

Session 4

The '97% of scientists agree' statements

BBC Coverage

Climategate

Session 4 – The ‘97% of scientists agree’ statement

Frequently stated thus:

"Ninety-seven percent of scientists agree that climate change is real, man-made and dangerous."

Or maybe the more measured form from NASA

"Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists agree that climate-warming trends over the past century are very likely due to human activities."

Session 4 – The ‘97% of scientists agree’ statement

This so-called consensus seems to come primarily from four surveys and abstract-counting exercises listed below.

In 2004 – by Naomi Oreskas

In 2009 – by Maggie Kendal Zimmerman & Peter Doran

In 2010 – by William R. Love Anderegg

In 2013 – by John Cook

Critiques of them have been written by a number of people, and some of these will be posted on our website.

Session 4 – The ‘97% of scientists agree’ statement

Rigorous international surveys conducted by German scientists Dennis Bray and Hans von Storch—most recently published in 2016—have found that **most climate scientists disagree** with the consensus on key issues such as the reliability of climate data and computer models. They do not believe that climate processes such as cloud formation and precipitation are sufficiently understood to predict future climate change.

Surveys of meteorologists repeatedly find a majority oppose the alleged consensus. **Only 39% of over 1,800** American Meteorological Society members who responded to a survey in 2012 said man-made global warming is dangerous.

Session 4 – The ‘97% of scientists agree’ statement

The U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change claims to speak for more than 2,500 scientists on the matter of man's influence.

The IPCC lists only **41 authors** and editors of the relevant chapter of the Fifth Assessment Report addressing anthropogenic effect.

Session 4 - BBC bias

On the 26th January 2006, a day-long 'high-level seminar' was staged at the BBC Television Centre. Entitled 'Climate Change - The Challenge to Broadcasting'

It was directed by Roger Harrabin, one of the BBC's senior environmental reporters, and Dr Joe Smith, an Open University geographer who describes himself as an 'action researcher' on climate change

In 1996 they had set up the 'Cambridge Media and Environment Programme' to promote environmental coverage in the media. They were funded, *inter alia*, by Defra, the department responsible for government policy on global warming; the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), a leading environmental pressure group; and the Tyndall Centre, a climate research unit at the University of East Anglia.

Session 4 - BBC bias

Also helping to organise the BBC seminar was a body called the International Broadcasting Trust. Despite its name, this was a PR lobbying organisation which acted for several leading global warming activist groups, including Friends of the Earth.

Chief guest speaker at the seminar was Lord May of Oxford, a former chief scientific adviser to the government, who had recently stepped down as President of the Royal Society

According to Harrabin... *He told us the debate on climate change was 'over' and urged us to stop reporting the views of climate sceptics.*

Again, according to Harrabin... *The BBC's Director of News, Helen Boaden, 'endorsed the advice'*

Session 4 - BBC bias

BBC Trust published a report in July 2011; its subject was ‘the impartiality and accuracy of the BBC’s coverage of science’

Much of the report consisted of what was described as ‘an independent assessment’ by Professor Steve Jones, a geneticist who had long worked for the BBC on a range of science-related programmes

Only seven pages of the 102-page report were devoted to Jones’s review of its climate coverage, but it was clear from advance publicity given to the press that this was regarded as a very important part of what Jones had to say.

His conclusion was - **“We need more bias, not less”**

Session 4 - Climategate

In November 2009, a large archive of emails and files from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia in the United Kingdom was released on the internet. A second set appeared in Nov. 2011. These appeared to show that the CRU had...

- Manipulated, hid or misrepresented data and evidence in official reports.
- Blocked the publication of scientific results that contradicted the IPCC theory.
- Expressed greater doubt in the emails about the science than they wrote in official reports.
- Manipulated the peer-review process to get friends to review their papers.
- Blocked access to data and methodologies to prevent other scientists from evaluating their work.
- Pressured scientific journals to reject papers showing evidence contrary to their theory.
- Intimidated or discredited scientific journals that publish evidence contrary to their theory.
- Conspired to destroy data and emails subject to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) laws.

Session 4 - Climategate

Some examples emails written by Dr Phil Jones - Director of the CRU...

“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) amd [sic] from 1961 for Keith’s to hide the decline.”

“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!”

“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.”

“Recently rejected two papers (one for JGR [Journal of Geophysical Research] and for GRL) from people saying CRU has it wrong over Siberia. Went to town in both reviews, hopefully successfully. If either appears I will be very surprised.”

“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.”

Session 4 - Climategate

Some examples emails written by Dr Phil Jones - Director of the CRU...

And don't leave stuff lying around on anonymous download sites—you never know who is trawling them. McIntyre and McKittrick have been after the Climatic Research Unit data for years. If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the United Kingdom, I think I'll delete the file rather than send it to anyone.

Mike,

Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith regarding the latest IPCC report? 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.

Climate Change - How Catastrophic is it?

Session 4 - Climategate

Inquiry	Investigators	Work Done
The UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee	14 Members of Parliament	Reviewed honesty of hide the decline, transparency, blocking opposing views, compliance with the FOIA and the CRUTEM dataset
The Oxburgh Panel	Lord Ronald Oxburgh and 6 others	Reviewed 11 papers selected by UEA, none of which were controversial. Failed to investigate science issues.
The Independent Climate Change Emails Review	Sir Muir Russell and 4 others	Review emails for evidence of manipulation and suppression of data, response to FOIA requests. Found that "hide the decline" was misleading.
Penn State University Inquiry Investigation	2 Tenured Professors 5 Tenured Professors	Interviewed Michael Mann, no critics. Dismissed allegations without any investigation.
InterAcademy Council	12 members	Investigate IPCC procedures. Made numerous recommendations to improve procedures and transparency.

Session 4 - Climategate

The UK House of Commons Science and Technology Committee

The committee was announced on 22 January 2010.

- All committee members were committed to policies to restrict carbon dioxide emissions and subsidize renewable energy.
- The inquiry received 58 submissions. The Inquiry held only one session for receiving oral evidence, on 1 March 2010.
- Only two critics were interviewed, neither were experts in the issues under examination.
- None of the many erroneous statements made by CRU supporters were subject to cross examination.
- **The committee found the CRU:**
- Failed to abide by best scientific practice by refusing to share its raw data and detailed methods.
- Had deliberately misrepresented the data, in order to produce results that fit its preconceived views.

Session 4 - Climategate

Some queries regarding the HoC enquiry

CRU selected some 2000 records out of 8000 from the Global Historical Climate Network archive for use in their temperature index. They do not disclose the list of records used and their methods or justification for selecting and adjusting the data.

CRU claimed some data couldn't be released due to confidentiality agreements, but they couldn't produce those agreements (likely because they don't exist?)

CRU deleted paleo-climate tree-ring data which showed declining temperatures in the 20th century, with instrument data to "hide the decline" in IPCC and WMO reports for policy makers. The committee said the deleted data was known to be erroneous, but there was no evidence that the data was erroneous.

BUT!

The committee concluded it was OK to produce a misleading graph for policy makers as long as the flaw was disclosed in a scientific journal.

Session 4 - Climategate

The Oxburgh Enquiry

The University of East Anglia (UEA) announce on 22 March 2010 that Lord Ron Oxburgh would lead an inquiry into the science of the CRU.

Contrary to UEA announcements, Lord Oxburgh never reviewed any science issues. Oxburgh wrote, “We were assessing people and their motivations. We were not assessing the wisdom of their judgments or the validity of their conclusions. ... The science was not the subject of our study.”

The UEA prepared a list of 11 papers, vetted by Phil Jones, for the Oxburgh inquiry to examine.

There was no independence between the UEA and the Oxburgh inquiry. The list was determined by the UEA and rubber stamped by two members of the Royal Society, both of whom stated they had no expertise in the matter.

Session 4 - Climategate

The Oxburgh Enquiry

None of the papers examined were controversial. They did not include the papers discussed in the climategate emails.

The enquiry did not call for submissions, did not hold any public hearings and did not interview any CRU critics. No notes were taken of interviews of CRU staff. None of the statements made by CRU staff were subject to cross examination.

The enquiry found that the CRU failed to use the best statistical methods, failed to properly document their methods and archive data. The CRU scientists, as lead authors of the IPCC reports, failed to disclose important uncertainty, especially the divergence problem, which would invalidate the tree ring base proxy temperature reconstructions.

The Enquiry excused the scientists for producing misleading IPCC document where they disclosed the problems in scientific journals.

Session 4 - Climategate

Independent Climate Change Email Review

The review chaired by Sir Muir Russell was announced on 11 February 2010.

The inquiry called for submissions from the public. No public hearings were held. The review team interviewed CRU and UEA staff but made no transcripts of the interviews. No critics were interviewed. There was no cross-examination of CRU scientist statements.

The review set out a set of 8 allegations against the CRU to investigate. The review ignored several of the allegations but instead investigated irrelevant or non-existent questions.

Session 4 – Summing Up

The 97% of scientists agree is myth based of false data

Much of the main stream media (MSM) and especially the BBC, report on climate from a particular environmentalists position and, as a matter of policy, have decided to severely control views contrary to AGW.

Key players in the CRU acted with political motivation to promote their own agenda.

End of Session 4