

Human Caused Climate Change? A Skeptical Look at the Narrative

ClimateGate, the IPCC, and Cheating Scientists

(eighth PDF of 12)

Roger Golden Brown

Published June 21, 2023

Find all PDFs in this package & other Climate Related material on [their website page](#).

Other PDFs on various subjects, exposing the machinations behind the mainstream narrative about our world, can be found [here on my website](#).

Should anyone feel like supporting my continuing this work, a donation button is to be found [on my website](#) (left sidebar and on a page shown in the menu). Thank you.

Note: Please read the first PDF, *Introduction to Human Caused Climate Change? A Skeptical Look at the Narrative* first, where the intent and scope of this project are explained.

Note: Text that is indented both from the right and left (like this paragraph) is quoted from the noted source.

Sections

[Introduction](#)

[ClimateGate](#)

[The IPCC, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#)

[Cheating Scientists](#)

[The Hockey Stick Graph](#)

Introduction

Scientists are people too. Just because someone has studied and is learned or degreed in a field doesn't mean they have integrity. The word "science" and the use of data and graphs have long been used to give leverage to an argument or debate.

In reality, cherry picked data can be used to demonstrate or prove almost anything. I've heard it cleverly said that you can torture any conclusion out of data. This PDF is

about the dissembling and about flat out lying and cheating that is part of the fraud being perpetrated upon trusting souls who believe the authorities just because.

It is in three main parts. The first is about ClimateGate, the hacked information from a major climate research facility exposing elements of the fraud. The second part is about the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. And the third part is about information that is presented which appears to bolster the CO2, unprecedented warming, doom scenario but that is fraudulent.

ClimateGate

ClimateGate refers to the hacking in 2009 of a server at the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia, United Kingdom and the releasing of more than 1,000 emails and more than 2,000 other documents. This section will offer resources relative to those emails and then cover just a few of the issues exposed by them.

According to the Wikipedia page, [Climatic Research Unit](#):

The Climatic Research Unit is a component of the University of East Anglia and is one of the leading institutions concerned with the study of natural and anthropogenic climate change.

The Hacked (Leaked?) Files Themselves

First here are the downloadable files released in the ClimateGate hack:

- [Climatic Research Unit emails, data, models, 1996-2009](#) - zip file of the leaked material, originally from WikiLeaks.

Excerpts From the Emails and Sources for More Related Information

Here are sources for lots of material related to the ClimateGate hack (+ one article):

- [Climate cuttings 33](#) - Bishop Hill website, November 20, 2009 (overview of and excerpts from the ClimateGate files, including links to some of the emails, for which you need to use the Wayback Machine to access)
- [Climategate 3.0](#) - Bishop Hill website, March 13, 2013 (email sent to Andrew Montford from FOIA, the name under which the material was released, discussing motives for releasing the material)
- [ClimateGate For Dummies](#) - Steve Watson & Paul Joseph Watson, November 27, 2009 (lots of links to sources for ClimateGate information)
- [ClimateGate](#) - Anthony Watts (long list of articles about ClimateGate, including comments)

- [Black Tuesday of Climate Science](#) - Jean S. (a dialogue shown in the emails reveals discussions about the creating of the Hockey Stick Graph + more about that)

The Death Blow to Science

A November 21, 2009 article by Tim Ball on the Canada Free Press website, [The Death Blow to Climate Science](#), takes a hard look at the ClimateGate revelations; his main take being that the behavior revealed makes it a sad day for science:

Global Warming is often called a hoax. I disagree because a hoax has a humorous intent to puncture pomposity. In science, such as with the Piltdown Man hoax, it was done to expose those with fervent but blind belief. The argument that global warming is due to humans, known as the anthropogenic global warming theory (AGW) is a deliberate fraud. I can now make that statement without fear of contradiction because of a remarkable hacking of files that provided not just a smoking gun, but an entire battery of machine guns.

Dominant names involved are ones I have followed throughout my career including, **Phil Jones, Benjamin Santer, Michael Mann, Kevin Trenberth, Jonathan Overpeck, Ken Briffa and Tom Wigley**. I have watched climate science hijacked and corrupted by this small group of scientists. This small, elite, community was named by Professor Wegman in his report to the National Academy of Science (NAS).

Total Control - These people controlled the global weather data used by the IPCC through the joint Hadley and CRU and produced the HadCRUT data. They controlled the IPCC, especially crucial chapters and especially preparation of the Summary for PolicyMakers (SPM). Stephen Schneider was a prime mover there from the earliest reports to the most influential in 2001. They also had a left wing conduit to the New York Times.

James Corbett Interviews Tim Ball

James Corbett interviews Tim Ball in a short 10 minute video: [Climategate: Dr. Tim Ball on the hacked CRU emails](#)

The Warming Conspiracy's Most Damning Emails

Wikipedia, fact checkers, and the media dismissed the revelations in the emails as unimportant, and the critiques of the emails as exaggerated and misinterpreted.

In a November 25, 2009 article, [Column - The warming conspiracy's most damning emails](#), Andrew Bolt features a number of "the most damning" so you can decide for yourself. Later I refer to a few of the emails, but first his good overview of the scandal:

This conspiracy comprises a group of warming scientists who have been central in spreading the false claim that the world has never been hotter and man's gases are to blame.

What they (the emails) reveal is perhaps the greatest scientific scandal of our time - a conspiracy by warmist scientists to fudge statistics, sack sceptical scientists, block the release of data to prevent checking, illegally destroy data, deceive reporters, censor sceptical papers, and hide errors in their work.

These are not some obscure scientists. Rather, they include co-authors of the reports of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - which Rudd [Kevin Rudd, Australian prime minister] cites as his proof that warming is "happening and it's caused by human activity".

They include **Phil Jones**, head of the CRU unit from which the emails were taken - a unit that Britain's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, said "set the agenda for the major research effort" in climate science.

They include Pennsylvania State University's **Michael Mann** and CRU deputy director **Keith Briffa**, both IPCC co-authors, who also produced the two studies that most convinced journalists of the false claim that it's now hotter than the Medieval Warm Period just 800 years ago.

Silencing Skeptics

In Andrew Bolt's article he highlighted a number of the emails, organized into sections. Here are some of the excerpts from the emails presented in his *Silencing Skeptics* section (quotes from the emails are in *italics*):

- Tom Wigley on ousting the editor of *Geophysical Research Letters* (achieved):

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

- Phil Jones to Michael Mann on keeping two sceptics' papers from the IPCC:

I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. K and I will keep them out somehow - even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!

- Michael Mann on removing the editor of *Climate Science* (achieved):

How to deal with this is unclear, since there are a number of individuals with bona fide scientific credentials who could be used by an unscrupulous editor to ensure that anti-greenhouse science can get through the peer review process (Legates, Balling, Lindzen, Baliunas, Soon, and so on).

- Michael Mann to the CRU's Tim Osborn and Keith Briffa, on blocking sceptics' comments on his RealClimate website:

We can hold comments up in the queue and contact you about whether or not you think they should be screened through or not ...

Alarmists at Odds With Britain's Freedom of Information Act

Here's a couple of the emails, taken from Andrew Bolt's article showing the alarmists' resistance to sharing their information (quotes from the emails are in *italics*):

- Phil Jones warns Michael Mann that Steve McIntyre and Prof Ross McKittrick, two sceptics who first debunked Mann's "hockey stick", are now wanting to check CRU data:

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 ... We also have a data protection act, which I will hide behind.

- From Phil Jones to Michael Mann and others:

PS 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!

A January 28, 2010 article by David Derbyshire on the Mail Online website, [Scientists broke the law by hiding climate change data: But legal loophole means they won't be prosecuted](#), shows that they were found guilty of violating the UK's Freedom of Information Act:

Scientist at the heart of the 'Climategate' email scandal broke the law when they refused to give raw data to the public, the privacy watchdog has ruled.

The Information Commissioner's office said University of East Anglia researchers breached the Freedom of Information Act when handling requests from climate change sceptics.

But the scientists will escape prosecution because the offenses took place more than six months ago.

The ruling followed a complaint from retired engineer David Holland-66, whose Freedom of Information-requests were ignored.

Last night Mr Holland welcomed the watchdog's decision but said it was disappointing the researchers would not be prosecuted.

'All we are trying to do is make the scientists follow their own professional rules by being open, transparent and honest,' he said. 'We are not trying to show that human beings don't affect the climate, but to show that the science is not settled.'

The UK Met Office Was Complicit With the CRU

In this article by Stephen McIntyre, posted on Jul 23, 2009, [UK Met Office Refuses to Disclose Station Data Once Again](#), he writes about how, after his requesting CRU data, the UK Met Office covered up for Phil Jones and the CRU:

It must be humiliating for the UK Met Office to have to protect Phil Jones and CRU. Even a seasoned bureaucrat must have winced in order to write the following:

"Some of the information was provided to Professor Jones on the strict understanding by the data providers that this station data must not be publicly released and it cannot be determined which countries or stations data were given in confidence as records were not kept."

The IPCC, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

This section will look at what the IPCC's actual purpose is and then look at some of their unprofessional behavior. First, a little about the IPCC in their own words.

From the [History of the IPCC](#) page on their website:

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established in 1988 to provide policymakers with regular scientific assessments on the current state of knowledge about climate change.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in 1988.

The establishment of the IPCC was endorsed by UN General Assembly in 1988. Its initial task, as outlined in UN General Assembly Resolution 43/53 of 6 December 1988, was to prepare a comprehensive review and recommendations with respect to the state of knowledge of the science of climate change; the social and economic impact of climate change, and potential response strategies and elements for inclusion in a possible future international convention on climate.


The astute reader will notice that according to what they say of themselves, they are tasked with studying climate change; this appears to mean that from the get-go they are not designed to be objective. They assume climate change is a critical issue and are oriented to "response strategies" and the political act of developing a convention.

In a short video, [Dr. Tim Ball on the IPCC's Terms of Reference](#), Tim Ball addresses just this issue, saying that anytime a study group is organized they have terms of reference -

the areas, subjects, etc. that an organization or inquiry has been ordered to deal with. It's less than 5 minutes long and gives food for thought about the limitations of the IPCC.

If one looks at the document, [Review of the IPCC Terms of Reference](#), a 2007 IPCC document, it seems clear that it is as much a political organization as it is scientific. They know what they are looking for:

That the activities of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) should be aimed at (i) assessing the scientific information that is related to the various components of the climate change issue such as emissions of major greenhouse gases and modification of the Earth's radiation balance resulting therefrom, and that needed to enable the environmental and socio-economic consequences of climate change to be evaluated; and (ii) formulating realistic response strategies for the management of the climate change issue.



GlacierGate, AmazonGate, and AfricaGate

Following are three stories, all about bogus information being included and even featured in the IPCC's 2007 Assessment Report.

A January 23, 2010 article by David Rose on the The Mail on Sunday website, [Glacier scientist: I knew data hadn't been verified](#), exposes the fact that dramatic climate doom

language was put into the 2007 IPCC report that was completely false, for political reasons:

The scientist behind the bogus claim in a Nobel Prize-winning UN report that Himalayan glaciers will have melted by 2035 last night admitted it was included purely to put political pressure on world leaders.

Dr Murari Lal also said he was well aware the statement, in the 2007 report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), did not rest on peer-reviewed scientific research.

In an interview with The Mail on Sunday, Dr Lal, the co-ordinating lead author of the report's chapter on Asia, said: 'It related to several countries in this region and their water sources. We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action.'

A January 25, 2010 article on the EU Referendum website, [And now for Amazongate](#), exposes more bogus claims put into the 2007 report, again for political reasons.

The IPCC also made false predictions on the Amazon rain forests, referenced to a non peer-reviewed paper produced by an advocacy group working with the WWF. This time though, the claim made is not even supported by the report and seems to be a complete fabrication.

Thus, following on from "Glaciergate", where the IPCC grossly exaggerated the effects of global warming on Himalayan glaciers – backed by a reference to a WWF report - we now have "Amazongate", where the IPCC has grossly exaggerated the effects of global warming on the Amazon rain forest.

This is to be found in Chapter 13 of the Working Group II report, the same part of the IPCC fourth assessment report in which the "Glaciergate" claims are made. There, is the startling claim that:

Up to 40% of the Amazonian forests could react drastically to even a slight reduction in precipitation; this means that the tropical vegetation, hydrology and climate system in South America could change very rapidly to another steady state, not necessarily producing gradual changes between the current and the future situation (Rowell and Moore, 2000). It is more probable that forests will be replaced by ecosystems that have more resistance to multiple stresses caused by temperature increase, droughts and fires, such as tropical savannas.

This, then appears to be another WWF report, carried out in conjunction with the IUCN - The International Union for Conservation of Nature.

The link given is no longer active, but the report is on the [IUCN website here](#). Furthermore, the IUCN along with WWF is another advocacy group and the report is not peer-reviewed. According to IPCC rules, it should not have been used as a primary source.

Firming up the WWF link, the second of the two authors, Dr P F Moore, is cited as the coordinator of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and World Conservation Union (IUCN) Project FireFight South-East, Asia, Bogor, Indonesia. He works for both organisations.

In all, then, the IPCC claim is a fabrication, unsupported even by the reference it gives, which it should not in any event have used as it is not a primary source.

The significance of this cannot be understated. Together with polar bears and melting ice-caps, and melting glaciers, the Amazon rain forests are iconic symbols for the climate change industry, and their potential loss was fully exploited at December's Copenhagen summit.

Another article on the EU Referendum website, this time from February 07, 2010, [And now for Africagate](#), exposes yet more fakery in the 2007 IPCC report:

Following an investigation by this blog (and with the story also told in *The Sunday Times*), another major "mistake" in the IPCC's benchmark Fourth Assessment Report has emerged.

Similar in effect to the erroneous "2035" claim – the year the IPCC claimed that Himalayan glaciers were going to melt – in this instance we find that the IPCC has wrongly claimed that in some African countries, yields from rain-fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50 percent by 2020.

At best, this is a wild exaggeration, unsupported by any scientific research, referenced only to a report produced by a Canadian advocacy group, written by an obscure Moroccan academic who specialises in carbon trading, citing references which do not support his claims.

Unlike the glacier claim, which was confined to a section of the technical Working Group II report, this "50 percent by 2020" claim forms part of the key Synthesis Report, the production of which was the personal responsibility of the chair of the IPCC, Dr R K Pachauri. It has been repeated by him in many public fora. He, therefore, bears a personal responsibility for the error.

And, another story that goes into the whole debacle that the 2007 report was, a January 30, 2010 article by Christopher Booker, [Amazongate: new evidence of the IPCC's](#)

[failures](#). This excerpt from the article goes full circle back to the Terms of Reference and the IPCC's purpose that I started this section with:

A Canadian analyst has identified more than 20 passages in the IPCC's report which cite similarly non-peer-reviewed WWF or Greenpeace reports as their authority, and other researchers have been uncovering a host of similarly dubious claims and attributions all through the report. These range from groundless allegations about the increased frequency of "extreme weather events" such as hurricanes, droughts and heatwaves, to a headline claim that global warming would put billions of people at the mercy of water shortages – when the study cited as its authority indicated exactly the opposite, that rising temperatures could increase the supply of water.

Little of this has come as a surprise to those who have studied the workings of the IPCC over the years. As I show in my book *The Real Global Warming Disaster*, there is no greater misconception about the IPCC than that it was intended to be an impartial body, weighing scientific evidence for and against global warming. It was set up in 1988 by a small group of scientists all firmly committed to the theory of "human-induced climate change", and its chief purpose ever since has been to promote that belief.

Forecasts by Scientists Versus Scientific Forecasts

This report, [Global warming: Forecasts by scientists versus scientific forecasts](#), by Kesten C. Green and, J. Scott, Armstrong, published August 3, 2007, takes exception to the scientific forecasting processes used in the IPCC's 2007 Fourth Assessment Report.

From their Abstract:

Using forecasting principles as our guide we asked: Are these forecasts a good basis for developing public policy? Our answer is "no."

We found no references to the primary sources of information on forecasting methods despite the fact these are easily available in books, articles, and websites. We audited the forecasting processes described in Chapter 8 of the IPCC's WG1 Report to assess the extent to which they complied with forecasting principles. We found enough information to make judgments on 89 out of a total of 140 forecasting principles.

The forecasting procedures that were described violated 72 principles. Many of the violations were, by themselves, critical. The forecasts in the Report were not the outcome of scientific procedures. In effect, they were the opinions of scientists transformed by mathematics and obscured by complex writing. Research on forecasting has shown that experts' predictions are not useful. We have been unable to identify any scientific

forecasts of global warming. Claims that the Earth will get warmer have no more credence than saying that it will get colder.

95% Certain Humans are Causing Climate Change

In a very short "Global Warming Minute" video, [Why is the IPCC "95% Certain" that Climate Change is Manmade?](#), published September 9, 2013, James Corbett critiqued the IPCC's claim that it is 95% certain that humans are causing climate change. The transcript from the video:

In recent days, you've probably heard ad nauseum that the UN's new IPCC report claims that it is "95% certain" that humans are causing climate change.

95% is a very specific number. So where does it come from?

The IPCC uses a "[likelihood scale](#)" that assigns percentages to various phrases, ranging from "exceptionally unlikely" (0-1% probability) to "virtually certain" (99-100% probability). This sounds like it is based on a precise scientific measurement or well-defined statistical process, but when it comes to deciding how likely it is that climate change is manmade, this is in fact a subjective decision that is made by the report's authors.

[According to the IPCC](#): "The approaches used in detection and attribution research described above cannot fully account for all uncertainties, and thus ultimately expert judgment is required to give a calibrated assessment of whether a specific cause is responsible for a given climate change."

In other words, the "95% probability" that is making all of the headlines is nothing more than an arbitrary number decided on in closed door meetings between the report authors. Still, it serves an important propaganda purpose in giving a veneer of scientific credibility to the decision, one that a media that never bothers to explain these decisions to you thinks you will be too stupid to figure out for yourself:

So how reliable is the IPCC process in general? That will be the subject of next week's report.

The Delinquent Teenager

In 2010 Donna Laframboise wrote the book, [The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert](#) (the link is to a PDF of the first few chapters). In the book she says that, in spite of the rhetoric usually heard about the IPCC, they are an extremely incompetent and unqualified group of people. Check it out for yourself and listen to an interview of her talking about her book with James Corbett: [Interview 434 - Donna Laframboise](#)


Cheating Scientists

Although throughout this project there have been many references to instances of misrepresentation and false claims and consequently a certain level of fraud, this section will focus on exposing some blatant cheating; making claims to further an agenda that are demonstrably false.

Constructing Graphs From Cherry Picked Data


On Anthony Watts' Everything Climate website he responds to the claim that climate change has caused an increase in wildfires. In his response, [Wildfires are far less frequent and severe than was the case throughout the first half of the 20th century](#), he demonstrates how truncating the data, cherry picking just the data necessary to purportedly demonstrate something, is perpetrating a fraud. He talks about how a page with data about wildfires on the National Interagency Fire Center website used to show data going back to 1926, but now they have altered it to only show data going back to 1983. (Read more about that in PDF 3, *Individual Issues of the Narrative*.)

Watts made the graphic below to show how cherry picking data is used to deceive.



I wasn't sure if there was really such a cherry picked graph so did a search online. It took about a minute to come up with the September 8, 2020 article, [Infographic: Wildfires and Climate Change - Visualizing the Connection in Five Sets of Photos and Charts](#), on the website of the Union of Concerned Scientists with just such a chart.

The chart from the Union of Concerned Scientists article:



And further down in the article they have a scary chart (see below) with the message in bold: *Climate change is a key driver behind the growth of Western forest fires*. The chart shows the increase in fires since 1985 and shows what proportion of those fires (that someone has magically divined) was because of climate change.


Unfortunately, it's a lie. The Concerned Scientists are either knowingly perpetrating a fraud or they are incompetent. And they are not alone. The following 4 articles all used truncated data (one went back to 1970) for a cherry picked result:

[Trend: Large Wildfires More Common and Destructive in the West](#) - KQED

[Wildfires in the Western United States](#) - Kyle Fairweather

[Iconic Forests Reaching Climate Tipping Points in American West, Study Finds](#) - Inside Climate News

[2012: Third highest number of wildfire acres burned](#) - Wildfire Today



Cherry Picking Heat Waves


In the article, [Extreme Fraud In The National Climate Assessment](#), Tony Heller looks at claims made in a 2018 U.S. Global Change Research Program report, [Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume II - Impacts, Risks, and Adaptation in the United States](#), that heat waves are increasing in the United States:

When the National Climate Assessment was released last fall, a massive barrage of hysterical propaganda came with it – like this article in The Atlantic ([The Three Most Chilling Conclusions From the Climate Report](#)) saying we are all going to burn up, based on an increase in US heat waves since the 1960s:

"In its first chapter, the National Climate Assessment reports that heat-wave season has expanded by more than 40 days since the 1960s. In the bleakest scenario of unchecked climate change, Phoenix could have as many as 150 days per year above 100 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of the century."


The Atlantic cites the following and the graph from page 38 of the Assessment:

Over the past two decades, the number of high temperature records recorded in the United States far exceeds the number of low temperature records. The length of the frost-free season, from the last freeze in spring to the first freeze of autumn, has increased for all regions since the early 1900s. The frequency of cold waves has decreased since the early 1900s, and the frequency of heat waves has increased since the mid-1960s. Over timescales shorter than a decade, the 1930s Dust Bowl remains the peak period for extreme heat in the United States for a variety of reasons, including exceptionally dry springs coupled with poor land management practices during that era.




Back to Tony Heller's article:

But why did they choose the 1960s for their start date? The US has excellent temperature records going back to the late 19th century, and in fact the [2017 National Climate Assessment](#) showed heat wave data going back to 1900. The 2017 data showed unambiguously that US summers were much hotter prior to 1960, and that the 1960s and 1970s had the fewest heatwaves of any period in the US. This very important data was excluded from the 2018 report [one of several graphs shown here]:



The article continues:

I overlaid the 2018 NCA graph on the 2017 NCA data, and it becomes very clear what they are doing. The 2018 report released to the public, cherry-picked the only start date in the graph which they could use to create the appearance of a warming trend:



The Australian Bureau of Meteorology Tweaking the Temperature

In a January 19, 2023 article by Jennifer Marohasy on her website, [Hyping Daily Maximum Temperatures \(Part 1\)](#), she explains the fraudulent methodology that the Australian Bureau of Meteorology uses to determine maximum daily temperature.

There is more than one way to ruin a perfectly good historical temperature record. The Australian Bureau of Meteorology achieves this in multiple ways, primarily through industrial scale remodelling (also known as homogenisation – stripping away the natural warming and cooling cycles that correspond with periods of drought and flooding), and also by scratching historical hottest day records, then there is the setting of limits on how cold a temperature can now be recorded and also by replacing mercury thermometers with temperature probes that are purpose-built, as far as I can tell, to record hotter for the same weather.


The Australian Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) regularly claims new record hot days, and Australian scientist report that heat records are now 12 times more likely than cold ones. But how reliable – how verifiable – are the new records?

I have been trying for five years to verify the claim that the 23 September 2017 at Mildura was the hottest September day ever recorded in Victoria. According to media reporting at that time, it was the hottest September day all the way-back to 1889 when records first began. Except that back then, back in September 1889, maximum temperatures were recorded at Mildura with a mercury thermometer. Now they are recorded with a temperature probe that is more sensitive to fluctuations in temperature and can thus potentially record warmer for the same weather.

"In the absence of any other influences, an instrument with a faster response time [temperature probe] will tend to record higher maximum and lower minimum temperatures than an instrument with a slower response time [mercury thermometer]. This is most clearly manifested as an increase in the mean diurnal range. At most locations, particularly in arid regions, it will also result in a slight increase in mean temperatures, as short-term fluctuations of temperature are generally larger during the day than overnight." *Research Report No. 032*, by Blair Trewin, BoM, October 2018, page 21.

To standardise recordings from temperature probes with mercury thermometers, one-second readings from probes are normally averaged over one minute – or batches of ten second readings are averaged and

then averaged again over one minute. That is the world-wide standard to ensure recordings from temperature probes are comparable with recordings from mercury thermometers. But the Australian Bureau of Meteorology do *not* do this, instead they take one-second instantaneous readings and then enter the highest of these one-second spot readings for any given 24-hour period as the official maximum temperature for that day.




Cherry Picking Temperature Data

On the Climate4You website they ask the question, [Is The Global Temperature Increase 1981-2005 Unique Compared To The General Temperature Rise Since The End Of The Little Ice Age?](#) They are responding to the IPCC's 2007 [Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#), in which the IPCC uses a graph (below) to demonstrate the ostensibly extreme rise in temperature during the 25 years 1981-2005:

An excerpt from IPCC's long description of the figure, Figure A:

Figure A. Results from climate models driven by estimated radiative forcings for the 20th century suggest that there was little change prior to about 1915, and that a substantial fraction of the early 20th-century change was contributed by naturally occurring influences including solar radiation changes, volcanism and natural variability. From about 1940 to 1970 the increasing industrialisation following World War II increased pollution in the Northern Hemisphere, contributing to cooling, and increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases dominate the observed warming after the mid-1970s.

Figure A



Curiously they make three claims here that seem to be fairly subjective.

In the section of the full report where they preface the above graph (page 252) they don't seem to make the case for volcanism and solar changes causing the 1915 - 1945 sharp rise in temperature.

Neither do they show that pollution was responsible for the 1945 - 1970 temperature drop.

And they do not explain that no other warming forcings could be at play after 1981.

Finally, it seems completely arbitrary where they drew their lines. Why not a line from 1910 to 1940?

Here's what Climate4You has to say about it:

From the text above the period 1981-2005 is identified by IPCC as being unique, representing a new trend characterised by an accelerated temperature rise. The accelerated temperature increase is suggested to be caused by atmospheric increases in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, assumed to dominate the observed warming after the mid-1970s.

This is clearly an important conclusion, and the analysis leading up to the conclusion therefore deserves to be considered in some detail.

In the figure above, error bars and linear fits tend to hide the original data (the black dots). This is in itself most unfortunate, as the diagrams in the IPCC report should be prepared for consumption by policy makers and other intelligent lay persons. Therefore, they should be easy to understand, being faithful to both the data and the science, designed to shed light rather than to mislead.

The unusual and unfortunate procedure adopted by IPCC 2007 therefore calls for a new analysis of the post Little Ice Age temperature increase.

In the figure above HadCRUT3 global surface temperature estimates have been used. In the figure below, the original monthly HadCRUT3 data are plotted in a new diagram:




Figure B. Monthly global surface air temperature since 1850, according to HadCRUT3. The blocks in the bottom part of the diagram indicate the following interpretation of the data: The early data show the last part of the Little Ice Age, and the younger data show the temperature rise since the termination of the Little Ice Age in the early 20th century. The data series is updated to August 2008.

In the following diagram (Figure C), only the data points representing the post Little Ice Age period from 1908 are considered.




Figure C. Monthly global surface air temperature since 1908, according to HadCRUT3. The blue line show the variation of the monthly values, and the green line show a linear trend line calculated for the whole period 1908-2008. The data series is updated to August 2008.

In the diagram above a post Little Ice Age linear trend line has been calculated (green line). This trend line has a slope of 0.75° C per 100 year, suggesting that the overall global temperature increase since the termination of the Little Ice Age (here defined as 1908) has been about 0.75° C.

It is now possible to compare the rate of temperature increase from 1981 to 2005 with the general temperature rise since the termination of the Little Ice Age, to investigate if this period of rapid temperature increase is unique in relation to the remaining part of the data series since 1908.

At this point the article goes into great detail, showing lots of graphs, and explaining their analysis. Skipping to Climate4You's conclusion:

Summing up: The unfortunate procedure of comparing linear fits calculated for time windows of different lengths lead IPCC 2007 to the

unwarranted conclusion that the temperature rise 1981-2005 was unique ([Figure A](#)). In reality, this is not the case. The temperature increase leading up to the warm peak around 1940 is entirely comparable to that characterising the period 1981-2005 ([Figure E](#)). Also when the monthly temperature change is considered, the 1981-2005 does not stand out ([Figure F](#)). Consequently the latter part of the post Little Ice Age warming do not differ from the early part of the warming period. The whole warming period since 1908 may therefore be seen as representing one single development, not showing a new trend corresponding to the rising atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases after the mid-1970s. Thus, the simplest interpretation of the global temperature increase since 1908 is that it represents mainly a natural recovery from low Little Ice Age temperatures, without clear anthropogenic impact.

Is Bogus Data Being Used for Modeling?

Computer modeling is where most of the predictions of climate doom come from, and consequently policy considerations. A paper, [On the Validity of NOAA, NASA and Hadley CRU Global Average Surface Temperature Data & The Validity of EPA's CO2 Endangerment Finding](#), by Dr. James P. Wallace III, Dr. Joseph S. D'Aleo, Dr. Craig D. Idso, June 2017, asks the question, as to whether the data being used for modeling from several top groups is valid.

See the 30 page PDF for sources and lots of graphs. Here's the Abstract:

The objective of this research was to test the hypothesis that Global Average Surface Temperature (GAST) data, produced by NOAA, NASA, and HADLEY, are sufficiently credible estimates of global average temperatures such that they can be relied upon for climate modeling and policy analysis purposes. The relevance of this research is that the validity of all three of the so-called Lines of Evidence in EPA's GHG/CO2 Endangerment Finding require GAST data to be a valid representation of reality.

In this research report, the most important surface data adjustment issues are identified and past changes in the previously reported historical data are quantified. It was found that each new version of GAST has nearly always exhibited a steeper warming linear trend over its entire history. And, it was nearly always accomplished by systematically removing the previously existing cyclical temperature pattern. This was true for all three entities providing GAST data measurement, NOAA, NASA and Hadley CRU.

As a result, this research sought to validate the current estimates of GAST using the best available relevant data. This included the best


documented and understood data sets from the U.S. and elsewhere as well as global data from satellites that provide far more extensive global coverage and are not contaminated by bad siting and urbanization impacts. Satellite data integrity also benefits from having cross checks with Balloon data.

The conclusive findings of this research are that the three GAST data sets are not a valid representation of reality. In fact, the magnitude of their historical data adjustments, that removed their cyclical temperature patterns, are totally inconsistent with published and credible U.S. and other temperature data. Thus, it is impossible to conclude from the three published GAST data sets that recent years have been the warmest ever – despite current claims of record setting warming.

The Hockey Stick Graph

The "Hockey Stick Graph" was the graph that showed a huge upswing in warming on Earth that was used in Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth*, as well as in an untold amount of papers and presentations since its first appearance.

A report by the World Meteorological Organization, [WMO Statement on The Status of the Global Climate in 1999](#), featured a really slick version of the graph in all of its beauty on the cover of their report (image below).



Notice whose responsible for the 3 different lines shown in the graph - Jones, Mann, and Briffa, all featured in the ClimateGate scandal and mentioned earlier in this PDF.

Climate skeptics with expertise in proxies and in graphing are extremely skeptical of the hockey stick graph. The emails show that Phil Jones writes about using "Mike's Nature trick", but that is often quoted without much context.

Below I will feature an article that gives the context to Mike's Nature trick, and then I will offer a number of links to articles and discussions about the Hockey Stick Graph and about hiding the decline in the temperature that messed up their narrative.

Black Tuesday of Climate Science

In a September 22, 2014 article, [Black Tuesday of Climate Science](#), by Jean S. on the Climate Audit website, she gives details of a dialogue revealed in the ClimateGate emails, showing discussions about the creation of the graph:

Today I will review the timeline of the above WMO 1999 graph in the light of the ClimateGate (CG) letters. The main events took place on Tuesday, November 16th, 1999.

Things start rolling 9 AM (UK time), when Tim Osborn sends the new Briffa and recalibrated Jones (1998) time series to Phil Jones along with the suggestion to hide the decline.

"It is ready calibrated in deg C wrt. 1961-90, against the average Apr-Sep land temperature north of 20N. It goes from 1402 to 1994 – but you really ought to replace the values from 1961 onwards with observed temperatures due to the decline."

Jean S. continues showing the dialogue. Here I will just show the part about the "trick" and leave it to the curious reader to check out the article for far more detail:

After that Jones apparently begins to work with the times series. He's ready 1:30 PM and sends the now infamous trick email.

"Once Tim's got a diagram here we'll send that either later today or first thing tomorrow."



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. Mike's series got the annual land and marine values while the other two got April-Sept for NH land N of 20N. The latter two are real for 1999, while the estimate for 1999 for NH combined is +0.44C wrt 61-90. The Global estimate for 1999 with data through Oct is +0.35C cf. 0.57 for 1998.

Thanks for the comments, Ray."

Note that Jones clearly explained what he means by “Mike’s Nature trick”. Mann has claimed that his “Nature trick” was nothing more than clearly showing observations and reconstructions on the same graphic with proper labeling. But the direct comparison of observations to reconstructions is as old as statistics – and Jones and Briffa had themselves made such comparisons in prior articles without regarding clear labeling as anything more than elementary hygiene. In this email (which is often shortened in quotation), Jones says that Mann’s “Nature trick” is “adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (ie from 1981 onwards) and from 1961 for Keith’s”, as originally explained in November 2009 [here](#).

Included at the bottom of the article are images of two graphs (thanks to one of the commenters) that show the version of the graph without using Mike's Nature trick and the finally chosen graph looking hockeystick-like.

Before and After Mike's Nature Trick



More Hockey Stick Graph Related Discussions

Here is a number of links to explanations and discussions related to the famous / infamous Hockey Stick Graph:


- [The Yamal implosion](#) - Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill website, September 29, 2009
- [YAD06 – the Most Influential Tree in the World](#) - Stephen McIntyre, September 30, 2009
- [The IPCC AR6 Hockeystick](#) - Stephen McIntyre, Aug 11, 2021

- [The Decline, the Stick and The Trick – Part1](#) - Stephen McIntyre, November 2, 2021
- [The rise and fall of the Hockey Stick and Mann-made global warming alarm](#) - The Hockey Schtick website, January 14, 2014
- [How to Make a Hockey Stick – Paleoclimatology \(What they don't want you to know\)](#) - The Air Vent website, September 4, 2008
- [Hiding the Decline](#) - Judith Curry, February 22, 2011
- [Doubling The Hockey Stick Fraud](#) - Tony Heller

See the next page for two other versions of the graph with a legend and notes.

THE HOCKEY STICK: THE ORIGINAL AND LATER VERSIONS

The 2001 IPCC version: "Variations of the Earth's surface temperature over the past 1000 years"
The error bars (in grey) show the 95 per cent confidence range



The IPCC version compared with some other northern hemisphere temperature reconstructions*

