Emails to Lubos June 19 – 20 2014

18-Jun-14 7:52 PM Joanne Nova

Lubos, I've just realized you've posted a lot. We have not lifted the embargo, we've only put out about 1/3rd -- we have about 12 posts to go. We have not discussed the equations you have there. We've put 18 months of work into this, and would have appreciated it greatly if you could have written privately first to check before releasing so much. Because you didn't email we assumed you had lost interest, otherwise would have let you know more about the release. David would really have appreciated sending emails back and forward and getting more feedback, he didn't realize you'd even read it.

We're delighted of course and honored that you've taken so long to look through it.

But this is potentially unfortunate, and disappointing. You did agree not to release it.

It's cost my family a lot to do this. Literally thousands in foregone wages and risk, etc etc. We don't expect to get paid, but it would be nice if skeptics could at least do us the courtesy of respecting our wishes to release it as we chose too.

Jo

2014-06-18 9:21PM Joanne Nova

Lubos, I can see now that there is not much extra beyond what we have posted. Apologies for suggesting otherwise.

I am grateful that you've tried to read it, I do appreciate the hours it would have taken. However there are several things you have mistaken and it would have preferred to help you get them right before you posted.

Sigh. Sigh. Sigh. Were you mad at me for the last few months? I am sorry if I have put you out over something.
I have no idea if I said something that hurt you. I did not mean too.

Sincerely,

Jo

2014-06-19 9:44AM Joanne Nova
Lubos,

1. Please don't apologize for finding it hard to believe. I would prefer you stay skeptical, we want nothing less. Indeed we were disappointed not to get more serious review. We kept asking. But I figured that it is a big ask for someone to read something so long and involved.
2. Sorry I fired off the first email before I had read it, but I was not asking you to make it invisible. There's no point since it had been up for a day and was being discussed. Thanks for trying. post it.
3. Unfortunately we will have to reply to it on my blog anyway. Since it's been out there, we need to explain where it was wrong.
4. A real in depth review that shows someone took the time to understand the work is an honor even if it disagrees.
5. After putting in five years of unpaid work with the genuine goal of improving science and understanding the world, the implication that I'm doing this for marketing or blind faith is something I am used too -- but not from people who I thought shared the same goals. What can I say - disappointing.

Jo

2014-06-19 10:20PM Joanne Nova
Lubos,

1. your talk of the length-worked is a strawman. I never said he was right because he spent 18 months on it. I was just asking for some respect for the cost this has been for us. Perhaps you get paid. We don't.

2. Crackpot index? His ideas stand or fall on the evidence and reasoning. That is the type of fallacious argument Cook would make. C'mon lubos you are better than that. (Re point 26 - we provided everything to you? I'm genuinely baffled? Re point 12: I thought I did know you? You said you were grateful at the time. I am sad. :- ( )

3. Re: “Classified” work? I am baffled again why you don’t let that non-point go?. I corrected that claim 90 minutes after my first email -- before you replied and long before you took the post down. I asked you to repost it. I apologized twice. What else can I do?

> science is and should be ultimately cruel and uncompassionate.

Cruelty has nothing to do with science. Nature is cruel. People can choose.

Lubos, I really don’t want to have a flame war. I like you! That’s why I was astonished at the tone of your post.

You say you don’t want to hurt, but your actions show no respect or courtesy.

That was not what I expected.

Jo

BTW: I have posted our reply. I have done my best to be diplomatic.
http://joannenova.com.au/2014/06/lubos-and-a-few-misconceptions/

---
19 June 11:50pm Joanne Nova:

Lubos,

I did include the link, it is in the post already. I thought it was a dead link, but it is there and was there all long. paragraph 4. I took the trouble of copying it and making a back up page so you would see I have no desire to hide your arguments, and so people could judge for themselves.

> By skeptics who are ready to endorse any thing that will be against consensus, I meant very specific folks who described themselves in this way themselves, openly, I could enumerate, as well as people like Lord Monckton. I said it because it’s true and important and “manners” - i.e. psychological tricks to hide the truth - are something that has no room in science.

Why include it in a post about us if it is not aimed at us?

Your idea of manners may be different. I mean treating people with respect. Science without civility is mere competition of bullies. May the one who yells loudest wins. Sometimes the best ideas come from the quietest voices. How do ad homs and slurs advance science?

I don’t know what Lindzen will think. I would not prejudge it. But we have had some excellent feedback from some people we admire.

I really do not know what to make of your last email. I have been impeccably logical.

Still baffled. :- (

Jo