

>Dear Gerald North and Mike Mann,

>

>I have received no reply to the e-mails below. At this stage, in light of
>previous requests, one can only conclude that Wegman et al blankly refuse to
>provide any item whatsoever to my requests for information relative to
>key inputs to their calculations.

>This is a sad commentary on people who have so strongly and publicly
>attacked others for supposed failures to provide such information, and their
>report must accordingly be judged in this context.

>

>Sincerely

>

>Dave Ritson

>

>

>----- Forwarded message -----

>Date: Mon, 7 Aug 2006 11:01:41 -0700 (PDT)

>From: David M. Ritson <dmr@slac.stanford.edu>

>To: ewegman@gmu.edu

>Cc: scottdw@rice.edu, yhs@jhu.edu, Gerald North <g-north@tamu.edu>,

> mann@psu.edu, Gavin Schmidt <gschmidt@giss.nasa.gov>

>Subject: Re: Your report

>

>

> Dear Drs Wegman, Scott and Said,

>

>I am again forwarding to you my previous requests for information essential to
>evaluate and replicate elements of your report to Congressional Energy
>committee. I understand that people are away or pursuing other interests
>over the summer. However minimal professional courtesy would generally have
>ensured a reply as to when you people would provide the requested information.
>If I do not receive a reply in the next days I can only presume that the
>requested information will not be supplied. Frankly such an outcome would
>be quite unprecedented over my long scientific career

>

>Sincerely

>

>David Ritson

>

=====

>David Ritson, Emeritus Prof of Physics

>Physics Dept

>Varian Physics Building

>382 Via Pueblo Mall

>Stanford University

>Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA

>

>e-mail: ritson@slac.stanford.edu

>Telephone number: 650/723-2685

>FAX Number: 650/725/6544

>

=====

>

>

>On Sun, 30 Jul 2006, David M. Ritson wrote:

>

>

>

>>Dear Dr Wegman and colleagues,

>>

>>I am forwarding below an e-mail I sent you and your colleagues

>>requesting essential, but missing, basic, information relative to your

>>report to Congress.

>>

>>To facilitate a reply I attach the Auto-Correlation Function used

>>by the M&M to generate their persistent red noise simulations for their

>>figures shown by you in your Section 4 (this was kindly provided me by M&M on

>>Nov 6 2004). The black values are the ones actually used by M&M. They derive

>>directly from the seventy North American tree proxies, assuming the proxy values

>>to be TREND-LESS noise.

>>Surely you realized that the proxies combine the signal components on which is

>>superimposed the noise? I find it hard to believe that you would take

>>data with obvious trends, would then directly evaluate ACFs without

>>removing the trends, and then finally assume you had obtained results for the

>>proxy specific noise! You will notice that the M&M inputs purport to show

>>strong persistence out to lag-times of 350 years or beyond.

>>Your report makes no mention of this quite improper M&M procedure

>>used to obtain their ACFs. Neither do you provide any specification data for

>>your own results that you contend confirm the M&M results. Relative to your

>>Figure 4.4 you state

>>"One of the most compelling illustrations that M&M have produced

>>is created by feeding red noise (AR(1) with parameter = .2 into the MBH

>>algorithm".

>>In fact they used and needed the extraordinarily high persistences contained in

>>the attached figure to obtain their 'compelling' results.

>>

>>Obviously the information requested below is essential for replication and

>>evaluation of your committee's results. I trust you will provide it in

>>timely fashion.

>>

>>Sincerely

>>

>>David Ritson

>>

>>David Ritson, Emeritus Prof of Physics

>>Physics Dept

>>Varian Physics Building

>>382 Via Pueblo Mall

>>Stanford University

>>Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA

>>

>>e-mail: ritson@slac.stanford.edu

>>Telephone number: 650/723-2685

>>FAX Number: 650/725/6544

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>----- Forwarded message -----
>>Date: Sun, 23 Jul 2006 15:31:09 -0700 (PDT)
>>From: David M. Ritson <dmr@slac.stanford.edu>
>>To: ewegman@gmu.edu
>>Cc: scottdw@rice.edu, yhs@jhu.edu, Gerald North <g-north@tamu.edu>,
>> mann@psu.edu
>>Subject: Your report

>>Dear Dr. Wegman,

>>I read with interest your report to the Barton congressional committee.
>>I am very familiar with the work and controversies surrounding the
>>generation of "hockey-sticks" from trend-less red noise. Your Section 4
>>showed several figures, accompanied by discussion. I have read it
>>carefully, and would appreciate some clarifications as to factual details.

>>1). Which of the figures derive from M&M work and which were
>>independently derived by you?

>>2). M&M used ARFIMA persistent red-noise throughout their published
>>work. You state that your figure 4.4 results from AR(1) .2 red-noise?
>>If so did you otherwise follow M&M using short-span normalization
>>and 70 member Monte Carlo generated ensembles? Did you use the same
>>AR(1) .2 noise to generate all your figures?

>>3). If you indeed used similar persistent red-noise to that used by
>>M&M do you believe it to be in accord with real-world proxy-specific noise?

>>4). Any of my colleagues would have routinely checked their results
>>to see if their derived PC1 (etc) derived from a systematic signal or from
>>random noise. For example for a 70 member population, all that is required
>>is to use the extracted PC1 vector from the 70 members, and apply it to
>>each member to project out its relative sign (and amplitude). For signal
>>dominated results one sign will predominate and for noise dominated
>>results both signs will be roughly equally present. Needless to say when, a
>>couple of years ago, I checked the M&M work, I did just that.

>>The questions raised by your report are clearly of importance, and I
>>would very much appreciate your clarifications of the above,

>>Sincerely

>>David Ritson

>>David Ritson, Emeritus Prof of Physics
>>Physics Dept
>>Varian Physics Building
>>382 Via Pueblo Mall
>>Stanford University
>>Stanford, CA 94305-4060, USA

>>e-mail: ritson@slac.stanford.edu
>>Telephone number: 650/723-2685
>>FAX Number: 650/725/6544