


Climategate 4- Die Chronik eines wissenschaftlichen Skandals des IPCC Zulieferers CRU!



Ein anonymes Kommentator hat auf der skeptischen Internet Seite noconsensus.wordpress.com einen Text mit folgendem Inhalt sowie den Link zu einem Dateiarchiv hinterlassen. Der Name der Datei ist "FOI2009.zip", womit wohl Bezug genommen wird auf den amerikanischen Freedom Information Act, der jedem US-Bürger das Recht zubilligt, Zugang zu Dokumenten der Exekutive (der Regierung) der Vereinigten Staaten zu verlangen

We feel that climate science is, in the current situation, too important to be kept under wraps. We hereby release a random selection of correspondence, code, and documents

Die erwähnte Datei ist 61 Megabyte groß und enthält neben verschiedenen Dokumenten und Code-Dateien auch über Tausend E-Mails. Die betreffenden Dateien scheinen von der britischen Climate Research Unit (CRU) zu stammen und enthalten unter anderem Korrespondenz zwischen Klimaforschern.

Unter den E-Mails befindet sich Korrespondenz der Klimaforscher untereinander, zwischen Klimaforschern und Skeptikern und auch zwischen Umweltorganisationen und den Wissenschaftlern. In einigen Mails werden Details offenbart, welche die Forscher vermutlich lieber im engeren Kreis behalten hätten

Richtigkeit der Daten bestätigt

Nach anfänglichen Zweifeln stellte sich bald heraus, dass die Daten tatsächlich von der CRU stammten und echt sind. Das bestätigten sowohl Reporter, die in der Korrespondenz eigene Texte wiederfanden, als auch skeptische Wissenschaftler die ebenfalls die Echtheit ihrer E-mails in dem Datensatz bestätigten. Und sehr bald gestand auch Phil Jones, Direktor der Climate Research Unit, ein dass es einen Hackerangriff auf die Rechner seines Instituts gegeben habe und bestätigte damit hoch offiziell die Echtheit der Daten.

Nachdem feststeht, dass die Dateien und E-Mails in der sogenannten [FOIA-Datei](#)

echt sind, findet in der internationalen Presse und in der Blogger-Szene eine intensive Debatte über den Inhalt der Dateien und über die Konsequenzen der Affäre statt.

Besonders diskutiert wird dabei der Inhalt der mehr als 1000 E-Mails. Schnell fanden sich im Internet Seiten, auf denen diese gelesen werden und nach Inhalten durchsucht werden konnten ([Alleged CRU Emails – Searchable](#)).

In diesen E-Mails kamen unter anderem Details darüber ans Tageslicht, wie Daten gezielt verändert wurden, damit sie das gewünschte Ergebnis zeigten. So wurden Datensätze, die eine Abkühlung zeigten einfach abgeschnitten und durch andere Daten ersetzt ([Mike's Trick](#) und auch hier in deutsch). Auch wurde besprochen, wie man unliebsame wissenschaftliche Publikationen aus dem IPCC-Report heraus halten wollte. Notfalls, so wurde diskutiert, würde man einfach das Verfahren zur Begutachtung (Peer-review) an die eigenen Bedürfnisse [anpassen](#). Und wenn das nicht klappte versuchte man die Publikation nach Möglichkeit zu [ignorieren](#).

Forscherkollegen, die nicht die „richtigen“ Ansichten vertraten wurden in den E-Mails auf äußerst diskreditierende Weise dargestellt. Einer der Klimawissenschaftler drückte in einem Schreiben sogar unverhohlen seine [Freude über den Tod](#) eines kritischen Kollegen aus.

Deutscher Klimaforscher fordert Ausschluss von Kollegen vom IPCC

Auch der prominente deutsche Klimawissenschaftler Professor von Storch vom GKSS-Forschungszentrum Geesthacht hat sich mit seinen kritischen Ansichten zur Politisierung der Klimawissenschaft nicht nur Freunde gemacht. Dementsprechend waren die Erwähnungen seines Namens in den E-Mails meist von wenig schmeichelhafter Art. Unter anderem wurde ihm vorgeworfen, die Klimawissenschaft zu zerstören, weil er Forschungsdaten an Gegenspieler weitergegeben habe. In einem anderen Schreiben freute sich Michael Mann darüber, dass er von Storch erfolgreich von einem Gutachtertreffen über historische Temperaturrekonstruktionen ausschließen konnte. Dabei konnte von Storch wegen der Menge der Daten bislang erst einen Teil des ihn betreffenden Briefverkehrs begutachten.

„Ich würde annehmen dass noch interessantere Punkte in den Dateien gefunden werden, und dass eine hilfreiche Debatte über den Grad der Politisierung der Klimawissenschaften entstehen wird.“

Angesichts des bekannt gewordenen Skandals um zweifelhafte Praktiken in der Klimaforschung fordert von Storch auf seiner [Homepage](#) jetzt eine öffentliche Debatte über die Normen, nach denen Wissenschaft betrieben wird.

„Offensichtlich kann die Wissenschaft selbst nicht definieren, wie diese Normen aussehen sollten. Eine Hauptrolle in diesem Prozess sollten die Medien spielen – und es scheint, dass die Medien endlich anfangen sich ernsthaft dem Problem zu widmen. Ein Beispiel ist das [Wall Street Journal](#). In Deutschland beurteilen die

Journalisten diese Affäre moderater, wie z.B. im [Tagesspiegel](#)."

Konsequenzen fordert von Storch nicht nur für die moralischen und ethischen Richtlinien, unter denen Wissenschaft betrieben werden soll. Auch die Art und Weise, wie Forschungsergebnisse publiziert werden und vor allem wie die Daten für die Öffentlichkeit zugänglich gemacht werden sollen, bedarf nach seiner Ansicht einer dringenden Überarbeitung.

„Eine Schlussfolgerung sollte sein, dass das Prinzip nach dem Daten veröffentlicht werden müssen, damit Kontrahenten die Ergebnisse überprüfen können, wirklich verstärkt angewandt werden muss. **Eine andere Schlussfolgerung könnte sein, dass Wissenschaftler wie Michael Mann, Phil Jones und andere nicht mehr länger in Prozessen zur Begutachtung (Peer-review) oder an Beurteilungs-Aktivitäten wie dem IPCC teilnehmen dürften.**“

Konsequenzen auch in britischen Medien gefordert

Ganz allein steht der Deutsche mit dieser Forderung nicht da. Der bislang eher für seine unkritische Haltung der etablierten Klimaforschung gegenüber bekannte britische Zeitungsjournalist George Monbiot stieß ins gleiche Horn, als er in einem Artikel schrieb:

„Noch schlimmer ist es, dass einige E-Mails Versuche nahe legen die Arbeiten von Klimaskeptikern an der Publikation zu hindern oder diese aus dem IPCC-Report herauszuhalten. **Ich glaube, dass der Direktor des Instituts, Phil Jones, jetzt zurücktreten sollte.** Einige der Daten die in den E-Mails diskutiert wurden sollten neu analysiert werden.“

Es spricht für die journalistische Integrität von Monbiot, dass er in den Kommentaren im Anschluss an den Artikel offen bei seinen Lesern dafür um Entschuldigung gebeten hat, oft zu gutgläubig an das Thema Klima herangegangen zu sein.

„Ich bitte um Entschuldigung. Ich habe denen die die Beweise geliefert haben zu sehr vertraut. Ich habe sie bevorzugt. Ich wäre ein besserer Journalist gewesen, wenn ich deren Aussagen besser untersucht hätte.“

Währenddessen scheinen die Reaktionen auf die Affäre in Großbritannien langsam an Fahrt zu gewinnen. Der konservative Politiker und Journalist Lord Nigel Lawson hat eine [unabhängige Untersuchung gefordert](#), um die Vorwürfe über Datenmanipulationen aufzuklären. Lawson sah die Integrität der wissenschaftlichen Beweise für die globale Erwärmung als zweifelhaft an. Auch angesichts der Tatsache dass mit Hilfe dieser Daten politische Entscheidungen

gerechtfertigt werden sollen, die die ganze Welt betreffen, sei eine Überprüfung absolut notwendig.

Untersuchungen in den USA – Schweigen in Deutschland

Auch von jenseits des Atlantiks, dem zweiten Epizentrum des Daten-Skandals, kommen zunehmend Stimmen, die [eine genaue Untersuchung der Daten und E-Mails fordern](#). Schließlich handelt es sich bei einem Großteil der E-Mails um Korrespondenz zwischen englischen und amerikanischen Forschern. Laut Aussage des hochrangigen Republikanischen Vertreters Darrell Issa werden die Dokumente bereits von Ermittlern überprüft. Besonderes Augenmerk legen die Ermittler auf die Verwicklung des wissenschaftlichen Beraters des Präsidenten, John Holdren.

Was die Frage aufwirft, wann die Bundesregierung in dieser Sache aktiv werden will. Schließlich ist mit [Professor Stefan Rahmstorf](#) vom Potsdamer Institut für Klimafolgenforschung (PIK) und einflussreiches Mitglied im [WBGU](#) (Wissenschaftlicher Beirat der Bundesregierung für globale Umweltveränderung) möglicherweise auch ein hochrangiger deutscher Klimaforscher in den Skandal verwickelt. Und ebenso wie in Großbritannien und den USA hat auch hierzulande die Klimaforschung einen großen Einfluss auf politische Entscheidungen. Rahmstorfs Chef Hans Joachim Schellnhuber ist der Klimaberater unserer Kanzlerin.


Zündstoff auch in den anderen Dateien

Nachdem anfangs hauptsächlich der Inhalt der über Tausend E-Mails gesichtet, analysiert und diskutiert wurde, wuchs auch das Interesse am Inhalt der Dateien im Ordner ‚Dokuments‘. Befanden sich darin doch fast 150 Megabyte an Dokumenten, Datensätzen und Programmcode. Bestimmt ließ sich darin einiges Verwertbares finden.

Und in der Tat, bereits erste Sichtungen brachten ans Tageslicht, auf welche Art die Klimawissenschaftler Daten manipulierten, die nicht das richtige, nämlich eine sich fortschreitende Erwärmung im 20. Jahrhundert, zeigten. In einem Programmcode fand sich zum Beispiel eine Prozedur, die ab 1930 eine künstliche Erwärmung in einem Datensatz produzierte. Ein Blogger kommentierte das mit diesen Worten:

From the file pl_decline.pro: check what the code is doing! It's reducing the temperatures in the 1930s, and introducing a parabolic trend into the data to make the temperatures in the 1990s look more dramatic.

Was der erwähnte Code mit einem neutralen Datensatz macht kann man in der folgenden Abbildung erkennen. Es wird eine Steigerung der Temperaturen produziert, wo diese in den Rohdaten gar nicht vorhanden ist.



Auch in vielen anderen Programmcodes finden sich Zeilen, die nahe legen dass im Programmcode Daten künstlich verändert oder durch Daten ausgetauscht werden, um eine Steigerung der Temperatur zu erzeugen, wo die Rohdaten stagnierende oder fallende Temperaturen zeigen.

Einige Reaktionen der Medien:

27.11.

Toronto Sun – [Why ,climategate‘ won’t stop greens](#)

Wall Street Journal – [,Cap and Trade Is Dead‘](#)

Washington Times – [The global-cooling cover-up](#)

Telegraph – [Climategate: the whitewash begins](#)

26. 11.

NationalPost – [Steve Janke: How zealotry came to pervert climate science](#)

NationalPost – [Skewed science](#)

Telegraph – [Climategate: this is our Berlin Wall moment!](#)

25.11.

Eigentümlich Frei – [Cyberkrieg der Klimaforscher: In Norwich wurden keine Dateien geklaut](#)

24. 11.

Canada Free Press – [Obama’s Science Czar John Holdren involved in unwinding “Climategate” scandal](#)

Telegraph – [Climate change scientists face calls for public inquiry over data manipulation claims](#)

MailOnline – [Lord Lawson calls for inquiry into cover-up over climate change data](#)

Hannoversche Allgemeine – [Zwischen Datenklau und Alarmismus](#)

23.11.

Guardian – [Global warming rigged? Here's the email I'd need to see](#)

22.11.

Spiegel.de – [Cyberkrieg unter Klimaforschern](#)

Welt.de – [Die Tricks der Forscher beim Klimawandel](#)

Welt.de – [Tricksen im Namen der Klimakatastrophe?](#)

21.11.

Washington Post – [Hackers steal electronic data from top climate research center](#)

Times Online – [Skeptics publish climate e-mails 'stolen from East Anglia University'](#)

BBC – [Harrabin's Notes: E-mail arguments](#)

Eigentümlich Frei – [Climategate – Klimagate: Der Klima-Lügen-Ballon platzt!](#)

Welt.de – [Hacker knacken Rechner von Klima-Institut](#)

20.11.

Telegraph – [Climategate: the final nail in the coffin of 'Anthropogenic Global Warming'?](#)

New York Times – [Hacked E-Mail Is New Fodder for Climate Dispute](#)

Hier einige der bislang öffentlich gemachten E-Mails nach Themen sortiert

Freude über den Tod eines Skeptikers

From: Phil Jones, Thu Jan 29 14:17:01 2004

In an odd way this is cheering news !

(1075403821.txt)

Wie man mit Daten umgeht, die das Falsche zeigen

From: Tom Wigley, Date: Fri, 06 Nov 2009 17:36:15 -0700

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)

From: Kevin Trenberth, before Wed, 14 Oct 2009 01:01:24 -0600

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. The CERES data published in the August BAMS 09 supplement on 2008 shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate.

(1255496484.txt)

From: Michael Mann Date: 27/10/2009, 16:54

Perhaps we'll do a simple update to the Yamal post, e.g. linking Keith/s new page–Gavin t? 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)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Thu Mar 19 17:02:53 2009

In my 2 slides worth at Bethesda I will be showing London's UHI and the effect that it hasn't got any bigger since 1900. It's easy to do with 3 long time series

(1237496573.txt)

From: Darrell Kaufman, Date: Sat, 5 Sep 2009 08:44:19 -0700

Regarding the "upside down man", as Nick's plot shows, when flipped, the Korttajarvi series has little impact on the overall reconstructions. Also, the series was not included in the calibration. Nonetheless, it's unfortunate that I flipped the Korttajarvi data. We used the density data as the temperature proxy, as recommended to me by Antii Ojala (co-author of the original work). It's weakly inversely related to organic matter content. I should have used the inverse of density as the temperature proxy. I probably got confused by the fact that the 20th century shows very high density values and I inadvertently equated that directly with temperature.

(1252154659.txt)

From: Keith Briffa, Date: Sun Apr 29 19:53:16 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 . Much had to be removed and I was particularly unhappy that I could not get the statement into the SPM regarding the AR4 reinforcement of the results and conclusions of the TAR. I tried my best but we were basically railroaded by Susan.

(1177890796.txt)

Datenmanipulation

From: Date: Tue, 16 Nov 1999 13:31:15 -0000

*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)

From: Tom Wigley, Date: Sun, 27 Sep 2009 23:25:38 -0600

*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).*

(1254108338.txt)

From: Tom Crowley, Date: Tue, 14 Jun 2005 15:13:28 -0400

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)

From: Gary Funkhouser, Date: Thu, 19 Sep 1996 15:37:09 -0700

*I really wish I could be more positive about the Kyrgyzstan material, but I swear I pulled every trick out of my sleeve trying to milk something out of that. (...) I don't think it'd be productive to try and **juggle the chronology statistics any more than I already have** – they just are what they are (that does sound Graybillian.*

(843161829.txt)

From: Keith Briffa, Date: Wed Sep 22 16:19:06 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)

From: Keith Briffa Date: Thu Nov 16 17:21:25 2006

*Another serious issue to be considered relates to the fact that the PC1 time series in the Mann et al. analysis was **adjusted to reduce the positive slope in the last 150 years** (on the assumption – following an earlier paper by Lamarche et al. – that this incressing growth was evidence of carbon dioxide fertilization) , by differencing the data from another record produced by other workers in northern Alaska and Canada (which incidentally was standardised in a totally different way). This last adjustment obviously will*

have a large influence on the quantification of the link between these Western US trees and N.Hemisphere temperatures. **At this point, it is fair to say that this adjustment was arbitrary and the link between Bristlecone pine growth and CO2 is , at the very least, arguable.**

(1163715685.txt)

From: Michael E. Mann, Date: Wed, 04 Jun 2003 10:17:57 -0400

Phil and I have recently submitted a paper using about a dozen NH records that fit this category, and many of which are available nearly 2K back—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)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Fri, 03 Mar 2000 13:04:24 +0000

As all our (Mike, Tom and CRU) all show that the first few centuries of the millennium were cooler than the 20th century, we will come in for some flak from the skeptics saying we’re wrong because everyone knows it was warmer in the Medieval period. **We can show why we believe we are correct with independent data from glacial advances and even slower responding proxies,** however, what are the chances of putting together a group of a very few borhole series that are deep enough to get the last 1000 years. Basically trying to head off criticisms of the IPCC chapter, but good science in that we will be rewriting people’s perceived wisdom about the course of temperature change over the past millennium.

(952106664.txt)

Löschen von Daten

From: Phil Jones, Date: Mon Feb 21 16:28:32 2005

The skeptics seem to be building up a head of steam here ! Maybe we can use this to our advantage to get the series updated ! Odd idea to update the proxies with satellite estimates of the lower troposphere rather than surface data !. Odder still that they don’t realise that Moberg et al used the Jones and Moberg updated series ! Francis Zwiers is till onside. He said that PC1s produce hockey sticks. He stressed that the late 20th century is the warmest of the millennium, but Regalado didn’t bother with that. Also ignored Francis’ comment about all the other series looking similar to MBH. The IPCC comes in for a lot of stick. **Leave it to you to delete as appropriate!**

(1109021312.txt)

From: Phil Jones, 2/2/2005 09:41 AM

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)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Thu May 29 11:04:11 2008

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)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Fri Jan 16 13:25:59 2004

This is for YOURS EYES ONLY. Delete after reading – please ! I'm trying to redress the balance. One reply from Pfister said you should make all available !! Pot calling the kettle black – Christian doesn't make his methods available. I replied to the wrong Christian message so you don't get to see what he said. Probably best. Told Steve separately and to get more advice from a few others as well as Kluwer and legal. PLEASE DELETE – just for you, not even Ray and Malcolm

(1074277559.txt)

Reaktionen auf Kritik

From: Phil Jones, Date: Mon Feb 21 16:28:32 2005

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 !

(1109021312.txt)

From: Michael E. Mann, Date: Mon, 04 Aug 2003 09:05:47 -0400

It is true that the skeptics twist the truth clockwise rather than counterclockwise in the Southern Hemisphere? There was indeed a lot of activity last week. Hans Von Storch's resignation as chief editor of CR, which I think took a lot of guts, couldn't have come at a better time. (..) It was on the night before before the notorious "James Inhofe", Chair of the Senate "Environment and Public Works Committee" attempted to provide a public stage for Willie Soon and David Legates to peddle their garbage (...) Fortunately, these two are clowns, neither remotely as sharp as Lindzen or as slick as Michaels, and it wasn't too difficult to deal with them. Suffice it to say, **the event did *not* go the way Inhofe and the republicans had hoped. The democrats, conveniently, had received word of Hans' resignation, but the republicans and Soon/Legates had not.**

(1060002347.txt)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Tue Jul 5 15:51:55 2005

If anything, I would like to see the climate change happen, so the science could be proved right, regardless of the consequences. This isn't being political, it is being selfish.

(1120593115.txt)

From: Ben Santer, Date: Fri, 09 Oct 2009 11:07:56 -0700

Next time I see Pat Michaels at a scientific meeting, I'll be tempted to beat

the crap out of him. Very tempted.

(1255100876.txt)

Verstecken von Informationen

From: Michael E. Mann, Date: Thu, 09 Feb 2006 16:51:53 -0500

*Anyway, I wanted you guys to know that you're free to use RC in any way you think would be helpful. **Gavin and I are going to be careful about what comments we screen through, and we'll be very careful to answer any questions that come up to any extent we can. On the other hand, you might want to visit the thread and post replies yourself. We can hold comments up in the queue and contact you about whether or not you think they should be screened through or not, and if so, any comments you'd like us to include.***

(1139521913.txt)

From: Michael E. Mann, Date: Thu, 31 Jul 2003 11:18:24 -0400

Attached are the calibration residual series for experiments based on available networks back to:

AD 1000

AD 1400

AD 1600

*(...) But basically, you'll see that **the residuals are pretty red for the first 2 cases, and then not significantly red for the 3rd case—its even a bit better for the AD 1700 and 1820 cases, but I can't seem to dig them up. (...)** p.s. I know I probably don't need to mention this, but just to insure absolutely clarify on this, I'm providing these for your own personal use, since you're a trusted colleague. **So please don't pass this along to others without checking w/ me first. This is the sort of "dirty laundry" one doesn't want to fall into the hands of those who might potentially try to distort things...***

(1059664704.txt)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Wednesday, September 12, 2007 11:30 AM

*You likely know that McIntyre will check this one to make sure it hasn't changed since the IPCC close-off date July 2006! Hard copies of the WG1 report from CUP have arrived here today. **Ammann/Wahl – try and change the Received date! Don't give those skeptics something to amuse themselves with.***

(1189722851.txt)

From: Phil Jones, before 19/06/03 12:33 -0400

*Keith and I have discussed the email below. I don't want to start a discussion of it and **I don't want you sending it around to anyone else, but it serves as a warning as to where the debate might go should the EOS piece come out.***

(1057944829.txt)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Mon Feb 9 09:23:43 2004

I hid behind the fact that some of the data had been received from

individuals and not directly from Met Services through the Global Telecommunications Service (GTS) or through GCOS.

(1076336623.txt)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Wed Aug 20 09:32:52 2008

Keith/Tim still getting FOI requests as well as MOHC and Reading. All our FOI officers have been in discussions and are now using the same exceptions not to respond – **advice they got from the Information Commissioner.** (...) The FOI line we're all using is this. IPCC is exempt from any countries FOI – the skeptics have been told this. Even though we (MOHC, CRU/UEA) possibly hold relevant info the IPCC is not part our remit (mission statement, aims etc) **therefore we don't have an obligation to pass it on.**

(1219239172.txt)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Fri Jan 21 15:20:06 2005

If FOIA does ever get used by anyone, there is also IPR to consider as well. Data is covered by all the agreements we sign with people, **so I will be hiding behind them.**

(1106338806.txt)

Einfluss auf Peer-review Verfahren

From: Tom Wigley, Date: 1/20/2005 04:30 PM

If you think that Sakers is in the greenhouse skeptics camp, then, if we can find documentary evidence of this, we could go through official AGU channels to get him ousted.

(1106322460.txt)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Fri Aug 13 13:38:32 2004

I'd rather you didn't. I think it should be sufficient to forward the para from Andrew Conrie's email that says the paper has been rejected by all 3 reviewers. You can say that the paper was an extended and updated version of that which appeared in CR. Obviously, **under no circumstances should any of this get back to Pielke.**

(1092418712.txt)

From: Michael E. Mann, Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 08:14:49 -0500

This was the danger of always criticising the skeptics for not publishing in the "peer-reviewed literature". Obviously, they found a solution to that–take over a journal! **So what do we do about this? 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...

(1047388489.txt)

From: Edward Cook, Date: 6/4/03 09:50 AM -0400

*I got a paper to review (submitted to the Journal of Agricultural, Biological, and Environmental Sciences), written by a Korean guy and someone from Berkeley, that **claims that the method of reconstruction that we use in dendroclimatology (reverse regression) is wrong, biased, lousy, horrible, etc.** They use your Tornetrask recon as the main whipping boy. (...) **If published as is, this paper could really do some damage.** It is also an ugly paper to review because it is rather mathematical, with a lot of Box-Jenkins stuff in it. It won't be easy to dismiss out of hand as the math appears to be correct theoretically (...) **I am really sorry but I have to nag about that review – Confidentially I now need a hard and if required extensive case for rejecting – to support Dave Stahle's and really as soon as you can. Please***

(1054756929.txt)

From: Tom Wigley, Date: Thu, 24 Apr 2003 09:17:29 -0600

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. I have heard that the publishers are not happy with von Storch, so the above approach might remove that hurdle too.

(1051190249.txt)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Thu Mar 19 17:02:53 2009

*I'm having a dispute with the new editor of Weather. **I've complained about him to the RMS Chief Exec.** If I don't get him to back down, I won't be sending any more papers to any RMS journals and I'll be resigning from the RMS.*

(1237496573.txt)

From: Benjamin D. Santer, Date: 19/03/2009 16:48

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)

From: Phil Jones, Date: Thu 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)

Finanzierungspraktiken

From: Andrew Manning, Date: 06/10/2009 00:13

*is this another witch hunt (like Mann et al.)? How should I respond to the below? (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 measurments here in the UK – looking promising, so the last***

thing I need is news articles calling into question (again) observed temperature increases – I thought we'd moved the debate beyond this, but seems that **these sceptics are real die-hards!!**).

(1254832684.txt)

From: Tatiana M. Dedkova, Date: Thu, 7 Mar 96 09:41:07 +0500

Also, it is important for us if you can transfer the **ADVANCE money on the personal accounts** which we gave you earlier and the sum for one occasion transfer (for example, during one day) will not be more than 10,000 USD. **Only in this case we can avoid big taxes** and use money for our work as much as possible.

(826209667.txt)

From: Phil Jones, before 19/06/03 12:33 -0400 There are also **some snipes at CRU and our funding**, but we're ignoring these here. Also Mike comes in for some stick, so stay cool Mike – you're a married man now ! **So let's keep this amongst ourselves** . (...) I say this as **this might come out if things get nasty**.

(1057944829.txt)

From: Mick Kelly, Date: Tue, 24 Jun 2003 14:17:15

NOAA want to give us more money for the El Nino work with IGCN. How much do we have left from the last budget? I reckon most has been spent but **we need to show some left to cover the costs of the trip Roger didn't make and also the fees/equipment/computer money we haven't spent otherwise NOAA will be suspicious**. Politically this money may have to go through Simon's institute but there overhead rate is high so maybe not!

(1056478635.txt)

Umgang mit Skeptikern

From: Phil Jones Date: Tue, 28 October 2009 16:39

Phil Jones writes to University of Hull to try to stop sceptic Sonia Boehmer Christiansen using her Hull affiliation. Graham F Haughton of Hull University says its easier to push greenery there now SB-C has retired.

(1256765544.txt)

Einige Mails mit deutscher Beteiligung

In [1051190249.txt](#) fällt von Storch beim Kollegen Wigley in Ungnade, weil er zum Publizieren von "crap science 'in order to stimulate debate'" ("schlechter" Wissenschaft, zwecks Anregung der Debatte) ermuntern würde.

Michael Mann gibt sich in [1060002347.txt](#) hocherfreut, dass von Storch ihnen als Editor bei Climate Research (CR) nicht mehr im Wege ist: "Hans Von Storch's resignation as chief editor of CR, which I think took a lot of guts, couldn't have come at a better time."

In [1125067952.txt](#) wird über Teilnehmer an einem Workshop beraten, die sie mit von Storch in Verbindung bringen und daher ablehnen: "If the Germans need to be represented here, I would suggest instead someone from the Potsdam group,"

Rahmstorf in [1141164645.txt](#) : "Von Storch's contention that the "hockey stick" is "nonsense" (cited in the US Senate) is based on a mistake."

Rahmstorf ist die Hockey-Stick-Problematik bestens bekannt, wie in [1141169545.txt](#) nachzulesen ist.

An anderer Stelle will Rahmstorf Ergebnisse von Storchs aus dem IPCC-Bericht heraus halten ([1140567354.txt](#))

Rudolf Kipp EIKE

siehe auch, die Kritik von John Mclean und IPCC Beobachter: [Climate Science Corrupted](#)

sowie:

<http://www.science-skeptical.de/category/climategate/>

Related Files

- [climate_science_corrupted-pdf](#)