>shows 1934 slightly warmer, as we still
>find. Of course, scientifically this is all
>nonsense, as the difference of 0.02 is much less
>than the accuracy, so practically it should be
>stated as a tie. I know that whenever new
>stations are added to the record it can change
>things by small amounts. Did we once find 1998
>as warmer??? Jim (I will be away from e-mail for a few hours).
>
>On 8/14/07, DEMIAN MCLEAN, BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:
><<mailto:dmclean8@bloomberg.net>dmclean8@bloomberg.net> wrote:
>Thanks, James. I'm not familiar with that paper from 2001. Is it not
true,
>though, that NASA's rankings, as available at:
>
><http://data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/graphs/Fig.D.txt>http://data.giss.nasa.g
>
>now show 1934 as the hottest year, where 1998 used to hold that position?
>
>thanks,
>demian
>----- Original Message -----
>From: James Hansen <<mailto:jhansen@giss.nasa.gov>
jhansen@giss.nasa.gov>
>At: 8/14 13:00:38
>
>Demian,
>
>No, we have not changed ranking of warmest year in the U.S. As you will
see
>in our 2001 paper we found 1934 slightly warmer, by an insignificant hair
>over, 1998. We still find that result. The flaw affected temperatures
only
>after 2000, not 1998 and 1934.
>
>Yes, our analysis algorithm is available, described fully in publication,
>and other researchers have taken that description, applied it to the raw
>data and come up with the same results that we get.
>
>Jim
>
>On 8/14/07, DEMIAN MCLEAN, BLOOMBERG/ NEWSROOM:
><<mailto:dmclean8@bloomberg.net> dmclean8@bloomberg.net>
>wrote:
> >
> > james, pardon me: i see the records volz was referring to are
global.