



Climategate: the final nail in the coffin of 'Anthropogenic Global Warming'?

By [James Delingpole Politics](#) Last updated: November 20th, 2009

[478 Comments](#) [Comment on this article](#)

If you own any shares in alternative energy companies I should start dumping them NOW. The conspiracy behind the Anthropogenic Global Warming myth (aka AGW; aka ManBearPig) has been suddenly, brutally and quite deliciously exposed after [a hacker broke into the computers at the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit](#) (aka Hadley CRU) and released 61 megabytes of confidential files onto the internet. (Hat tip: [Watts Up With That](#))

When you read some of those files – including 1079 emails and 72 documents – you realise just why the boffins at Hadley CRU might have preferred to keep them confidential. As [Andrew Bolt](#) puts it, this scandal could well be “the greatest in modern science”. These alleged emails – supposedly exchanged by some of the most prominent scientists pushing AGW theory – suggest:

Conspiracy, collusion in exaggerating warming data, possibly illegal destruction of embarrassing information, organised resistance to disclosure, manipulation of data, private admissions of flaws in their public claims and much more.

One of the alleged emails has a gentle gloat over the death in 2004 of John L Daly (one of the first climate change sceptics, founder of the [Still Waiting For Greenhouse](#) site), commenting:

“In an odd way this is cheering news.”

But perhaps the most damaging revelations – the scientific equivalent of the Telegraph's MPs' expenses scandal – are those concerning the way Warmist scientists may variously have manipulated or suppressed evidence in order to support their cause.

Here are a few tasters. (So far, we can only refer to them as alleged emails because – though Hadley CRU's director Phil Jones has confirmed the break-in to [Ian Wishart at the Briefing Room](#) – he has yet to fess up to any specific contents.) But if genuine, they suggest dubious practices such as:

Manipulation of evidence:

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.

Private doubts about whether the world really is heating up:

The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't. The CERES data published in the August BAMS 09 supplement on 2008 shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate.

Suppression of evidence:

Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4?

Keith will do likewise. He's not in at the moment – minor family crisis.

Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same? I don't have his new email address.

We will be getting Caspar to do likewise.

Fantasies of violence against prominent Climate Sceptic scientists:

Next

time I see Pat Michaels at a scientific meeting, I'll be tempted to beat the crap out of him. Very tempted.

Attempts to disguise the inconvenient truth of the Medieval Warm Period (MWP):

.....Phil and I have recently submitted a paper using about a dozen NH records that fit this category, and many of which are available nearly 2K back—I think that trying to adopt a timeframe of 2K, rather than the usual 1K, addresses a good earlier point that Peck made w/ regard to the memo, that it would be nice to try to “contain” the putative “MWP”, even if we don't yet have a hemispheric mean reconstruction available that far back....

And, perhaps most reprehensibly, a long series of communications discussing **how best to squeeze dissenting scientists out of the peer review process**. How, in other words, to create a scientific climate in which anyone who disagrees with AGW can be written off as a crank, whose views do not have a scrap of authority.

“This was the danger of always criticising the skeptics for not publishing in the “peer-reviewed literature”. Obviously, they found a solution to that—take over a journal! So what do we do about this? I think we have to stop considering “Climate Research” as a legitimate peer-reviewed journal. Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues in the climate research community to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal. We would also need to consider what we tell or request of our more reasonable colleagues who currently sit on the editorial board... What do others think?”

“I will be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor.”“It results from this journal having a number of editors. The responsible one for this is a well-known skeptic in NZ. He has let a few papers through by Michaels and Gray in the past. I've had words with Hans von Storch about this, but got nowhere. Another thing to discuss in Nice !”

Hadley CRU has [form in this regard](#). In September – I wrote the story up here as “How the global warming industry is based on a massive lie” – Hadley CRU's researchers were exposed as having “cherry-picked” data in order to support their untrue claim that global temperatures had risen higher at the end of the 20th century than at any time in the last millenium. Hadley CRU was also the organisation which – in contravention of all acceptable behaviour in the international scientific community – spent years withholding data from researchers it deemed unhelpful to its cause. This matters because Hadley CRU, established in 1990 by the Met Office, is a government-funded body which is supposed to be a model of rectitude. Its HadCrut record is one of the four official sources of global temperature data used by the IPCC.

I asked in my title whether this will be the final nail in the coffin of Anthropogenic Global Warming. This was wishful thinking, of course. In the run up to Copenhagen, we will see more and more hysterical (and grotesquely exaggerated) stories [such as this](#) in the Mainstream Media. And we will see ever-more-virulent campaigns conducted by eco-fascist activists, such as this risible new advertising campaign by Plane Stupid showing [CGI polar bears falling from the sky and exploding](#) because kind of, like, man, that's sort of what happens whenever you take another trip on an aeroplane.

The world is currently cooling; electorates are increasingly reluctant to support eco-policies leading to more oppressive regulation, higher taxes and higher utility bills; the tide is turning against Al Gore's Anthropogenic Global Warming theory. The so-called “sceptical” view is now also the majority view.

Unfortunately, we've a long, long way to go before the public mood (and scientific truth) is reflected by our policy makers. There are too many vested interests in AGW, with far too much to lose either in terms of reputation or money, for this to end

without a bitter fight.

But if the Hadley CRU scandal is true, it's a blow to the AGW lobby's credibility which is never likely to recover.

Tags: [AGW](#), [Andrew Bolt](#), [Climategate](#), [Hadley CRU](#), [ManBearPig](#), [scandal](#)

  Text size  [Share this article](#)  [Print this article](#)  [Mail this article](#)

     [Recent Posts](#)

- [Climate change has nothing to do with the Holocaust or 9/11](#)
November 21st, 2009 15:51
[59 Comments](#)
- [Climategate: how the MSM reported the greatest scandal in modern science](#)
November 21st, 2009 12:25
[172 Comments](#)
- [Climategate: the final nail in the coffin of 'Anthropogenic Global Warming'?](#)
November 20th, 2009 13:54
[478 Comments](#)
- [How Al Gore's amen corner Newsweek censored his critics](#)
November 17th, 2009 11:27
[37 Comments](#)
- [Architectural magazine's editor questions Global Warming: hysteria ensues](#)
November 16th, 2009 16:54
[22 Comments](#)

COMMENTS

- Feels like you're perched on top of a rocket James – thrilling stuff!



yaosxx on Nov 20th, 2009 at 2:03 pm

[Report comment](#)

- @yaosxx Yep. I was feeling that way in Brussels at Roger Helmer's sceptics conference on Wednesday. It's a journalist's dream: having the weight of evidence on your side and the public mood behind you, yet simultaneously being in the position where you're thought of as some bold, maverick contrarian flying in the face of the Establishment.



James Delingpole on Nov 20th, 2009 at 2:05 pm

[Report comment](#)

- maybe the tide will turn – yesterday we had the interview on David Bellamy (I sent you that message) in DT – he's been ignored for ages because of his anti CC views so maybe that was a sign!



yaosxx on Nov 20th, 2009 at 2:07 pm

[Report comment](#)

- The big question is will DT give you the opportunity to do a bigger spread??



yaosxx on Nov 20th, 2009 at 2:09 pm

[Report comment](#)