

The Week That Was (January 30, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

Quote of the Week

I am compelled to fear that science will be used to promote the power of dominant groups rather than to make men happy. ~Bertrand Russell, *Icarus, or the Future of Science*, 1925

THIS WEEK:

Less than two months ago, before the Copenhagen Conference, the IPCC was considered by political leaders and the press as a paragon of science. This assumed excellence is rapidly eroding.

- In mid-August, after repeated requests for such data under the Freedom of Information Act, the Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia (CRU), one of the three international agencies that calculate global temperatures, announced that it discarded the raw data used to calculate global surface temperatures. The CRU action renders independent review and verification of the temperature trends published by the CRU impossible – a clear violation of principles of science and the Freedom of Information Act
- In October, at the 2009 annual meeting of the Geological Society of America, Dr. Don Easterbrook presented graphs demonstrating how tree ring data from Russia showing a cooling after 1961 were truncated and artfully disguised in IPCC publications. The artful deceit, so exposed, indicates that the IPCC Assessment Report 4 (AR4) contains deceptions rendering the entire document scientifically questionable.
- In November, emails from the CRU were leaked to the public. These emails reveal efforts to suppress independent studies that are contrary to IPCC conclusions of human caused global warming. Thus, the IPCC scientific review process has a systematic bias of an unknowable magnitude in favor of human induced warming.
- In mid-December, the Russian Institute of Economic Analysis (IEA) reported that the Hadley Center for Climate Change of the British Meteorological Office (Met Office) had probably tampered with Russian climate data and that the Russian meteorological station data do not support human caused global warming. The Met Office collaborates with the CRU in reporting global temperatures. The reported global surface temperature trends are unreliable and probably have a strong warming bias of an unknown magnitude.
- In January, Joe D'Aleo and E. Michael Smith reported that the National Climatic Data Center (NOAA-NCDC) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Goddard Institute of Space Studies (NASA-GISS) dropped many meteorological stations from their data bases in recent years. The dropped stations, many of which continue to make appropriate reports, are generally in colder climates. [For a detailed report see item #1 below.] The actions by NOAA -NCDC and NASA-GISS make their reported temperature trends unreliable and likely to have a strong warming bias of an unknown magnitude. [NOAA-NCDC and NASA-GISS are the two other organizations that report global surface temperatures.]
- Thus, all global surface temperatures and temperature trends announced by the three major reporting international organizations probably have a warming bias of an unknown magnitude rendering their announced temperatures and temperature trends scientifically unreliable.
- On January 23, 2010, the Sunday Times (London) reported that the AR4 wrongly linked natural disasters to global warming. AR4 claimed that global warming is causing increases in

property losses. Yet the Sunday Times reported the actual published report upon which this claim was based actually stated: “We find insufficient evidence to claim a statistical relationship between global temperature increase and catastrophic losses

- In January, Dr. Murari Lal, the coordinating lead author of the AR4’s chapter on Asia, stated that the report deliberately exaggerated the possible melt of the Himalayan glaciers. “We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action.” This admission demonstrates that the AR4 is a political document and not a scientific one.
- This past week, additional reports reveal that IPCC’s claims that warming will cause extensive adverse effects in the Amazon rainforests and on coral reefs came not from peer reviewed science but from publications by environmental groups such as the World Wildlife Fund and Greenpeace. Thus, the IPCC pretense that it represents peer reviewed science is false.

On December 7, 2009, the EPA administrator made the determination that Carbon Dioxide and other greenhouse gases threaten public health and welfare. The EPA determination is based almost entirely on the reports of the IPCC. During the public hearing period, which closed on June 23, 2009, a number of scientists, including members of SEPP, testified that the IPCC reports are not the best science available; thus such a determination is scientifically flawed. At that time it was not clear the extent to which IPCC science had been compromised. The recent revelations demonstrate that the science upon which the EPA relies is hopelessly flawed.

Stern Report: Many politicians base their claims that carbon dioxide controls are necessary on the Stern report. It claims that the damage from further warming caused by carbon dioxide will exceed the damage to the economy from carbon dioxide controls. Removing inflated surface temperature trends relied upon in the Stern report, demonstrates the correlation between carbon dioxide and warming is extremely weak. As reported in the Jan 23, 2010 Sunday Times, there is no science supporting a link between warming and property losses. Thus, the Stern report has no foundation.

SEPP Correction: Professor Cliff Ollier informed us that he wrote his independent review of V.K. Raina’s study of Himalayan Glaciers for the government of India, not the government of Australia as we mistakenly assumed. Perhaps we all would be better served if government officials had independent review of the science which they are using to establish policy.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #5-2010 (Jan 30, 2010)

By S. Fred Singer, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project

[Note: This is another of a series of mini-editorials on the “junk science” influencing the global warming issue. Other topics will include the UN Environmental Program, and some individuals heavily involved in these matters.]

The Global Mean Surface Temperature (GMST) is largely determined by the Sea Surface Temperature (SST) – since oceans cover 71% of the earth’s surface. So even if the land data are manipulated to show a major warming (as the ClimateGate e-mails suggest), this should not affect the SST data – one would think. Unfortunately, SST has problems of its own: (1) Scarcity of data; and (2) Lack of compatibility of different methods of collecting data.

For much of the 20th century, data came only from shipping routes -- and large parts of the world’s oceans were not contributing data. Data collection came from samples gathered with

buckets from sailing ships, first wooden buckets and later canvas ones (which required substantial corrections). After the advent of steamers, temperatures were measured at the inlets for engine cooling water (inlet temperature).

Around 1980, satellites produced major changes: (1) Infrared emission from the sea surface was thought to measure temperature directly, But the method worked only in the absence of clouds and haze, and it responded to 'skin' temperature rather than the bulk of the sea surface (as inlet temperatures). (2) The introduction of buoys, first 'drifters' and then diving buoys, expanded geographic coverage. But this introduced a new problem: As I have discussed (see also NIPCC 2008 Fig 20), drifters measure temperatures in the upper 50cm, which are usually warmer than the 'inlet temperatures.' It is easily shown that the increasing fraction of data from drifters leads to an artificial warming trend.

But don't the measurements of Ocean heat content show a warming? What better authority than the flawed paper by Hansen et al [*Science* **308**:1431-35 (2005)]-that had proudly claimed to be the "smoking gun" for AGW. Its Fig 2 shows hardly any increase in observed stored heat between 1992 and 1996; Fig 3 shows a cooling of the upper layers in the equatorial region. There is poor correspondence to model runs (which strongly disagree with each other).

These are all problems that require detailed corrections before one can accept the published SST results – and therefrom the IPCC's global surface warming trends. By comparison, the MSU (satellite) data show good agreement between tropospheric temperature over land and ocean (see NIPCC 2008 Fig 13), with little warming over land and even slightly less over oceans.

To sum up: Both the land data and SST data tell us that the claimed rise of global surface temperature between 1979 and 1997, shown by IPCC, is probably much smaller or may even be non-existent.

ARTICLES: [For the numbered articles below please see the attached pdf.]

1. Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception

SPPI Original Paper

By Joseph D'Aleo & Anthony Watts, Jan 27, 2010



D'Aleo & Watts
270110.pdf

The summary on why surface temperature records are unreliable is excellent.

2. UN wrongly linked global warming to natural disasters

By Janathan Leake, The Sunday Times Online, Jan 24, 2010

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7000063.ece>

In its 2007 Assessment Report the IPCC cited a 'to be published paper' to buttress its claim that the world had "suffered rapidly rising costs due to extreme weather-related events since the 1970s." When published in 2008, the paper states: "We find insufficient evidence to claim a statistical relationship between global temperature increase and catastrophic losses."

3. Wow! UK parliamentary investigation into Climategate may not be a whitesash

By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Jan 22, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100023449/wow-uk-parliamentary-investigation-into-climategate-may-not-be-a-whitewash/>

4. Glacier scientist: I knew data hadn't been verified

By David Rose, MailOnline, Jan 24, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1245636/Glacier-scientists-says-knew-data-verified.html>

5. Save the Panel on Climate Change!

Richard Tol, Roger Pielke, and Hans von Storch, Der Spiegel Online, Jan 25, 2010

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,673944,00.html>

Two months ago, few would have imagined this plea.

6. After Climategate, Pachaurigate and Glacieregate: Amazongate

By James Delingpole, Jan 25, 2010

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100023598/after-climategate-pachaurigate-and-glacieregate-amazongate/>

7. United Nations' Climate Chief Must Go

Investor's Business Daily, Jan 27, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=519317>

8. Climate agency going up in flammers: Exit of Canada's expert a sure sign IPCC in trouble

By Terence Corcoran, National Post, Jan 27, 2010 [H/t Mark LaRochelle]

<http://www.nationalpost.com/opinion/columnists/story.html?id=90f8dd19-4a79-4f8f-ab42-b9655edc289b>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

A dispassionate report on the finding that the CRU broke the law on the Freedom of Information Act from a hometown newspaper.

New twist in UEA climate change row

By David Bale, Norwich Evening News, Jan 28, 2010 [H/t Anthony Watts, Watts Up With That?]

<http://www.eveningnews24.co.uk/content/eveningnews24/norwich-news/story.aspx?brand=ENOnline&category=News&tBrand=ENOnline&tCategory=xNews&itemid=NOED28%20Jan%202010%2010%3A05%3A43%3A370>

Greenpeace provided the sole source of the claim climate change is linked with coral reef degradation – references provided.

Greenpeace and the Nobel-Winning Climate Report

By Donna Laframboise, NOconsensus.org, Toronto, Jan 28, 2010 [H/t Charles Anderson]

http://nofrackingconsensus.blogspot.com/2010/01/greenpeace-and-nobel-winning-climate_28.html

A long article on the importance of Climategate. “Those skeptics who argue that the environmental alarmism on display at Copenhagen and elsewhere is the product of a modern pantheistic faith and not the result of empirical reasoning must be taken seriously. The best that can be hoped for in the aftermath of Climategate is that the community that cares about science will live up to the purpose of its studies: to ask questions and observe the evidence with cold eyes.”

Ignoring ‘Climategate’

By Jillian Kay Melchior, Commentary, Feb, 2010

<http://www.commentarymagazine.com/viewarticle.cfm/ignoring--climategate--15339>

Britain's longest-serving environmental correspondent is calling for the resignation of IPCC Chairman Pachauri. However, the author of the article ignores or is not aware that the problems started long before Pachauri. After the second IPCC Assessment Report, Frederick Seitz stated in an editorial in the August 13, 1996 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report. (Please See Science Editorial # 41-2009 in the Dec 26, 2009 TWTW.)

Pachauri must resign at once as head of official climate science panel

By Geoffrey Lean, Telegraph, UK, Jan 24, 2010 [H/t Warren Wetmore]

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/geoffreylean/100023489/pachauri-must-%3Equit-as-head-of-official-science-panel/>

Even the alarmist ABC News is asking:

Can Climate Forecasts Still Be Trusted? Confidence Melting Away: Doubts Grow in Climate Change Debate

By Gerald Traufetter, ABC News, Jan 28, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://abcnews.go.com/print?id=9685251>

BASIC ministers task IPCC with need for rigour in climate reports

Business Standard, New Delhi, Jan 25, 2010 [H/t Donna Bethell]

<http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/basic-ministers-task-ipccneed-for-rigour-in-climate-reports/383602/>

Excellent comments by John Christy. A number of those defending the IPCC misstate its purpose. They claim it was set up to advise policy makers on climate change – yet the mandate states it is to assess the risks of **human induced** climate change. In the discussion of the need for significant error tails due to the enormous consequences of error, there is no discussion of consequences in the error of underestimating the possibility of cooling. It was cooling that concerned HH Lamb, the founder and first director of the CRU. He found that generally warming is beneficial to humanity and cooling harmful.

From Inside and Out, Climate Panel Is Pushed to Change

By Andrew Revkin, NYT Dot Earth, Jan 26, 2010

<http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/01/26/from-inside-and-out-climate-panel-pushed-to-change/?pagemode=print>

The IPCC issued a statement rebuking the Sunday Times for its article demonstrating that the IPCC wrongly linked global warming to natural disasters. For the statement and the response to the IPCC statement by Roger Pielke Jr. please see:

<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2010/01/ipcc-statement-on-trends-in-disaster.html>

A blunt response to the New York Times editorial supporting the “cap and trade” bill.

The New York Times: Desperate, Blatant Lies

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, Jan 24, 2010

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2010/01/new-york-times-desperate-blatant-lies.html>

Comments on the Stern Report

(WT)² du jour – warming costs to double

John Brignell, Number Watch.com

<http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2009%20December.htm>

“They call economics the “dismal science”. This is a misnomer. It might be dismal but there is little relation to the scientific method in it. It is just a set of untested hypotheses on which there is total

disagreement among the practitioners. It is also no coincidence that the head of the UN IPCC and Britain's Scaremonger in Chief are both economists." [SEPP Comment: A few economists try to empirically test their hypotheses.]

Global warming measures will cost 'twice as much as predicted'

By Ben Webster, Times Online, Dec 2, 2009

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6939942.ece>

The consequences of the Supreme Court decision declaring carbon dioxide is a pollutant are coming to light. Regardless who wins, American citizens lose in this enormous waste of resources. The EPA and the Justice Department refused to contest the claim by Massachusetts that carbon dioxide from automobile emissions is causing sea level rise – even though sea levels have been rising for 18,000 years.

Courts as Battlefields in Climate Fights

By John Schwartz, NYT, Jan 26, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/27/business/energy-environment/27lawsuits.html?th&emc=th>

Will companies be sued for failure to properly predict warming – or a future cooling?

“This might be an opportunity for companies to point to the financial risks of Waxman-Markey's Cap & Trade or to EPA regs if they succeed in regulating CO2 under the CAA.” [Fred Singer]

S.E.C. Adds Climate Risk to Disclosure List

By John Broder, NYT, Jan 27, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/28/business/28sec.html?th&emc=th>

Senator Boxer remains confused about science. Contrary to her claim nicotine does not cause lung cancer, inhalation of hot tobacco smoke does. [Fred Singer]

Move Afoot in the Senate to Can EPA CO2 Regs

By Marlo Lewis, Pajamas Media, Jan 23, 2010

<http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/move-afoot-in-the-senate-to-can-epa-co2-regs/>

The EPA has issued proposed new rules for smog (ozone) that will more than double the number of counties that are out of compliance adding to the EPA's regulatory reach.

The Hole In the EPA's Ozone Claim

By Michael Fumento, Forbes Online, Jan 26, 2010

<http://fumento.com/epa/ozone.html>

- [Singer's Comments]
1. The EPA ozone standard applies to ambient (i. e., outdoor) air. Few of us, esp urban folk, spend more than 10% of our days outdoors. The EPA does not control indoor air quality
 2. No matter where EPA sets the standard, there will always be a subset of the population that is sensitive to ozone. Those who are prudent should not engage in outdoor exercise on the occasional days of "Ozone Alerts" [No one would go jogging in a blizzard]
 3. And finally, there is a natural level of ozone (which depends on geography and local meteorological conditions) below which one cannot go. In many places, we may already be at this level.

Consequences of international climate agreements

Micronesia Gets Power-Plant Review [In the Czech Republic]

By Leos Rousek, WSJ, Jan 27, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704094304575028733358203068.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

A glowing report about wind power. Unfortunately the journalist does not distinguish between name plate capacity and effective capacity.

Wind Power Grows 39% for the Year

By Jad Mouawad, NYT, Jan 26, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/26/business/energy-environment/26wind.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: Last week TWTW carried the report from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) on what is required to integrate the Eastern grid for wind power. The Eastern grid stretches from the Texas panhandle to eastern Montana eastward to the Atlantic Ocean. Most of Texas is not in the grid. Don Dears pointed out that the base study is a 2008 report by NREL that has some highly questionable assumptions. Namely, 1) the average size of the wind turbine will almost double from 1.6 MW to 2.8 MW, and 2) the efficiency factor will increase to 40% of capacity. We are unaware of any empirical study showing 40% efficiency, particularly for base load.] For the 2008 study please see:

<http://www.20percentwind.org/20p.aspx?page=Report>

Wind’s Chill Factor

Investor’s Business Daily, Jan 26, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=519152>

Surprisingly blunt editorial. It appears that Fish and Wildlife is more concerned with using the Endangered Species Act to expand its regulatory reach than to protect endangered species.

Jaguars Don’t Live Here Anymore

By Alan Rabinowitz, New York Times, Jan 24, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/25/opinion/25rabinowitz.html?th&emc=th>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Bin Laden blasts US for climate change

By Salah Nasrawi, Washington Post, Jan 29, 2010

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/29/AR2010012901463.html>

Obama announces government greenhouse gas emissions targets

By Anne Kornblut, Washington Post Jan 29, 2010

<http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2010/01/obama-announces-government-gre.html?hpid=topnews>

[SEPP Comment: So that the Federal Government reduces its greenhouse emissions by 28% and moves away from oil and coal and towards local, clean energy, will we have windmills on The Mall?]

#####

1. Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception

SPPI Original Paper

By Joseph D’Aleo & Anthony Watts, Jan 27, 2010



D’Aleo & Watts
270110.pdf

The excellent summary on why surface temperature records are unreliable is reproduced below.

1. Instrumental temperature data for the pre-satellite era (1850-1980) have been so widely, systematically, and unidirectionally tampered with that it cannot be credibly asserted there has been any significant “global warming” in the 20th century.
2. All terrestrial surface-temperature databases exhibit very serious problems that render them useless for determining accurate long-term temperature trends.
3. All of the problems have skewed the data so as greatly to overstate observed warming both regionally and globally.

4. Global terrestrial temperature data are gravely compromised because more than three-quarters of the 6,000 stations that once existed are no longer reporting.
5. There has been a severe bias towards removing higher-altitude, higher-latitude, and rural stations, leading to a further serious overstatement of warming.
6. Contamination by urbanization, changes in land use, improper siting, and inadequately-calibrated instrument upgrades further overstates warming.
7. Numerous peer-reviewed papers in recent years have shown the overstatement of observed longer term warming is 30-50% from heat-island contamination alone.
8. Cherry-picking of observing sites combined with interpolation to vacant data grids may make heat-island bias greater than 50% of 20th-century warming.
9. In the oceans, data are missing and uncertainties are substantial. Comprehensive coverage has only been available since 2003, and shows no warming.
10. Satellite temperature monitoring has provided an alternative to terrestrial stations in compiling the global lower-troposphere temperature record. Their findings are increasingly diverging from the station-based constructions in a manner consistent with evidence of a warm bias in the surface temperature record.
11. NOAA and NASA, along with CRU, were the driving forces behind the systematic hyping of 20th-century “global warming”.
12. Changes have been made to alter the historical record to mask cyclical changes that could be readily explained by natural factors like multidecadal ocean and solar changes.
13. Global terrestrial data bases are seriously flawed and can no longer be trusted to assess climate trends or VALIDATE model forecasts.
14. An inclusive external assessment is essential of the surface temperature record of CRU, GISS and NCDC “chaired and paneled by mutually agreed to climate scientists who do not have a vested interest in the outcome of the evaluations.”
15. Reliance on the global data by both the UNIPCC and the US GCRP/CCSP also requires a full investigation and audit.

2. UN wrongly linked global warming to natural disasters

By Janathan Leake, The Sunday Times Online, Jan 24, 2010

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7000063.ece>

THE United Nations climate science panel faces new controversy for wrongly linking global warming to an increase in the number and severity of natural disasters such as hurricanes and floods.

It based the claims on an unpublished report that had not been subjected to routine scientific scrutiny — and ignored warnings from scientific advisers that the evidence supporting the link too weak. The report's own authors later withdrew the claim because they felt the evidence was not strong enough.

The claim by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), that global warming is already affecting the severity and frequency of global disasters, has since become embedded in political and public debate. It was central to discussions at last month's Copenhagen climate summit, including a demand by developing countries for compensation of \$100 billion (£62 billion) from the rich nations blamed for creating the most emissions.

Ed Miliband, the energy and climate change minister, has suggested British and overseas floods — such as those in Bangladesh in 2007 — could be linked to global warming. Barack Obama, the US president, said last autumn: "More powerful storms and floods threaten every continent."

Last month Gordon Brown, the prime minister, told the Commons that the financial agreement at Copenhagen "must address the great injustice that . . . those hit first and hardest by climate change are those that have done least harm".

The latest criticism of the IPCC comes a week after reports in The Sunday Times forced it to retract claims in its benchmark 2007 report that the Himalayan glaciers would be largely melted by 2035. It turned out that the bogus claim had been lifted from a news report published in 1999 by New Scientist magazine.

The new controversy also goes back to the IPCC's 2007 report in which a separate section warned that the world had "suffered rapidly rising costs due to extreme weather-related events since the 1970s".

It suggested a part of this increase was due to global warming and cited the unpublished report, saying: "One study has found that while the dominant signal remains that of the significant increases in the values of exposure at risk, once losses are normalised for exposure, there still remains an underlying rising trend."

The Sunday Times has since found that the scientific paper on which the IPCC based its claim had not been peer reviewed, nor published, at the time the climate body issued its report.

When the paper was eventually published, in 2008, it had a new caveat. It said: "We find insufficient evidence to claim a statistical relationship between global temperature increase and catastrophe losses."

Despite this change the IPCC did not issue a clarification ahead of the Copenhagen climate summit last month. It has also emerged that at least two scientific reviewers who checked drafts of the IPCC report urged greater caution in proposing a link between climate change and disaster impacts — but were ignored.

The claim will now be re-examined and could be withdrawn. Professor Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, a climatologist at the Universite Catholique de Louvain in Belgium, who is vice-chair of the IPCC, said: "We are reassessing the evidence and will publish a report on natural disasters and extreme weather with the latest findings. Despite recent events the IPCC process is still very rigorous and scientific."

The academic paper at the centre of the latest questions was written in 2006 by Robert Muir-Wood, head of research at Risk Management Solutions, a London consultancy, who later became a contributing author to the section of the IPCC's 2007 report dealing with climate change impacts. He is widely respected as an expert on disaster impacts.

Muir-Wood wanted to find out if the 8% year-on-year increase in global losses caused by weather-related disasters since the 1960s was larger than could be explained by the impact of social changes like growth in population and infrastructure.

Such an increase, coinciding with rising temperatures, might suggest that global warming was to blame. If proven this would be highly significant, both politically and scientifically, because it would confirm the many predictions that global warming will increase the frequency and severity of natural hazards.

In the research Muir-Wood looked at a wide range of hazards, including tropical cyclones, thunder and hail storms, and wildfires as well as floods and hurricanes.

He found from 1950 to 2005 there was no increase in the impact of disasters once growth was accounted for. For 1970-2005, however, he found a 2% annual increase which "corresponded with a period of rising global temperatures,"

Muir-Wood was, however, careful to point out that almost all this increase could be accounted for by the exceptionally strong hurricane seasons in 2004 and 2005. There were also other more technical factors that could cause bias, such as exchange rates which meant that disasters hitting the US would appear to cost proportionately more in insurance payouts.

Despite such caveats, the IPCC report used the study in its section on disasters and hazards, but cited only the 1970-2005 results.

The IPCC report said: "Once the data were normalised, a small statistically significant trend was found for an increase in annual catastrophe loss since 1970 of 2% a year." It added: "Once losses are normalised for exposure, there still remains an underlying rising trend."

Muir-Wood's paper was originally commissioned by Roger Pielke, professor of environmental studies at Colorado University, also an expert on disaster impacts, for a workshop on disaster losses in 2006. The researchers who attended that workshop published a statement agreeing that so far there was no evidence to link global warming with any increase in the severity or frequency of disasters. Pielke has also told the IPCC that citing one section of Muir-Wood's paper in preference to the rest of his work, and all the other peer-reviewed literature, was wrong.

He said: "All the literature published before and since the IPCC report shows that rising disaster losses can be explained entirely by social change. People have looked hard for evidence that global warming plays a part but can't find it. Muir-Wood's study actually confirmed that."

Mike Hulme, professor of climate change at the Tyndall Centre, which advises the UK government on global warming, said there was no real evidence that natural disasters were already being made worse by climate change. He said: "A proper analysis shows that these claims are usually superficial"

Such warnings may prove uncomfortable for Miliband whose recent speeches have often linked climate change with disasters such as the floods that recently hit Bangladesh and Cumbria. Last month he said: "We must not let the sceptics pass off political opinion as scientific fact. Events in Cumbria give a foretaste of the kind of weather runaway climate change could bring. Abroad, the melting of the Himalayan glaciers that feed the great rivers of South Asia could put hundreds of millions of people at risk of drought. Our security is at stake."

Muir-Wood himself is more cautious. He said: "The idea that catastrophes are rising in cost partly because of climate change is completely misleading. "We could not tell if it was just an association or cause and effect. Also, our study included 2004 and 2005 which was when there were some major hurricanes. If you took those years away then the significance of climate change vanished."

Some researchers have argued that it is unfair to attack the IPCC too strongly, pointing out that some errors are inevitable in a report as long and technical as the IPCC's round-up of climate science. "Part of the problem could simply be that expectations are too high," said one researcher. "We have been seen as a scientific gold standard and that's hard to live up to."

Professor Christopher Field, director of the Department of Global Ecology at the Carnegie Institution in California, who is the new co-chairman of the IPCC working group overseeing the climate impacts report, said the 2007 report had been broadly accurate at the time it was written.

He said: "The 2007 study should be seen as "a snapshot of what was known then. Science is progressive. If something turns out to be wrong we can fix it next time around." However he confirmed he would be introducing rigorous new review procedures for future reports to ensure errors were kept to a minimum.

3. Wow! UK parliamentary investigation into Climategate may not be a whitesash

By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Jan 22, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100023449/wow-uk-parliamentary-investigation-into-climategate-may-not-be-a-whitewash/>

The [Commons Science and Technology Committee](#) has launched an inquiry into "the unauthorised publication of data, emails and documents relating to the work of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia (UEA)" – ie Climategate. (hat tip R. Campbell; [Platosays](#)).

On 1 December 2009 Phil Willis, Chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, wrote to Professor Edward Acton, Vice-Chancellor of UEA following the considerable press coverage of the data, emails and documents relating to the work of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU). The coverage alleged that data may have been manipulated or deleted in order to produce evidence on global warming. On 3 December the UEA announced an Independent Review into the allegations to be headed by Sir Muir Russell.

The Independent Review will:

1. Examine the hacked e-mail exchanges, other relevant e-mail exchanges and any other information held at CRU to determine whether there is any evidence of the manipulation or suppression of data which is at odds with acceptable scientific practice and may therefore call into question any of the research outcomes.
2. Review CRU's policies and practices for acquiring, assembling, subjecting to peer review and disseminating data and research findings, and their compliance or otherwise with best scientific practice.
3. Review CRU's compliance or otherwise with the University's policies and practices regarding requests under the Freedom of Information Act ('the FOIA') and the Environmental Information Regulations ('the EIR') for the release of data.
4. Review and make recommendations as to the appropriate management, governance and security structures for CRU and the security, integrity and release of the data it holds .

But here's the really surprising part: it's planning to ask the right questions.

- What are the implications of the disclosures for the integrity of scientific research?
- Are the terms of reference and scope of the Independent Review announced on 3 December 2009 by UEA adequate (see below)?
- How independent are the other two international data sets?

This is very heartening news for taxpayers, rationalists, and everyone who believes in the integrity of the scientific process. More encouraging still is [Bishop Hill's suggestion](#) that it might be used by climate realists in the US government to launch a pincer movement against the eco fascists in the Obama administration:

Joe Barton, the man behind the US Senate's 2006 hearings on the Hockey Stick, has been stirring things up in Washington again:

Rep. Joe Barton (R-Texas) is pressing Energy Secretary Steven Chu for information about department ties to the U.K. climate institute at the center of the controversy over the infamous hacked climate science emails.

Barton, the top Republican on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and Rep. Greg Walden (R-Ore.) [wrote to Chu Friday](#) asking about DoE funding for projects connected to the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia.

Observes the Bishop: Coming so soon after the announcement of the UK Parliamentary inquiry, one can't help but wonder if the timing is entirely coincidental. Nevertheless, shedding sunlight on what has been going on is certainly no bad thing.

UPDATE: The following quote in today's Telegraph from committee chairman Phil Willis suggests that the panel has a Warmist bias:

"There are a significant number of climate change deniers, who are basically using the UEA emails to support the case this is poor science that has been changed or at worst manipulated.

We do not believe this is healthy and therefore we want to call in the UEA so the public can see what they are saying"

[Bishop Hill, meanwhile, has moderate-to-bad news](#) about the panel members, most of whom have Warmist sympathies. Especially the Conservative ones.

4. Glacier scientist: I knew data hadn't been verified

By David Rose, MailOnline, Jan 24, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1245636/Glacier-scientists-says-knew-data-verified.html>

The scientist behind the bogus claim in a Nobel Prize-winning UN report that Himalayan glaciers will have melted by 2035 last night admitted it was included purely to put political pressure on world leaders.

Dr Murari Lal also said he was well aware the statement, in the 2007 report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), did not rest on peer-reviewed scientific research.

In an interview with The Mail on Sunday, Dr Lal, the co-ordinating lead author of the report's chapter on Asia, said: 'It related to several countries in this region and their water sources. We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action.

'It had importance for the region, so we thought we should put it in.'

Dr Lal's admission will only add to the mounting furore over the melting glaciers assertion, which the IPCC was last week forced to withdraw because it has no scientific foundation.

According to the IPCC's statement of principles, its role is 'to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis, scientific, technical and socio-economic information – IPCC reports should be neutral with respect to policy'.

The claim that Himalayan glaciers are set to disappear by 2035 rests on two 1999 magazine interviews with glaciologist Syed Hasnain, which were then recycled without any further investigation in a 2005 report by the environmental campaign group WWF.

It was this report that Dr Lal and his team cited as their source.

The WWF article also contained a basic error in its arithmetic. A claim that one glacier was retreating at the alarming rate of 134 metres a year should in fact have said 23 metres – the authors had divided the total loss measured over 121 years by 21, not 121.

Last Friday, the WWF website posted a humiliating statement recognising the claim as 'unsound', and saying it 'regrets any confusion caused'.

Dr Lal said: 'We knew the WWF report with the 2035 date was "grey literature" [material not published in a peer-reviewed journal]. But it was never picked up by any of the authors in our working group, nor by any of the more than 500 external reviewers, by the governments to which it was sent, or by the final IPCC review editors.'

In fact, the 2035 melting date seems to have been plucked from thin air.

Professor Graham Cogley, a glacier expert at Trent University in Canada, who began to raise doubts in scientific circles last year, said the claim multiplies the rate at which glaciers have been seen to melt by a factor of about 25.

'My educated guess is that there will be somewhat less ice in 2035 than there is now,' he said.

'But there is no way the glaciers will be close to disappearing. It doesn't seem to me that exaggerating the problem's seriousness is going to help solve it.'

One of the problems bedevilling Himalayan glacier research is a lack of reliable data. But an authoritative report published last November by the Indian government said: 'Himalayan glaciers have not in any way exhibited, especially in recent years, an abnormal annual retreat.'

When this report was issued, Raj Pachauri, the IPCC chairman, denounced it as 'voodoo science'.

Having been forced to apologise over the 2035 claim, Dr Pachauri blamed Dr Lal, saying his team had failed to apply IPCC procedures.

It was an accusation rebutted angrily by Dr Lal. 'We as authors followed them to the letter,' he said. 'Had we received information that undermined the claim, we would have included it.'

However, an analysis of those 500-plus formal review comments, to be published tomorrow by the Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF), the new body founded by former Chancellor Nigel Lawson, suggests that when reviewers did raise issues that called the claim into question, Dr Lal and his colleagues simply ignored them.

For example, Hayley Fowler of Newcastle University, suggested that their draft did not mention that Himalayan glaciers in the Karakoram range are growing rapidly, citing a paper published in the influential journal Nature.

In their response, the IPCC authors said, bizarrely, that they were 'unable to get hold of the suggested references', but would 'consider' this in their final version. They failed to do so.

The Japanese government commented that the draft did not clarify what it meant by stating that the likelihood of the glaciers disappearing by 2035 was 'very high'. 'What is the confidence level?' it asked.

The authors' response said 'appropriate revisions and editing made'. But the final version was identical to their draft.

Last week, Professor Georg Kaser, a glacier expert from Austria, who was lead author of a different chapter in the IPCC report, said when he became aware of the 2035 claim a few months before the report was published, he wrote to Dr Lal, urging him to withdraw it as patently untrue.

Dr Lal claimed he never received this letter. 'He didn't contact me or any of the other authors of the chapter,' he said.

The damage to the IPCC's reputation, already tarnished by last year's 'Warmergate' leaked email scandal, is likely to be considerable.

Benny Peiser, the GWPF's director, said the affair suggested the IPCC review process was 'skewed by a bias towards alarmist assessments'.

Environmentalist Alton Byers said the panel's credibility had been damaged. 'They've done sloppy work,' he said. 'We need better research on the ground, not unreliable predictions derived from computer models.'

Last night, Dr Pachauri defended the IPCC, saying it was wrong to generalise based on a single mistake. 'Our procedure is robust,' he added.

5. Save the Panel on Climate Change!

Richard Tol, Roger Pielke, and Hans von Storch, Der Spiegel Online, Jan 25, 2010

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,673944,00.html>

We have seen a crisis of confidence gathering momentum around climate science in recent weeks. Following the unauthorized release of e-mails from the University of East Anglia, showing climate scientists not at their best, now comes a flurry of attention to errors in official reports and accusations of conflicts of interest.

The crisis centers on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), set up by the United Nations Environment Programme and World Meteorological Organization, and its chair, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri. Without significant institutional reform, the IPCC, and climate science as a whole, risks more than just bad press. It risks losing its credibility and trust.

The IPCC was set up to advise policymakers on issues of climate science and policy, with a stated goal to be "policy-relevant and yet policy-neutral, never policy-prescriptive". The executive secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change explains that "the credibility of climate change policy can only be based on credible science." The IPCC seeks to meet its rigorous standards of

academic integrity through a thorough review process "to ensure an objective and complete assessment of current information."

The IPCC Has Failed

The ideals of the IPCC are both worthwhile and hard to live up to. Academics have all of the foibles that are seen in every other profession. Politicians and advocates seek to politicize scientific advice, often preferring to hide behind "the science" rather than explain the normative choices behind tough decisions. Such factors make it important for scientific advisory institutions to have rigorous and transparent policies to ensure trust and the credibility of their work. The IPCC has failed in this respect.

The IPCC's shortfalls are illustrated with the behavior of Pachauri, its chair since 2002. In recent months, Pachauri has participated in overt political advocacy, such as by calling on people to eat less meat and on the United States government to pass a certain climate policy. He has endorsed 350 parts per million as the right target for the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases, despite the IPCC offering no recommendation on such a target. Being a scientific advisor sometimes means recusing yourself from engaging in the political processes that you are advising. We expect no less from intelligence agencies advising the military and medical professionals advising governments on health and safety.

When the e-mails were stolen or leaked from the University of East Anglia, they revealed, among other things, the intent of IPCC authors to violate IPCC procedures. Pachauri first said that all was fine, then announced an investigation, and then cancelled it.

The Glacier Error is not Unique

When the latest IPCC report said glaciers could disappear from the Himalayas by 2035, with major ramifications for the water supply in South Asia, it generated headlines around the world. That prediction [proved to be grossly in error](#). It revealed a serious breach of the organization's own standards of review. When the error was initially publicized, Pachauri declared that the IPCC does not make mistakes and viciously attacked people who disagreed, before the sheer weight of evidence made him admit the error.

Another IPCC scientist claims to have been aware of the error in 2006, but was unable to have it corrected. The glacier error is not unique. That such a large body of work contains some errors is unavoidable. An appropriate mechanism to deal with false or contested knowledge claims is needed, but has not been implemented.

The whole situation became more bizarre when it emerged from the investigations of Richard North that Pachauri's Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) has built a large research effort on Himalayan glaciers on the back of the error in the IPCC report. TERI is also the beneficiary of considerable sums from companies with a financial interest in climate policy, resulting from payments for Pachauri's advice or authority. Astoundingly, it appears that Pachauri has not broken any rules for the simple reason that there is no code of conduct governing conflicts of interest for IPCC participants and leaders.

The Credibility of Climate Science is at Stake

The IPCC has started the preparations for the next major report, to be released in 2014. It may be advisable to pause for wholesale institutional reform. The IPCC needs guidelines for the behavior of its officials, and those guidelines must be enforced. With a policy on conflict of interest similar to those in place in leading scientific advisory institutions, it seems obvious that the IPCC would need a new chairperson. The IPCC needs to adhere to its own standards for appointing experts and reviewing material that it reports. It needs to make its procedures for appointments more transparent. The IPCC peer-review

should be made more robust, with quality assurance overriding deadlines. A formal mechanism should be put in place to correct errors after publication. Such reform will be a large and difficult task. But the credibility of climate science depends upon it.

It will take many electoral cycles and all major countries to address the problems associated with climate change. Partisan advice will be unpicked, sloppy research will be exposed. New observations and theory will change aspects of the current understanding. Sustaining a climate policy that is effective, acceptable and durable can only be based on sound and impartial advice from institutions that do their science sustainably over many decades. The IPCC was supposed to provide that advice, but its standards have slipped, its procedures have turned out to be insufficient and its credibility has been questioned.

Climate policy matters, and so too does the IPCC. Its importance means that reform is needed before the reputation of all of climate science is irreparably damaged.

Richard Tol is a research professor at the Economic and Social Research Institute in Dublin and the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Roger Pielke Jr. is a professor of environmental studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder and Hans von Storch is director of the Institute for Coastal Research at the GKSS Research Center in Geesthacht and and a climate researcher at the Institute of Meteorology at the University of Hamburg.

6. After Climategate, Pachaurigate and Glaciergate: Amazongate

By James Delingpole, Jan 25, 2010

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100023598/after-climategate-pachaurigate-and-glaciergate-amazongate/>

[AGW theory is toast](#). So's Dr Rajendra Pachauri. So's the Stern Review. So's the credibility of the IPCC. But if you think I'm cheered by this you're very much mistaken. I'm trying to write a Climategate book but the way things are going by the time I'm finished there won't be anything left to say: the battle will already have been won and the only people left who still believe in Man Made Global Warming will be the eco-loon equivalents of those wartime Japanese soldiers left abandoned and forgotten on remote Pacific atolls.

Here's the latest development, courtesy of [Dr Richard North](#) – and it's a cracker. It seems that, not content with having lied to us about shrinking glaciers, increasing hurricanes, and rising sea levels, the IPCC's latest assessment report also told us a complete load of porkies about the danger posed by climate change to the Amazon rainforest.

This is to be found in Chapter 13 of the Working Group II report, the same part of the IPCC fourth assessment report in which the "Glaciergate" claims are made. There, is the [startling claim](#) that:

Up to 40% of the Amazonian forests could react drastically to even a slight reduction in precipitation; this means that the tropical vegetation, hydrology and climate system in South America could change very rapidly to another steady state, not necessarily producing gradual changes between the current and the future situation (Rowell and Moore, 2000). It is more probable that forests will be replaced by ecosystems that have more resistance to multiple stresses caused by temperature increase, droughts and fires, such as tropical savannas.

At first sight, the reference looks kosher enough but, following it through, one sees:

Rowell, A. and P.F. Moore, 2000: *Global Review of Forest Fires*. WWF/IUCN, Gland, Switzerland, 66 pp. http://www.iucn.org/themes/fcp/publications/files/global_review_forest_fires.pdf.

This, then appears to be another WWF report, carried out in conjunction with the IUCN – [The International Union for Conservation of Nature](#).

The link given is no longer active, but the report is on the IUCN website [here](#). Furthermore, the IUCN along with WWF is another advocacy group and the report is not peer-reviewed. According to IPCC rules, it should not have been used as a primary source.

It gets even better. The two expert authors of the WWF report so casually cited by the IPCC as part of its, ahem, “robust” “peer-reviewed” process weren’t even Amazon specialists. One, Dr PF Moore, is a policy analyst:

My background and experience around the world has required and developed high-level policy and analytical skills. I have a strong understanding of government administration, legislative review, analysis and inquiries generated through involvement in or management of the Australian Regional Forest Agreement process, Parliamentary and Government inquiries, Coronial inquiries and public submissions on water pricing, access and use rights and native vegetation legislation in Australia and fire and natural resources laws, regulations and policies in Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand, South Africa and Malaysia.

And the lead author Andy Rowell is a freelance journalist (for the Guardian, natch) and green activist:

Andy Rowell is a freelance writer and Investigative journalist with over 12 years’ experience on environmental, food, health and globalization issues. Rowell has undertaken cutting-edge investigations for, amongst others, Action on Smoking and Health, The Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, IFAW, the Pan American Health Organization, Project Underground, the World Health Organization, World in Action and WWF.

But the IPCC’s shamelessness did not end there. Dr North has searched the WWF’s reports high and low but can find no evidence of a statement to support the IPCC’s claim that “40 per cent” of the Amazon is threatened by climate change. (Logging and farm expansion are a much more plausible threat).

[Watts Up With That](#) provides a further, worryingly long list of the non-peer-reviewed papers from the World Wildlife Fund cited as evidence in the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment report. Time, it asks, for the IPCC to be stripped of its Nobel Peace Prize?

We can but dream.

7. United Nations’ Climate Chief Must Go

Investor’s Business Daily, Jan 27, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=519317>

Global Warming: If we're serious about restoring science to its rightful place, the head of the U.N.'s panel on climate change should step down. Evidence shows he quarterbacked a deliberate and premeditated fraud.

The U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has been forced to back off its now-discredited claim that the Himalayan glaciers would soon disappear. But it's not true, the panel's vice chairman, Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, told the BBC, that it was simply a "human mistake."

The panel's chairman, Dr. Rajendra K. Pachauri, who was forced to admit the claim had no basis in observable scientific fact, said its inclusion was merely a "poor application" of IPCC procedures, acting as if the original source of the claim, Indian scientist Dr. Syed Hasnain, was a total stranger.

In fact, as Christopher Booker of the London Telegraph points out, Dr. Hasnain "has for the past two years been working as a senior employee of the Energy and Resources Institute (TERI), the Delhi-based company of which Dr. Pachauri was director-general."

So after the 2007 assessment that included Hasnain's claim, Pachauri was impressed enough to hire him as an employee. Pachauri should have been familiar with both his work and the fact the claim had not been peer-reviewed, and aware that it had been challenged by reputable geologists.

Before the 2007 report was published, Hasnain's claim was challenged by another of its lead authors, Austrian glaciologist Dr. Georg Kaser. He described Hasnain's prediction of glaciers vanishing by 2035 as "so wrong that it is not even worth dismissing."

So why was it included in the 2007 IPCC assessment? In an interview with the London Daily Mail on Sunday, Dr. Murari Lal, the coordinating lead author of the chapter on Asia, gave a disturbing answer. "It related to several countries in the region and their water sources," he said. "We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policymakers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action."

In other words, the motive was political, not scientific, in contradiction to the IPCC mission statement that says its role is "to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis, scientific, technical and socioeconomic information — the IPCC reports should be neutral with respect to policy."

Was money another motivation? Booker points out that Hasnain's claim "helped TERI win a substantial share of a \$300,000 grant from one of America's leading charities, along with a share in a 3-million-euro research study funded by the EU."

Deception and manipulation are apparently established practices at the IPCC, just as they were with the researchers at Britain's Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia. Marc Morano at Climate Depot, who has done yeoman work exposing climate fraud, relates the witness of Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama in Huntsville.

Christy served as an IPCC lead author in 2001 for the third assessment report and personally witnessed U.N. scientists trying to distort the science for political purposes.

"I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol," Christy told CNN on May 2, 2007.

Twenty years ago, Stanford University environmentalist Stephen Schneider told Discover magazine that it's perfectly fine "to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements and make little mention of any doubts we might have. ... Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest."

The IPCC of Dr. Pachauri has turned out to be neither. Under his tutelage, it has continued to foster climate fraud in the face of contrary evidence. Scary scenarios are offered up, but little else. As his and then IPCC's credibility melts away faster than the Himalayan glaciers, he should resign or be fired.

8. Climate agency going up in flammers: Exit of Canada's expert a sure sign IPCC in trouble

By Terence Corcoran, National Post, Jan 27, 2010 [H/t Mark LaRochelle]

<http://www.nationalpost.com/opinion/columnists/story.html?id=90f8dd19-4a79-4f8f-ab42-b9655edc289b>

A catastrophic heat wave appears to be closing in on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. How hot is it getting in the scientific kitchen where they've been cooking the books and spicing up the stew pots? So hot, apparently, that Andrew Weaver, probably Canada's leading climate scientist, is calling for replacement of IPCC leadership and institutional reform.

If Andrew Weaver is heading for the exits, it's a pretty sure sign that the United Nations agency is under monumental stress. Mr. Weaver, after all, has been a major IPCC science insider for years. He is Canada Research Chair in Climate Modelling and Analysis at the University of Victoria, mastermind of one of the most sophisticated climate modelling systems on the planet, and lead author on two recent landmark IPCC reports.

For him to say, as he told Canwest News yesterday, that there has been some "dangerous crossing" of the line between climate advocacy and science at the IPCC is stunning in itself.

Not only is Mr. Weaver an IPCC insider. He has also, over the years, generated his own volume of climate advocacy that often seemed to have crossed that dangerous line between hype and science.

It is Mr. Weaver, for example, who said the IPCC's 2007 science report -- the one now subject to some scrutiny -- "isn't a smoking gun; climate is a battalion of intergalactic smoking missiles."

He has also made numerous television appearances linking current weather and temperature events with global warming, painting sensational pictures and dramatic links.

"When you see these [temperature] numbers, it's screaming out at you: 'This is global warming!'"

Mr. Weaver is also one of the authors of The Copenhagen Diagnosis, an IPCC-related piece of agit-prop issued just before the recent Copenhagen meeting.

The Copenhagen Diagnosis is as manipulative a piece of policy advocacy as can be found, filled with foreboding and alarming assessments. Described as "an interim evaluation of the evolving science," it was an attempt to jump-start decision-making at Copenhagen. It failed, perhaps in part because one of the authors was U.S. climate scientist Michael Mann, who plays a big role in the Climategate emails.

That Mr. Weaver now thinks it necessary to set himself up as the voice of scientific reason, and as a moderate guardian of appropriate and measured commentary on the state of the world's climate, is firm evidence that the IPCC is in deep trouble. He's getting out while the getting's good, and blaming the IPCC's upper echelon for the looming crisis.

In the language typical of an IPCC report, one might say that the radiative forcing created by Climategate and Glaciergate strongly suggest this is very likely to bring about cataclysmic melting of the organization within the next portion of the current decadal period. The words "very likely" in IPCC risk assessment terms mean a 90% or greater probability that something will happen. As it looks now, the IPCC is burnt toast and unless it is overhauled fast there's a 90% probability the climate-change political machine is going to come crashing down.

Mr. Weaver's acknowledgement that Climategate -- the release/leak/ theft of thousands of incriminating emails from a British climate centre showing deep infighting and number manipulation -- demonstrates a

problem is real news in itself. When Climategate broke as a story last November, Mr. Weaver dismissed it as unimportant and appeared in the media with a cockamamie story about how his offices had also been broken into and that the fossil-fuel industry might be responsible for both Climategate and his office break-in.

The latest IPCC fiasco looks even more damaging. In the 2007 IPCC report that Mr. Weaver said revealed climate change to be a barrage of intergalactic ballistic missiles, it turns out one of those missiles -- a predicted melting of the Himalayan ice fields by 2035 -- was a fraud. Not an accidental fraud, but a deliberately planted piece of science fiction. The IPCC author who planted that false Himalayan meltdown said the other day "we" did it because "we thought ... it will impact policy makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action."

Mr. Weaver told Canwest that the Himalayan incident is "one small thing" and not a sign of a "global conspiracy to drum up false evidence of global warming." We shall see. It is a safe bet that there have been other tweaks, twists, manipulations and distortions in IPCC science reports over the years. New revelations are inevitable. Now is a good time to get out of the kitchen. Mr. Weaver is the first out the door.

#####