

February 2, 2010

In [Real Clear Politics](#), [Tom Bevan](#) blogs about Obama coming clean about some of the dirt in Obamacare.

*There's been a remarkable amount of coverage of President Obama's appearance at the House Republican retreat today, but I haven't seen anyone focus on the President's rather stunning admission about the Democrats' health care legislation ([Video](#)):*

*"The last thing I will say, though -- let me say this about health care and the health care debate, because I think it also bears on a whole lot of other issues. If you look at the package that we've presented -- and there's some stray cats and dogs that got in there that we were eliminating, we were in the process of eliminating. For example, we said from the start that it was going to be important for us to be consistent in saying to people if you can have your -- if you want to keep the health insurance you got, you can keep it, that you're not going to have anybody getting in between you and your doctor in your decision making. And I think that **some of the provisions that got snuck in might have violated that pledge.**" [emphasis added]*

*...This was one of the core debates on health care throughout last year: Would President Obama and the Democrats' legislation allow government to come between citizens and their choice of doctors and insurers? Obama promised it wouldn't. Republicans said it would, and this was one of the aspects of the legislation that led them to characterize it as a government takeover of health care - the same characterization that **Obama chastised the GOP for today.***

*So it's a bit of shock to find out now - from the President himself, no less - that one or both of the bills that passed Congress late last year (the House passed its version in late November, the Senate on Christmas Eve Day) contained language that would have violated this pledge.*

[Daniel Foster](#), in the [Corner](#), posts on how close we were to having Obamacare.

*This is how close we were to the "precipice" the president once spoke about:*

*Sen. Tom Harkin, the chairman of the Senate Health Committee, said negotiators from the White House, Senate and House reached a final deal on [healthcare](#) reform days before Scott Brown's victory in Massachusetts.*

*Labor leaders had announced an agreement with White House and congressional representatives over an excise tax on high-cost [insurance](#) plans on the Thursday before the special election. . . .*

*Harkin (D-Iowa), who attended healthcare talks at the [White House](#), said negotiators were on the cusp of bringing a bill back for final votes in the Senate and House.*

*Harkin said "we had an agreement, with the House, the White House and the Senate. We sent it to [the Congressional Budget Office] to get scored and then Tuesday happened and we didn't get it back." He said negotiators had an agreement in hand on Friday, Jan. 15. ...*

[John Steele Gordon](#) comments in [Contentions](#) about a post from Jennifer Rubin.

*[Jennifer](#) referred this morning to the columns of [Gail Collins](#) and [Charles Blow](#) in the New York Times, in which they complain that the problems the Obama administration face are due to: 1) the wretched selfishness of Americans in general and Republicans in particular; and 2) the intellectual inadequacy of Americans in general and Republicans in particular. If the American people were only of a higher quality*

*morally and intellectually, everything would be just fine, and President Obama would be sailing majestically toward an overwhelming re-election.*

*This sort of thinking reminds me of a dictum coined by Oscar Hammerstein I, the great theatrical impresario of the turn of the 20th century (and grandfather of the eponymous lyricist). After a play he had produced flopped badly, a friend commiserated with him and blamed it on the Broadway audience. Hammerstein looked at him and said, "When the audience doesn't like the play, there is something wrong with the play, not the audience."*

*Good advice, not likely to be taken.*

In Euro Pacific Capital, [John Browne](#) recommends caution in assessing the stock market and the economy.

*As a former army parachutist with a bad head for heights, I recall standing in the doorway of an aircraft while my jumping instructor shouted: "Don't look down!" He understood that my unease with parachuting combined with the sight of thousands of feet of open air could be enough to elicit panic. Many investors in today's American stock and bond markets appear to be getting the same advice. While in my predicament, I had a parachute and a rudimentary understanding of how to use it, I fear that American investors have nothing to break their fall.*

*Looking down from the lofty nominal heights of today's American stock and bond markets, there is cause for real concern.*

*First, the Dow has risen 62% over the past ten months.<sup>[1]</sup> Despite the fact that a market collapse appears to have been averted - for a time, at least - this normally would be considered an unhealthy speed. This rapid rise may be the result of government and media cheerleading, which have been based in part on government statistics whose accuracy gives additional cause for concern. In short, the stock markets appear to be heavily overbought.*

*Second, the somewhat surprisingly solid earnings posted by American companies over the past year have been achieved largely by savage labor cuts, inventory depletion, margin reductions and reduced research and advertising expenses.<sup>[2]</sup> It is doubtful that such cuts can be continued over the longer term. At the same time, the top-line revenues of many companies have been in decline, threatening future earnings. These are not the types of metrics that would normally inspire long term confidence. ...*

In the National Review, [Jay Nordlinger](#) reviews the break-up of the global warming conspiracy. *...In truth, the science was not quite settled. The hockey stick had been called into grave question by those two inconvenient Canadians. When McIntyre first saw the graph, his curiosity was piqued. He had spent his career in mineral exploration, and had witnessed his share of spectacular claims. Dot-com rackets would forecast big profits, using hockey sticks. Most of the time, the forecasts proved bogus. It was necessary to examine the raw data behind a hockey stick. McIntyre had never even heard of the IPCC — how many of us had? — but he was determined to look into its stick. And he was astonished to discover something: No one had challenged that stick, had put it to the test. Was the world to accept the IPCC's claims about global warming, and alter its economies accordingly, without due diligence? ...*

*...In 2003, he linked up with Ross McKittrick, an economist at the University of Guelph, west of Toronto. McKittrick had co-authored a book called "Taken by Storm: The Troubled Science, Policy and Politics of Global Warming." Together, the two M's formed a kind of Team B, doing a rigorous check or audit of the "A" team's work. McKittrick points out that this is perfectly normal, even mandatory, in business — in the engineering fields, for example. You don't attempt to put a new plane in the air, or a new space shuttle,*

*without a serious Team B — or C or D — effort. Shouldn't the U.N.'s climate panel have the soundest information possible, before spooking the world with a hockey stick? Shouldn't the world's governments be on the soundest footing possible before spending billions and upsetting their arrangements?...*

*...But the e-mails were eye-opening to journalists, he says, some of whom were "shocked." "They've been reporting the standard global-warming line for years, and I've learned in conversations with them that they had no idea that this group of scientists acted this way." Hence, the "loss of innocence." McKittrick says that Climategate "pried the lid off the process behind the IPCC reports and what goes on in journals, and forced people to realize that this is not a pure, rarefied search for truth" but "a very partisan and distorted process." Reporters, he says, are more respectful to him now. Before, it was basically, "Why don't you believe what all the world's scientists are saying?" Now they are humbler, asking more intelligent questions. ...*

**Roger Simon** posts on Scientific American getting to eat crow. Cold.

*Pity Scientific American. Little did the magazine's editors know when putting together their February issue that their boneheaded article Negating "Climategate": Copenhagen Talks and Climate Science Survive Stolen E-Mail Controversy now reads as if it were written by David Biello somewhere around 1993. Oh, well, back when this nonsense was written (December?) some people still believed the Himalayan glaciers were about to disappear, not to mention the Amazonian rainforests. Nor did we know that not just the East Anglia CRU, but also our own NASA had been playing fast and loose with AGW temperature facts, for some reason needing a FOIA to cough up data that should be public record in such a scientific endeavor. The poor editors of SA are taking a drubbing in the comments, which they richly deserve.*

*UPDATE: Meanwhile, Bin Laden is apparently jumping on the "global warming bandwagon." I think we should give him an Oscar!*

**Mark Steyn** points out the foreign press is reporting all the new global warming embarrassments. Our press - not so much.

*You have to assume that America's dying monodailies are now actively auditioning for state ownership. How else to explain the silence of the massed ranks of salaried "environmental correspondents" on the daily revelations emerging from the fast disintegrating "scientific consensus" on "climate change"? You get livelier coverage from the Chinese press.*

*But in competitive newspaper markets they still know a story when they see one. Surely the most worrying sign for the thuggish enforcers of "settled science" is that even the eco-lefties at The Guardian and The Independent, two of the most gung-ho warm-mongers on the planet, are beginning to entertain doubts. ...*

In Volokh Conspiracy, **Jonathan Adler** reports on more trouble for the IPCC. Apparently they also cited a fifth-grader's science report as proof of their global warming scams. Not really, but awfully close.

*...It has also become clear that the IPCC report systematically misrepresents the peer-reviewed literature on the effect of climate change hurricanes and natural disasters. Specifically, the report falsely claims there is evidence that human-induced climate change is producing an increase in extreme weather events and associated losses and includes a graph that is not based upon published, peer-reviewed work. Yet the studies upon which the IPCC purports to base its claim — including one that was not peer-reviewed and should not have been cited at all — say no such thing. Worse, when the IPCC's erroneous claims were challenged during the review process, an IPCC author fabricated a response to defend the erroneous claim. In response, the IPCC now claims it "carefully followed" its official procedures. Yet as Roger Pielke Jr., one of the researchers whose work is misrepresented in the report, responds, this claim is simply false as the*

IPCC “relied on an unpublished, non-peer reviewed source to produce its top line conclusions in this section,” ignored the complaints of reviewers, and fabricated a defense of the claim. Indeed, when the then-unpublished, un-peer-reviewed paper upon which the IPCC purported to rely was eventually published, it rejected the climate-disaster loss link asserted by the IPCC.

But wait, there's more. It turns out that other claims in the IPCC's WGII report were also based upon non-scientific sources, including magazine articles and reports by advocacy groups. For instance, the IPCC's claim that climate change could endanger up to 40 percent of the Amazonian rain forest is based upon a report issued by an environmental advocacy organization, not a peer-reviewed scientific study, and the advocacy report misrepresented peer-reviewed studies to reach its conclusion. It also appears other IPCC claims about glaciers in the Andes and Alps were based upon a magazine article and student's dissertation.

...

And we have NRO Shorts. Here are three:

Reporters largely ignored it, but the Department of Health and Human Services released a study showing that Head Start's positive effects peter out by the end of first grade. The study included 44 tests, of which 42 found no statistically significant and lasting improvement. Some positive results are to be expected when you run that many tests, and a footnote points out that the two apparently lasting results disappear after correcting for that tendency. Andrew Coulson and Adam Schaeffer of the Cato Institute point out that school choice, on the other hand, appears to have lasting positive results. Naturally, the Democrats have expanded funding for Head Start while ending school choice in D.C.

In a region traditionally known for producing loud, blustery autocrats who champion failed economic policies (Castro, Ortega, Chávez), Chile is a quietly remarkable success story. On January 11, it signed an accession agreement to become the first South American member of the OECD. Less than a week later, Chilean voters elected a conservative government for the first time since General Pinochet stepped down 20 years ago. The victory of presidential candidate Sebastián Piñera, a billionaire airline mogul, ends two decades of rule by the center-left Concertación coalition, whose multiple governments largely maintained the free-market economic reforms that were adopted under Pinochet. In recent years, Chilean officials moved away from pro-growth policies and toward greater social spending, but they also saved much of their copper windfall during the commodity boom, ensuring that they were in a strong fiscal position when the global financial crisis erupted. Piñera will inherit a well-run economy — one that has the potential to grow much faster. His election, like that of Ricardo Martinelli in Panama last May, affirms that not all Latin American countries are moving left.

Miep Gies used to say she was just an ordinary housewife. Austrian by birth, and Catholic, she married a Dutchman named Jan Gies and lived in Amsterdam. In the war, Miep and Jan helped hide Otto Frank and his family in a secret room, daily risking their own lives to do so. For Miep, Otto Frank's young daughter Anne was a girl “full of the joy of just being alive,” and she remembered seeing Anne writing her diary with a look of utter intensity in her face. When the Gestapo rounded up the Franks, Miep kept Anne's diary safe. She also respected Anne's privacy. If she'd read those pages, she would have found references to herself and Jan, and might well have destroyed the lot for fear that the Gestapo in another search would incriminate them. After the war Otto Frank returned, and he was with Miep when he heard that his wife and daughters were dead. Miep took out the diary, saying, “Here is your daughter Anne's legacy to you.” More than that, it is a legacy to us all. The Diary of Anne Frank has been published in millions of copies in dozens of languages. Miep had her part in rescuing a human document that touches the heart like no other. This admirable lady lived to be 100. The world could do with a lot more ordinariness like hers. R.I.P.

---

---

---

There's been a remarkable amount of coverage of President Obama's appearance at the House Republican retreat today, but I haven't seen anyone focus on the President's rather stunning admission about the Democrats' health care legislation ([Video](#)):

“The last thing I will say, though -- let me say this about health care and the health care debate, because I think it also bears on a whole lot of other issues. If you look at the package that we've presented -- and there's some stray cats and dogs that got in there that we were eliminating, we were in the process of eliminating. For example, we said from the start that it was going to be important for us to be consistent in saying to people if you can have your -- if you want to keep the health insurance you got, you can keep it, that you're not going to have anybody getting in between you and your doctor in your decision making. And I think that **some of the provisions that got snuck in might have violated that pledge.**” [emphasis added]

If we take this statement at face value, President Obama is admitting the the health care bills passed by either the House or Senate (or both) contained provisions which were "snuck in" - presumably by Democratic members and perhaps on behalf of certain lobbyists - that would have in fact prevented people from keeping their current insurance and/or choosing the doctor they want.

This was one of the core debates on health care throughout last year: Would President Obama and the Democrats' legislation allow government to come between citizens and their choice of doctors and insurers? Obama promised it wouldn't. Republicans said it would, and this was one of the aspects of the legislation that led them to characterize it as a government takeover of health care - the same characterization that [Obama chastized the GOP for today](#).

So it's a bit of shock to find out now - from the President himself, no less - that one or both of the bills that *passed* Congress late last year (the House passed its version in late November, the Senate on Christmas Eve Day) contained language that would have violated this pledge.

## The Corner

[Obamacare Defused with 00:03 Seconds Left](#) [Daniel Foster]

This is how close we were to the "precipice" the president once spoke about:

Sen. Tom Harkin, the chairman of the Senate Health Committee, said negotiators from the White House, Senate and House reached a final deal on [healthcare](#) reform days before Scott Brown's victory in Massachusetts.

Labor leaders had announced an agreement with White House and congressional representatives over an excise tax on high-cost [insurance](#) plans on the Thursday before the special election. . . .

Harkin (D-Iowa), who attended healthcare talks at the [White House](#), said negotiators were on the cusp of bringing a bill back for final votes in the Senate and House.

Harkin said “we had an agreement, with the House, the White House and the Senate. We sent it to [the Congressional Budget Office] to get scored and then Tuesday happened and we didn't get it back.” He said negotiators had an agreement in hand on Friday, Jan. 15.

Harkin made clear that negotiators had reached a final deal on the entire bill, not just the excise plans, which had been reported the previous day, Jan. 14.

Harkin said the deal covered the prescription-drug “donut hole,” the level of federal insurance subsidies, national insurance exchanges and federal Medicaid assistance to states.

Senate Democratic aides declined to confirm Harkin’s [account](#). A White House spokesman also declined to comment.

A House Democratic aide, however, said not all the issues were resolved.

## Contentions

### [Hammerstein’s Dictum](#)

by John Steele Gordon

[Jennifer](#) referred this morning to the columns of [Gail Collins](#) and [Charles Blow](#) in the *New York Times*, in which they complain that the problems the Obama administration face are due to: 1) the wretched selfishness of Americans in general and Republicans in particular; and 2) the intellectual inadequacy of Americans in general and Republicans in particular. If the American people were only of a higher quality morally and intellectually, everything would be just fine, and President Obama would be sailing majestically toward an overwhelming re-election.

This sort of thinking reminds me of a dictum coined by Oscar Hammerstein I, the great theatrical impresario of the turn of the 20th century (and grandfather of the eponymous lyricist). After a play he had produced flopped badly, a friend commiserated with him and blamed it on the Broadway audience. Hammerstein looked at him and said, “When the audience doesn’t like the play, there is something wrong with the play, not the audience.”

Good advice, not likely to be taken.

## Euro Pacific Capital

### [Geronimo!](#)

by John Browne

As a former army parachutist with a bad head for heights, I recall standing in the doorway of an aircraft while my jumping instructor shouted: “Don’t look down!” He understood that my unease with parachuting combined with the sight of thousands of feet of open air could be enough to elicit panic. Many investors in today’s American stock and bond markets appear to be getting the same advice. While in my predicament, I had a parachute and a rudimentary understanding of how to use it, I fear that American investors have nothing to break their fall.

Looking down from the lofty nominal heights of today’s American stock and bond markets, there is cause for real concern.

First, the Dow has risen 62% over the past ten months.<sup>[1]</sup> Despite the fact that a market collapse appears to have been averted - for a time, at least - this normally would be considered an unhealthy speed. This rapid rise may be the result of government and media cheerleading, which have been based in part on government statistics whose accuracy gives additional cause for concern. In short, the stock markets appear to be heavily overbought.

Second, the somewhat surprisingly solid earnings posted by American companies over the past year have been achieved largely by savage labor cuts, inventory depletion, margin reductions and reduced research

and advertising expenses.<sup>[iii]</sup> It is doubtful that such cuts can be continued over the longer term. At the same time, the top-line revenues of many companies have been in decline, threatening future earnings. These are not the types of metrics that would normally inspire long term confidence.

Third, in addition to these pricing concerns, the stock market corrections of last week appear to have been reflecting a growing wave of uncertainties, which markets detest. The biggest questions involve the outlook for interest rates. Despite the "extended period" language that seems to be permanently chiseled into the Federal Reserve policy statements, interest rates are set to climb sooner or later, threatening both the bond and stock markets. Now that Ben Bernanke has been re-appointed as Fed Chairman, he will try to hold rates down far into the future. However, the massive Treasury borrowing program, together with reckless government spending proposals, are forcing rates upwards, especially at the long end.<sup>[iii]</sup>

Fourth, the prospect of an imminent economic recovery is far from certain. With the U.S. jobless rate continuing to mount towards depressionary levels<sup>[iv]</sup> and China announcing a curb to its high economic growth,<sup>[v]</sup> it is likely that the economy will soon face a dramatic aftershock of falling demand and asset prices. In addition, major governments abroad, yielding to taxpayers and bond buyers, may be winding down their stimulus packages. Although the removal of these government interventions is a long term positive, in the short run this would certainly pull the rug out from under this recent rally.

Fifth, and most alarmingly, developments in recent months have exposed great uncertainty in the policy direction of the U.S. government. In particular, Scott Brown's victory in Massachusetts, in the minds of some investors, has raised the possibility of Republican election victories, which could favor the kinds of pro-business policies that are beneficial to stock prices. However, since the days of President Ronald Reagan, the Republican Party, much like the Democratic Party, fosters big government, the antithesis of what is needed for economic revival.

If investors in the American stock and bond markets adhere to my parachute instructor's advice to not look down, they may remain happy for a time. However, without a parachute, unable to recognize the faults in their financial equipment, and instilled with baseless confidence, they may well regret going so high and risking such a massive free-fall.

My advice would be to look for a good parachute - preferably a golden one.

## National Review

### Two Inconvenient Canadians

#### *The unlikely men who shook up global-warming science*

by Jay Nordlinger

In 2006, a major American climate scientist referred to them as "two Canadians." He did not mean that very nicely. They are also known as "M&M," "M/M," and "the two M's." In the recently publicized e-mails of the Climatic Research Unit in Britain, one of those M's is referred to as "a certain Canadian." Across the CRU e-mails, both M's are treated as objects of fear and loathing. You may wonder, Who are these monsters from Canada? They are Stephen McIntyre and Ross McKittrick, and they are inconvenient to the men of the CRU: They have challenged the work of global-warming red-hots. And "Climategate," as the scandal of the CRU e-mails has been called, has embarrassed the red-hots. They are on the defensive, for the first time since global warming became a going concern. And M&M are looking pretty good. McKittrick says that Climategate has brought "a loss of innocence": about how the major climate scientists operate, about their devotion to scientific truth.

The Climatic Research Unit, ensconced at the University of East Anglia, feeds the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, an arm of the United Nations. The IPCC is considered the ultimate authority on global warming (for better or worse). In 2001, the IPCC's report featured a killer graphic: It was a graph, in fact, claiming to show the global temperature for the past millennium. From the year 1000 to about 1900, the line was relatively flat; then, from 1900 to 2000, there was a very sharp upswing. The graph looked like a hockey stick, and came to be known as just that: the "hockey-stick graph." It was the work of a team headed by

Michael Mann, then of the University of Virginia, now of Pennsylvania State University. These men are allied with the CRU. Such scientists are known, collectively and cozily, as “the climate community.”

The graph in question was not only a hockey stick, but a smoking gun, as people saw it: proof positive of man-made global warming. The stick went around the world, impressing and alarming people in all corners. It was featured in endless government reports, on newscasts, on posters. Al Gore used it in his Oscar-winning film, *An Inconvenient Truth*. The hockey stick became an icon, a symbol of global warming, along with the polar bear stranded on an ice floe. And the symbol was accompanied by a “soundbite,” as Stephen McIntyre says — a bite taken from the IPCC report: “It is . . . likely that, in the Northern Hemisphere, the 1990s was the warmest decade and 1998 the warmest year” during the past thousand years. Nineteen ninety-eight as the warmest year: That, along with the hockey blade — the graph’s sharp upswing — concentrated the mind.

In due course, Al Gore and the IPCC won the Nobel Peace Prize, “for their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change,” said the committee, “and to lay the foundations for the measures that are needed to counteract such change.” Man-made global warming became accepted by almost all right-thinkers. To dispute it was to dispute the roundness of the earth, or its perpetual trek around the sun. The science was settled; there was to be no more discussion.

In truth, the science was not quite settled. The hockey stick had been called into grave question by those two inconvenient Canadians. When McIntyre first saw the graph, his curiosity was piqued. He had spent his career in mineral exploration, and had witnessed his share of spectacular claims. Dot-com rackets would forecast big profits, using hockey sticks. Most of the time, the forecasts proved bogus. It was necessary to examine the raw data behind a hockey stick. McIntyre had never even heard of the IPCC — how many of us had? — but he was determined to look into its stick. And he was astonished to discover something: No one had challenged that stick, had put it to the test. Was the world to accept the IPCC’s claims about global warming, and alter its economies accordingly, without due diligence?

McIntyre would perform this due diligence himself — and the mineral-exploration man had some skills: He had math in his background, having studied the subject at the University of Toronto. He was offered Ph.D. scholarships in mathematical economics by Harvard and MIT. One of those offers came personally from Paul Samuelson, the late MIT economist. But McIntyre went a different route, accepting a Commonwealth Scholarship to Oxford, where he studied philosophy, politics, and economics. He overlapped with Bill Clinton, possibly even played rugby against him, he says. And he has long liked to explore intellectual byways. When he was interested in archeology, he taught himself “a bit of Assyrian cuneiform,” as he puts it, and also taught himself “a bit of German,” for the purpose of reading relevant articles in that language. This kind of activity may not be commonplace — but “there are no rules against it,” as he notes.

In 2003, he linked up with Ross McKittrick, an economist at the University of Guelph, west of Toronto. McKittrick had co-authored a book called “Taken by Storm: The Troubled Science, Policy and Politics of Global Warming.” Together, the two M’s formed a kind of Team B, doing a rigorous check or audit of the “A” team’s work. McKittrick points out that this is perfectly normal, even mandatory, in business — in the engineering fields, for example. You don’t attempt to put a new plane in the air, or a new space shuttle, without a serious Team B — or C or D — effort. Shouldn’t the U.N.’s climate panel have the soundest information possible, before spooking the world with a hockey stick? Shouldn’t the world’s governments be on the soundest footing possible before spending billions and upsetting their arrangements?

Team A was not especially grateful for M&M’s work, to put it mildly. They resented the Canadians as amateurs and interlopers and spoilers. They were not inclined to share data, or discuss theories, or debate. They circled the wagons tightly and hotly. A referee for *Nature* magazine said, “I am particularly unimpressed by [this team’s] style of ‘shouting louder and longer so they must be right.’” In one of those publicized e-mails, a CRU scientist had this to say about a member of the team: “His air of papal infallibility is really quite nauseating at times.” Many others, over the decade, have suffered the same nausea.

Along the way, M&M attracted some support. When they submitted a paper to *Geophysical Research*

*Letters*, a referee told the journal, “I urge you not to shy away from this paper because of its potential controversy. The whole field of global warming is currently suffering from the fact that it has become politicized. Science really depends for its success on an open dialogue.” *GRL* published the paper (“Hockey Sticks, Principal Components, and Spurious Significance”). A Dutch journal, *Natuurwetenschap & Techniek*, was originally skeptical of M&M, thinking they needed a dismissal. On investigation, however, *N&T* wound up respectful and supportive. In 2005, Congress asked the National Academy of Sciences to look into the controversy. Once the report was issued, both sides claimed victory. M&M said that the NAS had confirmed them, in all substantive points — but that they had lost the “spin war,” which is to say, the war for media (and therefore public) support. Another panel, headed by the statistician Edward Wegman, had a look: and came down very hard on the hockey-stickers, or “hockey team,” as they are sometimes called. Michael Mann, the team leader, issued a statement saying that the Wegman panel “simply uncritically parrots claims by two Canadians (an economist and an oil industry consultant).” (Actually, McIntyre is in minerals, but “oil” sounds worse.)

The economist and the consultant have persevered, despite slights and snubs. At one point, in response to a data request, a member of the hockey team said to McIntyre, “The climate community has moved on — so should you.” This is quite typical, says the other M, McKittrick. “When you point to a study of theirs that is flawed, they say, ‘We’ve moved on,’ or appeal to some nebulous big picture. They say, ‘Okay, this one study may be flawed, but that really doesn’t matter, because we have all this other evidence.’” And on it goes. Some of the battling is waged on two prominent websites. Mann launched RealClimate.org — “Climate science from climate scientists” — which dumped heavily on M&M. In response, McIntyre launched ClimateAudit.org.

In mid-November 2009 came that explosion in the “climate community,” and in the world at large: the CRU e-mails, Climategate. Someone — either a computer hacker or a disgruntled, whistleblowing insider — made available more than a thousand e-mails, from the chieftains of climatology. And those e-mails reveal a tawdry world of stonewalling, dissembling, covering up, scheming, defaming, and unprofessionalism at large. They show a determination to present one claim, no matter what: and that claim is man-made global warming, requiring dramatic global action. Honest global-warming believers and activists are shaken by what the e-mails reveal; others manage to glide on.

In an article for *The Weekly Standard*, Steven F. Hayward pointed out the following: “After 2003 the CRU crew became obsessed with McIntyre above all others” — above all other critics. “He appears in 105 of the emails by name (in some others, he’s referred to as ‘a certain Canadian’), usually with a tone of resentment and contempt.” The head of the CRU, Phil Jones, wrote to Michael Mann, “Don’t leave stuff lying around on ftp sites [File Transfer Protocol sites] — you never know who is trawling them. The two MMs [*sic*] have been after the CRU station data for years. If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the UK, I think I’ll delete the file rather than send to anyone.” That is just a flavor of these e-mail communications.

McIntyre says that his first reaction to the e-mails was “one of exhaustion, not one of satisfaction.” He did not feel any sort of vindication or triumph. He had been through a lot, to challenge the hockey stick, to get a fair hearing. And, “at some level, you should be able to discuss statistical issues without being attacked personally. Even the simplest point seems to have occasioned tremendous ground warfare, with people being reluctant to concede anything.” McIntyre adds that he is old enough — has had “enough ups and downs” in life — not to be too affected, one way or the other. And “I didn’t take any particular satisfaction in seeing these guys run into trouble.” The second M, McKittrick, says that his first reaction was, “Nothing here surprises me” — because he had been working in this field for so long. But the e-mails were eye-opening to journalists, he says, some of whom were “shocked.” “They’ve been reporting the standard global-warming line for years, and I’ve learned in conversations with them that they had no idea that this group of scientists acted this way.” Hence, the “loss of innocence.” McKittrick says that Climategate “pried the lid off the process behind the IPCC reports and what goes on in journals, and forced people to realize that this is not a pure, rarefied search for truth” but “a very partisan and distorted process.” Reporters, he says, are more respectful to him now. Before, it was basically, “Why don’t you believe what all the world’s scientists are saying?” Now they are humbler, asking more intelligent questions.

McKittrick is not particularly worried about being on the minority side in the global-warming debate. For one thing, he says, he has “the privilege of being a tenured professor at a university.” And, as an economist, he has other fish to fry than global warming. But also, is his side really the minority one? McKittrick says that there are plenty of scientists and other well-informed people who are skeptical of the big IPCC claims. “I’m convinced that the numbers on our side, and the credentials on our side, are just as impressive as on the other side.” The problem is that the global-warming red-hots have the funding, the influence, and the media. They also tend to be in control of the professional societies and journals. They can claim to represent thousands and thousands of scientists. But are their pronouncements ever put to a vote of those multitudes of scientists? McKittrick makes a further point: Many scientists, in many disciplines or subdisciplines, have a finger in the climate-change pie. They tend to say, “In my own particular field” — be it sea ice or solar physics or what have you — “I don’t really see evidence for global warming. But I of course accept the consensus view.” This calls to mind one of (Robert) Conquest’s Laws: “Everyone is a conservative in his own field of expertise.”

Some are with M&M, where the hockey stick and other points are concerned, but keep mum, so as not to bring trouble on themselves. “Government scientists are often in that position,” says McKittrick. “They have to keep their mouth shut.” McIntyre recalls attending a conference of the American Geophysical Union. He says that “two of the more eminent young scientists” told him of their admiration for his work. They said that, as far as they were concerned, he and McKittrick had smashed the hockey stick. But they were not prepared to go public.

Politics is never far from climate science, and we may ask about the Canadians’ politics. Are they right-wingers? McKittrick, in addition to being an econ prof at Guelph, is a senior fellow (unpaid) of the Fraser Institute, which is a free-market think tank. Some of his opponents like to make something of this. McKittrick says that, when they argue on any grounds other than substantive ones, they are conceding defeat. It is “their way of crying uncle.” As for McIntyre, he says that the only political donations he has made in the past 20 years have been to “an extremely left-wing municipal councilor in Toronto, who’s a friend of my wife’s.” He does not allow any political discussion at his blog. And he points out that “I live in downtown Toronto, which is a liberal city. I am not a red-meat-eating Midwestern Republican.” (Not that there’s anything wrong with that, surely.) “I’m the same age and generation as Bill Clinton. I admire him.”

Have the M’s had any fun in this debate, as Davids taking on Goliaths? McKittrick says no, not really. “I wouldn’t ever choose this as a hobby or pastime. There has been a lot of stress.” He doesn’t take any pleasure in causing an intellectual opponent embarrassment. There is, in fact, a hint of weariness about him, of someone who just wishes that science could be discussed dispassionately, and conclusions arrived at civilly. McIntyre has the same wish, as we have seen. But he has a greater liking for combat. “I wouldn’t do what I’m doing if I didn’t like it,” he says. He has sacrificed a good deal of time and money to pursue the global-warming question: “I used to make money.” In recent years, not so much. But he forges ahead “because I’m interested” and because he considers his work a kind of public service.

McIntyre is loath to make any big claims about global warming. “I’m saying that they can’t know what they claim to know,” about a thousand years of temperature history. And the “they” refers to the IPCC/CRU crowd. Someone may come along with fresh data that make a hockey stick, says McIntyre — a right and defensible hockey stick. But, according to him, that has not happened. His partner, McKittrick, says that “you’ve got a range of data sets of varying levels of quality.” And the best data sets indicate the least amount of warming. He is for keeping an eye on the global temperature, and making adjustments in policy when needed — adjustments based on solid information and not merely model predictions.

The M’s are in a great tradition of scientific inquiry and enterprise. They saw a major claim, which was to shake up the world. And they were skeptical of this claim, or, at a minimum, curious. They went ahead and did some testing. And they have shaken up the world a bit themselves. Science is no respecter of persons. Whether you are a High Priest in the Church of Climatology or a head-scratching Canuck, the question is, Can you make it add up? And while science may be no respecter of persons, the two Canadians, in the wake of Climategate, are getting some new respect.

**Roger L. Simon**

### **Climategate: The Shaming of “Scientific American”**

Pity *Scientific American*. Little did the magazine’s editors know when putting together their February issue that their boneheaded article [Negating “Climategate”: Copenhagen Talks and Climate Science Survive Stolen E-Mail Controversy](#) now reads as if it were written by David Biello somewhere around 1993. Oh, well, back when this nonsense was written (December?) some people still believed the [Himalayan glaciers](#) were about to disappear, not to mention the [Amazonian rainforests](#). Nor did we know that not *just* the East Anglia CRU, but also our own [NASA](#) had been playing fast and loose with AGW temperature facts, for some reason needing a FOIA to cough up data that should be public record in such a scientific endeavor. The poor editors of SA are taking a drubbing in the comments, which they richly deserve.

UPDATE: Meanwhile, [Bin Laden](#) is apparently jumping on the “global warming bandwagon.” I think we should give him an Oscar!

### **The Corner**

#### **Change of Climate** [Mark Steyn]

You have to assume that America's dying monodailies are now actively auditioning for state ownership. How else to explain the silence of the massed ranks of salaried "environmental correspondents" on the daily revelations emerging from the fast disintegrating "scientific consensus" on "climate change"? You get livelier coverage from the Chinese press.

But in competitive newspaper markets they still know a story when they see one. Surely the most worrying sign for the thuggish enforcers of "settled science" is that even the eco-lefties at *The Guardian* and *The Independent*, two of the most gung-ho warm-mongers on the planet, are beginning to entertain doubts. From *The Independent*:

Professor Jones and a colleague, Professor Wei-Chyung Wang of the State University of New York at Albany suggested in an influential 1990 paper in the journal *Nature* that the urban heat island effect was minimal – and cited as supporting evidence a long series of temperature measurements from Chinese weather stations, half in the countryside and half in cities, supplied by Professor Wei-Chyung...

However, it has been reported that when climate sceptics asked for the precise locations of the 84 stations, Professor Jones at first declined to release the details. And when eventually he did release them, it was found that for the ones supposed to be in the countryside, there was no location given.

Oh, right. Very scientific. From *The Guardian*:

It also emerges that documents which Wang claimed would exonerate him and Jones did not exist...

Wang said: "I have been exonerated by my university on all the charges. When we started on the paper we had all the station location details in order to identify our network, but we cannot find them any more..."

Ah, yes. The old dog-ate-my-tree-rings excuse yet again. As Andrew Bolt notes, the Warmergate scandal is actually a media scandal, too:

This example actually suggests how complicit the media has been in keeping the global warming scare alive by failing to report what was actually under its nose.

Meanwhile, James Delingpole can do without these johnnies-come-lately:

For years I've been made to feel a pariah for my views on AGW... Now it's payback time and I take small satisfaction from seeing so many rats deserting their sinking ship. I don't want them on my side. I want to see them in hell, reliving scenes from Hieronymus Bosch ...screw 'em.

Happily, the terminal somnolence of the American press is undisturbed by such vulgar ructions. *The St Louis Post-Dispatch* knows its priorities when it comes to environmental news:

**Dear Dr. Donohue** — My daughter complains that I flatulate more often than most individuals. Furthermore, she claims that the gas an individual passes contributes to global warming. I don't know if I am physically able to keep my gas to myself to go green. Is my daughter really right?

Of course she is. You're not one of these "deniers", are you?

## **Volokh Conspiracy** **The IPCC Under Siege** by Jonathan H. Adler

2010 has not been kind to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). This U.N. sanctioned body is supposed to issue periodic reports that summarize the state of the science of global climate change based upon a comprehensive review and synthesis of the relevant peer-reviewed scientific literature. In the past few weeks, however, it has been revealed that the IPCC's 2007 Working Group II report on "Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability" contains claims about the projected impacts of climate change that are completely unfounded, based upon non-scientific (let alone peer reviewed) sources, or misrepresent the underlying scientific literature.

The first revelation was that there was no scientific basis for the IPCC's widely-hyped claim that Himalayan glaciers could disappear by 2035. This projection is off by a few *centuries*, at best. When an Indian climate researcher first challenged this claim, suggesting there is no evidence (yet) of warming-induced glacial retreat in the Himalayas, IPCC chief Rajendra Pachauri was dismissive. Now, however, he's changed his tune, and the IPCC has acknowledged the error. This was more than a simple mistake, however, as it appears the IPCC was informed of the error before the report was finalized, but failed to make any changes, nor was Pachauri quick to acknowledge the error once it was brought to his attention.

It has also become clear that the IPCC report systematically misrepresents the peer-reviewed literature on the effect of climate change hurricanes and natural disasters. Specifically, the report falsely claims there is evidence that human-induced climate change is producing an increase in extreme weather events and associated losses and includes a graph that is not based upon published, peer-reviewed work. Yet the studies upon which the IPCC purports to base its claim — including one that was not peer-reviewed and should not have been cited at all — say no such thing. Worse, when the IPCC's erroneous claims were challenged during the review process, an IPCC author fabricated a response to defend the erroneous claim. In response, the IPCC now claims it "carefully followed" its official procedures. Yet as Roger Pielke Jr., one of the researchers whose work is misrepresented in the report, responds, this claim is simply false as the IPCC "relied on an unpublished, non-peer reviewed source to produce its top line conclusions in this section," ignored the complaints of reviewers, and fabricated a defense of the claim. Indeed, when the then-unpublished, un-peer-reviewed paper upon which the IPCC purported to rely was eventually published, it rejected the climate-disaster loss link asserted by the IPCC.

But wait, there's more. It turns out that other claims in the IPCC's WGII report were also based upon non-scientific sources, including magazine articles and reports by advocacy groups. For instance, the IPCC's claim that climate change could endanger up to 40 percent of the Amazonian rain forest is based upon a report issued by an environmental advocacy organization, not a peer-reviewed scientific study, and the

advocacy report [misrepresented peer-reviewed studies](#) to reach its conclusion. It also appears other IPCC claims about glaciers in the Andes and Alps were [based upon a magazine article and student's dissertation](#).

What's interesting is that all of these errors are in the WG II report — the report that is supposed to highlight the practical effects of a gradually warming climate — as opposed to the WG I report, which focuses on the underlying scientific evidence that increases in greenhouse gas emissions are contributing to climate change. For this reason, these revelations do not dissuade me that human activity is likely contributing to atmospheric warming. But it does provide further evidence that many scientists have adopted an unscientific, advocacy stance in which they seek to convince the public that there is incontrovertible proof of an impending climatic disaster so as to build the case for drastic action. This problem is actually exacerbated by the IPCC process, which seeks to formulate an “official,” government-approved, scientific “consensus,” as I [explained here](#).

Climate change is a serious concern, even if it does not threaten to eradicate Himalayan glaciers in my lifetime or wipe coastal cities off the map. If we are to have a serious and honest debate about climate policy, we have to have more honest and responsible conduct by climate scientists. While ClimateGate and the above-mentioned IPCC errors may have been the work of only a handful of climate scientists, unless the climate science community does a better job of policing its own, and accommodating legitimate dissenting views, it will become increasingly unable to inform and enlighten the policy debate.

## **National Review**

[Reporters largely ignored it](#), but the Department of Health and Human Services released a study showing that Head Start's positive effects peter out by the end of first grade. The study included 44 tests, of which 42 found no statistically significant and lasting improvement. Some positive results are to be expected when you run that many tests, and a footnote points out that the two apparently lasting results disappear after correcting for that tendency. Andrew Coulson and Adam Schaeffer of the Cato Institute point out that school choice, on the other hand, appears to have lasting positive results. Naturally, the Democrats have expanded funding for Head Start while ending school choice in D.C.

[Bret Schundler was once just about every conservative's favorite mayor](#), or at least one in whom they placed many hopes. “Look for him in 2008,” wrote William F. Buckley Jr. This was during the 1990s, when Schundler was the Republican mayor of heavily Democratic Jersey City, N.J., just across the Hudson River from Manhattan. He gained national attention for his tireless promotion of school choice. This advocacy never enjoyed a payoff in actual policy, but it wasn't for a lack of effort: Trenton always blocked Schundler's initiatives. His two forays into state politics flopped. In 2001, he won the Republican gubernatorial nomination but lost the general election. In 2005, he didn't even get out of the GOP primary. Yet Schundler soon may find himself in New Jersey's capital: Gov. Chris Christie has nominated him to serve as state education commissioner. This is a bold selection that says much about Christie's commitment to education reform. Schundler still must be confirmed, but his presumptive return to the public arena is a welcome development.

[President Obama wants to slap a cumbrous new tax on American banks](#). “We want our money back,” he says. The government is expected to lose money on the bailouts — but not the money used to backstop the banks, which are paying it back, with interest. The real losses are expected to come from insurer AIG and from such untouchable Democratic holies as Fannie Mae, the heavily unionized automakers, and the foreclosure-prevention program. Obama's tax hike would harrow the prudent and imprudent alike, extracting billions of dollars from banks that never took bailout money in the first place. A new tax on banks is a new tax on Americans' savings and checking accounts. How big? It would have cost JPMorgan's customers and shareholders \$1.5 billion had it been in effect last year, another \$1.5 billion for Bank of America, another \$1 billion for Morgan Stanley, and would have punished many smaller banks to the tune of billions more. The Democrats are having trouble running against Republicans at the moment, so

Obama seeks to run instead against Wall Street — and against the bailouts he voted for as a senator and expanded as president.

**The standard argument for the superiority of the American to the more statist European economic model** holds that the former does more to promote economic growth. National Review contributor Jim Manzi, writing in *National Affairs*, argues that the American model, to be sustained, must incorporate reforms to enable the least fortunate to improve their lot. Liberals, notably Paul Krugman, have reacted to the essay by claiming that Manzi never proves that the American model is in fact better at promoting growth — which is true, since proving that view was not Manzi's aim. In the ensuing debate, liberals pointed out that Europe's per capita growth has been roughly equal to America's. Conservatives made three points in response. The first was that one might have expected Europe to grow faster than America over the last few decades since America had a head start after World War II. The second is that total economic growth has been higher in the U.S. than in European social democracies because of population growth. That may suggest that the European model cannot accommodate large families and immigration, and that it is better suited to countries that are resigned to declining on the world stage: Geopolitical influence depends more on the total size of the economy than on individual living standards. The third is that Europe has had the advantage of not having to devote the resources to the military that the U.S. does, in part *because* the U.S. does. All in all, for the U.S. to go the social-democratic route seems like a bad idea — for the world as well as for us.

**IRS Commissioner Douglas Shulman** recently confessed that our tax system is so complicated that even he has to pay somebody else to do his taxes: "I find the tax code complex, so I use a preparer," he said on C-SPAN. Maybe he could ask his boss, Tim Geithner, for some tips.

**The pyramids of Egypt have excited wonder and speculation for millennia.** Some other responses, too: Dr. Johnson called the Great Pyramid "a monument of the insufficiency of human enjoyments." These astonishing structures continue to deliver surprises — a hitherto-unknown one, much reduced and buried in sand, was discovered only in November 2008. How were they built? Herodotus was told that the Pharaoh Cheops "commanded all Egyptians to do forced labor for him," including the cutting and transporting of stones for his pyramids. In later centuries, perhaps influenced by the Book of Exodus (which, however, deals with events a millennium later), people came to think that foreign slaves built the pyramids. Egyptologists, working from traces left by the ancient work force, were skeptical, and their skepticism has now been vindicated. Tombs of workmen have been discovered that are better appointed, and closer to the pyramids themselves, than would have been the case for slaves. Indirect evidence suggests the workers may even have been from upper-class families. Perhaps the well-informed parents of ancient Egypt, like those of today's United States, were urging their kids to get a government job.

**Some of President Obama's appointments have been at least mildly encouraging** (Robert Gates, Arne Duncan), while others have been disappointing in all-too-predictable ways (Eric Holder, Sonia Sotomayor, Kevin Jennings). But the now-withdrawn nomination of Erroll Southers to head the Transportation Safety Administration was a puzzler. For a job that requires great judgment and discretion, Obama chose a man who misused a secret government database for personal reasons (and was less than forthcoming in his testimony about it); who would have given workers on the front lines against terror the same union protections as Agriculture Department file clerks; and who, based on a 2008 interview, seemed to view pro-life and "Christian identity" groups as a bigger threat than al-Qaeda and its allies (who are, of course, provoked by America's foreign policy). We're sure Mr. Southers would have done fine work keeping fundamentalist Episcopalians from blowing up aircraft, but for the job of stopping Islamic terrorists he was singularly ill-suited. Let us give thanks that the job will not be his.

**The president has done it again: called Guantanamo Bay a "recruiting tool,"** something that causes Muslims to join up with the jihad. He said, "Make no mistake: We will close Guantanamo Prison, which has damaged our national-security interests and become a tremendous recruiting tool for al-Qaeda. In fact, that was an explicit rationale for the formation of al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula." Jihadism has no shortage of excuses — it never has. It had plenty of excuses before any jihadist was sent to Guantanamo

Bay. And an American president should be careful not to give any credence to jihadist excuses. He should also be careful about mentioning the “explicit rationales” of jihadists. The American-Israeli alliance is an explicit rationale of terrorist groups; so is the American-Saudi alliance; so is an Iraq striving toward democracy. Terrorists do not dictate our policies, and they should be free of any illusion that they do.

**In a region traditionally known for producing loud, blustery autocrats who champion failed economic policies (Castro, Ortega, Chávez),** Chile is a quietly remarkable success story. On January 11, it signed an accession agreement to become the first South American member of the OECD. Less than a week later, Chilean voters elected a conservative government for the first time since General Pinochet stepped down 20 years ago. The victory of presidential candidate Sebastián Piñera, a billionaire airline mogul, ends two decades of rule by the center-left Concertación coalition, whose multiple governments largely maintained the free-market economic reforms that were adopted under Pinochet. In recent years, Chilean officials moved away from pro-growth policies and toward greater social spending, but they also saved much of their copper windfall during the commodity boom, ensuring that they were in a strong fiscal position when the global financial crisis erupted. Piñera will inherit a well-run economy — one that has the potential to grow much faster. His election, like that of Ricardo Martinelli in Panama last May, affirms that not all Latin American countries are moving left.

**Miep Gies used to say she was just an ordinary housewife. Austrian by birth, and Catholic, she married a Dutchman named Jan Gies and lived in Amsterdam.** In the war, Miep and Jan helped hide Otto Frank and his family in a secret room, daily risking their own lives to do so. For Miep, Otto Frank’s young daughter Anne was a girl “full of the joy of just being alive,” and she remembered seeing Anne writing her diary with a look of utter intensity in her face. When the Gestapo rounded up the Franks, Miep kept Anne’s diary safe. She also respected Anne’s privacy. If she’d read those pages, she would have found references to herself and Jan, and might well have destroyed the lot for fear that the Gestapo in another search would incriminate them. After the war Otto Frank returned, and he was with Miep when he heard that his wife and daughters were dead. Miep took out the diary, saying, “Here is your daughter Anne’s legacy to you.” More than that, it is a legacy to us all. *The Diary of Anne Frank* has been published in millions of copies in dozens of languages. Miep had her part in rescuing a human document that touches the heart like no other. This admirable lady lived to be 100. The world could do with a lot more ordinariness like hers. R.I.P.



"RELAX, I PUT A **FREEZE** ON RECKLESS FLYING."



© by Wash Post/Intern Group  
Lisw © 2012

