

We've updated our [Privacy Policy](#) and by continuing you're agreeing to the updated terms.

OK



Popular Technology



Join

Login

## Popular Technology

Highly engaging Computer and Technical discussions with some politics thrown in.



Popular Technology > Popular Technology > The Sciences >

## Climategate Resource

Share

Switch to Print View - 10 posts



Andrew

8,771

O-10 \*\*\*\*

General

Nov 21, 2009 #1

**Centre of the storm** (*Maclean's*, December 13, 2009) - [\[Archive\]](#)

**Scientists Behaving Badly**. (*The Weekly Standard*, December 14, 2009) - [\[Archive\]](#)

**In Denial: The meltdown of the climate campaign** (*The Weekly Standard*, March 15, 2010) - [\[Archive\]](#)

**Climategate (Part II) A sequel as ugly as the original** (*The Weekly Standard*, December 12, 2011) - [\[Archive\]](#)

**Climategate Continues: Will a penalty be called for Keith Briffa's excessively curved hockey stick?**

(*NRO*, May 24, 2012) - [\[Archive\]](#)

**The Scientists Involved in Deliberately Deceiving the World on Climate** (*Canada Free Press*, November 30, 2009)

**The New Big Lie: Climategate Emails Are Not Significant** (*Canada Free Press*, December 14, 2009)

**Climategate Part 1 - A 2,000-page epic of science and skepticism** (*National Post*, Canada, December 19, 2009)

**Climategate Part 2 - A 2,000-page epic of science and skepticism** (*National Post*, Canada, December 21, 2009)

**A Climatology Conspiracy?** (*American Thinker*, December 20, 2009)

**Peer-to-Peer Review (Part I): How 'Climategate' Marks the Maturing of a New Science Movement**

*(Big Journalism, January 8, 2010)*

Peer-to-Peer Review (Part II): How 'Climategate' Marks the Maturing of a New Science Movement

*(Big Journalism, January 10, 2010)*

Peer-to-Peer Review (Part III): How 'Climategate' Marks the Maturing of a New Science Movement

*(Big Journalism, January 12, 2010)*

Climate libel chill *(Benny Peiser, National Post, Canada, March 13, 2010)*

### **Reports:**

'Consensus' Exposed: The CRU Controversy (PDF) (83 pgs) *(United States Senate)*

**The CRU emails show scientists,**

- **Obstructing release of damaging data and information;**
- **Manipulating data to reach preconceived conclusions;**
- **Colluding to pressure journal editors who published work questioning the climate science “consensus”; and**
- **Assuming activist roles to influence the political process**

The Climategate Emails (PDF) (168 pgs) *(The Lavoisier Group)*

Climategate: Caught Green-Handed! (PDF) (43 pgs) *(Science & Public Policy Institute)*

Climategate: A Battlefield Perspective (PDF) (22pgs) *(Stephen McIntyre, B.Sc. Mathematics, May 16, 2010)*

### **Books:**

Climategate: The Crutape Letters *(Steven Mosher, Thomas W. Fuller, 2010)*

The Climate Files: The Battle for the Truth About Global Warming *(Fred Pearce, 2010)*

### **Data:**

The Smoking Gun At Darwin Zero *(Watts Up With That?)*

Russian IEA claims CRU tampered with climate data – cherry-picked warmest stations

*(Watts Up With That?)*

**Gatekeeping:**

Climategatekeeping (*Climate Audit*)

Climategatekeeping #2 (*Climate Audit*)

**Hide The Decline:**

Understanding Climategate's Hidden Decline (*American Thinker*)

Climategate 'hide the decline' explained by Berkeley professor Richard A. Muller

(Video) (5min)

Mike's Nature Trick (*Climate Audit*, November 20, 2009)

Mike's Nature Trick (*Watts Up With That?*, November 20, 2009)

The Trick (*Climate Audit*, November 26, 2009)

IPCC reviewer: "don't cover up the divergence" (*Watts Up With That?*, November 26, 2009)

The Deleted Data from the "Hide the Decline" Trick (*Watts Up With That?*, November 26, 2009)

How "The Trick" was pulled off (*Watts Up With That?*, November 28, 2009)

IPCC and the "Trick" (*Climate Audit*, December 10, 2009)

...the version of the Briffa reconstruction shown in the subsequent proxy diagram in the IPCC "First Order Draft" (October 27, 1999), presumably prepared under the direction of IPCC section author Mann, deleted the inconvenient portion (post-1960) of the Briffa reconstruction, together with other modifications that had the effect of not "diluting the message". [...]

Contrary to claims by various climate scientists, the IPCC Third Assessment Report

**Scientist Responses:**

Climate scientists subverted peer review (*Patrick J. Michaels, Ph.D. Climatology*)

ClimateGate and the Elitist Roots of Global Warming Alarmism (*Roy W. Spencer, Ph.D. Meteorology, Former Senior Scientist for Climate Studies, NASA*)

Comment On The Hacking Of The CRU Website (*Roger Pielke Sr., Ph.D. Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Science*)

Good Science, Bad Politics (*Hans Von Storch, Ph.D. Professor of Meteorology*)

Letter to the Editor of New Scientist (*Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen, Ph.D. Emeritus Reader in Geography*)

Petr Chylek: Open Letter to the Climate Research Community. (*Petr Chylek, Ph.D. Professor of Atmospheric Science*)

The Death Blow to Climate Science (*Tim F. Ball, Ph.D. Climatology*)

Why I think that Michael Mann, Phil Jones and Stefan Rahmstorf should be barred from the IPCC process

(*Eduardo Zorita, Ph.D. Senior Scientist, Institute for Coastal Research*)

Viscount Monckton on Climategate: 'They Are Criminals' (*Christopher Monckton, Former Science Advisor to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, UK*)

### **Timeline:**

The Mosher Timeline (*Climate Audit, January 12, 2010*)

Climategate - The CTM story. (*WUWT, January 13, 2010*)

Search for hacker may lead police back to East Anglia's climate research unit

(*The Guardian, February 9, 2010*)

Climategate: An Autopsy. (*DeSmogBlog, March 30, 2010*)

### **Various Media:**

Breaking News Story: CRU has apparently been hacked – hundreds of files released

(*Watt Up With That?, November 19, 2009*)

Climategate: the final nail in the coffin of 'Anthropogenic Global Warming'?

(*The Daily Telegraph, UK, November 20, 2009*)

Warmist conspiracy exposed? (*Herald Sun, Australia, November 20, 2009*)

Hacked E-Mails Fuel Global Warming Debate (*Wired, November 20, 2009*)

Wrecking CRU: hackers cause massive climate data breach (*The Register, November 20, 2009*)

Hackers 'expose global warming con': Sceptics claim that leaked emails reveal research centre massaged temperature data

(*The Daily Mail, UK, November 21, 2009*)

Harrabin's Notes: E-mail arguments (*BBC, November 21, 2009*)

Sceptics publish climate e-mails 'stolen from East Anglia University' (*The Times, UK, November 21, 2009*)

The Evidence of Climate Fraud (*The American Thinker, November 21,*

2009)

CRU Files Betray Climate Alarmists' Funding Hypocrisy (*American Thinker*, November 22, 2010)

Climate Emails Stoke Debate (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 23, 2009)

Global Warming With the Lid Off (*The Wall Street Journal*, November 24, 2009)

Why You Should Be Hot and Bothered About 'Climate-gate' (*Fox News*, November 24, 2009)

Climate change data dumped (*The Times*, UK, November 29, 2009)

Climategate: Follow the Money (*The Wall Street Journal*, December 1, 2009)

Facing Scandal, Head of Climate Research Lab to Temporarily Step Down

(*Fox News*, December 1, 2009)

Climate-Gate Heats Up But Mainstream Media Ignore Firestorm (*Fox News*, December 3, 2009)

Were Russian security services behind the leak of 'Climategate' emails?

(*Daily Mail*, UK, December 6, 2009)

Climate change emails row deepens as Russians admit they DID come from their Siberian server

(*Daily Mail*, UK, December 13, 2009)

Chinese hackers linked to 'Warmergate' climate change leaked emails controversy

(*Daily Mail*, UK, December 27, 2009)

Scientists in stolen e-mail scandal hid climate data (*The Times*, UK, January 28, 2010)

Leaked climate change emails scientist 'hid' data flaws (*The Guardian*, UK, February 1, 2010)

University 'tried to mislead MPs on climate change e-mails' (*The Times*, UK, February 27, 2010)

Head of 'Climategate' research unit admits sending 'pretty awful emails' to hide data

(*Daily Mail*, UK, March 2, 2010)

Climategate university condemned for 'unacceptable culture of secrecy' (*Daily Mail*, UK, March 31, 2010)

The Climategate Chronicle: How the Science of Global Warming Was Compromised

(*Spiegel Online*, May 14, 2010)

👍 Like    👎 Dislike    ➦ Share

[CRU Email Search](#) (*YourVoiceMatters.Org*)

[ClimateGate FOIA Grepper](#) (*EcoWho*)

[Climategate 2 FOIA 2011 Searchable Database](#) (*FOIA2011.org*)

[Searching the CRU leaked emails](#) (*Di2.NU*)

[Climatic Research Unit emails, data, models, 1996-2009](#) (*WikiLeaks*)

[Index of Climategate Emails](#)

[FOI2009.ZIP](#) (*Google Search*)

**"I think the only thing that counts is numbers. The media is going to say '1000 scientists signed' or '1500 signed'. No one is going to check if it is 600 with PhDs versus 2000 without. They will mention the prominent ones, but that is a different story."** - Joseph Alcamo, Lead Author, IPCC (2001, 2007)

**"But the current diagram with the tree ring only data [i.e. the Briffa reconstruction] somewhat contradicts the multiproxy curve and dilutes the message rather significantly."** - Chris Folland, Lead Author, IPCC (1990, 1992, 1996, 2001)

**"everyone in the room at IPCC was in agreement that this [the Briffa reconstruction] was a problem and a potential distraction/detraction from the reasonably consensus viewpoint we'd like to show w/ the Jones et al and Mann et al series."** - Michael Mann, Lead Author, IPCC (2001)

**"So, if we show Keith's series in this plot, we have to comment that "something else" is responsible for the discrepancies in this case. [Perhaps Keith can help us out a bit by explaining the processing that went into the series and the potential factors that might lead to it being "warmer" than the Jones et al and Mann et al series?? We would need to put in a few words in this regard] Otherwise, the skeptics have an field day casting doubt on our ability to understand the factors that influence these estimates and, thus, can undermine faith in the paleoestimates. I don't think that doubt is scientifically justified, and I'd hate to be the one to have to give it fodder!"** - Michael Mann, Lead Author, IPCC (2001)

**"I never liked it that the 2001 IPCC report pictured Mann's without showing alternates. [...] It now seems clear from looking at all the different analyses that Mann is an outlier"** - Curtis Covey, Research

Scientist, Program for Climate Model Diagnosis and Intercomparison,  
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

**"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." - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"Anyway, I'll maybe cut the last few points off the filtered curve before I give the talk again as that's trending down as a result of the end effects and the recent cold-ish years." - Mick Kelly, Visiting Fellow, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"...it would be nice to try to "contain" the putative "MWP", even if we don't yet have a hemispheric mean reconstruction available that far back." - Michael Mann, Lead Author, IPCC (2001)**

**"I believe that the recent warmth was probably matched about 1000 years ago" - Keith Briffa, Lead Author, IPCC (2007)**

**"The scientific community would come down on me in no uncertain terms if I said the world had cooled from 1998. OK it has..." - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"If you think that Saiers [GRL Editor] is in the greenhouse skeptics camp ...we could go through official AGU channels to get him ousted." - Tom Wigley, Former Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. Kevin and I will keep them out somehow – even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!" - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"I'm getting hassled by a couple of people to release the CRU station temperature data. Don't any of you three tell anybody that the UK has a Freedom of Information Act!" - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"The two MMs have been after the CRU station data for years. If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the UK, I think I'll delete the file rather than send to anyone." - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"I've managed to persuade UEA to ignore all further FOIA requests if the people have anything to do with Climate Audit." - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4? Keith will do likewise. ...Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same? I don't have his new email address. We will be getting Caspar to do likewise." - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"I think we have to stop considering "Climate Research" as a legitimate peer-reviewed journal. Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues in the climate research community to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal. We would also need to consider what we tell or request of our more reasonable colleagues who currently sit on the editorial board..." - Michael Mann, Lead Author, IPCC (2001)**

**"I have refused to send McIntyre the "derived" model data he requests, ...I will continue to refuse such data requests in the future. Nor will I provide McIntyre with computer programs, email correspondence, etc." - Ben Santer, Lead Author, IPCC (1995)**

**"If the RMS is going to require authors to make ALL data available - raw data PLUS results from all intermediate calculations - I will not submit any further papers to RMS journals." - Ben Santer, Lead Author, IPCC (1995)**

**"The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't." - Kevin Trenberth, Lead Author, IPCC (2001, 2007)**

Subject: John L. Daly [Skeptic] Dead

**"...this is cheering news!" - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"Next time I see Pat Michaels at a scientific meeting, I'll be tempted to beat the crap out of him. Very tempted." - Ben Santer, Lead Author, IPCC (1995)**

Exactly who was emailing who in Climategate (Warwick Hughes)



Like Dislike Share

Dec 02, 2009 #3



## Videos:

[FOX: Hot Air? \(Video\) \(8:05\) \(11-23-09\)](#)

[FOX: Glenn Beck - Unsettled Science? \(Video\) \(11-23-09\) \(5:11\)](#)

**[FOX: Ed Begley, Jr. Loses Control Over ClimateGate \(Video\) \(4:24\) \(11-24-09\)](#)**

[FOX: 'Illegal Act' \(Video\) \(5:43\) \(11-25-09\)](#)

[FOX: 'Climategate' \(Video\) \(4:52\) \(11-27-09\)](#)

**[COM: John Stewart - Scientists Hide Global Warming Data \(Video\) \(5:42\) \(12-01-09\)](#)**

[FOX: Glenn Beck - James Delingpole on Climategate \(Video\) \(5:28\) \(12-01-09\)](#)

[CBC: Rex Murphy - Climate Change: Science or Politics? \(Video\) \(3:54\) \(\[Transcript\]\(#\)\) \(12-03-09\)](#)

[WSJ: Climategate: Science Is Dying \(Video\) \(2:47\) \(12-2-09\)](#)

[FOX: Hannity - Chris Horner on ClimateGate \(Video\) \(7:36\) \(12-03-09\)](#)

[BBC: Martha Kearney - How much will the UEA e-mail row affect Copenhagen?](#)

(Video) (6:00) (12-04-09) (Andrew Watson, Marc Morano)

**[BBC: Prof. Watson calls Morano an asshole \(Video\) \(2:06\) \(12-04-09\) \(Andrew Watson, Marc Morano\)](#)**

[FOX: Hannity - Senator Inhofe on Climategate \(Video\) \(8:08\) \(12-04-09\)](#)

[CNN: Anderson Cooper - Climate Conspiracy \(Video\) \(5:54\) \(12-07-09\) \(\[Transcript\]\(#\)\) \(Bill Nye, Patrick J. Michaels\)](#)

[CNN: Campbell Brown - Global Warming: Trick or Truth? \(1/2\) \(Video\) \(8:15\) \(12-07-09\) \(\[Transcript\]\(#\)\) \(Chris Horner, Michael Oppenheimer, Stephen McIntyre\)](#)

[CNN: Campbell Brown - Global Warming: Trick or Truth? \(2/2\) \(Video\) \(5:24\) \(12-07-09\) \(\[Transcript\]\(#\)\) \(Chris Horner, Michael Oppenheimer, Stephen McIntyre\)](#)

[CBS: "Climate-Gate" a Hot Debate \(Video\) \(2:20\) \(12-09-09\)](#)

[CNN: Wolf Blitzer - Global Warming: Fact or Fiction? \(Video\) \(7:48\) \(12-09-09\) \(\[Transcript\]\(#\)\) \(Gavin Schmidt, John Christy\)](#)

[FBN: Obama Backing the Wrong Climate Scientists? \(Video\) \(3:38\) \(2-26-10\) \(Roger Pielke Sr.\)](#)

[FOX: Hannity - Brian Sussman on Climategate \(Video\) \(6:36\) \(4-23-2010\)](#)

**Humor:**

[All Your Emails Are Belong To Us](#) (Video)

[Hitler was behind Global Warming - Climategate](#) (Video)

---

👍 Like    👎 Dislike    ➦ Share

🕒 Dec 02, 2009 #4

**Source Code:**

[Climategate: The Smoking Code](#) (*WattsUpWithThat?*)

[The Smoking Code, part 2](#) (*WattsUpWithThat?*)

[CRU's Source Code: Climategate Uncovered](#) (*American Thinker*)

[Revenge of the Computer Nerds](#) (*American Thinker*)

[The Mathematics of Global Warming](#)(*American Thinker*)

[Climate-Gate: Leaked](#)

[CRU's programming 'below commercial standards'](#) (*BBC*)

- [CRU's programming 'below commercial standards'](#) (*BBC*) (Video)

[Climategate - CRU Source Code Explained](#) (Video)

---

👍 Like    👎 Dislike    ➦ Share

🕒 Aug 29, 2010 #5

**Whitewash Investigations:**

[Slanted inquiries](#) (*Financial Post, Canada, September 17, 2010*) - [[Archive](#)]

[The Climategate Inquiries](#) (PDF) (55 pgs) (*The Global Warming Policy Foundation*)

[Understanding the Climategate Inquiries](#) (PDF) (50 pgs) (*Ross McKittrick, Ph.D. Professor of Environmental Economics*)

---

**House of Commons Science and Technology Committee (U.K.)**

- Finding: Comments made by Phil Willis suggest that he was not a neutral chairman.
- Finding: With the general election looming, the scope of the Select Committee's work was extremely limited.
- Finding: The Select Committee appears to have accepted that scientists can leave out important information about the reliability of their results when presenting findings to policymakers.
- Finding: The Select Committee appear to have been confused about the nature of the divergence problem and the Scientific Appraisal Panel failed to investigate the issue.
- Finding: The Select Committee did not consider the important issue of ad-hoc bodging of data by CRU scientists.
- Finding: The Committee did not consider the issue of cherrypicking of data despite having several examples put to them.
- Finding: The Committee appears to have exonerated Jones of the charge of fabrication without any evidence to justify such a conclusion.
- Finding: The Committee dismissed allegations of threats to journals on the basis of explanations provided by Jones. No attempt was made to obtain evidence from the journal editors themselves.
- Finding: The Committee failed to consider or publish a submission of evidence containing allegations of fraud.
- Finding: The Committee misunderstood Peiser's evidence and failed to investigate Keenan's fraud allegation made against Jones.
- Finding: The Select Committee does not appear to have investigated a serious allegation of a breach of scientific standards.
- Finding: Although the Committee are clear that the law of freedom of information was flouted, no attempt seems to have been made to identify the individuals responsible.
- Finding: Despite concerns that some of the appointed CCE Panel members were unsuitable, the Committee accepted Russell's vague expressions of hope that they would act in an objective fashion.
- Finding: The Committee chairman refused to reveal how decisions had been reached.

'Climategate': what a pointless investigation (*Spiked, UK, March 31, 2010*)

The disclosure of climate data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia - Written Evidence  
(U.K. House of Commons)

---

**Science Assessment Panel (U.K.)**

- Finding: The Panel appears to have been deliberately selected to have a majority who would not address the review objectively and to exclude sceptical views entirely.
- Finding: UEA appointed Oxburgh as chairman of the Panel in the full knowledge that he had conflicts of interest.
- Finding: Kerry Emanuel appeared to have prejudged the inquiry findings.
- Finding: UEA restricted the scope of the Oxburgh inquiry to published papers only, avoiding the serious allegations related to the IPCC activities of CRU staff.
- Finding: The scope was further restricted to the conduct of the scientists. UEA had led the Science and Technology Committee members to believe that the quality of CRU's scientific work would be re-assessed. The Committee's chairman, Phil Willis, felt that UEA had misled them.
- Finding: The papers examined by the Panel were selected by UEA and appear to have been cleared with Jones himself.
- Finding: Lord Oxburgh's report misled the public by stating that the papers were chosen 'on the advice of the Royal Society'.
- Finding: Lord Rees said that he had consulted with experts about the papers. In fact he had only discussed them with Sir Brian Hoskins, who had said he did not know CRU's work.
- Finding: Many of the papers examined were obscure and had not been questioned by critics. Many of the papers that had been criticised were not examined.
- Finding: Contrary to the strong recommendation from the Science and Technology Committee, the inquiry did not carry out its interviews in public, nor did it make notes, recordings or transcripts of interviews.
- Finding: The Oxburgh Panel commended CRU for continuously updating their chronologies, but failed to report on CRU's failure to update the Polar Urals chronology, an issue that had long concerned critics.
- Finding: The Panel's conclusions that criticisms of CRU were 'selective' and 'uncharitable' appear to be baseless since there is no record of these criticisms having been examined.

- Finding: The Panel do not appear to have examined Keenan's serious allegation.
- Finding: The Panel upheld one of the chief complaints of the IPCC's critics, noting that the IPCC report overlooked caveats and statements of uncertainty in the scientific literature. It is important to note however, that the panel failed to note the role CRU scientists had in downplaying uncertainty in the IPCC reports.
- Finding: At least one panellist had serious concerns over CRU science and how it was used in the IPCC reports. There was no word of these concerns in the Oxburgh Panel report.

Climategate: the whitewash continues (*The Daily Telegraph, UK, March 22, 2010*)

MPs begin the Climategate whitewash (*The Daily Telegraph, UK, April 3, 2010*)

Climate whitewash: British farce (*Pittsburgh Tribune-Review, April 5, 2010*)

ClimateGate Whitewash (*American Thinker, April 14, 2010*)

Climate-Gate Gets A Whitewash (*Investors Business Daily, April 15, 2010*)

The Non-Inquiry of Climategate (*Financial Post, Canada, April 15, 2010*)

Whitewashing is quick work! (*The Daily Caller, April 15, 2010*)

Climategate whitewash (*National Post, Canada, April 16, 2010*)

A Green-inspired whitewash (*Toronto Sun, April 18, 2010*)

- Failed to transcribe or take notes of those they interviewed.

---

### **Independent Climate Change Email Review (U.K.)**

- Finding: Several members of the Panel were unsuited to be panellists, having strong connections to UEA or having a tendency to make alarmist statements on the impact of manmade global warming.
- Finding: No known critic of CRU was on the Panel.
- Finding: Only two interviews were held with key CRU staff. The majority of the Panel, including the chairman, Sir Muir Russell, did not attend.
- Finding: No interviews were held with critics of the CRU.
- Finding: The Panel correctly noted that hiding the divergence problem in the WMO report was misleading but failed to investigate similar issues in the IPCC reports.

- Finding: The Panel appear to have exonerated CRU staff of undermining the peer review process without any evidence beyond unrecorded statements from Phil Jones. The Panel themselves acknowledge that such uncorroborated testimony is inadequate.
- Finding: The possibility of improper approaches having been made to another journal was not investigated.
- Finding: The Panel ignored the recommendation of their own advisor that they investigate the possibility that CRU staff had breached the confidentiality of the peer review process.
- Finding: No substantive defence against McKittrick's allegation of fabrication has been made.
- Finding: The Panel misunderstood the nature of the IPCC process, almost certainly affecting their conclusions as a result.
- Finding: The Panel refused to publish the evidence of one of the most important witnesses.
- Finding: The Panel did not address the question of whether Briffa chose to ignore the problems with the Wahl and Ammann paper or to break the IPCC rules by using a preliminary version.
- Finding: The Panel did not publish David Holland's evidence that the change to the IPCC timetables was unauthorised and did not mention it in the report.
- Finding: The Panel did not discuss strong third party evidence that Briffa acted outside IPCC rules, preferring to rely on submissions from scientists at the centre of the allegations.
- Finding: The Panel failed to ask Jones whether he had deleted emails, but said they had not seen anything to suggest he had, despite having evidence to the contrary.
- Finding: The Panel failed to consider important evidence of breaches of Freedom of Information legislation.
- Finding: The Panel failed to investigate allegations of cherry-picking.
- Finding: It is not possible to question the Panel's findings on the issue of 'bodging' since they rely on unpublished research.

Climategate Inquiry Chairman Failed to Check the Science (*Canada Free Press*, July 3, 2010)

Climategate Whitewash Complete: Third Inquiry Clears Everyone Involved

(*Prison Planet*, July 7, 2010)

Global Warming 'ClimateGate' Investigation Yields Whitewash Report (*CEI*, July 7, 2010)

Climategate Investigations Are Arrogant Insults (*Canada Free Press*, July 8, 2010)

Russell Report Whitewashes Climategate Scandal (*The New American*, July 8, 2010)

Climategate probe proves nothing (*WorldNetDaily*, July 9, 2010)

Parliament misled over Climategate report, says MP (*The Register, UK*, July 9, 2010)

Climategate whitewash: Third time's no charm (*Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*, July 12, 2010)

The Climategate Whitewash Continues (*The Wall Street Journal*, July 12, 2010)

Climategate and the Big Green Lie (*The Atlantic*, July 14, 2010)

ClimateGate 'Whitewash' Helps 'Clear' Scientists, U.S., International Media Claim

(*Business & Media Institute*, July 14, 2010)

Muir Russell Climategate Findings: Superficial, Uncompelling (*Master Resource*, July 26, 2010)

- Failed to ask Phil Jones of the CRU whether he actually deleted any emails to defeat FOI requests.

---

### **Pennsylvania State University (U.S.)**

- Finding: By failing to interview Mann's chief critics, the inquiry failed to notice clear falsehoods in the evidence presented to them.

Penn State Probe into Mann's Wrongdoing a 'Total Whitewash' (*Fox News*, February 5, 2010)

Penn State's integrity crisis (*The Daily Caller*, July 14, 2010)

Climategate and the Big Green Lie (*The Atlantic*, July 14, 2010)

---

### **Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.)**

- The Environmental Protection Agency is not an independent committee but a partisan run U.S. government agency where director (Dem. Lisa Jackson) was appointed by President Obama.  
Director Jackson later resigned after it was found she used a fake identity and a fake email account to take government training courses and to conduct official agency business

Gavin Schmidt who had a direct conflict of interest with Michael Mann had been involved in the review and evaluation of the EPA

- A's denial decision
- .
- The EPA chose to ignore the conclusions of reports, peer reviewed papers, and testimony which differ from the EPA findings.
- The EPA ignored peer reviewed research that shows a discrepancy between the surface and lower tropospheric temperature trends.
- The EPA chose to ignore documentation of the deliberate successful attempt to exclude viewpoints in the CCSP and IPCC reports which differ from the EPA findings.

Gavin Schmidt and the EPA Denial Decision (*Climate Audit*, October 18, 2014)

Comment On The Denial of Petitions for Reconsideration of the Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings For Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) Of The Clean Air Act"

(Roger Pielke Sr. Ph.D. Senior Research Scientist of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, July 29, 2010)

\*

EPA Denial of Petitions for Reconsideration of the Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under Section 202 (a) of the Clean Air Act

\* EPA Rejects Claims of Flawed Climate Science

---

### **Inspector General of the Department of Commerce (U.S.)**

- The Department of Commerce is not an independent committee but a partisan run U.S. government agency where the Secretary (Dem. Gary Locke) was appointed by President Obama.  
The Inspector General (Todd Zinser) later resigned amid growing
- scandals
- .

\*

DOC Examination of issues related to internet posting of emails from Climatic Research Unit

(PDF)

---

### **National Science Foundation: (U.S.)**



- The National Science Foundation is not an independent committee but a partisan run U.S. government agency where the director (Subra Suresh) was appointed by President Obama.
- Suresh's ability to run large organizations is questionable. He quit the NSF after serving less than half of his 6-year term to become President of Carnegie Mellon University only to later resign in just four years making his tenure the shortest in the school's 117-year history.
- The National Science Foundation OIG neglected to consider obvious and fundamental questions about Michael Mann's participation in Phil Jones' document destruction enterprise and arrived at empirical conclusions that were unsupported by the inadequate record that they had collected.
- The National Science Foundation OIG report states that it interviewed various parties, but does not give any information on those interviews.
- Stephen McIntyre who was one the most prominent skeptic involved in Climategate was interviewed by the NSF Inspector General but the report makes no mention of the issues that they discussed in their meeting.

NSF on Jones' Email Destruction Enterprise (*Climate Audit*, September 2, 2011)

🕒 Apr 24, 2011 #6



### Rebuttals:

Climategate: What Really Happened? (*Mother Jones*, April 21, 2011)

- Jaeah's Investigation (*Climate Audit*, April 22, 2011)
- Comments on Mother Jones (*Climate Audit*, April 23, 2011)

👍 Like    👎 Dislike    ➦ Share

🕒 Nov 26, 2011 #7



### Climategate 2.0

Climategate (Part II) A sequel as ugly as the original (*The Weekly Standard*, December 12, 2011)

Climategate 2.0: New E-Mails Rock The Global Warming Debate (*Forbes*, November 23, 2011)

Climategate 2.0? More Emails Leaked From Climate Researchers (Fox News, November 22, 2011)

Climategate 2.0 emails – They're real and they're spectacular! (Watts Up With That?, November 22, 2011)

Climategate 2.0 (The Wall Street Journal, November 28, 2011)

Climategate 2.0: New E-Mails Rock The Global Warming Debate (Forbes, November 23, 2011)

Climategate 2.0: Fresh trove of embarrassing emails (The Register, UK, November 23, 2011)

Climategate 2.0: the most damning email of them all (The Telegraph, UK, November 23, 2011)

Climategate 2.0: the not nice and clueless Phil Jones (The Telegraph, UK, November 24, 2011)

Climategate scientists DID collude with government officials to hide research that didn't fit their apocalyptic global warming (Daily Mail, UK, November 25, 2011)

BBC sought advice from global warming scientists on economy, drama, music... and even game shows (Daily Mail, UK, November 27, 2011)

The contextual collection of ClimateGate 2.0 quotes (Watts Up With That?, December 4, 2011)

Climategate Bombshell: Did U.S. Gov't Help Hide Climate Data? (Fox News, December 16, 2011)

👍 Like    👎 Dislike    ➦ Share

🕒 Dec 01, 2011 #8



Over 250 noteworthy Climategate 2.0 emails (Tom Nelson)

**"...there have been a number of dishonest presentations of model results by individual authors and by IPCC."** - Tom Wigley, Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)

**"I have been talking w/ folks in the states about finding an investigative journalist to investigate and expose McIntyre, and his thusfar unexplored connections with fossil fuel interests [...] I believe that the only way to stop these people is by exposing them and discrediting them"** - Michael Mann, Lead Author, IPCC (2001)

**"I gave up on Judith Curry a while ago. I don't know what she**

**think's she's doing, but its not helping the cause" - Michael Mann, Lead Author, IPCC (2001)**

**"It would help the cause to be able to refer to that reconstruction as confirming Mann and Jones" - Michael Mann, Lead Author, IPCC (2001)**

**"Sounds like you guys have been busy doing good things for the cause." - Joseph Alcamo, Lead Author, IPCC (2001, 2007)**

**"So to state boldly that trends agree and therefore all is well is again our living in a fools paradise." - Peter Thorne, Met Office**

**"I also think the science is being manipulated to put a political spin on it..." - Peter Thorne, Met Office**

**"I'm sure you agree--the Mann/Jones GRL paper was truly pathetic and should never have been published. I don't want to be associated with that 2000 year 'reconstruction'." - Ray Bradley, Contributing Author, IPCC (2001)**

**"Basic problem is that all models are wrong - not got enough middle and low level clouds. Problem will be with us for years," - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"I've been told that IPCC is above national FOI Acts. One way to cover yourself and all those working in AR5 would be to delete all emails at the end of the process." - Phil Jones, Director, Climatic Research Unit (CRU)**

**"[T]hey should fire him [Steve McIntyre] as a reviewer of IPCC - I can't believe they included him in the first place!" - Rosanne D'Arrigo, Research Professor, Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory**

**"I must say in fairness that, considering the photographs of how not to observe temperature on Anthony Watts' blog, Mr. Watts gave a well reasoned position." - Thomas Peterson, Lead Author, IPCC (2007)**

**"We are getting blogged all over for a cover-up of poor global station and US stations we use. They claim NCDC is in a scandal by not providing observer's addresses. In any case Anthony Watts**

**has photographed about 350 stations and finds using our criteria that about 15% are acceptable. I am trying to get some our folks to develop a method to switch over to using the CRN sites, at least in the USA."** - Thomas Karl, Lead Author, IPCC (1990, 1992, 1995)

👍 Like 👎 Dislike ➦ Share

🕒 Dec 01, 2011 #9



### Videos:

[FOX: Special Report: Climategate 2.0](#) (Video) (1:22)

[TEN: The Bolt Report: Climategate 2.0](#) (Video) (4:07) (11-25-2011)  
(Steve McIntyre)

[CFACT parachutes into Durban Climate Conference](#) (Video) (3:12) (12-6-2011) (Lord Monckton)

👍 Like 👎 Dislike ➦ Share

🕒 Mar 19, 2013 #10



### Climategate 3.0


[Climategate: FOIA – The Man Who Saved The World](#) (*The Telegraph, March 13th, 2013*)

[Who Released The Climategate Emails And Why](#). (*March 15, 2013*)

**"Analyses like these by people who don't know the field are useless. A good example is Naomi Oreskes work."** - Tom Wigley, Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)

👍 Like 👎 Dislike ➦ Share

Share this topic with:



➦ Share

Get the Tapatalk app



**PRODUCTS**

- Tapatalk Groups
- Tapatalk Mobile App

**ABOUT US**

- LinkedIn
- Crunchbase

**SUPPORT**

- Support Forum
- Submit Security Incident

[Privacy Policy](#) | [Privacy Shield](#) | [Terms of Use](#) | [Code of Conduct](#) | [End-User License Agreement](#) | [Site Owner License Agreement](#) | [Tapatalk API Terms of Service](#) | [Manage Privacy Settings](#) | © 2024 Everforo, Inc

