

Google me this....

By Chris Horner

You may have heard about Google's committee to help re-spin and [further spread the 'climate' message](#), presumably in support of expensive and intrusive policies it also advocates -- which depend on widespread acceptance of this very same 'message' -- and Goggle's various [various projects](#) of the variety that are otherwise uneconomic without said policies.

For a *search engine*, of all things, Google's homework was lacking. Or, it is telling.

In addition to consciously selecting Andrew Dessler as one of their advisors -- whose track record includes [curious insistence](#) about non-facts and that *there was [nothing to that ClimateGate](#) thing* -- Google has chosen a lady who pops up with some frequency in those very same [ClimateGate emails](#), Julia Cole of University of Arizona.

At Arizona, Cole is a [colleague](#) of Jonathan Overpeck, to whom the infamous "We have to get rid of the Medieval Warm Period" instruction and similar sentiments have been [attributed](#), and [Hockey Stick](#)-co-author Malcolm Hughes.

We can be pretty sure the email address popping up in the ClimateGate emails, [coleje@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx](#) (search [eastangliaemails.com](#) for 'cole') is the same Julia E. Cole (her AU address begins [jecole@](#)). And of course she's directly cited in a few mails as an Overpeck colleague, and expressly cited as copied in others.

In the ClimateGate emails, Cole is e.g., [cited](#) by Caspar Ammann as a 'human disturbance' type, [to](#) Phil Jones a project partner for purpose of tweaking the IPCC's high-profile work "Working Group I" (WG1), [by](#) Hockey Stick co-author Keith Briffa as a collaborator, as well as [by](#) Hockey Stick lead author Michael Mann, and was one of an apparently like-minded crowd [copied](#) about the looming rollout of RealClimate, among other communications including or citing her.

She's also a [fave](#) of the not overly measured Union of Concerned Scientists.

Quickly searching the emails for the names was the first thing that came to my mind when seeing Goggle's roster. I presume it wasn't one of their considerations.

The illustrative part about this involves the issue of Google skewing search terms, the propriety of which I fully endorse -- however one seeks to skew them -- so long as they do not pretend that they are doing otherwise. Sort of like how it's perfectly fine with me for partisan UK papers the *Guardian* to be as left-wing (or right) as they want, so long as they're largely open about it and don't play cutesy like the *New York Times* or *Washington Post*, denying it.

Somewhere between Google denying its advocacy and publicly, openly promoting their algorithm-and-sifting-as-advocacy (and telling readers *why*, their stake in the matter), we should find the marketplace getting the information out there. So you know what you're dealing with.

So that, if you are so inclined, you might conclude, as Willis Eschenbach [writes](#) in his Open Letter to Google on Watts Up With That:

The problem is, *now Google has a dog in the fight*. You've clearly declared that you're not waiting until the [null climate hypothesis](#) gets falsified. You're not waiting for a [climate anomaly](#) to appear, something that's unlike the historical climate. You have made up your mind and picked your side in the discussion. Here's what that does. Next time I look up something that is climate science related, **I will no longer trust that you are impartial.** No way.

So, Google is an advocate of global warming policies and alarmism. This is reflected, it seems, in their product. This assemblage of climatist cheerleaders further affirms this activism and what the worldview is that underlies it.