

&nbsp;Fax:&nbsp;&nbsp;  +49-431/565876<br>  
 &nbsp;e-mail: avillwock@ifm.uni-kiel.de<br>  
 &nbsp;WWW: http://www.clivar.org<br>  
 \*\*\*\*\*<span>  
 pan  
 ></span>\*\*\*</div>  
 </body>  
 </html>  
 </x-html>

### XXX-122

From ???@??? Fri Sep 07 10:36:33 2001  
 Return-Path: <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>  
 Received: from deimos.email.Arizona.EDU (128.196.133.166) by  
 phobos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)  
 id 3B96CDBF0002DE5A for jto@email.arizona.edu; Fri, 7 Sep 2001  
 09:48:43 -0700  
 Received: from s8.pik-potsdam.de (193.174.19.132) by  
 deimos.email.Arizona.EDU  
 (5.1.071)  
 id 3B9542A800055667 for jto@email.arizona.edu; Fri, 7 Sep 2001  
 09:48:41 -0700  
 Received: from pik-potsdam.de (pc111.pik-potsdam.de [193.174.19.82])  
 by s8.pik-potsdam.de (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTP id SAA11810;  
 Fri, 7 Sep 2001 18:48:54 +0100  
 Message-ID: <3B98FAB9.11EAF00C@pik-potsdam.de>  
 Date: Fri, 07 Sep 2001 18:50:01 +0200  
 From: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>  
 X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (WinNT; U)  
 X-Accept-Language: en  
 MIME-Version: 1.0  
 To: Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
 CC: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu, lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-  
 state.edu,  
 rbradley@climatl1.geo.umass.edu, jcole@geo.arizona.edu,  
 Malcolm hughes <mhughes@lrr.arizona.edu>,  
 Jean-Claude.Duplessy@cfr.cnrs-gif.fr,  
 Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
 p.jones@uea.ac.uk, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,  
 "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
 Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
 References: <3AB2315B.5D211D58@pik-potsdam.de>  
 <a0433014db6d7e11ebbe4@[128.196.13.114]>  
 <3ABA24E1.24055404@pik-potsdam.de>  
 <a04330113b6dffd6e4bb3@[209.179.157.243]>  
 <3B98D9E7.63FC6590@pik-potsdam.de>  
 <a04330110b7bea3ff8427@[128.196.13.114]>  
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
 Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
 Hi colleagues,  
 I think such a resolution is a good medium-term idea, but not the  
 solution to my short-term problem - I need to write a few sentences  
 over  
 the weekend basically, and will be grateful for any suggestions. Is it  
 true that the Mann et al. compilation shows similar unusual warming in

the last hundred years even with the tree data not included? (I apologise to Mike for only vaguely remembering his talks about this, I'm

afraid I didn't take notes.) That would be an important point, as the written sceptics statement that I'm trying to refute specifically attacks the tree ring data.

Stefan

--

Stefan Rahmstorf

Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK)

For contact details, reprints, movies & general infos see:

<http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~stefan>

XXX-123

From ???@??? Fri Sep 07 10:36:35 2001

Return-Path: <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>

Received: from mail.virginia.edu (128.143.2.9) by phobos.email.Arizona.EDU

(5.1.071)

id 3B96CDBF0002E18F for jto@email.arizona.edu; Fri, 7 Sep 2001

09:54:37 -0700

Received: from smtp.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa06299; 7 Sep 2001 12:54 EDT

Received: from MannPC.virginia.edu (mannpc.evsc.Virginia.EDU [128.143.42.178])

by smtp.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id MAA20956;

Fri, 7 Sep 2001 12:54:07 -0400

Message-Id:

<5.0.2.1.0.20010907130612.02bb3ec0@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>

X-Sender: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2

Date: Fri, 07 Sep 2001 13:10:55 -0400

To: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>,

Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>

From: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>

Subject: Re: sceptics attack!

Cc: lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu,

rbradley@climatl.geo.umass.edu,

jcole@geo.arizona.edu, Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,

Jean-Claude.Duplessy@cfr.cnrs-gif.fr,

Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,

p.jones@uea.ac.uk, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,

"Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>, mann@virginia.edu

In-Reply-To: <3B98FAB9.11EAF00C@pik-potsdam.de>

References: <3AB2315B.5D211D58@pik-potsdam.de>

<a0433014db6d7e11ebbe4@[128.196.13.114]>

<3ABA24E1.24055404@pik-potsdam.de>

<a04330113b6dffd6e4bb3@[209.179.157.243]>

<3B98D9E7.63FC6590@pik-potsdam.de>

<a04330110b7bea3ff8427@[128.196.13.114]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

<x-flowed>HI Stefan,

I have to run off to teach but will reply a bit later on. As Peck mentions, there are still some legitimate uncertainties in what we do, and



we're all working to address that and introduce the appropriate caveats in our current conclusions. If that's what this was all about, there would be no problem. Unfortunately, the skeptics aren't interested in a balanced or honest discussion, but rather in delivering a one-sided and deeply flawed attack that disinforms a relatively ignorant the lay public who is their target...

There are a few key points that address the most serious flaws in their line of reasoning and attack. Got to run, but will outline these in an email later on this afternoon.

Thanks for getting in touch w/ us about this. More in a bit,  
mike

At 06:50 PM 9/7/01 +0200, Stefan Rahmstorf wrote:

>Hi colleagues,

>

>I think such a resolution is a good medium-term idea, but not the  
>solution to my short-term problem - I need to write a few sentences  
over

>the weekend basically, and will be grateful for any suggestions. Is it  
>>true that the Mann et al. compilation shows similar unusual warming in  
>the last hundred years even with the tree data not included? (I  
>apologise to Mike for only vaguely remembering his talks about this,  
I'm

>afraid I didn't take notes.) That would be an important point, as the  
>written sceptics statement that I'm trying to refute specifically  
>attacks the tree ring data.

>

>Stefan

>

>--

>Stefan Rahmstorf

>Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK)

>For contact details, reprints, movies & general infos see:

><http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~stefan>

---

Professor Michael E. Mann

Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, VA 22903

---

e-mail: [mann@virginia.edu](mailto:mann@virginia.edu) Phone: (434) 924-7770 FAX: (434) 982-2137

<http://www.evsc.virginia.edu/faculty/people/mann.shtml>

</x-flowed>

XXX-124

From ???@??? Sat Sep 08 15:48:20 2001

Return-Path: <[hpollack@jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu](mailto:hpollack@jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu)>

Received: from jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu (141.211.108.22) by  
phobos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)

id 3B96CDBF000447DF for jto@email.arizona.edu; Sat, 8 Sep 2001

11:30:15 -0700

Received: from localhost by jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3)

with  
ESMTP id OAA15106;  
Sat, 8 Sep 2001 14:29:43 -0400 (EDT)  
Date: Sat, 8 Sep 2001 14:29:42 -0400 (EDT)  
From: "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
To: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>  
cc: <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>, <lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu>,  
<rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu>, <jcole@geo.arizona.edu>,  
Malcolm Hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
<Jean-Claude.Duplessy@cfm.cnrs-gif.fr>,  
Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, <tcrowley@nc.rr.com>,  
Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>, <drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu>,  
Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
In-Reply-To: <a04330110b7bea3ff8427@[128.196.13.114]>  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.  
4.31.0109081243550.14496-100000@jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN  
<x-charset X-UNKNOWN>  
Hello Stefan and others,  
While there are differences that remain between the northern hemisphere temperature reconstructions that emerge from the borehole temperatures versus those that derive from the multi-proxies, both techniques tell essentially the same story for the 20th century: it has been a century of rapid warming, both in the magnitude and rate of warming. The boreholes and the multiproxies independently say that it has been the warmest and the most rapidly warming century of the past five and past ten centuries, respectively. Sceptics have a very difficult time sidestepping these fundamental observations about the 20th century. The boreholes, however, suggest that the 20th century warming is an acceleration of warming that began earlier, whereas the multiproxies show a long slow cooling prior to the 20th century warming. I am among those who have wondered whether the dendroclimatologic data has fully retained the long period variability of the climate signal. Were it only the borehole people who are in need of persuasion here, it would be one thing. But this perspective is shared to varying degrees by others in the paleoclimate community, and I do not think it is a dead issue. I have not been persuaded by Mike's arguments to the effect that the long term cooling trend prior to the 20th century warming can be seen in the other proxies independently of the dendro data. This is not the place to argue that point, but I concur with Peck that we must be really clear about what we know with high confidence, and what issues still have some scientific play associated with them. To that end, I repeat my opening statement recommending that we continue

to emphasize the strong 20th century agreement between the instrumental record, the borehole record, the multi-proxies, and a host of other indirect indications that the 20th century was a very unusual century. Add

to that the strong correlation of the 20th century surface temperature history with the radiative forcing history (but only if the anthropogenic

forcings are included), and you essentially make the IPCC case. The disagreements that we may have amongst ourselves are small compared to that common view of the 20th century.

To address some of Stefan's particular questions:

That there is evidence that natural forcings played a central role in climate prior to when humans became big influences on climate is no surprise. But the question is not whether the sun has played an important

role in the climate system thousands of year ago. The question is whether

it is the central player in the 20th century. All efforts to model 20th century climate using only natural forcings have failed. Anthropogenic forcings are a necessary and increasingly important ingredient in reproducing the global temperature over the 20th century with climate models.

As for the argument that CO2 plays a minor role in climate, one can simply

point to the Vostok and Grip cores which show strong correlations of CO2,

CH4 and temperature. If nothing else these observations argue for strong

coupling between the carbon cycle and temperature. The "lead or lag" arguments sometimes put out are to my mind irrelevant; the essential point

is that when one changes, the other does too. In the 20th century it is the CO2 that is driving, and temperature is tracking closely. Not even the

skeptics argue with the observation that anthropogenic greenhouse gases increased dramatically in the 20th century.

As for the past 2000 years, I don't know which cores they are referring to, and Lonnie is the obvious person to help with the details. But if it

is the Greenland cores the German skeptics are emphasizing, one can point

out that what happens locally in Greenland does not necessarily paint a global picture. It may be a good indicator for the North Atlantic, but is

it a representative record for the entire hemisphere or globe? This is one

argument frequently used in addressing the question of whether the Medieval Warm Period or the Little Ice Age were global or regional events.

A hemispheric or global picture requires hemispheric or global data. In summary, my experience with the skeptics (and I have had quite a bit)

leads me to recommend that you turn the argument back to the 20th century

at every possible opportunity. They always want to exploit the uncertainties of the past, whereas the more current information is more strongly based on instrumental observations, is much

more diverse, and much more geographically widespread.  
 Good luck!  
 Cheers,  
 Henry Pollack

---

On Fri, 7 Sep 2001, Jonathan Overpeck wrote:

> Hi Stefan (and other friends of coal companies) - um, this does sound  
 > familiar, and the only good thing about this kind of attack is that  
 > it forces us to be really clear about what we know and don't know. In  
 > the US, that has meant refuting the biased attacks on the various  
 > paleo proxy-based records (e.g., Mann et al), at the same time  
 > working to improve what we know about the same proxies.  
 > Unfortunately, we don't know anything for sure, but that's science.  
 > We do know that lots of the attacks are biased and poorly justified.  
 >  
 > We never got around to doing any PAGES/CLIVAR resolution - the WG  
 > support one way or the other was not strong, so it was easier not to  
 > do anything. Of course, you make a good case why we should have tried  
 > harder. But that's behind us. It might be possible for us to do it  
 > now - IF we had a hero to lead the effort - right now, I'm maxed out  
 > (but would be happy to help).  
 >  
 > I've cc'd your msg to a host of colleagues who have been in this  
 > debate for some time over here. Some on the list are on the  
 > PAGES/CLIVAR working group - now smaller and more focused thanks to  
 > CLIVAR's pushing. But, for a paleo "resolution" to be drafted, I  
 > think we'd want at least this group - some "neo" guys, but also so  
 > card-carrying dirt-digging paleo guys. We could easily get more.  
 >  
 > But we need a hero - probably from this group - to take the lead.  
 > I'm hoping Mike Mann might be that person. He's on the P/C working  
 > group, knows the issues as well as (understatement) anyone, and seems  
 > to be the most productive person this side of the mid-Atlantic ridge.  
 > But, as you say, we'd need good buy in from more traditional paleo  
 > folk - e.g., dendro, borehole, ice-core, coral, sediments.  
 >  
 > What do you all think?  
 >  
 > Does this make sense Jean-Claude and Keith? (I can't speak for P/C  
 alone).  
 >  
 > cheers, Peck  
 >  
 > >Hi Jonathan,  
 > >  
 > >I thought the subject line might capture your attention... but  
 > >seriously, we're facing a concerted action here at the moment, a  
 German  
 > >geological institute has launched a well-orchestrated challenge to  
 IPCC  
 > >including a book launch, cover articles in major newspapers, a  
 > >simultaneous official request in the Bundestag, etc. They have the  
 coal  
 > >industry on their side. Not surprising to you in the US I'm sure but  
 a  
 > >novelty for germany, where so far the sceptics had no ground to  
 stand

> >on.  
> >  
> >The gist: IPCC is dominated by modelers and neo-climatologists;  
> >paleo-climatologists were marginalised; if you look at the  
paleoclimatic  
> >facts you come to opposite conclusions from the scare-mongering  
> >modelers, namely that CO2 plays a minor role for climate and solar  
> >variability dominates everything.  
> >  
> >I need to draft a response for the government and remember our  
Venice  
> >meeting - didn't you plan some kind of resolution, emphasising that  
> >paleo-records point at the 20th Century being extremely unusual, and  
> >emphasising that many records are threatened due to glaciers  
vanishing?  
> >Does this resolution exist, so I can quote it as an example of  
> >internationally leading paleoclimatologists supporting IPCC  
conclusions?  
> >In my response I want to argue that these guys from the  
Bundesanstalt  
> >f\_r Geowissenschaften do not represent paleoclimatology, but rather  
are  
> >completely marginal in the paleoclimatology community. (Or have you  
> >heard much of them? The most prominent guy is Ulrich Berner.)  
> >  
> >Specifically, they challenge Mann et al. data based on the argument  
that  
> >tree rings are unreliable for long-term trends. They claim that ice  
core  
> >records show climate shifts within the past 2,000 years that are  
much  
> >larger than what happened in the 20th C.  
> >Any ideas how to counter this? I thought that a catchy example that  
> >politicians might understand is Lonnie's problems with vanishing ice  
on  
> >Kilimandjaro. What other clear examples do we have for the 20th C  
being  
> >beyond normal variability?  
> >Hope that now before your baby is there you might still have a few  
> >minutes to give me some advice.  
> >  
> >Cheers,  
> >Stefan  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> >--  
> >Stefan Rahmstorf  
> >Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK)  
> >For contact details, reprints, movies & general infos see:  
> ><http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~stefan>  
>  
> --  
> Jonathan T. Overpeck  
> Director, Institute for the Study of Planet Earth  
> Professor, Department of Geosciences  
>

> Mail and Fedex Address:  
 >  
 > Institute for the Study of Planet Earth  
 > 715 N. Park Ave. 2nd Floor  
 > University of Arizona  
 > Tucson, AZ 85721  
 > direct tel: +1 520 622-9065  
 > fax: +1 520 792-8795  
 > [http://www.geo.arizona.edu/Faculty\\_Pages/Overpeck.J.html](http://www.geo.arizona.edu/Faculty_Pages/Overpeck.J.html)  
 > <http://www.ispe.arizona.edu/>  
 >

XXX-125

```
</x-charset>
From ???@??? Sat Sep 08 15:48:20 2001
Return-Path: <mann@virginia.edu>
Received: from deimos.email.Arizona.EDU (128.196.133.166) by
phobos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)
id 3B96CDBF00044BEA for jto@email.arizona.edu; Sat, 8 Sep 2001
11:58:59 -0700
Received: from mail.virginia.edu (128.143.2.9) by
deimos.email.Arizona.EDU
(5.1.071)
id 3B99715B00008D29 for jto@email.arizona.edu; Sat, 8 Sep 2001
11:58:58 -0700
Received: from smtp.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa02926;
8 Sep 2001 14:58 EDT
Received: from mem6u95.virginia.edu (va-charlottesville2a-
149.chr.adelphia.net
[24.51.158.149])
by smtp.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id OAA06316;
Sat, 8 Sep 2001 14:58:40 -0400
Message-Id:
<5.0.2.1.0.20010907145851.022a91a0@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>
X-Sender: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2
Date: Sat, 08 Sep 2001 15:04:56 -0400
To: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>,
Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>, lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-
state.edu,
rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu, jcole@geo.arizona.edu,
Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,
Jean-Claude.Duplessy@cfr.cnrs-gif.fr,
Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,
p.jones@uea.ac.uk, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,
"Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>
From: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@virginia.edu>
Subject: Re: sceptics attack!
Cc: mann@virginia.edu
In-Reply-To:
<5.0.2.1.0.20010907130612.02bb3ec0@multiproxy.evsc.virginia
.edu>
References: <3B98FAB9.11EAF00C@pik-potsdam.de>
<3AB2315B.5D211D58@pik-potsdam.de>
<a0433014db6d7e11ebbe4@[128.196.13.114]>
<3ABA24E1.24055404@pik-potsdam.de>
```



<a04330113b6dffd6e4bb3@[209.179.157.243]>  
 <3B98D9E7.63FC6590@pik-potsdam.de>  
 <a04330110b7bea3ff8427@[128.196.13.114]>  
 Mime-Version: 1.0  
 Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
 boundary="===== 76200674==\_ .ALT"  
 <x-html><!x-stuff-for-pete base="" src="" id="0" charset=""><html>  
 Dear Stefan (and others):<br>  
 <br>  
 Here are two typical related erroneous claims by the skeptics, and  
 appropriate responses:<br>  
 <br>  
 <i>1) &quot;Proxies such as that used by MBH (Mann/Bradley/Hughes)  
 don't  
 show&nbsp; late 20th warming&quot;<br>  
 <br>  
 </i>The warming trend in the proxy-reconstructed Northern Hemisphere  
 temperature reconstruction closely matches that in the actual 20th  
 century Northern Hemisphere temperature series, with no evidence of any  
 significant trend in the residuals. The calibration interval terminates  
 in 1980 because relatively few proxy records extend into the most  
 recent  
 decades (many terminate in the 1970s and early 1980s).&nbsp; It is  
 a&nbsp; thus a deliberately misleading statement to say that the  
 reconstruction &quot;doesn't reproduce the post 1980 warming&quot;. We  
 don't attempt to reconstruct the post 1980 warming w/ the network at  
 hand. <br>  
 <br>  
 The skeptics often confuse this (intentionally?) with a largely  
 independent observation (Briffa et al, 1998; see also followup by  
 Vaganov, Hughes et al) of a decline in the strength of the relationship  
 between certain types of (mostly high latitude) tree ring density  
 records  
 and temperature in the latter 20th century. This decline is largeeey  
 evident in&nbsp; only&nbsp; tree ring latewood density and not annual  
 ring width data (very few of the former are used by MBH), and only  
 appears to be a problem in the most recent decades. <br>  
 <br>  
 <i>2) &quot;Problems w/ tree-ring data compromise the reliability of  
 MBH  
 (Mann/Bradley/Hughes) <br>  
 <br>  
 </i>It is indeed the case (as you correctly recall) that we have shown  
 that our reconstruction of the century-scale trends over the past few  
 centuries is robust to the inclusion/disclosure of tree ring data from  
 our proxy network (there is enough coral, ice core, and long historical  
 data to attempt a multiproxy reconstruction w/out tree ring data over  
 the  
 past few centuries--such a comparison shows that the basic trends are  
 not  
 sensitive to using tree ring data anyways. This is shown in the  
 following  
 article:<br>  
 <br>  
 Mann, M.E., Gille, E., Bradley, R.S., Hughes, M.K., Overpeck, J.T.,  
 Keimig, F.T., Gross, W., Global Temperature Patterns in Past Centuries:  
 An interactive presentation, Earth Interactions, 4-4, 1-29, 2000. <br>

<br>

which is available electronically here:

[http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/paleo/ei/ei\\_cover.html](http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/paleo/ei/ei_cover.html)<br>

<br>

In this regard, I must take some exception to one of the statements in Henry's otherwise very informative and helpful email&nbsp;; (which I just

received now as I was ready to send this out!). We *\*have\** shown in the above peer-reviewed manuscript (of which Peck is, incidentally, a co-author)&nbsp;; that the basic trends in our Northern Hemisphere temperature reconstruction are insensitive to whether or not tree ring data are used at all! In fact, in unpublished work (hopefully soon to be published) we believe we show reasonably convincingly that a reconstruction<i> using borehole data </i>(based an alternative approach

from that used by Henry which makes use of spatial covariance information

and explicit calibration) yields again more or less the same trend!

But,

I agree with Henry, this is not the place for that particular debate...<br>

<br>

I hope the above is helpful. Please let me know if I can be of further help.<br>

<br>

Cheers,<br>

<br>

mike<br>

<br>

At 01:10 PM 9/7/01 -0400, Michael E. Mann wrote:<br>

<blockquote type=cite class=cite cite>HI Stefan,<br>

<br>

I have to run off to teach but will reply a bit later on.&nbsp;; As Peck mentions, there are still some legitimate uncertainties in what we do, and we're all working to address that and introduce the appropriate caveats in our current conclusions. If that's what this was all about, there would be no problem. Unfortunately, the skeptics aren't interested

in a balanced or honest discussion, but rather in delivering a one-sided

and deeply flawed&nbsp;; attack that disinforms a relatively ignorant&nbsp;; the lay public who is their target...<br>

<br>

There are a few key points that address the most serious flaws in their line of reasoning and attack. Got to run, but will outline these in an email later on this afternoon.<br>

<br>

Thanks for getting in touch w/ us about this. More in a bit,<br>

<br>

mike<br>

<br>

At 06:50 PM 9/7/01 +0200, Stefan Rahmstorf wrote:<br>

<blockquote type=cite class=cite cite>Hi colleagues,<br>

<br>

I think such a resolution is a good medium-term idea, but not the<br> solution to my short-term problem - I need to write a few sentences over<br>





state.edu,  
 rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu, jcole@geo.arizona.edu,  
 Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
 Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr,  
 Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
 p.jones@uea.ac.uk, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,  
 "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"  
 <x-flowed>Hi Peck,  
 I agree with you that we need to take position. This implies  
 writing some scientific paper and obviously we need a hero to push  
 it, M. Mann could be the right guy, together with people from corals,  
 ice core, etc..  
 As editor of CLIMATE DYNAMICS, a journal which is well read  
 on both sides of the Atlantic, and in particular in Europe with the  
 EGS support, I suggest this review being submitted to CLIMATE  
 DYNAMICS. Obviously, it will experience a large review process, but I  
 could ensure to speed it up. Then it would be nice to have it printed  
 and published in Germany. I think that a review in an international  
 journal would have more impact than any grey literature coming out as  
 IGBP report.  
 cheers  
 jean claude  
 Jean-Claude DUPLESSY  
 laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement  
 Laboratoire mixte CNRS-CEA  
 F - 91198 Gif sur Yvette cedex  
 - tel (33) 01 69 82 35 26  
 - fax (33) 01 69 82 35 68  
 - e-mail : [Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr](mailto:Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr)

XXX-127

From ???@??? Wed Sep 12 10:31:12 2001  
 Return-Path: <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>  
 Received: from tree.ltrr.arizona.edu (128.196.218.200) by  
 phobos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)  
 id 3B96CDBF0009D4A2 for jto@email.arizona.edu; Wed, 12 Sep 2001  
 10:14:31 -0700  
 Received: from QUPE (uofa40.dakotacom.arizona.edu [150.135.116.40])  
 by tree.ltrr.arizona.edu (8.10.1/8.10.1/LTRR) with ESMTP id  
 f8CHE5U285101;  
 Wed, 12 Sep 2001 10:14:05 -0700 (MST)  
 From: "Malcolm Hughes" <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>  
 To: "Malcolm K. Hughes" <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
 Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>,  
 "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 Date: Wed, 12 Sep 2001 10:16:06 -0700  
 MIME-Version: 1.0  
 Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
 Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
 CC: mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu, Keith Alverson  
 <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>,  
 Jean-Claude Duplessy <Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr>,  
 Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>,  
 lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu, rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu,



jcole@geo.arizona.edu, Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
 Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr,  
 Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
 drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,  
 "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
 Message-ID: <3B9F35E6.28772.12CEDA@localhost>  
 X-Confirm-Reading-To: "Malcolm Hughes" <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>  
 X-pmrqc: 1  
 Return-receipt-to: "Malcolm Hughes" <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>  
 Priority: normal  
 In-reply-to:  
 <5.0.2.1.0.20010912121028.02b88c30@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 References: <1000306901.3b9f78d51d62f@schulman.ltrr.arizona.edu>  
 X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)  
 <x-charset ISO-8859-1>Mike- the issue is not mainstream climatologists,  
 by  
 people and an  
 institute who may well be mainstream geoscientists. My comments  
 were based on my reading of Stefan's original message to Peck  
 (reproduced at the end of this message). Hope this helps, Cheers,  
 Malcolm  
 Hi Jonathan,  
 >  
 >I thought the subject line might  
 capture your attention... but  
 >seriously, we're facing a concerted  
 action here at the moment, a German  
 >geological institute has launched a  
 well-orchestrated challenge to IPCC  
 >including a book launch, cover  
 articles in major newspapers, a  
 >simultaneous official request in the  
 Bundestag, etc. They have the coal  
 >industry on their side. Not surprising  
 to you in the US I'm sure but a  
 >novelty for germany, where so far  
 the sceptics had no ground to stand  
 on.  
 >  
 >The gist: IPCC is dominated by  
 modelers and neo-climatologists;  
 >paleo-climatologists were  
 marginalised; if you look at the  
 paleoclimatic  
 >facts you come to opposite  
 conclusions from the scare-mongering  
 modelers,  
 >namely that CO2 plays a minor role  
 for climate and solar variability  
 >dominates everything.  
 >  
 >I need to draft a response for the  
 government and remember our Venice  
 >meeting - didn't you plan some kind  
 of resolution, emphasising that  
 >paleo-records point at the 20th  
 Century being extremely unusual, and

>emphasising that many records are threatened due to glaciers vanishing?  
 >Does this resolution exist, so I can quote it as an example of  
 >internationally leading paleoclimatologists supporting IPCC conclusions?  
 >In my response I want to argue that these guys from the Bundesanstalt für Geowissenschaften do not represent paleoclimatology, but rather are completely marginal in the paleoclimatology community. (Or have you heard  
 >much of them? The most prominent guy is Ulrich Berner.)  
 >  
 >Specifically, they challenge Mann et al. data based on the argument that  
 >tree rings are unreliable for longterm trends. They claim that ice core  
 >records show climate shifts within the past 2,000 years that are much  
 >larger than what happened in the 20th C. Any ideas how to counter this? I  
 >thought that a catchy example that politicians might understand is  
 >Lonnie's problems with vanishing ice on Kilimandjaro. What other clear  
 >examples do we have for the 20th C being beyond normal variability? Hope  
 >that now before your baby is there you might still have a few minutes to  
 >give me some advice.  
 >  
 >Cheers,  
 >Stefan  
 >>>  
 >--  
 >Stefan Rahmstorf  
 >Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK)  
 >For contact details, reprints, movies & general infos see:  
 ><http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~stefan>  
 Malcolm Hughes  
 Professor of Dendrochronology  
 Laboratory of Tree-Ring Research  
 University of Arizona  
 Tucson, AZ 85721  
 520-621-6470  
 fax 520-621-8229

From ???@??? Tue Sep 11 10:33:33 2001  
 Return-Path: <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 Received: from deimos.email.Arizona.EDU (128.196.133.166) by  
 phobos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)  
 id 3B96CDBF00080894 for jto@email.arizona.edu; Tue, 11 Sep 2001  
 10:07:23 -0700  
 Received: from mail.virginia.edu (128.143.2.9) by  
 deimos.email.Arizona.EDU  
 (5.1.071)  
 id 3B99715B00042917 for jto@email.arizona.edu; Tue, 11 Sep 2001  
 10:07:22 -0700  
 Received: from smtp.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa24293;  
 11 Sep 2001 13:06 EDT  
 Received: from MannPC.virginia.edu (mannpc.evsc.Virginia.EDU  
 [128.143.42.178])  
 by smtp.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id NAA27532;  
 Tue, 11 Sep 2001 13:05:58 -0400  
 Message-Id:  
 <5.0.2.1.0.20010911122846.02138790@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 X-Sender: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu  
 X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2  
 Date: Tue, 11 Sep 2001 13:23:14 -0400  
 To: Jean-Claude Duplessy <Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr>,  
 Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
 From: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
 Cc: lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu,  
 rbradley@climatel.geo.umass.edu,  
 jcole@geo.arizona.edu, Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
 Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr,  
 Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
 p.jones@uea.ac.uk, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,  
 "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>, mann@virginia.edu  
 In-Reply-To: <v0422080cb7c3d541bf59@[157.136.14.188]>  
 References: <a04330110b7bea3ff8427@[128.196.13.114]>  
 <3AB2315B.5D211D58@pik-potsdam.de>  
 <a0433014db6d7e11ebbe4@[128.196.13.114]>  
 <3ABA24E1.24055404@pik-potsdam.de>  
 <a04330113b6dffd6e4bb3@[209.179.157.243]>  
 <3B98D9E7.63FC6590@pik-potsdam.de>  
 <a04330110b7bea3ff8427@[128.196.13.114]>  
 Mime-Version: 1.0  
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed  
 <x-flowed>Dear Jean-Claude, Peck, et al...  
 The currents events transpiring in the U.S. make this all seem so  
 trivial  
 in comparison, but a few comments:  
 I'm flattered by Peck and Jean-Claude's support for me to head this  
 particular effort...  
 However, I'm not sure if this is likely to be most effective. The  
 problem  
 is that I in particular have been the focal point of many of the ad  
 hominem  
 attacks by the skeptics, even though it is clear that the basic message  
 the  
 skeptics don't like (ie, that recent temperatures are unprecedented at  
 the

hemispheric/global level over the past several centuries/millennium) follows from many of our efforts. The "skeptics" (as Malcolm points out, we need a new word for them--suggestions?) like to single me out (e.g., the "Mann reconstruction", etc.), as if my work is isolated from my collaborators and other colleagues doing similar work (Tom, Phil, Keith, Ed, Henry, etc.).

I think this effort would be more successful if a few of our more august senior colleagues were to lead this sort of effort. I know that Ray and Henry have been particularly active in trying to counter act "skeptical" disinformation campaigns here in the states. I think Peck, Tom, and Phil would be very helpful here too. It isn't just the paleo record but the observational surface temperature record which is often under attack. I think that anything that we right had to have broad authorship and representation...

I'm happy to help out, but I think its actually best if I'm not seen as the

"leader" of the effort,

mike

At 04:59 PM 9/11/01 +0200, Jean-Claude Duplessy wrote:

>Hi Peck,

>>

> I agree with you that we need to take position. This implies  
> writing some scientific paper and obviously we need a hero to push  
it, M.

> Mann could be the right guy, together with people from corals, ice  
core,  
etc..

>

> As editor of CLIMATE DYNAMICS, a journal which is well read on  
> both sides of the Atlantic, and in particular in Europe with the EGS  
> support, I suggest this review being submitted to CLIMATE DYNAMICS.  
> Obviously, it will experience a large review process, but I could  
ensure

> to speed it up. Then it would be nice to have it printed and published  
in

> Germany. I think that a review in an international journal would have  
> more impact than any grey literature coming out as IGBP report.

>

> cheers

>

>jean claude

>

>Jean-Claude DUPLESSY

>laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement

>Laboratoire mixte CNRS-CEA

>F - 91198 Gif sur Yvette cedex

>

>- tel (33) 01 69 82 35 26

>- fax (33) 01 69 82 35 68

>

>- e-mail : Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr

---

Professor Michael E. Mann  
 Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall  
 University of Virginia  
 Charlottesville, VA 22903

---

e-mail: mann@virginia.edu Phone: (434) 924-7770 FAX: (434) 982-2137  
<http://www.evsc.virginia.edu/faculty/people/mann.shtml>  
 </x-flowed>

**XXX-129**

From ???@??? Wed Sep 12 10:20:31 2001  
 Return-Path: <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>  
 Received: from mailhub.unibe.ch (130.92.9.52) by  
 phobos.email.Arizona.EDU  
 (5.1.071)  
 id 3B96CDBF000947DF for jto@email.arizona.edu; Wed, 12 Sep 2001  
 00:11:03 -0700  
 Received: from CONVERSION-DAEMON by mailhub.unibe.ch (PMDF V5.2-32  
 #42480)  
 id <OGJJ00701FX6JW@mailhub.unibe.ch> for jto@u.arizona.edu; Wed,  
 12 Sep 2001 09:10:20 +0200 (MEST)  
 Received: from ubecx01 (ubecx01.unibe.ch [130.92.6.40])  
 by mailhub.unibe.ch (PMDF V5.2-32 #42480)  
 with ESMTP id <OGJJ0077XFX5DQ@mailhub.unibe.ch>; Wed,  
 12 Sep 2001 09:10:18 +0200 (MEST)  
 Received: from [130.92.225.155] (pages-icecore.unibe.ch  
 [130.92.225.155])  
 by ubecx01.unibe.ch (PMDF V5.2-32 #42481)  
 with ESMTP id <OGJJ008MLFY5LR@ubecx01.unibe.ch>; Wed,  
 12 Sep 2001 09:10:53 +0200 (MET DST)  
 Date: Wed, 12 Sep 2001 09:14:30 +0200  
 From: Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>  
 Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
 In-reply-to:  
 <5.0.2.1.0.20010911122846.02138790@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 To: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>,  
 Jean-Claude Duplessy <Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr>,  
 Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
 Cc: lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu,  
 rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu,  
 jcole@geo.arizona.edu, Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
 Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr,  
 Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
 p.jones@uea.ac.uk, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,  
 "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>, mann@virginia.edu  
 Message-id: <B7C4D7F5.1F3F%alverson@pages.unibe.ch>  
 MIME-version: 1.0  
 Content-type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1  
 Content-transfer-encoding: 8BIT  
 User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022  
 <x-charset ISO-8859-1>Hi All,  
 I agree that a high profile peer reviewed publication rather than grey  
 literature is best. It may be that (some) of the worries that Mike  
 expresses  
 could be alleviated by having the publication somehow appear as an  
 'official' CLIVAR/PAGES product, thereby removing some of the



association  
 with any particular author's perceived personal agenda and  
 distinguishing  
 this from a review paper coming from an individual or small group of  
 collaborators.  
 Should a leader nominate him/herself, and should a group of people  
 (such as  
 the email recipients of these emails or a similar one) wish to  
 collaborate  
 on such a paper oriented around debating the points of the un-skeptical  
 greenhouse deniers as an official CLIVAR/PAGES product, I am confident  
 that  
 PAGES would be able to support this effort both in name and with a  
 (small  
 amount) of funding should it be required. I guess that CLIVAR would  
 also be  
 supportive.  
 Note that the recently published PAGES glossy brochure "Environmental  
 Variability and Climate Change" which serves as the executive summary  
 of our  
 (in prep) synthesis book, is in part oriented around discussing a  
 series of  
 questions often raised by these deniers (if you have not received a  
 copy yet  
 please request it). The glossy is of course aimed at a much different  
 audience than a paper in the peer reviewed literature would be.  
 Keith  
 --

Keith Alverson  
 Executive Director  
 PAGES International Project Office  
 Borenplatz 2, 3011 Bern  
 Switzerland  
<http://www.pages-igbp.org>  
 Tel: +41 31 312 31 33  
 Mobile: (+41) 079 641 9220  
 Fax: +41 31 312 31 68  
 > From: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 > Date: Tue, 11 Sep 2001 13:23:14 -0400  
 > To: Jean-Claude Duplessy <Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr>,  
 Jonathan  
 > Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
 > Cc: lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu,  
 rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu,  
 > jcole@geo.arizona.edu, Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
 > Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr, Keith Alverson  
 > <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
 p.jones@uea.ac.uk,  
 > drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu, "Henry N. Pollack"  
 <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>,  
 > mann@virginia.edu  
 > Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
 >  
 > Dear Jean-Claude, Peck, et al...  
 >  
 > The current events transpiring in the U.S. make this all seem so  
 trivial

> in comparison, but a few comments:  
 >  
 > I'm flattered by Peck and Jean-Claude's support for me to head this  
 > particular effort...  
 >  
 > However, I'm not sure if this is likely to be most effective. The  
 problem  
 > is that I in particular have been the focal point of many of the ad  
 hominem  
 > attacks by the skeptics, even though it is clear that the basic  
 message the  
 > skeptics don't like (ie, that recent temperatures are unprecedented  
 at the  
 > hemispheric/global level over the past several centuries/millennium)  
 > follows from many of our efforts. The "skeptics" (as Malcolm points  
 out,  
 > we need a new word for them--suggestions?) like to single me out  
 (e.g., the  
 > "Mann reconstruction", etc.), as if my work is isolated from my  
 > collaborators and other colleagues doing similar work (Tom, Phil,  
 Keith,  
 > Ed, Henry, etc.).  
 >  
 > I think this effort would be more successful if a few of our more  
 august  
 > senior colleagues were to lead this sort of effort. I know that Ray  
 and  
 > Henry have been particularly active in trying to counter act  
 "skeptic"  
 > disinformation campaigns here in the states. I think Peck, Tom, and  
 Phil  
 > would be very helpful here too. It isn't just the paleo record but  
 the  
 > observational surface temperature record which is often under attack.  
 I  
 > think that anything that we right had to have broad authorship and  
 > representation...  
 >  
 > I'm happy to help out, but I think its actually best if I'm not seen  
 as the  
 > "leader" of the effort,  
 >  
 > mike  
 >  
 > At 04:59 PM 9/11/01 +0200, Jean-Claude Duplessy wrote:  
 >> Hi Peck,  
 >>  
 >>  
 >> I agree with you that we need to take position. This implies  
 >> writing some scientific paper and obviously we need a hero to push  
 it, M.  
 >> Mann could be the right guy, together with people from corals, ice  
 core,  
 >> etc..  
 >>  
 >> As editor of CLIMATE DYNAMICS, a journal which is well read on  
 >> both sides of the Atlantic, and in particular in Europe with the EGS

>> support, I suggest this review being submitted to CLIMATE DYNAMICS.  
 >> Obviously, it will experience a large review process, but I could ensure  
 >> to speed it up. Then it would be nice to have it printed and published in  
 >> Germany. I think that a review in an international journal would have  
 >> more impact than any grey literature coming out as IGBP report.  
 >>  
 >> cheers  
 >>  
 >> jean claude  
 >>  
 >> Jean-Claude DUPLESSY  
 >> laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement  
 >> Laboratoire mixte CNRS-CEA  
 >> F - 91198 Gif sur Yvette cedex  
 >>  
 >> - tel (33) 01 69 82 35 26  
 >> - fax (33) 01 69 82 35 68  
 >>  
 >> - e-mail : Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr  
 >  
 >

---

> Professor Michael E. Mann  
 > Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall  
 > University of Virginia  
 > Charlottesville, VA 22903  
 >

---

> e-mail: mann@virginia.edu Phone: (434) 924-7770 FAX: (434) 982-2137  
 > <http://www.evsc.virginia.edu/faculty/people/mann.shtml>  
 >  
 </x-charset>

### XXX-130

From ???@??? Wed Sep 12 10:20:39 2001  
 Return-Path: <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 Received: from mail.virginia.edu (128.143.2.9) by  
 phobos.email.Arizona.EDU  
 (5.1.071)  
 id 3B96CDBF0009ADC7 for jto@email.arizona.edu; Wed, 12 Sep 2001  
 09:01:43 -0700  
 Received: from smtp.mail.virginia.edu by mail.virginia.edu id aa03197;  
 12 Sep 2001 11:54 EDT  
 Received: from MannPC.virginia.edu (mannpc.evsc.Virginia.EDU  
 [128.143.42.178])  
 by smtp.mail.Virginia.EDU (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id LAA12294;  
 Wed, 12 Sep 2001 11:54:42 -0400  
 Message-Id:  
 <5.0.2.1.0.20010912121028.02b88c30@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 X-Sender: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu  
 X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.0.2  
 Date: Wed, 12 Sep 2001 12:12:05 -0400

To: "Malcolm K. Hughes" <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>, Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>  
 From: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
 Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
 Cc: mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu, Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, Jean-Claude Duplessy <Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr>, Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>, lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu, rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu, jcole@geo.arizona.edu, Malcolm Hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>, Jean-Claude Duplessy <lsce.cnrs-gif.fr>, Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu, "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
 In-Reply-To: <1000306901.3b9f78d51d62f@schulman.ltrr.arizona.edu>  
 References: <5.1.0.14.0.20010912092809.00aac870@pop.uea.ac.uk> <5.0.2.1.0.20010911122846.02138790@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu> <5.1.0.14.0.20010912092809.00aac870@pop.uea.ac.uk>  
 Mime-Version: 1.0  
 Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed  
 <x-flowed iso-8859-1>Malcolm,  
 Can you share w/ us the source of your information? I wasn't aware of this  
 "campaign" and I know that mainstream German climate researchers will (e.g., Stefan Ramstorf) will not support this kind of thing. If there is  
 such a plan, we need to consult w/ Stefan about this,  
 mike  
 At 08:01 AM 9/12/01 -0700, Malcolm K. Hughes wrote:  
 >Dear colleagues,  
 >We have discussed a published response to the "skeptics", in particular the  
 >web-based type of critic, but I wonder if Jean-Claude had something else in  
 >mind. As I understand it, the concern has arisen that a part of  
 >"established" or  
 >"official" science in Germany is planning an active campaign within the  
 >German  
 >governmental and political scene. Their intent is to question the main IPCC  
 >findings, with, in their eyes, the high-resolution paleo component as a weak  
 >point of the IPCC TAR. Because the critics are geologists, they will have  
 >credibility in these circles, and a journal article, appropriately  
 >distributed,  
 >could be a useful tool. As in the US, those with power and influence (even  
 >within our National Academy of Science) seem not to understand the difference  
 >between the scientific approaches needed to study decade to century  
 >variability  
 >as distinct from longer-term phenomena.  
 >If my understanding is correct, I think Jean-Claude's suggestion should be

>followed. If we are only talking about the general problem Phil discussed,  
>then  
>Phil is right.  
>Malcolm  
>>  
>Quoting Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>:  
>  
> >  
> > Dear All,  
> > I've been bogged down with meetings and proposal writings to  
> > respond>  
> > sooner, and today  
> > doesn't seem appropriate but here goes.  
> > Mike raised the issue of the observational record and with this  
> > no  
> > matter what I write or  
> > say will alter the skeptic view. CRU has had several emails  
thanking  
> > us  
> > for the information  
> > pages on our web site urging us to do more to counter the view.  
> > Questions>  
> > I get at talks on  
> > the surface record generally cite the satellite record as showing  
> > no  
> > warming. I have a  
> > prepared answer, which I think is good, but in Britain at least  
there  
> > is>  
> > a partial belief that  
> > scientists (and governments for some) are not to be believed  
(because  
> > of>  
> > CJD, foot and mouth,  
> > nuclear research etc). Even though we are working in a different  
area  
> > the>  
> > view permeates and  
> > we get tarred with the same brush. Responding to people who say we  
> > are  
> > the greenhouse  
> > industry and we say what we say to get more grants is difficult. If  
> > only>  
> > they knew how  
> > difficult is to get some grants !  
> > Mike and a few of you may have been on a skeptic email list. I  
> > was  
> > until recently and it  
> > has taken me about a month to get off. I used to respond and  
> > possibly  
> > changed a few  
> > minds - noticing that when I got these emails they were to me  
> > personally>  
> > and not to the  
> > group. When I responded the issues changed and a month or two later  
> > it



> > was back to the  
> > first issue again. It was just self defeating and time wasting.  
I've  
> > left>  
> > it Mike MacCracken  
> > and a few others to keep replying but he's probably realising it is  
> > a  
> > lost cause.  
> > As a result of the responses I am working on a paper (not really  
> > started) with Dave  
> > Easterling at NCDC on the surface record pointing to a few facts  
> > about  
> > the surface record -  
> > Russia is warming, getting lake/river freeze dates and the like.  
> > Lonnie  
> > writing something  
> > about the demise of tropical ice caps - great talk last time we  
met,  
> > by  
> > the way - would be  
> > useful. Maybe it's done, but the literature is enormous now. My big  
> > hope>  
> > is a paper I know  
> > is being written with a new MSU2 series, with different  
corrections.  
> > The>  
> > new series shows  
> > more warming, but it means the sonde record is wrong. Obviously it  
> > is  
> > important for the  
> > authors to get it right (with Christy and Spencer as reviewers) but  
> > it  
> > all relates (for the MSU  
> > and the sondes) to diurnal cycles not being correctly accounted  
for.  
> > One point the skeptics have been getting at me about is this -  
> > briefly to illustrate their  
> > lack of logic. Christy et al have a paper in GRL (Vol28, 183-186)  
> > which  
> > shows that since  
> > 1979 air temperatures measured by ships and buoys in the tropics  
> > (mainly>  
> > Pacific) have  
> > not warmed as much as SSTs. I was asked by several of the skeptics  
> > when>  
> > I would be  
> > taking this into account in the gridded data. When I said I  
> > wouldn't  
> > because of the assumptions  
> > I make (these are that SST is a surrogate for air temperature) I  
> > was  
> > slammed on the email  
> > list. I said I would need to have the corrections to apply  
spatially  
> > and>  
> > by month and it was  
> > just the tropics (20N-20S, OK a large part of the Earth's surface).

I

> > do>

> > know that a paper will

> > be submitted soon that shows that SSTs in the South Pacific agree

> > better>

> > with island

> > air temperatures than marine temperatures (MATs). Also the paper

> > will

> > show that MATs in

> > the Pacific are being affected by the now dominance of larger

> > container

> > ships as we don't

> > get access to Korean, Japanese and Taiwanese fishing fleet data

> > until

> > decades later.

> > So, to writing a paper. I have written a review in Reviews of

> > Geophysics in 1999 and there

> > was a Science paper (with Keith and Tim) in April 2001. Both were

> > high

> > profile, yet seem

> > to have little effect. They are well cited but they haven't changed

> > any

> > skeptics. In my opinion

> > the satellite record is the key to all this. The millennial record

> > got

> > attention because it was

> > one more thing that needed to be explained away by the skeptics,

but

> > take>

> > away the

> > satellite record and they will melt away like the tropical ice

caps.

> > Mike is right that he isn't right person. They'll just say he got

> > all>

> > his pals to agree that his

> > curve is right. Whether any one else would be better is doubtful.

> > Mike

> > has experienced most

> > of the verbal and web-site attacks, but there isn't much between

> > the

> > curves I've produced,

> > or Keith, Tom and now Ed. Basically the LIA wasn't as cold or the

MWE

> > as>

> > warm as

> > people believed and we are warmer now that we've been for a

> > millennium.

> > What the

> > temperatures were in the 10th century may be an issue but this

wasn't

> > in>

> > the last millennium.

> > My belief is that another paper, even with a CLIVAR/PAGES

> > product

> > name, will do little

> > good to allay the skeptical view. It would be good to work together

> > but

> > it won't achieve the  
> > particular aim. The vital piece of evidence that will be listened  
to  
> > is  
> > the tropical ice caps -  
> > if they are not producing layers now and have nice medieval layers,  
> > this>  
> > is pretty damning.  
> > Knowing why it is happening is something else. The scanty local  
> > records  
> > near the ice caps,  
> > don't show enough warming, but the ice is clearly going, even if  
> > the  
> > MSU2LT/MSU2 show  
> > little warming at these elevations.  
> > The skeptics are skeptical of everything, not just in the  
> > climate  
> > field. I have met a couple  
> > and been told this by a few others over email. They are mostly  
right  
> > wing>  
> > but I guess we all  
> > knew that. As for a new name for them - those I can think of today  
> > aren't>  
> > appropriate. Any  
> > term needs to be secular and not suggesting belief etc.  
> > As I said at the beginning this type of email doesn't seem  
> > relevant  
> > today, but life should  
> > go on - I hope it does.  
> >  
> > All the best to all of you  
> >  
> > Phil  
> >  
> >  
> >  
> > At 09:14 12/09/01 +0200, Keith Alverson wrote:  
> > >Hi All,  
> > >  
> > >I agree that a high profile peer reviewed publication rather than  
grey  
> > >literature is best. It may be that (some) of the worries that  
Mike>  
> > >expresses  
> > >could be alleviated by having the publication somehow appear as an  
> > >'official' CLIVAR/PAGES product, thereby removing some of the  
> > >association  
> > >with any particular author's perceived personal agenda and  
> > >distinguishing  
> > >this from a review paper coming from an individual or small group  
of  
> > >collaborators.  
> > >  
> > >Should a leader nominate him/herself, and should a group of people  
> > (such as  
> > >the email recipients of these emails or a similar one) wish to

> > collaborate  
> > >on such a paper oriented around debating the points of the un-  
skeptical  
> > >greenhouse deniers as an official CLIVAR/PAGES product, I am  
confident  
> > that  
> > >PAGES would be able to support this effort both in name and with a  
> > (small  
> > >amount) of funding should it be required. I guess that CLIVAR  
would  
> > also be  
> > >supportive.  
> > >  
> > >Note that the recently published PAGES glossy brochure  
"Environmental  
> > >Variability and Climate Change" which serves as the executive  
summary  
> > of> our  
> > >(in prep) synthesis book, is in part oriented around discussing a  
> > series of  
> > >questions often raised by these deniers (if you have not received  
a  
> > copy> yet  
> > >please request it). The glossy is of course aimed at a much  
different  
> > >audience than a paper in the peer reviewed literature would be.  
> > >  
> > >Keith  
> > >--  
> > >Keith Alverson  
> > >Executive Director  
> > >PAGES International Project Office  
> > >B%renplatz 2, 3011 Bern  
> > >Switzerland  
> > ><http://www.pages-igbp.org>  
> > >Tel: +41 31 312 31 33  
> > >Mobile: (+41) 079 641 9220  
> > >Fax: +41 31 312 31 68  
> > >  
> > > > From: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
> > > > Date: Tue, 11 Sep 2001 13:23:14 -0400  
> > > > To: Jean-Claude Duplessy <Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-  
gif.fr>,>  
>Jonathan  
> > > > Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
> > > > Cc: lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu,  
> > > rbradley@climatl.geo.umass.edu,  
> > > > jcole@geo.arizona.edu, Malcolm hughes  
<mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
> > > > Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr, Keith Alverson  
> > > > <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
> > > p.jones@uea.ac.uk,  
> > > > drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu, "Henry N. Pollack"  
> > > <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>,  
> > > > mann@virginia.edu  
> > > > Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
> > > >

```

> > > > Dear Jean-Claude, Peck, et al...
> > > >
> > > > The currents events transpiring in the U.S. make this all seem
so>
>trivial
> > > > in comparison, but a few comments:
> > > >
> > > > I'm flattered by Peck and Jean-Claude's support for me to head
this
> > > > particular effort...
> > > >
> > > > However, I'm not sure if this is likely to be most effective.
The>
>problem
> > > > is that I in particular have been the focal point of many of
the ad>
>hominem
> > > > attacks by the skeptics, even though it is clear that the basic
> > message> the
> > > > skeptics don't like (ie, that recent temperatures are
unprecedented
> > at> the
> > > > hemispheric/global level over the past several
> > centuries/millennium)
> > > > follows from many of our efforts. The "skeptics" (as Malcolm
> > points> out,
> > > > we need a new word for them--suggestions?) like to single me
out
> > (e.g.,> the
> > > > "Mann reconstruction", etc.), as if my work is isolated from my
> > > > collaborators and other colleagues doing similar work (Tom,
Phil,
> > Keith,
> > > > Ed, Henry, etc.).
> > > >
> > > > I think this effort would be more successful if a few of our
more
> > august
> > > > senior colleagues were to lead this sort of effort. I know that
Ray
> > and
> > > > Henry have been particularly active in trying to counter act
> > "skeptic"
> > > > disinformation campaigns here in the states. I think Peck, Tom,
and
> > Phil
> > > > would be very helpful here too. It isn't just the paleo record
but
> > the
> > > > observational surface temperature record which is often under
> > attack. I
> > > > think that anything that we right had to have broad authorship
and
> > > > representation...
> > > >
> > > > I'm happy to help out, but I think its actually best if I'm not
seen

```



```

> > as> the
> > > "leader" of the effort,
> > >
> > > mike
> > >
> > > At 04:59 PM 9/11/01 +0200, Jean-Claude Duplessy wrote:
> > >> Hi Peck,
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> I agree with you that we need to take position. This implies
> > >> writing some scientific paper and obviously we need a hero to
push
> > it,> M.
> > >> Mann could be the right guy, together with people from corals,
ice>
>core,
> > >> etc..
> > >>
> > >> As editor of CLIMATE DYNAMICS, a journal which is well read on
> > >> both sides of the Atlantic, and in particular in Europe with
the
> > EGS
> > >> support,I suggest this review being submitted to CLIMATE
DYNAMICS.
> > >> Obviously, it will experience a large review process, but I
could>
>ensure
> > >> to sped it up. Then it would be nice to have it printed and
> > published> in
> > >> Germany. I think that a review in an international journal
would
> > have
> > >> more impact than any grey literature coming out as IGBP
report.
> > >>
> > >> cheers
> > >>
> > >> jean claude
> > >>
> > >> Jean-Claude DUPLESSY
> > >> laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement
> > >> Laboratoire mixte CNRS-CEA
> > >> F - 91198 Gif sur Yvette cedex
> > >>
> > >> - tel (33) 01 69 82 35 26
> > >> - fax (33) 01 69 82 35 68
> > >>
> > >> - e-mail : Jean-Claude.Duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr
> > >>
> > >>
> >

```

---

```

> > > > Professor Michael E. Mann
> > > > Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall
> > > > University of Virginia
> > > > Charlottesville, VA 22903
> > > >

```

> >

---

> > > > e-mail: mann@virginia.edu Phone: (434) 924-7770 FAX: (434)  
> > 982-2137

> > > > <http://www.evsc.virginia.edu/faculty/people/mann.shtml>

> > > >

> >

> > Prof. Phil Jones

> > Climatic Research Unit Telephone +44 (0) 1603 592090

> > School of Environmental Sciences Fax +44 (0) 1603 507784

> > University of East Anglia

> > Norwich Email p.jones@uea.ac.uk

> > NR4 7TJ

> > UK

> >

---

> -----

>>

> > >

> >

> >

>>>

>Professor Malcolm K. Hughes

>Laboratory of Tree-Ring Research

>W.Stadium 105

>University of Arizona

>Tucson, AZ 85721

>phone 520-621-6470

>fax 520-621-8229

---

Professor Michael E. Mann

Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, VA 22903

---

e-mail: mann@virginia.edu Phone: (434) 924-7770 FAX: (434) 982-2137

<http://www.evsc.virginia.edu/faculty/people/mann.shtml>

### XXX-131

From ???@??? Thu Sep 13 09:48:37 2001

Return-Path: <hpollack@jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu>

Received: from deimos.email.Arizona.EDU (128.196.133.166) by  
phobos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)

id 3B96CDBF000B8AFC for jto@email.arizona.edu; Thu, 13 Sep 2001  
07:36:16 -0700

Received: from jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu (141.211.108.22) by  
deimos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)

id 3BA07084000037FE for jto@email.arizona.edu; Thu, 13 Sep 2001  
07:36:15 -0700

Received: from localhost by jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu (8.9.3/8.9.3)  
with

ESMTP id KAA17871;

Thu, 13 Sep 2001 10:35:33 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Thu, 13 Sep 2001 10:35:33 -0400 (EDT)

From: "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>

To: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>  
cc: <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>, <lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu>,  
<rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu>, <jcole@geo.arizona.edu>,  
Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
<Jean-Claude.Duplessy@cfre.cnrs-gif.fr>,  
Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, <tcrowley@nc.rr.com>,  
Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>, <drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu>,  
Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
Subject: Re: sceptics attack!  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.GSO.  
4.31.0109081243550.14496-100000@jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.  
4.31.0109130952160.17533-100000@jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Hello colleagues,

I have read with interest the latest round of exchanges suggesting an authoritative review article on the paleoclimate of the past millennium or perhaps longer time interval.

At risk of seeming contrarian, I do not think that is what is needed. The IPCC TAR is an excellent review and summary of the entire issue; a more detailed paleoclimate review would hardly be more persuasive to those who are unwilling to accept the IPCC science. The "ideologues" (thank you, Malcolm, I am no longer referring to them as skeptics) are hardly open to persuasion.

Another review article would be something akin to preaching to the choir.

We need to spend time reaching out to the public through their media, not ours. We need an educated public who believes what the science is saying, and who will reach decision-makers with no fear of being called self-serving. That is a label that the ideologues try to pin on us, when it is they who should be wearing the scarlet letter of self-service. Whenever the issue arises of scientists arguments being self serving, I turn the argument around immediately, pointing to the fossil fuel industry's obvious self-interest. I never let such a charge go unanswered.

We probably spend more time than is necessary talking to each other, and much less than is necessary in engaging an interested but somewhat puzzled public. But we are making headway: in the USA there are now appearing articles in non-scientific magazines on how to argue with the ideologues, and how to persuade the puzzled public. The League of Conservation Voters magazine recently had such a presentation; the Union of Concerned Scientists as well. The County Planning Commission of one of the Florida coastal counties featured in a newsletter a summary of the possible

consequences of sea level rise due to 21st century warming.  
 The public is moving to accept the science, because of dramatic  
 consequences that they can see: the melting of the ice on Kilimanjaro,  
 an  
 ice-free passage through the Northwest passage in 2000, the thinning of  
 Arctic sea-ice by 40%, an iceberg the size of Belgium breaking out of  
 the  
 Larsen ice shelf. These are the images that need to be put before the  
 public at every opportunity. And there are many opportunities:  
 community  
 service clubs such as Rotary, Kiwanis; University alumni groups,  
 legislative public hearings, radio and television interviews, trips  
 with  
 eco-tourists, etc. etc. We can argue until doomsday with each other  
 whether the temperature over the past thousand years was ever warmer  
 than  
 today, and the public will yawn.  
 So Stefan, how can we help you win the hearts and minds of the  
 decision-makers in Germany? What specific questions do you think you  
 will  
 face and need to answer with short, concise, easy to understand  
 responses?  
 Let us all share with Stefan our experiences of teaching this material  
 to  
 non-scientific audiences.  
 I am emerging from the recent dark days fighting mad.  
 Henry

### XXX-132

From ???@??? Thu Sep 13 09:48:38 2001  
 Return-Path: <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>  
 Received: from deimos.email.Arizona.EDU (128.196.133.166) by  
 phobos.email.Arizona.EDU (5.1.071)  
 id 3B96CDBF000B9B8D for jto@email.arizona.edu; Thu, 13 Sep 2001  
 08:16:25 -0700  
 Received: from s8.pik-potsdam.de (193.174.19.132) by  
 deimos.email.Arizona.EDU  
 (5.1.071)  
 id 3BA0708400004844 for jto@email.arizona.edu; Thu, 13 Sep 2001  
 08:16:24 -0700  
 Received: from pik-potsdam.de (pc111.pik-potsdam.de [193.174.19.82])  
 by s8.pik-potsdam.de (8.9.1a/8.9.1) with ESMTTP id RAA14436;  
 Thu, 13 Sep 2001 17:16:12 +0100  
 Message-ID: <3BA0CE01.ABF2B3E6@pik-potsdam.de>  
 Date: Thu, 13 Sep 2001 17:17:21 +0200  
 From: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@pik-potsdam.de>  
 X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (WinNT; U)  
 X-Accept-Language: en  
 MIME-Version: 1.0  
 To: "Henry N. Pollack" <hpollack@geo.lsa.umich.edu>  
 CC: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu, lgthomps@magnus.acs.ohio-  
 state.edu,  
 rbradley@climate1.geo.umass.edu, jcole@geo.arizona.edu,  
 Malcolm hughes <mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu>,  
 Jean-Claude.Duplessy@cfr.cnrs-gif.fr,



Keith Alverson <keith.alverson@pages.unibe.ch>, tcrowley@nc.rr.com,  
 Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>, drdendro@ldgo.columbia.edu,  
 Jonathan Overpeck <jto@u.arizona.edu>  
 Subject: Re: sceptics attack!

References: <Pine.GSO.

4.31.0109130952160.17533-100000@jeffreys.geo.lsa.umich.edu>

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Dear Henry and everyone else,

let me first thank all of you who have written supportive and helpful  
 mails and my apologies for not responding immediately. I did spend late  
 nights last weekend drafting a response with the help of your input -  
 in

German, so sending it around is probably useless for most of you. It is  
 now being worked over by Martin Claussen and others from our institute  
 and next week we plan to finalise it.

Of course we are also very shocked and stunned by the attack on the US.  
 We had a five-minute work stoppage and silence in Germany this morning,  
 including at PIK, where staff gathered outside our main building. In  
 Berlin people are queing up outside the US embassy to bring flowers and  
 write their names in a book. We feel that not only do we have many  
 friends in New York and other parts of the US, but also this is really  
 an attack on us as well, on all of modern democratic society.

I personally hope for a determined, united and wise response that will  
 fight terrorism without harming innocent people and will not cause more  
 hatred and an escalation of violence.

Back to the climate contras. What struck me from your responses is that  
 these people of the BGR are using exactly the same arguments, down to  
 citing the same references, as you mention from your experience. I  
 wonder whether there is some sinister connection or orchestrated  
 campaign here, the german coal industry connected with their US  
 counterparts? Do you have access to any materials (pamphlets etc.) that  
 the US "sceptics" have produced? This is not really something for me to  
 follow up but I'm thinking of passing information to a friendly  
 journalist - I think it's a job for a journalist to research some of  
 the

background of where the ideas and funding for this recent campaign over  
 here actually come from. I think in either case - whether the BGR is  
 using taxpayers money to produce disinformation leaflets or whether  
 they

are sponsored by coal money - it is something the public should know  
 about.

Regards, Stefan

--

Stefan Rahmstorf

Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK)

For contact details, reprints, movies & general infos see:

<http://www.pik-potsdam.de/~stefan>

**XXX-133**

From ???@??? Wed Nov 30 08:34:38 2005

Return-Path: <christoph.kull@pages.unibe.ch>

Received: from smtgate.email.arizona.edu (deagol.email.arizona.edu  
 [10.0.0.142])