

Published: Feb. 12, 2010
Updated: Feb. 16, 2010 4:56 p.m.

Mark Landsbaum: What to say to a global warming alarmist



By MARK LANDSBAUM
Register editorial writer and columnist
mlandsbaum@oregister.com

Story Highlights

Some talking points for refuting the claims of global warming alarmists.

It has been tough to keep up with all the bad news for global warming alarmists. We're on the edge of our chair, waiting for the next shoe to drop. This has been an Imelda Marcos kind of season for shoe-dropping about global warming.

At your next dinner party, here are some of the latest talking points to bring up when someone reminds you that Al Gore and the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change won Nobel prizes for their work on global warming.

ClimateGate – This scandal began the latest round of revelations when thousands of leaked documents from Britain's East Anglia Climate Research Unit showed systematic suppression and discrediting of climate skeptics' views and discarding of temperature data, suggesting a bias for making the case for warming. Why do such a thing if, as global warming defenders contend, the "science is settled?"

FOIGate – The British government has since determined someone at East Anglia committed a crime by refusing to release global warming documents sought in 95 Freedom of Information Act requests. The CRU is one of three international agencies compiling global temperature data. If their stuff's so solid, why the secrecy?

ChinaGate – An investigation by the U.K.'s left-leaning Guardian newspaper found evidence that Chinese weather station measurements not only were seriously flawed, but couldn't be located. "Where exactly are 42 weather monitoring stations in remote parts of rural China?" the paper asked. The paper's investigation also couldn't find corroboration of what Chinese scientists turned over to American scientists, leaving unanswered, "how much of the warming seen in recent decades is due to the local effects of spreading cities, rather than global warming?" The Guardian contends that researchers covered up the missing data for years.

HimalayaGate – An Indian climate official admitted in January that, as lead author of the IPCC's Asian report, he intentionally exaggerated when claiming Himalayan glaciers would melt away by 2035 in

order to prod governments into action. This fraudulent claim was not based on scientific research or peer-reviewed. Instead it was originally advanced by a researcher, since hired by a global warming research organization, who later admitted it was "speculation" lifted from a popular magazine. This political, not scientific, motivation at least got some researcher funded.

PachauriGate – Rajendra Pachauri, the IPCC chairman who accepted with Al Gore the Nobel Prize for scaring people witless, at first defended the Himalaya melting scenario. Critics, he said, practiced "voodoo science." After the melting-scum perpetrator 'fessed up, Pachauri admitted to making a mistake. But, he insisted, we still should trust him.

PachauriGate II – Pachauri also claimed he didn't know before the 192-nation climate summit meeting in Copenhagen in December that the bogus Himalayan glacier claim was sheer speculation. But the London Times reported that a prominent science journalist said he had pointed out those errors in several e-mails and discussions to Pachauri, who "decided to overlook it." Stonewalling? Cover up? Pachauri says he was "preoccupied." Well, no sense spoiling the Copenhagen party, where countries like Pachauri's India hoped to wrench billions from countries like the United States to combat global warming's melting glaciers. Now there are calls for Pachauri's resignation.

SternGate – One excuse for imposing worldwide climate crackdown has been the U.K.'s 2006 Stern Report, an economic doomsday prediction commissioned by the government. Now the U.K. Telegraph reports that quietly after publication "some of these predictions had been watered down because the scientific evidence on which they were based could not be verified." Among original claims now deleted were that northwest Australia has had stronger typhoons in recent decades, and that southern Australia lost rainfall because of rising ocean temperatures. Exaggerated claims get headlines. Later, news reporters disclose the truth. Why is that?

SternGate II – A researcher now claims the Stern Report misquoted his work to suggest a firm link between global warming and more-frequent and severe floods and hurricanes. Robert Muir-Wood said his original research showed no such link. He accused Stern of "going far beyond what was an acceptable extrapolation of the evidence." We're shocked.

AmazonGate – The London Times exposed another shocker: the IPCC claim that global warming will wipe out rain forests was fraudulent, yet advanced as "peer-reveiwed" science. The Times said the assertion actually "was based on an unsubstantiated claim by green campaigners who had little scientific expertise," "authored by two green activists" and lifted from a report from the World Wildlife Fund, an environmental pressure group. The "research" was based on a popular science magazine report that didn't bother to assess rainfall. Instead, it looked at the impact of logging and burning. The original report suggested "up to 40 percent" of Brazilian rain forest was extremely sensitive to small reductions in the amount of rainfall, but the IPCC expanded that to cover the entire Amazon, the Times reported.

PeerReviewGate – The U.K. Sunday Telegraph has documented at least 16 nonpeer-reviewed reports (so far) from the advocacy group World Wildlife Fund that were used in the IPCC's climate change bible, which calls for capping manmade greenhouse gases.

RussiaGate – Even when global warming alarmists base claims on scientific measurements, they've often had their finger on the scale. Russian think tank investigators evaluated thousands of documents and e-mails leaked from the East Anglia research center and concluded readings from the coldest regions of their nation had been omitted, driving average temperatures up about half a degree.

Russia-Gate II – Speaking of Russia, a presentation last October to the Geological Society of America showed how tree-ring data from Russia indicated cooling after 1961, but was deceptively truncated and only artfully discussed in IPCC publications. Well, at least the tree-ring data made it into the IPCC report, albeit disguised and misrepresented.

U.S. Gate – If Brits can't be trusted, are Yanks more reliable? The U.S. National Climate Data Center has been manipulating weather data too, say computer expert E. Michael Smith and meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo. Forty years ago there were 6,000 surface-temperature measuring stations, but only 1,500 by 1990, which coincides with what global warming alarmists say was a record temperature increase. Most of the deleted stations were in colder regions, just as in the Russian case, resulting in misleading higher average temperatures.

IceGate – Hardly a continent has escaped global warming skewing. The IPCC based its findings of reductions in mountain ice in the Andes, Alps and in Africa on a feature story of climbers' anecdotes in a popular mountaineering magazine, and a dissertation by a Switzerland university student, quoting mountain guides. Peer-reviewed? Hype? Worse?

ResearchGate – The global warming camp is reeling so much lately it must have seemed like a major victory when a Penn State University inquiry into climate scientist Michael Mann found no misconduct regarding three accusations of climate research impropriety. But the university did find "further investigation is warranted" to determine whether Mann engaged in actions that "seriously deviated from accepted practices for proposing, conducting or reporting research or other scholarly activities." Being investigated for only one fraud is a global warming victory these days.

ReefGate – Let's not forget the alleged link between climate change and coral reef degradation. The IPCC cited not peer-reviewed literature, but advocacy articles by Greenpeace, the publicity-hungry advocacy group, as its sole source for this claim.

AfricaGate – The IPCC claim that rising temperatures could cut in half agricultural yields in African countries turns out to have come from a 2003 paper published by a Canadian environmental think tank – not a peer-reviewed scientific journal.

DutchGate – The IPCC also claimed rising sea levels endanger the 55 percent of the Netherlands it says is below sea level. The portion of the Netherlands below sea level actually is 20 percent. The Dutch environment minister said she will no longer tolerate climate researchers' errors.

AlaskaGate – Geologists for Space Studies in Geophysics and Oceanography and their U.S. and Canadian colleagues say previous studies largely overestimated by 40 percent Alaskan glacier loss for 40 years. This flawed data are fed into those computers to predict future warming.

Fold this column up and lay it next to your napkin the next time you have Al Gore or his ilk to dine. It should make interesting after-dinner conversation.

Comments



frederickmichael wrote:

The defenders here of the AGW religion are missing a key point. The earth has been warming since about the time of the Civil War. Obviously, not all of this was caused by SUVs.

You can't prove AGW just by proving that it's getting warmer. We all know that it's getting warmer. You need to show that the warming is a problem.

That is where the case fails and the attempts to make such an extreme case have been hilarious overreaches. We're still recovering from the Little Ice Age and it's just not a big deal. It may continue for a century or more and it still won't be a big deal.

It may even get as warm as it was when the Vikings colonized Greenland.

3/24/2010 10:40 PM PDT on ORegister.com

[Recommend \(1\)](#)

[Report Abuse](#)

[Permalink](#)



mikejo wrote:

I'd like to thank davejs for giving us another perfect example of bad science by global warming advocates and here's why: Science is not just changes in data, it is relationships, confirmed relationships between changes in data. In good scientific research, this usually involves isolating environmental factors, often done through a control study. Unfortunately in global weather, you cannot create a meaningful classic control because (as noted by others above), we simply cannot control the rotation of the earth, the angle of it's axis, it's proximity to the sun, and the event of sunbursts, etc. However we can, at the least, in good science, TRY to keep clean data (apparently this is not a habit of global warming advocates...tragic) and we can also explore associations as thoroughly as we can in messy systems like Earth's atmosphere. So to your three points, I object as follows.

1. An increase in a "proven greenhouse gas" does not necessarily dictate that it is the sole, or major cause of any increase in temperature in a system as large as the earth. It's entirely possible that it's 99% of the cause, or less than .00000001% of the cause (unless you do further research to prove the association). In point of fact CO2 only retains a portion of the wavelengths of heat received into earth's atmosphere. After a certain amount of CO2, that wavelength is completely absorbed and MORE CO2 simply doesn't equal MORE heat retention because there is not MORE input of that particular heat form into the system. It's like having a bucket big enough to hold all your water, if you have 5 gallons of water, and a

10 gallon bucket, buying a 20 gallon bucket simply wont give you more water or water retention. (Are we all following this? I hope so). In fact, good science, (probably from those same satellites you mentioned) has also shown that we've pretty much capped retention of this particular wavelength. This doesn't mean there are no other harmful effects from CO₂, but it does pretty much point out that your 'inference' based "science" stinks like sweaty gym shorts left in a tiny sealed gym bag for a month.

2. Thank you for pointing out a mean temperature increase over a period of 100 years. Remind me again the dates of the industrial revolution and the advent of massive CO₂ production by MAN? Hmmm, I think I'll let the foolishness here speak for itself. Once again the inference that gains are associated with any particular part of our activity simply can't be verified without GOOD, THOROUGH, EMPIRICAL, OBJECTIVE, RESEARCH. Lack of a thorough history might limit our findings, however looks into layers of ice, and tree rings suggest that earth has been heating and cooling to the extent and rates experienced in the last 100 years all by itself for a very very long time before we modestly tampered with the system by irresponsibly cutting down rainforests and pumping out CO₂ like our lives depended on it. (I disapprove of irresponsible deforestation and wasteful production of energy for the record) At the end of the day, the 100 year mark does NOTHING to show that CO₂ is making a "statistically significant" difference in global warming, compared to the global system on it's own for mellenia past, it's just lazy, poor science that finds it's method in it's presumed results.

3. Once again, an increase in sea level does not necessarily specifically correlate to any other factor without good proof of the relationship. I'm curious, who was out there measuring sea levels by millimeters "over 100" years ago? What was the basis of that measurement and how does that method of evaluation compare to the measuring methods today, do they work together well? Who exactly was polling the data from those satellites, was it the same people extrapolating a rise in temperature after eliminating the coldest temperature data, or their BFF's? I just have to ask at this point with concerns duly noted above. But laying the skepticism aside again, man was not a significant contributor of CO₂ OVER 100 years ago, so how does this support your claims exactly? Something that has maintained a relative consistency for a period extending past our major CO₂ impact and reflecting uch a short period of earth's history discredits your conclusions in BOTH directions. Congratulations, I think your defense just earned your enemies a defensive slam dunk.

For the record, I'm for the responsible use of energy, I'm for the responsible care of the earth, I'm for the appropriate use of resources, and I'm flat against bad science no matter what "side" of a political issue it defends. If i see a bad anti-global warming report, I'll discredit it's method just as happily. What people need is more TRUTH, more thoughtful research, and more PROVEN relationships to make fewer, less expensive, and more EFFECTIVE responses. We need fewer people carrying their favorite bandwagon flag, and more people willing to put that aside for a productive look at what's REALLY happening. My

.02 free of charge to you.

2/27/2010 10:15 AM PST on ORegister.com

Recommend (12)

Report Abuse

Permalink



davejs wrote:

Excellent examples of Wingnut Denialism. It is great to see such lunacy preserved for posterity in the Register. Opinions in direct contradiction with the facts.

To support the facts we have good old American measurements and data. With ground station measurements being confirmed with satellite measurements, the data speaks for itself. Here are the key points of the global warming argument, supported with good old American data.

1) CO₂, a proven greenhouse gas, has been increasing in the atmosphere for over 100 years. Precision measurements of the CO₂ in the atmosphere since the 1960s show that as mankind increased our CO₂ emissions (from 0 to 28 GigaTons of CO₂ per year from fossil fuels) the rate of increase of CO₂ in the atmosphere has increased.

www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends/#mlo_full

2) The Earth's Global Mean Temperature has been increasing for over 100 years.

data.giss.nasa.gov/gistemp/

3) The world's mean sea level has been increasing for over 100 years at about 2 mm per year. Current satellite observations have found that the increase in sea level has increased to 3 mm per year

ibis.grdl.noaa.gov/SAT/SeaLevelRise/

2/25/2010 6:48 AM PST on ORegister.com

Recommend (4)

Report Abuse

Permalink



mcharris wrote:

Thank you Mark Landsbaum for this timely list of ONE OFF errors..... well Dr. Pachauri would have us believe that you can expect the odd error in a report as large as the IPCC's 4th Assessment report. Pity he can't count!

Personally I doubt the list is yet complete. One must wonder if our Elected Leaders are keeping abreast of these things... one would hope they are, and that it might influence them into doing away with proposed Carbon Taxes, which are totally unnecessary, when it can be shown that human kind is NOT causing AGW - Climate Change. Goodness, it would seem that this maybe another excuse to raise taxes just to fill Government Coffers! Cynic that I am!

<http://just-me-in-t.blogspot.com/2010/02/after-dinner-conversations.html>

2/19/2010 8:10 PM PST on OCRegister.com

Recommend (6)

Report Abuse

Permalink



mcharris wrote:

Great to have all the 'gates' listed in such a fashion... I will link to them in my next blog.

Orac, dare I call him "The Oracle" has published today a wonderful and somewhat heart wrenching blog about corruption in scientific practise. I was particularly impressed with his description of how science today is and should be practised.

<http://just-me-in-t.blogspot.com/2010/02/horses-for-course.html>

Quite an appropriate article when you consider the 'fudged' scientific data coming out of the IPCC and causing us great consternation..... TIME we took back our governments they don't really serve us only themselves me thinks!

2/19/2010 4:41 PM PST on OCRegister.com

Recommend (2)

Report Abuse

Permalink



teapartyanyone wrote:

to davejs, NASA does all of those things to keep the funding coming, every time there is a disaster at NASA the politions want to cut there funding. So I believe the people at NASA As with any funded government program will lie cheat and decieve to keep there funding coming.

2/19/2010 9:21 AM PST on OCRegister.com

Recommend (9)

Report Abuse

Permalink



republicson wrote:

calprez, All the Global Warming Liars have been exposed. It's time for you to understand what is happening and join reality. You haven't lived as long as I have . It's almost cyclical for climate extremists to predict destruction. In the 70's it was an oncoming "Ice Age", today it's global warming. The fact of the matter is, if you actually want to know what's happening with the EARTH'S climate, you have to look no further than the SUN!!!!!!

2/18/2010 7:14 PM PST on OCRegister.com

[Recommend \(9\)](#)

[Report Abuse](#)

[Permalink](#)



republicson wrote:

Hay calprez, Why should the cleanest living "CAPITALIST NATIONS" be taxed to fund the polluting MARXIST nations?

2/18/2010 6:49 PM PST on OCRegister.com

[Recommend \(4\)](#)

[Report Abuse](#)

[Permalink](#)



puravida1 wrote:

Bill Gates said you have to ask yourself just how rich do you want to make Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia and Venezuela.....We don't get away from this by pushing lies about global warming. The money that is backing this huge lie comes from Saudi Arabia. Somehow these people gained the foresight that oil is inelastic and the US has a lot of it on her land. But since they (Saudi oil princes)are smarter than many of you they know they can scare you to away from drilling the evil oil while they continue to sell it to us at an artificially inflated price set by OPEC. Well done, many of you monkeys waiting for your next banana have been had. I think you have been on this earth long enough, it is grown up time.

2/17/2010 8:49 PM PST on OCRegister.com

[Recommend \(6\)](#)

[Report Abuse](#)

[Permalink](#)



jbnnetdev wrote:

Excuse my typos on the last post. I think you can still understand what i said anyway..im too lazy to correct them

2/17/2010 7:42 PM PST on OCRegister.com

[Recommend](#)

[Report Abuse](#)

[Permalink](#)