



November 21, 2009

The Evidence of Climate Fraud

By [Marc Sheppard](#)

A folder containing documents, data and, e-mails purportedly "hacked" from Britain's Climate Research Unit (CRU) may be smoking-gun proof of a worldwide conspiracy to exaggerate the existence, causation, and threat of global warming. And the list of apparent conspirators includes many of the world's leading climate alarmists -- the very scientists on whose work the entire anthropogenic global warming theory is based.

In a Friday interview with *Investigative Magazine's TGIF Edition*, CRU director Phillip Jones confirmed [\[PDF\]](#) that the incriminating documents, which have been widely disseminated online, are in fact genuine. Accordingly, whether indeed the labor of hackers, or instead that of a CRU whistleblower, the contents of the *FOI2009* folder are now public record -- and that's nothing short of dynamite.

After all, the names of the email exchangers represent a who's-who of the world's leading climate alarmism scientists, including Stephen Schneider, Gavin Schmidt, and James Hansen. And the e-mails themselves seemingly betray an organized apparatus of deception.

In one particularly odious e-mail dated November 1999, Jones writes to Michael Mann, Raymond Bradley, and Malcolm Hughes:

I've just completed Mike's Nature trick of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (ie from 1981 onwards) and from 1961 for Keith's to hide the decline.

Now, these are the same Mann, Bradley, and Hughes whose MBH98 reconstruction (aka the "Hockey Stick" graph) -- which deceitfully depicts last millennium's global temperatures as flat prior to a dramatic upturn last century -- remains the poster-child of global warming hysteria despite being thoroughly debunked. **And here we find Jones writing the three the following year admitting to using Mann's "trick" to "hide" a temperature decline.**

Not surprisingly, the Keith mentioned is none other than CRU's own Keith Briffa, another Hockey-Team leader, whose temperature graphs, derived from tree ring data from Yamal, Russia, were cited by the IPCC as supporting evidence of MBH's assertion of unprecedented 20th-century warming. But as we [reported at the time](#), that buttress crumbled last month when Briffa's results were proven to stand no more reliably than Mann's.

Ultimately, neither reconstruction attained its alarmist imperative goal of proving today's global temperatures unprecedented. Despite repeated fraudulent efforts to demonstrate otherwise, 20th-century highs remain documented as several degrees cooler than those of the Medieval Warming Period of 900-1300 AD. Bad news for the mankind-stinks crowd in general; worse news for those actually involved in this devious deception.

Both Mann and Briffa had been challenged for years to produce their data, methods, and source code by Climate Audit's Steve McIntyre. Both ignored the tenets of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) McIntyre cited and fought every effort to induce their coming clean. And actually not without good reason -- last month, CRU was effectively forced to release the Yamal information, whereupon an analysis by McIntyre [proved](#) that Briffa et al. had cherry-picked and manipulated data, intentionally omitting records not friendly to their position.

And we now know that on the very day our exposé of the Briffa scandal, [UN Climate Reports: They Lie](#), appeared here at *AT*, Jones forwarded this email response from Tom Wigley of the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research to Briffa: [my emphasis]

It is distressing to read that **American Stinker item. But Keith does seem to have got himself into a mess.** As

I pointed out in emails, Yamal is insignificant. And you say that (contrary to what M&M say) Yamal is *not* used in MBH, etc. So these facts alone are enough to shoot down M&M in a few sentences (which surely is the only way to go - complex and wordy responses will be counter productive). But, more generally, (even if it *is* irrelevant) how does Keith explain the McIntyre plot that compares Yamal-12 with Yamal-all? And how does he explain the apparent "selection" of the less well-replicated chronology rather than the later (better replicated) chronology?

Of course, I don't know how often Yamal-12 has really been used in recent, post-1995, work. I suspect from what you say it is much less often than M&M say - but where did they get their information? I presume they went through papers to see if Yamal was cited, a pretty foolproof method if you ask me. Perhaps these things can be explained clearly and concisely - but I am not sure Keith is able to do this as he is too close to the issue and probably quite pissed off.

And the issue of with-holding data is still a hot potato, one that affects both you and Keith (and Mann). Yes, there are reasons - but many *good* scientists appear to be unsympathetic to these. The trouble here is that with-holding data looks like hiding something, and hiding means (in some eyes) that it is bogus science that is being hidden.

I think Keith needs to be very, very careful in how he handles this. I'd be willing to check over anything he puts together.
Tom.

Beyond his sophomoric cheap shot at this fine publication's highly regarded name, Wigley admitted that McIntyre's comparison of "Yamal-12 with Yamal-all" implied a "selection" of data on the part of Briffa. Yet his concern was not one of scientific integrity, but instead that Briffa may not be up to the task of properly "explaining" the cherry-picking as he is "too close to the issue and probably quite pissed off[f]." And while offering his assistance in the cover-up, imploring caution because "in some eyes" it might appear they're hiding "bogus science," Wigley actually defended the practice of withholding data.

Perchance the hitherto-sequestered April 2007 document entitled *jones-foiathoughts.doc*, concerning reactions to FOIA inquiries, might lend some insight into CRU's atrocious reporting policies. Within, Jones lists three options to such requests. As an alternative to the first of actual compliance, he suggests he and his co-conspirators might "send them a subset removing station data from some of the countries" and "remove many of the early stations that we coded up in the 1980s." Or perhaps "send them the raw data as is, by reconstructing it from GHCN" (Global Historical Climatology Network), adding that "this would be the raw data, but it would annoy them."

Amazing. Yet this is but the tip of the seasonally advancing iceberg. Communiqués suborning subterfuge abound here, including one from May of 2008 in which Jones actually exhorts Mann to "delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4" and to entreat others to perform likewise. Was this in fact a fourth (and likely illegal) Jones option for dealing with McIntyre's FOIA requests?

There appear to be thousands of emails, documents, reports, and data files to review here. So I'm sure this fledgling story will continue to evolve as greater minds than mine analyze them throughout the weekend. For those sporting taste buds leaning toward the technical, rest assured that both [Climate Audit](#) and [Watts Up With That](#) will certainly sate those appetites. Needless to say, look no further than *American Thinker* for continuing political analysis. And for those of you wishing to join in this criminal investigation, the *FOI2009* folder is available for download [here](#).

Criminal? Oh yes, indeed. As this mock-science serves as justification for trillions of dollars in imposed and proposed new taxes, liens, fees, and rate hikes -- not to mention the absurd wealth-redistribution premise of international climate debt "reparations" -- such manipulation of evidence should be treated as exactly what it is: larceny on the grandest scale in history.

Sorry, Al -- the science hasn't been settled. It's merely been meddled.

Page Printed from: http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/11/the_evidence_of_climate_fraud.html at February 03, 2010 - 04:56:33 PM CST