



Dr. Fred Schwarz

The Schwarz Report

Volume 50, Number 4



Dr. David Noebel

April 2010

God, Science and Beauty

by David A. Noebel

As an avid reader of *Free Inquiry* magazine, a Secular Humanist publication, I've learned over the years how much Christianity is disdained and science and reason are praised. So I decided to do a little open-minded research into the "science" scene to see if I could discover anything that could bury Christianity once and for all. Now I'd like to share exactly what I uncovered in my investigation.

First, let's look at a colorful comment on science and objectivity as described by Paul Davies, a popular writer on science, especially physics: "There is a popular misconception that science is an impersonal, dispassionate, and thoroughly objective enterprise. Whereas most other human activities are dominated by fashions, fads, and personalities, science is supposed to be constrained by agreed rules of procedure and rigorous tests. It is the results that count, not the people who produce them. This is, of course, manifest nonsense. Science is a people-driven activity like all human endeavor, and just as subject to fashion and whim. In this case, fashion is set not so much by choice of subject matter, but the way scientists think about the world."

I found Davies' quote in the introduction to Richard P. Feynman's book *Six Easy Pieces: Essentials of Physics*. Because physics is the king of the sciences, I decided to begin my homework there. Davies names Richard Feynman as the one physicist who stands out among twentieth century physicists!

Yes, there was Paul Dirac, who, according to John C. Taylor at the University of Cambridge, "was one of the finest physicists of [the twentieth] century. The development of quantum mechanics began at the turn of the century, but it was Dirac who, in 1925 and 1926, brought the subject to its definite form, creating a theory as compelling as Newton's mechanics had been."

Taylor also summarized Dirac's philosophy of physics: "Physical laws should have mathematical beauty." So science includes the concept of beauty in addition to imagination, experimentation, and "guess work" (Feynman).

Another physicist, Steven Weinberg, actually says that modern day "string" theory will "survive in the final underlying laws of physics" because the theory is "beautiful." (The Taylor and Weinberg quotes are both found in Richard P. Feynman and Steven Weinberg's *Elementary Particles and the Laws of Physics*.)

If "beauty" plays a role in physics, why then are Christians ridiculed for believing the "heavens declare the beauty [the Hebrew word *kabod* can be translated glorious, splendor, beautiful, stately, magnificence] of God, and they are a marvelous display of His craftsmanship" (Psalm 19:1)?

Let me explain why I chose Feynman as the focus of my research. According to Davies, there have been three major icons in the realm of physics—Isaac Newton, Albert Einstein, and Richard Feynman. Davies says, "Richard Feynman has become an icon for late twentieth-century physics—the first American to achieve this status." Davies also believes it "is unlikely that the world will see another Richard Feynman."

So what did I do? I ordered and tried to read the following works by Feynman: *The Meaning of It All: Thoughts of*

Founded in 1953, the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, under the leadership of Dr. Fred C. Schwarz (1913-2009), has been publishing a monthly newsletter since 1960. *The Schwarz Report* is edited by Dr. David A. Noebel and Dr. Michael Bauman. The Crusade's address is PO Box 129, Manitou Springs, CO 80829. Our telephone number is (719) 685-9043. All correspondence and tax-deductible gifts (the Crusade is a 501(c)3 tax-exempt organization) may be sent to this address. Permission to reproduce materials from this *Report* is granted provided our name and address are given.

a Citizen-Scientist; Six Easy Pieces: Essentials of Physics; Elementary Particles and the Laws of Physics; The Pleasure of Finding Things Out; Theory of Fundamental Processes; and The Feynman Lectures on Physics.

Apart from the 1001 equations sprinkled throughout Feynman's work, e.g., $(h^2/2s) + (nh^2/2s') = (b-1)h^2/2R$ (I think that translates "earth," but I could be wrong!), I actually began to understand what the world of particle physics is about. (Don't worry, though—it isn't going to my head because somewhere I read that if you think you understand it, you really don't understand it!)

However, because my academic background is philosophy (unfortunately, Feynman does not like philosophers, psychologists, or for that matter, the National Academy of Sciences), I knew there were some challenges ahead, but, in all honesty, not exactly what I expected.

Reading Paul Davies alerted me to the fact that Feynman walks, eats, drinks, sleeps, and dreams "subatomic particles, atoms and nuclei, molecules and chemical bonding, the structure of solids, superconductors and superfluids" (just a few areas of his expertise), and also the fact that Feynman exhibits another quality lacking in much of science today—when he doesn't know something, he admits it!

For example, in *Six Easy Pieces*, Feynman says, "It is important to realize that in physics today, we have no knowledge of what energy is" (p. 71). That got my immediate attention!

If we don't know what energy is, what do or don't we know about gravity, magnetism, weak forces, strong forces, dark matter, or dark energy? This line of thinking brought to mind an article in which a Harvard astronomer admitted that we use terms like dark matter and dark energy because we don't know anything about them. This admission should strike us immediately because the latest word is that over 90% of the universe consists of dark energy!

This knowledge immediately brings to mind an obvious question for the *Free Inquiry* brethren: if we don't know such things, how do they know with absolute certainty that God does not exist? In every issue, Richard Dawkins and Christopher Hitchens pontificate on why God doesn't exist, telling their readers they are basing their certainty claims on "science."

I think Paul Kurtz would be wise to have a little chat with his atheist writers to question them about the source of their "proof." My wild guess is they get it from Jack Daniels 90 proof!

After I discovered that energy isn't yielding up too much information about itself even for Feynman to

grasp definitively (and if he can't grasp it, I'm quite sure Dawkins can't), I began wondering what else physics can't tell us.

Here is Feynman in his own words on what we don't know:

"First, we do not yet know all the basic laws [of physics]: there is an expanding frontier of ignorance." (p.2)

"Where do the laws that are to be tested come from?" (p.2)

"The rules of the game are what we mean by fundamental physics . . . actually, we do not have all the rules now." (p. 24)

"The calculations that are involved in this theory [quantum nucleodynamics] are so difficult that no one has ever been able to figure out what the consequences of the theory are . . . we do not yet know where it fits." (p. 39)

"Everything works exactly the same for the muon as for the electron, except that one is heavier than the other. Why is there another heavier, what is the use for it? We do not know." (p. 43)

"We do not know how the universe got started, and we have never made experiments which check our ideas of space and time accurately." (p. 44)

"We seem gradually to be groping toward an understanding of the world of sub-atomic particles, but we really do not know how far we have yet to go in this task." (p. 44)

"We do not know the patterns of motions that there should be inside the earth." (p. 66)

"It is important to realize that in physics today, we have no knowledge of particles inside the nucleus, and we have formulas for that, but we do not have the fundamental laws. We know that it is not electrical, not gravitational, and not purely chemical, but we do not know what it is." (p. 71)

"We do not understand energy as a certain number of little blobs." (p. 84)

"We do not understand the conservation of energy." (p. 84)

"Galileo discovered a very remarkable fact about the principle of inertia—if something is moving with nothing touching it and completely undisturbed, it will go on forever, coasting at a uniform speed in a straight line. Why does it keep on coasting? We do not know." (p. 93)

"None of these nuclear or electrical forces has yet been found to explain gravitation." (p. 113)

"The gravitational attraction relative to the electrical repulsion between two electrons is 1 divided by 4.17×10 to the 42nd power. The question is, where does such a

large number come from? . . . This fantastic number is a natural constant so it involved something deep in nature.” (p. 110)

“The quantum-mechanical aspects of nature have not yet been carried over to gravitation.” (p. 113)

“What is the machinery behind the law [regarding quantum behavior]? No one has found any machinery behind the law . . . no one can ‘explain’ any more than we have just ‘explained’ . . . we have no idea about a more basic mechanism from which these results can be deduced.” (p. 134)

These “we don’t know” are from just one book—*Six Easy Pieces: Essentials of Physics*.

In *The Meaning of It All*, Feynman says something that should interest Hitchens and Dawkins, Harris and Dennett: “Science cannot disprove the existence of God” (p. 36). To that he adds, “I also agree that a belief in science and religion is consistent.” He insists that science cannot produce “the meaning of life” nor can it tell us “the right moral values.” These must come from somewhere else.

Now if science and physics cannot tell us what or who is behind the machinery of the laws of the universe, then why is it so illogical for Christians to suggest John 1:1-3 for starters? And if science cannot tell us the meaning of life or what is right and wrong, then why is it so illogical for Christians to suggest Paul’s epistle to the Romans?

Why doesn’t Feynman get the attention he deserves? My guess is that he’s way too honest for a scientific world hung up on government grants. He would never say global warming is based on “settled” science. In fact, he says, “all scientific knowledge is uncertain.” He would never have agreed with the scientific powers that destroyed the career of Dr. Richard Stenberg for publishing a peer-reviewed article by Steven Meyer on natural selection and mutations in a Smithsonian publication. Since Feynman is never at a loss for words, he probably would have referred to those responsible for such an outrage as “dishonest scientific hacks.”

Feynman also believes that Western Civilization is based primarily on two things: science and Christian ethics—“The other great heritage is Christian ethics—the basis of action on love, the brotherhood of all men, the value of the individual—the humility of the spirit.” This statement would never pass muster at *Free Inquiry*! (This, in spite of the fact that the atheist Bertrand Russell acknowledged that what the world really needs is love, “Christian love.” You can find Russell’s quote on Google under “Bertrand Russell Quotes.”)

Feynman is also too conservative for the hierarchy of the National Academy of Sciences. In *The Pleasure of Finding Things Out*, he says, “I believe, therefore, that although it is not the case today, that there may some day come a time, I should hope, when it will be fully appreciated that the power of government should be limited; that government ought not to be empowered to decide the validity of scientific theories, that that is a ridiculous thing for them to try to do; that they are not to decide the various descriptions of history or of economic theory or of philosophy” (p. 115).

Richard Feynman is not a Christian, but he reminds me of Sir Isaac Newton, who said, “I was like a boy playing on the seashore and diverting myself now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me.”

Would that this were the mindset of *Free Inquiry*’s Richard Dawkins!

Pelosi’s Favorite Stalinist

by Joshua Muravchik

Since becoming speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi has campaigned for unconditional withdrawal from Iraq with surprising fervor, making it sound as if “the war” and George W. Bush were America’s only enemies. I had supposed that the Democrats would prefer to keep up a drumbeat of criticism of the administration’s teetering policies without assuming responsibility for whatever comes next in Iraq, which is what they will in effect be doing if they force the president’s hand. I had, in short, thought they would behave more like politicians than like ideologues and activists. I had missed the ideological streak in Pelosi’s own background.

Pelosi comes from the San Francisco Bay Area, where Democrats have long positioned themselves far to the left of the national party. For example, former congressman Ron Dellums of Berkeley was a tireless stalwart of Communist front groups, and other representatives, like George Miller, Pelosi’s closest colleague in the House, and the Burton brothers, John and Phil, manned the party’s left fringe. Miller still does.

The reason for this sharp tilt was not, as one might imagine, the influence of University of California student

radicalism, which in reality had little reach into practical politics. Rather, it was the unique character of organized labor in the Bay Area. Everywhere else in America, the AFL-CIO was a staunch force for anti-communism. This was symbolized by labor's most important postwar leader, George Meany, who denied labor's backing to George McGovern in the 1972 presidential election for the sole reason that McGovern was soft on communism, and who organized a welcome to America gala for Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in 1975, when President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger refused to receive the Soviet dissident.

Beginning in the late 1940s, American labor unions had purged their own ranks of Communists, the AFL-CIO adopting a policy of expelling any union led by Communists. By and large, this policy provided sufficient impetus for anti-Communist factions to organize to battle the Communists within those unions in which they had become powerful. In most cases the anti-Communists succeeded in running the Communists out. But in some cases the Communists won, and the most important such exception was the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU), which controlled the docks of San Francisco.

The ILWU was duly expelled from the AFL-CIO, but it thrived nonetheless. It became arguably the most powerful union in the Bay Area and a big supporter of leftist causes, including inside the Democratic party. Unlike UC students, the ILWU could bring lots of money and resources to bear on behalf of favored candidates.

The force behind the ILWU's ideology was Harry Bridges, an Australian immigrant and devoted Communist. The Roosevelt and Truman administrations tried to deport Bridges, on the grounds that he had lied about his Communist affiliation in his immigration papers, but for various procedural reasons the case was dismissed. So loyal was Bridges to Moscow that during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact, he opposed the (1940) reelection of labor hero FDR, because Roosevelt was aligning the United States with Britain against Germany, and the ILWU printed antiwar pamphlets proclaiming "The Yanks Are NOT Coming." As soon as Hitler's forces invaded the Soviet Union, Bridges did a 180-degree about-face on the war.

While Bridges and his union took transparently pro-Communist stances, Bridges denied that he was a Communist. Only after the fall of the USSR, and the opening of Soviet archives, did the truth emerge that Bridges had been not merely in the party but a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party USA, a position for which the documents show he was directly approved by

the Kremlin.

This means, plain and simple, that he had devoted his life to the service of the Soviet Union and its ruler, Joseph Stalin, one of the three greatest mass murderers of all time. (Hitler and Mao Zedong are the other two.) Like Ronald Reagan, Bridges believed the world was menaced by an evil empire, but to him, the evil was the United States. The influence of Harry Bridges and his ILWU was what pulled the Bay Area Democratic party so far to the left.

The point of rehearsing all of this ancient history is that one of those he influenced and who still goes out of her way to honor that influence is Nancy Pelosi. In 2001, she took to the pages of the Congressional Record to effuse her sentiments on the hundredth anniversary of Harry Bridges's birth, an occasion celebrated only by a gnostic few.

Here is what she said: "Harry Bridges [was] arguably the most significant labor leader of the twentieth century," who was "beloved by the workers of this Nation, and recognized as one of the most important labor leaders in the world." She added: "The International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union [was] the most progressive union of the time." In other words, this Communist-run union was more admirable than all of the anti-Communist unions.

Pelosi delivered this encomium a full nine years after Bridges's membership in the CP Central Committee had been revealed. Nor was this just a single moment. As recently as this February she visited ILWU headquarters to deliver this homage: "It is very special to me, any occasion that I can come to the ILWU hall and acknowledge the leadership of this great union. . . ." This was not just an infatuation with one man. In addition to her tribute to Bridges, she delivered a similar encomium to another prominent Bay Area Stalin fan, Vivian Hallinan, whose husband was Bridges's lawyer and the 1952 candidate for president of the Communist-front Progressive party. "Vivian," she enthused, "was devoted intellectually and passionately to many causes, well before they became popularly embraced."

This is not to say that Pelosi is a Communist—who is these days?—or that she ever was. But about her adoration of the Stalin-worshiping Bridges there is no doubt. It is no less egregious than Senator Trent Lott's apparent endorsement of Strom Thurmond's racist past, which cost Lott the Senate leadership, the difference being that Thurmond had long since renounced racism, while Bridges never renounced communism.

As she leads the Democratic campaign to withdraw

from Iraq and sallies off to meet the likes of Syrian strongman Bashar al-Assad, we should know Pelosi's wretched record in judging who are history's good guys and who are its bad. And we should be mindful that some of what she knows about political values was learned at the feet of people who believed fervently that the great enemy of mankind was none other than America itself.

—*Weekly Standard.com*, June 25-July 2, 2007

Back on Uncle Sam's Plantation

by Star Parker

Six years ago I wrote a book called *Uncle Sam's Plantation*. I wrote the book to tell my own story of what I saw living inside the welfare state and my own transformation out of it.

I said in that book that indeed there are two Americas. A poor America on socialism and a wealthy America on capitalism.

I talked about government programs like Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS), Emergency Assistance to Needy Families with Children (EANF), Section 8 Housing, and Food Stamps—a vast sea of perhaps well-intentioned government programs, all initially set into motion in the 1960s, that were going to lift the nation's poor out of poverty.

A benevolent Uncle Sam welcomed mostly poor black Americans onto the government plantation. Those who accepted the invitation switched mindsets from “How do I take care of myself?” to “What do I have to do to stay on the plantation?”

Instead of solving economic problems, government welfare socialism created monstrous moral and spiritual problems, the kind of problems that are inevitable when individuals turn responsibility for their lives over to others.

The legacy of American socialism is our blighted inner cities, dysfunctional inner city schools, and broken black families.

Through God's grace, I found my way out. It was then that I understood what freedom meant and how great this country is.

I had the privilege of working on welfare reform in 1996, passed by a Republican congress and signed into law by a Democrat president. A few years after enactment,

welfare roles were down fifty percent.

I thought we were on the road to moving socialism out of our poor black communities and replacing it with wealth producing American capitalism.

But, incredibly, we are going in the opposite direction.

Instead of poor America on socialism becoming more like rich America on capitalism, rich America on capitalism is becoming like poor America on socialism.

Uncle Sam has welcomed our banks onto the plantation and they have said, “Thank you, Suh.”

Now, instead of thinking about what creative things need to be done to serve customers, they are thinking about what they have to tell Massah in order to get their cash.

There is some kind of irony that this is all happening under our first black president on the 200th anniversary of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln.

Worse, socialism seems to be the element of our new young president. And maybe even more troubling, our corporate executives seem happy to move onto the plantation.

In an op-ed on the opinion page of the *Washington Post*, Mr. Obama is clear that the goal of his trillion dollar spending plan is much more than short-term economic stimulus.

“This plan is more than a prescription for short-term spending—it's a strategy for America's long-term growth and opportunity in areas such as renewable energy, health care, and education.”

Perhaps more incredibly, Obama seems to think that government taking over an economy is a new idea. Or that massive growth in government can take place “with unprecedented transparency and accountability.”

Yes, sir, we heard it from Jimmy Carter when he created the Department of Energy, the Synfuels Corporation, and the Department of Education.

Or how about the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—The War on Poverty—which President Johnson said “. . . does not merely expand old programs or improve what is already being done. It charts a new course. It strikes at the causes, not just the consequences of poverty.”

Trillions of dollars later, black poverty is the same. But black families are not, with triple the incidence of single parent homes and out of wedlock births.

It's not complicated. Americans can accept Barack Obama's invitation to move onto the plantation. Or they can choose personal responsibility and freedom.

Does anyone really need to think about what the choice should be?

—*Townhall.com*, February 9, 2009

The Global Warming

Meltdown

by E. Calvin Beisner

Forget all you've heard about unprecedented global warming; global warming so rapid it can't be natural but must be anthropogenic; global warming threatening to devastate economies, ecosystems, and perhaps even human civilization itself; global warming on which “the science is settled” and “the debate is over.”

Forget it all.

Last Saturday (February 13), Dr. Phil Jones, long-time director of the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia (until he stepped down in December under investigation for scientific misconduct) and the provider of much of the most important data on which the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and many governments have based fears of unprecedented global warming starting in the mid-1970s, gave an interview to the BBC in which he made some shocking revelations.

Keep in mind, as you read the list of those revelations below, that the BBC has been a major proponent of belief in dangerous anthropogenic global warming (DAGW) and indeed has billions of dollars of its pension funds invested in ventures that stand to benefit from that belief. Its interviewer was by no means hostile to Jones, did not follow up when Jones's answers were less than forthcoming, and generally simply gave Jones a platform from which to attempt to vindicate himself and the theory he has long promoted.

Nonetheless, in the interview Jones:

1. admitted that he did not believe that “the debate on climate change is over” and that he didn't “believe the vast majority of climate scientists think this” (Al Gore, Barack Obama, Barbara Boxer, did you hear that? Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, Union of Concerned Scientists, did you hear that? Ed Begley, Robert Kennedy, Richard Cizik, Jim Ball, did you hear that?);

2. admitted that there was no statistically significant difference between rates of warming from 1860-1880 and 1910-1940 and the rate from 1975-1998, though he and other DAGW believers had for years said the rate in the last period was unprecedented and therefore couldn't be natural but must be manmade;

3. admitted that there has been no statistically significant warming for the last 15 years (though he personally believes this is only a temporary pause in manmade warming);

4. admitted that natural influences could have contrib-

uted to the 1975-1998 warming (significantly mentioning only the sun and volcanoes—the latter a brief cooling factor—and completely omitting reference to ocean circulations such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the North Atlantic Oscillation, and the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, and changes in cloudiness stemming from both the ocean circulations and changes in influx of cosmic rays, all of which have been demonstrated to have strong effect on global temperature);

5. admitted that the revelation of data handling failures at CRU and elsewhere (e.g., the U.K. Meteorological Office) had shaken the trust many people have in science;

6. admitted that the Medieval Warm Period might well have been as warm as the Current Warm Period (1975-present), or warmer, and that if it was “then obviously the late-20th century warmth would not be unprecedented” (though he persisted in doubting the MWP to have been global and as warm as the present);

7. dodged a question about a change of rules at the IPCC allowing lead authors to cite scientific papers not published by deadline, despite the Climategate emails record having shown that he was actively involved in precisely that change;

8. said that his “life has been awful” since Climategate broke in November;

9. dodged a question about why he had asked a colleague to delete emails relating to the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report, asked the colleague to ask others to do likewise, and said he had already done so himself;

10. dodged a question about whether some of his handling of data had crossed the line of acceptable scientific practice;

11. dodged a question about the significance of his having written in one email that he had used a “trick” to “hide the decline” in tree-ring temperature data.

As a former journalist, having conducted many interviews, and now often interviewed myself by journalists and talk show hosts, I can't avoid the strong impression that Jones was given the questions, or at least some, in advance and probably made lack of tough follow-up questions a condition of submitting to be interviewed. (By the way, I have never either required or granted such conditions.) His obviously having been prepared with a statistical table to refer to in answer to the first question is one of the evidences of that.

In related news, the UK's *Mail Online* reported that Jones has admitted having trouble “keeping track” of the data he has used in constructing the research papers claiming unprecedented recent warming. *Mail Online* said Jones said there was truth in colleagues' observations “that he lacked organizational skills, that his office was swamped

with piles of paper and that his record keeping is ‘not as good as it should be.’” It also reported that colleagues say “the reason . . . Jones refused Freedom of Information requests is that he may have actually lost the relevant papers.” Though admitting his failure at record keeping, however, Jones “denied he had cheated over the data or unfairly influenced the scientific process.” Nonetheless, Jones told the *Sunday Times* “that he had contemplated suicide” over the revelations that he had “misjudged” the “handling of requests for information.”

BBC environmental editor Roger Harrabin also interviewed Jones. Harrabin's report tells of Jones's saying American data centers suffered similar poor record keeping—which implies that none of the datasets on which the IPCC and other bodies have relied is really trustworthy. (This is the same Roger Harrabin, by the way, who admits that the IPCC needs major reforming to regain credibility but rejects its abolition because “without a mutually-accepted source of information it is inconceivable that nations of the world will be able to agree on a joint resolve to cut emissions”—i.e., he already knows the conclusion and what policy should be, and the crucial thing is to ensure that the world stays on message. For all you non-logicians out there, this is called begging the question.)

Replicability is a hallmark of truly scientific research, and meticulous record keeping is essential to replicability. And, as Dr. Benny Peiser, director of the Global Warming Policy Foundation and editor of CCNet, the Cambridge Conference Network newsletter, points out, Jones's excuse for his failure to share data in response to requests rings hollow in light of the fact that the Climategate emails leaked from the CRU demonstrate that he readily shared the data with sympathetic researchers.

Dr. Indur M. Goklany, who has worked with the IPCC as an author, U.S. delegate, and reviewer and was an analyst with the U.S. Department of the Interior, and the author of a book and numerous scholarly papers on climate change, posted annotations to Jones's BBC interview at WattsUpWithThat.com, a leading site critical of DAGW. A few of his points:

- Jones's dismissal of the lack of warming over the last 15 years and cooling over the last 8 hides the fact that “this is at odds with the IPCC's model-based claim that were emissions frozen at 2000 levels then we would see a global temperature increase of 0.2°C per decade. This, in turn, suggests that the IPCC models have overestimated climate sensitivity for greenhouse gases, underestimated natural variability, or both. This also suggests that there is a systematic upward bias in the impacts estimates [forecasts of damage from warming] based on these models.”

- Jones's saying he still believes the post-1975 warming

is anthropogenic because it can't be explained by solar and volcanic forcing “is based on laughable logic. It is an ‘argument from ignorance’! . . . What about internal natural variability and other ‘natural influences’? How well do we know the external and internal sources of natural variability?”

- Jones's attempt to whitewash his claim in an email to have used “Mike's Nature trick” to “hide the decline” was mere obfuscation. Although Jones rightly pointed out that he wasn't trying to hide a decline in instrumental temperature observations, the reality is that he was trying to hide a decline in tree-ring temperature proxy observations from about 1960 to 1999—a decline that put the tree-ring proxies in direct opposition to thermometer measures for that period, what paleoclimatologists now refer to in shorthand as “the divergence problem.” Goklany comments, “1. Given the divergence problem, how can it be assumed that tree rings are valid proxies for temperature for other places at other times?” But if they aren't, then the alarmists have lost all basis for their “hockey stick” graphs purporting to show stable global temperature for thousands of years leading to unprecedented warming in the last century. “2. The divergence problem may be well known among tree ring researcher but laymen and policy makers for whom the IPCC Summary for Policy Makers was supposedly written are generally ignorant of it. I also suspect that scientists in other disciplines were not aware of the divergence problem. They were owed this information up front, in the only document on climate change they were likely to read. Another sin of omission.” I.e., however technically accurate Jones's explanation of the event might be, hiding the decline still resulted in deceiving decision makers and hiding the much more important implication of the divergence problem: The basis for claims of long-term stability brought to an end by human carbon dioxide emissions was wrong.

Jones's concessions are no tempest in a teapot. They strike at the very root of DAGW fears and of the credibility of temperature data on which the IPCC and governments around the world have based those fears and consequent policies. As the editors of Sunday's *Mail Online* put it,

“Untold billions of pounds have been spent on turning the world green and also on financing the dubious trade in carbon credits.

“Countless gallons of aviation fuel have been consumed carrying experts, lobbyists, and politicians to apocalyptic conferences on global warming.

“Every government on Earth has changed its policy, hundreds of academic institutions, entire school curricula and the priorities of broadcasters and newspapers all over the world have been altered—all to serve the new doctrine that man is overheating the planet and must undertake heroic and costly changes to save the world from drowning as the

icecaps melt.

“You might have thought that all this was based upon well-founded, highly competent research and that those involved had good reason for their blazing, hot-eyed certainty and their fierce intolerance of dissent.

“But, thanks to the row over leaked emails from the Climatic Research Unit, we now learn that this body’s director, Phil Jones, works in a disorganised fashion amid chaos and mess.

“Interviewed by the highly sympathetic BBC, which still insists on describing the leaked emails as ‘stolen’, Professor Jones has conceded that he ‘did not do a thorough job’ of keeping track of his own records.

“His colleagues recall that his office was ‘often surrounded by jumbled piles of papers’.

“Even more strikingly, he also sounds much less ebullient about the basic theory, admitting that there is little difference between global warming rates in the Nineties and in two previous periods since 1860 and accepting that from 1995 to now there has been no statistically significant warming.

“He also leaves open the possibility, long resisted by climate change activists, that the ‘Medieval Warm Period’ from 800 to 1300 AD, and thought by many experts to be warmer than the present period, could have encompassed the entire globe.

“This is an amazing retreat, since if it was both global and warmer, the green movement’s argument that our current position is ‘unprecedented’ would collapse.

“It is quite reasonable to suggest that human activity may have had some effect on climate.

“There is no doubt that careless and greedy exploitation has done much damage to the planet.

“But in the light of the ‘Climategate’ revelations, it is time for governments, academics and their media cheerleaders to be more modest in their claims and to treat sceptics with far more courtesy.

“The question is not settled.”

The *Wall Street Journal* wrote similarly in an editorial today that before even getting to the story of Jones’s admissions led off:

“It has been a bad—make that dreadful—few weeks for what used to be called the “settled science” of global warming, and especially for the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that is supposed to be its gold standard.

First it turns out that the Himalayan glaciers are not going to melt anytime soon, notwithstanding dire U.N. predictions. Next came news that an IPCC claim that global warming could destroy 40% of the Amazon was based on a report by an environmental pressure group. Other IPCC sources of scholarly note have included a mountaineering magazine

and a student paper.

Since the climategate email story broke in November, the standard defense is that while the scandal may have revealed some all-too-human behavior by a handful of leading climatologists, it made no difference to the underlying science. We think the science is still disputable. But there’s no doubt that climategate has spurred at least some reporters to scrutinize the IPCC’s headline-grabbing claims in a way they had rarely done previously.

Take the rain forest claim. In its 2007 report, the IPCC wrote that “up to 40% of the Amazonian forests could react drastically to even a slight reduction in precipitation; this means that the tropical vegetation, hydrology and climate system in South America could change very rapidly to another steady state.”

But as Jonathan Leake of London’s *Sunday Times* reported last month, those claims were based on a report from the World Wildlife Fund, which in turn had fundamentally misrepresented a study in the journal *Nature*. The *Nature* study, Mr. Leake writes, “did not assess rainfall but in fact looked at the impact on the forest of human activity such as logging and burning.”

The IPCC has relied on World Wildlife Fund studies regarding the “transformation of natural coastal areas,” the “destruction of more mangroves,” “glacial lake outbursts causing mudflows and avalanches,” changes in the ecosystem of the “Mesoamerican reef,” and so on. The Wildlife Fund is a green lobby that believes in global warming, and its “research” reflects its advocacy, not the scientific method.

The IPCC has also cited a study by British climatologist Nigel Arnell claiming that global warming could deplete water resources for as many as 4.5 billion people by the year 2085. But as our Anne Jolis reported in our European edition, the IPCC neglected to include Mr. Arnell’s corollary finding, which is that global warming could also increase water resources for as many as six billion people.

The IPCC report made aggressive claims that “extreme weather-related events” had led to “rapidly rising costs.” Never mind that the link between global warming and storms like Hurricane Katrina remains tenuous at best. More astonishing (or, maybe, not so astonishing) is that the IPCC again based its assertion on a single study that was not peer-reviewed. In fact, nobody can reliably establish a quantifiable connection between global warming and increased disaster-related costs. In Holland, there’s even a minor uproar over the report’s claim that 55% of the country is below sea level. It’s 26%.

—*Cornwall Alliance Newsletter*, February 17, 2010 To view this article in its entirety, please check our website.