

**FOUND: WEAPONS OF MASS (DATA) DESTRUCTION!**  
– (Or ... Mad Scientist + Paper Shredder = Magical Results)

Stephen L. Bakke – December 6, 2009

**The Scandal**

I am sure most have heard or read about the recent “Climategate” scandal involving controversial emails between global warming alarmists – primarily scientists. For those who have not followed this closely, I will try to add some value here by summarizing the information, and by giving some commentary on the situation.

The scandal is very simple: renowned scientists, all global warming alarmists, were caught with their lab coats inside out. Many emails were discovered which give serious evidence that some research behind the global warming argument has been manufactured, and that real data has been concealed and sometimes even destroyed by scientists who are prominent in the debate. One example is Pennsylvania State University’s Michael E. Mann who was the one responsible for Al Gore’s global temperature “hockey stick” which is now experiencing serious criticism and loss of credibility.

**The Stingers Got Stung**

“Hackers” managed to obtain these emails through admittedly devious means – some experts believe there was a whistle blower who started the process. The source of the emails was a server at Britain’s Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia. This unit is commonly described as “the world’s leading center for reconstructing past climate and temperatures.” The emails are credible evidence that things may not be exactly as presented in the literature and press. The accuracy of the emails is fairly certain. Whether or not too much “mischief” was involved in obtaining the emails is another discussion altogether. The fact is this information exists and must be evaluated. One skeptic proclaimed: “This is not a smoking gun; this is a mushroom cloud.”

**The Emails**

Many of the following emails are from/to/or referencing Phil Jones who is the director of CRU and one of the world’s leading climate scientists. The “Mike” often referred to is confidently identified by the Wall street Journal as Michael Mann (the hockey stick guy) whom I introduced in the first section above. These emails go back several years:

- Referring to research by global warming skeptics: “I can’t see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. **Kevin and I will keep them out somehow – even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!**”
- Referring to Michael Mann’s construction of the infamous and discredited temperature “hockey stick” graph which is so prominent in Al Gore’s presentations and his book on global warming: “I’ve just completed **Mike’s Nature trick** of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (i.e. from 1981 onwards) and from 1961 for Keith’s **to hide the decline.**”

- Referring to the recent 9+ years of global cooling: “The fact is that **we can’t account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty we can’t** ..... Our observing system is inadequate.” This email was from Kevin Trenberth to Michael Mann. Here they are stating the lack of warming must be wrong – that the observing system must be inadequate because their model predicted much higher temperatures than. **Perhaps the model is wrong!**
- Referring to the repeated requests to release their data Jones sent this to Mann and others: “I’m getting hassled by a couple of people to release the CRU temperature station data. **Don’t any of you three tell anybody that the U.K. has a FOI!**”
- “The two MMs have been after the CRU station data for years. If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the U.K., **I think I’ll delete the file rather than send to anyone** ..... We also have a data protection act, which I will hide behind.” According to the Wall Street Journal, “the ‘two MMs’ are almost certainly Stephen McIntyre and Ross McKittrick, two Canadians who have devoted years to seeking the raw data and codes used in climate graphs and models .....” In Britain it is a crime to delete information requested under FOI.
- This probably was sent by Jones to Mann in 2008: “Mike, **can you delete any emails** you may have had with Keith re AR4 (the last IPCC ‘consensus’ report)? Keith will do likewise ... Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same?”
- Jones sent this to Eugene Wahl of NOAA in 2007: “**try and change the Received date!** Don’t give those skeptics something to amuse themselves with.”
- “The **FOI (Freedom of Information) line we’re all using is this** ..... IPCC is exempt from any countries’ FOI – the skeptics have been told this. Even though we ..... possibly hold relevant info the IPCC is not part of our remit (mission statement, aims etc.) **therefore we don’t have an obligation to pass it on.**” This from Jones in 2008 as an alternative to the previously unsuccessful practices of deleting, doctoring or withholding information. This was sent to Gavin Schmidt of NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies and to (guess who?) Mike Mann.
- Jones commented about an article, challenging his theories, from the journal “Climate Research”: it must “**rid themselves of this troublesome editor.**”
- And Michael Mann also responds by attempting to blacklist scientists who disputed his work, as well as journals that printed the skeptical opinions. “I think we have to stop considering ‘Climate Research’ as a legitimate peer-reviewed journal ..... **perhaps we should encourage our colleagues in the climate research community to no longer submit to, or cite papers in this journal.**”
- Panic among top global warming alarmists is evident in Mann’s complaint about a skeptical article published in Geophysical Research Letters: “It’s one thing to lose ‘Climate Research’ (journal). We can’t afford to lose GRL.
- Tom Wigley, also at CRU, talks about going after an editor who doesn’t agree with them: “If you think that Saiers is in the greenhouse skeptics’ camp, then, if we can find documentary evidence of this, **we could go through official AGU (American Geophysical Union) channels to get him ousted.**”
- And that’s what happened (referring to the proposed “ouster” from the prior item). Another email refers to the “ouster”: “**The GRL leak may have been plugged up now** with new editorial leadership there.”

- Robert Tracinski notes that the CRU scientists also conspired to **secure friendly reviewers** who could be counted on. Phil Jones suggests a list of persons: **“All of them know the sorts of things to say without any prompting.”**
- RealClimate.org is supposedly an objective site where all sides can depend on an impartial debate. But the following are from CRU emails claiming that RealClimate is actually a friendly site: “I wanted you guys to know that you’re free to use RC in any way you think would be helpful. Gavin and I are going to be careful about what comments we screen through. We can hold comments up in the queue and contact you about whether or not you think they should be screened through or not, and if so, any comments you’d like us to include ..... **think of RC as a resource that is at your disposal.** We’ll use our best discretion to **make sure the skeptics don’t get to use the RC comments as a megaphone.”**
- From the Times of London: “After the leak of highly embarrassing email messages ... **CRU has been forced to admit that it dumped ‘the original raw’ climate data ... while retaining only the ‘value-added’ (massaged? ed.) data.”**
- In the following email, New York Times’ Andrew Revkin appears to be “in the pocket” of Dr. Mann. The email refers to skeptic Stephen McIntyre, the Ontario mathematician whose “Climate Audit” web site exposed the fraud of Dr. Mann’s global warming “hockey stick” graph. McIntyre has also, for years, tried to pry loose the raw data used in developing the theory. We now learn the data probably was disposed of. Here, Revkin writes to Mann to provide reassurance as to how he will “cover” the story: **“I’m going to blog on this as it relates to the value of the peer review process and not on the merits of the McIntyre et al attack.”**

The complete 43 page list of 1098 emails, with links to their text, has been made available at [eastangliaemails.com/index.php](http://eastangliaemails.com/index.php).

### **Summary of Disclosures in the Emails**

I recommend a report dated November 30, 2009 by Lord Christopher Monckton, former science advisor to Lady Margaret Thatcher. The report is about 40 pages and is readily available on-line. The title is “Caught Green-Handed! – Cold facts about the hot topic of global temperature change after the Climategate scandal.” The author provides a very complete analysis of the scandal. Information is also available on the National Center for Policy Analysis (NCPA) website, [ncpa.org](http://ncpa.org). NCPA provided the following summary of highlights of Lord Monckton’s “take” on what the emails revealed:

- The CRU at East Anglia had profited to the tune of at least \$20 million in “research” grants from the Team’s activities.
- The Team had tampered with the complex, bureaucratic processes of the United Nation’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), so as to exclude inconvenient scientific results from its four Assessment Reports, and to influence the panel’s conclusions for political rather than scientific reasons.
- The Team had conspired in an attempt to redefine what is and is not peer-reviewed science for the sake of excluding results that did not fit what they and the politicians with whom they were closely linked wanted reported by the U.N.
- They had tampered with their own data to conceal inconsistencies and errors.

- They had emailed one another about using a “trick” for the sake of concealing a “decline” in temperatures in the paleoclimate.
- They had expressed dismay at the fact that, contrary to all of their predictions, global temperatures had not risen in any statistically-significant sense for 15 years, and had been falling for nine years.
- They had mounted a venomous public campaign of disinformation and denigration of their scientific opponents via an expensive website.
- Contrary to all the rules of open, verifiable science, the Team had committed the criminal offense of conspiracy to conceal and then to destroy computer codes and data that had been legitimately requested by an external researcher who had very good reason to doubt that their “research” was either honest or competent.

### **The Investigation**

From the above you can get a clear picture of a very legitimate controversy and the obvious reasons this is called a potential scandal. It’s a basic rule of science that you can’t just publish conclusions and tell the public to “trust us.” A scientist also has to make available the data and method of analysis. And it goes without saying, any attempt to control the result or the reaction is absolutely unacceptable. I imagine these rogue scientists are sincere global warming zealots who are willing to go to any lengths to impose their unproven views on the world. It has become a religion for them.

The University of East Anglia has required Dr. Jones to relinquish his position pending completion of an independent review into charges that he altered the presentation of global temperature data. Pennsylvania State University has not yet taken any publicized action, but the student newspaper reports there is an inquiry into the charges that Dr. Michael Mann fabricated, distorted or manipulated data on global warming.

Dr. Mann has stated: “I’m very happy they’re doing it (the inquiry).” Do ya’ think? In the U.S. Senate, James Inhofe (R-OK) called for hearings on the issues of data manipulation, vilification of opposing scientists, and circumventing disclosure laws.

### **Reactions**

- Commentator Robert Tracinski opines on “peer review” comments in the emails: “Note the circular logic. Skepticism about global warming is wrong because it is not supported by scientific articles in ‘legitimate peer-reviewed journals.’ But if a journal actually publishes such an article, then it is by definition not ‘legitimate.’”
- The Atlantic’s Megan McArdle stated: “The CRU’s main computer model may be, to put it bluntly, complete rubbish.”
- Warming alarmist George Monbiot of the Guardian concedes the emails “could scarcely be more damaging . . . . I’m dismayed and deeply shaken by them.”
- Ian Plimer is an Australian geologist and a global warming skeptic. He stated that the emails “show that data was massaged, numbers were fudged, diagrams were biased, there was destruction of data after freedom of information requests, and there was refusal to submit taxpayer-funded data for independent examination.”

- The Wall Street Journal states that “even a partial review of the emails is highly illuminating. In them, scientists appear to urge each other to present a ‘unified’ view on the theory of man-made climate change ..... to advise each other on how to smooth over data so as not to compromise the favored hypothesis; to discuss ways to keep opposing views out of leading journals; and to give tips on how to ‘hide the decline’ of temperature in certain inconvenient data.”
- Michael Barone, stated: “The CRU has been a major source of data on global temperatures, relied on by the International Panel on Climate Change. But the emails suggest that CRU scientists have been suppressing and misstating data and working to prevent the publication of conflicting views in peer-reviewed science periodicals ..... cast serious doubt on the ballyhooed consensus on manmade global warming.”
- An article in Der Spiegel stated: “I don’t know where these people got their scientific education, but where I come from, if your theory can’t predict or explain the observed facts, it’s wrong.”
- The Times of London environmental editor Jonathan Leake, commenting on disposal of data: “It means that other academics are not able to check basic calculations said to show a long-term rise in temperature over the past 150 years.”
- Mark Steyn observed: “The headline in the Wall Street Journal Europe is unimprovable: ‘How to Forge a Consensus’. Pressuring publishers, firing editors, blacklisting scientists – that’s ‘peer review’ climate style. The more their echo chamber shriveled, the more Mann and Jones insisted that they and only they represent the ‘peer-reviewed’ ‘consensus.’”
- “The now non-secret data prove ..... that most of the evidence of global warming was simply made up. Not only are the global warming computer models unreliable, the experimental data on which these models are built are also unreliable.” That from Frank Tripler, a physics professor at Tulane.

## The Press and Mainstream Media

With a potential scandal of this magnitude, relevance and importance, the press and media must be really “buzzing” with anticipation and information! Right? Wrong “alligator breath!” I refer you to information provided by the Media Research Center (MRC) and Business and Media Institute (BMI) for more detailed information on this topic. The following commentary is based largely on those two sources but I have relied on several other news services as well. Much of the following analysis uses information as of December 2<sup>nd</sup>, and I haven’t noted much change in the few days since:

- A BMI examination of the morning and evening news on ABC, CBS and NBC since the release of the controversial emails yielded absolutely no mention of the developing scandal – not even when they were covering Obama’s intentions relative to the Copenhagen climate conference which starts this week. **That’s ZERO mention folks!** In contrast, those same network programs reported on Tiger Woods’ “mischief” at least 37 times. They also reported on orphaned moose and the process of meal selection at the President’s recent state dinner.
- Other news outlets, including The New York Times, Washington Post, CNN and AP did make some mention. And of course Fox News gave it coverage. ABC

and CBS relegated a mention of Climategate to the web sites. ABC finally mentioned it on their Sunday talk show featuring George Stephanopoulos.

- This treatment of the global warming debate didn't start two weeks ago. BMI reported that, during 2007 on the three major networks, "there was an average of 13 global warming advocates for each skeptic featured. CBS had the worst ratio: 38 to 1." The networks also habitually have not reported on the cost of suggested solutions and almost never explain "cap-and-trade."
- NPR's treatment tended to emphasize that these emails were "stolen" – implying they were thereby tainted. NPR didn't give any idea of the potential importance of this disclosure, nor did they mention any of the questionable tactics implied by these emails. NPR merely glossed over the entire issue stating that the "consensus" remains. They never give mention to the size of the growing community of scientists who are beginning to doubt the consensus, many being full-fledged skeptics, and a growing number actual being categorized as deniers.
- AP reported on November 23: "Greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere reached record highs in 2008, with carbon dioxide levels increasing faster than previously ..... The IPCC has said if nothing is done to stop emissions, global temperatures, could rise as much as 6 degrees Celsius by 2100, triggering droughts, floods and other disasters." The story omitted that temperatures have actually been declining over the last decade. As far as the developing Climategate scandal, the AP writer of this story simply didn't even mention the controversial emails nor the growing controversy caused by their release.
- U.N.'s top climate official Yvo de Boer stated: "I think a lot of people are skeptical about this issue in any case. And then when they have the feeling ... that scientists are manipulating information in a certain direction when of course it causes concern in a number of people to say 'you see I told you so, this is not a real issue.'" Yet, he went on to say nothing in the debate has changed. **(What!?)**
- Lord Christopher Monckton reports that the BBC had the "email information" for at least a month before they were disclosed. They actually sat on the story and even since the story broke, they have not reported on any important information contained in the emails nor the potential implications of the controversy. They merely glossed over the issue by having a non-scientific reporter write a story quoting the CRU minimizing the event.

Brent Bozell, President of MRC reacted: **"The networks' silence on ClimateGate is deafening.** Scandal, cover-ups and conspiracy are the bread and butter of the media. Yet they have selectively and deliberately decided not to report this bombshell – or any of the incriminating details surrounding the scandal – because it goes against their left-wing agenda. **To pretend this story simply doesn't exist is damning to journalism.** The so-called 'news' media are protecting scientists because it exposes their underbelly. **That's not journalism. That's cover-up.** And we will continue to call them out for ignoring these allegations and the mounting, inconvenient evidence against them."

## **Wait Just a Pea Pickin' Minute!**

One of the frequent attempts by alarmists to provide a rationale for all of this, while attempting not to derail their goals, is to say something like: “this just shows that any attempt to embellish an already strong argument may backfire” or “OK, but how come the arctic glaciers don't understand they shouldn't be melting after all?”

These completely miss the point of the global warming skeptics (not all of whom agree on the reasons for skepticism). Some believe that humans do affect global warming, but to a very limited degree. Others focus on the questionable data linking CO2 to warming – emphasizing that while warming may be occurring in the long term, the major causes are forces of nature on our planet and the immense influence of solar activity. There is also the camp that quite simply feels that long term warming is not occurring. But the focus of the skeptics argument has never been that there isn't warming, nor that it could never happen. Warming (whether it exists or not) is not the focus of the skeptics' argument. Rather, what is being contested is the extent to which man is to blame (if at all), the negligible amount of impact (if any) a CO2 reduction can have on climate, and the devastating results which are likely from an impetuous reaction to questionable conclusions.

Some alarmists argue, as the **Washington Post** did, that while bothered by the “cover up”, there is a much more important consideration. An **editorial stated: “..... a recent, measured lack of warming ..... demonstrates that the Earth's systems are extremely difficult to predict in detail ..... climate scientists should not let themselves be goaded by the irresponsibility of the deniers into overstating the certainties of complex science.....”**

**Exactly! That last quote is completely!! and precisely!! the point being made by many, many skeptics!! GOOD GRIEF!!** Climate change is “difficult to predict in detail” and the certainties of complex science have been overstated. These are just “models” for goodness sake – imperfect models! We must not impetuously do many trillions of dollars damage to our economy, and spend many trillions more on useless solutions or ineffectively supporting the third world. **Never should such flawed and admittedly uncertain information be accepted as the basis for totally transforming our economy, society, and culture.** The alarmists are trying to direct trillions of dollars based on this imperfect science. **We must continue to object so they can be stopped!**

---

I extend thanks, as always, to the many writers, commentators, researchers, and others, from all political extremes, whose hard work helps me greatly. They gather details and present much information. About all I do is gather, organize, summarize, and attempt to fill in with comments – commonly referred to as my frequent “RANTS”.

More comments will follow on important topics and personal thoughts as our President battles through tough territory. I want to join other conservatives in recognizing and respecting our new President – and supporting him when we should. But when we oppose our President's policies, we should act in accordance with values of decency – but that doesn't preclude a healthy dose of sarcasm and satire, which are valuable tools for political commentary.