A STORY OF INTRIGUE, DECEPTION AND SECRECY

On November 17, 2009 some 3,000 e-mails, software files, and other documents from the University of East A
Research Unit were covertly released onto the Internet. In his November 28, 2009 telegraph.co.uk article “Climate
the Worst Scientific Scandal of Our Generation,” Christopher Booker summarized the far-reaching ramificatio
exposed in these documents:

The reason why even the Guardian’s George Monbiot has expressed total shock and dismay at the picture reve
documents is that their authors are not just any old bunch of academics. Their importance cannot be overestimated. V
looking at here is the small group of scientists who have for years been more influential in driving the worldwide alarm
warming than any others, not least through the role they play at the heart of the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Clim
(IPCC).

Professor Philip Jones, the CRU’s director, is in charge of the two key sets of data used by the IPCC to draw up its reports.
link to the Hadley Centre, part of the UK Met Office, which selects most of the IPCC’s key scientific contributor
temperature record is the most important of the four sets of temperature data on which the IPCC and governments re
for their predictions that the world will warm to catastrophic levels unless trillions of dollars are spent to avert it.

Dr Jones is also a key part of the closely knit group of American and British scientists responsible for promoting that pict
temperatures conveyed by Michael Mann’s “hockey stick” graph which 10 years ago turned climate history on its hea
that, after 1,000 years of decline, global temperatures have recently shot up to their highest level in recorded history.

Given star billing by the IPCC, not least for the way it appeared to eliminate the long-accepted Medieval Warm Period as
peaks fall is their area today, the graph became the central icon of the entire man-made global warming mo

Since 2003, however, when the statistical methods used to create the “hockey stick” were first exposed as fundamenta
an expert Canadian statistician Steve McIntyre, an increasingly heated battle has been raging between Mann’s supp
themselves “the Hockey Team”, and McIntyre and his own allies, as they have ever more devastatingly called into q
entire statistical basis on which the IPCC and CRU construct their case.

The senders and recipients of the leaked CRU emails constitute a cast list of the IPCC’s scientific elite, including not just
Team”, such as Dr Mann himself, Dr Jones and his CRU colleague Keith Briffa, but Ben Santer, responsible for a highly c
rewriting of key passages in the IPCC’s 1995 report; Kevin Trenberth, who similarly controversially pushed th
scaremongering over hurricane activity; and Gavin Schmidt, right-hand man to Al Gore’s ally Dr James Hansen, whose record of surface temperature data is second in importance only to that of the IPCC and CRU construct their case.

Writing in The Atlantic, Clive Crook is more candid: “In my previous post on Climategate I blithely said that nothing in the
e-mail dump surprised me much. Having waded more deeply over the weekend I take that back. The closed-mindedness of
men of science, their willingness to go to any lengths to defend a preconceived message, is surprising even to me. The si
corruption is overpowering.” [159]

As Charlie Martin explained in “Global WarmingGate: What Does It Mean,” the e-mails suggested:

1) [T]he authors co-operated covertly to ensure that only papers favorable to CO2-forced AGW [Anthropoge
Warming or man-made global warming] were published, and that editors and journals publishing contrary
punished. They also attempted to ‘discipline’ scientists and journalists who published skeptical information.

2) [T]he authors manipulated and ‘massaged’ the data to strengthen the case in favor of unprecedented CO2-force
to suppress their own data if it called AGW into question.

3) [T]he authors co-operated (perhaps the word is ‘conspired’) to prevent data from being made available to oth
through either data archiving requests or through the Freedom of Information Acts of both the U.S. and the UK. [1}
WHOS WHO [8,38]

(CRU) CLIMATIC RESEARCH UNIT, UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA -- ENG
PHIL JONES: director; custodian of CRU temperature set; contributor to IPCC.
KEITH BRIFFA: deputy director; lead author of the millennial paleoclimate section,
2007 IPCC report.
TREVOR DAVIES: present director; current pro-vice chancellor UEA;
IAN “HARRY” HARRIS: researcher, programmer.
MICK KELLY: fellow; leading climate scientist.
TIM OSBORN: academic fellow; specialist in climate modeling.

MET OFFICE HADLEY CENTRE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE -- ENG
CHRIS FOLLAND: research fellow; former head Met Office Hadley Centre Climate
Variability and Forecasting Group; IPCC author and editor.

(TCCCR) TYNDALL CENTRE FOR CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH -- ENG
MIKE HULME: director; fellow, professor of climate science: UEA.
TIM MITCHELL: present 1997-2004; PhD: 2001: UEA (supervised by Mike Hulme)
[115]; possibly software author “Harry” (of HARRY_READ_ME.TXT) was analyzing.

(NASA GISS) NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION:
GODDARD INSTITUTE FOR SPACE STUDIES, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY -- USA
JAMES HANSEN: director.
GAVIN SCHMIDT: climatologist; modeler; co-founder of realclimate.org.

(NOAA NCDC) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION:
NATIONAL CLIMATIC DATA CENTER -- USA
THOMAS KARL: director.
EUGENE WAHL: physical scientist: paleoclimatology. [104]

(NCAR) NATIONAL CENTER FOR ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH -- USA
KEVIN TRENBERTH: head of climate analysis section; lead author of the 1995, 2001,
and 2007 IPCC reports. [102]
CASPAR AMMANN: scientist: climate and global dynamics; co-founder realclimate.org.

(PSU) PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY -- USA
MICHAEL E. MANN: director Earth System Science Center; lead author of the hockey
stick graph; co-founder realclimate.org.

(UCAR) UNIVERSITY CORPORATION FOR ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH - USA
TOM WIGLEY: senior scientist; former director and current visiting fellow: CRU.

RASMUS E. BENESTAD: senior scientist; Institute; co-founder realclimate
RAYMOND BRADLEY: director; University of Massachusetts (USA)
TIMOTHY CARTER: former realclimate.org.
EDWARD R. COOK: director of Observatory Tree-Ring Laboratory
GRANT FOSTER: chief scientist: UEA;
MALCOLM HUGHES: professor of Arizona (USA); co-author of the
EYSTEIN JANSEN: research direct Research (NO); coordinating lead
STEVEN MCINTYRE: mathematici of the 2007 IPCC report. [101]
ROSS MCKITRICK: professor of the IPCC report. [100]
BENJAMIN SANTER: statistician: Laborator
STEPHEN SCHNEIDER: profession Global
RICHARD SOMERVILLE: profess Potsdam (DE); co-founder of realclimate.org.
JONATHAN OVERPECK: director of IPCC Assessm
STEPHEN SCHNEIDER: professions AGW, and
ERIC J. STEIG: director of Quarter

30 YEARS IN THE MAKING
FALSEHOOD, JUST AS A LITTLE FIRE BURNS A LOT OF WOOD."
-- HAZRAT ALI (D. 661)
1 INTRIGUE
INTERFERENCE WITH PEER REVIEW PROCESS TO SUPPRESS RESEARCH
JEOPARDIZING THE "CONSENSUS" ABOUT AGW (ANTHROPOGENIC GLOBAL WARMING OR MAN-MADE GLOBAL WARMING)

WORDS TO PONDER

"[T]o capture the public's imagination ... we have to offer up some scary scenarios, make simplified dramatic statements and little mention of any doubts one might have.... Each of us has to decide the right balance between being effective, and being honest." -- STEPHEN SCHNEIDER (1989), contributor to all four IPCC reports. [88]

"Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?" -- MAURICE STRONG (1990), founder of the UN Environment Program [91]

""[The observed] data don't matter' ... 'The data don't matter' ... 'Besides, we're not basing our recommendations [for immediate reductions in CO2 emissions] based upon the data; we're basing them upon computer models." -- CHRIS FOLLAND (1991) of the UK Met Office. [162]

"Unless we announce disasters no one will listen." -- JOHN HOUGHTON (1994), first co-chair of the IPCC WG1. [89]

"If you put tomfoolery into a computer, nothing comes out of it but tomfoolery. But this tomfoolery, having passed through a very expensive machine, is somehow ennobled and no one dares criticise it." -- PIERRE GALLOIS [163]

"There is no opinion, however absurd, which men will not readily embrace as soon as they can be brought to the conviction that it is generally adopted." -- ARTHUR SCHOPENHAUER [163]

"Nothing is more obtrusive than a fashionable consensus." -- MARGARET THATCHER [163]
A major problem for the Anthropogenic (i.e., Man-made) Global Warming theory is the Medieval Warm Period of a thousand years ago. The MWP was a time when global temperatures were much warmer than today's. Indeed "more than 700 scientists from 400 institutions in 40 countries have contributed to peer-reviewed papers providing evidence that the Medieval Warm Period was real and global."

1992

**AL GORE'S CONSENSUS?**

**AL GORE:** "Only an insignificant fraction of scientists deny the global warming crisis. The time for debate is over. The science is settled." [80]

**GALLUP POLL:** 83% of scientists actively involved in global climate research did not believe global warming had occurred or weren't sure (53% and 30% respectively). Only 17% thought global warming had begun. [80]

**GREENPEACE POLL:** "47% of climatologists didn't think a runaway greenhouse effect was imminent; only 36% thought it possible and a mere 13% thought it probable." [80]

Also see [CRICHTON 17 Jan 2003].

Nov 11, 1991

**GREENPEACE CO-FOUNDER: TRUTH DOESN'T MATTER; ONLY WHAT PEOPLE BELIEVE**

PAUL WATSON (founder of Greenpeace): "It doesn't matter what is true, it only matters what people believe is true.... You are what the media define you to be. [Greenpeace] became a myth, and a myth-generating machine." [90] [135]
Mar 7, 1996 - Nov 12, 2009
PERIOD COVERED BY CRU E-MAILS
OTHER DOCUMENTS AND DATA FILES GO BACK TO MAY 31, 1991 (AS PER THE FILES’ LAST EDIT DATE)

Jun 12, 1996
WALL STREET JOURNAL, "A MAJOR DECEPTION OF GLOBAL WARMING."
BY FREDERICK SEITZ

“This IPCC report, like all others, is held in such high regard largely because it has been peer-reviewed. That is, it has been read, discussed, modified, and approved by an international body of experts. These scientists have had their reputations on the line. But, this report is not what it appears to be — it is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists listed on the title page. In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report....

“The following passages are examples of those included in the report as approved by the scientists but deleted from the supposedly peer-reviewed published version:

- "None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed [climate] changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases."
- "No study to date has positively attributed all or part [of the climate change observed to date] to anthropogenic [man-made] causes." [15]

“A leading article in Nature (June 13 [1996]), while dismissive of IPCC critics, had to admit that ‘phrases that might have been (mis)interpreted as undermining ... [IPCC] conclusions ... “disappeared” in the revision process.” [14]

[Dr. Benjamin] Santer was lead author of Chapter 8 for the 1995 IPCC Report and involved in [this] major controversy. He altered contents of the Chapter so it agreed with the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) without consent of other authors.” [13] "Santer ... has always taken full responsibility for making the actual changes, although he has not been forthcoming in revealing who instructed him to make such revisions and who approved them after they were made. He has, however, told others privately that he was asked [prevailed upon?] to do so by IPCC co-chairman John Houghton. ... [A] November 15 letter from the State Department ... [instructed] Dr. Houghton to 'prevail upon' chapter authors 'to modify their texts in an appropriate manner following discussion in Madrid.” [14]

DECEMBER 12, 2009: UPDATE ON THE IPCC’S “PEER REVIEW” PROCESS

LORD CHRISTOPHER MONCKTON, REPORTING FROM THE COPENHAGEN IPCC CONFERENCE: “[IPCC Chairman Rajendra] Pachauri asked us to believe that the IPCC’s documents were ‘peer-reviewed’. Then he revealed the truth by saying that it was the authors of the IPCC’s climate assessments who decided whether the reviewers’ comments were acceptable. That — whatever else it is — is not peer review.” [76]
7, 1998

MANN COMES ON BOARD: "I LIKE THE IDEA. INCLUDE ME IN"

Bradley: so offended by some comments of Mann that he titles this e-mail "CENSORED!!!!!!". He also makes clear that there is no consensus even among UEA/CRU scientists, and doesn't like the "gatekeeper" role many have assumed.

Bradley: I would like to dissociate myself from Mike Mann's view that 'xxxxxxxxxxx' and that they 'xxxxxxxxxxxxx'. I find this notion quite absurd. I have worked with the UEA group for 20+ years and have great respect for them and for their work. Of course, I don't agree with everything they write, and we often have long (but cordial) arguments about what they think versus my views, but that is life.

Indeed, I know that they have broad disagreements among themselves, so to refer to them as 'the UEA group', as though they all march in lock-step seems bizarre.

"As for thinking that it is 'Better that nothing appear, than something unacceptable to us'...as though we are the gatekeepers of all that is acceptable in the world of paleoclimatology seems amazingly arrogant." [0924532891.txt]

May 6, 1999

MANN to others: "I trust us all properly control what is going on here." [0924532891.txt]

Sep 22, 1999

BRIFFA: JUST AS WARM 1000 YEARS AGO

BRIFFA: "I believe that the recent warmth we matched about 1000 years ago." [0938018124.txt]

Sep 22, 1999

MANN: "I have less confidence in my data than some others..."

MANN: "I should point out that Chris, through no fault of his own, probably thought that I was giving singular confidence in my own [Mann et al., 1998]."

MANN: IPCC AND THE 'TRICK':

MANN: IPCC doesn't want to undermine consensus...

SEPTEMBER 1-3, 1999: IPCC Arusha meeting to consider "zero-order draft" of TAR (Mann in attendance). [0929985154.txt]

SEPTEMBER 22, 1999: MANN, JONES, BRIFCA and FOLLAND (copy to KARL) discuss "IPCC Revisions."

MCINTYRE'S "IPCC AND THE 'TRICK":

"No minutes of this meeting are available, but Climategate..."
In "Climategate Part 2 - A 2,000-page epic of science and skepticism," Terence Corcoran explains how BRIFFA and MANN butt heads over BRIFFA’S forthcoming paper, in which he "decided to mention uncertainties in tree-ring data while pushing the need for more work." [092397760.txt]

Corcoran explains that BRIFFA was "struggling with Russian tree-ring results and the reports of Russian scientists on their difficulties. Their findings often contradicted the idea that the world is warmer today than hundreds or even thousands of years ago. ‘Relatively high number of trees has been noted during 750-1450 A.D. There is no evidence of moving polar timberline in the north during the last century,’ wrote Rashit Hanttemirov from Russia in October 1998 [0907975032.txt] – implying that warming has been common in the past and nothing unusual was happening today.

"The reference to 750-1450 would appear to support the long-held scientific view on the existence of a Medieval Warm Period that might have been hotter than the 20th century. A couple of weeks later, another Russian, Eugene Vaganov, wrote in a paper saying that 'the warming in the middle of the 20th century is not extraordinary. The warming at the border of the 1st and 2nd millennia was [longer] ... and similar in amplitude.' [0908297214.txt]. Mr. Briffa, in his Science paper, proposed his own 2,000-year record as an alternative to Mr. Mann’s hockey stick ... The paper raises issues that cast doubt on Mr. Mann’s version of climate history.... When Mr. Mann saw the pre-publication version of Mr. Briffa’s critical paper, he blew up...."

A series of heated e-mails ensue and it "appears, moreover, that Mr. Mann had interfered with the peer-review process of Mr. Briffa’s article at Science magazine. One of Mr. Mann’s associates, Raymond Bradley at the University of Massachusetts, on April 19, wrote to Science editor Julia Uppenbink, saying, ‘I would like to dissociate myself from Mike Mann’s view regarding the climate warming article. Mr. Bradley sends a blind copy of this email to Mr. Briffa.’ [See (BRADLEY 19 Apr. 1999)]."

"The conflict eventually makes it up to Phil Jones, the head of CRU, who writes a stinging letter to Mr. Mann on May 6. ‘You seem quite pissed off with us all in CRU... [Jones] then rips into Mr. Mann [accusing him] of ‘slanging us all off to [the journal] Science.’ ‘[A month later MANN offers an apology about which] Mr. Bradley, Mr. Mann’s associate in Massachusetts and co-creator of the hockey stick graph, sends a private response to Mr. Briffa: ‘Excuse me while I puke....’"

"At this point in the Climategate emails, the stage has been set for a decade of high drama. Over the next 10 years, the emails become a zone of internal conflict and external battles to suppress criticism, ridicule critics and resist all outside interference with the official science story they had assembled: The late 20th century was the warmest in history, and the next 100 years could be a climate nightmare.” ‘The Mann technique of aggressive intervention in the peer-review process over Mr. Briffa’s work sets the tone for what would become a major strategy as all the scientists within the IPCC loop waged war on any science and papers that contravened or questioned the official view.” [124:2]

May 5, 1999

HOW TO HIDE COOLING: DON'T USE THE DATA

BRIFFA had been using Yamal tree ring data since late 1996, but by November 1997, he is "struggling with results." [124:1] His data shows cooling after 1960, while the instrument record shows warming. (See also [1 142108839.txt] in [JONES 12 Aug.1996]). OSBORN attributes the discrepancy to a "non-temperature signal." They go from 1402 to 1995, although we usually stop the series in 1960 because of the recent non-temperature signal that is superimposed on the tree-ring data that we use." [0939154709.txt]

The problem is that "the divergence raises the question that if the tree-ring reconstructions could not read the higher temperatures of today, how could the scientists be sure that there weren’t higher temperatures throughout the last thousand years that have also gone undetected by the tree-rings." [167:2] BRIFFA’S decline is raised at the IPCC 1 Sep.1999 Arusha meeting, and to solve it, OSBORN advises MANN to remove all data after 1960 for the IPCC figure he is preparing, as explained by MCINTYRE (also see [60]):

"On Oct 5, 1999, Osborn (on behalf of Briffa) sent Mann a revised version of the Briffa reconstruction with more 'low-frequency' variability ... a version that is identical up to 1960..." [T] his version had an even larger late-20th century decline than the version shown at the Tanzania Lead Authors’ meeting. Nonetheless, the First Order Draft, sent out a few weeks later [see (FIRST

Mar 11, 2003

THREATEN CLIMATE RESEARCH

MANN e-mails JONES, HUGHES, and adminstrative status at Wikipedia that more than 2000 Wikipedia contributions and administrative status was revoked by WILLIE SOH. See [79]

On one hand, the team insists on publishing their papers, he suggests publishing their papers, he suggests he doesn't get a new editor. See [79]

"This was the danger of always going for the "peer-reviewed literature", "If a paper is not in a journal: So what do we do about 'Climate Change'... it's time to encourage our colleagues in the science community to submit to, or cite papers that consider what we tell or request, and do not currently sit on the editorial board."

JONES: "I will be emailing the journal editor assigned by Hans von Stomm..."
[Founder William] Connolley took control of all things climate in d has ever known -- Wikipedia. Starting in February 2003, just members were beginning to gel, Connolley set to work on the articles on global warming, on the greenhouse effect, record, on the urban heat island, on climate models, on to erase the Little Ice Age; on Aug. 11, the Medieval attention to the hockey stick graph. He rewrote articles on the list who were skeptical of the band. Richard Lindzen and Fred climate scientists, were among his early targets, followed by as Willie Soon and Sallie Baliunas of the Harvard-Smithsonian Medieval Warm Period. [109] (Also see [111]).

unique Wikipedia articles' and was granted a senior editorial it enabled him to delete 'over 500 articles' and 'barred' editors who 'ran afoul of him.'" [110] CONNOLLEY'S Wikipedia in September, 2009 for his involvement in an

UNIQUE WIKIPEDIA ARTICLES

posing views be aired in peer review action against editors who publish contrary to & Sallie Baliunas paper that "identifies the ar forcing,' not carbon dioxide (CO2)." [169] (1996.)

what they wanted--the claim of a peer-reviewed journal that does not make its way through the peer review process?

SALINGER to WIGLEY, JONES, HULME, BRIFFA, HANSEN, HARVEY, SANTER, TRENBERTH, WILBY, MANN, KARL and 20 other "friends and colleagues" about their duty to act as the gatekeepers of what papers appear in scientific publications, even if the papers pass peer review:

SALINGER: "Ignoring bad science eventually reinforces the apparent 'truth' of that bad science in the public mind, if it is not corrected. As importantly, the 'bad science' published by CR is used by the sceptics' lobbies to prove that there is no need for concern over climate change. Since the IPCC makes it quite clear that there are substantial grounds for concern about climate change [this is circular logic since the IPCC said so because of the hockey team's work!], is it not partially the responsibility of climate science to make sure only satisfactorily peer-reviewed science appears in scientific publications? - and not to refuse any inadequately reviewed and wrong articles that do make their way through the peer review process?" [1051230500.txt]

COOK: We KNOW OF PROBABLE FLAWS IN MANN'S WORK

BRIFFA is "sick to death" of MANN'S representations about his temperature data, which COOK agrees is problematic. See [MANN 19 Apr. 1999] and [MCINTYRE AND MCKITRICK Nov.2003] for background on MANN'S work.

COOK: "Now some to review (such Biological, and Korean guy and the method of dendroclimatic laisy, horrible, as the main use the word 'perceived' here, since whether it is true or not is not what the publishers care about -- it is how the journal is seen by the community that counts. I think we could get a large group of highly credentialed scientists to sign such a letter -- 50+ people.

"Note that I am copying this view only to Mike Hulme and Phil Jones. Mike's idea to get editorial board members to resign will probably not work -- must get rid of von Storch too, otherwise that hurdle too." (Von Storch subsequently resigns.)
PAPERS CRITICAL OF OWN WORK
BRIFFA for help to put down a paper that is critical of BRIFFA'S own work: "view- confidential REALLY URGENT" - nothing to ask from you.... I got a paper submitted to the Journal of Agricultural, Environmental Sciences), written by a and someone from Berkeley, that claims that "reconstruction that we use in-logy (reverse regression) is wrong, biased, etc. They use your Tornetrask recon whipping boy.... If published as is, could really do some damage. It is also to review because it is rather mathematical, x-Jenkins stuff in it. It won't be easy to of hand as the math appears to be critically... Your assistance here is (sic) [1054756929.txt]

Mar 31, 2004
JONES "REVIEWS" MORE PAPERS CRITICAL OF HIS OWN WORK
JONES: "Recently rejected two papers (one for JGR and for GRL) from people saying CRU has it wrong over Siberia. Went to town in both reviews, hopefully successfully. If either appears I will be very surprised, but you never know with GRL." [1080742144.txt]: FROM [B5]: "One of those rejected papers about Siberian temperatures may have been by me [Lars Kames]. The time is about right. I got it rejected because of nonsense from a reviewer and the editor saw it as an attack on him when I criticized the quality of the review. After that, I gave up the idea of ever getting something AGW critical published in a journal."

I4, 2003
ULME: TERMINATE ALL INVOLVEMENT WITH CLIMATE RESEARCH JOURNAL
JANN: "I think that the community should, as Mike H has previously suggested in this eventuality, terminate its involvement with this journal [Climate Research] at all levels--reviewing, editing, and submitting, and leave it a'wher way [sic] into oblivion and disrepute." [1057941657.txt]

Jul 8, 2004
CONTROL PAPERS USED BY THE IPCC
JONES: "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!" [1089318616.txt] (Note: the papers were excluded from the IPCC report. See [B1] for more about what took place.)

Jan 21, 2005
THREATEN GEOPHYSICAL RESEARCH LETTERS JOURNAL
HUGHES, MANN, WIGLEY, BRADLEY, JONES, and SCHMIDT discuss what to do about the journal Geophysical Research Letters (GRL), which had been publishing papers they don’t like. Its editor James Saiers is subsequently ousted.

WIGLEY: "This is truly awful. GRL has gone downhill recently. I think the decline began before Saiers.... "Proving bad behavior here is very difficult. If you think Saiers is in the greenhouse skeptics camp, then, can find documentary evidence of this, we could through official ... channels to get him ousted. It would be difficult."

MANN: "It’s one thing to lose 'Climate Research'. We can’t lose GRL. I think it would be useful if people begin to mobilise their experiences w/ both Saiers and potentially Mackw... in Chief, GRL (I don’t know him—he would seem to be c...in the fast lane)."

"If there is a clear body of evidence that something is amiss, could be taken through the proper channels." [1106322000.txt]

NEWS" PAPER DEALING WITH HIS OWN WORK [1077829152.txt]:
KE: "Just agreed to review a paper for GRL - it is absolute rubbish. It is having it a go at - data - not the latest version, but the one you used in MBH99!! We added lots of data in for person says has Urban Warming! So easy review to do. Sent Ben the Soon et al. paper and he reviews these sorts of things. Says GRL doesn’t have a clue with editors or reviewers. By chance they seem to hit person with the one just received.

something in CONFIDENCE - don’t email around, especially not to Keith and Tim here. Have you papers have underestimated variability in the millennial record - from models or from some data. Just a yes or no will do. Tim is reviewing them - I want to make sure he takes my comments on wants to be squeaky clean with discussing them with others. So forget this email when you reply.

Dec 10, 2004
REALCLIMATE.ORG IS BORN
GAVIN SCHMIDT, MIKE MANN, ERIC STEIG, WILLIAM CONNOLLEY, STEFAN RAHMSTORF, RAY BRAD団, RASMUS BENESTAD, and CASPAR AMOS CHADWICK, STEFAN RAHMSTORF, RAY BRADLEY, GAVIN SCHMIDT, MIKE MANN, ERIC STEIG, WIGLEY, BRADLEY, JONES, and SCHMIDT discuss what to do about the journal Geophysical Research Letters (GRL), which had been publishing papers they don’t like. Its editor James Saiers is subsequently ousted.

SCHMIDT: "The idea is that we working climate scientific community has a place where we can mount a rapid response to any 'bombshell' papers that are doing the rounds and give the context to climate related stories or events." [1102687049.txt]

CONTAIN THE MWP
"Proving bad behavior here is very difficult. If you think Saiers is in the greenhouse skeptics camp, then, can find documentary evidence of this, we could through official ... channels to get him ousted. It would be difficult."

MANN: "It’s one thing to lose 'Climate Research'. We can’t lose GRL. I think it would be useful if people begin to mobilise their experiences w/ both Saiers and potentially Mackw... in Chief, GRL (I don’t know him—he would seem to be c...in the fast lane)."

Jul 8, 2004
CONTROL PAPERS USED BY THE IPCC
JONES: "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!" [1089318616.txt] (Note: the papers were excluded from the IPCC report. See [B1] for more about what took place.)

Jun 23, 2005
CONGRESS QUESTIONS IPCC ABOUT MANN’S METHODS
Joe Barton and Ed Whitfield, Chairmen, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations raise the issue of MANN et al’s “historical record of temperatures and climate change” wi Chairman because “recent peer-reviewed articles in Science, Geophysical Research Letters, & Environment, among others, researchers question the results of this work.” They state this is
MANN confirms to JONES, BRIFFA, OSBORN that the GRL "leak has been plugged," but in an earlier e-mail the same day notes that they have a problem with the U.S. Climate Change Science Program because it allowed McIntyre to prominently display a poster at their recent meeting.

MANN: "I suspect that this is the first in a line of attacks (I'm sure Tom C is next in line) that will ultimately get 'published' one way or another. The GRL leak may have been plugged up now w/ new editorial leadership there, but these guys always have 'Climate Research' and 'Energy and Environment,' and will go there if necessary. They are telegraphing quite clearly where they are going w/ all of this." [1132094873.txt]

Feb 9, 2006
MANN: USE REALCLIMATE.ORG TO COMBAT "DISINFORMATION"
MANN: "I've already given it a good go-over w/ Gavin, Stefan, and William Connelly (our internal "peer review" process at RC), so I think its in pretty good shape." [1139504822.txt]

MANN: "Anyway, 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, and we'll be very careful to answer any questions that come up to any extent we can. On the other hand, you might want to visit the thread and post replies yourself. 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.

"You're also welcome to do a followup guest post, etc. think of RC as a resource that is at your disposal to combat any disinformation put forward by the McIntyres of the world. Just let us know. We'll use our best discretion to make sure the skeptics don't get to use the RC comments as a megaphone." [1139521913.txt]

JONES: DISCREDIT WORK USING REALCLIMATE.ORG
JONES: "I'd like to prove that it (Figure 7.1c by CRU founder LAMB) in the 1990 IPCC report showing the MWP and LIA) is a schematic and it isn't based on real data..." "What we'd like to do is show this either on 'Real Climate' or as background in a future paper, or both." [1168022320.txt]

BRIFFA: ARBITRARY DATA MODIFICATIONS IN RELATIONSHIPS TO CO2 "ARGUABLE"
BRIFFA: "Another serious issue to be considered relates to the Mann et al. analysis was adjusted to reduce the link between Bristlecone pine growth and CO2..." "At this point, it is fair to say that this study is probably now an embarrassment, given the recent revelations..." [1168022320.txt]

JONES: "I'm sure the CRU will be very embattled for a while... It seems the CLA (Climate Change Alarmists) are defending its leadership... and I both had so many emails against New Science... I'm sure the skeptics don't get to use the RC comments as a megaphone."

SANTER available to calculate radiative forcing"
**A CLIMATOLOGY CONSPIRACY?**

"The CRU e-mails have revealed how the normal conventions of the peer review process appear to have been compromised by a team of global warming scientists, with the willing cooperation of the editor of the International Journal of Climatology (IJC), Glenn McGregor. The team spent nearly a year preparing and publishing a paper that attempted to rebut a previously published paper in IJC ... which had shown that the IPCC models that predicted significant "global warming" in fact largely disagreed with the observational data." [147]

---

**ENSURING FAVORABLE REVIEWS**

JONES and FOSTER (copies to TRENBERTH, MANN, SALINGER, SCHMIDT, and others) discuss FOSTER’s recommendations for reviewers the journal of Geophysical Research requires for a paper he’s submitted. They recommend colleagues who “know the sorts of things to say,” despite JGR’s rules (actually quoted in the e-mail) prohibit this. See (WEGMAN REPORT 14 Jul 2006).

FOSTER: “J) Suggested Reviewers to Include

"Please list the names of 5 experts who are knowledgeable in your area and could give unbiased review of your work. Please do not list colleagues who are close associates, collaborators, or family members (this requires name, email, and institutional address)

Tom Wigley [[13]wigley@xxxxxxxxx.xxx NCAR
Ben Santer [2]<santer1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> Lawrence Livermore
Mike Wallace [3]<wallace@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> U Washington...
Dave Thompson [4]<davet@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> Cal State Univ
Dave Easterling [5]<David.Easterling@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> NCDC

JONES: “Agree with Kevin that Tom Karl has too much to do. Tom Wigley is semi retired like Mike Wallace may not be responsive to requests from JGR. We have Ben Santer in common! Dave Thompson is a good suggestion. I’d go for one of Tom Peterson or Dave Easterling. To get a spread, I’d go with 3 US, One Australian and one in Europe. So Neven Nicholls and David Parker. All of them know the sorts of things to say – about comment and the awful original, without any prompting.” [1249503274.txt]

---

**TEN ROYAL METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY**

Dealt with Climate Research and Geophysical Research Letters, and SANTER turn to Weather, a journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, because SANTER is opposed to disclosing all the raw data – raw data PLUS results from all intermediate steps - I will not submit any further papers to RMS journals. [1237496573.txt]

---

**MANN’S ANALYSIS MAKE**

MANN’s analysis makes the positive slope in the last 150 years significant “global warming” in fact largely disagreed with the observational data. (1163715685.txt)

---

**ENSURING FAVORABLE REVIEWS**

Published in the improperly refereed journal Energy and Environment. MANN to Revkin (NY TIMES): “[M]ore likely he [McIntyre] won’t be sending any more papers to any RMS journals. That was the understanding we had.” [1254259645.txt]

---

**WIGLEY: BRIFFA IS IN A MESS OVER YAMAL**

Immediately after the Yamal issue breaks, WIGLEY admits tough time explaining his way out of it:

WIGLEY: “But Keith does seem to have got himself into a bit of a pickle. Keith explain the McIntyre plot that compares Yamal...”
TRENBERTH: WHERE THE HECK IS GLOBAL WARMING?

TRENBERTH discusses the BBC’s October 9 article, and not only confirms warming has stopped for 10-12 years [see {JONES 5.Jul.2005} and {KELLY 26.OCT.2008}], but that this was not predicted by any of the models. His explanation for the failure: The data are wrong:

"Well I have my own article on where the heck is global warming? We are asking that here in Boulder where we have broken records the past two days for the coldest days on record.... The high the last 2 days was below 30F and the normal is 69F, and it smashed the previous records for these days by 10F.... This is January [winter] weather [in early autumn]."

"The fact is that we can’t account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can’t. The CERES data ... shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate." [1255352257.txt]

FRUSTRATE SKEPTICS’ PEER REVIEW BIDS: MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

FROM "How to Manufacture a Climate Consensus" by Patrick J. Michaels: "People who didn’t toe Messrs. Wigley, Mann and Jones’s line began to experience increasing difficulty in publishing their results. This happened to me [Patrick J. Michaels] and to the University of Alabama’s Roy Spencer, who also hypothesized that global warming is likely to be modest. Others surely stopped trying, tiring of summary rejections of good work by editors scared of the mob." [79]

FROM "More evidence of gatekeeping" by Bishop Hill: "It is exactly as we feared. If I [Arthur Rorsch] were to submit an article from a friendly colleague who wanted to publish in a scientific journal, we would always get a rejection: without proper argumentation. I was not the only Dutch researcher that happened to. Climate skeptics everywhere ran into brick walls." [85]

JONES: "You are probably aware of this, but the journal Sonja edits [Energy & Environment] is at the very bottom of almost all climate scientists lists of journals to read. It is the journal of choice of climate change skeptics and even here they don’t seem to be bothering with journals at all recently." [1256765544.txt]
THE CLIMATEGATE TIMELINE AND THE TICKING TIME BOMB

To better appreciate these themes, this Timeline chart consolidates and chronologically organizes information published about the CRU e-mails by many researchers (see references) to visually show who said or did what from simultaneous events, to understand the context in which events occurred. There is far more information assembled in one place, and more continues to be uncovered, but some of the key material found to-date has been

Though many event boxes are important, perhaps two are most critical: one from 1981, and another from O (both with bomb icons). The first sets out the shaky foundation underpinning the AGW (Anthropogenic Global Man-made global warming) enterprise, and the second an admission of its failure. Together, they help explain why occurred in between (as revealed by the CRU documents and independent researchers like Steven McIntyre) plug the holes in the leaky boat and keep up appearances. Consequently, as Terence Corcoran sets out in "A 2, science and skepticism," disagreement and skepticism ran strife throughout the 13 years of e-mails [124].

The story that emerges is not of a smoking gun, but of a 30-year time bomb whose fuse was lit in 1981, when handful of scientists supporting it -- the AGW theory was championed, without question, by the Popular Press.

Given this foundation, it was only a matter of time before the growing divergence between real-world data and theory, models, which had been considered beyond reproach, became self-evident and problematic. Offending data was the models to stave off questions and the losses that would ensue to the billion dollar climate industry: "$32 research, and another $36 billion for development of climate-related technologies" by the US government alone. [131]

The data manipulation became so extreme that a CRU programmer tasked in 2006 with reproducing CRU: results using its own models and data was unable to do so after three years. Releasing the data and computer models for others to review and verify was out of the question. Though FOI requests are redundant for peer-reviewed, the CRU's refusal to release data and methods used for papers published in respected peer-reviewed journals rules prohibiting such refusals, inevitably led to legal FOI requests, if for no other reason than that some scientists that the world commit trillions of dollars to economic policies based on what they claimed their research showed

Lest there be any doubt that these scientists did anything wrong, Richard Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan Professor o the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, explains what the CRU documents reveal: "They are unambiguously < that are unethical and in many cases illegal..." "[S]cientists manipulating raw temperature data..." "The willingness to destroy release it. The avoidance of Freedom of Information requests..." [66] Thus, while UEA and Pennsylvania State University investigating the matter [69], the UK Met Office (which works closely with the CRU and relies heavily on its pro

What about the supposedly independent temperature records of NASA's GISS and NOAA's NCDC? CRU, GISS most of their raw data from NOAA's GHCN. [50] [125298593.txt] Serious irregularities and questionable starting to surface with the source GHCN data itself. [50] [60] [62] [67] [72] [77] [114] [132] [168] [171] "The weather observation points used as a starting point for world average temperatures has been reduced from about 6,000 in t 1,300 in the most recent years [in the NCDC data]... And in the final NASA/GIStemp data file, it drops to about 1,000, degrees latitude, where temperatures are naturally warmer. [168] And so, like the Three Musketeers, the NOAA temperature records stand or fall together.

Data fudging and secrecy aside, by 1998, Earth had stopped warming and begun cooling, despite record levels of event box with a bomb icon). This divergence between AGW theory and reality grew so enormous that by O Kevin Trenberth, in a fit of frustration, e-mailed his colleagues: "Where the heck is global warming?" "The fact is the for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't. The reason he gave for their inability to acc

Where the heck is global warming?

The data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate. This, arguably, is the key revelation of Climatology self-evident that blind faith and bankrupt logic are now masquerading as rational science. No matter how much used to make today's climate models sound impressive, they have all proved wrong. The hockey team scientists no clue why this is so, though other scientists do (see "Climate Corrections" [92]).

These problems would have been publicized years ago if the AGW theorists didn't have powerful allies: policy π every professional scientific body, editors of virtually every major scientific journal, and reporters and editors mainstream media outlets. Few provided unbiased, impartial forums where alternate views and evidence were ai Instead, most took official positions, invariably with an air of authority, and spared no effort to ensure that the artifical consensus were quashed by editorial fiat and a persistent campaign of vilification, intimidation, and ridicule.

Twenty-first Century science has borrowed a page from the medieval Church in using fear and persecution to The oppressed have become the oppressors. Given that most professional scientific bodies and peer-review been active accomplices in this scandal, one wonders how many other "scientific consensuses" have been similar!

1974

ANOTHER ICE AGE!

TIME MAGAZINE (June 24, 1974): "Climatological Cassandras are becoming increasingly apprehensive, for the weather aberrations they are studying may be the harbinger of another ice age." [1]
October 12, 2009
Global Warming or Cooling everything that was inevitable to the 1,000-page epic of... -- despite only a... the AGW climate was massaged to fit! billion for climate... s own published codes behind the... s, despite journalists were insisting id. f Meteorology at dealing with things... s) announced sed record. S and NCDC get adjustments are the number of actual heating cooling were gate. It makes techno-babble is admit they have makers in virtually every major journal have been... voices against the... silence skeptics. red journals have been engineered.

1981

JAMES HANSEN HAS A GOOD YEAR

JAMES HANSEN becomes Director of NASA Goddard position he still holds, and shortly thereafter publishes analysis, “Climate Impact of Increasing Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide: The basic temperature analysis scheme published by HANSEN in the late 1970s. [18] The GISS global temperature records now used by the IPCC, the... However, both obtain most of their raw data from NCDC and CRU, GISS and... S and NCDC get adjustments are the number of actual heating cooling were gate. It makes techno-babble is admit they have makers in virtually every major journal have been... voices against the... silence skeptics. red journals have been engineered.

According to a graph (shown) in HANSEN’S paper of Increasing Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide emissions;
a) Warmed from 1880 to 1940 (60 years), CO2 emissions;
b) Cooled from 1940 to 1980 (40 years), despite man-made emissions of CO2 up to that date economic boom.

Regardless of a previous warming trend of 60 years into a cooling trend, it was decided at the J... Earth was again undergoing warming, and the... How could HANSEN have predicted a warming in the 1970s, when his own data didn’t show it? One seeming trend had set in, it was declared a... period. Was this a coincidence? Was HANSEN’s “simple climate model[s]” [133] constructed to... global warming and atmospheric cooling and later, more sophisticated models run of the... all failed to predict the global cooling that has occurred in the... Or is it as Syun-Ichi Akasofu, former director of the International Arctic Research Center at the University of Alaska Fairbanks, author of over 500 articles, explained in September... supercomputer, no matter how powerful, is able to... hypothesis that says the greenhouse effect is responsible for global warming and atmospheric cooling.

In fact, after 12 years of cooling, one hacker today that it is a "travesty" models cannot account for... (TRENBERTH 12.Oct.2009)). If these models stand on the assumption that... it stands to reason they cannot explain the other factors changing the climate are overwhelming...

Yet, while only a handful of scientists agree with conclusions or HANSEN’S 1981 position, it was given him front-page billing. Why?
JONES is the lead author of a September, 1990 paper that concludes there is no relevant urban localized temperature increase in and around urban centers. [46]. However, 3 months later, in November, 1990, Wang publishes another paper using the very same Eastern China data, concluding that urban temperature studies must take this into account to avoid skewing results in favor of warming. [WIGLEY 11 Nov 09]

Aside from producing contradictory conclusions, the data set used by the authors poses other challenges from which it allegedly derived were chosen because of a supposed history of “few, if any, instrumentation, location or observation times.” [48]

In February, 2007, mathematician Doug Keenan learns that data are available for only 35 of the at least half have undergone substantial moves. [48] Keenan asks JONES about the location of the other 49 stations. JONES replies that Wang “selected the stations based on his ‘extensive knowledge’” Keenan writes to Wang, who replies that Zhao-Mei Zeng (a co-author of [47]) has “hard copies of data.” However, the authors, including Zeng, of a U.S. Department of Energy and Chinese Academy of Sciences station moves note that the copies to which Wang referred were “not currently available.” [49]

Later in 2007 Keenan publishes “The Fraud Allegation Against Some Climatic Research of Wei-Sen’s CO2 induced warming, because CO2 was to blame. How?” [92] In fact, determining the UHI is not complicated. “The potential for future global warming, and the relative contributions of natural processes and human influences are still poorly known.” [93] In FY 1989, funding for focused global change research activities totals $133.9 million. [131:2]

Today research funding exceeds $2 billion annually, as compared to $23 million by Exxon over 10 years (just $2 million per year). “In total, over the last 20 years, by the end of fiscal year 2009, the US government will have poured in $32 billion for climate research—and another $36 billion for development of climate-related technologies.” [131:1] (See also [142].)

Smith says after all that was not a random string finding, but a well documented manipulation process. Thermometers moved from one location to another, from cities to rural locations. The Garden Spot stations are a prime example. Smith moved from city to rural areas, and from pristine rural locations and from pristine rural locations to pristine rural locations. He found that the U.S. climate has not changed much over the last century, but the climate has changed significantly over the last century, but the climate has changed significantly. Smith moved from city to rural areas, and from pristine rural locations to pristine rural locations. There has been no change in the climate, but there has been a significant change in the climate. Smith moved from city to rural areas, and from pristine rural locations to pristine rural locations. There has been no change in the climate, but there has been a significant change in the climate. Smith moved from city to rural areas, and from pristine rural locations to pristine rural locations. There has been no change in the climate, but there has been a significant change in the climate. Smith moved from city to rural areas, and from pristine rural locations to pristine rural locations. There has been no change in the climate, but there has been a significant change in the climate. Smith moved from city to rural areas, and from pristine rural locations to pristine rural locations. There has been no change in the climate, but there has been a significant change in the climate.
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A warm peak in 1940 was another obstacle for AGW theorists, since it occurred before
significant man-made CO2 emissions (see {GRAPH 1981}). A programmer's notation in the
CRU software (see {HOW TO HIDE 7 Sep 1998}) to "Apply a VERY ARTIFICIAL correction for
" appears to reveal the CRUs' method for erasing the problem: The recorded peak
was artificially lowered, and subsequent temperatures hiked. [153]

During the MWP, Chaucer spoke of vineyards in northern England [128] [129]. "All over the
city of London there are little memories of the vineyards that grew in the MWP." [137] An
agronomist at Virginia Tech suggests that if you are planning to start a vineyard, the roots of
the vines cannot be exposed to temperatures below 25°F or the vine will die. Even though there were no
thermometers at the time of Eric the Red, this gives us a benchmark for reference. In fact, the
Smithsonian reports that there is evidence which supports the theory that the Viking colonies later
collapsed as a result of a dramatically cooling climate. [78] (To learn more, see "On the Vikings and Greenland" [86].) Clearly these high MWP temperatures could not have been due to
man-made CO2. [25] In general, warm periods have coincided with human prosperity and
progress, while cool periods have coincided with suffering, disease, and famine. [70]

Following the MWP was the Little Ice Age: a time when the River Thames froze (evidenced in
paintings and in social events held on the river [136]). The LIA proves Earth has been
steadily warming for centuries (see {GLACIER FACTS 2008}), contradicting the claim
that recent warming is anomalous. In addition, there was the 3,000 year Holocene
Maximum of 7,000 years ago when temperatures were also significantly higher than today's.
[138] [123]. Together, the HC, MWP, and LIA show that global temperatures fluctuate
several degrees from natural causes with no ill-effects.

However, because the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age were fatal to the AGW
theory, the hockey team needed to erase them. With reference to this, David Deming, a
geophysicist at the University of Oklahoma, wrote the following concerning a 1995 e-mail
he received, and about which he has testified [58]:

"They thought I was one of them, someone who would pervert science in the service of social and
political causes. So one of them let his guard down. A major person working in the area of climate
change and global warming sent me an astonishing email that said "We have to get rid of the
Medieval Warm Period." [59]

And this is what MANN'S 1999 hockey stick graph accomplished. [36] [127] Compare the
temperature graph from the 1990 IPCC report with the one in the 2001 IPCC report (see
(IPCC 1999) and (IPCC 2001)). The 2001 report used MANN'S now discredited hockey
stick graph that flattened the MWP and LIA to make it appear that modern global
temperatures were unusually high.

Despite MANN'S creativity, both OVERPECK and JONES remained convinced the MWP
and LIA were real. In 2003 Overpeck wanted to "contain the putative 'MWP'" (see
(OVERPECK 4 Jun 2003)), while in 2004, Jones contested MWP and LIA temperatures,
based on feelings rather than facts:

JONES: "There is no way the MWP (whenever it was) was as warm globally as the last 20 years.
There is also no way a whole decade in the LIA period was more than 1 deg C on a global basis
cooler than the 1961-90 mean. This is all gut feeling, no science..." [1096472400.txt]

"Carbon emissions have been traded, albeit at minor levels, since the 1990s." [34] "According to the World Bank, the
$63 billion in 2007 to $126 billion in 2008." [131:1]

"Bart Chilton, head of the energy and environmental markets,
Future Trading Commission ... has predicted that within
of the markets his agency currently regulates: 'I can see
The largest commodity market in the world.' [131:1]
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financial commodity in the world.' He predicted that

"In other words, carbon trading will be bigger than oil, an
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our economy and to our world, and we need to get this right
If there is no evidence that we need to
2008."
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If there is no evidence that we need to
**FORECAST TO BE THE WORLD'S MARKETS ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE COMMODITY TURNOVER OF CARBON TRADING**

Dr. John Daly uncovered an eleven-year signal in the temperature data set from the island of Tasmania. In a 1996 e-mail to the CRU's Daly says: "The transform result shows a sharp spike at the 11 year point..." It would appear that the 11 year solar cycle does indeed affect temperature." I tried the same run on the [smoothed] CRU global temperature set...[T]he 11 year pulse is still there..." [0839635440.txt]

"In his effort to correlate the data, Dr. Wigley concludes that the solar signal is strong enough to convince him that solar forcing is a major factor in climate change: 'Causes. Here, ice cores are more valuable..." But the main external candidate is solar, and more work is required to improve the "paleo" solar forcing record and to understand how the climate system responds both globally and regionally to solar forcing." [0839858862.txt]

"What is significant about this paragraph is that it identifies the main cause of climate change as 'solar forcing,' not carbon dioxide (CO2). This fact was also kept secret. Remarkably, this was exactly what [Willie] Soon and [Sallie] Baliunas published in...[a] Climate Research paper...[in 2003]. The solar correlation became a lightning rod. More than a dozen e-mails from the Jones Gang discuss how to discredit Soon and Baliunas." (See {11.March.2003 THREATEN CLIMATE RESEARCH})." [169]

**JONES: ICE CORES VERY UNRELIABLE AND TREE RINGS LESS THAN 50% RELIABLE FOR DETERMINING PAST TEMPERATURE**

JONES [0839858862.txt]: "I am disturbed by how some people in the paleo community try to oversell their product... Climate variance explained by the proxy variable—close to zero for ice core isotopes, up to 50% for tree rings, somewhere in between for most other indicators." Also see [1142108839.txt], an 11.March.2006 e-mail from Richard Alley (of Pennsylvania State University) to JONES, BRIGA, and others, in which he summarizes the NRC's skepticism towards "the ability of proxies to detect warming above the level of a millennium ago." Alley mentions that "one of the committee members was asking each presenter whether the presenter believed that temperatures could be reconstructed for 1000 years ago within 0.5 C, and that the presenters were answering with some qualified version of "no."" He also summarizes the many problems with using tree rings for determining temperature.

**CARBON ECONOMICS 2: A STACKED DECK**

As Terence Corcoran explains in "Climategate: the Skepticism," CRU became involved with developed ideological exercise in March 1998, Mike Hulme, a 100-year forecast scenarios...[T]he A1 scenario, "rapid and successful economic development," brings forward some issues...is that it produced a lot of carbon emissions...The good news, from the IPCC perspective, is that carbon capture and sequestration is still there...In the end, Mike Hulme appeared as one of the few brave souls who dared to take on the IPCC's 100-year forecast scenarios...The upshot of these scenarios, based on a deck stacked against free markets and global free trading, is that they make their way through a barrage of comment from one small sample, Tom Wigley wrote to Mike Hulme...revised" because they fail to take into account account...David Schimel, a climate scientist at the U.S. National Center for Atmospheric Research...involving various 100-year scenarios. It concludes 1.250% above the pre-industrial level of 1750 units, as much as 5.88 degrees Celsius. "Capitalism clearly ruins everything." [124]
of code establish a twenty-element array (yrloc) comprising the year 1400 (base year, needed here) and nineteen years between 1904 and 1994 in half-decade increments. Panding 'fudge factor' (from the valadj matrix) is applied to each interval.... [N]ot only biases to the upside later in the century (though certainly prior to 1960), but a few stray is being biased slightly lower...." [22]

CRU PROGRAMMING CODE [DENSPLUS18811960NETCDF].PRO [23]
(Date from the file's last edit.)

Note these comments from the programming code specifically say that while the CRU has temperature data going back to 440 and 1070, it only uses data after 1400, that is, after the Medieval Warm Period that undermines the Anthropogenic Global Warming (or man-made global warming) hypothesis.

... we know the file starts at yr 440, but we want nothing till 1400, so we... can skill lines (1400-440)/10 + 1 header line

... we now want all lines (10 yr per line) from 1400 to 1980, which is ... (1980-1400)/10 + 1 lines

... we know the file starts at yr 1070, but we want nothing till 1400, so we... can skill lines (1400-1070)/10 + 1 header line

... we now want all lines (10 yr per line) from 1400 to 1991, which is ... (1990-1400)/10 + 1 lines (since 1991 is on line beginning 1990)

The final IPCC diagram (2.21) is shown ... ([IPCC 2001]) In this rendering, the Briffa reconstruction is obviously no longer 'a problem' and does not "dilute the message". Mann has not given any 'fodder' to the skeptics, who obviously did not have a "field day" with the decline." [54] [The main fiddle was to simply delete the offending data (see [HOW TO HIDE 5.Oct.1999] and [IPCC 2001]).]

HOW TO HIDE COOLING: BURY IT IN SOFTWARE

CRU PROGRAMMING CODE [CALIBRATE_CORRECTMIXD.FPRO]
(Date from the file's last edit.)

... No need to verify the correct and uncorrected versions, since these should be identical prior to 1920 or 1930 or whenever the decline was corrected onwards from. [23]

THE HOCKEY STICK IS BORN

MANN, BRADLEY and HUGHES publish their hockey stick paper (MBH98) in Nature. However, the graph only goes back to 1400, which is after the Medieval Warm Period, so it only flattens the Little Ice Age. A year later, they publish a new version, MBH99, going back a thousand years and flattening the MWP, too. [43]
27.Oct.1999] contained a new version of the proxy diagram, a version which contains the main elements of the eventual Third Assessment Report proxy diagram [see [IPCC 2001]].

"The diagram [right] shows the IPCC version of the Briffa reconstruction (digitized from the IPCC 2001) compared to actual Briffa data [in 0939154709.txt]..." [T]he decline [after 1960] in the Briffa reconstruction has, for the most part, been deleted from the IPCC proxy diagram [see green line in graph at right, and in close-up graph shown with [IPCC 2001]]." "Contrary to claims by various climate scientists, the IPCC Third Assessment Report did not disclose the deletion of the post-1960 values." "The deletion of the decline was repeated in the 2007 Assessment Report First Order and Second Order Drafts, once again without any disclosure." [54]

OSBORN also advises MANN to try changing the baseline (i.e., to massage the data) if a decline prior to 1960 appears. "Indeed, if the non-temperature signal that causes the decline in tree-ring density begins before 1960, then a short 1931-60 period might yield a more biased result than using a longer 1881-1960 period." [0939154709.txt]

**BRIFFA NOT HAPPY ABOUT CREATING “CONSENSUS” BY EXCLUDING DATA**

**BRIFFA:** "My concern was motivated by the possibility of expressing an impression of more consensus than might actually exist. I suppose the earlier talk implying that we should not ‘muddy the waters’ by including contradictory evidence worried me." [0938125745.txt]

**Nov 16, 1999**

**HOW TO HIDE COOLING: USE MANN’S “NATURE” TECHNIQUE**

JONES announces he’s successfully used MANN’S "Nature trick" (used to create the controversial MBH98 temperature record (see {MCINTYRE Nov.2003}) and (MANN 23.Apr.98)) to hide a drop in proxy-based reconstructed temperatures.

JONES: Subject: Diagram for WMO Statement

"I've just completed Mike's Nature trick of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (ie from 1981 onwards) and from 1961 for Keith's to hide the decline." [0942777075.txt]

See [36] for a full explanation of how this was done, and how the "trick" became part of the iconic hockey stick graph in the 2001 IPCC report; see {IPCC 2001}.

**2000**

**JUST SAY YOU DON’T HAVE THE DATA EVEN IF YOU DO**

BRIFFA publishes BRIFFA2000 [156] which uses the now controversial Yamal tree ring measurement temperature data. In 1995 BRIFFA published that 1032 "was the coldest year of the millennium" however new data by Schweingruber showed "the opposite situation - a very warm 11th century". So in BRIFFA2000 he substituted his original data with the Yamal data without reporting the contradictory results. [157] [This Yamal data was] used like crack cocaine by paleoclimatologists, and [is critical] in many spaghetti graph reconstructions...” [158]

Curious about this situation, MCINTYRE requests the data in 2006, but is refused. He finally obtains the data by luck in 2009 (see {MCINTYRE 26.Sep.2009}). In fact, as he explains, OSBORN even advised the editors of Science in 2006 that he (i.e. CRU) didn’t "have any core measurement data”...” [though] the Climategate documents show that CRU had an extensive collection of Yamal measurement data... Not only did CRU actually have Yamal measurement data (which it had had since the 1990s), the CRU letters showed that CRU had funded collection of the Yamal data (at last in part).” [155]

**2001**

**UN FAO: EARTH WARMs AND COOLS EVERY 30 YEARS**

The UN Food and Agriculture Organization sought to understand climate change on long-term fluctuations of commercial catches that several independent measures showed "a clear 55-65 year (i.e. approx 30 year warming then cooling) over both short and long terms (1500 years). [146:1] The report also highlighted the "meridional" epoch... is now in its final stage..." [146:2] Latitudinal changes corresponded to warm periods and meridional circulations to

**1998 - 2010**

**STABLE, THEN COOLING, GLOBAL TEMPERATURES**

1998 - 2002

**HOCKEY STICK AUTHORITY PRELIMINARY AND TRASHED**

HUGHES, a co-author of MBH99, expresses reservations (also see [33]):

HUGHES: "All of our attempts to find records of temperatures for the previous 1000 years using the most recent proxy records and a variety of techniques were unsuccessful... The next generation of proxies (including higher-resolution temperature records) is a subject of much concern..."
OR: OUR WORK SHOULD BE CONSIDERED EATED WITH CONSIDERABLE CAUTION

Attempts, so far, to estimate hemisphere-scale period around 1000 years ago are based on far f we would like. None of the datasets used so far has cal distribution that experience with recent centuries one has yet found a convincing way of validating the ts of them against independent data. As Ed [Cook] records that the backbone of most of the e problem of poor replication near the p particularly acute, and ubiquitous.... rt everything we are doing is preliminary, and considerable caution." [1018647333.txt]

MCINTYRE AND MCKITRICK EXPOSE HOCKEY STICK FLAWS

WE DON'T KNOW THE PROBABLE FLAWS IN Mike's recon, particularly as it relates to the tropical stuff. Your response is also why I chose not to read the published version of his letter. It would be too aggravating..... It is puzzling to me that a guy as bright as Mike would be so unwilling to evaluate his own work a bit more objectively." [1024334440.txt]

JONES: WE’VE GOT 25 YEARS WORK IN THE DATA; WHY SHOULD I GIVE IT TO YOU?

JONES, whose research is publicly funded, claims ownership when asked to give his data and methods. From "The Dog Ate Global Warming" by Patrick J. Michaels and Steven V. Mosher.

"Warwick Hughes, an Australian scientist, wondered where that "+/-" came from, so he wrote Phil Jones in early 2005, asking for the original data. Jones’s response to a fellow atmospheric scientist attempting to replicate his work was, "We have 25 years or so invested in the work. Why should I make the data available to you, when your aim is to try and find something wrong with it?"

"Reread that statement, for it is breathtaking in its anti-scientific thrust. In fact, the entire purpose of replication is to ‘try and find something wrong’—"

"Then the story changed. In June 2009, Georgia Tech’s Peter Webster told Canadian researcher Stephen McIntyre that he had requested raw data, and Jones freely gave him. So McIntyre promptly filed a Freedom of Information Act request for the same data. Despite having been invited by the National Academy of Sciences to present his analysis of Medieval millennial temperatures, McIntyre was told that he couldn’t have the data because he was not a ‘fellow of the Academy’.

"I have just read this letter - and I think it is crap. Of course, I agree with you. We both know the probable flaws in Mann's 1998 paper is a very sloppy piece of work - an opinion I have held for some time. Presumably what you have done with Keith is better? - or is it? I get asked about this a lot." [1098472400.txt]

2005

"In October, 2004 WIGLEY reads MM03 and e-mails JONES he thinks MANN'S paper is very sloppy; "I have just read the M&M stuff criticizing MBH. A lot of it seems valid to me. At the very least MBH is a very sloppy piece of work - an opinion I have held for some time. Presumably what you have done with Keith is better? - or is it? I get asked about this a lot." [1098472400.txt]

The graph from MM03 highlights the result after MANN'S hockey stick is corrected. Specifically, high temperatures at the end of the Medieval Warm Period (1400-1500) are restored (see WEGMANN 14.Jul.2006). The hockey stick graph, used in the 2001 IPCC report, removes the MWP and LIA, and makes it appear that there is warming in recent years compared with purportedly stable temperatures in earlier centuries.

For a layman’s explanation of the MCINTYRE and MCKITRICK paper and why it proves MANN’S hockey stick is statistically invalid (i.e. the hockey stick is a fabrication), as well as a riveting account of the maelstrom of intrigue the M&M paper unleashed, see [33]. In 2005, MCINTYRE and MCKITRICK publish more papers (following further disclosures about Mann) they claim "are a definitive resolution of issues first raised in MM03." [57]
LIMITE IS ARBITRARILY DEFINED AS A 30 YEAR TREND

JONES and PLUMMER discuss the 30-year reference temperature period used by the IPCC. JONES explains that the length was an arbitrary choice which has no scientific basis. PLUMMER doesn't want to change it from the 1961-90 period because global warming won't appear as dramatic.

JONES: "20 years (1981-2000) isn't 30 years, but the rationale for 30 years isn't that compelling. The original argument was for 35 years around 1900 because Bruckner found 35 cycles in some Russian lakes (hence periods like 1881-1915). This went to 0 as it easier to compute. Personally I don't want to change the base period till after I retire!"

PLUMMER: "There is a preference in the atmospheric observations chapter of IPCC AR4 to stay with the 1961-1990 normals. This is partly because a change of normals confuses users, e.g. nomalies will seem less positive than before if we change to newer normals, so the impression of global warming will be muted."

This raises serious questions for their committee: "[O]ne concern relates to what review has been sufficiently robust and independent. We understand that Dr. McKitrick and Mann, the lead author of the studies in question, was also a lead author of the chapter that assessed and reported this very same work, and that two co-authors were also contributing authors to the same chapter." [1120593115.txt]

Feb 18, 2005

MANN'S METHOD CREATES HOCKEY STICKS

The Wall Street Journal cites experts questioning the validity of MANN's hockey stick graph, and the methods used to produce it:

"Statistician Francis Zwiers of Environment Canada (a government agency) notes that Mr. Mann's method 'preferentially produces hockey sticks when there are none in the data.' Other reputable scientists such as Berkeley's Richard Muller and Hans von Storch of Germany's GKSS Center essentially agree."

Jan 21, 2005

FIRST CONTACT WITH FOI: THE SCHEMING STARTS

The moment JONES and WIGLEY first become aware of the Freedom of Information Act from a UEA leaflet, they immediately start planning how to get around it [1106338086.txt]:

WIGLEY: "I got a brochure on the FOI Act from UEA. Does this mean that, if someone asks for a computer program we have to give it out?? Can you check this for me and Sarah?"

JONES: "As you're no longer an employee I would use this argument if anything comes along..."

WIGLEY: "The leaflet appeared so general, but it was prepared by UEA so they may have simplified things. From their wording, computer code would be covered by the FOIA. My concern was if Sarah is/was still employed by UEA. I guess she could claim that she had only written one tenth of the code and release every tenth line."

JONES: "As for FOIA Sarah isn't technically employed by UEA and she will likely be paid by Manchester Metropolitan University. I wouldn't worry about the code. If FOIA does ever get used by anyone, there is also IPR to consider as well. Data is covered by all the agreements we sign with people, so I will be hiding behind them."

Feb 2, 2005

JONES: I'LL DELETE CRU DATA RATHER THAN RELEASE IT

JONES and MANN discuss how to circumvent US and UK Freedom of Information Acts. JONES' solution: Delete the data. MANN's solution: Claim intellectual property rights:

JONES: "The two MM [Mann and McIntyre] have been after the CRU station data for years. If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the UK, I think I'll delete the file rather than send to anyone. Does your similar act in the US force you to respond to enquiries within 20 years? - our does! The UK works on precedents, so the first request will test it. We also have a data protection act, which I will hide behind. Tom Wigley has sent me a worried email when he heard about it - thought people could ask him for his model code. He has retired officially from UEA so he can hide behind that. IPR should be relevant here, but I can see me getting into an argument with someone at UEA who'll say we must adhere to it!"
density records tend to show a decline after 1960 relative to the summer temperature in many high-latitude locations. In this data set this "decline" has been artificially removed in an ad-hoc way, and this means that data after 1960 no longer represent tree-ring density variations, but have been modified to look more like the observed temperatures."

"Others, such as mxgrid2ascii.pro, issue this warning:

"NOTE: recent decline in tree-ring density has been ARTIFICIALLY REMOVED to facilitate calibration. THEREFORE, post-1960 values will be much closer to observed temperatures then (sic) they should be which will incorrectly imply the reconstruction is more skilful than it actually is. See Osborn et al. (2004)...." [22]

Feb 16, 2006

BRIFFA AGAIN WORRIED ABOUT EXAGGERATIONS

BRIFFA and OVERPECK, lead authors the 2007 IPCC report, discuss the draft. BRIFFA is worried about overstatements. [1140067691.txt] [1158175939.txt]

"[BRIFFA] urged caution, warning that when it came to historical climate records, there was no new data, only 'the same old evidence' that had been around for years. "'Let us not try to over-egg the pudding,' he wrote in an email to an IPCC colleague...." "[T]here have been many different techniques used to aggregate and scale data - but the efficacy of these is still far from established. But when the 'warmest for 1,300 years' claim was published in 2007 in the IPCC's fourth report, the doubters kept silent." [60]

Jun 19, 2007

JONES CONVINCES HIS UNIVERSITY TO IGNORE FOI REQUESTS

JONES advises KARL he may have convinced UEA to ignore FOI requests from MCINTYRE (i.e. people with climateaudit.org (CA)) and that others in Australia are doing the same. They have cause to be fearful: MCINTYRE discredited MANN'S hockey stick graph and later found errors forcing HANSEN to revise NASA's GISS temperature record.

JONES: "I. Think I've managed to persuade UEA to ignore all further FOIA requests if the people have anything to do with Climate Audit."

"2. Had an email from David Jones of BMRC, Melbourne. He said the are ignoring anybody who has dealings with CA, as there are threads it about Australian sites." [1182255717.txt]

Jun 21, 2006

HOW TO HIDE COOLING: ONLY USE DATA SHOWING WARMING

IPCC review editor John Mitchell admits the reason they don't include proxy data for recent decades is because they don't show warming: MITCHELL: "There needs to be a clear statement of why the instrumental and proxy data are shown on the same graph. The issue of why we don't show the proxy data for the last few decades (they don't show continued warming) but assume that those values are valid for early warm periods needs to be explained." [1150923423.txt]

Apr 23, 2007

JONES sets out the options he was considering with regard to FOI requests he was facing (date taken from the file's last edit date):

"Options appear to be:

1. Send them the data
2. Send them a subset removing station data from some of the countries who made us pay in the normal papers of Hulme et al. (1990s) and also any number that David can remember. This should also omit some other countries like (Australia, NZ, Canada, Antarctica). Also could extract some of the sources that Anders added in (31-38 source codes in J&M 2003). Also should remove many of the early stations that we coded up in the 1980s.
3. Send them the raw data as is, by reconstructing it from [NASA's GISS' dataset known as] GHCN. How could this be done? Replace all stations where the WMO ID agrees with what is in GHCN. This would be the raw data, but it would annoy them." [jones-foiathoughts.doc]
Oct 27, 2009

MANN ON YAMAL: IT ISN'T ABOUT...

MANN to JONES: "As we all know, this is truth at all, its about plausibly deniable accusations." [1256735067.txt]

Oct 6, 2009

JONES: CRU TEMPERATURE DATA IS BETTER THAN THE IPCC & FOI

JONES tells WIGLEY why he believes UK’s CRU temperature is more accurate than HANSEN’S GISS record at NASA.

As explained on wattsupwiththat.com: "Many of [JONES']s GISS products we’ve covered here on WUWT and at Climate Audit problems with CRU’s temperature series is in the code already. If Dr., he thinks GISS is inferior, well then, wow, just how bad is GISS?" [30]

JONES: "GISS is inferior - not just because it doesn’t use back data urbanization adjustment which is based on population/nights lights, gridding also smooths things out. Plotting all three together for land can see some decadal timescales. GISS does have less year-to-year variability - with CRU and HANSEN it’s more consistent.

May 5, 2008

FIRST FOI REQUEST TO CRU FOR AR4 INFO

David Holland, an engineer seeking information on how authors, reviewers and editors of AR4 (the IPCC 2007 report) discharge their duties, submits an FOI request to CRU (whose BRIFFA and OSBORN were lead authors of the report). This proceeds as follows: May 6 - CRU Acknowledgement; June 3 - CRU Refusal Notice; June 4: Holland Appeal; June 20: CRU Rejection of Appeal. [24]

Dec 3, 2008

JONES: UEA IS ON BOARD TO IGNORE FOI REQUESTS FROM McNITRYE

JONES: "When the FOI requests began here, the FOI person said we had to abide by them. It took a couple of half hour sessions - one at a screen, to convince him otherwise showing them what CA [climateaudit.org] was all about. They became aware of the types of people [McIntyre] we were dealing with, so many false references.. so many changes that aren’t documented. As explained on wattsupwiththat.com: "Many of [JONES]'s GISS products we’ve covered here on WUWT and at Climate Audit problems with CRU’s temperature series is in the code already. If Dr., he thinks GISS is inferior, well then, wow, just how bad is GISS?" [30]

JONES: "GISS is inferior - not just because it doesn’t use back data urbanization adjustment which is based on population/nights lights, gridding also smooths things out. Plotting all three together for land can see some decadal timescales. GISS does have less year-to-year variability - with CRU and HANSEN it’s more consistent.

"I'm hitting yet another problem that’s getting seriously fed up with the state of the Australian data cleaning, so have very little - if anything at all to blow up our economy and lower our standard of living to ‘fix’ the climate? Are they insane?" [21]

May 29, 2008

JONES: EVERYONE DELETE E-MAILS RELATED TO IPCC AR4

In an e-mail regarding "IPCC & FOI", JONES instructs MANN to delete e-mails related to the IPCC AR4 (2007). GENE, KEITH and CASPAR are to do the same. JONES’ request is after the formal FOI request of May 5, 2008 and discussions with UEA’s FOI officer on May 9, 2008.

JONES: "Mike, Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4? Keith will do likewise. He’s not in at the moment - minor family crisis. Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same? I don’t have his new email address. We will be getting Caspar to do likewise."

MANN: "I’ll contact Gene about this ASAP. His new email is: generwahl@xxxxxxxxx.xxx" [1212063122.txt]

May 12, 2008

ANTER: I’LL QUIT IF LLNL FORCES ME TO DISCLOSE

ANTER at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory says he will continue to refuse such data requests in support of McIntyre and reviewing how to avoid FOI requests. A few days later he says he’ll leave LLNL if the management does not support him in this.

ANTER: "I will continue to refuse such data requests in the future. Nor will I provide McIntyre with computer programs, which he can get anything I’ve written about him. If he pays 10 pounds (which he hasn’t yet) I am supposed to go through my e-mails and he can get anything I’ve written about him. About 2 months ago I deleted of emails, so have very little - if anything at all." [122830629.txt]

Oct 17, 2009

MANN ON YAMAL: IT ISN’T ABOUT...

MANN to JONES: "As we all know, this is truth at all, its about plausibly deniable accusations." [1256735067.txt]

Feb 6, 2008

THINK WE CAN AVOID IPCC AR4 FOI REQUESTS

[To "Mike, Ray, Caspar"]: "2. You can delete this if you want. Keep this quiet also, but this is the person sitting in FOI requests for all emails Keith [BRIFFA] and Tim [NJ] have written and received re Ch 6 of AR4 [IPCC 2007]. Think we’ve found a way around this." [1210367056.txt]

Dec 6, 2008

JONES: CRU TEMPERATURE DATA IS BETTER THAN THE IPCC & FOI

JONES tells WIGLEY why he believes UK’s CRU temperature is more accurate than HANSEN’S GISS record at NASA.

As explained on wattsupwiththat.com: "Many of [JONES']s GISS products we’ve covered here on WUWT and at Climate Audit problems with CRU’s temperature series is in the code already. If Dr., he thinks GISS is inferior, well then, wow, just how bad is GISS?" [30]

JONES: "GISS is inferior - not just because it doesn’t use back data urbanization adjustment which is based on population/nights lights, gridding also smooths things out. Plotting all three together for land can see some decadal timescales. GISS does have less year-to-year variability - with CRU and HANSEN it’s more consistent.

"I'm hitting yet another problem that’s getting seriously fed up with the state of the Australian data cleaning, so have very little - if anything at all to blow up our economy and lower our standard of living to ‘fix’ the climate? Are they insane?" [21]
Sep 26, 2009

**MCINTYRE EXPOSES BRIFFA’S YAMAL**

After trying for 3 years, MCINTYRE finally obtains, by luck, the Yamal tree ring measurement data used by BRIFFA (see [BRIFFA 2000]). [45] He discovers BRIFFA only used 12 cores. Furthermore, he finds that only one freak tree of the 12 created the hockey stick! If that tree is removed from the equation, the hockey stick disappears, and when a larger sample is used -- the 34 cores in the Schweingruber Yamal dataset -- the result is cooling, as shown in the graph. [26]

Dec 10, 2008

**JONES: I'M NOT TO DELETE E-MAILS; FOI COMMISSIONER: FOI DOESN'T APPLY TO IPCC**

JONES: “Haven’t got a reply from the FOI person here at UEA. So I’m not entirely confident the numbers are correct. One way of checking would be to look on CA, but I’m not doing that. I did get an email from the FOI person here early yesterday to tell me I shouldn’t be deleting emails unless this was ‘normal’ deleting to keep emails manageable! McIntyre hasn’t paid his £10, so nothing looks likely to happen re his Data Protection Act email. Anyway requests have been of three types - observational data, paleo dat and who made IPCC changes and why. Keith has got all the latter - and there have been at least 4. We made Susan aware of these - all came fro David Holland. According to the FOI Commissioner’s Office, IPCC is a international organization, so is above any national FOI. Even though we (MOHC, CRU/UEA) possibly hold relevant info the IPCC is not part our remit (mission statement, aims etc) therefore we don’t have an obligation to pass it on, unless it has anything to do with our core business - and it doesn’t.” [1228922050.txt]

Nov 8, 2009

**“GLOBAL WARMING ATE MY DATA”**

Faced with pressure to release data, the CRU Web site claims CRU no longer has the original, only its “value-added version” [29], evoking scorn.

*The world’s source for global temperature record admits it’s lost or destroyed all the original data that would allow a third party to construct a global temperature record. The destruction (or loss) of the data comes at a convenient time for the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) in East Anglia - permitting it to snub FoIA requests to see the data. “The CRU has refused to release the raw weather station data and its processing methods for inspection - except to hand-picked academics - for several years. Instead, it releases a processed version, in gridded form. NASA maintains its own (GISSTEMP), but the CRU Global Climate Dataset, is the most cited surface temperature record by the UN IPCC. So any errors in CRU cascade around the world, and become part of ‘the science.’” [28]

Aug 20, 2009

**JONES: UK CLIMATE INSTITUTIONS COORDINATING RESISTANCE TO FOI REQUESTS USING EXCEPTIONS ADVISED BY INFORMATION COMMISSIONER**

JONES: Keith/Tim still getting FOI requests as well as MOHC and Reading. All our FOI officers have been in discussions and are now using the same exceptions not to respond - advice they got from the Information Commissioner.... The FOI line we’re all using is this. IPCC is exempt from any countries FOI - the skeptics have been told this. Even though we (MOHC, CRU/UEA) possibly hold relevant info the IPCC is not part our remit (mission statement, aims etc) therefore we don’t have an obligation to pass it on.” [1219239172.txt]
NEW YORK TIMES (May 21, 1975): "Scientists ponder why world's climate is changing: Major cooling widely considered to be inevitable." [2]

NEWSWEEK (April 28, 1975): The Cooling World - "[A]most unanimous in the view that the trend will reduce agricultural productivity for the rest of the century." [3]

INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE (July 1975): "[T]he threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind." -- Nigel Calder [150]

See [135] for media coverage of warming and cooling spanning 114 years.

1974

BERT BOLIN (LATER THE 1ST IPCC CHAIRMAN) SUGGESTS ON BBC'S "THE WEATHER MACHINE" THAT CO2 MIGHT CAUSE GLOBAL WARMING

Niger Calder, editor of New Scientist magazine and "the man responsible" for the BBC 1974 series "The Weather Machine," explains: "We were also the first to put Bert Bolin of Sweden on international television talking about the dangers of carbon dioxide, and I remember being bitterly criticized by top experts for indulging him in his fantasy.... In the 1980s, Margaret Thatcher] said to the scientists, she went to the Royal Society, and she said: 'There's money on the table for you to prove this stuff' [i.e. CO2 induced warming], because she was in favor of nuclear power for many reasons]. So, of course they went away and did that." [140]

BOLIN ON THE BBC: "And there is a lot of oil, and there are vast amounts of coal left. We seem to be burning it at an ever increasing rate. And if we go on doing this, in about 50 years time, the climate may be a few degrees warmer than today. We just don't know." [139]
March 9, 1980: "Scientists are reviving the controversial notion that millions of cubic miles of Antarctic ice can sometimes abruptly slip off the continent into the sea, resulting in extreme increases in global ocean levels and precipitating a dramatic chilling of the world's climate."[2]

One year after headlining cooling, the New York Times flip-flops, and in an op-ed piece sets the terms of the CO2-induced global warming debate: "[By] the time we were certain that a carbon dioxide induced climate change was occurring, it would be too late to prevent it."[6]

---

**Feb 21, 1978 - Nov 1980**

**DESPITE COOLING SINCE 1940, AND NO CONSENSUS ON FUTURE TEMPERATURE TRENDS, A NUMBER OF CONFERENCES ON HOW CO2 SUPPOSEDLY IMPACTS CLIMATE ARE HELD BETWEEN 1978 AND 1980**

Many of the individuals directly involved in the ClimateGate e-mails (including JONES, WIGLEY, and HANSEN) attend these conferences in the days prior to the IPCC. The same individuals are now major players in the IPCC itself. [13]

**FEBRUARY 21, 1978: "Carbon Dioxide, Climate and Society," a workshop sponsored by WMO, UNEP and SCOPE.** [10:1]

**FEBRUARY 12, 1979: First World Climate Conference organized by the World Meteorological Organization calls "on all nations to unite in efforts to understand climate change and to plan for it," but does "not call for action to prevent future climate change."** [5]

**MARCH 7, 1979: A Miami Beach workshop on the global effects of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels is conducted by the U.S. Department of Energy.** [10:1]

**JULY 23, 1979: A study group convened by the National Academy of Sciences to "assess the scientific basis for projection of possible future climatic changes resulting from man-made release of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere" meets in response to a request by the Director of Office of Science and Technology. HANSEN and A. Gilchrist (of the UK Meteorological office) are contributing scientists.**

Despite acknowledging significant gaps in knowledge, and omitting "the role of the biosphere in the carbon cycle" from their deliberations, the group's conclusion, assuming a doubling of CO2 by 2050, is that "warming will eventually occur." [10:2]

**NOVEMBER, 1980: "[A conference] in Villach, Austria, in 1980 organised jointly by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and the International Council for Science (ICSU) also concluded that the potential threats were sufficient to warrant an international programme of co-operation in research but that, due to scientific uncertainties, the development of a management plan for CO2 would be premature."**[5]

---

**Aug 22, 1981**

**GLOBAL WARMING MAKES THE FRONT PAGE**

Global warming makes the front page after HANSEN provides a New York Times reporter with a preview copy of his paper "Climate Impact of Increasing Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide" to be published in the journal Science.[4], in which he makes dramatic predictions about CO2 greenhouse effects [7].

"Many scientists were critical of the approach taken by HANSEN and others for damaging the integrity of science. According to [Spencer] Weart, *respected scientists publicly rebuked Hansen, saying he had gone far beyond what scientific evidence justified.*" [4]

---

**Oct 9, 1985**

**THE IPCC IS CONCEIVED**

A second conference in Villach, critical to placing the climate international political agenda and the subsequent establishment of the need for government action is more urgent than press statement of the three organizing bodies: "As a result of the greenhouse gases, it is now believed that in the first half of the temperature could occur which is greater than any in man's history."[5]

"[Wendy E.] Franz points out that these conclusions were far stronger and stood in stark contrast to the conclusion of a US National Academy of Sciences on a two years earlier in 1983, which 'advocated "caution not panic to development of policies to limit CO2 emissions."'"[5]

According to John McLean, citing Franz's paper "The Development of Policies to Limit CO2 Emissions."[170] "This time the 100 attendees, representatives of their countries, and they were selected by the conference."[5]

"These agencies pressured the attendees for policy recommendations, asking for a recommendation about moving away from fossil fuel statements about the state of knowledge and for advice to policy 'necessary policies at the national and international level. There was already asking for a movement away from fossil certain policies that shows they had decided the conference began. But these were not the only ones. Fred Bruce, told the participants to 'develop a consensus on our scientific knowledge of increases in CO2 and other physical and socio-economic impacts, and to develop sound recommendations by international agencies, based on this scientific consensus."[5]

Authors of CRU e-mails, including JONES and WIGLEY,
WMO and UNEP establish the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

“Bert Bolin, the first chairman of the IPCC was already heavily committed to the notion of manmade warming, having worked previously for the UNEP, WMO, the Brundtland Report, the SCOPE 29 report (on which the first IPCC report was largely based) and, very crucially, having documented that the Villach conference reached a consensus that manmade emissions of carbon dioxide were to blame for variations in climate.” [130]

“John Houghton, of the UK’s Met Office and seemingly as much a believer in man-made warming as Bolin, [was] appointed to chair IPCC Working Group I, whose role was to look for evidence of climate change and attribute causes (as if that blame hadn’t been predetermined.” [130]

Hansen: stop waffling; other scientists rebuke Hansen

“The present hysteria formally began in the summer of 1988, although preparations had been put in place at least three years earlier.... James Hansen, director of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies, in testimony before Sen. Al Gore’s Committee on Science, Technology and Space, said, in effect, that he was 99 percent certain that temperature had increased and that there was some greenhouse warming. He made no statement concerning the relation between the two.” [151] Afterwards, Hansen tells journalists that it is time to “stop waffling, and say that the evidence is pretty strong that the greenhouse effect is here.” [4] [5]

The media leap onto CO2 induced global warming, and the number of American newspaper articles about it rise tenfold in just one year. [4] [5]

“The interest Hansen generated in the media was also well-timed with regard to a major conference held in Toronto at the end of June 1988 [the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere] organised by scientists involved with the Villach and Bellagio workshops of 1987. This conference brought together 341 delegates, including 20 politicians and ambassadors, 118 policy and legal advisers and senior government officials, 73 physical scientists, 50 industry representatives and energy specialists, 30 social scientists and 50 environmental activists from 46 countries.” [5] According to Franz, the conference’s challenge to reduce CO2 emissions by about 20 percent of 1988 levels by 2004 had minimal scientific support. [5]

“Many scientists were critical of the approach taken by Hansen and others for damaging the integrity of science. According to [climate historian Spencer] Weart, ’respected scientists publicly rebuked Hansen, saying he had gone far beyond what scientific evidence justified.” [5] See also [151].
2093 is Director of the University of Anglia’s CRU, and custodian of the literature record, the primary record on by the IPCC. [19]
DAVIES is Director of University of East Anglia’s CRU and custodian of its temperature record, which is the primary data set relied on by the IPCC. [19]

Dec 11, 1997

KYOTO PROTOCOL

1998

PETITION: "NO CONVINCING SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE" OF AGW; BY 2010, 31,486 SCIENTISTS SIGN

The Petition Project is initiated in response to claims by Mr. Gore, the IPCC and others at Kyoto the "science is settled" - that an overwhelming 'consensus' of scientists agrees with the hypothesis of human-caused global warming, with only a handful of skeptical scientists in disagreement." "In PhD scientist signers alone [more than 9,000], the project already includes 15-times more scientists than are seriously involved in the United Nations IPCC process." [154:1] Of 31,486 scientists who have signed, 3,804 are trained in atmospheric, environmental, and Earth sciences; 935 in computer and mathematical methods; 5,812 in physics and aerospace sciences, and 4,621 in chemistry. [154:2]

1981 - 2010

HANSEN is Director of NASA GISS. He is custodian of the second most important temperature record used by the CRU, GISS and NOAA GHCN global temperature records agree with each other, that CRU's dataset is reliable (prompting a 3 year U.K. Met Office project to reassess 160 years worth...they are consistent with it, the GISS and GHCN records are now also suspect. [30] CRU and GISS obtain all the GHCN! [50] [1255298593.txt] See [50] [60] [62] [77] [114] [132] [168] [171] for examples of...
1. Shell International would give serious consideration to what I referred to in the meeting as a 'strategic partnership' with the TC, broadly equivalent to a 'flagship alliance' in the TC proposal. A strategic partnership would involve not only the provision of funding but some (limited but genuine) role in setting the research agenda etc.

2. Shell's interest is not in basic science. Any work they support must have a clear and immediate relevance to 'real-world' activities. They are particularly interested in emissions trading and CDM. [uea-tyndall-shell-memo.doc]
MISSIONS EVER

but it is only 7 years of data..."

COOK: WE KNOW FOR TEMPERATURES BEFORE CO2

"COOK e-mails BRIFFA..."


KEY STICK ARRIVES ON STAGE

created by Hubert Lamb, CRU’s Period 1000 years earlier and they were global phenomena, and a major event in the Medieval Warm Period“ (see

The hockey team needed to the Lead Author of Chapter 2, “Observed with Briffa... The Team features 36 mentions; JONES 36 mentions; JONES 31. Mar 31, 2004

RUSSIAN INSTITUTE WITH RUSSIAN

DECEMBER

Institute of Eco Climate Chan

"Analysts say the Hadley Center..."

"The data of the IEA..."

"The IEA said..."

"What the latest data show is that global temperature policy is a fast and loose..." [148]

2003 CO2 DOES NOT DRIVE TEMPERATURE -- IT IS THE OTHER WAY AROUND: FIRST TEMPERATURE INCREASES THEN CO2 INCREASES

"In the 1990’s the classic Vostok ice core graph showed temperature and carbon in lock step moving at the same time. It made sense to worry that carbon dioxide did influence temperature. But by 2003 new data came in and it was clear that carbon lagged behind temperature... After temperatures rise, on average it takes 800 years before carbon starts to move [see graph]. The extraordinary thing is that the lag is well accepted by climatologists, yet virtually unknown outside these circles.” [148]
MANN: "Yeah, there is a freedom of information act in the U.S., and the contrarians are going to try to use it for all its worth. But there are also intellectual property rights issues, so it isn't clear how these sorts of things will play out ultimately in the U.S." [1107454306.txt]

JONES HOPES FOR CATASTROPHE JUST TO PROVE HIS SCIENCE RIGHT

JONES: "As you know, I'm not political. If anything, I would like to see the climate change happen, so the science could be proved right, regardless of the consequences. This isn't being political, it is being selfish." [1120593115.txt]

VON STORCH: TIME TO TOSS THE HOCKEY STICK


Revkin: "Again, takeaway msg is that mann method can only work if past variability same as variability during period used to calibrate your method. So it could be correct, but could be very wrong as well. By the way, von storch doesn't concur with osborn/briffa on the idea that higher past variability would mean there'd likley be high future variability as well (bigger response to ghg forcing). He simply says it's time to toss hockey stick and start again, doesn't take it further than that." [1096382684.txt]

O R CERTAIN WE KNOW NOTHING ABOUT RE 1900

with a suggestion for a new paper, "Northern Ures Over The Past Millennium: Where Are The * written by himself, BRIFFA, Esper, OSBORN, and possibly JONES and MANN. "[W]hat I am suggesting is aisan of published 1000 year nh [northern hemisphere] this is exactly the kind of study that needs to be done before assessment.

topics, including "Describe the past work (Mann, Briffa, ba, yada, yada) and their data overlaps," and ends with the paper will come to (note: expletives partially redacted):

I'm certain this work, but also because of what I almost think I know of this study will show that we can probably say a fair bit optical nh temperature variability (at least as far as we s), but honestly know "**k-all about what the >100 be with any certainty (i.e. we know with certainty )." [1062592331.txt]

INSTITUTE (DEC.2009): HADLEY CENTER PROBABLY TAMPERED IAN CLIMATE DATA

2009: "Climategate has already affected Russia... [T]he Moscow-based economic Analysis (IEA) issued a report claiming that the Hadley Center for ge ... had probably tampered with Russian-climate data."

Russian meteorological stations cover most of the country's territory, and that inter had used data submitted by only 25% of such stations in its reports. Russian territory was not included in global-temperature calculations...

stations located in areas not listed in the ... UK (HadCRUT) survey often does substantial warming in the late 20th century and the early 21st century." Say climatologists use the data of stations located in large populated centers enced by the urban-warming effect more frequently than the correct data of ns."

It was necessary to recalculate all global-temperature data in order scale of such exaggeration." [74]

Russians are suggesting here, in other words, is that the entire temperature record used by the IPCC to inform world government... it has long been suspected that the CRU had been playing especially with Russian - more particularly Siberian - temperature records. [See Mar.2004]." [75] (See [82] for more.)
The project aims to photographically survey all 1,221 USHCN weather stations that are used for the US temperature record, the world’s most “accurate.” By spring 2009 over 70% of the network has been surveyed, and “89 percent of the stations ... fail to meet the National Weather Service’s own site requirements that stations must be 30 meters ... or more away from an artificial heating or radiating/reflecting heat source.” [117] The raw temperature data produced by the USHCN stations [used by GISS, CRU, NSDC, IPCC, and others] are not sufficiently accurate to use in scientific studies or as a basis for public policy decisions. ... "The data currently used to claim that the twentieth century witnessed a statistically significant warming trend are unreliable.” [132]

2005

|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|

2007

FOURTH IPCC ASSESSMENT REPORT (AR4) AND THE IPCC’S “4,000 SCIENTISTS”

Dr. William Schlesinger: Approximately 80% of IPCC scientists do not deal with climate. [84]

THE NATIONAL POST, "NUMBERS RACKET," BY LAWRENCE SOLOMON:

"This is the conclusion of 4,000 scientists appointed by governments from virtually every country in the world," asserted Mr. Rudd [Prime Minister of Australia], in making his case that the planet is in peril ...

"[Australian] John McLean scrutinized the lists that the IPCC used to arrive at its figures and found them to be riddled with duplications, such as the 383 authors who also acted as reviewers for the same sections in which their work appeared, and the authors and reviewers who were listed twice or thrice. Remove the duplications and the total number of authors plus reviewers drops from 3,750 to 2,890 ...

"Most importantly, the great majority of the reviewers commented on chapters that dealt with historical or technical issues ... The exception was Chapter 9 - Understanding and Attributing Climate Change. An endorsement here would clearly be a bono fide endorsement of the IPCC's conclusion.

"Chapter 9 had 53 authors and it received comments from 55 individual reviewers. Of the 55 individuals, four commented favourably on the entire chapter and three on a portion of the chapter." "The 53 authors and seven favourable reviewers represent a total of 60 people, leading McLean to conclude: 'There is only evidence that about 60 people explicitly supported the claim made by the IPCC that global warming represents a threat to the planet.’” [20]

FROM NASA GISS, UNEP, AMS AND OTHERS

been receding since the bottom of the Little Ice Age some 300 years ago (see [MEDEIVAL WARM PERIOD]

Glacier image [116] shows its retreat since 1780. Within this 300 year trend, glaciers also advance and retreat [117], and are now slwoing their retreat: "Gangotri's drawdown - 20 metres per annum in the '70s - is now mere six even if Gangotri retreats at 20 m per annum, it will last for 1,500 years.” [121] (Also see [UN FAO 2001].)

Meteorological Society reports "glaciers are only shrinking in the eastern Himalayas. Further west ... glaciers are pending.” [118] (Also see [TIMESONLINE 17 Jan 2010] and [121].) And, in fact, are doing so worldwide. [119]

Himalayas, NASA GISS [120:1] and UNEP [120:2] report that soot from densely populated south Asian cities or warming: "Soot’s role in Himalayan Warming ... Over areas of the Himalayas, the rate of warming is more than five warming globally ... There’s a localized phenomenon at play.” [120:1] [118]

2005

WEWMAN REPORT: MCINTYRE AND MCKITRICK RIGHT, MANN WRONG

"Dr. [Edward] Wegman [see [41]] is a professor at the Center for Computational Statistics at George Mason University, chair of the National Academy of Sciences’ Committee on Applied and Theoretical Statistics, and board member of the American Statistical Association. Few statisticians in the world have CVs to rival his…” "Wegman became involved in the global-warming debate after the energy and commerce committee of the U.S. House of Representatives asked him to assess one of the hottest debates in the global-warming controversy: the statistical validity of work by Michael Mann....

"Wegman accepted the energy and commerce committee’s assignment ... pro bono. He conducted his third-party review by assembling an expert panel of statisticians, who also agreed to work pro bono. Wegman also consulted outside statisticians, including the Board of the American Statistical Association. At its conclusion, the Wegman review entirely vindicated the Canadian critics and repudiated Mann’s work.” [113]

THE COMMITTEE’S FINDINGS (SUMMARIZED):

"In general, we found MBH98 and MBH99 [by Mann et al.] to be somewhat obscure and incomplete and the criticisms of MM03/05a/05b [McIntyre and McKitrick] to be valid and compelling...

"In our further exploration of the social network of authorships in temperature reconstruction, we found that at least 43 authors have direct ties to Dr. Mann by virtue of coauthored papers with him. Our findings from this analysis suggest that authors in the area of paleoclimate studies are closely connected and thus ‘independent studies’ may not be as independent as they might appear on the surface...

"It is important to note the isolation of the paleoclimate community; even though they rely heavily on statistical methods they do not seem to be interacting with the statistical community. Additionally, we judge that the sharing of research materials, data and results was haphazardly and grudgingly done. In this case we judge that there was too much reliance on peer review, which was not necessarily independent. [See [JONES 5.Aug.2009] and [JONES 26.2Feb.2004]] Moreover, the work has been sufficiently politicized that this community can hardly reassess their public positions without losing credibility. Overall, our committee believes that Mann’s assessments that the decade of the 1990s was the hottest decade of the millennium and that 1998 was the hottest year of the millennium cannot be supported by his analysis.” [40] [52]

2007

Mar 6, 2007

CANADA: POLAR BEAR NUM

"The latest government survey of polar bears roaming the vast Arctic expanses of Quebec, Labrador and southern B show the population of polar jumped to 2,100 animals from 800 in the mid-1980s. As recently as three years ago, a local count placed the number at 1,400.
1226500291.txt] “bers up official” [83]
TIMESONLINE.CO.UK: UK MET OFFICE TO COMMENCE 3 YEAR PROJECT TO RE-EXAMINE 160 YEARS OF CLIMATE DATA

[NOTE: This requires the original raw data, which the CRU claims to have destroyed.]

"The Met Office plans to re-examine 160 years of temperature data after admitting that public confidence in the science on man-made global warming has been shattered by leaked e-mails.

The new analysis of the data will take three years, meaning that the Met Office will not be able to state with absolute confidence the extent of the warming trend until the end of 2012.

"The Met Office database is one of three main sources of temperature data analysis on which the UN's main climate change science body relies for its assessment that global warming is a serious danger to the world. This assessment is the basis for next week’s climate change talks in Copenhagen aimed at cutting CO2 emissions.

"The Government is attempting to stop the Met Office from carrying out the re-examination, arguing that it would be seized upon by climate change sceptics.

"The Met Office works closely with the University of East Anglia’s Climatic Research Unit (CRU), which is being investigated after e-mails written by its director, Phil Jones, appeared to show an attempt to manipulate temperature data and block alternative scientific views.

"The Met Office’s published data showing a warming trend draws heavily on CRU analysis. CRU supplied all the land temperature data to the Met Office, which added this to its own analysis of sea temperature data."

WIGLEY: SINCE 1980 LAND WARMING DOUBLE THAT OF OCEAN

WIGLEY: "We probably need to say more about this. Land warming since 1980 has been twice the ocean warming -- and skeptics might claim that this proves that urban warming is real and important" [1257546975.txt]

CEI FILES NOTICE OF INTENT TO SU⁄ NASA GISS TO COMPLY WITH FOI REQUESTS AND RELEASE CLIMATE DOCUMENTS

Christ Horner, for the Competitive Enterprise Institute, "filed three Notices of Intent to File Suit against NASA and its Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS), for those bodies’ refusal - for nearly three years - to provide documents requested under the Freedom of Information Act.” "These documents were requested in January 2007 and NASA/GISS have refused to date to comply with their legal obligation to produce responsive documents." [73]
CLIMATEGATE: 30 YEARS IN THE MAKING
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