

Hi Phil,

Gavin and I have been discussing, we think it will be important for us to do something on the Thompson et al paper as soon as it appears, since its likely that naysayers are going to do their best to put a contrarian slant on this in the blogosphere.

Would you mind giving us an advance copy. We promise to fully respect Nature's embargo (i.e., we wouldn't post any article until the paper goes public) and we don't expect to in any way be critical of the paper. We simply want to do our best to **help make sure that the right message is emphasized.**

thanks in advance for any help!

mike — Michael E. Mann Associate Professor Director, Earth System Science Center (ESSC)"

---

*From: Phil Jones*

*To: "Michael E. Mann"*

*Subject: HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL*

*Date: Thu Jul 8 16:30:16 2004*

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

*Cheers*

*Phil*

---

Dear All,

This has been passed along to me by someone whose identity will remain in confidence.

Who knows what trickery has been pulled or selective use of data made. Its clear that "Energy and Environment" is being run by the baddies--only a shill for industry would have republished the original Soon and Baliunas paper as submitted to "Climate Research" without even editing it. Now apparently they're at it again...

My suggested response is:

1) **to dismiss this as stunt, appearing in a so-called "journal" which is already known to have defied standard practices of peer-review. It is clear, for example, that nobody we know has been asked to "review" this so-called paper**

2) to point out the claim is nonsense since the same basic result has been obtained by numerous other researchers, using different data, elementary compositing techniques, etc.

Who knows what sleight of hand the authors of this thing have pulled. Of course, the usual suspects are going to try to peddle this crap. The important thing is to deny that this has any intellectual credibility whatsoever and, if contacted by any media, to dismiss this for the stunt that it is..

Thanks for your help,

mike

two people have a forthcoming 'Energy & Environment' paper that's being unveiled tomorrow (monday) that -- in the words of one Cato / Marshall/ CEI type -- "will claim that Mann arbitrarily ignored paleo data within his own record and substituted other data for missing values that dramatically affected his results. When his exact analysis is rerun with all the data and with no data substitutions, two very large warming spikes will appear that are greater than the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Personally, I'd offer that this was known by most people who understand Mann's methodology: it can be quite sensitive to the input data in the early centuries. Anyway, there's going to be a lot of noise on this one, and knowing Mann's very thin skin I am afraid he will react strongly, unless he has learned (as I hope he has) from the past..."

Professor Michael E. Mann  
Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall  
University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, VA 22903

---

From: "Michael E. Mann"  
To: Phil Jones ,rbradley@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx,  
mhughes@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx,srutherford@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx,tcrowley@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx  
Subject: Re: Fwd: Soon & Baliunas  
Date: Tue, 11 Mar 2003 08:14:49 -0500  
Cc: k.briffa@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx,jto@u.arizona.edu,drdendro@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx,  
keith.alverson@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx,mmacrac@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx,jto@u.arizona.edu,  
mann@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx

Thanks Phil,

(Tom: Congrats again!)

The Soon & Baliunas paper couldn't have cleared a 'legitimate' peer review process anywhere. That leaves only one possibility--that the peer-review process at Climate Research has been hijacked by a few skeptics on the editorial board. And it isn't just De Frietas, unfortunately I think this group also includes a member of my own department...

The skeptics appear to have staged a 'coup' at "Climate Research" (it was a mediocre journal to begin with, but now its a mediocre journal with a definite 'purpose'). Folks might want to check out the editors and review editors: [1] <http://www.int-res.com/journals/cr/crEditors.html>

In fact, Mike McCracken first pointed out this article to me, and he and I have discussed this a bit. I've cc'd Mike in on this as well, and I've included Peck too. I told Mike that I believed our only choice was to ignore this paper. They've already achieved what they wanted--the claim of a peer-reviewed paper. There is nothing we can do about that now, but the last thing we want to do is bring attention to this paper, which will be ignored by the community on the whole...

It is pretty clear that thee skeptics here have staged a bit of a coup, even in the presence of a number of reasonable folks on the editorial board (Whetton, Goodess, ...). My guess is that Von Storch is actually with them (frankly, he's an odd individual, and I'm not sure he isn't himself somewhat of a skeptic himself), and without Von Storch on their side, they would have a very forceful personality promoting their new vision.

There have been several papers by Pat Michaels, as well as the Soon & Baliunas paper, that couldn't get published in a reputable journal.

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?

mike

---

From: Phil Jones  
To: Andrew Manning  
Subject: Re: Fwd: Co2 Data  
Date: Tue Oct 6 08:38:04 2009

Andrew,

Getting a bit fed up with these baseless allegations.

You could point out several things to Martin.

1. Projections aren't made with observed data - instrumental or paleo. They are made with climate models.
2. The initial seed for all these allegations is made on Climate Audit. Here they are quite clever and don't go over the top. They leave it to others like the National Review, the American Thinker to make the ridiculous ones.

Here is what Stephen McIntyre says on Climate Audit. "While there is much to criticise in the handling of this data by the authors and the journals, the results do not in any way show that 'AGW is a fraud' nor that this particular study was a 'fraud'.

McIntyre has no interest in publishing his results in the peer-review literature. IPCC won't be able to assess any of it unless he does. You dad and Susan Solomon have had runs in with him and others

3. You might like to send him this pdf and its Figure 2. Three different groups get much the same result.

Here are the two web pages we have put up so far. Keith is working on the tree one and put much more later in the week.

[1] <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/data/availability/>

So other groups around the world have also entered into agreements. I know this doesn't make it right, but it is the way of the world with both instrumental and paleo data. I frequently try and get data from other people without success, sometimes from people who send me the pdf of their paper then tell me they can't send me the series in their plots.

[2] <http://www.cru.uea.ac.uk/cru/people/briffa/yamal2000/>

It is the right wing web sites doing all this, presumably in the build up to Copenhagen.

---

At 00:13 06/10/2009, Andrew Manning wrote:

Hi Phil,

is this another witch hunt (like Mann et al.)? How should I respond to the below? (I'm in the process of trying to persuade Siemens Corp. (a company with half a million employees in 190 countries!) to donate me a little cash to do some CO2 measurements here in the UK - looking promising, so the last thing I need is news articles calling into question (again) observed temperature increases - I thought we'd moved the debate beyond this, but seems that these sceptics are real die-hards!!).

Kind regards,

Andrew

---

Date: Mon, 5 Oct 2009 15:50:38 +0100

Subject: Co2 Data

From: Martin Lutyens

To: Andrew Manning

Dear Andrew,

I just came across an article in The Week, called "The case of the vanishing data". It writes in a rather wry and sceptical way about your UEA colleagues Phil Jones and Tom Wigley, saying that only their "homogenised" or "adjusted" historical data is available, and the original, raw data has gone missing. Apparently some other environmental gurus now want to look at the original data and were "fobbed off".

According to the article, the adjusted data forms the basis for much of the climate change debate and, because others now want to look at the source data, it is "at the centre of an academic spat that could have major implications for the climate change debate". The author of the original article is Patrick Michaels in The National Review, who may just be stirring it.

The article concludes "In short, the data invoked to verify the most significant forecasts about the world's future, have simply vanished." Could you comment on this please, as someone (eg Siemens Corp.) may pick this up and I think we should all be forearmed by knowing what really happened and what to say if asked.

Many thanks, Martin