




Michael E. Mann
Departments of Meteorology and
Geosciences; Earth and Environmental
Systems Institute
Penn State University

Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ
Sep 5, 2012

The scientific case is relatively straightforward.

The “greenhouse effect” has been known for two centuries.



Joseph Fourier

1827



John Tyndall

1859



Svante Arrhenius

1896



Guy Callendar


1939

FOSSIL FUEL BURNING




Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide

Measured at Mauna Loa, Hawaii



WARMING **TEMPERATURES**

Indicators of a Warming World




MODELS


Climate Models



Hansen's 1988 Predictions




Hansen's 1988 Predictions




Observed/Predicted Climate Trends

With Natural Factors Only



Observed/Predicted Climate Trends

With Natural *and* Human Factors




Projections of the Future



The pathways we choose.

Projections of the Future

Predicted Surface Warming Under Varying Emissions Scenarios















WHY NO ACTION?



FRANK LUNTZ MEMO, 2002



WINNING THE GLOBAL WARMING DEBATE - AN OVERVIEW

Please keep in mind the following communication recommendations as you address global warming in general, particularly as Democrats and opinion leaders attack President Bush over Kyoto.

1. ***The scientific debate remains open.*** Voters believe that there is *no consensus* about global warming within the scientific community. Should the public come to believe that the scientific issues are settled, their views about global warming will change accordingly. Therefore, *you need to continue to make the lack of scientific certainty a primary issue in the debate*, and defer to scientists and other experts in the field.
2. ***Americans want a free and open discussion.*** Even though Democrats savaged President Bush for formally withdrawing from the Kyoto accord, the truth is that none of them would have actually voted to ratify the treaty, and they were all glad to see it die. Emphasize the importance of *"acting only with all the facts in hand"* and *"making the right decision, not the quick decision."*
3. ***Technology and innovation are the key in arguments on both sides.*** Global warming alarmists use American superiority in technology and innovation quite effectively in responding to accusations that international agreements such as the Kyoto accord could cost the United States billions. Rather than condemning corporate America the way most environmentalists have done in the past, they attack their us for lacking faith in our collective ability to meet any economic challenges presented by environmental changes we make. This should be our argument. *We need to emphasize how voluntary innovation and experimentation are preferable to bureaucratic or international intervention and regulation.*
4. ***The "international fairness" issue is the emotional home run.*** Given the chance, Americans will demand that all nations be part of any international global warming treaty. Nations such as China, Mexico and India would have to sign such an agreement for the majority of Americans to support it.
5. ***The economic argument should be secondary.*** Many of you will want to focus on the higher prices and lost jobs that would result from complying with Kyoto, but you can do better. Yes, when put in specific terms (food and fuel prices, for example) on an individual-by-individual basis, this argument does resonate. Yes, the fact that Kyoto would hurt the economic well being of seniors and the poor is of particular concern. However, the economic argument is less effective than each of the arguments listed above.

FRANK LUNTZ MEMO, 2002



WINNING THE GLOBAL WARMING DEBATE – AN OVERVIEW

1. *The scientific debate remains open.* Voters believe that there is *no consensus* about global warming within the scientific community. Should the public come to believe that the scientific issues are settled, their views about global warming will change accordingly. Therefore, *you need to continue to make the lack of scientific certainty a primary issue in the debate*, and defer to scientists and other experts in the field.

3. *Technology and innovation are the key to arguments on both sides.* Global warming alarmists use American superiority in technology and innovation quite effectively in responding to accusations that international agreements such as the Kyoto accord could cost the United States billions. Rather than condemning corporate America the way most environmentalists have done in the past, they attack their us for lacking faith in our collective ability to meet any economic challenges presented by environmental changes we make. This should be our argument. We need to emphasize how *voluntary* innovation and experimentation are preferable to bureaucratic or international intervention and regulation.


4. *The "international fairness" issue is the emotional home run.* Given the chance, Americans will demand that all nations be part of any international global warming treaty. Nations such as China, Mexico and India would have to sign such an agreement for the majority of Americans to support it.

5. *The economic argument should be secondary.* Many of you will want to focus on the higher prices and lost jobs that would result from complying with Kyoto, but you can do better. Yes, when put in specific terms (food and fuel prices, for example) on an individual-by-individual basis, this argument does resonate. Yes, the fact that Kyoto would hurt the economic well being of seniors and the poor is of particular concern. However, the economic argument is less effective than each of the arguments listed above.






SENATOR JAMES INHOFE, (R) OKLAHOMA

A portrait of Senator James Inhofe, a man with short grey hair, wearing a dark suit, white shirt, and a red tie with small white dots. He is smiling slightly. In the background, an American flag is visible on the left, and a bookshelf is on the right. The image has a dark overlay.

“With all of the hysteria, all of the fear, all of the phony science, could it be that man-made global warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the American people? It sure sounds like it.”


SENATOR JAMES INHOFE, (R) OKLAHOMA

Proxy Reconstructions of Past Climate



source: Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, Houghton, J.T., et al. (eds.), Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2001

Hockey League



THE POLITICIZATION OF SCIENCE

THE SCIENTIZATION OF POLITICS

CONGRESSMAN JOE BARTON, (R) TEXAS

The Committee on Energy and Commerce
U.S. House of Representatives
Joe Barton, Chairman
Fax Transmission

2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-2927
Fax: (202) 225-1919

To: Dr. Michael Mann
From: The Honorable Ed Whitfield, Chairman, Subcommittee
on Oversight and Investigations
Fax: 434-982-2137
Date: June 23, 2005
Phone: 434-924-7770
Pages: 5, including cover
Notes: Hard copy to follow by U.S. Mail.

VICE CHAIRMAN
 FRED LIFTON, MICHIGAN
 CLIFF STEARNS, FLORIDA
 PAUL E. GILLMOR, OHIO
 NATHAN DEAL, GEORGIA
 ED WHITFIELD, KENTUCKY
 CHARLIE NORWOOD, GEORGIA
 BARBARA CUBIN, WYOMING
 JOHN SHIMKUS, ILLINOIS
 HEATHER WILSON, NEW MEXICO
 JOHN D. SHADDESS, ARIZONA
 CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING, MISSISSIPPI
 VICE CHAIRMAN
 VITO FOSSILLA, NEW YORK
 ROY BLUNT, MISSOURI
 STEVE BUYER, INDIANA
 GEORGE RACANOVICH, CALIFORNIA
 CHARLES F. BASS, NEW HAMPSHIRE
 JOSEPH R. PITTS, PENNSYLVANIA
 MARY BONO, CALIFORNIA
 GREG WALDEN, OREGON
 LEE TERRY, NEBRASKA
 MIKE PENCE, NEW JERSEY
 MIKE ROGERS, MICHIGAN
 CL. "BUTCH" OTTER, IDAHO
 SUE MYRICK, NORTH CAROLINA
 JOHN SULLIVAN, OKLAHOMA
 TIM MURPHY, PENNSYLVANIA
 MICHAEL C. BURGESS, TEXAS
 MARSHA SLACKDORN, TENNESSEE

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

U.S. House of Representatives
 Committee on Energy and Commerce
 Washington, DC 20515-6115

JOE BARTON, TEXAS
 CHAIRMAN

June 23, 2005

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
 EDWARD J. MARKEY, MASSACHUSETTS
 RICK BOUCHER, VIRGINIA
 EDOLPHUS TOWNS, NEW YORK
 FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY
 SHEPHERD BROWN, OHIO
 BART GORDON, TENNESSEE
 BOBBY L. RUSH, ILLINOIS
 ANNA G. ESHOO, CALIFORNIA
 BART STUPAK, MICHIGAN
 ELIOT L. ENGEL, NEW YORK
 ALBERT R. WYNN, MARYLAND
 GENE GREEN, TEXAS
 TED STRICKLAND, OHIO
 DIANA DRETTI, COLORADO
 LOIS CAPPS, CALIFORNIA
 MIKE DOYLE, PENNSYLVANIA
 TOM ALLEN, MAINE
 JIM DAVIS, FLORIDA
 JAY SCHAKOWSKY, ILLINOIS
 ELIDA L. SOLIS, CALIFORNIA
 CHARLES A. GONZALEZ, TEXAS
 JAY INSLEE, WASHINGTON
 TAMMY BALDWIN, WISCONSIN
 MIKE ROSS, ARKANSAS

To: RUD ALDRIGHT, STAFF DIRECTOR
 From:
 Fax:
 Date:
 Phone:
 Page:
 Notes:

Dr. Michael Mann
 Assistant Professor
 Department of Environmental Sciences
 University of Virginia
 Charlottesville, VA 22904

Dear Dr. Mann:

Questions have been raised, according to a February 14, 2005 article in *The Wall Street Journal*, about the significance of methodological flaws and data errors in your studies of the historical record of temperatures and climate change. We understand that these studies of temperature proxy records (tree rings, ice cores, corals, etc.) formed the basis for a new finding in the 2001 United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Third Assessment Report (TAR). This finding – that the increase in 20th century northern hemisphere temperatures is “likely to have been the largest of any century during the past 1,000 years” and that the “1990s was the warmest decade and 1998 the warmest year” – has since been referenced widely and has become a prominent feature of the public debate surrounding climate change policy.



Alan I. Leshner
Chief Executive Officer and
Executive Publisher, Science

The Honorable Joe
Barton, Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On behalf of
general science and
deep concern about
Mann, Malcom K.



8 August 2005

The Honorable Joe Barton
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
U.S. House of Representatives
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Barton:

We are the Presidents of the two
scientists engaged in climate research. However, we write today not primarily about climate
research, but about the deleterious effects your requests to Drs. Mann, Hughes, and Bradley, and
the National Science Foundation could have on the quality of science and its utility to you in the
public policy process.

nature

www.nature.com/nature

Vol 436 | Issue no. 7047 | 7 July 2005

Climate of distrust

Six months into President George W. Bush's second term of office, partisan politics continues to widen the gulf between researchers and the administration.

The story has become so familiar that new twists in the plot cease to outrage. Time after time, in agency after agency, political factors have prevented US science from serving its time-honoured role in informing government decisions.

In one of the latest examples, Congressman Joe Barton (Republican, Texas) has asked three climate researchers, along with the heads of the National Science Foundation and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), for background information on certain palaeoclimate research. On the surface, such a request seems natural. The congressman heads the House of Representatives' Committee on Energy and Commerce, which deals with environmental matters, among other topics.

But dig a little deeper and you find Joe Barton is not known as a friend of the environment. His home town's newspaper, *The Dallas Morning News*, nicknamed him 'Snokey Joe' for his efforts to exempt cement plants in his district from stricter anti-smoke rules. This spring

questioning and overthrowing of currently accepted ideas, and the detail of Mann and colleagues' work has itself been debated within the climate community. Barton, in contrast, has chosen to cherry-pick selected information on the hockey-stick work, using an article from *The Wall Street Journal* as his scientific guide.

Even President George Bush, in widely reported comments last weekend, now accepts that humans are contributing to climate change. But by requesting information on research that does not fit his world view, Barton seems determined to use his political influence to put pressure on the scientific process.

Questions remain over how this might affect scientists' contributions to the next IPCC.

"Congressman Barton has chosen to cherry-pick selected information, using an article from *The Wall Street Journal* as his guide."

The New York Times

Editorials/Op-Ed

EDITORIAL

Houses Divided on Warming

Published: July 23, 2005

It's going to be hard enough to find common political ground on global warming without the likes of Representative Joe Barton harassing scientists who helped alert the world to the problem in the first place.

EDITORIAL
Hunting Witches

The Washington Post

Saturday, July 23, 2005; Page A16

"THIS IS HIGHLY usual," declared a spokesman for the House Energy and Commerce Committee when asked this week whether the request by committee Chairman Joe Barton (R-Tex.) for information from three climate scientists was out of the ordinary. He and his boss are alone in that view. Many scientists and some of Mr. Barton's Republican colleagues say they were stunned by the manner in which the committee sought to discredit the existence of climate change, last month from researchers whose work was widely cited. The scientists, co-authors of an influential report on global warming over the past decade, had provided raw data but personal financial records and computer codes.

July 20, 2005, 1:27AM

TRULY CHILLING

HOUSTON
CHRONICLE

Rep. Barton's harassment of scientists, disdain for fellow lawmakers a disservice

Copyright 2005 Houston Chronicle

The heart of science isn't quiet. Challenges to data, methodology and interpretation churn throughout the scientific process. Harassment of scientists, however, deserves no role in scientific inquiry. U.S. Rep. Joe Barton, R-Emmis, ignores this principle in his shameful hectoring of well-known climatologists.

2204 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-0530
(202) 225-3576

DISTRICT OFFICE:
8425 WEST TUNO STREET
SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90048-4183
(323) 691-1040
(818) 675-7400
(310) 652-3095

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-0530

HENRY A. WAXMAN
30TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

SENIOR DEMOCRATIC MEMBER
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT REFORM

MEMBER
COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND COMMERCE

July 1, 2005

The Honorable Joe Barton
Chairman
Committee on Energy and Commerce
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On June 23, 2005, you wrote to three of the world's most respected experts on global warming to demand information about "all financial support" they ever received during their long and distinguished careers, "the source of funding" for every study they ever conducted, "all data archives" for every published study they ever wrote, and multiple other burdensome and intrusive subjects.



CONGRESSMAN HENRY WAXMAN, (D) CALIFORNIA



Photo by Carol T. Powers for The New York Times


CONGRESSMAN SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, (R) NEW YORK

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

SUITE 2320 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6301
(202) 225-6371
TTY: (202) 225-4410
<http://www.house.gov/science/boehlert.htm>

July 14, 2005

The Honorable Joe Barton
Chairman
Committee on Energy and Commerce
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Sincerely,

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT
Chairman

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing to express my strenuous objections to what I see as the misguided and illegitimate investigation you have launched concerning Dr. Michael Mann, his co-authors and sponsors.

First, your Committee lacks jurisdiction over this matter. Both the National Science Foundation and climate change research are under the purview of the House Committee on Science. This is in no way my central concern about your investigation, but I raise it at the outset because it may have legal implications as you proceed. Jurisdiction is also relevant because the insensitivity toward the workings of science demonstrated in your investigative letters may reflect your Committee's inexperience in the areas you are investigating.

My primary concern about your investigation is that its purpose seems to be to intimidate scientists rather than to learn from them, and to substitute Congressional political review for scientific peer review. This would be pernicious.

It is certainly appropriate for Congress to try to understand scientific disputes that impinge on public policy. There are many ways for us to do that, including hearings with a balanced set of witnesses, briefings with scientists, and requests for reviews by the National Academy of Sciences or other experts.

But you have taken a decidedly different approach - one that breeds only resentment and political uneasiness.

THE CHRONICLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION


The Chronicle Review

Published online September 2, 2005

The message sent by the Congressional committee to the three scientists was not subtle: Publish politically unpalatable scientific results and brace yourself for political retribution, which might include denial of the opportunity to compete for federal funds.

~~Comments that such requests are routine may be common. Acting for~~

produced in a scientist's career is highly irregular. It represents a kind of intimidation, which threatens the relationship between science and public policy. That behavior must not be tolerated.



SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN, (R) ARIZONA



Sarah Palin 'ClimateGate': Calls For Obama To Boycott Copenhagen



Glenn Beck Skewers Scientists Involved In ClimateGate




By Noel Sheppard (Bio 1 Archive)
November 23, 2009 - 23:36 ET

Fox News's Glenn Beck took on the global warming e-mail scandal known as ClimateGate Monday, and really laid into all the high-profile scientists involved.

As NewsBusters reported Friday, hacked e-mail messages to and from folks with direct access to the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change show a concerted effort on the part of these powerful scientists to manipulate temperature data in order to exaggerate average global temperatures.

As Beck pointed out Monday, those involved also conspired to prevent viewpoints counter to their own from getting published in scientific journals or becoming part of IPCC reports.





The Washington Post



E-mail furor doesn't alter evidence for climate change

"a lot of those emails obviously weren't meant for public consumption" and could be misinterpreted if "taken out of context."

—Sarah Palin, June 2011

not possibly have referred to the claim that global temperatures have declined over this decade -- a claim that is false (the current decade, as has been recently reported, will go down as the warmest on record).

Environment / Hacked climate science emails

US Senate's top climate sceptic accused of waging 'McCarthyite witch-hunt'

James Inhofe calls for criminal investigation of climate scientists as senators prepare proposal that would ditch cap and trade

Suzanne Goldenberg, US environment correspondent
guardian.co.uk, Monday 1 March 2010 17:14 GMT
Article history



Sen. Inhofe Leading Witch Hunt to Prosecute 17 Climate Scientists

by Brian Marchant, Brooklyn, New York on 02/25/10
BUSINESS & POLITICS

Recommend 152 recommendations. Sign up to see what your friends recommend.




Photo via 5/27/10

In a move that bears an eerie resemblance to the communist witch hunts lead by McCarthy, the infamous climate action opponent Sen. James Inhofe is leading an inquisition to attempt to prosecute 17 leading climate scientists. Their crimes? Doing climate science and participating in the IPCC. In other words, anything Inhofe can distort to sound like one-so far, he's come up with 7 laws he thinks scientists might have violated, and is embarking on an inquisition that would simply be a farce if it weren't also disturbing.



ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN CUCCINELLI, VIRGINIA

A photograph of Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli, a man with dark hair, wearing a dark suit, light blue shirt, and a yellow patterned tie. He is looking slightly to the right with a serious expression.

Attorney general demands papers on climate data from UVa

By [BRIAN MCNEILL](#)
Published: May 01, 2010

The
Daily Progress

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
900 EAST MAIN STREET
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219


CID NO. 2-MM

TO: The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia
SERVE: John O. Wynne, Rector
University of Virginia
One Commercial Place, Suite 1420
Norfolk, VA 23510

CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND

The Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Virginia, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by the Virginia Fraud Against Taxpayers Act ("FATA"), *Virginia Code* § 8.01-216.1, *et seq.*, hereby commands your production of the information and documentary materials described in the Attachment hereto at the Office of the Attorney General, 900 East Main Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219, on the 27th day of May, 2010 at 10:00 a.m.

ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN CUCCINELLI, VIRGINIA



ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN

News Center

Home • News • Press Releases

May 7, 2010
VA Attorney General's Misguided Investigation

Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli's office is investigating former University of Virginia (UVA) professor Michael Mann, a climate scientist, under the [Fraud Against Taxpayers Act \(FATA\)](#). The attorney general, who [says he has no before climate change is caused by human activity](#), says he wants to know whether Mann used state grants to defend Virginia citizens about climate change. The section of the FATA in question makes it illegal to "knowingly" present a "false or fraudulent" claim to the state in order to obtain compensation.

On April 23, Cuccinelli's office served UVA with a Civil Investigative Demand, essentially subpoenaing documents related to Mann's grants. Mann was on the UVA faculty between 1999 and 2005. He now works as a professor at Penn State U.

May 6, 2010
Contacts:
AAUP: [Rachel Levinson](#), Senior Counsel or [John Curtis](#), Director of Research and Public Policy
ACLU of VA: Rebecca K. Glenberg, Legal Director, 804-644-8080 or Kent Willis, Executive Director, 804-644-8080

AAUP and ACLU Subpoena Records

Charlottesville
the ACLU of Virginia
research of a g

FIRE

Foundation for Individual Rights in Education
601 Walnut Street, Suite 100 • Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106
T 215-717-3473 • F 215-717-3440 • info@fire.org • www.fire.org

Greg Lukianoff
PRESIDENT

Robert L. Shibley
VICE PRESIDENT

William Cressley
DIRECTOR OF LEGAL AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Alan Charles Kees
CO-FOUNDER AND CHAIRMAN EMERITUS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Harvey A. Silverglate
CHAIRMAN AND CHAIRMAN

Barbara Bishop
James E. Ferguson II
William J. Harris
Richard Lottick
Joseph M. Malone
Madeline Minkie
Daphne Patai
Virginia Posner
David S. Saper

May 12, 2010


Attorney General Kenneth T. Cuccinelli, II
Office of the Attorney General
900 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Sent via U.S. Mail and Facsimile (804-786-1991)

Dear Attorney General Cuccinelli:

As you can see from our list of Directors and Board of Advisors, FIRE unites civil rights and civil liberties leaders, scholars, journalists, and public intellectuals across the political and ideological spectrum on behalf of liberty, due process, legal equality, voluntary association, freedom of speech, religious liberty, and academic freedom on America's college campuses. Our website, www.thefire.org, will give you a greater sense of our identity and activities.

FIRE is gravely concerned about the threat to academic freedom posed by your decision to issue a Civil Investigative Demand (CID) to the Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (UVA) pursuant to your authority under the Virginia Fraud Against Taxpayers Act (FATA). By requesting production of the "data, materials and communications" created by former UVA professor Dr. Michael Mann in conjunction with five research grants he and others obtained during his tenure at UVA, you are threatening the academic freedom of UVA faculty.



ATTORNEY GENERAL

May 18, 2010
800 VA Scientists, Academic Leaders Tell Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli to Stop Harassing Climate Scientist

WASHINGTON (May 18, 2010) — More than 800 scientists and academics in Virginia, including nearly 300 from the University of Virginia (UVA), today sent a [letter](#) (pdf) to Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli, urging him to drop his investigation of former UVA Professor Michael Mann's scientific research.

"This letter shows that much of Virginia's scientific and academic community is appalled that their attorney general has launched such a blatantly political investigation of a scientist," said Dr. Kenneth P. Plummer, President of the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), which facilitated the organization's efforts.

UVA has submitted documents to the attorney general's office, but Cuccinelli has refused to allow the documents to be made public.

"Labeling a scientist as a fraud is a serious accusation," said Dr. Plummer. "The attorney general's investigation is a witch hunt, and it is a disgrace that the state's highest law enforcement officer is conducting such a biased and politically motivated investigation."

http://www.aaas.org/news/releases/2010/0518board_statement.shtml



Hinkle: First They Came for the Climatologists

...

A. BARTON HINKLE TIMES-DISPATCH COLUMNIST
Published: May 11, 2010

Richmond
Times-Dispatch

THE CHRONICLE of Higher Education


October 7, 2010, 04:00 PM ET

Ken Cuccinelli, Enemy of Freedom


By Kevin Carey



ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN CUCCINELLI, VIRGINIA



ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN



ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN CUCCINELLI, VIRGINIA



Cuccinelli Curtailed; Judge Quashes UVA Subpoena

Climate change challenge dead – for now

Updated 7:59 PM EDT, Mon, Aug 30, 2010

BLUZZ UP

Recommend



Judge Blocks Virginia AG's Climate Witch Hunt

— By [Kate Sheppard](#) [C/author/katesheppard](#) | Mon Aug. 30, 2010 11:30 AM PDT



— Photo by [Kenton Ngo](#), via [Facebook](#) [http://www.flickr.com/photos/82601790@N00/500152727/](#)

Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli has been [waging a war](#) (<http://motherjones.com/politics/2010/02/chamber-commerce-vs-climate-science>) on climate science, among his [many](#) (<http://motherjones.com/ken-drum/2010/03/healthcare-and-supreme-court>) other (<http://motherjones.com/mojo/2010/04/bob-mcdonnells-southern-aggression>) right-wing crusades. Today, his climate mission was [dealt a setback](#) (<http://voices.washingtonpost.com/virginiapolitics/2010/08/judge-quashes-cuccinelli-subpo.html>) after a judge denied his attempt to subpoena documents relating to a former University of Virginia climate scientist.

The GOP's Coming Climate Witch Hunt



Scientists are bracing for a new wave of attacks and investigations by the incoming House majority.

— *Bu Kate Sheppard (/authors/kate-sheppard)*

Global warming critic plots revenge

9/28/2010


POLITICO



Mother Jones

Angeles Times | NATION

WORLD BUSINESS SPORTS ENTERTAINMENT HEALTH LIVING
IPHONE APPS WEATHER TRAFFIC OBITUARIES COMMUNITY
LAKERS SUNS | WORLD SERIES GAME 2 | OIL SPILL PROBE | WEEKEND WEATHER



attacks on the EPA and climate
10/30/2010

in control of the House, they plan to go after the Obama administration's policies and the researchers who have offered evidence on global warming, of manipulating data.



Photo by Carol T. Powers for The New York Times

The Washington Post

Can the party of Reagan accept the science of climate change?

By Sherwood Boehlert

Friday, November 19, 2010

Watching the raft of newly elected GOP lawmakers converge on Washington, I couldn't help thinking about an issue I hope our party will better address. I call on my fellow Republicans to open their minds to rethinking what has largely become our party's line: denying that climate change and global warming are occurring and that they are largely due to human activities.

National Journal reported last month that 19 of the 20 serious [GOP Senate challengers declared that the science of climate change is either inconclusive or flat-out wrong](#). Many newly elected Republican House members take that position. It is a stance that defies the findings of our country's National Academy of Sciences, national scientific academies from around the world and 97 percent of the world's climate scientists.

Why do so many Republican senators and representatives think they are right and the world's top scientific academies and scientists are wrong? I would like to be able to chalk it up to lack of information or misinformation.

I can understand arguments over proposed policy approaches to climate change. I served in Congress for 24 years. I know these are legitimate areas for debate. What I find incomprehensible is the dogged determination by some to discredit distinguished scientists and their findings.

CONGRESSMAN SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, (R) NEW YORK

**“All that is necessary for the triumph of evil
is that **good men do nothing.**”**

—EDMUND BURKE

SOLUTIONS



