



RESEARCH

A A A | EMAIL PRINT | SHARE

Wash. Times loose with facts on claims that climate "alarmists" silence "dissent"

4 hours and 40 minutes ago — 6 Comments

The Washington Times falsely claimed both that a paper by economist Ross McKittrick was "excluded" from the 2007 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report, as evidence of attempts by "alarmists" to "silence" McKittrick for his "dissent" on global warming science, and that the IPCC was the "sole authority upon which the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) based its December 'endangerment finding.'" In fact, McKittrick's paper was included in the IPCC report, and the EPA cites several sources as the basis for its finding.

Wash. Times: "Mr. McKittrick's views were indeed excluded from the IPCC report"

From the April 7 *The Washington Times* [editorial](#):

Scientific journals evaluate arguments of this sort using a peer-review process by which purportedly impartial experts in the relevant field verify the paper's accuracy and suitability for publication. By addressing issues raised by reviewers, researchers are able to present an improved and refined final product. In Mr. McKittrick's case, the process appears to have been abused to stifle dissent.

The leading journals *Science* and *Nature* both rejected the paper as too specialized and lacking in novelty. The *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* did not respond. Reasons given for refusing the paper in other outlets frequently contradicted one another.

One of the famous leaked e-mails from the former head of the Climatic Research Unit at Britain's University of East Anglia sheds light on what really happens behind the scenes. "I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report," professor Phil Jones wrote in reference to a 2004 journal article by Mr. McKittrick. "Kevin and I will keep them out somehow - even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!"

Mr. McKittrick's views were indeed excluded from the IPCC report, but his paper will now be published in a forthcoming edition of *Statistics, Politics and Policy*. One of that journal's editors told *The Washington Times* that the submission was treated as "fairly routine." That is to say, they treated it as scientists should.

McKittrick paper was not "excluded" from the IPCC report

Jones criticized McKittrick paper in his email. The *Times* editorial refers to a July 8, 2004, [email](#), in which Jones criticized two papers -- including the one by McKittrick and [now Cato Institute fellow] Pat Michaels -- and said he couldn'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!"

But McKittrick's paper was not "excluded" from the IPCC, as the Times claimed. As the Yale Forum on Climate Change & the Media [explained](#), McKittrick's paper was [included](#) in the IPCC report, "suggesting that no small group of scientists could be final arbiters of what is included in the IPCC reports":

This [Jones] e-mail refers to two papers, one by Kalnay and Cai (2003) in *Nature* and [one by McKittrick and Michaels](#) (2004) in *Climate Research*, both dealing with effects of land-use change on temperature measurements. Despite Jones' dislike of the papers and his threat to keep them out of the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, both papers were [subsequently](#)

Search MediaMatters.org | Search Options

Enter Your Email Address Zip Code SIGN UP

my.MediaMatters.org »

LOGIN SIGN UP

Related

NETWORKS: [The Washington Times](#)

Push Back

Phone calls, emails and letters from the public do make a difference. Remember that to be effective you must be polite, and professional. Express your specific concerns regarding that particular news report or commentary, and indicate what you would like the media outlet to do differently in the future.

- The Washington Times Washington Times 3600 New York Ave NE Washington, DC 20002-1947 (202) 636-3000 http://twitter.com/washtimes

MMtv »

- Limbaugh: "What are we doing having relationships with the Muslim world, anyway?" 49 MINUTES AGO
- Beck warns that country is "on eve of destruction" and "will be destroyed if we don't turn our ways" 1 HOUR AND 26 MINUTES AGO
- Rush reacts to attack on "racist dog" by mocking hate crime statutes 1 HOUR AND 54 MINUTES AGO
- Limbaugh claims media is out to portray "conservatives as kooks, black helicopter types, the tin foil hat crowd" 2 HOURS AND 11 MINUTES AGO
- Beck in disbelief that "great Republican hope" Coburn would defend Nancy Pelosi 2 HOURS AND 15 MINUTES AGO
- GOP strategist Christie tells Erickson to "grow up" after

keep them out of the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report, both papers were **subsequently included** in the Assessment, suggesting that no small group of scientists could be final arbiters of what is included in the IPCC reports.



his "pretty stupid" and "irresponsible" shotgun remark

2 HOURS AND 15 MINUTES AGO

Wash. Times: IPCC is the "sole authority" on which EPA based its finding

From the **editorial**:

The prophets of global warming continue to lament as their carefully crafted yarn unravels before their eyes. Ross McKittrick, an intrepid economics professor from the University of Guelph in Ontario, Canada, has tugged apart the thin mathematical threads that once held together the story of climate change.

Recent attempts to silence Mr. McKittrick illuminate the extent to which the alarmists have abandoned proper scientific method in their pursuit of political goals.

Mr. McKittrick has spent the past two years attempting to publish a scientific paper that documents a fundamental error in the 2007 United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report. This U.N. document serves as the sole authority upon which the Environmental Protection Agency based its December "endangerment finding" that will allow unelected bureaucrats to impose cap-and-trade-style regulations without a vote of Congress. The cost to the public in higher gas and energy prices will run in the billions.

EPA cited sources other than IPCC as the basis for its finding

The EPA's **endangerment finding** on six greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide, **stated** that "[t]he major assessments by the U.S. Global Climate Research Program (USGCRP), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and the National Research Council (NRC) serve as the primary scientific basis supporting the Administrator's endangerment finding." It gave a **detailed explanation** of its use of all three sources, and a summary of the three assessments is provided in the EPA's **Technical Support Document**.

— D.C.P.

EXPAND ALL EXPAND 1ST LEVEL COLLAPSE ALL

+ Add Comment



by SLRTX (3 hours and 57 minutes ago)

4

It's just astonishing how the minds of some people work, or in this case don't work.

First it's, "no one will publish the anti-AGW 'skeptics' papers."

Then, they proclaim, "**Reference: 450 skeptical peer reviewed papers!**"

Which is it? No one will publish these papers, but magically we now have 450 "peer-reviewed" papers?

Ask McIntyre how he got published.

Ask Soon and Baliunas how they got published.

Where's this vast conspiracy to keep so-called "skeptics" from publishing?

I'm skeptical of these claims. As usual, they don't hold up to scrutiny.

REPLY REPORT ABUSE



by MidnightWriter (3 hours and 48 minutes ago)

2

Here's the deal. If I'm in my house, I smell smoke and see flames dancing across my couch, I'm going to say, "Hey, someone started a fire."

Now, it's entirely possible someone might hold a dissenting view and say, "Oh, that's not a fire. It's just plasma, a natural state of matter. And you can't prove it was man made." Fine. I'll listen, but I'm still grabbing an extinguisher. I'd like to put the damned thing out before it reduces my place to ashes.

REPLY REPORT ABUSE



by Tommy (2 hours and 24 minutes ago)

3

AGW is a hoax

<http://climatedepot.com>

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by MidnightWriter (2 hours and 6 minutes ago)

3

People who engage in actual science disagree.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by dkylep (2 hours and 4 minutes ago)

2

Jesus. You just never get tired of spewing the same bull, do you? Might as well just link Beck's site too, while you're at it, since you only decide that right-wing sites are 'acceptable' to use as evidence. You don't address the claims, you don't read, you don't think; your 'answer' to everything is to simply link a site that is so obviously partisan and biased that it would take an absolute idiot not to see it. Hmm.....

Educate yourself before posting. I know that you won't, and that the statement falls on deaf ears, but I simply had to write it. I honestly used to think that all you had to do was present the facts to people and they would examine them logically and debate them rationally. People like you have proven my belief naive and incorrect a thousand times over. You're not interested in any facts or proof that show anything contrary to what you already believe. You're like that woman on the Texas School Board that didn't want to teach about Ramirez because he wasn't famous enough.

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)



by SLRTX (1 hour and 27 minutes ago)

2

Tommy -

I find it fascinating that so-called "skeptics" of AGW claim that science has it all wrong, but then they use information from some blog site as if that site is somehow more credible than scientists.

Complain about science and peer-review as much as you want, but at least it IS an identifiable process.

Just what process do you propose?

Here, look at these links, then see if you can come back with a rational answer. But please keep your answer RATIONAL.

http://www.skeptic.com/about_us/manifesto.html

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eUB4j0n2UDU>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T69TOuqaqXI>

[REPLY](#) [REPORT ABUSE](#)

[ABOUT US](#) | [PRESS/BLOGGERS](#) | [SPECIAL REPORTS](#) | [CORRECTIONS](#) | [JOBS](#) | [STORE](#) | [PRIVACY POLICY](#) | [CONTACT US](#)

MOST POPULAR TAGS

- Fox News Channel
- Glenn Beck
- The O'Reilly Factor
- Bill O'Reilly
- Premiere Radio Networks
- James O'Keefe
- Hannah Giles
- The Rachel Maddow Show
- MSNBC
- Rachel Maddow
- Glenn Beck show
- Glenn Beck Program
- Thomas Sowell
- FOX & Friends
- Shannon Travis
- Newt Gingrich
- Today Show
- NBC
- Stuart Vamey
- The Washington Times

RSS FEEDS

Select a Feed

Get personalized rss or email alerts

CONNECT & SHARE

