


# Coordinated attack on broadcast and forecast meteorologists


January 21 10:41 AM

by Joe D'Aleo, Weatherbell

The AGW theories are failing global warming became climate change became climate disruption. NONE of the model forecasts are verifying as we have not warmed for 13 years and sea levels are falling, ocean heat content steady or down, climate change model hot spots are missing, global hurricane activity at a 30 year low, etc. Their focus keeps changing - most recently to the extreme events associated with a super La Nina as proof. They are manipulating data. For example.




Or Darwin Australia before and after Hansen adjusted.



They are shameless.

I did a 40 page peer review paper outlining many other such fabrications. An [early version](#), later enhanced, trimmed down and corrected with peer comments appeared in a peer review Elsevier book Evidence Based Climate Change (one of 4 papers I authored or co-authored there).




When the satellite started showing sea levels falling,



they added an adjustment to account for the land rising after the Little Ice Age that reversed it.



When we argued about the Medieval Warm Period being warm and natural suggesting the chance this was too, the hockey stick was born, when the 1940s warm blip was cited, they adjusted the data to cool off the 1930s and warm the recent decades. In one of the climategate emails, Wigley suggested cooling the oceans (71% of the earth's surface) by 0.15C around 1940 would help do that and still escape scrutiny as being plausible.

When the weather balloons and satellites did not show the warming at 200mb in the tropics that the greenhouse models, they claimed the balloons and satellites must be wrong. A UK scientist said they were not basing their advice on data but on the models.





When the tropical oceans showed no long term trend in temperatures in the region that is the source for much of the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, they claimed the heat was hiding in the deep ocean where we could not measure it.



In *As When Prophecies Fail*, Leon Festinger found that as cultists prophecies fail, denial then in some cases increasing efforts to try and convince other they were right, their forecast events are simply being delayed, and their attacks can become more frantic and vicious. That is occurring now

See [Forecast the Facts](#), and the [League of Conservation Voters Campaign](#). The AMS is having its annual meeting with broadcasters under the gun as they have been in recent years with subtle pressure about Seals and heavy duty education campaigns using Kevin Trenberth and other misguided scientists.

One former TV met responded well:

*As a former t.v. seal holding member of the AMS, I can only say that this initiative is deplorable and smacks of the "re-education" of Macedonians to integrate them into Bulgarian society. In a similar vein, the Nazis claimed that concentration camps were social "re-education" centers.*

*In addition to the idea of your re-education plan being reprehensible, the scientific basis upon which this initiative is placed is tenuous at best. Thanks to the exposure of blatant data manipulation on the part of NASA GISS, as well as the multitude of revelations of scientific misdeeds on the part of prominent AGW proponents exposed by the HADCRU emails, it has become quite evident that the AGW argument is false. To think that the AMS feels compelled to forcefully perpetuate this crumbling myth through its' most visible members is disgusting. To think that a formerly great organization has been reduced to this...pitiful.*

I was a councilor of the AMS in the 2003-2007 time frame. I was elected by my peers with intentions to try and help improve the value of the organization for the operational meteorologists in broadcast and industry. Instead I found myself trying to defend a balanced position on climate change. I suggested they society should advocate good science and let the chips fall as they may instead of advocating a position and public policy (advocacy unbelievably is actually the #3 goal of the AMS). See Dr. Gray's rant on the AMS [here](#).

## TRENBERTH'S NEW CLOTHES



This is all the result of the fact that the academic community and society has benefited hugely from the multi-billion dollar funding of the AGW position by biased political parties (both to some degree). They fall back on the corrupt UN IPCC for support. I could tell you stories that could curl your hair.

Instead of funding research into areas that would help us understand the real causes of climate and improve modeling, we have funded ridiculous studies into impact of assumed climate change even outside meteorology in areas like sociology, biology, botany, psychology, and on and on. As long as they mentioned AG in their proposal their checks are in the mail and papers assured publication.

I have heard on the other hand from many of the greatest scientific minds in the country in our field, they are being shut out from funding because they don't tow the line on AGW. In one case, the scientist who has done landmark work, may have to return to his homeland as he can't afford to live here.

When I was a college professor, I believed in teaching people how to think not what to think. That is no longer the case in many schools at all levels.

The AMS is especially frustrated with the broadcasters because they saw them as their voice to convince a skeptical public they need to endorse the big spending renewable energy and carbon control regulatory efforts the environmental whackos are pushing. I consider myself an environmentalist in the traditional sense. I conserve energy, recycle, and believe in a clean environment and sensible steps to make it even cleaner and safer. I am all for finding new more efficient sources of energy but not subsidizing failed ones. The private market place will succeed if left to its own.

But I don't believe bird cuisinards and solar farms can be anything more than supplemental and local sources but that we need to exploit the natural gas and coal and oil riches we are blessed with to lower the gas end energy costs for all Americans. The enviros claim their solution will make us energy independent and will save our planet and save money. But even as the administration from top to bottom has admitted - energy costs were bound to skyrocket. High energy costs are a hidden regressive tax - affecting low and middle income most.

In a future longer post, I will outline all the ways the AGW models have failed and how natural factors can be used to explain all the ups and downs on the long term as they do on the seasonal basis.

By the way just like the MSM has in recent articles defending climategate scientists or promoting extremes as proof of AGW, the AMS will throw at the broadcasters at the conference this week the "...97% agree why don't you" argument.

FYI: here is the basis of that number - a survey conducted at UIL

With 3146 individuals completing the survey, the participant response rate for the survey was 30.7%. This is a typical response rate for Web-based surveys [*Cook et al.*, 2000; *Kaplowitz et al.*,

2004]. Of our survey participants, 90% were from U.S. institutions and 6% were from Canadian institutions; the remaining 4% were from institutions in 21 other nations. More than 90% of participants had Ph.D.s, and 7% had master's degrees. With survey participants asked to select a single category, the most common areas of expertise reported were geochemistry (15.5%), geophysics (12%), and oceanography (10.5%). General geology, hydrology/hydrogeology, and paleontology each accounted for 5–7% of the total respondents.

Approximately 5% of the respondents were climate scientists, and 8.5% of the respondents indicated that more than 50% of their peer-reviewed publications in the past 5 years have been on the subject of climate change. While respondents' names are kept private, the authors noted that the survey included participants with well-documented dissenting opinions on global warming theory.

Results show that overall, 90% of participants answered "risen" to question 1 (HAS IT WARMED SINCE 1980) and 82% answered yes to question 2 (HAS MAN PLAYED A ROLE). In general, as the level of active research and specialization in climate science increases, so does agreement with the two primary questions (Figure 1). In our survey, the most specialized and knowledgeable respondents (with regard to climate change) are those who listed climate science as their area of expertise and who also have published more than 50% of their recent peer-reviewed papers on the subject of climate change (**79 individuals in total**). Of these specialists, 96.2% (76 of 79) answered "risen" to question 1 and 97.4% (75 of 77) answered yes to question 2. This is in contrast to results of a recent Gallup poll.

Both Joe and I would have probably answered yes to both non questions - since surely we have warmed since the Little Ice Age and man through UHI, land use changes, deforestation has effects on the climate (mainly local).

So when you hear the 97% think of it like most of the other claims as bogus and meaningless. There real objectives in most cases are financial and social. Want evidence?

## CONVICTED BY THEIR OWN WORDS

*"No matter if the science is all phoney, there are collateral environmental benefits...Climate change provides the greatest chance to bring about justice and equality in the world"* Christine Stewart, former Minister of the Environment of Canada, quoted from the Calgary Herald, 1999

*"We've got to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing, in terms of economic policy and environmental policy."* Timothy Wirth quoted in Science Under Siege by Michael Fumento, 1993

*Urgent and unprecedented environmental and social changes challenge **scientists to define a new social contract... a commitment on the part of all scientists to devote their energies and talents to the most pressing problems of the day, in proportion to their importance, in exchange for public funding.***" Jane Lubchenco, Current NOAA Administrator, from 1997 AAAS presidential address



*“Isn’t the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn’t it our responsibility to bring this about?” Maurice Strong, Rio Summit 1992*

*“One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy.” Instead, climate change policy is about how “we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth...” UN IPCC’s Ottmar Edenhofer.*