

What Top U.N. Climate Scientists Say

Here are some email excerpts from the the world's leading climate scientists who control much of the UN's IPCC climate reports. (A note to Americans: many of these emails were written in Europe where the date format and spelling are a bit different.) Google the number in () to see the full text.)

Phil Jones - head of the Climatic Research Unit

Draft Contributing Author to the Summary for Policy Makers, and Coordinating Lead Author of Ch3 of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change, AR4)

Jul 5 2005: **The scientific community would come down on me in no uncertain terms if I said the world had cooled from 1998. OK it has but it is only 7 years of data and it isn't statistically significant.** (1120593115.txt)

Note: in 2009, it is now 11 years of cooling.

2/2/2005: 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.** (1107454306.txt)

Thu May 29, 2008, Subject: **IPCC & FOI: Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4?** Keith will do likewise. He's not in at the moment - minor family crisis. **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. (1212073451.txt)

Note: Destroying information subject to a FOI request is a crime.

September 12, 2007: **Ammann/Wahl - try and change the Received date! Don't give those skeptics something to amuse themselves with.** (1189722851.txt)

Jul 8 16:30:16 2004: 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!** (1089318616.txt)

16 Nov 1999: 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.** (942777075.txt)

Note: this is an extremely important admission: the "decline" he is hiding is the temperature decline since 1961, in the tree ring data, while the actual temperature rose. The existence of this decline suggests that tree ring data can't be trusted for any period, since it deviates from measured temperatures in one period (after 1961.) **This is crucial as much of the IPCC case rests on tree rings.**

11 Mar 2003: I will be emailing the journal to tell them **I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor. A CRU person is on the editorial board,** but papers get dealt with by the editor assigned by Hans von Storch. (1047390562.txt)

Dec 3, 2008: When the FOI requests began here, the FOI person said **we had to abide by the requests. It took a couple of half hour sessions - one at a screen, to convince them otherwise** showing them what CA was all about. Once they became aware of the types of people we were dealing with, everyone at UEA (in the registry and in the Environmental Sciences school - the head of school and a few others) became very supportive. (1228330629.txt)

Learn more at SustainableOregon.com

Dec 3, 2008: **About 2 months ago I deleted loads of emails, so have very little - if anything at all.** (1228330629.txt)

Nov 24, 2009 Guardian: **We've not deleted any emails or data here at CRU.**

(<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/nov/24/climate-professor-leaked-emails-uea>)

Note: he emails that he has deleted loads of emails and a year later tells the newspaper he didn't.

Kevin Trenberth

Draft Contributing Author for the Summary for Policy Makers, contributing author to Ch 1, a lead author for Ch 3, and contributing author to Ch 7 of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change, AR4.)

12 Oct 2009: **...we have broken records the past two days for the coldest days on record. (...)** and it smashed the previous records for these days by 10F. (...) **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. (. . .) Our observing system is inadequate.** (1255352257.txt)

Oct 14, 2009: **We are not close to balancing the energy budget. The fact that we can not account for what is happening in the climate system** makes any consideration of geoengineering quite hopeless as we will never be able to tell if it is successful or not! It is a travesty! (1255523796.txt)

Michael E. Mann

Creator of the famous "hockey stick" shaped temperature curve prominently featured in the UN's third climate report (tar) used by Al Gore.

04 Jun 2003: I think that trying to adopt a timeframe of 2K, rather than the usual 1K, addresses a good earlier point that Peck made w/ regard to the memo, that **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 (1054736277.txt)

Note: Elimination of the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) makes today's temperatures look unusual.

27/10/2009, 16:54: As to the issues of robustness, particularly w.r.t. inclusion of the Yamal series, we actually emphasized that (including the Osborn and Briffa '06 sensitivity test) in our original post! **As we all know, this isn't about truth at all, its about plausibly deniable accusations.** (1256735067.txt)

15/11/2005, Michael E. Mann wrote: **The GRL leak may have been plugged up now w/ new editorial leadership there, but these guys always have "Climate Research" and "Energy and Environment", and will go there if necessary.** (1132094873.txt)

May 1999: **Trust that I'm certainly on board w/ you that we're all working towards a common goal.** That is what is distressing about commentaries (yours from last year, and potentially, **without us having had appropriate input**, Keith and Tim's now) that appear to "divide and conquer". The skeptics happily took your commentary last year as reason to doubt our results! In fact, your piece was references in several commentaries (mostly on the WEB, not published) attacking our work. So THAT is what this is all about. **It is in the NAME of the common effort we're all engaged in**, that I have voiced concerns about language and details in this latest commentary--so as to avoid precisely that scenario.

Please understand the above to be a complete and honest statement about the source of my concerns. It really doesn't have anything to do about who did what first, etc. **I trust that history will give us all proper credit for what we're doing here.** (926010576.txt)

Learn more at SustainableOregon.com

Tom Wigley

Contributing Author to Ch 10 of of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change.

06 Nov 2009: We probably need to say more about this. **Land warming since 1980 has been twice the ocean warming** -- and skeptics might claim that this proves that urban warming is real and important. (1257546975.txt)

24 Apr 2003: **Mike's idea to get editorial board members to resign will probably not work -- must get rid of von Storch too**, otherwise holes will eventually fill up with people like Legates, Balling, Lindzen, Michaels, Singer, etc.(1051190249.txt)

27 Sep 2009: **So, if we could reduce the ocean blip by, say, 0.15 degC, then this would be significant for the global mean -- but we'd still have to explain the land blip.**

I've chosen 0.15 here deliberately. This still leaves an ocean blip, and i think one needs to have some form of ocean blip to explain the land blip (via either some common forcing, or ocean forcing land, or vice versa, or all of these). When you look at other blips, the land blips are 1.5 to 2 times (roughly) the ocean blips -- higher sensitivity plus thermal inertia effects. My 0.15 adjustment leaves things consistent with this, so you can see where I am coming from. (1254108338.txt)

Oct 14, 2009: **...there have been a number of dishonest presentations** of model results by individual authors and **by IPCC**. (1255553034.txt)

Tim Osborn

Contributing author to chapters 6 & 8 of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change, AR4

05 Oct 1999: Subject: Briffa et al. series for IPCC figure: The data are attached to this e-mail. They go from 1402 to 1995, although **we usually stop the series in 1960 because of the recent non-temperature signal** (39154709.txt)

Note: This appears to be another "hide the decline"

Benjamin D. Santer,

contributing author to Ch 1, 9 & 10 of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change

19/03/2009: **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.** (1237496573.txt)

Keith Briffa

Lead author for Ch 6 of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change, AR4

Apr 29, 2007: **I tried hard to balance the needs of the science and the IPCC , which were not always the same.** I worried that you might think I gave the impression of not supporting you well enough while trying to report on the issues and uncertainties . (1177890796.txt)

Sep 22, 1999: I know **there is pressure to present a nice tidy story as regards 'apparent unprecedented warming in a thousand years or more** in the proxy data' but in reality the situation is not quite so simple. We don't have a lot of proxies that come right up to date and those that do (at least a significant number of tree proxies) some unexpected changes in response that do not match the recent warming. (938031546.txt)

Note: There is that troublesome decline again, that needed to be hidden.

Learn more at SustainableOregon.com

Sep 22, 1999: **I believe that the recent warmth was probably matched about 1000 years ago. I do not believe that global mean annual temperatures have simply cooled progressively over thousands of years...** (0938031546.txt)

David Parker

Lead author of ch 3 of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change, AR4

05/01/2005: There is a preference in the atmospheric observations chapter of IPCC AR4 to stay with the 1961-1990 normals. This is partly because a change of normals confuses users, e.g. anomalies will seem less positive than before if we change to newer normals, **so the impression of global warming will be muted.** (1105019698.txt)

Edward Cook

Contributing author to Ch 6 of the 4th UN IPCC report on climate change, AR4

6/4/03: I got a paper to review (...) that claims that the method of reconstruction that we use in dendroclimatology (reverse regression) is wrong, biased, lousy, horrible, etc. (...) **If published as is, this paper could really do some damage.** (1054756929.txt)

Note: Reviewers agree to be impartial and independent.

More CRU Emails - (not from IPCC authors)

From: Tom Crowley, Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2005: **I have been fiddling with the best way to illustrate the stable nature of the medieval warm period** - the attached plot has eight sites that go from 946-1960 (1118866416.txt)

Note: A warmer medieval warm period might make today's climate look normal.

Soliciting Money From Siemens Corp, Exxon-Mobile and Shell International

06/10/2009, From: Andrew Manning: **(I'm in the process of trying to persuade Siemens Corp. (a company with half a million employees in 190 countries!) to donate me a little cash** to do some CO2 measurements here in the UK - looking promising,... (1254832684.txt)

11 Sep 2000, From: "Mick Kelly: Notes from the meeting with Shell International attached. **I suspect that the climate change team in Shell International is probably the best route through to funding from elsewhere in the organisation...** (968691929.txt)

24 May 2000, From: John Shepherd: **I gather you're going to collect the free lunch(?) with Esso !** I agree with Mike's analysis : i.e. there's room for some constructive dialogue...

(...)

19/05/00: Mike Hulme wrote: **I would think Tyndall should have an open mind about this and try to find the slants that would appeal to Esso.** (959187643.txt)

Note: Esso is a subsidiary of Exxon-Mobil.

Note (number) in brackets is the time stamp of the email and can be googled for the entire email.

Learn more at SustainableOregon.com