

[‘Watergate’ in klimatologenland](#)

Nov 22nd 2009 [Hans Labohm](#) [Frontpage](#)



Phil Jones

In mijn [vorige posting](#) rapporteerde ik over bedrog en manipulatie bij de CRU (‘Climatic Research Unit’) van de East Anglia University. De affaire ontwikkelt zich tot een soort ‘Watergate’ in klimatologenland en begint nu ook tot de reguliere media door te dringen.

Zo schrijft Keith Johnson in de ‘Wallstreet Journal’:

Emails Show Climate Science Ridden with Rancor

The picture that emerges of prominent climate-change scientists from the more than 3,000 documents and emails accessed by hackers and put on the Internet this week is one of professional backbiting and questionable scientific practices. It could undermine the idea that the science of man-made global warming is entirely settled just weeks before a crucial climate-change summit. ..

The release of the documents comes just weeks before a big climate-change summit in Copenhagen, Denmark, meant to lay the groundwork for a new global treaty to curb greenhouse-gas emissions and fight climate change. Momentum for an agreement has been undermined by the economic slump, which has put environmental issues on the back burner in most countries, and by a 10-year cooling trend in global temperatures that runs contrary to many of the dire predictions in climate models such as the IPCC’s.

A partial review of the emails shows that in many cases, climate scientists revealed that their own research wasn’t always conclusive. In others, they discussed ways to paper over differences among themselves in order to present a “unified” view on climate change. On at least one occasion, climate scientists were asked to “beef up” conclusions about climate change and extreme weather events because environmental officials in one country were planning a “big public splash.”

Since the hacking, many Web sites catering to climate skeptics have pored over the material and concluded that it shows a concerted effort to distort climate science. Other Web sites catering to climate scientists have dismissed those claims.

Zie verder [hier](#).

En in de ‘Washington Post’ schrijft Juliet Eilperin onder meer:

In one e-mail, the center’s director, Phil Jones, writes Pennsylvania State University’s Michael E. Mann and questions whether the work of academics that question the link between human activities and global warming deserve to make it into the prestigious IPCC report, which represents the global consensus view on climate science.

“I can’t see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report,” Jones writes. “Kevin and I will keep them out somehow — even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!”

In another, Jones and Mann discuss how they can pressure an academic journal not to accept the work of climate skeptics with whom they disagree. “Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues in the climate research community to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal,” Mann writes.

“I will be emailing the journal to tell them I’m having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor,” Jones replies.

Patrick Michaels, a senior fellow at the libertarian Cato Institute who comes under fire in the e-mails, said these same academics repeatedly criticized him for not having published more peer-reviewed papers.

“There’s an egregious problem here, their intimidation of journal editors,” he said. “They’re saying, ‘If you print anything by this group, we won’t send you any papers.’ “

Lees verder [hier](#).

Zou het niet eens tijd worden dat de Nederlandse klimatologen zich publiekelijk van dit soort praktijken distantieerden?