



**Foreign Policy**

**THE NEW SCHOOL** New York City

CLICK HERE FOR MORE

SUBSCRIBE TODAY TO FPI!

GLOBAL NEWS FEEDS

# The FP Guide to Climate Skeptics

Can't tell the legitimate concerns from the nonsense? FP is here to help.

BY CHRISTINA LARSON, JOSHUA KEATING | FEBRUARY 26, 2010



The field of climate science is under duress, which is wholly different than saying it's discredited. While recent headlines about the woes of U.N.-led efforts to assemble a comprehensive picture of the science have caused gleeful headlines on *The Drudge Report* and other skeptical media outlets, the vast weight of the evidence -- from melting glaciers to warming oceans to satellite temperature readings, and much more -- still points to a changing climate caused by human activity.

So why have we heard so much lately about climate-science controversies? One reason is that the stakes are incredibly high: On the one hand, mainstream climate scientists and environmental advocates who believe that there are severe consequences to failing to curb greenhouse-gas emissions; on the other, a loose coalition of skeptical or contrarian scientists, conservatives, industry interests, and outright cranks who may disagree on specific issues, but tend to believe the costs, economic and otherwise, of acting are staggering.

The second reason may be something of a bunker mentality evident at some top climate-research centers. In part because criticisms are so strident, some inside the system have complained that decisions are made by a relatively small circle of mutually supportive insiders. There have been complaints of articles being kept out of scientific journals, or peer comments that haven't been adequately considered. Most reporters aren't qualified to make individual scientific assessments, so they have to take some of what scientists, or their detractors, say at face value. But it is clear that the tensions are running high, and a troubling sense of hostility has long since polarized the debate, even as the real-world evidence of climate change has piled up.

Climate skepticism covers a broad range of views. A first group -- call them the professionals -- has often raised legitimate questions, whether about methodology and transparency, and stuck more or less to a scientific critique about different aspects of climate science. And then there are the shouters, who don't add much more than sensationalism, confusion, and outright deception to the debate. To sort out the noise from the serious concerns, FP is here to help.

## ROSS MCKITRICK

**Who is he?** Economist at the [University of Guelph in Ontario](#); fellow at the [Fraser Institute](#), a free-market think tank

**Chief beef:** the statistics and tree-ring data behind the so-called hockey-stick graph

**Telling quote:** "What the hockey-stick graph did, it created the impression that you can use statistical data from all around the world and derive one big picture -- and that was where they went wrong." —*interview with FP*

**Role:** McKitrick was among the first to take a swipe at the famed "hockey-stick graph," a reconstruction of temperature in the Northern Hemisphere for the [foreignpolicy.com/.../the\\_fp\\_guide\\_to\\_cl...](#)

past 1,000 years that has been featured prominently by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and in Al Gore's movie *An Inconvenient Truth*. The task of assembling the graph, so dubbed because of the dramatic shape of the temperature curve, which rose slowly for centuries then shot upward in recent decades, was a monumental challenge. Modern scientists have thermometer readings from the mid-1800s from across Europe and North America, and after World War II, thermometer readings from around the globe. But for years prior to that, scientists can only infer temperatures using what's called "proxies," such as ice cores or tree rings, whose annual growth can be correlated with annual temperature variations.

The graph resulted from research by climatologists Michael Mann, Raymond Bradley, and Malcolm Hughes that used multiple proxies, including tree rings, coral, ice cores, sediments, and historical records. They found that average temperatures had remained relatively stable for most of the past millennia, but had started to rise steeply around 1900, when the Industrial Revolution kicked into full gear in Europe and North America, with new factories and automobiles pumping new sources of carbon dioxide emissions.

As it attracted more attention from the public and press, their graph also became a target of attack, including from researchers outside the climate community. Beginning in 2003, McKittrick, along with retired Canadian mining executive Stephen McIntyre, began to probe two aspects of the research: the statistical method and the reliability of certain tree-ring samples, which they charged exaggerated the warming effect. McKittrick maintains, "The data and the methods they used meant you couldn't draw conclusions."

Subsequent research, such as by P. Huybers ([pdf](#)) of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, however, found that McKittrick and McIntyre's work was itself flawed, and other peer-reviewed studies affirmed the basic pattern of the original study. Mann et al. have continued to refine their data, including in an article ([pdf](#)) published last November in *Science*.

The debate has attracted a lot of popular attention, but scientists who work in the climate field tend to regard it as an "ink-blot issue." In other words, it's possible to come up with a variety of justifiable methodological choices, as well as endless objections to those choices. A related, and equally endless, debate rages over who has authority to speak on climate issues -- some scientists, including Mann, think an economist has no role picking bones, while others have been more welcoming of critiques from specialists outside the field.

### ROGER PIELKE, JR.\*

**Who is he?** Environmental studies professor at the University of Colorado-Boulder and a fellow of the university's [Cooperative Institute for Research in Environmental Sciences](#); author of *The Honest Broker: Making Sense of Science in Policy and Politics*

**Chief beef:** Hurricanes and the bottom line

**Telling quote:** "We cannot make a causal link between increase in greenhouse gases and the costs of damage associated with hurricanes, floods, and extreme weather phenomena." —*interview with FP*

**Role:** Pielke, whose father is also a scientist and an outspoken critic of the IPCC, is emblematic of just how confusing traditional labels are: For his work questioning certain graphs presented in IPCC reports, Pielke has been accused by some of being a climate change "denier." Meanwhile, for his work on adaptation, he has been accused by others of being an "alarmist."

One of Pielke's main additions to larger climate debate has been participation in studies and workshops that have concluded, in his words, "We cannot make a causal link between increase in greenhouse gases and the costs of damage associated with hurricanes, floods, and extreme weather phenomena." Whereas *An Inconvenient Truth* presented worsening storms as reason to support greenhouse gas mitigation, Pielke thinks that increased costs of disasters in recent years are due to "one overriding factor -- more wealth, more people, more property in harm's way." He took issue with the IPCC for one chart in its **2007 report**, which seemed to imply causation when there was, if anything, only circumstantial evidence in his eyes. "Mine is an argument against using disasters as a justification for greenhouse gas emissions."

But his refutation of what he saw as sloppy logic certainly does not imply skepticism about climate change and the need to take mitigation and adaptation efforts seriously, he insists. In outlets like *The New Republic* and *Yale Environment 360*, Pielke has articulated a more nuanced point of view, often arguing for greater distinctions between debates about scientific integrity and those about public policy. For his part, he thinks, "Climate change is a huge problem, and it's a problem linked to human activity. Greenhouse gases are an important part of that, but it's not only greenhouse gases. And we need to respond accordingly."

**\*Editor's note:** Pielke has informed the editors of *FP* that he strongly objects to being included on a list titled "Climate Skeptics." The aim of the list was, as the introduction states, to separate "the noise from the serious concerns" with regards to those offering critiques of either climate science or institutions charged with presenting climate science to the public or policy-makers; the article was explicitly not intended to equate the viewpoints of all people contained on the list. Pielke has been quoted in the mainstream media voicing concerns about the IPCC, as in today's *Wall Street Journal*, as well as questioning sloppy logic on the part of some environmentalists, for instance [objecting](#) to overstatements about hurricanes being linked to global warming.

### JOHN CHRISTY

**Who is he?** Climate scientist and director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama in Huntsville; fellow of the American Meteorological Society

**Chief beef:** Atmospheric temperature readings

**Telling quote:** "If you want to measure temperatures, the popular surface data sets are not the ones to use." —*interview with FP*

Christy, a lead author for sections of the 2001 IPCC report, is a climatologist who has expressed a minority viewpoint, yet retains the fundamental respect of his peers. In such a polarized debate, that is a rarity.

Christy's concerns center on whether land-surface temperatures or lower-atmospheric temperatures are the most reliable data sources to understand a changing climate. In 1990, he joined with a colleague, Roy Spencer, to use measurements taken by NASA satellites since 1979 to produce the first global atmospheric temperature data. His initial findings showed a lesser degree of warming than most climate models predict, leading him to question those models. However, in 2005, subsequent peer-reviewed studies examining Christy and Spencer's data found that a missing sign and an arithmetic error meant that their findings, if not the insight of using NASA satellite readings, were flawed. An exchange between Christy and Spencer and also the scientific teams of Carl Mears and Frank Wentz, and Steven Sherwood and John Lanzante, played out in the letters of *Science* magazine. This back-and-forth is sometimes cited as an example of how self-correcting science should work.

"I respect him," Pielke says. "I disagree with him, but I respect him."

## RICHARD S. LINDZEN

**Who is he?** Atmospheric physicist and professor of meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; member of the National Academy of Sciences; contributing expert to the free-market Cato Institute and the industry-funded George C. Marshall Institute

**Chief beef:** everything about climate science

**Telling quote:** "Climate science ... may be the first of the physical sciences that has become a part of the political process." —*interview with FP*

Lindzen is a decorated scientist who doesn't think that carbon dioxide has a significant effect on the Earth's temperatures. "If you double carbon dioxide and do nothing else, that only produces 1 degree of warming," he says. He's a distinct minority in the field, and neither his scientist peers who dispute his findings nor the more polemic climate skeptics who find his research useful know what to make of him. He commands respect from some scientists interviewed, even those who disagree with him, despite having worked as a consultant for the coal industry, while others charge he has effectively made the transition from working scientist to professional shill.

His own political leanings are clear (he sees climate advocates as wanting "to roll back industrial society" and an excuse "to redistribute global wealth"). Perhaps ironically, one of his chief conjectures is about how mixing science and politics is detrimental to both, a concern echoed by those with precisely opposite ideological leanings. As the 70-year-old tells it: "Climate science always been a small backwater field, mostly [composed of scientists who] considered themselves atmospheric or oceanic scientists.... It was not a particularly strong field. In the 1960s and 70s, a number of people in the environmental movement began to look to climate as a vehicle [to advance an agenda].... It may be the first of the physical sciences that has become a part of the political process."

## BJORN LOMBORG

**Who is he?** Danish social scientist and professor of business; author of *The Skeptical Environmentalist* and *Cool It*

**Telling quote:** "Climate change is happening, it's man-made, it's a problem, but it's not the end of civilization." —*interview with FP*

**Role:** Lomborg thinks the mainstream global-warming movement doth protest too much. So, too, he believes, do most climate skeptics. "It's unlikely that we will make good policy judgments if we follow either side," he says. "To either deny [climate change] entirely or to say it's the end of mankind -- neither seems to be in accordance with working toward the best solution."

Most climate-change-mitigation advocates have overhyped the science and underdelivered on policy, Lomborg argues. Attempts to reach and enforce binding emissions treaties at U.N. climate summits at Rio de Janeiro, Kyoto, and Copenhagen have disappointed, largely because of the high costs associated with carbon mitigation. And so Lomborg advocates a different approach: "Where do you do most good for each climate-change-fighting dollar you spend -- geo-engineering or R&D on green energy technology?... If you can make solar panels cheaper than fossil fuels by 2040, then people will willingly use them."

His contrarian viewpoint has made him a darling of the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page and other conservative outlets. Yet Lomborg says that his own ideology is "probably left of center, even in Denmark" and wouldn't necessarily make him feel at home at the **Cato Institute**. Most of his critics are on the left, including author Howard Friel, whose recent book *The Lomborg Deception* took him to task for allegedly **playing fast and loose** with sourcing, logic, and footnotes in his books. (Lomborg told *FP* that Friel never contacted him for clarification in the course of writing the book and assumed bad intentions at points of ambiguity. Lomborg has responded at length to Friel's critique [here](#).)

In 2003, Lomborg faced charges of scientific dishonesty that were reviewed by the Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty; their ruling found his work was "contrary to the standards of good scientific practice" but not characterized by "[bad] intent or gross negligence." The controversial finding was later overruled, however, by the Danish Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation.

### FREEMAN DYSON

**Who is he?** Theoretical physicist and mathematician, formerly of the Institute for Advanced Study

**Chief beef:** Whether the potential dangers posed by global warming have been exaggerated

**Telling quote:** "[Climate models] do not begin to describe the real world that we live in. The real world is muddy and messy and full of things that we do not yet understand. It is much easier for a scientist to sit in an air-conditioned building and run computer models, than to put on winter clothes and measure what is really happening outside in the swamps and the clouds. That is why the climate model experts end up believing their own models." —*A Many-Colored Glass: Reflections on the Place of Life in the Universe*

**Role:** Thanks to his prominence as a theoretical physicist and popularizer of science, as well as his leftish political affiliations -- he has long been active in the anti-nuclear movement -- Dyson is seen by many as bringing credibility to climate-change skepticism. The 86-year-old scientist doesn't dispute that carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere are increasing because of human activity, but thinks the warming effect may be exaggerated, and in any case is not necessarily harmful. "The fact that the climate is getting warmer doesn't scare me at all," he has **said**, believing that most places are better off with a warmer climate and that human technology will advance fast enough to offset the worst effects of pollution. Most famously -- or notoriously -- he thinks that "carbon-eating trees" could one day be bioengineered to reduce carbon dioxide levels.

Whatever the scientific truth, which Dyson admits he isn't positive about, he doesn't think that the case for global warming is sufficient to curtail economic development or take resources away from more pressing problems like reducing poverty. Dyson has openly attacked outspoken NASA scientist James Hansen as well as Al Gore, whom he was quoted calling a "propagandist" and "opportunist" in a widely read *New York Times Magazine* **cover story** published in March 2009.

Mainstream scientists mostly dismiss Dyson's views as the eccentricities of an aging scientist well out of his area of expertise. "There are bigger fish to fry than Freeman Dyson," **says** Hansen.

### DOUGLAS KEENAN

**Who is he?** Former London banker, freelance mathematician, and analyst

**Chief beef:** missing data, transparency

**Telling quote:** "The fundamental point, perhaps, is that scientists are human -- which implies that scientific research is a human affair. Transparency and accountability are, in general, prerequisites for integrity in human affairs." —*interview with FP*

**Role:** When scientists raise issue with the work of other scientists, they typically publish concerns in papers in peer-reviewed journals. Not so with Keenan, a former City of London banker, who instead began with fraud accusations.

When attempting to establish an accurate past global temperature record, one question scientists have raised is to what extent the location of meteorological centers might impact or skew data. Specifically, does the fact that temperature readings are most often taken near large population centers -- with "urban heat islands" such as surface parking lots -- skew temperatures upward? A team of researchers, including Phil Jones at the Climatic Research Unit at Britain's University of East Anglia and **Wei-Chyung Wang**, a climatologist at the State University of New York (SUNY)-Albany, published a paper in *Nature* in 1990 that examined this question using data that included readings from multiple Chinese meteorological stations and found the urban heat bias to be minimal. The paper has been cited in IPCC assessments, among other places.

Keenan, now a freelance analyst, wanted to know more about where the data came from. In particular, he was concerned that temperature readings Wang obtained lack backup documentation as to how reliable certain temperature stations in China were, how they had been maintained, and whether their locations had varied over time. Keenan also filed an accusation of scientific fraud with SUNY-Albany, where Wang works -- raising the temperature of the dispute immensely.

One of Keenan's contentions, as he wrote in a letter to Wang's university, was that "when a station moves, the temperature data from before the move is not, in general, directly comparable to the data from after the move." His second, broader concern, as he wrote in an email to *FP*: "Regarding transparency, the data and methods used by scientists should be publicly available."

Since then, Jones has published another peer-reviewed paper largely confirming that the urban heat-island effects were minimal, and last year SUNY-Albany dismissed Keenan's fraud allegations. (Read **the Guardian's story** on this controversy as well as **this rebuttal** on the *RealClimate* blog for more.)

But though Keenan may not have succeeded in discrediting past results, he has raised one salient issue: transparency. Today, the general feeling is that climate scientists must be accountable and able to produce backup data upon request, even if to show that their original conclusions still hold.

### ANTHONY WATTS

**Who is he?** Chief meteorologist at **KPAY radio** in Northern California and blogger at **Watts Up With That?** and **SurfaceStations.org**

**Chief beef:** Reliability of temperature measurement data

**Telling quote:** "The reliability of data used to document temperature trends is of great importance in this debate. We can't know for sure if global warming is a problem if we can't trust the data." —*Is the U.S. Surface Temperature Record Reliable?*, 2009

**Role:** Only in the Internet era could Watts -- a local California weatherman and designer of weather monitoring systems -- become a prominent voice in an ongoing international policy debate. But his *Watts Up With That?* (*WUWT*) has improbably become one of the world's most popular climate-change blogs, and an online poll won it a **Weblog Award** for best science blog in 2008. *WUWT* passes along tidbits of news on the trials and tribulations of the IPCC, as well as weather events that Watts suggests dispute the conventional wisdom of global warming.

But Watts's most significant contribution to the global warming debate may be *WUWT*'s sister site, **SurfaceStations.org**. After raising concerns about the reliability of the monitoring stations that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) relies on to measure the U.S. surface-temperature data used to show warming over time, Watts began to investigate. NOAA specifies that each station be located far from exhaust fans, asphalt, sidewalks, heat-absorbing buildings, or cities. Using his website, Watts recruited more than 650 volunteers to take photos of these stations around the country and document inconsistencies. According to Watts in a **2009 report** documenting his findings, of the 860 stations his team inspected, 89 percent fail to meet NOAA's site requirements.

The study made Watts something of a star in the climate-skeptic community, earning him national press and television appearances. But Watts never crunched the numbers to determine whether the discrepancies mattered. Several months after Watts's report was released, several NOAA scientists published a peer-reviewed study ([pdf](#)) finding that the stations exhibited an "overall residual negative ('cool') bias." Even with the irregularities Watts observed, the authors noted, what mattered was not the spot temperatures but the change over time. Plus, they found, data from only the 70 stations that SurfaceStations.org classified as "good" or better showed warming over time that was similar to the overall data NOAA had been using.

Despite his views on anthropogenic global warming and dislike of environmentalists, Watts **claims to be** a "green" who drives an electric car and has installed solar panels on his house.

### CHRISTOPHER BOOKER

**Who is he?** Columnist for Britain's *Sunday Telegraph*

**Chief beef:** The anti-capitalist implications of climate change legislation

**Telling quote:** "If one accepts the thesis that the planet faces a threat unprecedented in history, the implications are mind-boggling. But equally mind-boggling now are the implications of the price we are being asked to pay by our politicians to meet that threat." —*Sunday Telegraph*, March 25, 2009

**Role:** With its aggressive muckraking style and demonstrably lower standards for accuracy and fact-checking, the British press has become one of the most effective conduits for the global-warming denying movement. The *Times*, *Telegraph*, and *Daily Mail* highlight and promote often misleading stories that contradict the IPCC line on climate change, feeding back into the U.S. media through right-wing blogs and the *Drudge Report* (founder Matt Drudge seems to take particular pleasure in posting reports of blizzards during major climate conferences). But no British writer enjoys infuriating the climate establishment with quite as much relish as the *Telegraph*'s Booker, whose weekly column has become a must-read for climate skeptics.

It was largely Booker who popularized McIntyre's critique of the hockey-stick graph and, more recently, the "**climategate**" scandal. But the IPCC's failings, both real and imagined, were just icing on the cake for Booker, who had previously declared 2008 "the year climate change was disproved" by low temperatures and record snowfalls (scientists say it takes years of data for a trend to be established). Booker, a history major at Cambridge, also frequently attacks the scientific credentials of the IPCC and particularly those of its chairman, Rajendra Pachauri, a "**former railway engineer** with no qualifications in climate science." (Pachauri has a dual Ph.D. in industrial engineering and economics from North Carolina State University.)

What really rankles Booker is the **millions of pounds** spent on efforts to mitigate climate change and the economic effects of environmental legislation. In his 2009 book, *The Real Global Warming Disaster*, Booker argues that environmental restrictions will destroy the Western way of life and put Europe and the United States at an economic disadvantage to Asian countries that have not bought into the climate hype.

Booker has also touted research arguing that **white asbestos is not harmful** and **disputing** that smoking causes cancer. These views have prompted Booker's frequent adversary -- the *Guardian*'s Monbiot -- to create a "**Booker Prize for Bullshit**."

### RICHARD NORTH

**Who is he?** Contributor for the *Telegraph*, blogger for *EU Referendum*, and commentator at the **Bruges Group**, a Euroskeptic British think tank

**Chief beef:** Credibility of climate-change proponents

**Telling quote:** "This is the biggest heist in history. As they poured carbon over snow-covered Denmark from their gas-guzzling jets, world leaders were congratulating themselves on securing a deal which will make their backers and financiers a trillion pounds a year." —*The Daily Mail*, Dec. 22, 2009

**Role:** Like his frequent collaborator Christopher Booker, with whom he was co-authored two books and numerous articles, North combines skepticism about climate change with opposition to the European Union and the British welfare state. North -- not to be confused with **Richard D. North**, another right-wing British journalist and climate-change skeptic -- worked as a research director at the European Parliament and then emerged as one of the most outspoken critics of EU bureaucracy and the effects of EU integration on British businesses.

He **started** the *EU Referendum* blog with fellow Bruges group commentator Helen Szamuely in 2005 with a focus on EU politics. But with the latest controversy over the IPCC, North has begun to focus almost exclusively on climate change. In particular, North has **set his sights** on IPCC chairman Pachauri, **publicizing** his ties to India's Tata group and even the **golf course** owned by his NGO, the **Energy and Resources Institute**.

North is generally not particularly concerned with the science behind climate change, and though he links frequently to science-focused bloggers like Anthony Watts, he is more interested in impugning the credibility of the IPCC and climate-change community. "This is not about science but 'prestige,'" he **writes**. "The only sure way to destroy the scam is to rob the players of that vital quality, their own 'prestige.'"

### CHRISTOPHER MONCKTON

**Who is he?** Third Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, former political advisor, writer

**Chief beef:** The "flawed science" behind anthropogenic global warming and the international left's promotion of it

**Telling quote:** "The right response to the non-problem of 'global warming' is to have the courage to do nothing." —**U.S. congressional testimony**, March 29, 2009

**Role:** In his long and controversial career, Lord Monckton has been a journalist, policy advisor in Margaret Thatcher's government and corporate consultant. Monckton currently serves as policy advisor to the **Science and Public Policy Institute**, an anti-global-warming think tank based in Virginia. A classics major at Cambridge University, Monckton burst onto the climate-change scene in 2006 with a lengthy two-part series in the *Daily Telegraph* written in response to the **Stern Review**, the British government's commissioned report on the economic effects of climate change. Monckton disputed the IPCC's assessment of the science, pointing to what he said were flaws in the controversial "hockey-stick graph." ("There is scarcely a line in Lord Monckton's paper which is not wildly wrong," the *Guardian*'s environmental correspondent George Monbiot **responded**, and **Gavin Schmidt** of NASA's Goddard Institute called it "**cuckoo science**.")

Monckton has since become one of the most popular speakers on the subject, traveling around the world to give **his own version** of Gore's slide-show presentation from *An Inconvenient Truth*. Monckton has repeatedly challenged the former U.S. vice president to a public debate on climate change, which Gore has so far refused to accept. In 2009, Monckton was **invited as an expert** witness to testify before the U.S. House Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment.

Monckton went into overdrive before the U.N. summit in Copenhagen, **arguing that** U.S. President Barack Obama was planning to sign away U.S. sovereignty and that a "world government is going to be created" by the international agreement. Monckton traveled to Copenhagen, speaking on the margins of the conference. As usual, he managed to attract controversy, this time by **comparing** environmental protesters to "Hitler Youth."

Save over 50% when you **subscribe** to FP.

AFP/Getty Images

## COMMENTS (11)

HIDE COMMENTS

LOGIN OR REGISTER

REPORT ABUSE

### OBUSQUETS

10:16 PM ET

February 25, 2010

### Activism

I am not even going to read this article. CHRISTINA LARSON is obviously biased in favor of Climate Change (based on her prior articles in FP), and I like to read objective analyses, not propaganda. I have enjoyed reading FP, but a few months ago, after Carnegie sold it, it has become unbalanced, to the left. I hopes it finds equilibrium again.  
I wonder why Mr Naim, who I admire, and with whom I share nationality, is allowing this to happen.

By the way, the only constant about climate is change.

► **REPLY**

**ITGURU42**

11:26 AM ET  
February 26, 2010

### Haven't you heard?

The new left-wing tactic is based on Scientology's scams. Buy up / take over a respectable publication, and burn up its reputation spewing raw propaganda.

► **REPLY**

**WYSYBACK**

3:55 AM ET  
February 26, 2010

### A "guide"? I do not think so.

Apparently, Roger Pielke Jr. is surprised by your characterization of his views:

<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2010/02/defining-skepticism-down.html>

I do not even think that the quote from him was in fact a quote. It is not "consistent with" his opinions.

► **REPLY**

**BUFFALO09**

4:24 AM ET  
February 26, 2010

### FP Here To Help? Intellectual Insulting/Blatant Dishonesty

To describe the above submission offered by Larson and Keating as dishonest and demagogic would be to promote those terms to the level of respectability. To describe this article as a piece of crap would be to run the risk of a discourse that would never again rise above the excremental.

"The FP Guide to Climate Skeptics"

Can't tell the legitimate concerns from the nonsense? FP is here to help.

FP is here to help.....really??? Yes, we the people who have supported and defended FP's journalistic integrity and honesty are complete idiots and should be grateful that we have been afforded an opportunity to be presented and expected to adhere to the merits of this submission whose work can only be accurately classified as being the perfect example where dishonesty has been practiced in an effort to reinforce selfish personal political ideological appetites. Insulting the intellect of a sizable portion of your subscriber base who utilize objectivity in order to establish a foundation of thought cannot be classified by any fair minded free thinking individual as receiving a form of assistance or in the words of the dishonest contributing authors who insist that their work is actually been presented by FP in an effort to "help" does not warrant any recognition of retaining even a miniscule amount of credibility. In an effort to educate oneself about this issue, researching multiple sources from various backgrounds is required while also acknowledging realities that have occurred regardless of which group benefits as a result of their exposure is mandatory and essential if participating parties involved in discussions are to be considered as being credibly versed in the subject. The blatant practice of dishonesty is consistently evident among groups who choose to ignore realities that have surfaced throughout the debate and by refusing to acknowledge these truths exposes their lack of credibility as their political allegiances that stem from a lack of desire to think for themselves expose the presence of political ideology. The introduction of thought based upon political ideologies regardless of where evolution of thought across the entire spectrum occurred immediately disqualifies the group or organization as being able to engage in productive discussion while ignoring realities is to be perceived as an indirect assault upon the institution of free thought. Therefore, it would only be responsible to categorize FP's self proclaimed climate help guide whose foundation is questionable if non-existent due to the lack of recognition given towards realities whose presence in the debate remain uncontested. The proclaimed help guide warrants excessive scrutiny due to the foundation being solely constructed upon the political ideologies adhered towards by both contributing authors.

I must be a fool to think that recent admissions, occurrences, emails, and reports regarding this issue require recognition and merit discussion if we, members of the community who strive to compose a basis of thought by utilizing objectivity should be expected to accept this fabrication of journalistic fraud whose foundations are evidently lazily influenced and associated with political ideologies; as offered so graciously by FP, this submission is presented in an irresponsible dishonest manner whose insistence demands attention and expects

readers to accept the opinions offered as justifiable non contestable verifiable truths. I have many questions about this issue and have yet to come to a conclusion due to a majority of the information available for research not having been conducted based upon adhering to the merits of scientific integrity, but selfishly promoting personal agendas that stem from the inclusion of political ideologies that should be replaced towards offering the mass public with verifiable truths if scientific capabilities allow. Engaging in childish behavior from both sides of the argument has created a hostile environment that is not conducive towards facilitating an educational resource tool for public education. While I continue to be amused by the labeling by members of the Green Movement who label individuals whether being skeptical or citizens currently engaged in ongoing research as being tagged with the label as being a "skeptic" or perceived in the realm as being a "denier" similar to those whom dismissed the Holocaust. Recent revelations as offered by Phil Jones would suggest that labels should now be applied towards individuals that felt the science had been settled may now be considered as being "duped", "Hoaxed green fundamentalist" or simply "you gullible dumbass" whatever. The name calling on both sides should provide ample evidence that submissions from both scientific groups should be subject to rigorous scrutiny. There may come a day in our future when issues of such a massive scale involving huge global implications which involve scientific collaboration towards gaining knowledge to facilitate learning and provide sound reasoning, however that day might come along unfortunately a long time once we have passed on.

To the editorial staff at Foreign Policy, I offer a challenge to your organization whose journalistic credibility, integrity, and classification as being an institution whose contributions demand merit and honest consideration are all receiving justifiable scrutiny, due to the lack of applying independent thought and disgusting omission of honest realities whose analysis of facts are essential towards accessing the entire spectrum of whatever issue is being discussed in order properly make viable contributions inspired from the institution of free thought. Essentially the challenge would entail offering a submission whose foundation includes contributions from a multiplicity of perspectives across the entire spectrum involving climate change and that would include discussing the ethical merits involving data manipulation and also assessing characteristic traits of individuals from individuals who respectfully dissent from anthropogenic theoretical based proposals and inclusion that questions the integrity of Phil Jones regarding violations involving the designations of the Freedom of Information Act.

Is it too much to offer the constituency who has remained faithful and provided support since the evolution of Foreign Policy as once was considered a resource whose original intent and purpose was created to offer insightful, innovative, educational ideas of a nature where responsible consideration was applied towards offerings involving the serious arena of topics covered in the global area of foreign affairs?

I demand an increased effort on the part of the editorial staff, which used to offer substantive publications whose evolutions were inspired by insightful innovative thought whose topics stimulated and evoked productive thought which at times provided challenges whose purpose involved expanding perspectives, while they also inspired thoughtful, respectful debate and discussion.

Foreign Policy used to be a publication worthy of merit and complimentary recognition as a source of innovative thought, however the recent excessive inclusion of thought based upon political ideologies from either end of the spectrum; I no longer am able to consider this publication of even retaining a minimal level of credibility that is vital for an organization to warrant serious consideration when discussing topics of a nature involving foreign affairs.

To the editorial staff at Foreign Policy, I challenge you to redirect your efforts towards regaining a respectful level of credibility by revisiting and implementing the methods that were incremental towards building a successful organization whose credibility and character until recently, never warranted scrutiny or merit. We demand a publication whose dedication is devoted towards informing and educating through innovation where political influence is only notable on miniscule scales, remaining almost non-existent. I can only hope that FP's dedication towards its subscriber's remains as strong as the dedication we have provided the organization over the past years. Dedication is dependent upon how Foreign Policy decides to operate moving forward and my renewal will be based upon witnessing a positive innovative transition and reversal of gradual trends I have witnessed over the past three years that have tarnished my perception and reputation of FP.

To the editors of Foreign Policy with the honest desire and hope of restoring a once powerful, honest, credible, uncontestable influential .....I dare you to accept the challenge once again return to become a known as the publication that leads .....instead of remaining complacent as a follower whose credibility continues to deteriorate and remain questionable.....

► **REPLY**

**EJT**11:31 AM ET  
February 26, 2010**stop spinning**

You loose all credibility on page 2, where you imply that Mann was vindicated. It has been proven, and stated in a paper by the professional body of US mathematical statisticians, that his key paper was a red-noise to hockey-stick parsing algorithm.

Also, ref. dismissing those who are now attacking politically – this has been necessitated by the media ignoring the legitimate science concerns that have been on record for years now.

▶ **REPLY****NERDENCEMAN**12:15 PM ET  
February 26, 2010**"FP is here to help [by promoting the side we like]."**

This isn't the kind of "help" I was interested in.

▶ **REPLY****RICHARD LAWSON**1:43 PM ET  
February 26, 2010**Thanks ever so much!**

This is probably the most appalling piece of 'journalism' I a have read in a very long time.

You both obviously prefer the nodding donkey style of many modern journalists - you just repeat verbatim what you are told.

How can I put this simply: No one will ever confuse you two with Woodward and Bernstein.

▶ **REPLY****AJSTRATA**2:13 PM ET  
February 26, 2010**The Science Is Destroyed**

Look, there comes a point where you have to a modicum of credibility. The AGW theory is based on the premise CO2 emissions have warmed the planet. One of the obvious proofs would be to show global warming over the last century outside any urbanization effects. I live outside DC and grew up here. I remember when Dulles International Airport was out in the middle of wild forest. It is not surrounded by urbanization. I have no doubt its temperatures have risen as urbanization circled around it and expanded.

So where would we expect to see clear indication of CO2 driven warming without any possible UHI effects? In rural areas with long term measurements.

A paper has just come out comparing rural and urban temp records in the US. It has two very critical graphs: one showing the raw station data and one showing adjustments supposedly applied to adjust for urban heat island effects.

In the raw data we find rural stations basically remain flat, while urban centers warm. Clearly we can conclude there is NO CO2 driven warming since the rural areas are not warming.

But even more damning to the credibility of the adjustments. Instead of removing any urban effect from the urban temps (by cooling them obviously), the so called adjustment to remove UHI actually ADDS IT TO THE RURAL DATA!

<http://strata-sphere.com/blog/index.php/archives/12882>

Come on - this is a HS science level mistake. This is not credible science. How is it an adjustment to remove UHI ends up forcing the non UHI rural data to warm with the urban data? And this doesn't destroy the AGW theory???

▶ **REPLY****FRANK LANSNER**2:35 PM ET  
February 26, 2010**The sceptic A - Z in subjects, see**

[www.hidethedecline.eu](http://www.hidethedecline.eu)  
K.R. Frank

▶ **REPLY****SARA CHAN**3:26 PM ET  
February 26, 2010**Epic Fail**

Steve McIntyre is the world's leading climate skeptic by far, and he is not on the list. So even without reading the FP article, you can tell

that it is a serious failure.

I read the parts for three people: McKittrick, Keenan, Watts.

McKittrick. The authors obviously know very little about the hockey stick. There is a book about this: The Hockey Stick Illusion. It is highly recommended. Especially to imitation journalists who want to write about the topic.

Keenan. The article falsely claims that he did not publish in a peer-reviewed journal. It also links to a bogus criticism on RealClimate, but not to Keenan's web site. Perhaps if the authors had had the tenacity to find Keenan's site (after first learning out to use Google), they would have found his paper.

Watts. The authors obviously did not interview Watts, who would have debunked the criticism. Actually interviewing the person being written about would of course upset their agenda.

I stopped reading after that. I know I made a mistake by reading as much as I did.

► [REPLY](#)

#### SUNDRESSES

4:54 PM ET

February 26, 2010

#### Sundresses

There are always going to be people who won't believe in climate change until they are wearing sundresses in the arctic.

► [REPLY](#)

---

**ABOUT FP:** [MEET THE STAFF](#) | [FOREIGN EDITIONS](#) | [REPRINT PERMISSIONS](#) | [ADVERTISING](#) | [CORPORATE PROGRAMS](#) | [WRITERS' GUIDELINES](#) | [PRESS ROOM](#) | [WORK AT FP](#)

**SERVICES:** [SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES](#) | [ACADEMIC PROGRAM](#) | [FP ARCHIVE](#) | [REPRINT PERMISSIONS](#) | [FP REPORTS AND MERCHANDISE](#) | [SPECIAL REPORTS](#) | [BUY BACK ISSUES](#)

[SUBSCRIBE TO FP](#) | [PRIVACY POLICY](#) | [DISCLAIMER](#) | [RSS FEEDS](#) | [CONTACT US](#)



1899 L STREET NW, SUITE 550 | WASHINGTON, DC 20036 | PHONE: 202-728-7300 | FAX: 202-728-7342

FOREIGN POLICY IS PUBLISHED BY THE SLATE GROUP, A DIVISION OF WASHINGTONPOST.NEWSWEEK INTERACTIVE, LLC

ALL CONTENTS ©2009 WASHINGTONPOST.NEWSWEEK INTERACTIVE, LLC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.