Rusty, the yellow highlight and/or bolding indicate things I found worth noting/pondering. I wonder what you think about any of these points.

 -Fred

[**My Rebuttal To Politifact**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/)

Posted on [June 28, 2014](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/)by [stevengoddard](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/author/stevengoddard/)

Politifact wrote a [hit piece against Steve Doocy and me](http://www.politifact.com/punditfact/statements/2014/jun/25/steve-doocy/foxs-doocy-nasa-fudged-data-make-case-global-warmi/) the other day without doing any actual fact checking or bothering to contact me. I responded to them and they asked me to send over my response. Here it is :

*Jon,*

*Here is my rebuttal to your Fox’s Doocy piece. If you are a legitimate fact checker, you will post it on your site – as you made serious errors.*

*————————*

*Politifact accused Steve Doocy of being a liar,  for accurately reporting on a blog post made on my blog (stevengoddard.wordpress.com) which showed how NASA has altered the US temperature record over time.*

*Politifact’s claim is the result of a failure to understand the topic, for the following reasons.*

*1. There is no question that the temperature record has been dramatically altered, to turn a long term cooling trend into a long term warming trend. No one disputes this.*

*2. You cited the explanation for why they do this, but made no effort to verify that their reasons are correct. Their adjustments are highly subjective, and are subject to software and algorithm errors. The adjustments could just as easily go the other way, and make the cooling trend even larger. The adjustments they make are based on opinion, not fact.*

*3. The expert list you cited was flawed.*

*Anthony Watts was discussing a different specific topic related to missing station data, and has since admitted he was wrong. If you actually contact him, you will find that out.*

*Mark Serreze has no experience or expertise with the temperature record*

*John Nielsen-Gammon and Zeke Hausfather are two people expressing their own opinion about the adjustments, and those opinions are subject to change as new facts emerge.*

*Jon Greenberg and Politifact did nothing to demonstrate that Doocy’s reporting was inaccurate, much less a lie. This is a scientific debate, which you simply don’t understand. You need to retract your article.*

*Tony Heller aka Steven Goddard
– Columbia, Maryland*

### 75 Responses to My Rebuttal To Politifact

1. [**Will Nitschke**](http://www.capitaloffice.com.au/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 10:49 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378471)

Nicely done.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378471#respond)

* + **Dave** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 12:11 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378520)

There is $10k available to prove the climate is not warming. I hope you win this prize.<http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/06/23/3451810/physicist-offers-climate-denier-reward/>
When will you apply for it?

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378520#respond)

* + - [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 12:17 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378525)

Everyone agrees that man influences the climate. Straw man debates are for idiots.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378525#respond)

* + - * **geran** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 2:33 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378606)

“Everyone agrees that man influences the climate.”
>>>>>>>
I cringe every time I see that statement. I wish you would add a qualifier, such as: “Everyone agrees that man influences the climate, but that influence is lost in the noise of natural variability.”

* + - * [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 2:36 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378608)

Are you a UHI denier? [UHI means Urban Heat Island]

<https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2015/02/16/uhi-deniers-2/>

**[**

UHI Deniers

Posted on February 16, 2015 by stevengoddard

There appears to be a large contingent of UHI deniers on both sides of the climate debate. I think we need to start classifying the science deniers.

UHI deniers

Data tampering deniers

Solar minimum deniers

Satellite deniers

Warming hiatus deniers

Broken climate model deniers

Climate history deniers

There are many more. Please add to the list.

**]**

[**kirkmyers**](http://kirkmyers.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[March 12, 2015 at 11:00 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-501502)

Mankind does influence local microclimates and temperatures via the UHI effect and deforestation, but I see no empirical evidence that human-induced CO2 emissions are changing the planet’s climate.

The AGW theory is nothing more than unscientific (and, often times, fraudulent) fear-mongering based on climate models that have been tuned to produce a warming signal. The True Believers in AGW are guilty of hubris on a grand scale; do they really believe that mankind has the power to change Earth’s climate?

* + - **John Silver** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 1:51 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378576)

Anyone can prove that in the coming years.
Does he have $10k times the number of people with thermometers?

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378576#respond)

* + - **Brian G Valentine** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:43 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378647)

Another of these wonderful “prizes” offered for “winning” games with no possibility to win them (offered with no intention of paying them).

Like Richard Branson’s “billion dollars” (or billion pounds, whatever it was) offered to anybody devising a method to get half the CO2 out of the air.

Now tell me why sane people avoid blogs like “think progress” like the plague

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378647#respond)

1. **emsnews** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 11:08 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378483)

And this is a typical problem indeed. I have been misquoted and attacked in the press in the past and they merrily refused to allow me a rebuttal or to talk to me further. These are character assassinations.

You see, if you kick them all in the balls, they will strike back by trying to decapitate you. Left or right, if you irritate the ruling elites and their donkeys who toil for them, they will be quite unforgiving.

And no, they will NEVER debate just the facts. They can’t. It is impossible. You do have allies but these don’t own Hollywood or the bulk of the media. So good luck fighting the Bilderberg gang. You will need it.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378483#respond)

* + **Gail Combs** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 12:01 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378512)

[*Alinsky’s Rules for Radicals*](http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1420684/posts)

*RULE 5: “Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon.” There is no defense. It’s irrational. It’s infuriating. It also works as a key pressure point to force the enemy into concessions.*

Unfortunately Anthony Watts keeps giving them ammunition which they gleefully take and use.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378512#respond)

* + - [**squid2112**](http://jeffgreenwell.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 2:15 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378601)

*Unfortunately Anthony Watts keeps giving them ammunition which they gleefully take and use.*

**Exactly!**

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378601#respond)

* + **Dave** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 12:13 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378521)

Debate the facts with this guy.
<http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/06/23/3451810/physicist-offers-climate-denier-reward/>

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378521#respond)

* + - [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 12:17 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378524)

Everyone agrees that man influences the climate. Straw man debates are for idiots.

And I guarantee you that he won’t debate me, because he knows that he will get his ass kicked.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378524#respond)

* + - * **annieoakley** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 1:55 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378581)

That man is just baiting someone. There will be no debate because: the topic changes every few years cooling/warming/cooling/warming and Polar Bears! It isn’t scientific or serious. It is Political Theater. IMO

* + - * **Dave** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:38 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378642)

So you will not take this man’s money? It is free money. How about your win and give me the money?

* + - * **Sundance** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:11 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378672)

Steve, if Politifact doesn’t do a Politiretract, these folks might be interested. Politifact was established by liberal journalists and is clearly left leaning so I don’t expect they’ll retract.

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

* + - **stpaulchuck** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 2:36 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378609)

right off the bat when someone uses “denier” in their paper or article you know it’s either BS or a strawman argument. Something to disregard.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378609#respond)

* + - **stpaulchuck** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 2:38 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378612)

debate this Dave – CO2 concentrations went from about 350ppm to 400ppm and yet global temps flattened for almost 19 years while that was going on.

Oh, and please! don’t tell me the oceans ate your global warming.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378612#respond)

* + - * **emsnews** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 7:30 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378804)

No, the DOGS ate it all. :)

* + - * **Gail Combs** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 10:44 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378925)

emsnews, don’t forget [The Goats Ate the Data!](http://boballab.wordpress.com/2010/02/01/the-goat-ate-the-data/) (I caught[Rose eating it.](http://edenhills.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/dsc_0219.jpg) )

* + - **Sundance** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:03 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378664)

Who

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378664#respond)

* + [**omanuel**](http://omanuel.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 1:54 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378580)

I agree that they will NEVER debate just the facts.

To win this battle, Tony, I recommend the selfless technique of Gandhi. It is our own egos that defeat us.

I.e., this has to be a battle for society as a whole.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378580#respond)

1. [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 12:37 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378537)

Good response.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378537#respond)

1. **jeremy** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 1:47 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378573)

The agwers say the debate is over? What debate?

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378573#respond)

1. **Anthony Watts** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 2:47 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378616)

Well worth noting in the context of above essay:

<http://judithcurry.com/2014/06/28/skeptical-of-skeptics-is-steve-goddard-right/>

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378616#respond)

* + [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:03 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378621)

Will we have to wade through gobs and gobs of ‘Joshua’ comments and like misanthropes? Like Curry but some of the other personalities that show up turn my stomach … just being honest.

Regards.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378621#respond)

* + - **Anthony Watts** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:24 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378634)

Just read the article, skip the comments.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378634#respond)

* + - * **kbray in california** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:41 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378645)

The name “Anthony” means “Praiseworthy”.
Both of you Anthonys have lived up to that meaning.
Glad to see you here to clarify.
These current events are quite significant.

* + - * [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:43 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378646)

But, Anthony, I like the cross examination of the author’s OP; the devil is sometimes in the details, as you know, and it is impossible for one human being to cover all applicable ‘factors’ in any given issue, and especially climate science. Some commenters (really, just a very few) come across as adolescents in need of attention, they detract from the discussion, draining energy from other commenters who should think better and ignore the adolescent … and lest this be misunderstood I’m \_not\_ talking about the Stokes or Moshers of the world either. You run a good site and very few of the referenced ‘adolescents’ show up there, but for some reason a few have ‘rooted in’ and found a home at Curry’s.

Regards.

* + [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:46 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378695)

Thanks, Anthony.

I’m blocked from commenting on Judith’s web site – but worth noting that if you cry wolf long enough, eventually some other people will see the wolf. Probably a better strategy than continuing to lose lambs for fear of offending the town folk.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378695#respond)

* + - [**omanuel**](http://omanuel.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 10:37 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378919)

On behalf of all of the inhabitants of planet Earth, Tony Heller aka Steven Goddard, I express appreciation for your courage.

If allowed to post on WUWT, I would also personally congratulate Anthony Watts for admiting in public his own confirmation bias and saying *“this time Steve Goddard was right.”*

We will work together to understand the source of energy that sustains our lives, or we will die separately.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378919#respond)

* + - [**curryja**](http://curryja.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 3:05 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379068)

Steve, I have never seen a comment of yours show up at my site. Note: you are not blocked (in fact no one is blocked but a few head straight to moderation). Not sure what is going on with your attempts to post a comment

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=379068#respond)

* + - * [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 3:18 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379073)

Judy,

Some people have suggested that it is a common WordPress bug. I will try again tomorrow. Thanks for letting me know.

* + - [**suyts**](http://suyts.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 3:26 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379080)

Spot on, Steve, spot on.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=379080#respond)

* + **gregole** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:54 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378699)

Anthony,

Thanks for the link. Rarely read Dr. Curry because my time is limited; but this one is worthwhile.
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please everyone, check out the Paul Homewood link at the judithcurry link. More stations with unexplained  *“cooling the past”*  disorder.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378699#respond)

1. **geran** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 2:50 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378617)

Tony/Steven asks: “Are you a UHI denier?”
>>>>>>
No way, Jose. But, UHI is a localized phenomenon, lost in the statistical noise of natural variability. (Please email me at your earliest convenience.)

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378617#respond)

1. [**Paul Homewood**](http://notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:04 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378623)

USHCN have increased Jan 2013 temperatures in Kansas by 0.46C, from the actual station data.
This is in addition to the cooling of historic temperatures.

There is also 28%of estimated data.

<http://notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/ushcn-adjustments-in-kansas/>

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378623#respond)

1. **JP** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:20 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378631)

Politifact has conflated 2 different data sets. NOAA’s TOB adjustments and data homogenization is totally different from the many issues with GISS. GISS is a global data set, while the graph they posted for NOAA is US temps. GISS uses its own gridded data, and its own set of adjustments. The many battles between Steve McIntyre and Hansen bear this out. And what is interesting is that Politifact doesn’t deny that the TOB adjustments spuriously cool the 1930s and warm recent decades.

**Neither do the Alarmists deny that NOAA’s and NASA’s homogenization account for almost all of the warming the past 90 years**.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378631#respond)

1. **Eliza** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:23 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378633)

Wow looks like you have been vindicated read the whole thing
<http://judithcurry.com/2014/06/28/skeptical-of-skeptics-is-steve-goddard-right/>Keep your cool man! lets not start attacking other skeptic sites. This might be the big one Thanks to SG LOL
It amounts to a retraction it seems to me anyway. They wiil of course not say you were right along but it really does not matter at this stage.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378633#respond)

1. [**Dale Hartz**](http://none/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 3:51 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378652)

Steve, I am an old guy with some sight problems but I try to read your blog occasionally, WUWT and others about the climate debate. I certainly do not understand all the machinations that go into the temperature adjustments and final reports.

My question is about the Max/Min calculations and the TOBS adjustments.

What is the need for the Max/Min calculations? If I take all the daily readings and create a mean average for a month, what effect does the high and low readings have on the average?

I live in Oklahoma and I look once in a while at the Stillwater daily readings from the two stations on the USCRN. They calculate a daily and monthly average mean temperature along with the Max/Min readings. Sometimes I average the Man/Min just to see if it is different the average mean and it is usually very close and quite often the same average.

So my question is what is the importance and necessity of the Max/Min temperatures to the current and past temperatures on the climate?

Incidentally, there are two stations for Stillwater, OK in the USCRN. One is close to the city and the other is a few kilometers further away. The one nearest the city always reads about 1.0 F higher than the station further out in the rural area. Do you know how NCDC handles this difference in their computations? Sounds like a little UHI.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378652#respond)

* + **JP** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:10 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378671)

The problem lies with what is reported – only the Max/Min for the 24 hour period. There is no running hourly reports, just a Max and a Min. In a perfect world, the Max would occur during the height of the diurnal period, usually 500PM local standard time (right before local sundown). The min would occur within a half hour of local sunrise. However, there are those periods when the Max temp could occur right after midnight (say in the winter before a cold front right after midnight), and the Min temp could occur at 0500PM (say in the summer right after a cold front passes). This would cause some issues. However, those occurrences are rare. Adjusting the entire data set to “fix” this problem is absurd.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378671#respond)

* + - [**Dale Hartz**](http://none/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 7:40 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378813)

But the question is why would adjusting the Max/Min cause a difference ithe temperature for that day (or period)? If you just averaged the Max/Min would you get the average mean for the day?

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378813#respond)

1. **gregole** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:09 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378668)

Fascinating.

Anyone who cares to actually look at the temperature data in question can see it is being altered – with what intention I will leave alone for the moment; because it could be for any number of reasons.

Additionally, alterations of past data will skew a linear trend-line; cooling the past will produce an apparent warming trend generally speaking; this is simple mathematics.

Without cooling the past, currently, the slope of a linearly interpolated line is close to zero or slightly negative for substantial sets of temperature data and so-called Man-Made Global Warming reduces to close to zero. Observations of global temperature show it is cyclical on various time scales; so of course various linear-trends could be constructed; leading to charges of cherry picking, but two things are undeniably clear concerning our ability to forecast the future and know the past of global climate and temperature:

**1. General Circulation Models (GCM)** have failed to make reliable climate forecasts: (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_Circulation_Model>)

Current global temperature measurements continue to diverge from modeled temperatures.”*In the IPCC’s Fifth Assessment Report, it was stated that there was “…very high confidence that models reproduce the general features of the global-scale annual mean surface temperature increase over the historical period.” However, the report also observed that the rate of warming over the period 1998-2012 was lower than that predicted by 111 out of 114 Coupled Model Intercomparison Project climate models…*. Among other notable failures of GCM.

**2. What temperature increase we have seen is neither outside historic precedence in rate of heat change over time, nor is there credible evidence that global temperatures are at historic highs** as copious paleo and historic evidence shows a warm world in the historic past; reference Medieval, Roman, and Minoan warm periods. Point is, these changes in temperature have happened in the past and *are small in value*  with warm periods being good; cold bad; in the most general terms.

In summary, looking forward in time, if we use IPCC GCM we have no accurate idea of global temperature. Looking backwards in time, global temperatures have stayed within a relatively narrow range; only since the invention of the the mercury thermometer in 1714 have we been able to measure to the degree F or C and a fraction thereof. Global temperatures, in real measurable numbers, do not vary much; another way to say the same thing, is that small changes in average temperature are difficult to measure; the best evidence we have is that temperature change (climate change) has gone on as far back as can be seen.

With a small delta T over time, changes to historic records can create spurious trend-lines. Finally, no one, claims alterations to raw data, again, for whatever reason, are not being done. And yes, mathematically, cooling the past produces a warming trend; and or, erases a cooling trend.

**Whew.**

A lot of words for something very simple:

Climate changes, always has, and further, the changes are small; difficult to measure; and difficult to quantify cause and effect. Since the changes are small and hard to quantify, alterations to data, alterations made for whatever reason, can have a large effect on any given trend-line. Not too hard to figure out. Cooling the past warms the future. This is mathematics. Simple mathematics. Spreadsheet simple mathematics.

And there is a horrible failed track record so far on predicting future global temperatures. Producing spurious warming trends from whole cloth won’t improve forecasting.

What is fascinating to me, is how Politifact can turn this dry number crunching into a nasty little hit piece on our gracious and hard-working host who has done nothing more than dig up the data.

What is going on in with these media types?

If they want to tell a good story with data, Politifact could do a lot better than this nasty little piece of ignorance. Perhaps they are just weak-minded and cannot fathom the simplicity of just looking at data sets. Maybe they’re bored.

Weak minded simpletons. Bored. No wonder I gave up on all news media some years ago.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378668#respond)

1. **northernont** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:29 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378683)

Well, looks like from reading the curry link in this posts comments, that vindication of a sorts is coming down the pipe for Heller. The issues identified by Heller [Tony Heller aka Steven Goddard ] will be acknowledged, just that he won’t get any mention or credit because he cried wolf to many times or something along those lines (seems petty to me). Keep up the good work Heller, it does make a difference.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378683#respond)

* + [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:33 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378690)

ROFL – I cried wolf until people started paying attention to the wolf

I’m blocked from commenting on Judith’s web site.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378690#respond)

* + - **Brad Rollans** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 4:59 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378700)

Apparently you are not blocked.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378700#respond)

* + - * **Brad Rollans** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 5:04 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378701)

Brad | June 28, 2014 at 12:43 pm | Reply
I would also like to add if Heller is blocked from commenting on your comments of him, you should give him the platform here to comment on your comments.
curryja | June 28, 2014 at 12:46 pm | Reply
Heller is of course welcome here
Brad | June 28, 2014 at 12:58 pm |
Let me rephrase, allow Steven Goddard/ Tony Heller comment here? Semantics are sometimes important.

I missed the word “to” but who’s counting.

* + - * **geran** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 5:15 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378708)

Brad, Curry might ban you next! (Once censorship gets in their blood, there is no cure.)

* + - * **Brad Rollans** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 5:17 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378709)

Banning. It’s all the rave now.

* + - * **Tel** *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 1:07 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379004)

Steve’s blog is pretty well known, I’m sure anyone can read it should they choose to.

1. **Latitude** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 5:23 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378713)

This was a good thing……You got a lot of press from the first…….but……You’re getting a lot more traction from Anthony’s screw up

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378713#respond)

1. [**markstoval**](http://markstoval.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 5:24 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378715)

Let me see if I understand the dynamics of all this.

Steve Goddard has been showing us all the blatant manipulation of the temperature sets for a long time. Curry and Watts ban him from commenting on their sites. He [Tony Heller aka Steve Goddard] gets noticed by some media and then attacked as a “kook” by those who claim to be skeptics [of anyone pointing out an AGW exaggeration] Then Paul Homewood writes up a post about one horrific example of a particular Texas [weather] station. Now the “big league” skeptics [of anyone pointing out an AGW exaggeration] admit that there just might be something now right [right now?] going on in a few places. Do I have the story about right?

Today, Paul Homewood writes a great post on Kansas and “adjustments” that don’t make scientific sense and others are now coming around to at least admitting that the “adjustments” are happening.

I must admit to being gobsmacked at the “surprise” by “skeptics” to learn that government drones are cooling the past and warming the present to keep the CAGW myth alive.

Don’t get me wrong, I understand that Judith Curry will want to protect her academic position and reputation above all else. How could she question the federal government and its *Official*  keepers of the data? But the rest of the skeptics [of anyone pointing out an AGW exaggeration] attacking Steve for pointing out that the F’ing past keeps changing all the F’ing time? Unbelievable.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378715#respond)

* + **Latitude** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 5:30 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378719)

Mark, except for the part that Anthony was told over and over “do not trust Zeke”….Zeke is the one that set up the strawman that Goddard was trying to reconstruct temps …Anthony fell for it and it took a few days to get it out of his head

Read Anthony’s two articles on it….it’s obvious he doesn’t have a clue what Goddard was talking about

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378719#respond)

* + - [**squid2112**](http://jeffgreenwell.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:40 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378765)

The other problem, that I believe Mark hits on well, is that there are a faction of people, Watts included, they deem themselves the “big league” skeptics [of anyone pointing out an AGW exaggeration]. They have become the skeptic “gatekeepers”, and appear to like to attack those that step ahead of them in line. Like the kids fighting to be first in line for the ice cream truck. I am fairly well certain that if Willis had presented such information, Watts would have run out of the gates preaching it as gospel, since Willis is on Watts’ team. Shows me a weakness in their proclaimed positions and convictions, and more of a strength towards opportunism and notoriety. IMHO.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378765#respond)

* + [**omanuel**](http://omanuel.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 11:15 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378939)

The problem, markstoval, is that 97% of the scientific community accepted the false consensus models of nuclei and stars that were designed in 1946 to hide the source of energy that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The key to Climategate is unreported CHAOS and FEAR that Earth might be converted into a star by uncontrolled release of nuclear energy in Aug 1945

Fifty-seven years later, in 2002 BBC News admitted that Japan’s secret design for building atomic bombs went missing in 1945.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378939#respond)

* + - **Tel** *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 1:05 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379003)

I might point out that India, Pakistan and Israel all seem to have figured out this “top secret” trick for making nuclear weapons (and nuclear power) and they did their work **after 1945**. More than a few people think the Iranians will also figure it out, so I’m inclined to say this is not quite as secret as you think it is.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=379003#respond)

1. **Eliza** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:04 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378735)

Guys/gals:I Think SG has not been blocked from either sites! LOL check it anyway.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378735#respond)

* + [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:10 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378737)




[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378737#respond)

* + - **gregole** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:23 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378751)

Oh my.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378751#respond)

* + - * [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:51 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378777)

LOOKS LIKE A SIMPLE WORDPRESS SECURITY REJECTION. Yeah .. some of us have seen it before … see comment further below … doesn’t mean he isn’t banned though, just saying some of us HAVE seen this before.

* + - [**squid2112**](http://jeffgreenwell.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:42 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378768)

Color me shocked…/sarc

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378768#respond)

* + - * [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:50 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378776)

Overboard, hyperbolic; see comment below.

/sarc

* + - [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:49 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378774)

Before everyone ‘goes off’ on a tangent on this, realize a few things first.

In the past, I have had the same ‘response’ from WordPress when posting on WUWT on occasion \*while\* I thought I was ‘logged’ into WordPress (with the ‘control bar’ at the top of the screen showing; WordPress users know what I mean.)

By logging into WordPress **again**, I was then able to successfully post … all the while I thought \*I\* had been banned from WUWT (who would ban me? I’m not that important or vile so what could be the issue?)

Anyway, to make a long story short, Curry seems to be using WordPress, I get the same ‘control bar’ across the top of the screen so, **MY SUGGESTION is to log BACK into WordPress and give it another shot** ..

.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378774#respond)

* + [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:53 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378778)

Possible premature proclamation; all the votes have not been counted yet …

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378778#respond)

* + - **geran** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 10:50 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378928)

“Possible premature proclamation”
>>>>>
Nothing new, from \_you….

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378928#respond)

* + - * [**\_Jim**](http://www.freerepublic.com/~jim/) *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 1:18 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379007)

Totally uncalled for.

1. **Scott** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:49 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378773)

You probably already know, but in case you don’t, the always execrable Media Matters seems to have instigated the Politifact hit piece.
<http://mediamatters.org/blog/2014/06/24/fox-news-cites-birther-to-claim-nasa-faked-glob/199871>

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378773#respond)

1. **Eliza** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 6:59 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378783)

Well Chile lost but they played well LOL

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378783#respond)

1. **Brad Rollans** *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 10:10 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378903)

Now that Watts recognized his error(s), I wonder if the folks at Politihack will write a retraction. And I wonder if this cause any changes in the way temps are reported.

Good work Tony. It would be great to have a beer with you sometime.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378903#respond)

* + [**stevengoddard**](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/) *says:*

[June 28, 2014 at 10:58 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378932)

Of course they won’t. Anthony gave them the propaganda they needed to counter Christopher Booker’s story, and that is all they care about.

I could use a beer.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378932#respond)

1. **Tel** *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 12:57 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-378999)

Politifact say:

*Doocy exaggerated the findings in this blog post when he applied it to global warming. The post itself only talks about U.S. land temperatures and what happens in the United States is separate from global shifts*

Very difficult to believe that the NASA adjustments to US temperatures have no effect whatsoever on the global charts. Also, the question of adjustments is clearly a global question, for example the famous adjustments made to the Darwin temperature record. If one lot are doing it, entirely likely others are as well. Doocy made the right call.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=378999#respond)

* + **Gail Combs** *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 1:28 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379017)

They did the same to global temps. Decrease the number of stations and get the temperature to shoot up.
[Graph from 2010](http://diggingintheclay.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/canadadt.png) by Verity Jones and E.M. Smith’s explanation of the[Bolivia Effect](http://chiefio.wordpress.com/2010/01/08/ghcn-gistemp-interactions-the-bolivia-effect/) – the smearing of hot temperatures into a cool area.

Again E.M. Smith validated what Steve [Goddard] is telling us back in November 2009. [Don’t worry, it’s only a temperature sausage from GIStemp](http://chiefio.wordpress.com/2009/11/07/gistemp-ghcn-selection-bias-measured-0-6-c/)

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=379017#respond)

* + **talldave2** *says:*

[July 3, 2014 at 5:19 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-382906)

Yeah… also everyone acknowledges the US has the most robust network. So what’s happening to the rest of it is probably much worse.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=382906#respond)

1. [**Bryan W. White**](http://www.zebrafactcheck.com/) *says:*

[June 29, 2014 at 6:39 am](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-379174)

As an editor at PolitiFact Bias I can assure you that PolitiFact is unlikely to revisit its fact check.

The skepticism of PolitiFact I see in some of the posts above is well founded.

We’ll highlight this issue at the site, of course.

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=379174#respond)

* + **talldave2** *says:*

[July 3, 2014 at 5:16 pm](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/#comment-382903)

Thanks Bryan!

[Reply](https://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2014/06/28/my-rebuttal-to-politifact/?replytocom=382903#respond)

### Leave a Reply

## SUNDAY, JUNE 29, 2014

### NOAA and temperature data - it must be a conspiracy.

Sou | 7:11 PM[Go to the first of 26 comments.](http://blog.hotwhopper.com/2014/06/noaa-and-temperature-data-it-must-be.html#comments)[Add a comment](http://blog.hotwhopper.com/2014/06/noaa-and-temperature-data-it-must-be.html#comment-form)

From: <http://blog.hotwhopper.com/2014/06/noaa-and-temperature-data-it-must-be.html#more>
**Update:** [Nick Stokes of Moyhu](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/06/infilling-climatology-and-anomalies.html) has written two articles that demonstrate what would happen if Anthony Watts had his way and stations with no data were ignored completely. See [here](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/06/infilling-climatology-and-anomalies.html) and [here](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/07/infilling-graphics-version.html). Anthony Watts might change his tune if he read them.

**Sou***3:22 pm 1 July 2014 AEST*

This article is about the kerfuffle that erupted between a bunch of science deniers. It all started when Steve Goddard accused NOAA and NASA of "fabricating data" ([archived here](https://archive.today/HUbJf)).  The lie was spread [all over the right wing media](http://climatecrocks.com/2014/06/25/fox-news-flash-nasa-fakes-temp-data-obama-born-in-kenya-batboy-found-in-cave/). [Politifact](http://www.politifact.com/punditfact/statements/2014/jun/25/steve-doocy/foxs-doocy-nasa-fudged-data-make-case-global-warmi/)and [Climate Crocks](http://climatecrocks.com/2014/06/25/fox-news-flash-nasa-fakes-temp-data-obama-born-in-kenya-batboy-found-in-cave/) among others pointed out he was wrong. Steve didn't explain how the two agencies did this. All he did was put up an animated chart that he claimed showed that the US temperature was warmer in the 1930s than at any time since. He [wrote](https://archive.today/HUbJf#selection-377.0-377.345):

Prior to the year 2000, NASA showed US temperatures cooling since the 1930′s, and 1934 much warmer than 1998....Right after the year 2000, NASA and NOAA dramatically altered US climate history, making the past much colder and the present much warmer. The animation below shows how NASA cooled 1934 and warmed 1998, to make 1998 the hottest year in US history instead of 1934. This alteration turned a long term cooling trend since 1930 into a warming trend.

Steve doesn't say what data was "fabricated". Why should he? He's not a fact checker. Quite the opposite. He's [in the denial business](http://blog.hotwhopper.com/2014/03/merry-go-round-with-shonky-steve.html) of making up stuff to stop any action to mitigate global warming.

This article is another one that's too long :( Click read more if you're on the home page.

### Why Steve Goddard is wrong

The NOAA has spent quite a bit of effort explaining the various adjustments over the years. You can [click here](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/research/ushcn/) for one very comprehensive overview of the changes, together with links to relevant papers and data. There's a shorter FAQ paper on the US temperature record [here as a pdf file](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/about/response-v2.pdf). When data is missing or incorrect it can be replaced, using a calculated estimate based on surrounding temperatures as recorded. It's not simply an average either. Raw data could be missing altogether (eg if the observer missed some readings) or as a marked discontinuity (eg as a result of moving the weather station).

If you want to know why earlier USA records are more likely to be adjusted higher than lower, then read [Nick Stokes new article](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/06/tobs-nailed.html) on Time of Observation corrections. Read [this one too](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/05/the-necessity-of-tobs.html). It's got a chart that shows up the problem nicely. And then there's Victor Venema's [classic article](http://variable-variability.blogspot.com.au/2012/08/a-short-introduction-to-time-of.html) on the subject. (This mainly applies only to the USA.)

Sensible people ignore Steve Goddard.

### Judith Curry uses the fiasco as an excuse for spreading her FUD

Judith Curry wrote in her usual denialist fashion using words like "uneasiness" (definition: Judith hasn't checked the facts which gives her an "out" to spread FUD) and "astonishing" (definition: similar to the definition of "uneasiness"). Judith wrote, for example:

Apart from the astonishing scientific and political implications of what could be a major bug in the USHCN dataset, there are some interesting insights and lessons from this regarding the technical skeptical blogosphere.

Thing is, of course, there is no "major bug". Steve Goddard is full of it as usual, flinging his wild and baseless allegations hither and yon and delighted that they've been picked up by the right-wing media.

### Jump, NOAA, jump higher

Judith seems to think that NOAA needs to respond to every bit of silliness written by deniers on their little blogs. She wrote about an article by another science denier ([archived here](https://archive.today/nBzNB)), Paul Homewood, who is a frequent "guest" at WUWT, who made a silly song and dance about a single weather station in Luling Texas, which,[it turns out, had malfunctioned](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/06/ushcn-tempest-over-luling-texas-theres.html). Judith didn't wait, she can't help herself as usual and wrote:

Homewood’s post sheds light on Goddard’s original claim regarding the data drop out (not just stations that are no longer reporting, but reporting stations that are ‘estimated’). I infer from this that there seems to be a real problem with the USHCN data set, or at least with some of the stations. Maybe it is a tempest in a teacup, but it looks like something that requires NOAA’s attention. As far as I can tell, NOAA has not responded to Goddard’s allegations. Now, with Homewood’s explanation/clarification, NOAA really needs to respond.

Judith extrapolated from the record of a single weather station at Luling Texas, which malfunctioned so the data was dropped from the record for a bit and replaced by temperature estimated by an algorithm using the record from surrounding stations. But even the hint from a science denier that "something must be wrong" was enough for Judith to proclaim that "there seems to be a real problem with the USHCN data set". Although she does mildly [mildly?] qualify her pronouncement with a "at least some of the stations" and her "Maybe it is a tempest in a teacup" remark.

The blog reaction to Steve Goddard's idiocy provided an interesting insight into the mind of science deniers. Anthony Watts is boasting how he and Judith (a real live scientist) were emailing each other all day. Judith is writing about Anthony Watts as if he's got something of value to add. And both of them are expecting NOAA to jump through hoops for people who run piddly denier blogs when the blog owners say "jump".

### NOAA estimates missing data

The only thing that anyone eventually found was that a number of stations that purportedly had records were included as estimates in the NOAA data instead of actual values. Anthony reckons this is a dreadful state of affairs. But is it? Government agencies in the USA were stripped of staff for a long time because the Republicans refused to pay them. What is the priority for double checking records, when it will make virtually no difference anyway, compared to other priorities competing for scarce resources. I bet both Anthony Watts and Judith Curry approved of the budget cuts. Anthony claims that this affects readings in Texas and Kansas. But what is the effect on the national or even regional data?  It lies somewhere between zero and minimal. Turns out that only 13 Texas stations out of ~~188~~ 49, over one period of time or another in the past few years, were estimated (from nearby records).

### Anthony Watts should leave well enough alone

Anthony really got his knickers in a twist and wrote a lot of nonsense. He made a real mess of things. First he wrote about how Steve Goddard was wrong about "fabrication". Then he wrote about how Steve Goddard was right about "fabrication" - or at least that's how it appeared to many of his denier readers. Then in the comments he gets a whole heap wrong and adds some new claims of his own - which he fails to substantiate. It looks to me as if he's trying hard to reclaim his ground as a science denier. Doing penance and trying to repair the damage to his reputation from when he dared point out that Steve Goddard was writing a load of codswallop.

Here's an exchange between Anthony Watts and **Nick Stokes**, who says:

[*June 28, 2014 at 1:49 pm*](https://archive.today/kcxWN#selection-2477.0-2531.496)
” Along with that is his latest followup, showing the problem isn’t limited to Texas”
But what was the problem in Texas? I did a post on Luling here. When you look at the local anomaly plots there is a very obvious inhomogeneity. The NOAA software detected this, and quarantined the data, exactly as it should. It then turned out, via comments of mesoman who had worked on this very site, that there was a faulty cable causing readings to be transmitted low, and this was fixed on Jan 2014.
So, you might say, good for the computer, it got it right, and Paul H was wrong. A bit of introspection from Paul Homewood and co re how they had been claiming malfeasance etc? But no, no analysis at all – instead they are on to the next “problem” in Kansas. And so the story goes – first we had problems in Texas, now in Kansas.

**REPLY:**
Despite what you think you can’t “estimate” the characteristics of temperature from effects of a faulty cable. In Lulings’s case, just throw out the data, don’t imagine you are smart enough to be able to predict the resistance changes that occur from rain, heat, humidity, dust, etc. as they affect it or the next lawnmower bangs into it. As you’ll note, the test “mesoman” did say the temperatures were fluctuating when he did his test to determine what was wrong. he said the data was unstable.

Can you predict what the temperature will be in a thermistor that has a faulty connection at any given moment? Can you predict what the low and high temperatures it will produce will be on any given day when compared to the vagaries of weather it experiences?
Is is patently absurd to try to salvage data from a faulty instrument, especially when you have one nearby also recording the temperature.

THROW OUT THE DATA – DON’T TRY TO FIX IT.

Imagine forensic science trying to get away with this stuff. I’m reminded of the famous line from The Green Mile The Shawshank Redemption “how can you be so obtuse?”.
**-Anthony**

Anthony Watts got so irate that he shouted at Nick. He also showed he knows nothing about surface temperature records, suggesting wrongly that NOAA tried to "salvage data from a faulty instrument".

When **Nick Stokes** pointed out that the NOAA did indeed throw out the faulty data, Anthony shouts some more, this time about blood and accuses Nick of being "obtuse":

[June 28, 2014 at 2:12 pm](https://archive.today/kcxWN#selection-3229.0-3279.42)
...Throw out the data? That’s exactly what they did. They replaced it with an estimate based on neighboring stations. Not on trying to repair the Luling data. In the NCDC method which uses absolute temperatures, you have to have an estimate for each station, otherwise you get into the Godard spike issues.

I notice that John N-G said there were 13 stations in Texas that have had to replace measured data in recent years, for various periods. I believe Texas has 188 stations in total.

**REPLY:** Great, you should be a legal adviser in court.
Judge: The Blood samples tainted! You: OK. THROW IT OUT AND REPLACE IT WITH SOME BLOOD from …THAT GUY, OVER THERE! NO, Wait, lets get blood from the nearest five guys that look like him and mix it together. Yeah that’s a reasonable estimate.
You can’t ever assume your estimates will model reality.
Again, how can you be so obtuse? – **Anthony**

(**Note:**Nick's since advised in the comments there are 49 stations in Texas, not 188)

Anyone who's read any of Anthony's blog knows who is obtuse, and it's not Nick Stokes. There's more. **Nick Stokes** says:

[*June 28, 2014 at 2:39 pm*](https://archive.today/kcxWN#selection-4371.0-4429.99)
*“Wait, lets get blood from the nearest five guys that look like him and mix it together. Yeah that’s a reasonable estimate.”*

They are computing a spatial average, based on stations. Infilling with neighboring data doesn’t change anything. It just, in the final sum, changes the weighting. The neighboring stations get a bit more weight to cover the area near Luling.

As I showed in the shaded plots, there is plenty of data in the region. It doesn’t depend on Luling. Using a neighbour-based estimate is just the way of getting the arithmetic to work properly. With anomalies you could just leave Luling out completely. With absolute values, you have to do something extra, so that the climatology of the omitted Luling doesn’t create Goddard spike type distortions. Estimating from neighbor values is the simplest way to do it properly.

This is where Anthony Watts first makes the unsubstantiated claim that "80%" of the US temperature network is "compromised by bad siting". In other words, he's now shifted to claiming that virtually all the US temperature data is worthless.

**REPLY:** Oh Nick, puhlease. When 80% of your network is compromised by bad siting, what makes you think those neighboring stations have any data thats worth a damn? You are adjusting bad data with…drum roll….more bad data. And that’s why homogenization fails here. It’s perfectly mathematically legitimate, but its useless when the data you are using to adjust with is equally crappy or crappier than the data you want to “fix”.

The problem with climate science is they really have no handle on just how bad the surface network is. I do. Evan does, John N-G does. Even Mosher has a bit of a clue.
You can’t make a clean estimated signal out of a bunch of muddied signals, ever.
Now its well past your bedtime is Australia. Maybe that is why you aren’t thinking clearly -Anthony

This, of course, means that Anthony's argument falls apart. Why bother fixing a weather station if they are all wrong anyway? Why not simply discard 80% of the entire record or forget about US temperature data altogether.  He finishes up by lecturing Nick Stokes on staying up past what Anthony mistakenly thinks is his bedtime.

Nick picks up on Anthony's contradictory stance. **Nick Stokes** says:

[*June 28, 2014 at 3:00 pm*](https://archive.today/kcxWN#selection-4827.0-4883.89)
*“You can’t make a clean estimated signal out of a bunch of muddied signals, ever.”*

Then there’s no point in discussing analysis, is there? But it is the job of NOAA and USHCN to interpret the data, as best they can, even if you think it is worthless. And I think at Luling they did everything right. They picked up a problem, quarantined the data, and got the best estimate available with the remaining data.

*“Now its well past your bedtime is Australia. Maybe that is why you aren’t thinking clearly”*

When it’s afternoon in California, the sun is over the Pacific somewhere. It’s 8am here.

This time Anthony elaborates on his unsubstantiated claim about "compromised" network, and claims that it has a "warm bias". He replies to Nick Stokes:

**REPLY:** Right you are, I thought you’d been up all night based on your commentary elsewhere. I also thought you lived in Perth. Obviously not.

Estimating data is the issue, and again when you use let’s say the six nearest stations, and statistically as we have shown at least 80% of them are unacceptably sited, resulting in a warm bias (and that’s not just my opinion that’s from Leroy 99 and 2010, and NCDC’s use of that to setup USCRN), that means your signal is going to be biased, full of the mud from the other stations.

It renders the idea of a useful estimate pointless.

And if you are too obtuse to see that, then yes, there’s nothing else to discuss -**Anthony**

If you extrapolate what Anthony is arguing, you soon realise that firstly he's arguing that 80% of the records are wrong. He is arguing that there is a "warm bias". He's not provided any evidence for that being so. Nor does he indicate for how long that "warm bias" will last. He's also basically saying that if it's 20C in all places closely surrounding place A one cannot assume that it's 20C in place A.

I looked at Anthony's claim that there is a warm bias compared to the Climate Reference Network (USCRN), well I don't see it. The overlap between the new USCRN, the newish ClimDiv and the older USHCN records is so tight that you can't pick one from another. (The USCRN data starts in 2004.)

|  |
| --- |
| http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-6QrcwGvvpyY/U6--A6VM4pI/AAAAAAAAF9s/I0pvRJlqQQg/s1600/UScompared14.png |
| **Data source:**[NCDC/NOAA](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/temp-and-precip/national-temperature-index/) |

This is confirmed [by the NCDC on this page](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/news/ncdc-introduces-national-temperature-index-page). Check out the chart. The differences are so minute they are almost indistinguishable.

### Interpolating sea ice extent and maintaining the DJIA

Anthony finally comes up with what he thinks is a killer argument. **Anthony Watts** says:

[*June 28, 2014 at 4:40 pm*](https://archive.today/kcxWN#selection-7289.0-7330.0)
By Nick Stokes thinking, we could use FILNET to make up for missing ice in the Arctic extent maps by interpolating from nearby ice readings and “infill” where ice is missing. We know there’s supposed to be ice there, so let’s just infill it from surrounding ice data, even if its “rotten ice”.

Arctic problem solved. Polar bears saved!

No, wait, that would be wrong….and equally ridiculous.

Making up data where there is none, especially for years for long dead weather stations, is just wrong. If it were financial data, say companies that went bankrupt and closed, and fell off the Dow-Jones Industrial average, but somebody decided that they could “fill in” that missing company data to keep the “continuity” of the DJIA data set over the years, you can bet that somebody would be hauled off to jail within a day or two by the SEC.

Fixing a few missing datapoints in a month with FILNET to make the record useable is one thing, wholesale reanimation of dead weather stations for years is something else altogether.

Except that is exactly what happens with missing data within an image of sea ice. This is [how it's done at NSIDC](http://nsidc.org/data/docs/daac/nsidc0051_gsfc_seaice.gd.html#datagaps) (my bold italics):

There are instances of missing data. In some cases whole days (or weeks or months) are missing. In other cases, large swaths or wedges of missing data exist within an image, along with scattered pixels of missing data throughout the grid. The scattered pixels of missing data, resulting generally from mapping the orbital data to the SSM/I grid, were filled ***by applying a spatial linear interpolation scheme on the brightness temperature maps***. The larger areas of missing data, resulting from gaps between orbital swaths (generally at low latitudes on daily maps) or from partial coverage or missing days, were filled by temporal interpolation on the sea ice concentration maps.

It's only when there is no data at all that the (time) gap is left unfilled:

No data at all were available for the period from 02 December 1987 through 12 January 1988. This gap was not filled by temporal linear interpolation; instead it was left as missing data.

BTW, Anthony's analogy with the Dow Jones index is Freudian, don't you think. I wonder is Anthony aware that the companies that make up the index do change over time? What does he think happens when there's a stock split? Perhaps Anthony thinks that the DJIA still comprises the original twelve industrial stocks rather than the [current thirty](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-10/dow-jones-industrial-average-to-add-goldman-sachs-visa-nike.html).

### Infilling missing temperature data doesn't change the overall picture

**Zeke Hausfather** chimes in and tries to get back on point, which is not that Steve Goddard is correct because he's not. Nor is Anthony Watts. **Zeke Hausfather** says:

[*June 28, 2014 at 6:04 pm*](https://archive.today/kcxWN#selection-8869.0-8920.0)
If you don’t like infilling, don’t use it. It doesn’t change the result, almost by definition, since infilling mimics spatial interpolation:<http://rankexploits.com/musings/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/USHCN-infilled-noninfilled.png>

The interesting issue currently is that some stations that report apparently valid raw data are being replaced with estimated data. The cause seems to be that the NCDC data file is missing the X flag, which indicates that the data was too inhomogeneous at the time (e.g. between two station moves) to figure out what is going on. The folks at NCDC are looking into it, as the number of stations that fall into this category seems to be a bit high, at least in my opinion.

Also, the confusion here was on Anthony’s part rather than mine; I always knew that NCDC used infilling to ensure that there were 1218 reports per month in the homogenized dataset. I personally think infilling is silly, since its not really needed (as any sort of reasonable spatial interpolation will produce the same result). But I understand its something of a legacy product to ensure consistency for folks who want to calculate average absolute temperatures.

### Anthony wasn't "confused", just mistaken

Anthony tries to make out he wasn't "confused", after confusing all his denier readers and says he just didn't know in his reply to Zeke's comment above:

**REPLY:** Confusion is the wrong word, I simply didn’t know that NCDC was reanimating dead weather stations for the final dataset. I agree, it is silly.
However I disagree that it doesn’t make a difference, because the majority 80%+ of stations are non-compliant siting-wise. A small minority are compliant, and the infilling and homogenization obliterates their signal, and those stations are by definition, the most free from bias. As we have shown, compliant stations have a lower trend than non complaint stations, and a far lower trend than final adjusted data.

Basically what NCDC is doing here is mathematically favoring the signal of the crappiest stations – **Anthony**

### Deniers don't self-correct - that's left up to other people

Let's complete the circle. Deniers all claim to just want to get to the truth. Judith Curry wrote ([excerpts](https://archive.today/arcYY#selection-363.0-363.257)):

Who do I include in the technical skeptical blogosphere?  Tamino, Moyhu, Blackboard, Watts, Goddard, ClimateAudit, Jeff Id, Roman M.  There are others, but the main discriminating factor is that they do data analysis, and audit the data analysis of others. ...

...However, the main point is that this group is rapidly self-correcting – the self-correcting function in the skeptical technical blogosphere seems to be more effective (and certainly faster) than for establishment climate science.

Have any of the people involved in spreading FUD corrected their articles? Is anyone under the mistaken impression that deniers care about anything other than trying to prove that physics and chemistry and biology are all "wrong"?

* **Steve Goddard (denier)** - No. His "fabricated" claim is still up there and [he's repeated it](https://archive.today/l9OVS), despite being proven wrong and wrong and wrong again. He's a conspiracy nutter.
* **Anthony Watts (denier)** - No. He's left a [complete mess on his blog](https://archive.today/kcxWN). He's kissed and tried to make up with his brother-in-denial Steve Goddard but didn't make plain that Steve Goddard was wrong about "fabrication". And along the way he blustered and bluffed and added unsubstantiated claims of a "warm bias".
* **Judith Curry (denier)** - No. As usual, she's just left [her normal unsubstantiated fare](http://judithcurry.com/2014/06/28/skeptical-of-skeptics-is-steve-goddard-right/) "doubt and uncertainty" mixed with "astonishing" and "political ramifications".
* **Paul Homewood (denier)** - No. He's left his "[something nefarious is going on" article](https://archive.today/nBzNB) unchanged. He did [an update](https://archive.today/YnGM8) but only mentioned that the Texan station moved a bit. He didn't point out that the weather station was not reporting correctly.

The only people who published correct information and showed a keenness to expose the facts were Zeke Hausfather and Nick Stokes (who don't deny science) - **Nick Stokes** [investigated the record for Luling Texas](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/06/ushcn-tempest-over-luling-texas-theres.html), saw that it was anomalous. Found out the reason why it went askew and published [an update](http://moyhu.blogspot.com.au/2014/06/ushcn-tempest-over-luling-texas-theres.html).

So out of all the above, it's only Nick Stokes (and Zeke Hausfather) who bothered to write about the real situation. The science deniers are only interested in peddling denial, doubt and disinformation.

Posted by [Sou](https://www.blogger.com/profile/08818999735123752034)at [7:11 PM](http://blog.hotwhopper.com/2014/06/noaa-and-temperature-data-it-must-be.html)