

Posted by: **Michael Gersh**  
Dec 20, 04:16 AM

This is a sad time for science. Anyone who has been involved in the world of academic science is grieving right now. I thought that the situation in physics over string theory was bad - a researcher needs to be a true believer in string theory to get big grants and choice assignments - but there is no organized effort to discredit other schools of thought (that I am aware of). Now we have this.

The difference is caused by the sheer amount of money and resources at stake, plus the factor that some portion of humanity has a religious belief that humanity has spoiled his nest, and the AGW hypothesis fits that body of belief well. Then we have the statist left which plans to use this issue to garner great power for their cause. We are talking about trillions of dollars here, and the full involvement of politics and industry. Now we see from these emails that careers have been ruined, and governments led astray.

The dichotomy we face is immense. The political and industrial stakes have never been this large. The statist left and the Malthusian true believers will continue to act as if this is good science to further their agenda, even as anyone with a sound basis in science knows just how badly the cause of science and understanding of climate has been corrupted. This will not end well.

We are not being well served by the media either. Maybe they do not understand the issues, but they surely never present them honestly. The question is not even about warming climate. It is only opartially about man's contribution to whatever warming there might be. The real question, which science has not yet even addressed, is whether curtailing CO2 emissions will have any effect on world climate, and if it will have any effect, will this effect be negative or positive. Drowning bears and melting ice have nothing to do with it, but they make good television. Sad.

Posted by: **Nolie**  
Dec 20, 05:02 AM

What a web of deceit we weave when we seek to deceive.

Posted by: **carbonyes**  
Dec 20, 06:04 AM

Mr. Douglass, as I said in my email, after the great discovery, that you wrote the article, well written, and we appreciate your participation in the battle and all you have to offer.

As Michael Gersh has stated above, man there is a lot at stake here and the sheer magnitude of the power and influence that we are up against can take your breath away. It is kind of like David fighting Goliath, but never fear, greater is He who is with us than those who are with them. Maybe we can use them as cannon fodder against themselves. Got to have a sense of

humor in this battle.

God bless!  
Ken Shaw, Esq.

Posted by: **Peter/London**  
Dec 20, 06:39 AM

Just in case you might have missed this...

[[www.telegraph.co.uk](http://www.telegraph.co.uk)]

Posted by: **When Pigs Fly**  
Dec 20, 06:59 AM

I don't wanna be mean but... I'm gonna be mean. Has anyone else noticed that a good number of the major Chicken Little play'ahs on the world stage have some aura or aberrance in their visage (look at Peter/London's UK link)? This dude looks like a cross between Rumpelstiltskin, Rasputin, and the Beatle's shaman. Who in their right mind would place themselves or their posterity in this guy's clutches?

This engineering Dr. puts "railroading" in climatology. How apropos for this dude to have headed up this Copenhagen coven/Celtic/necromancer carbon-based life-form hating conference. The entire ACC/AGW religion is the ultimate railroading job. If D'uh O gets us committed to this globalist boondoggle we should demand our money back and him impeached/removed (whatever it takes) for subjugating our nation, contrary to our Mother Laws, to an international body's supposedly punitively enforceable laws.

Posted by: **patroness**  
Dec 20, 07:49 AM

I love how God is using nature to have his say.

I looooooooooove God's sense of humor.

Joy to the WORLD>

Posted by: **canuck**  
Dec 20, 07:58 AM

Unfortunately, there is no single entity for the convergence of the various "sciences" that constitute the climate industry the even can begin to evaluate and rate the quality of the science put forward. Climate "science" is a stew, unfortunately most of what has been cooked has been

the results to the taste of the chefs.

The likelihood is that the IJC is a commercial publication that carries the authorization of the Royal Meteorological Society. This is frequently seen in all areas of scientific endeavor where limited numbers of the hard copy are sold, usually to libraries.

Therefore, the place to begin is with RMeS board of directors who need to place their own credibility on line with the publication or withdraw the society's moniker from the journal. The peer process must be restored to retain credibility and there must be a public process to appeal to the sponsoring society. There has to be an open process to review the reviewers.

The alternative is to have libraries begin to withdraw the subscriptions and in its place label the Journal as a commercial, non-peer reviewed publication. Only alarmist authors will then publishing in a clearly opinion journal. It will take time but they will be marginalized as competition based in online publications takes over as the standard.

Posted by: **tarpon**  
Dec 20, 08:08 AM

The only salvation of science is open science. That way everyone can referee the papers. read them for themselves and decide. A formal referee may be of some value, but assigning credibility on the scale of today's peer review process shows clearly what happens to integrity.

The subverting of the peer revue process was a necessary part, the bribing of researchers with grant money the club.

Sad to see science descend to these depths.

Posted by: **Gatorgirl**  
Dec 20, 08:11 AM

Very nice detailed article and I'm sure it makes a lot of sense to the scientific types, however, you need to break it down for us, brother. If you look at a group of people as a curve, we're not all great thinkers, but most do have common sense and will understand when we're being sold a crock if it's presented in common sense language. No wonder the msm hasn't gotton behind the emails, they don't understand it at all, either.

Posted by: **topperj**  
Dec 20, 08:37 AM

Wow. There must be a LOT of money in climate "science" for this much chicanery and deception. Shame on these pseudo-scientists. Wouldn't this make a great Law and Order. Or maybe a 48 Hours expose. Or maybe Hewitt and the boys can do a gotcha interview on 58 Minutes with Mann, Jones, et al. And, imagine there's an Easter Bunny. Same probability of

these being a reality any time soon.

Posted by: **ReConUSMC**

Dec 20, 09:04 AM

In their 'own' words finally ; You decide ..... Duh !

We heard the Clinton Right wing Conspiracy change by Hillary that turned to be a lie . Bubba was flat guilty .

But this is turning out to be the great lie of all times ever told ..... in fact it has International Global wings .....from Al Gore , This President . Congress , EPA , Scientist world wide ,Colleges , The Media , dirty UN money , The redistribution mongers ,The third world , GE , Wall Street , ""traders "" , Green Peace , Syria Club , Marxist groups we saw their red flags ,Special interest groups and and even Main street .

We need for the Supreme court to hear these countless lies and cover ups .

And "Finally " nothing but the facts outed .

Then the American people can decide not Congress or any president what is right .

Posted by: **CynicalMan**

Dec 20, 09:08 AM

This issue of "Global Warming/Climate Change" has all the suspense and intrigue of a "Spy vs. Spy" cartoon.

When do the bombs start going off?

My prediction is that there will be a few unfortunate accidents of fatal consequence before this story is fully told. If it ever is.

As the major media continues to try and "hide the decline" by ignoring the matter we must continue to get the truth to the people by this and other electronic means. Use your email lists to fight back against those who have used their lists to forge deciet. The truth must come to light through prehaps the only means left to the people.

Posted by: **bob57**

Dec 20, 09:21 AM

The final product of most scientific research is publication. The number, quality and positioning of publications (the prestige of the journals in which your work appears) are critically important to one's career as a scientist. Your promotion through the ranks of academia depends on these criteria, but also your chances of funding do as well. The most brilliant concept has virtually no chance of being funded if not accompanied by a track record of publications along that line of research. The same people who review funding proposals also review articles submitted for

journal publication. This 'peer review' process, which works identically in both funding and publication, has created a perfectly circular chain of reasoning. If your 'brilliant concept' interferes with the current prevailing wisdom, you cannot join in the circular chain.

The same circular reasoning also applies to experimental data. I once considered a career in particle physics and was working in such a lab. I sat down one day with the scientist in charge of data analysis. The experiment would acquire 1000 hours of data at a national lab and all of the results would be fed into the computer at the end. This happened to be a search for a new particle, and the theory suggested that a total of six of these would be produced in the 1000 hours. I naively asked how long analysis would take and was told 'about a year'. I was shocked. "Why so long?" I asked. I was told that the processing would be adjusted and the entire dataset reanalyzed if the number was quite different than 6. That was my last day in particle physics.

As a working scientist, I warn my students about this trap. Yes, some measurements in a dataset do need to be discarded, or modified, if you know they are erroneous. But as the stakes increase (money and reputation), it becomes too easy to discard real data that does not fit in with one's hypothesis. Most of my students have read the Harry Potter series of books, so I use the example of the Mirror of Erised. ... (350 word limit)

Posted by: **Grant from Comfort**  
Dec 20, 09:37 AM

There's a growing parallel problem in my world: practically fraudulent project proposals. The renewable energy "industry" is full of nefarious individuals that purport to develop projects (wind, solar, landfill gas, etc.). Too often, conceptional engineering is barely better than what would come from 30 minutes of back-of-the-napkin brainstorming. The financial basis for raising investment money is frequently "justified" on excessively "half-glass-full" accounts of capital cost, ludicrous engineering & construction schedules and unattainable revenue production projections.

Increasingly, professional engineers are getting caught-up in the frenzy to "make it work". Some old guys like me know that it's past time to draw-the-line. Younger guys often don't have the "situational awareness" to know that making the client happy should not extend past strict ethical bounds.

There is tremendous pressure to "go-along-get-along" and given the federal commitment to "renewables", the bias to "press on" overwhelms any technical or commercial objection. Frankly, a lot of good folks have succumbed to what NASA used to call "go fever"....which almost always ends bad.

Risk assessment in any endeavor necessarily rests on a stack of interlocking estimates that must be reality based...otherwise the overall assessment will be hopelessly flawed (and the flaws always mask higher and sometimes fatal risks).

The concept of "ethics" needs to be restored, especially amongst science and engineering professionals whose work forms the basis of herculean commitments in both the public and private sectors.

Posted by: **Rob Misek**

Dec 20, 09:42 AM

This demonstrates that the truth is the only thing we share in peace. Lies are the beginning of every corruption.

Thank science for our communication revolution of free speech on the internet that identifies and exposes lies like never before in history.

Even so, the truth cannot succeed on its own. It always waits for us to stand up for it with our discrimination, values, speech and laws.

It's time to give the truth some more help. We have the technology to easily record all communication like never before in history. These recordings should be used to expose liars, their corruption and bring them to justice. Lying is currently criminalized where we could control it, in court and contracts. Now we can control it everywhere.

This is the frontier of the free speech revolution.

All we need to do is criminalize all lying to start the ball rolling.

Posted by: **sherlock**

Dec 20, 10:19 AM

As a non-scientist I do my part by reacting skeptically to products advertised as "green". If I am at Home Depot shopping for grass seed, I go right past the ones that blivate about the environment on their package. I know there are some products that are crafted with a sincere concern for the environment (which I share), but the louder they bray about it, the less likely I am to buy them.

Oh, and no product of the politically-driven enterprise known as General Electric EVER enters my home.

Posted by: **Uriel**

Dec 20, 10:27 AM

To be honest, I didn't read the whole article. I got about half-way through and the clear conspiracy and the unbelievable HYPOCRISY made me want to puke. Especially the part where "Wigley" says that "under normal circumstances" this would "cause him [Douglass] to lose his job," when it's clear that Wigley, Jones, and the others in the CONSPIRACY are the

ones who are establishing those "normal" circumstances.

Are there any real investigations planned by either Congress, Parliament, or any Law Enforcement Agency?

I'm sorry, but a so-called "investigation" by the MET Office -- AT THE HADLEY CENTER -- of the CRU -- AT THE HADLEY CENTER -- is an obvious attempt at a whitewash of the whole Conspiracy. Is there anyone capable of performing - and willing to perform - a black-wash of the whole "ClimateGate" Conspiracy, such that the conspirators face the very serious repercussions that they should be subject to.

I mean, how do any of these guys still have jobs?

And how is it that none of them have yet been indicted on FRAUD and CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT FRAUD charges? Unbelievable!

Posted by: **jr**  
Dec 20, 10:32 AM

Now the real problem here starts with the NYT, not surprising. The reporter lacked any intellectual curiosity perhaps he lacked any intellect. Had he followed an unbiased line of QUESTIONING and reading and research ( I know that detracts from the Manhattan cocktail hour) he might have found that there two sides to the story, two sides means it is not settled. That of course is a difficult concept for products of journalism schools to grasp having been ideologically trained in the first place at places like Columbia. Had this ignorant reporter done the job envisioned we might today have a different and more relevant view of things that probably are natural. Instead we are looking at the possibility of the loss of freedom. The scientists in this whole thing are despicable, grant driven, cherished hypothesis driven and arrogant. They definately are from substandard moral stock. Now one might say the deniers also have cherished hypothesis, well they do not need one. All they need to do is support their questions about the hypothesis de jour. If in fact they meet the peer review criteria what is to fear about publishing their data, an intense an open debate then could follow. But no these scientists and this reporter and the NYT wished no questioning, calls names instead of debating, gets people fired for disagreeing and so on. To me that means they have zero faith in their hypothesis. This is about getting grants, thisw about getting recognition, this about arrogance and ego. The shame is the public will never really be able to have a good grasp of ALL of the issues. Folks like Albert, raised to be in charge Gore use such hyperbole that it is almost impossible to quesiton anything. I think he does this on purpose in the grand tradition of Goebels. The most serious issue is the newspaper of record does not effectively call him on it. That is today the NYT under a third generation ... (350 word limit)

Posted by: **jeffd**  
Dec 20, 10:44 AM

I want people reading here to realize that this post has a great deal of meaning in the world of the consensus. These papers address the very core of the issue of future global warming as they address the only means of determining the future climate. -- the models.

There has been a lot of work done on this avenue and currently there is at least one other paper being unreasonably blocked from publication on this very topic. This is a story with many facets that can no longer be won by climate science and if I don't miss my guess, will shake the whole foundation of the thing.

We owe a debt to honest scientists like Dr's Douglass and Christy who selflessly publish results based on the data no matter the consequences to their careers. No matter which way the data takes the science, we must respect what it says.

Posted by: **Uriel**  
Dec 20, 10:49 AM

Posted by: Michael Gersh

---

" I thought that the situation in physics over string theory was bad - a researcher needs to be a true believer in string theory to get big grants and choice assignments - but there is no organized effort to discredit other schools of thought (that I am aware of). "

I would imagine you're re-thinking that assumption about now!

I have known Global Warming to be false for years now; but, I NEVER suspected the degree and scope of this flagitious fraud.

=====

Posted by: Grant from Comfort

---

"There's a growing parallel problem in my world: practically fraudulent project proposals. The renewable energy "industry" is full of nefarious individuals that purport to develop projects (wind, solar, landfill gas, etc.) "

It's no real surprise. After all, the "renewable energy" industry is premised entirely on the supposed "need" to eliminate CO2 emissions to prevent the "Global Warming" which we now all know is fraudulent.

Fraud begets fraud in this case; and I assume in many other cases as well. The consequent effects of the disclosure of the Global Hoaxing will eventually reach every phase of life that have up to now been reached by the "Global Warming" MOVEMENT. That is to say, almost everything.

Posted by: **ReConUSMC**  
Dec 20, 10:54 AM

Today Obama announced \$ 5 Billion more for Green Jobs and Electric Cars .....  
So tell me Obama what do Electric Cars run off of coming from Power plants ? Coal and Oil  
that's what Bro in fact 92.2 % .  
So why are you closing Coal Plants and not allowing for New Oil Drilling or Nuclear plants ?  
You said ""Alternatives "" ..... Sir in all due respect we get 1.2 % of all power in America  
from Solar , Wind and Etc after 40 years of testing .

\*\*\*\*\*

He who builds a great Sail Boat without Sails is a fool to the All he misleads to and Ill fate .  
The Art of War  
Obama is our sail Ship builder without sails .

Posted by: **angrytom**  
Dec 20, 11:11 AM

This entire administration is ONE BIG CONSPIRACY ! America had better hope that in 2010  
republicans retake the house and senate or we are all DOMMED !! FOREVER !!!!!

Posted by: **Choey**  
Dec 20, 11:12 AM

The EA-CRU scandal, unfortunately, is only the tip of the junk science iceberg. Much  
environmental science is shot through with the same kind of ideologues pushing their political  
agendas instead of science. From the Alar fraud to the DDT delusions to the polar bear  
nonsense, there is more politics than science. I'm glad I'm retired and don't have to put up with  
this politicized garbage.

Choey

I'm more concerned about the intellectual climate.

Posted by: **CEH**  
Dec 20, 12:04 PM

Science meets politics. It's fun to watch the "scientific" mind of Santer (especially) working  
overtime on his corruption experiment. A common man promoting the "flat-earth" science of  
our time.

Posted by: **sherlock**  
Dec 20, 12:21 PM

This is how Western science could be perverted into "Soviet" science.

Unless the perpetrators of this fraud are exposed and publicly denounced by honest scientists, within a generation their imitators will have infected other branches of science, and we will be on the way to state control of research (and its findings), and thus state-controlled truth.

Honest men and women in the sciences, wake up! Time to saddle-up, and ride to spread the warning like Paul Revere. Okay, you Brits can use some other imagery, but get on it!

Posted by: **Dr. Dave**

Dec 20, 12:24 PM

The authors provide a rare glimpse at the seamy underbelly of publishing in the "peer reviewed" climatology journals. The significance of this may be lost on many readers. In the world of "science" the "literature" is everything, the chatter on the blogosphere is irrelevant. The release of the CRU documents finally provide validation of what many climate scientists have long suspected. That is, it is nearly impossible to publish any work that contradicts the validity of the AGW theory. This article details the degree of corruption that exists in the publication and peer review process in the climate literature.

Ben Santer has what is referred to as a "white collar welfare job" at one of our nation's three national labs. He works with computer models. His job is to "make them right". Naturally he would feel threatened by the findings of the DCPS paper. What is astounding is the lengths he (and the "team") went to "fight back" and the willing complicity of the journal and its editor. This article provides a detailed snapshot of the events surrounding the publication of a single paper by very prominent authors. Extrapolate this to hundreds of papers submitted to perhaps as many as a dozen journals and it's easy to understand why the AGW fraud won't die easily.

Posted by: **Michael**

Dec 20, 12:40 PM

#### WATERMELON SURPRISE IN COPENHAGEN

The Global Climate Summit is Green on the outside, but Red where it counts

Posted by: **Lee-White Tanks AZ**

Dec 20, 01:22 PM

The above makes the case for the "Scientific" equivalent of Political Correctness (PC).

PC permeates our entire occidental civilization.

God help us if this same batch of buffoons had chosen a science that would have led them into

weapons related technologies.

PC is Thought Control

LEE

Posted by: **Theo Goodwin**

Dec 20, 01:23 PM

Thank you Mr. Douglas and Mr. Christy for doing the hard work of arranging these materials and pointing to the ugly tale that they constitute.

The best that can be said of these Climategate scientists is that they do not operate the way scientists in universities should operate; rather, they operate more like scientists employed by a corporation for the purpose of achieving some specified corporate end instead of scientific understanding. The journal editor behaves as if he, too, is in pursuit of a particular non-scientific end. The reporters are going along to get along.

For scientists, the only appropriate response to DCPS papers, lectures, inquiries, and various other communications would have been to take them on directly. The gang that participated in this email network should have determined the exact nature of their disagreement with DCPS, determined their response to DCPS, and openly published or otherwise publicly shared their view of the disagreement with DCPS. Of course, they should have followed the time honored scientific tradition of attempting to persuade DCPS of its errors. Short of successful persuasion, they should have settled for respectful disagreement in public literature.

However, the Climategate scientists acted as thugs, as if they belonged to a mafia. They attempted to suppress not only DCPS criticisms of their work but DCPS publications. Their success was grand. They controlled the time of DCPS publications, the journal layout, and editorial slant. They were permitted to make a critical response to the DCPS paper on its first appearance. So, the journal editor effectively joined them in their attempt to discredit the DCPS paper.

The game that these Climategate scientists play is "promote your hypotheses and data as the truth and then immediately do whatever possible to slap down any critical voice." That is a rude game worthy of teenagers. It feeds on high-energy narcissism and the joy of slapping down scientists that you are constitutionally incapable of respecting as scientists, colleagues, or human beings.

The damage that Climategate scientists have done to the goodwill that university sponsored science accumulated over the last century is unfathomable. However, the depth of ... (350 word limit)

Posted by: **PsychoDad**

Dec 20, 01:34 PM

: When Pigs Fly new

Dec 20, 04:59 AM

I don't wanna be mean but... I'm gonna be mean....

Ha, yeah I said the same thing about Pauchitari or whatever -- I thought he looked the boss villain in an old James Bond movie.

"Warmingology -- The Modern Science of Climate Health

by L. Ron AI"

Posted by: **PsychoDad**

Dec 20, 01:36 PM

Anyway, praise de Lawd! Beloved Leader succeeded in Copenhagen!! We couldn't be having a nationwide blizzard like this if the poor old globe was still warming, right?!?!

Posted by: **shemesh**

Dec 20, 01:36 PM

The "GREENHOUSE EFFECT"

What bothers me also is, how our universities and colleges have become Greenhouses and Incubators (providing the right temperatures, humidity etc.) for BREEDING poisonous species of AMERICA HATERS who pollute the landscape.

It used to be thought that American Universities breed the next generation of Philo-American ambassadors to be send all over the world - and now the opposite is true.

Posted by: **4USA**

Dec 20, 01:44 PM

The problem we're dealing with here is the vast myriad of motivations. Some are getting rich, others are incompetent and are securing a life-long job simply by being agreeable, while others are hell-bent on one world government, and still others just hate everything about the right and would back the devil if it hurts a conservative. None of them will reveal their true agenda and it's driving them crazy that "as brilliant as they are," they can't keep their lies straight.

Obamanites (meaning any leftist), hate having to explain anything. They're used to people like ACORN and SEIU-thugs that they can buy. Integrity is just too bothersome to them. It's a stumbling block to their "ends-justifies-the-means" modus operandi.

Posted by: **Lizzie**  
Dec 20, 01:54 PM

" ...it's easy to understand why the AGW fraud won't die easily."

But the illusion of consensus surrounding AGW is dead forever. They can no longer sneer at "deniers" because they have not had their work peer reviewed.

Thus it has been demonstrated that climate "scientists" are frauds and no different from people who scam the bereaved via seances.

Posted by: **Paul from SA**  
Dec 20, 02:33 PM

What are their motives? Wealth? Fame? Relevance? Security? Power? Revenge?

We know it's not a pursuit of the truth.

We're still so early in this process. How about an audit of their research money? How about a look into their personal bank accounts?

Getting federal grants for research, I imagine, is similar to getting gov't contracts. To qualify for many, excuse me, to be considered, for a contract/bid, you must be a HUB -- Historically Underutilized Business -- based on race and sex. I know people who have gone out of their way to qualify for a lucrative contract by cheating... by fudging their minority employment numbers, changing the company name to sound like a minority, or hiring a female family member to become minority-owned.

But you expect scientists to be professional and honest. I don't trust them anymore. The occupation is tarnished. What a shame.

Posted by: **biochemist**  
Dec 20, 02:47 PM

As a practicing scientist who regularly participates in the peer-review process both as an author and as a reviewer, I find this entire episode to be a travesty. There are so many violations of the process documented here that I don't even know where to begin. I have spent the last several hours oscillating between saddened and infuriated. Here are some thoughts:

1) As it stands, this journal cannot be regarded as a "peer-review" journal. The process is so clearly corrupted that to give it that description is a disservice to journals that operate by an honest peer evaluation process. (Although one begins to wonder how many such journals remain).

2) If the journal values the principles of science and peer-review, it needs to conduct an open investigation of its editors and dismiss all who engage in such practices, forthwith. Unfortunately, one of the primary players in this tawdry episode is THE Editor, not some associate member of the Editorial Board.

3) There is no question in my mind that the actions of Santer, Jones and the rest were reprehensible. However, I am most greatly disappointed in the Editor of the journal, Glenn McGregor. The editor is to be the gatekeeper of the peer-review process. The handling of the two manuscripts identified in these e-mail exchanges (that from DPCC and Santer et al.) shows an appalling level of collusion and corruption between editor and authors. How can the broader scientific community or the public believe that there is anything resembling objectivity in the review of any manuscript published there?

4) To me, the actions of Santer et al. reflect a group that believes their data, analyses, and conclusions to be so weak that a single contrary publication is sufficient to unravel the whole construct. Well, they're the experts. Who am I to argue?

Posted by: **Keizer**  
Dec 20, 03:24 PM

bob57 - Great post!!! I have a feeling we lost a great potential particle scientist.

I wonder how many other bob57's of the world have lost (as scientists in their chosen field) because of politics and the Santer's of the world. I hope they are publicly shamed, do they have any shame? How can you sleep at night trying to get someone fired for disagreeing with you?

Scientific and engineering breakthrough's happen because of rebels not conformists. All human invention will stop or slow greatly if we enforce conformity on our original thinkers. Who would logically think (without modern telescopes) that the Earth revolves around the Sun, that space can be bent or that time itself can be a variable?

I think we can wait until the invention of the Star Trek Holodeck for all scientific progress to stop. Once that is invented I think all motivation for work will stop completely.

Posted by: **Michael**  
Dec 20, 03:31 PM

WATERMELON SURPRISE IN COPENHAGEN  
The Global Climate Summit is Green on the outside, but Red where it counts

[[rjmoeller.com](http://rjmoeller.com)]

Posted by: **Dr. Dave**  
Dec 20, 03:57 PM

Paul from SA and Lizzie,

Be careful not to tar with the same brush the likes of Lindzen, Christy, Douglass, Happer, Singer, Spencer, Balling, Michaels, Idso, etc. These are the "good guys" ...the "real scientists". This article illustrates how difficult it is for anyone not completely ensconced in the polemic of AGW to get their work published. This article does not impugn the entire field of climate science. It illustrates the corruption by a relatively small group of like-minded "activists". That is the take-home message.

Consensus is a political term. It has no meaning in science. This article could have been more illustrative if the authors had spent a paragraph or so and explained the findings of the DCPS paper and how it relates to what Ben Santer does for a living. This is the bigger story and explains the motives of Santer et al. The Wegman report of a few years ago [[http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/108/home/07142006\\_Wegman\\_Report.pdf](http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/108/home/07142006_Wegman_Report.pdf)] described the incestuous relationship of many of the "top AGW proponents" in the climate science field. It seems it was largely ignored. The CRU documents simply validate what Wegman et al implied and now Douglass and Christy prove.

I realize that my medical analogies may grow wearisome but I am reminded of Drs. Marshall and Warren. By observation alone they theorized that gastric (or duodenal) ulcer disease is caused by bacterial infection, specifically H. pylori (at that time referred to as Campylobacter pylori). In 1982 this ran contrary to accepted medical science. They had a LOT stacked against them. This included pharmaceutical concerns with multi-billion dollar interests, almost the entire specialty field of gastroenterology (Dr. Marshall is a Family Practitioner) and surgeons who had created fellowships in gastric ulcer surgery. It turned out that Marshall and Warren were right (and were awarded the Nobel prize). The gastroenterologists accepted the new paradigm, the surgery fellowships vanished and the drug companies eventually protected their profits by making virtually all H2-RA antagonists and (now) at least 2 proton pump inhibitors OTC products. Nobody ... (350 word limit)

Posted by: **Uriel**  
Dec 20, 05:05 PM

Posted by: Lee-White Tanks AZ

---

"God help us if this same batch of buffoons had chosen a science that would have led them into weapons related technologies. "

I don't know Lee. The way these guys practice their "science", they'd have invented a bow & arrow and claimed it as the most powerful weapon ever devised. But, the bow & arrow these

clowns would invent would likely shoot **backwards** --- problem solved.

Posted by: **Keizer**  
Dec 20, 07:07 PM

Please note that I am often posting inside of 20 seconds while a kid or wife is demanding my attention. My grammar and spelling are usually not entirely dreadful, but "pubically shamed" was pretty comical.

My thanks and appreciation for brave and ethical people like Douglass, Christy, Pearson and Singer.

Posted by: **Keizer**  
Dec 20, 07:20 PM

From Dr. Dave:

The money riding on the AGW fraud makes the pharmaceutical industry's billions look like chump change. The "great sin" committed by DCPS was revealing climate models don't match real world observations (oh, the horror!). Just imagine the amount of damage the AGW cabal might experience if more honest researchers were able to publish the truth."

Funny thing is the vast majority of people aren't going to observe bacteria. Everyone north of the mason dixon line notices that we freeze our a\*\*es off every winter like we always have.

Even if global warming were true, not many of us are against it.

Posted by: **Lizzie**  
Dec 20, 08:53 PM

Dr Dave:

Since the Warmists claim to speak for all climate "scientists" it is they, not me, who tar them all with the same brush.

Lizzie

Posted by: **buster11706**  
Dec 20, 09:26 PM

Short and sweet...it's all CO2 BS

Posted by: **wbhickok**  
Dec 20, 09:34 PM

Not sure for how long, but most university papers have completely ignored this green fraud. I have access and read/glance at five different university daily newspapers, and nothing has been mentioned.  
The sad thing is that two of these five are student run.

Those same student socialist and campus dems who brand and protest any conservative speaker as ignorant and a hate-monger have been able to intimidate and silence the daily papers to not mention anything.

I'm sure they too couldn't care about the truth or be bothered with it.

Posted by: **Uriel**  
Dec 20, 10:08 PM

Keizer,

"but "pubically shamed" was pretty comical."

I don't know, I'm starting to think it's a good idea. Your follow-on was pretty good too: "do they have any (pubic) shame?"

Posted by: **kevoka**  
Dec 20, 11:38 PM

Mr Douglas and Christy,  
Thank you for putting these particular emails into context. I had read them, but did not have the background context. There are other documents in the CRU release that will require the interested parties to speak up in a similar manner in order to get the full story.

Two documents that I think should be of interest are:

ipcc\_tar\_master.rtf  
ipcc\_tar\_master2.rtf

(<http://www.climate-gate.org/cru/documents/>)

These are collated Expert commnets for the IPCC TAR for WG1 spanning April - June 2000. My understanding is that these comments were not made public (or if so are not available today), nor was the Editors notes on their disposition. Something that did finally happen for the AR4 Expert/Reviews and Editors comments.

The comments contained in the 2 files distinctly do not indicate the "science is settled".

Posted by: **james01**

Dec 21, 12:47 AM

David Douglass;

First, thank you for researching the CRU emails and sharing your findings. I read the whole article. I did not have time to read the link to your IJC paper.

I have a question. I found this note in your email chronology.

[Note b. Sherwood misunderstand the problem. RAOBCORE 1.4 had a shift to warmer temperatures in the middle of the time series, not a spike, which means the problem was located at a point in the time series which causes the greatest error in the trend calculation.]

Maybe I missed it. Was a cause for this shift ever determined? Is there any history showing other mid-time series shifts in data from these sensors? Has the manufacturer of the hardware attempted to duplicate the shift by simulating failure of a component in the hardware?

And a comment on this exchange;

Thorne: "The uncertainty with respect to upper air temperature estimates in the tropics is so substantial that we can draw no meaningful conclusions as to whether or not there is a discrepancy between long-term trends in the real world and our expectations from climate models."

Douglass: Does this statement include the results in the IJC paper that I published with John Christy? In particular, are the UAH and the RSS satellite MSU temperature trends also included?

Thorne: (my paraphrase) Yes. It is unfair to exclude some data sets because even though issues have been found or undoubtedly exist with all datasets, we must be fair and use all datasets. Also, you annoy me. All the effort responding to your rejection of some observational data due to anomalous and unexplained shifts to warmer temperatures takes important people like me away from doing useful science.

My comment: As a former aerospace engineer, I find Thorne's position to be extremely stupid. If, as Thorne says, "issues have been found or undoubtedly exist with all datasets", then all datasets should be rejected. Instead, under such circumstances Thorne thinks all datasets should be accepted. This makes absolutely no sense. Also, in my experience, hardware failure in a sensor can cause sudden and persistent shifts in telemetry data. ... (350 word limit)

Posted by: **sdcougar**

Dec 21, 10:43 AM

Posted by: jr

Dec 20, 08:32 AM referenced a 'reporter' at the NYT.

I suspect that Climategate fallout has a lot to do with the fact that this is his last day on the job at NYT. For some reason, Andy Revkin called it quits.

Posted by: **Socratease**

Dec 21, 04:08 PM

If you set this story to music, it would sound a lot like Tom Lehrer's "Lobachevsky".

[[www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com)]

Posted by: **jim1251**

Dec 21, 07:13 PM

just want to add my thanks to the author for explaining these emails. I've been slogging through all of them, and this particular exchange seemed to me to be the most serious I'd come across. I saved them and intended to post them on one of the various fora to ask if someone with a background could explain. To my pleasant surprise, I find this article and explanation! Thanks to the author(s) for wading into the fray, I hope and pray that others who are wounded by this whole sordid affair will do the same. Perhaps someone should dedicate a blog to all who have been so wronged by this to contribute their stories.

Posted by: **tomklein**

Dec 22, 12:28 AM

Dear Drs Douglas and Christy and other authors,  
I read your publication not long after it appeared. I thought it was a very lucid and well presented paper and in normal scientific discourse it should have put to rest any claim of the existence of greenhouse caused "hot spot". I also read the the "response" put out by Santer et al. I believe. I thought the response was garbage. So, in spite of all the machination and roadblocks, your work's message was received and appreciated, at least by some.

Posted by: **antipodean centrist**

Dec 22, 08:51 PM

If you haven't seen it already there's also a situation in NZ which you may find interesting. It is, essentially, a replay of CRU & Hansen stonewalling and also "model misrepresentations". Details here -

[[www.climateconversation.wordshine.co.nz](http://www.climateconversation.wordshine.co.nz)]

&

[[www.climateconversation.wordshine.co.nz](http://www.climateconversation.wordshine.co.nz)]

There's a couple of aspects of worth highlighting:

1. I am not sure how aggressively it's been reviewed but if it's correct it's another nail in the coffin.

2. Dr. Jim Salinger (who no longer works for NIWA) started the "official" NZ government sponsored model/graph in the 1980's when he was at the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia. Coincidence? Perhaps, but I think not. Conspiracy? Perhaps, and looks more likely as information unfolds.

3. The NZ base dataset is likely the purest of any existing, globally. Their base data can safely be assumed to have integrity. Punctiliousness is a national trait. It is well maintained, diverse and relatively complete. Topographically NZ is as diverse as any country. It is relatively pristine and does not have any significant "urban heat islands". Its population of about 4.5 million lives in a country that's 13% bigger than the states of NY, CT, MA, NH, RI and VT combined: low density. It also has more than it's share of livestock. I am comfortable asserting that there is no other significant country or region that shares all of these characteristics, and also has an uncorrupted data set.

Keep up the good fight, cheers

Posted by: **bbbeard**

Dec 22, 11:21 PM

Good work.

I have a small technical comment: DHD and JRC, you are evidently confused about the formula for the standard error and how it relates to the standard deviation. The standard error is the standard deviation divided by  $\sqrt{N}$ , not by  $\sqrt{N-1}$ . This is a very common mistake, because the formula for estimating standard deviation from a sample of size  $N$  contains the curious factor  $1/\sqrt{N-1}$  instead of the  $1/\sqrt{N}$  that you would expect from the formal definition of variance as the second cumulant. The substitution of  $\sqrt{N-1}$  in place of  $\sqrt{N}$  in the standard deviation is the standard practice because the naive estimator is biased for finite  $N$ . Unbiasing the sample standard deviation requires multiplying the naive expression by  $\sqrt{N/(N-1)}$ . However, the standard error is the standard error, so to speak. If you know the population standard deviation, just divide by  $\sqrt{N}$ . If all you have is the sample, then compute the standard deviation using the unbiased estimator and then divide by  $\sqrt{N}$ .

This likely does not affect your conclusions one iota, but in future work it would be best if you got this detail right.

For more information try googling "standard error" and click on the Wikipedia page....

**BBB**