

# The Week That Was SPECIAL (Nov 25, 2009)

## Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####  
Ken Haapala will host TWTW while Fred Singer lectures/briefs/debates in Europe.  
Come by to see Fred if you are close. Get detailed schedule and contacts from [Ken@Haapala.com](mailto:Ken@Haapala.com)  
Brussels (EU Parliament) Nov 18-19. London (IEA) Nov 20-24. Zurich Nov 25. Stuttgart (DLR) Nov  
26. Heidelberg, Mainz Nov 27-28. Brussels Nov 30-Dec 2. Berlin Dec 4. Copenhagen Dec 6 –11.  
#####

### Quote of the Week

*If a book be false in its facts, disprove them; if false in its reasoning, refute it. But for God s sake, let us freely hear both sides if we choose.* -Thomas Jefferson, third US president, architect, and author (1743-1826)

\*\*\*\*\*

**Error Alert:** The last issue of TWTW identified the noted Professor John Bringell as George Bringell. Professor John Bringell is the author of excellent books on the misuse of statistics as well as the blog Number Watch on which he posted his superb explanation how computer models may lead to grossly distorted results.

\*\*\*\*\*

### THIS WEEK – Special – Climategate

As last week’s TWTW was being completed, the reports were coming in that emails from the Hadley Climate Research Unit (CRU) were posted on the web. Since we deplore hacking and as skeptics require solid verification, we did not include these reports. A number of readers have requested our comments. Although we did not plan a TWTW this week, to satisfy these readers we are issuing a brief special TWTW. Since events are changing daily, primarily, this special edition will suggest some of the latest articles to our readers and try to put the developments into some constructive context. There are so many articles appearing each day, only a few were selected.

\*\*\*\*\*

### SEPP Editorial

By S. Fred Singer  
President, SEPP

These were sent by Prof. Singer as he was preparing for debates and lectures during his European trip.

1. The single most important question is whether warming is natural or man-made. The Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) claims it is natural. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) claims it is man-made but presents no credible evidence.
2. Even if the IPCC were correct, you must consider that a modest warming is beneficial and that therefore mitigation of carbon dioxide is counter-productive.
3. If NIPCC evidence is accepted, then CO2 is not a pollutant, and there is no need for alternative energy sources like wind, ethanol, etc., or for CCS (Carbon capture and Sequestration).
4. To sum up: I do not have any fears about climate change. I only fear what zealous politicians might do to distort the economy in their misguided quest to save the climate.

### Climategate:

The Climategate disclosures over the past few days, consisting of some thousand of emails between a small group of British and US climate scientists, demonstrate that global warming is man-made after all –

created by this small group of zealous scientists. They have used flawed data, phony statistics, and various tricks. They have covered up any contrary evidence and refused to open their work to the scrutiny of independent scholars. By keeping out intruders, by reviewing their own papers, by capturing scientific journals and intimidating editors, they have tried to suppress any dissent.

I do not wish to discuss any of the ethical or legal aspects, which may be self-evident.

I consider the whole matter a great tragedy not only for science but also for the institutions involved and for many of the scientists involved who have in fact spent many years and whole careers on their work. I have some personal sympathy for Philip Jones, the apparent leader of this group, and feel he has been dealt a bad hand. Trying to correct temperature observations from weather stations around the world is extremely difficult work. It involves much detail; it certainly not traditional science. However, I cannot endorse the actions of this group and hope that an impartial investigation will bring closure to this difficult matter.

Inevitably, the public's view of science will be affected and this will hurt all of science.

### **Summary of Climate Debate of November 23 2009**

Climate science is basic to climate policy. Based on successive IPCC-reports, there has been constructed a huge edifice of organizations, treaties, laws and regulations all of these essentially depending on the quality of the science. I include there the 1992 Global Climate Treaty, the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, the 15 annual meetings of the Conference of the Parties (COP) with nearly 200 national delegations, etc.

What will happen if the IPCC science turns out to be wrong? What if climate change is controlled by natural factors rather than human-produced greenhouse gases? Will the edifice collapse? One might think so but maybe not. The reason is money. There is so much tied up now with AGW. There are windmill constructors and wind farms, ethanol producers and farmers, there are emission traders, and many others - all of them intent to keep the edifice erected even without a foundation.

In the United States, the Waxman Markey Bill aims to extract \$865 billion from people who use energy, perhaps the biggest tax in history. Of this amount only 15% will go into the Treasury; 85% goes to favored entities that helped support the legislation.

The first IPCC report of 1990 led directly to the 1992 climate treaty. The second IPCC report of 1995 gave rise to the slogan the science is settled and there is now a complete consensus and led to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. The nations of the world are now considering an extension of Kyoto at Copenhagen; but more and more scientists have concluded that global warming is a non-problem and that the real problem is government action to solve a phantom issue.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Some of the Latest Articles Discussing Climategate:**

Please see "Climategate: some comments by Prof. S. Fred Singer" on the blog for the Institute for Economic Affairs, <http://blog.iea.org.uk/?p=954>. For a Prof. Singer's televised debate with Robert Watson, former the head of the IPCC and a science advisor to Al Gore, please see [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/the\\_daily\\_politics/8374523.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/the_daily_politics/8374523.stm) [H/t Richard Wellings] [SEPP comment: Watson's claim that the data cannot be released because it does not belong to the CRU is stunning. After billions in taxpayer money spent, the public cannot review the data because it is proprietary? It may be far cheaper to buy the data first before spending an additional pound in buying electricity to run the computer models that use data that has not been independently reviewed.]

For Viscount Monckton's latest views and public actions with Fred Singer please see 'They Are Criminals' <http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/viscount-monckton-on-global-warminggate-they-are-criminals-pjm-exclusive/?print=1>

For a Investors Business Daily Editorial please see "Climate Con Job" <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=513436>

For a Wall Street Journal editorial please see "Global Warming with the Lid Off" [http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704888404574547730924988354.html?mod=WSJ\\_hp\\_mostpop\\_read](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704888404574547730924988354.html?mod=WSJ_hp_mostpop_read)

For an article in the WSJ by Keith Johnson please see "Climate Emails Stoke Debate" <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125883405294859215.html> [Must be entered manually]

For another article in the WSJ by Keith Johnson and Gautam Naik please see "Lawmakers Probe Climate Emails" <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125902685372961609.html>

For an excellent review of key issues in some detail please see "CRU's Source Code: Climategate Uncovered" by Marc Sheppard in the American Thinker [H/t Joe D'Aleo -- ICECAP] [http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/11/crus\\_source\\_code\\_climategate\\_r.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/11/crus_source_code_climategate_r.html)

For the views of Ian Murray please see "Three Things You Absolutely Must Know About Climategate" <http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/three-things-you-absolutely-must-know-about-climategate/?print=1>

For views from the amusing blogger for the Wall Street Journal, James Taranto, please see "Settled Science?" <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704779704574552533758682774.html> and today's "You've Taken the Words Out of My Mouth" [http://online.wsj.com/article/best\\_of\\_the\\_web\\_today.html#printMode](http://online.wsj.com/article/best_of_the_web_today.html#printMode)

For the views of Canadian climate scientist Tim Ball and Judi McLeod on the involvement of President Obama's science advisor please see "Obama's Science Czar John Holdren involved in unwinding 'Climategate' scandal" [H/t Marc Morano – Climate Depot] <http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/17183>

The extent to which this scandal affects proposed legislation, the EPA findings regulations of American industry, and other pressing issues related to "Global Warming" are yet to be determined. However, the major US source for surface global warming temperature data has significant problems as this article by Chris Horner in American Spectator Blog states on the intent of the Competitive Enterprise Institute to sue NASA and the Goddard Institute for Space Studies "Climate Gate' Development: CEI Files Notice of Intent to Sue NASA" <http://spectator.org/blog/2009/11/24/climate-gate-development-cei-f/print>

This afternoon Carol Browner, former director of the EPA and President Obama's energy and environment advisor, stated nothing has changed as reported in this article by Stephen Dinan in the Washington Times "Browner says hacked e-mails don't change anything" <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/nov/25/climate-czar-says-e-mails-dont-change-anything/print/>

\*\*\*\*\*

## **COMMENTS ON UNFORTUNATE AFFAIRS**

By Kenneth Haapala

The events over the past few days have, in a very small measure, vindicated those whose careers have been damaged or altered and those whose research has not been published because they refused to do what ever was necessary or demanded at the time. It may be a time of relief, but not one of joy. Rather, it is a time for somber reflection on the tragedy of the failure of many great institutions of science to fiercely defend independent scientific inquiry. And it is time to try to understand what went wrong.

Almost forty-nine years ago, in his farewell address, US President Eisenhower warned of two grave threats to our liberties arising from within. One threat came from the centralization of economic and political power in a military-industrial complex. This threat was widely recognized and largely avoided. The second threat came from a concentration of scientific and technological research in government which could lead to a scientific-technological elite that would manipulate such research for its purposes. This threat was largely ignored.

President Eisenhower hoped that statesmen would mold and balance the need for such centralization in a manner to protect our liberties. Except for a few outstanding examples, it appears the global warming policy issue has been guided more by political opportunists than by statesman and needed balance is lacking.

For the complete speech please see:

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/dwightdeisenhowerfarewell.html>

\*\*\*\*\*