

I Just Saved A Fortune On My Life Insurance! Did You?

Take advantage of the current low rates today!

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|----|---------|
| 10-Yr Level Term Life Insurance | age male | 40 | \$20.56 |
| \$500,000 Policy | | 45 | \$31.06 |
| | | 50 | \$45.06 |
| | | 55 | \$77.00 |

Click Here for a FREE QUOTE!

AccuQuote®

- NEWS
- POLITICS
- OPINIONS
- BUSINESS
- LOCAL
- SPORTS
- ARTS & LIVING
- GOING OUT GUIDE
- JOB
- CARS
- REAL ESTATE
- RENTALS
- CLASSIFIEDS

SEARCH: | [Search Archives](#)

Planet Panel

Views and debates on climate change policy

- [Home](#)
- [Panelists](#)
- [Staff Blog](#)
- [RSS](#)



Post Carbon
Live staff reports from the U.N. conference on climate change

Special Report



The Climate Agenda

The latest resources and news on global climate change policy, science and the search for solutions.

RELATED LINKS

- Planet Panel: Main
- Staff Blog: Post Carbon

RECENT POSTS

- EPA under fire
- Climategate: East Anglia aftermath, and beyond
- Chinese leaders going forward with carbon restriction plans
- Dorgan's exit and climate change
- Is America's auto love affair fading?

Stories By Category

- about this blog
- Copenhagen morning reads

Stories By Date

- Full Story Archive

SUBSCRIBE TO THIS BLOG

- XML RSS Feed
- Google
- MY YAHOO!
- newsgator
- Bloglines
- netvibes
- MY MSN
- MY AOL
- ROJO
- Windows Live
- NewsAlloy

Climategate: East Anglia aftermath, and beyond

By Juliet Eilperin

A new guerrilla green operation has begun.

PolluterWatch, the brainchild of the advocacy group Greenpeace, is taking direct aim at major corporations who emit greenhouse gases and other pollutants. They're not just going after the companies themselves, but their hired guns and allies. (In the words of Greenpeace U.S. research director **Kert Davies**, those would be "their hired propagandists and influence peddlers.")

A case in point: Greenpeace has filed a Virginia Freedom of Information Request with both **Virginia Gov. Tim Kaine's** (D) office and the **University of Virginia** demanding an array of correspondence concerning **Patrick Michaels**, a senior fellow at both the conservative Cato Institute and at George Mason University. Michaels also held the title of Virginia's official climatologist starting in 1980 until Kaine **announced in August 2006** he did not consider Michaels as holding that honorary post.

The FOIA to Kaine requests any "letters, email, faxes, reports, meeting and teleconference agendas, minutes, notes, transcripts, tape recordings and phone logs generated by or involving Dr. Patrick Michaels regarding global climate change (a.k.a. global warming)."

Consider it a response to the November **release of hundreds of e-mails** by climate researchers that were housed on the server of the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit.

Davies, who directs PolluterWatch, said in an interview Kaine's office has informed him the documents "are in the mail," but he hasn't seen them yet. As for the project as a whole, Davies said it's an outgrowth of other Greenpeace projects, such as its tracking of **ExxonMobil's spending** on climate change research and PR.

Advertisement

Sponsored Links

Don't Pay For White Teeth
Mom's Whitening Method Exposed. The Results May Shock You.
www.ConsumersNewsDaily.com

"If successful, we will reveal how the corrupting influence of polluter lobbyists and the politicians they have in their pockets continues to handcuff the US government on climate and energy policy," he said. "The legacy of denial and delay caused by these actors will never be undone, but we can weaken their grip moving forward."

Michaels said he was unaware of the FOIA request of Kaine's office, but did know about the UVA request. In terms of handing over the documents, Michaels said, "That's not up to me, that's up to the University of Virginia to decide."

"Obviously there's an issue of precedent," he continued. "If you can get all the e-mails of one faculty member you don't like, you can get all the e-mails of another faculty member you don't like. I don't know what the answer is to that... It is a bad thing for academia for sure."

If interesting e-mails come to light as a result of these FOIAs, don't worry you'll be able to locate them through [Post Carbon](#).

BY JULIET EILPERIN | JANUARY 8, 2010; 3:17 PM ET

SAVE & SHARE:        

PREVIOUS: [CHINESE LEADERS GOING FORWARD WITH CARBON RESTRICTION PLANS](#) | NEXT: [EPA UNDER FIRE](#)

Comments

Please report offensive comments below.

According to one report, the Northern hemisphere may expect 20 or more years of cooling:

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1242011/DAVID-ROSE-The-mini-ice-age-starts-here.html>

This view is shared by two climate scientists who are not "skeptics". If they are right, the consequences for food production are profound. Already there are predictions that food prices in Europe will rise as a consequence of the bitter winter. The difficulty for agriculture will be that planning depends on a stable climate, and at the moment, it is not clear whether warming or cooling will dominate.

POSTED BY: ANNLEPAIN | JANUARY 11, 2010 6:36 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

WWWEXLER WROTE:

The question of whether global warming is occurring is not even debatable. It is occurring, and that is a provable, quantified fact. (I agree)

The incident with the emails doesn't have any bearing on this fact. None whatsoever. (I agree)

Those who point to the emailers and claim that this has some bearing on the facts are daft. It's as daft as holding up one or two scientists who disagree with the larger scientific community as proof that there's no global warming occurring. It's as daft as saying that because it's 40 degrees in Florida today, there couldn't be global warming.(I agree)

Oh, that goofy Al Gore. (My opinion of Gore is that he is a

Hot Penny Stock (USOG)

500% increase forecast for United States Oil and Gas - Analyst Report
www.stocksources.us

[Buy a link here](#)

carnival huckster who is motivated by money – therefore, I believe he is the wrong person to bear this message) (The 100MB of data is not statically significant when compared by the massive volume of data available – that is smoking gun from the e-mails – not some misunderstanding of technical jargon.)

Here's the deal. The warming is causing major climate disruptions which will only get worse. The disappearing ice caps, record droughts, creeping deserts, erratic weather patterns, etc. would be enough to catch a curious person's attention. (I agree)

People who deny that the human race's carbon footprint is contributing or possibly even causing the problem are in denial of the scientific facts.(Not proven – Ice cores show that CO2 increases have historically lagged temperature increases because the oceans – 70% of the surface of the globe hold less CO2 at higher temperatures. Ocean temps go up – atmosphere CO2 goes. Where is the evidence that CO2 increases first and then temperature?) (Back to the question of: What is the dependent variable in the formula? A significantly larger sample size may have settle this)

It is provable that the composition of the atmosphere has been changing since the explosion in the use of fossil fuels in the last century or so. There is a record in the tree rings and glaciers (if you can still find one). (I agree)

I wish people would stop viewing this through the lens of politics and start trying to come up with realistic solutions.(I agree – I am doing something personally by dramatic decreases in demand for electrical service at my home).

I am very dismayed with the performance/antics coming from the US for the last 30 years on all environmental affairs. The GOP always trumps science with ideology and that's what this is about. (You seriously need to drop GOP and substitute 'all politicians when they see a band wagon')

Pull your heads out of your behinds and take a good look around. What you're seeing is probably not going to be here for your great grandkids. (You underestimate the human capacity to adapt)

Serious question – what has come out of the work done by the University of Oxford through the BOINC project?

All the best
Phil

POSTED BY: PHILHOEY | JANUARY 10, 2010 9:54 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

dedreckon posted:

"Let me ask all the Global Climate change true believers a valid question. Where do you think Wall Street (and Al Gore) are going to get all the billions they are planning to pocket?"

They're going to pull them out of the same place that you and Jesse Ventura postulated they'd be.

You're exactly the kind of person to whom I addressed my last post. You need a clue, and I'll give you one, free. You need to stop looking at this as a conspiracy theory a la

Glenn Beck, Jesse Ventura, or others. It's not a theory, it's a problem, and chuckleheads need to either lend a hand or get out of the way.

Let me ask you a question, Sparky. What planet do you intend to live on if this one becomes uninhabitable? Do you think they'll take the dollar as currency there?

POSTED BY: WWWEXLER | JANUARY 10, 2010 9:42 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

GlobalWarming/Climate Change is the ponzi Scheme of the century. Al Gore and all of Wall Street are drooling over the prospect of making billions selling carbon credits globally. Wall street insiders are not even bashful when they brag on how the carbon credit business is going to make more than oil.

Let me ask all the Global Climate change true believers a valid question. Where do you think Wall Street (and Al Gore) are going to get all the billions they are planning to pocket?

POSTED BY: DEDRECKON | JANUARY 10, 2010 9:18 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The question of whether global warming is occurring is not even debatable. It is occurring, and that is a provable, quantified fact.

The incident with the emails doesn't have any bearing on this fact. None whatsoever. Those who point to the emailers and claim that this has some bearing on the facts are daft. It's as daft as holding up one or two scientists who disagree with the larger scientific community as proof that there's no global warming occurring. It's as daft as saying that because it's 40 degrees in Florida today, there couldn't be global warming. Oh, that goofy Al Gore.

Here's the deal. The warming is causing major climate disruptions which will only get worse. The disappearing ice caps, record droughts, creeping deserts, erratic weather patterns, etc. would be enough to catch a curious person's attention.

People who deny that the human race's carbon footprint is contributing or possibly even causing the problem are in denial of the scientific facts. It is provable that the composition of the atmosphere has been changing since the explosion in the use of fossil fuels in the last century or so. There is a record in the tree rings and glaciers (if you can still find one).

I wish people would stop viewing this through the lens of politics and start trying to come up with realistic solutions. I am very dismayed with the performance/antics coming from the US for the last 30 years on all environmental affairs. The GOP always trumps science with ideology and that's what this is about.

Pull your heads out of your behinds and take a good look around. What you're seeing is probably not going to be here for your great grandkids.

POSTED BY: WWWEXLER | JANUARY 10, 2010 8:33 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Dear prove me wrong.
I did not say the data was wrong. I said the sample size was too small to be statistically significant.

All the Best
Phil

POSTED BY: PHILHOEY | JANUARY 10, 2010 5:13 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Dear provemewrong.

I don't have to prove that humans do no cause global warming - you have to prove it does.
Have you ever heard of the scientific method? It is commonly taught in 7th grade.
Part of the scientific method is to document methods and procedures to prove or disprove the theory being presented.
No matter what the results, negative or positive, the 'test' is useful.
If you had bothered to read what I wrote you would realize that I am not saying humans have not influenced planet warming, I am DOUBTFUL that our interaction is the prime, or dependent variable, that IF taken in a new direction will actually make a difference.
Where in this theory is solar radiation, the variable tilt of the earth and other factors taken into account.
That is all I am saying. I am not a 'sky is falling' person.
However, I am not stupid. If I can make a difference I will - when I documented in my post.
Please address those facts with what you, Sir, have done.
Or or you just blowing hot air.
Put up or shut up.
All the best.
Phi.

POSTED BY: PHILHOEY | JANUARY 10, 2010 4:49 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I always find it interesting how many conservatives with either little schooling or an education in something far removed from science are suddenly "experts" in climatology - which is actually one of the more complex endeavors of human understanding.

I always want to ask, are you also this instant-authoritative in the molecular dynamics of recombinant genetics? Do you also have scholarly objections to the consensus about subatomic physics? Please do share them with us. Those people who've toiled for decades to gain a knowledge and conceptual framework to do this kind of research will be SO grateful to you for setting them straight with your "insights".

I do hope you all realize I'm being snarky. These people are far too busy trying to save your pathetic rear ends to spend time listening to you.

POSTED BY: B202 | JANUARY 10, 2010 4:14 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

U. S. Senate Minority Report

"For how many years must the planet cool before we begin to understand that the planet is not warming? For how many years must cooling go on?" - Geologist Dr. David Gee the chairman of the science committee of the 2008 International Geological Congress who has authored 130 plus peer reviewed papers, and is currently at Uppsala University in Sweden.

"Earth has cooled since 1998 in defiance of the predictions by the UN-IPCC....The global temperature for 2007 was the coldest in a decade and the coldest of the millennium...which is why 'global warming' is now called 'climate change.'" - Climatologist Dr. Richard Keen of the Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences at the University of Colorado.

"The 'global warming scare' is being used as a political tool to increase government control over American lives, incomes and decision making. It has no place in the Society's activities." - Award-Winning NASA Astronaut/Geologist and Moonwalker Jack Schmitt who flew on the Apollo 17 mission and formerly of the Norwegian Geological Survey and for the U.S. Geological Survey.

"I am a skeptic...Global warming has become a new religion." - Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever.

Warming fears are the "worst scientific scandal in the history...When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists." - UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist.

"The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn't listen to others. It doesn't have open minds... I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists." - Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.

"The models and forecasts of the UN IPCC "are incorrect because they only are based on mathematical models and presented results at scenarios that do not include, for example, solar activity." - Victor Manuel Velasco Herrera, a researcher at the Institute of Geophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico

"It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don't buy into anthropogenic global warming." - U.S Government Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA.

"Even doubling or tripling the amount of carbon dioxide will virtually have little impact, as water vapour and water condensed on particles as clouds dominate the worldwide scene and always will." - . Geoffrey G. Duffy, a professor in

the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering of the University of Auckland, NZ.

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=2674e64f-802a-23ad-490b-bd9faf4dcdb7

POSTED BY: AJAX2 | JANUARY 10, 2010 3:59 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Does science know, exactly, how many times the earth has experienced global warming in its entire five billion years history? Does science know of a single time, previously when warming occurred while human life existed on earth? Does science know exactly how previous warming cycles, pre human life, occurred.

Obviously in any global warming situation, before the existence of human life, the contribution of waste heat from human activity was not involved, but today because of the mushrooming population and the need to provide for them along with the need to produce goods and services to support human life, it should be obvious, whether the science supports it or not, that human activity adds to the natural warming cycles of the earth.

Perhaps science needs to explain to the public that there is a difference between the fact of global warming, and the climate changes that would result from global warming. Too many look at the cold temperatures of today and conclude that these temperatures prove that global warming is not a problem. Yet we must all know that the icebergs and icefields that are melting are not melting because the earth is cooling.

Global warming is a fact. The warming we are experiencing now is from the activities of over a thousand years; and the warming produced by human activity simply adds to the natural warming trends that must cause changes to our environment such as unexpected and extreme weather patterns.

POSTED BY: CALP | JANUARY 10, 2010 3:52 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I suggest some of those who accept the dire "predictions" of some climate scientists read the paper by Stainforth in the Proceedings of the Royal Society. Confidence, uncertainty and decision-support relevance in climate predictions
<http://rsta.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/365/1857/2145.full> From the abstract:

"...Complex climate models, as predictive tools for many variables and scales, cannot be meaningfully calibrated because they are simulating a never before experienced state of the system; the problem is one of extrapolation. It is therefore inappropriate to apply any of the currently available generic techniques which utilize observations to calibrate or weight models to produce forecast probabilities for the real world. To do so is misleading to the users of climate science in wider society...."

Second, honest climate scientists will tell you that the results from their computer models (GCMs) about what will be the climate 100 years from now ARE NOT predictions,

they are possible scenarios, given the input and assumptions made in the model. von Storch polled climate scientists several years ago and found that a majority did not believe that it was possible to "predict" climate even 10 years into the future, much less 100. He also had a very cogent recent article about science and how it has been perverted by some in the climate science community. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704238104574601443947078538.html#articleTabs%3Darticle>

POSTED BY: JHAWKER | JANUARY 10, 2010 11:35 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

PHILHOEY:

For someone with a Masters in MIS you really need to learn how to research things.

Not only do you have your facts WRONG about the emails that were released, but you also havent done enough self-study to find out that everything presented about global warming has been all based on flawed data.

As an added note, the simple fact that you felt the need to tell everyone you have a Masters in MIS (which means you barely know more than a 14 year old today) in order to lend credence to what you were posting tells everyone that you probably have not probably gotten that far in your studies.

Tell you what PHILHOEY. If you can post up provable facts supporting Human Induced Global Warming NOT BASED ON THE EAST ANGLIA DATA AND ALGORHYTHMS then you sir will be the hero of all the uneducated nut jobs out there.

So? Where is it? Please... The whole world is waiting on what you can provide with your knowledge of MIS LOL.

Sucker.

POSTED BY: PROVEMEWONG | JANUARY 10, 2010 11:34 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Good Morning. Interesting discussion.

1st: My position - yes there is a trend that the planet is warming.

2nd: There is evidence that CO2 levels are rising, most likely due to human activity.

3rd: That being said, just because two lines on a graph are both ascending does not establish a causal relationship between the two. And even if there is a causal relationship is that relationship a dependency – that is – does one cause the other? And – which is the leading and which one the following variable?

While the theft of the e-mails from East Anglia was not appropriate, if in fact it was an inside job, that indicates some individual has serious doubts about the validity of the study.

I was very surprised when it came out that this is entire issue of human caused global warming is based on about 100MB of data. I have a Masters in MIS and have done computer modeling professionally. To base such conclusions on so little data is appalling.

A model based on so little data has no validity. For

something of this magnitude, there should be terabytes of data in the model, run by multiple organizations – including those who don't believe that human generated CO2 is the dependent variable.

The data is certainly out there.

I would also like to question the motives of some of the 'sky is falling' crowd. Ask yourself the following question: What have you personally done to reduce CO2?

Have you planted 10 trees for every member of your household like I have? That ties up tons of carbon for centuries? Do you drive a smaller car? Have you reduced your personal electric consumption? In the past seven years I have reduced my KWH by 24%. What have you done? Besides take private jets every time you travel?

I personally don't believe the science is 'settled' and the carnival style 'barkers' used for promoting the theory of human caused global warming are hypocrites. This whole thing has the appearance of a con job.

POSTED BY: PHILHOEY | JANUARY 10, 2010 7:40 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Bullying, threats and intimidation are the last resort of these climate change brownshirts. If you disagree publicly with them you'll never work in this town again.
Nice.

POSTED BY: MIKE27 | JANUARY 10, 2010 7:18 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Will just one of the people on this blog who don't believe human action causes climate change quote some scientific research that backs them up?

Surely there must be some.

POSTED BY: JAMESLLOYD1 | JANUARY 9, 2010 10:34 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The weather stuff seems nutty to non-scientists, but it does appear to work. At one point, the ozone hole threatened to destroy humanity, but the countries of the world agreed with respect to means of controlling the problem. Now it seems as though there will not be an ozone depletion problem!

<http://www.theozonehole.com/>

The world's economies did not suffer from the changes necessary to preserve human life. In the present case, switching to sugar produced ethanol (or, even better, methanol, which can emanate from almost any plant) from petroleum produced gasoline would be quite wise. The world's dependence upon nasty little countries in the middle east would end.

POSTED BY: MARTIAL | JANUARY 9, 2010 10:32 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Arguing about the science is funny since no one understands it fully. The politics is simple and the reason that the Copenhagen talks failed. Nobody is willing to make

sacrifices today on predictions of bad things happening 20, 50 or 100 years from now. If they were, you would see many Social Security recipients returning their checks.

Furthermore, the public needs direct evidence that they can see of the truth of predictions. It is no accident that the height of public support for "doing something" about global warming came after the devastating 2005 hurricane season and why support is waning in this winter's deep freeze.

People are pretty much reactive and those who expect real action on ghg suppression need weather to reflect their dire predictions.

POSTED BY: EDBYRONADAMS | JANUARY 9, 2010 9:28 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

"Now the vandals who attacked the East Anglia computers
"

Actually, it was an anonymous scientist from East Anglia who released the information.

Since this research is publicly funded, it's probably best that all this information is released. That way it doesn't fall to one person to do the right thing.

POSTED BY: OMBUDSMAN1 | JANUARY 9, 2010 3:15 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

More political pressure by modern-day Environmentalist witch-hunters:
There MUST be global warming, because we said so:
There MUST be funding to study global warming, because we said so:
There MUST be links between global-warming deniers and big oil companies, because we said so:
There MUST be pressure brought to bear against global warming deniers, because we said so:
and so on. True religion brooks no heretics, and the global warming INQUISITION is on; Dr. P. Michaels is simply the heretic of the day. Sad to see, especially in America, but the holy writ of AGW must be protected from the unholy.
"Religion is the opiate of the masses" -- K. Marx
"Environmentalism is the new religion of the intelligentsia. Bureaucracy comes in a close second." -- J. Wright

POSTED BY: WANDERER13 | JANUARY 9, 2010 3:15 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

"The people that still think man-made global warming/climate change is only a theory are the same people who believe Jesus rode around on a dinosaur is a fact."

Nice straw man and irrelevant to the strong case against global warming.

I dare you to find someone *anyone* who believes what you typed above.

POSTED BY: OMBUDSMAN1 | JANUARY 9, 2010 3:11 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

"Climate change will mean different things. It does not mean the entire world will get hotter."

Another person who thinks they know the difference between weather and climate.

There's less than pseudo-scientists would like you to believe.

Here's a good link from NASA that explains it:

http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/noaa-climate/climate_weather.html

I know clicking on links is hard for people, so I'll give you the top line here:

"What's the Difference Between Weather and Climate?"

The difference between weather and climate is a measure of time. Weather is what conditions of the atmosphere are over a short period of time, and climate is how the atmosphere "behaves" over relatively long periods of time. "

That's it. No magic.

POSTED BY: OMBUDSMAN1 | JANUARY 9, 2010 3:09 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

People dying as a result of global warming is not the same as people dying from heat. I have no interest in wasting my time to try to educate you. When you figure out what it means post an intelligent question.

Posted by: James10 | January 9, 2010 12:29 PM
and idiot comment #2:

Guess I'll have to explain it all yet again to those here who watch Fox "News".

I'll try to use language even a third-grader can understand. Global warming causes climate change. Climate change will mean different things. It does not mean the entire world will get hotter.

It might be tornadoes in California. It might be deserts forming in the Midwest. It might mean blizzards in Florida. Global warming is causing the CLIMATE to change. That's not a theory. It's scientific fact. Got it now?

Posted by: wilder5121 | January 8, 2010 5:24 PM

Kool aid drinkers trying to save the Hoax. Hope you are expressing your stupidity on a solar or wind powered computer, and not being a carbon hypocrit that most of you all are.

POSTED BY: 65APR | JANUARY 9, 2010 1:23 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

So far all proof I have seen posted by the Cool Aid drinkers all rely on UNPROVABLE data... Which if anyone bothers actually reading is all based on the same flawed algorithm that came out of East Anglia.

Sorry Cool Aid drinkers... Keep trying.

The only reason I am so sure you cannot prove human induced global warming at this point is because ALL RAW DATA WAS DESTROYED IN THE 1980's. We need to ALL START OVER.

If you cant understand the problem with that and how it prevents any provable model, you need to go back to school and stop posting things online. It just shows the depths of ignorance one must go to in order to keep supporting this charade.

As an added point. Those who are so gullible should also refrain from having kids.... Ignorance breeds ignorance.

POSTED BY: PROVEMEWROG | JANUARY 9, 2010 12:58 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

please site the exact article that give that lying 150k deaths a year to man made global warming.

i see more reports on people freezing to death than i see dying because of heat.

Posted by: infantry11b4faus | January 8, 2010 8:29 PM

=====

People dying as a result of global warming is not the same as people dying from heat. I have no interest in wasting my time to try to educate you. When you figure out what it means post an intelligent question.

POSTED BY: JAMES10 | JANUARY 9, 2010 12:29 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Questions for the panel:

- Steve McIntyre has done a great deal of work regarding the statistical methods used to create the temperature trends on which the "hockey stick" is based. His conclusion was that the methodology was incorrect and that the sharp up trend in temperature in the last century is not supported by the data. Where did he go wrong?
- Have the major climate models undergone a formal verification and validation process? If so, are the records of this process available on request? V&V of analytical models is an essential step in their use for any meaningful analysis. If this hasn't been done or if the V&V results aren't readily available for independent review, the models should not be used as the basis for analysis.

POSTED BY: PACEJ001 | JANUARY 9, 2010 11:01 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

You know, what's interesting is how these discussions get started. Here we have a population of largely scientifically illiterate people debating highly technical points, armed only with their opinions and prejudices. I have to wonder what would happen if we were informed that the operation of silicon chips at a subatomic level could cause global problems in the environment. Would all of you spouting off about climate science suddenly become experts in quantum physics ?

POSTED BY: RBE1 | JANUARY 9, 2010 7:03 AM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The people that still think man-made global warming/climate change is only a theory are the same people who believe Jesus rode around on a dinosaur is a fact. The miracle of it all is that these people have figured out how to type on a computer and post their superstitious wingnut nonsense.

POSTED BY: WILDER5121 | JANUARY 8, 2010 10:38 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

infantryman,

"and if they go back from 2005 for 30 years you will see that we are in 1975, when the scientists were telling us we were all going to freeze to death."

No, they weren't. This is a common myth continually hyped by the oil companies and those who seize onto their PR simply because they don't want to make any needed changes. There WERE a few sensational cover stories in popular magazines making hay out of a cooling trend (Newsweek, etc.), but very few serious scientists were worried about it. The (relatively) small number of scientists studying climate back then were mostly wondering if the "greenhouse effect" would someday be a problem.

"the first earth day was about global COOLING!"

Not by the wildest stretch. It was about pollution - of all kinds (water, air, soil). You are falling for some really desperate propaganda there.

POSTED BY: B202 | JANUARY 8, 2010 9:41 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

thank you b202.

but that is a 2005 article and they appear to mix all climate change with all possible deaths.

and if they go back from 2005 for 30 years you will see that we are in 1975, when the scientists were telling us we were all going to freeze to death.

the first earth day was about global COOLING!

so the sky is not falling.

this is the coldest temps we have seen in 30 years too.

so some egg head using the UN to tell me we need to do something about carbon does not impress me.

did you know that in the late 70's the UN tried to get the world to limit carbon - but not because of weather, but as a method of equalizing wealth! now they are trying it again - not impressed.

POSTED BY: INFANTRY11B4FAUS | JANUARY 8, 2010 9:08 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Here you go, infantry11b4faus. The full article is subscription-only, but you can read the abstract. It was a joint study between WHO and the U. of Wisconsin (Madison).

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v438/n7066/full/nature04188.html>

Nature 438, 310-317 (17 November 2005) |
doi:10.1038/nature04188

Impact of regional climate change on human health

Jonathan A. Patz^{1,2}, Diarmid Campbell-Lendrum³, Tracey Holloway¹ & Jonathan A. Foley¹

[Top of page](#)

[Abstract](#)

The World Health Organisation estimates that the warming and precipitation trends due to anthropogenic climate change of the past 30 years already claim over 150,000 lives annually. Many prevalent human diseases are linked to climate fluctuations, from cardiovascular mortality and respiratory illnesses due to heatwaves, to altered transmission of infectious diseases and malnutrition from crop failures. Uncertainty remains in attributing the expansion or resurgence of diseases to climate change, owing to lack of long-term, high-quality data sets as well as the large influence of socio-economic factors and changes in immunity and drug resistance. Here we review the growing evidence that climate–health relationships pose increasing health risks under future projections of climate change and that the warming trend over recent decades has already contributed to increased morbidity and mortality in many regions of the world. Potentially vulnerable regions include the temperate latitudes, which are projected to warm disproportionately, the regions around the Pacific and Indian oceans that are currently subjected to large rainfall variability due to the El Niño/Southern Oscillation sub-Saharan Africa and sprawling cities where the urban heat island effect could intensify extreme climatic events.

POSTED BY: B202 | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:41 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

CRITTER: Sorry buddy... Most people require proof of things like seeing/smelling smoke and flames before jumping off a cliff to certain death to escape a fire.

TS: By then (in this case), it may be too late to put out the fire.

That's what a high consensus of the TOP climatologists in the world who study this in detail say!

"Scientists Agree Human-Induced Global Warming Is Real, Survey Says
ScienceDaily (Jan 2009)

a new survey finds consensus among scientists about the reality of climate change and its likely cause.

A group of 3,146 earth scientists surveyed around the world overwhelmingly agree that in the past 200-plus years, mean global temperatures have been rising, and that human activity is a significant contributing factor in

changing mean global temperatures.

Peter Doran, University of Illinois at Chicago associate professor of earth and environmental sciences, along with former graduate student Maggie Kendall Zimmerman, conducted the survey late last year.

Experts in academia and government research centers were e-mailed invitations to participate in the on-line poll conducted by the website questionpro.com. Two questions were key: have mean global temperatures risen compared to pre-1800s levels, and has human activity been a significant factor in changing mean global temperatures.

About 90 percent of the scientists agreed with the first question and 82 percent the second.

In analyzing responses by sub-groups, Doran found that climatologists who are active in research showed the strongest consensus on the causes of global warming, with 97 percent agreeing humans play a role.

He was not surprised, however, by the near-unanimous agreement by climatologists.

"They're the ones who study and publish on climate science. So I guess the take-home message is, the more you know about the field of climate science, the more you're likely to believe in global warming and humankind's contribution to it."

Doran and Kendall Zimmerman conclude that "the debate on the authenticity of global warming and the role played by human activity is largely nonexistent among those who understand the nuances and scientific basis of long-term climate processes."

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/01/090119210532.htm>

POSTED BY: TRUTHSEEKER1 | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:41 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Infantryman: please site the exact article that give that lying 150k deaths a year to man made global warming. i see more reports on people freezing to death than i see dying because of heat.

TS: Actually, the real threat of GW is 30-100 years into the future -- definitely not at the level we are at now.

POSTED BY: TRUTHSEEKER1 | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:35 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

JimBo77: I'd suggest you contact Prof. Richard Lindzen from MIT who has compiled 20 years of "real" data from US satellites that show little if any CO2 is trapped by the earth's atmosphere.

TS: Lindzen? LOL.

Lindzen's IRIS HYPOTHESIS (that higher temperatures lead to less clouds) was debunked in the scientific community by NASA climatologists at Langely when they

used Ceres satellite data.

See details here:

<http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/Iris/iris.php>

Lindzen's most recent paper [which you refer to] hints to the IRIS Hypothesis (but even he does not use the name anymore) but questions the CO2 mechanism) has been thoroughly debunked by the top technical climatology site in the US (run by NASA climatologists, etc)

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2010/01/lindzen-and-choi-unraveled/>

Try not to get your SOLE source of information from Right Wing/Libertarian ideological sites...

unless ideology is all you care about....

POSTED BY: TRUTHSEEKER1 | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:33 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

please site the exact article that give that lying 150k deaths a year to man made global warming.

i see more reports on people freezing to death than i see dying because of heat.

POSTED BY: INFANTRY11B4FAUS | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:29 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Wilder: The climate has been changing since biological oxygenation started billions of years ago. It got warmer. It got cooler. ...

TS: Scientists roughly understand many of the mechanisms of natural climate change as being due to Milankovitch cycles (changes in due to changes in the wobble and tilt of the earth) and then feedbacks such as from CO2 cycles back then amplified the warming/cooling.

Wilder: A lesser warming/cooling cycle of about 1000 years has persisted for the past 6000 years (Minoan, Roman, Medieval Warming, with intervening cooling, then current smaller sub-cycles since the Little Ice Age.) What makes the trivial, two decade, 1979-1998, warming unusual?

TS ; No, this isn't true.

Regarding the Holocene: (same link as above)

<<After the last glaciation ended, global temperatures appear to have peaked around 6000 years ago, called the Holocene Climatic Optimum. The warming appears have been largely localised, concentrated in the northern hemisphere in summer, and average global temperatures did not exceed those of recent decades by much, if at all. Again, orbital variations were the trigger, but these led to changes in vegetation and sea-ice cover that produced marked regional climatic alterations.

From about AD 800 to AD 1300, there was a minor peak called the medieval warm period, but it was not as warm as recent decades (see Climate myths: It was warmer during

the Medieval period).

Regarding the Medieval Warming Period.

Just look at the graph at Wikipedia under Medieval Warm Period

also

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn11644-climate-myths-it-was-warmer-during-the-medieval-period-with-vineyards-in-england.html>

See all New Scientists myths on global warming

<http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn11462-climate-change-a-guide-for-the-perplexed.html>

POSTED BY: TRUTHSEEKER1 | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:22 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

@shewholives

"The extreme lefties spend more time worrying over this than they do over Arab terrorism."

Given that global warming is currently contributing to roughly 150,000 deaths a year (and it's not even reached its worst), and that figure dwarfs the toll related to terrorism, I would say it is only rational to worry more about it. That's from a study published in Nature, which if you don't know is the most respected science journal in the world.

http://environment.about.com/od/globalwarmingandhealth/a/gw_deaths.htm

@Littlehands

"Remember when greenhouse gases were destroying the ozone layer and causing global cooling?"

I stay confused with lunatics who can not obtain and retain a real job. They just go around the world begging for money."

No, you stay confused by your breathtaking ignorance. You've confused several issues there, and in a spectacularly confused manner.

POSTED BY: B202 | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:15 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

i did not realize that if a person has the alphabet after their name, like phd, well we should never doubt or deny what they say is truth.

to get that degree that take special training to be pure and always honest and not have a personal point of view that could cloud their opinion, and they dont care about money either.

YEA RIGHT!

POSTED BY: INFANTRY11B4FAUS | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:11 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

dont plants need co2?

POSTED BY: INFANTRY11B4FAUS | JANUARY 8, 2010 8:08 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I'd suggest you contact Prof. Richard Lindzen from MIT who has compiled 20 years of "real" data from US satellites that show little if any CO2 is trapped by the earth's atmosphere. It is the premise of the Climate Deceivers that the trapped CO2 is what causes Global Warming. They have rigged their computer models to forecast this and create their bogus warming theories!!!!

So how are you enjoying your Global Warming this winter?

POSTED BY: JIMBO77 | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:50 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

As a geologist, I've had opportunity to brush elbows with climatologists who research anthropogenic global warming (in very remote locations) and are very convinced it is real. The truth is this: our best educated people have come up with their best educated guess, and anthropogenic global warming is it.

How arrogant some of the posts down here are.

JamesMarion says "A 5th graders explanation for global warming...planet has been cooling and warming for millions of years"...Well, yes, that's true. But it in no way negates AGW. I wonder if he even knows what an isotope or an ice core is, or has the faintest idea how scientists come to their conclusions.

How ignorant that he thinks his trinket of information trumps a PhD's years of experience.

Your scientists are the best you've got concerning matters like this. You people should listen.

POSTED BY: NEVADAGEO | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:48 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

HEY HOW IS THAT MAN MADE GLOBAL WARMING DOING FOR YOU?

POSTED BY: INFANTRY11B4FAUS | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:46 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Here's a fifth graders explanation for global warming's hysterical activists. The earth has warmed and cooled for many millenia (thousands of years) before Al Gore flew around the world in his private jet and drove around in his SUV!

POSTED BY: JAMESPMARION | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:28 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Gotta love it. Now the vandals who attacked the East

Anglia computers - and the bloggers who vandalize the public's understanding of science on a daily basis and were so happy to distort what the emails meant - will learn the full beauty of taking communications out of context.

Only this time, it will be about industry's organized campaign to confuse the public into continued paralysis on this issue. One that has been documented before Greenpeace did so.

Mother Jones a few years ago did a great rundown of the spending Exxon has done in this regard. Here's some of the filth they uncovered.

<http://motherjones.com/politics/2005/05/put-tiger-your-think-tank>

POSTED BY: B202 | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:28 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

if dr. michael holds a title granted by the state of virginia as their state's designated rep for climate science, then all the correspondence and work performed for the state of virginia should be made available.

POSTED BY: FRANKNERNEST | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:28 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Lobbyist. The legal face of corruption.

POSTED BY: BIGTREES | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:21 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I am amused by the folks that say show us proof that global warming is caused by human activity. Why am I amused? Because these are -- IMHO -- the same folk that are soooooo accepting of the deather, birther, tenther theories. These are -- IMHO -- the same folk that accepted the claim that Iraq has WMDs. And they are the same folk that claimed Clinton was a murderer.

I guess it is just easier to support wacked out idiot-log propoganda -- especially when propogated by the right.

POSTED BY: FREETHOTLIB | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:19 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

It does seem very vanilla, doesn't it? Perhaps conservative activists should demand details of all correspondence between Kaine Administration officials and Big Enviro groups or activists.

POSTED BY: GGREENBAUM | JANUARY 8, 2010 7:12 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Their trying hard to repair the damage of the whole ClimaGate fiasco.

POSTED BY: MOEBIUS22 | JANUARY 8, 2010 6:31 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Greenpeace is a collection of nut jobs, no different than PETA or the Earth First fanatics. I cannot believe that we even tolerate them, much less feature their views in a major American newspaper. I suspect that the Post is crawling with these vermin.

POSTED BY: MIBROOKS27 | JANUARY 8, 2010 6:19 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

POSTED BY: DJMONET |
by the way, you CAN prove something: Climate Change is real and the skeptics are wrong. These skeptical posters don't have any scientific reports to back up their bull.

=====

Do everyone a favor DJMONET... please point us in the direction of the provable scientific reports in support of human induced global warming and you will be the HERO of all the tree hugging hippies out there in the world.

They will bow to you...

So... Where is YOUR proof? What? All raw data was destroyed you say?

Does that mean you dont have any proof either?

POSTED BY: PROVEMEWONG | JANUARY 8, 2010 6:11 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

For wilder5121@ 5:24: I'll type slowly so you can understand.

Global warming IS climate change.

The climate has been changing since biological oxygenation started billions of years ago. It got warmer. It got cooler.

Half of North America was under a mile-thick glacial ice pack 20 thousand years ago. The climate changed and the glaciers retreated back to the Arctic. When did the post-glacial warming trend stop?

A lesser warming/cooling cycle of about 1000 years has persisted for the past 6000 years (Minoan, Roman, Medieval Warming, with intervening cooling, then current smaller sub-cycles since the Little Ice Age.) What makes the trivial, two decade, 1979-1998, warming unusual?

POSTED BY: JALLISON11 | JANUARY 8, 2010 6:05 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Oh, by the way, you CAN prove something: Climate Change is real and the skeptics are wrong. These skeptical posters don't have any scientific reports to back up their bull.

POSTED BY: DJMONET | JANUARY 8, 2010 6:01 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

CRITTER69:

Just so you dont continue to sound stupid about the subject, I wanted to let you know that the "hacked emails" WERE NOT HACKED!

It was a UK FOIA request which was posted on a public server for anyone to download.

As for WILDER5121 comments... did you know that the climate has ALWAYS CHANGED in earths history? If you know that, then why are you trying to control what you cannot control.

I agree with some environmental protections, but to create a UNPROVEN HUMAN INDUCED GLOBAL WARMING Economy, just because the US doesn't have anything new to innovate to offset our deficit into the future like we had in the 1930's (cars, refrigerators etc), doesn't mean we should all drink the Cool Aid because someone says "trust me"

Sorry buddy... Most people require proof of things like seeing/smelling smoke and flames before jumping off a cliff to certain death to escape a fire.

POSTED BY: PROVEMEWONG | JANUARY 8, 2010 6:01 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The question is, why are the few so called climate skeptic scientists given so much weight in the debate? Perhaps this inquiry will shed light on why Michael's pushes the climate skeptic "science" - which by the way, isn't peer-reviewed.

POSTED BY: DJMONET | JANUARY 8, 2010 5:59 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I find it funny they are trying to do a tit for tat when in the end, NOBODY CAN PROVE ANYTHING.

So just stop it all already and begin debates about the subject. If no hard data is available anymore, and since all the climate systems around the world all rely on these same flawed data sets including our own, how about scrapping everything and starting over so that whatever comes about, people will have confidence that we are not getting bent over and raped.

Until that happens, you will find that nobody with common sense will bother abiding by any rules they make make about it.

POSTED BY: PROVEMEWONG | JANUARY 8, 2010 5:51 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I find it interesting that certain people were all up in arms when someone ILLEGALLY accessed SarahBaracuda's Yahoo email account in the autumn of 2008, but all of those same up in arms people were cheering like crazy when someone ILLEGALLY accesed email accounts at East Anglia University in late 2009.

Two wrongs make the second wrong right?

At least GreenPeace is going after the information in a LEGAL manner, not ILLEGALLY like the SarahBaracuda and EAU incidents.

POSTED BY: CRITTER69 | JANUARY 8, 2010 5:39 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Guess I'll have to explain it all yet again to those here who watch Fox "News".

I'll try to use language even a third-grader can understand.

Global warming causes climate change. Climate change will mean different things. It does not mean the entire world will get hotter.

It might be tornadoes in California. It might be deserts forming in the Midwest. It might mean blizzards in Florida.

Global warming is causing the CLIMATE to change. That's not a theory. It's scientific fact. Got it now?

POSTED BY: WILDER5121 | JANUARY 8, 2010 5:24 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Just so the 'Earth is flat' crowd doesn't dominate the comments section, I'm going to pipe up and say that I support public policy that accepts and addresses climate change.

And really, is filing a FOIA request a 'guerrilla' activity? Not exactly Guevara-esque.

POSTED BY: TRYKS | JANUARY 8, 2010 5:05 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Yeah, you idiots are right. We don't need to worry about polluters poisoning our air, water and atmosphere. No one needs to watch them. They SURELY wouldn't do it for the money, would they?

When the ozone is gone, we can do like James Watt suggested and just wear hats and sunglasses. But what do we do when we can't breathe the air or drink the water? You clowns should get down on your hands and knees and thank whatever god you believe in that there is someone keeping tabs on these money grubbing bastards that don't care one bit about you and me.

POSTED BY: FIRECAT20906 | JANUARY 8, 2010 5:03 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The funny thing about FOIAs in at least the US Government is that they were designed for release of information but to protect names. So, for example, you wanted to know what the CIA did in Nicauraga during some time frame, you can ask, but the names will be deleted.

Any release of information about the person is a perversion of the FOIA act and should not be allowed.

POSTED BY: JHTLAG1 | JANUARY 8, 2010 5:02 PM

[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I think Greenpeace should go to court to file an injunction against all reports of current temperatures in the northern hemisphere.

POSTED BY: EDBYRONADAMS | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:55 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Greenpeace are fear-mongers, Luddites and are generally opposed to human progress and individual property rights. They have become "useful idiots" for future dictators.

POSTED BY: PGR88 | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:42 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Greenpeace is supported by two groups of people:

1. Really dumb people.
2. Government shills.

Of course, there's a lot of overlap between the two groups.

POSTED BY: THISISREALITY | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:40 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

I am waiting for Greenpeace to do a 180 and claim New Ice Age.

Remember when greenhouse gases were destroying the ozone layer and causing global cooling?

I stay confused with lunatics who can not obtain and retain a real job. They just go around the world begging for money.

POSTED BY: LITTLEHANDS | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:34 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

The extreme lefties spend more time worrying over this than they do over Arab terrorism.

POSTED BY: SHEWHOLIVES | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:24 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Strange to see Ms. Eilperin frittering away time on PR and gab. There is a terrific story developing with wind power in Britain, where contracts were just awarded to build out wind power that could supply up to 18% of UK electricity use. The arguments are going to be fierce.

Since the 1980s at least it has been claimed that wind power could supply 20% of electricity. However, Denmark, since 1997, and Spain, since 2006, have provided laboratories to see what happens when large supplies of wind power are built. Although Denmark generates enough electricity to supply 20% of its needs, it has been able to supply, on average, only 6% of its needs for electricity.

Spain has supplied up to 8% of its needs but has experienced transmission failures and may have to cut back.

So practical experience shows that the UK will not be able to use as much wind power as it now proposes to generate. The United States is nowhere near those limits yet, generating less than 1% of its electricity from wind power. But quite a few states, including California and Massachusetts, have passed laws ordering their utility companies to obtain 20% or more of their electricity from renewable sources. European experience shows that with the electrical grids they now maintain the utilities might be able to obtain that much, but they will not be able to transmit it reliably.

POSTED BY: APPDEV | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:23 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Interesting that it took the Post a full week to actually cover the East Anglia story after the initial news blurb about the hacking even though the scalding e-mails were the talk of the internet, yet the Post is parroting Greenpeace press releases about FOIA requests that haven't even been responded to yet. We're weeks, if not months, away from these requests resulting in a document production which may or may not unveil any interesting facts.

Unfortunate that the Post has proven to be so selectively proactive on these climate issues.

POSTED BY: JPEYSTER | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:23 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

How much total carbon emissions have been generated unnecessarily from coal burning power plants, and how many West Virginia mountains have been destroyed due to increased demand for coal.. are a DIRECT result of Greenpeace's efforts to eliminate the development of Nuclear Power Plants over the past 30 years. Put that in your bong on smoke it peaceniks.

POSTED BY: GENBARLOW | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:16 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

List them as a terrorist org. Close them down.

POSTED BY: ASKGEEES | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:15 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

<http://www.polluterwatch.com/>

I went to the site. The "most popular" posts had a grand total of 0 comments to each post. Did they get hacked by Exxon or mugged by reality?

POSTED BY: NAUCHI | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:08 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)

Gee will they surrender their documents showing how they fabricate data to present their views.

We need to stop pandering to these loons demands to control the environment. As long as they are allowed to spout unfounded facts, U S companies go where it's easier to produce their products.(for you liberals, this means off-shore jobs, none here)

POSTED BY: FRANKN1 | JANUARY 8, 2010 4:04 PM
[REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT](#)



[Post a Comment](#)

Dear Readers: We now require commenters to register at washingtonpost.com and sign in before posting. Your MyPost User ID, which you'll be asked to choose if you haven't done so already, will be displayed with your comment. We hope this will encourage more topical, spam-free, and respectful discussions. Please review the [full rules](#) governing commentaries and discussions, and [click here to comment](#).

[XML RSS Feed](#) [Subscribe to The Post](#)

© 2010 The Washington Post Company

SEARCH:



| [Search Archives](#)

[NEWS](#) | [POLITICS](#) | [OPINIONS](#) | [BUSINESS](#) | [LOCAL](#) | [SPORTS](#) | [ARTS & LIVING](#) | [GOING OUT GUIDE](#) | [JOBS](#) | [CARS](#) | [REAL ESTATE](#) | [RENTALS](#) | [CLASSIFIEDS](#)

[washingtonpost.com: Help](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Advertisers](#) | [Site Index](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Make Us Your Home Page](#) | [mywashingtonpost.com](#) | [Work for Us](#) | [Mobile](#) | [RSS](#)

[The Washington Post: Subscribe](#) | [Subscriber Services](#) | [Advertisers](#) | [e-Replica](#) | [Online Photo Store](#) | [The Washington Post Store](#)

[The Washington Post Company: Information and Other Post Co. Websites](#)

© Copyright 1996-2010 The Washington Post Company | [User Agreement and Privacy Policy](#) | [Rights and Permissions](#)