and "against" global warming proponents. However, if an "independent group" such as you guys at CRU could make a statement as to whether the M&M effort is truly an "audit", and if they did it right, I think that would go a long way to defusing the issue.

It's clear from the figure that Reno Knuti sent yesterday that something pretty whacky happened in their analysis prior to ~AD1600, and this led Mike to figure out the problem. See:

file:///c:/eudora/attach/nh_temp_rec.jpg

If you are willing, a quick and forceful statement from The Distinguished CRU Boys would help quash further arguments, although here, at least, it is already quite out of control.....yesterday in the US Senate the debate opened on the McCain-Lieberman bill to control CO2 emissions from power plants. Sen Inhofe stood up & showed the M & M figure and stated that Mann et al--& the IPCC assessment --was now disproven and so there was no reason to control CO2 emissions.....I wonder how many times a "scientific" paper gets reported on in the Senate 3 days after it is published....
Ray

</x-flowed>