

2. FINDINGS ON CHINESE WEATHER TAINTED BY ALLEGATIONS

The discredited glacier-claim is not the only error in the IPCC report that demonstrates the IPCC's failure to follow adequate scientific procedures. Newspaper reports indicate that temperature data produced at Chinese weather stations were "seriously flawed" and that the CRU could not produce documents relating to them.¹⁰⁸ Even so, the Fourth Assessment Report cited a 1990 paper in *Nature* which discussed the warming supposedly measured at the Chinese stations.¹⁰⁹ The history of where the weather stations were sited was central to the 1990 paper because it concluded that the warmer temperatures in China were caused by climate change rather than the heat-island effect of growing cities.¹¹⁰ The authors of that 1990 paper were Phil Jones and Wei-Chyung Wang of the State University of New York at Albany.¹¹¹ The Fourth Assessment relied on the Jones-Wang study to support the conclusion that "any urban-related trend" in global temperatures was "an order of magnitude smaller" than other trends.¹¹²

However, an amateur climate analyst, Doug Keenan, has been able to show that 49 of the Chinese meteorological stations had no histories of their location or other details.¹¹³ The 49 stations included 40 of the 42 rural stations cited in the study.¹¹⁴ Keenan demanded that Dr. Jones retract his claims about the Chinese data: "I ask you to retract your GRL paper, in full, and to retract the claims made in *Nature* about the Chinese data, If you do not do so, I intend to publicly submit an allegation of research misconduct to your university at Albany."¹¹⁵ In August 2007, Keenan submitted a formal complaint about Wang to the State University of New York at Albany after Wang refused to retract the claim.¹¹⁶ Although the university found "evidence of the alleged fabrication of results," it exonerated Wang. Ironically, Phil Jones submitted a report to the *Journal of Geophysical Research* re-examining temperatures in eastern China. His report concluded that not only was the urban heat effect not "negligible" it could account for 40% of the warming shown in the study.

¹⁰⁸ Fred Pearce, *Leaked climate change emails scientist 'hid' data flaws*, THE GUARDIAN, Feb. 1, 2010, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/01/leaked-emails-climate-jones-chinese>. (last visited Feb. 15, 2010).

¹⁰⁹ *Id.*

¹¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹¹ *Id.*

¹¹² IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007: Working Group I: The Physical Science Basis. 3.2.2.2 *Urban Heat Islands and Land Use Effects*.

¹¹³ Fred Pearce, *Strange case of moving weather posts and a scientist under siege*, THE GUARDIAN, Feb. 1, 2010, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/01/dispute-weather-fraud> (last visited Feb. 10, 2010).

¹¹⁴ *Id.*

¹¹⁵ Email of Doug Keenan to Dr. Wei-Chyung Wang and Phil Jones, April 20, 2007, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/01/dispute-weather-fraud> (last visited Feb. 15, 2010).

¹¹⁶ Fred Pearce, *Strange case of moving weather posts and a scientist under siege*. THE GUARDIAN. (Feb. 1, 2010) available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/01/dispute-weather-fraud>. (last visited Feb. 10, 2010).

Similarly, the Fourth Assessment erroneously claimed that “[t]he Netherlands is an example of a country highly susceptible to both sea-level rise and river flooding because 55% of its territory is below sea level where 60% of its population lives and 65% of its Gross National Product (GNP) is produced.”¹¹⁷ The Dutch government has asked for a correction to that claim, noting that only 26 percent of the country is below sea level.¹¹⁸ Trimo Vallaart, the Dutch environment ministry spokesman, said he regretted the fact that proper procedure was not followed, and added that it should not be left to politicians to check the IPCC's numbers.¹¹⁹ He also said that the Dutch government “will order a review of the report to see if it contains any more errors.”¹²⁰

3. RAIN FOREST CONCLUSIONS BASED ON NON-PEER REVIEWED SOURCES

As with the errors regarding Himalayan glaciers, rural Chinese weather stations, and Dutch land, the Fourth Assessment contains an improperly sourced and unverifiable claim about the Amazon rainforest. In the Fourth Assessment, the IPCC cited a WWF report¹²¹ claiming that, due to climate change, “[u]p to 40% of the Amazonian forests could react drastically to even a slight reduction in precipitation”¹²² The WWF report’s authors claimed their findings were based on an article in *Nature*,¹²³ but the sentence in the *Nature* piece that the WWF report relied on was about how logging, rather than climate change, affected the forest.¹²⁴ Similarly, the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment cited an article published in a popular magazine for climbers which was based on anecdotal evidence from mountaineers about the changes they saw while climbing.¹²⁵ The Fourth Assessment also cited¹²⁶ a geography student’s master’s

¹¹⁷ IPCC Fourth Assessment: Climate Change 2007: Working Group II: Impacts, Adaption and Vulnerability, Section 12.2.3, *Current adaptation and adaptive capacity*.

¹¹⁸ Alister Doyle, *U.N. Climate panel reviews Dutch sea level glitch*, REUTERS, Feb. 5, 2010, available at <http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6141VU20100205> (last visited Feb. 15, 2010).

¹¹⁹ *Dutch Point Out New Mistakes in U.N. Climate Report*, Feb. 5, 2010, available at <http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2010/02/05/dutch-point-new-mistakes-climate-report/> (last visited Feb. 15, 2010).

¹²⁰ *Id.*

¹²¹ Andy Rowell and Peter Moore, *Global Review of Forest Fires: A WWF/IUCN Report*, July 27, 2000, available at

http://www.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/conservation/forests/publications/?3596/Global-Review-of-Forest-Fires-A-WWF-IUCN-Report (last visited Feb. 15, 2010).

¹²² IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007: Working Group II: Impacts, Adaption and Vulnerability, Summary of Expected Key Future Impacts and Vulnerabilities, Section 13.4.1, *Natural ecosystems*.

¹²³ Daniel C. Nepstadt et al., *Large-scale impoverishment of Amazonian forests by logging and fire*. NATURE vol. 398 at 505 et seq., April 8, 1999, available at

http://www.whrc.org/resources/published_literature/pdf/NepstadNature.99.pdf (last visited Feb. 15, 2010) (noting that, “[l]ogging companies in Amazonia kill or damage 10±40% of the living biomass of forests through the harvest process.”).

¹²⁴ Christopher Booker, *Amazongate: new evidence of the IPCC's failures*, DAILY TELEGRAPH, Jan. 30, 2010, available at

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html>, (last visited Feb. 15, 2010).

¹²⁵ IPCC Fourth Assessment: Climate Change 2007: Working Group II: Impacts, Adaption and Vulnerability, Section 1.3.1.1 *Observed effects due to changes in the cryosphere*.