

22 of 22 DOCUMENTS

MetroDenverGreens.org

December 3, 2009 Thursday 1:03 PM EST

Denier Liars

BYLINE: Dave Chandler

LENGTH: 2235 words

Dec. 3, 2009 (Earthside.com delivered by Newstex) --

Anti-science right-wing loonies are trying their mightiest to discredit global warming because of some emails hacked from the University of East Anglia's (UK) Climate Research Unit. On the basis on these relatively few emails, the likes of Glenn Beck, U.S. Senator Inhofe, the Republican Party, the Christian right, WorldNetDaily.com, in other words, the whole crowd of paranoid reactionary conservatives is calling the whole body of recent climate science a 'hoax'.

Of course, the real hoax is that there is any scandal or 'cover-up' here at all. There is massive public data and research that demonstrates human-caused climate change. Period.

The corporate 'news' media being what it is these days, a soap box is being provided to the Neanderthal faction and some skittish administrators and scientists are bending to the frothing, book burning bullies. But make no mistake, this is a tempest in a teapot; how a few scientists correspond through email does not make much of a grand conspiracy to forcibly push global warming on all the rest of the world.

What is most depressing is that there is a surprisingly large number of Americans who will scoop-up this 'controversy' as evidence that climate change theory is a 'secret' plot to foist "one world government" and "Maoist communism" on the United States.

So, here are a few links and excerpts from science blogs to clarify the non-story of the global warming emails. First, though, we recommend a piece written that shows how Sir Issac Newton, calculus and gravity have been demonstrated to be a hoax by correspondence between Newton and his peers. Imagine what kind of fraud would have been revealed if email had been available to Newton! This little essay kind of puts the whole 'scandal' into perspective.

Newtongate: The Final Nail in the Coffin of Renaissance and Enlightenment [#x2dc]Thinking | CarbonFixated.com

If you own any shares in companies that produce reflecting telescopes, use differential and integral calculus, or rely on the laws of motion, I should start dumping them NOW. The conspiracy behind the calculus myth has been suddenly, brutally and quite deliciously exposed after volumes of Newtons private correspondence were compiled and published.

When you read some of these letters, you realise just why Newton and his collaborators might have preferred to keep them confidential. This scandal could well be the biggest in Renaissance science. These alleged letters " supposedly exchanged by some of the most prominent scientists behind really hard math lessons " suggest:

Conspiracy, collusion in covering up the truth, manipulation of data, private admissions of flaws in their public claims and much more.

But perhaps the most damaging revelations are those concerning the way these math nerd scientists may variously have manipulated or suppressed evidence to support their cause.

Here are a few tasters. They suggest dubious practices such as ... MORE

CRU Climate Data Already Over 95% Available | University of East Anglia

Over 95% of the CRU climate data set concerning land surface temperatures has been accessible to climate researchers, sceptics and the public for several years the University of East Anglia has confirmed.

oelt is well known within the scientific community and particularly those who are sceptical of climate change that over 95% of the raw station data has been accessible through the Global Historical Climatology Network for several years. We are quite clearly not hiding information which seems to be the speculation on some blogs and by some media commentators, commented the Universitys Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Research Enterprise and Engagement Professor Trevor Davies. ...

The Global Warming Emails Non-Event | Phil Plait/DiscoverMagazine.com

The CRU Hack | RealClimate.org

As many of you will be aware, a large number of emails from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia webmail server were hacked recently (Despite some confusion generated by Anthony Watts, this has absolutely nothing to do with the Hadley Centre which is a completely separate institution). As people are also no doubt aware the breaking into of computers and releasing private information is illegal, and regardless of how they were obtained, posting private correspondence without permission is unethical. We therefore arent going to post any of the emails here. We were made aware of the existence of this archive last Tuesday morning when the hackers attempted to upload it to RealClimate, and we notified CRU of their possible security breach later that day.

Nonetheless, these emails (a presumably careful selection of (possibly edited?) correspondence dating back to 1996 and as recently as Nov 12) are being widely circulated, and therefore require some comment. Some of them involve people here (and the archive includes the first RealClimate email we ever sent out to colleagues) and include discussions weve had with the CRU folk on topics related to the surface temperature record and some paleo-related issues, mainly to ensure that posting were accurate.

Since emails are normally intended to be private, people writing them are, shall we say, somewhat freer in expressing themselves than they would in a public statement. ...

... More interesting is what is not contained in the emails. There is no evidence of any worldwide conspiracy, no mention of George Soros nefariously funding climate research, no grand plan to get rid of the MWP, no admission that global warming is a hoax, no evidence of the falsifying of data, and no marching orders from our socialist/communist/vegetarian overlords. The truly paranoid will put this down to the hackers also being in on the plot though.

Instead, there is a peek into how scientists actually interact and the conflicts show that the community is a far cry from the monolith that is sometimes imagined. People working constructively to improve joint publications; scientists who are friendly and agree on many of the big picture issues, disagreeing at times about details and engaging in robust discussions; Scientists expressing frustration at the misrepresentation of their work in politicized arenas and complaining when media reports get it wrong; Scientists resenting the time they have to take out of their research to deal with over-hyped nonsense. None of this should be shocking. ...

This posting contains a point-by-point, ongoing refutation of what the anti-science deniers are alledging.

The SwiftHack Scandal: What You Need to Know | EnviroKnow.com

The oeClimateGate Burden of Proof | Chris Mooney/DiscoverMagazine.com

Those of us who think this is all smoke and no fire are starting from the following position: There is a massive body of science, tested and retested and ratified by many leading scientific bodies, showing that global warming is real and human caused. So then we pose the following question: What would it take for oeClimateGate to significantly weaken this body of evidence in a serious way?

Lets say, just for the sake of argument, that all of the worst and most damning interpretations of these exposed emails are accurate. I dont think this is remotely true, but lets assume it.

Even if this is the case, it does not prove the following :1) The scientists whose emails have been revealed are representative of or somehow a proxy for every other climate scientist on the planet.

2) The studies that have been called into questions based on the emails (e.g., that old chestnut the oehockey stick) are somehow the foundations of our concern about global warming, and those concerns stand or fall based on those studies. Neither one of these is true, which is why I can say confidently that oeClimateGate is overblown"and which is why Ive never been impressed by systematic attacks on the oehockey stick. Even if that study falls, we still have global warming on our hands, and its still human caused.

My sense is that the climate skeptic commenters were seeing arent actually familiar with the vast body of climate science work out there, and dont realize how most individual studies are little more than a drop in the evidentiary bucket. It is because of the consilience of evidence from multiple studies and fields that we accept that climate change is human caused, and it is because of the vast diversity and number of scientists, and scientific bodies, who find that evidence compelling that we talk of a consensus.

I dont see how anything about oeClimateGate changes this big picture significantly"and again, thats even if we assume the worst about

what the emails reveal.

Group Promoting Climate Skepticism Has Extensive Ties to Exxon-Mobil (NYSE:XOM) | Sahil Kapur/RawStory.com

A group promoting skepticism over widely-accredited climate change science has a web of connections to influential oil giant Exxon-Mobil, Raw Story has found.

The organization is called the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), apparently named after the UN coalition International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). An investigation into the group reveals its numerous links to Exxon-Mobil, a vehement opponent of climate legislation and notorious among scientists for funding global warming skeptics.

"Exxon-Mobil essentially funds people to lie," Joseph Romm, lauded climate expert and author of the blog Climate Progress, told Raw Story. "It's important for people to understand that they pay off the overwhelming majority of groups in the area of junk science."

The NIPCC's signature report, "Climate Change Reconsidered," disputes the notion that global warming is human-caused, insisting in its policy summary that "Nature, not human activity, rules the planet." Many of its assertions have been challenged by, among others, the scientists' blog RealClimate.

The report was released and promoted this summer by the Heartland Institute, a think tank that claims to support "common-sense environmentalism" as opposed to "more extreme environmental activism." It alleges that "Global warming is a prime example of the alarmism that characterizes much of the environmental movement."

"To call global warming a hoax is to question every scientific journal, every scientific academy, and buy into the most extreme conspiracy theories," Romm said.

Heartland has received at least \$676,500 from Exxon-Mobil since 1998, the year Exxon launched a campaign to oppose the Kyoto Treaty, according to official documents of the two groups that have been compiled and reproduced by the website ExxonSecrets.org. Also, the institute's self-described Government Relations Adviser Walter F. Buchholtz has been a lobbyist for Exxon-Mobil, the Washington Post reported in 2004.

The study's two principal authors and NIPCC leaders S Fred Singer and Craig D Idso are both associated with various organizations that have gotten generous funding from Exxon-Mobil.

Singer has researched and published for the Cato (NYSE:CATO) Institute, which has accepted \$125,000 in grants from Exxon-Mobil since 1998. Other professional affiliations include the National Center for Policy Analysis, Frontiers of Freedom, and American Council on Science and Health -- which have accepted contributions of \$540,000, \$1.27 million and \$150,000, respectively, from Exxon.

Although some praise him as a hero, Singer has been slammed by many fellow climate scientists as "a fraud, a charlatan and a showman" for his unorthodox views and research.

His co-author Idso is founder, board chairman and former president of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, whose mission statement is to "separate reality from rhetoric in the emotionally-charged debate that swirls around the subject of carbon dioxide and global change." The organization has taken \$100,000 in funding from Exxon since 1998, according to the oil company's reports.

Idso is also affiliated with the George Marshall Institute, which has reportedly won \$840,000 from Exxon.

Exxon-Mobil has spent more money lobbying Congress in the last two years than any enterprise other than the Chamber of Commerce, dishing out \$29 million in 2008 and over \$20 million so far in 2009 to legislators. It's among the top 10 biggest spenders of lobbying cash since 1998, according to the Center for Responsive Politics.

"Exxon has waged certainly the biggest, most concerted, and most extreme disinformation campaign on this issue," Romm told Raw Story. "The trouble is they don't have to win the argument -- all they have to do is blow smoke and cast doubt, and they've accomplished their end."

In a recent incident, hackers exposed private emails exchanged between climate scientists. Some said the revealed information didn't add up to a conspiracy, while others declared it definitive proof that anthropogenic global warming is made-up.

The Senate will soon take up the mantle on climate bill that the House narrowly passed this summer, and a heated debate is likely to occur in Congress over the nature of the threat and the type of action that needs to be taken.

"I think we're going to pass it, but it's going to be an epic struggle," Romm said.

Republican Sen. Orrin Hatch has referenced the NIPCC report, calling it a "Comprehensive scientific answer to the IPCC [sic] Reports." Various blogs, such the conservative Free Republic, have touted this report as evidence that "global warming is not a crisis, and never was."

Newstex ID: DAVE-0002-40206824

LOAD-DATE: December 3, 2009

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

NOTES: The views expressed on blogs distributed by Newstex and its re-distributors ("Blogs on Demand®") are solely the author's and not necessarily the views of Newstex or its re-distributors. Posts from such authors are provided "AS IS", with no warranties, and confer no rights. The material and information provided in Blogs on Demand® are for general information only and should not, in any respect, be relied on as professional advice. No content on such Blogs on Demand® is "read and approved" before it is posted. Accordingly, neither Newstex nor its re-distributors make any claims, promises or guarantees about the accuracy, completeness, or adequacy of the information contained therein or linked to from such blogs, nor take responsibility for any aspect of such blog content. All content on Blogs on Demand® shall be construed as author-based content and commentary. Accordingly, no warranties or other guarantees will be offered as to the quality of the opinions, commentary or anything else offered on such Blogs on Demand®. Reader's comments reflect their individual opinion and their publication within Blogs on Demand® shall not infer or connote an endorsement by Newstex or its re-distributors of such reader's comments or views. Newstex and its re-distributors expressly reserve the right to delete posts and comments at its and their sole discretion.

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Web Blog

Copyright 2009 Newstex LLC
All Rights Reserved
Newstex Web Blogs
Copyright 2009 Earthside.com