

Climate Change

COP15 COPENHAGEN UNITED NATIONS CLIMATE CHANGE CONFERENCE 2009

Why those emails are a scandal

Chris de Freitas

Climategate is a colossal scandal for several reasons.

First, the significance of the material extends well beyond the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia. An international group of high-profile scientists is involved, not just those from the CRU.

The emails show they manipulated and massaged data, blacklisted sceptics and critics of the global warming alarmist cause, defied requests for data that should be freely available to the scientific community, encouraged each other to delete damaging emails, hid from freedom of information law, fought to bar opposing research results from being published, embargoed journals they could not control or attempted to have their editors removed.

Second, the scientists involved are key players in the production of the major reports of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change IPCC), which is widely considered to be the supreme authority on global warming science.

Third, the CRU is the IPCC's main provider of climate data and therefore evidence of climate change.

Fourth, the emails reveal the original climate data on which the global warming alarmists' claims are based have been lost or destroyed. This is the most disturbing aspect of Climategate since it is common practice to adjust or "homogenise" raw climatic data to allow for assumed influences such as instrument and measurement site changes.

This process can result in the transformation of a cooling trend in the raw data into a warming trend in the "adjusted" data. Without the raw data, it is impossible to assess the integrity of the doctored records, the so-called evidence of human-caused climate change.

The biggest scandal in my view is not that Climategate is proof that science and advocacy have become enmeshed, but what the movement promotes; namely, that the existence and increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere is a harbinger of catastrophe.

Increasing the CO₂ concentrations alone cannot cause a climate catastrophe. Dramatic climatic change requires that amplification processes cut in, known as positive feedbacks.

The view that earth's climate is dominated by positive feedbacks is not supported by any empirical data. In fact, there are several research papers that point to the dominance of negative feedbacks or self-stabilising processes.

The apparent low sensitivity of global climate to 20th and 21st century increases in CO₂ concentration is entirely compatible

with the small warming that has been observed. On the other hand, the observed recent changes in temperature, both up and down, need no explanation other than that it reflects natural internal climatesystem variability.

CO₂ in the atmosphere is higher than at any time in the past 600,000 years, yet global temperature was much higher during all the major warm interglacial periods that occurred during this time, despite much lower levels of CO₂ during each of these warm periods.

The main players at Copenhagen should have heard by now that the basis for the longstanding claim that CO₂ is a major driver of global climate is being questioned. If they have not heard, it is because of the din of global warming hysteria.

The alarmists are going to great lengths to create a sense of urgency about climate change but nature refuses to oblige. Eighteen years of global warming came to an end in 1998. We are in the eleventh year of a global temperature stasis.

Sea levels, which have been rising for the past 300 years, show no sign of acceleration. Antarctica is cooling. Hurricane activity is down and does not appear to be connected to carbon dioxide emissions. Annual average Arctic sea ice extent, which is determined largely by wind and ocean currents, is increasing once again, a cycle that also occurred in the 1930s and 1940s.

If any good is to come from Copenhagen, it is that the anxiety about climate may allow the global community to see the need to pull together on the planet's real and truly pressing environmental and humanitarian problems.

Chris de Freitas is a climate scientist in the School of Environment at the University of Auckland