

C. THE LACK OF OBJECTIVITY & THE SUPPRESSION OF DISSENT

1. THE ABUSE OF THE PEER REVIEW PROCESS

In response to public concerns that the IPCC's authors "all share the same views . . . and that alternative perspectives were not incorporated into the process,"¹³¹ EPA claimed that "there is no evidence provided that supports the claim that collaboration among a small number of authors prevented the incorporation of a range of perspectives and alternative views or biased the conclusions."¹³² Since the comment period for the Endangerment Finding concluded,¹³³ it has been revealed that the tight-knit group of scientists who oversaw and authored the IPCC's climate-related work were involved in a calculated effort to undermine core tenants of scientific objectivity, impartiality, transparency, and accuracy. These revelations disprove EPA's previous claim that there was no evidence of bias among IPCC contributors.

One particularly striking email exchange revealed how Dr. Jones used the peer review process to prevent a manuscript from being published that questioned the CRU's research. In an email to Michael Mann, Dr. Jones wrote: "recently rejected two papers [one for the Journal of Geophysical Research and one for Geophysical Research Letters] from people saying CRU has it wrong over Siberia. Went to town in both reviews, hopefully successfully. If either appears I will be very surprised . . ." ¹³⁴ The rejected paper analyzed temperature readings from Siberian weather stations and concluded that there was much less warming than Dr. Jones predicted—even though both researchers analyzed much of the same data.¹³⁵

2. SUPPRESSING DISSENT

An email exchange between Professor Mann and Dr. Jones illustrates attempts to suppress any dissenting opinion regarding climate change. First, Dr. Jones indicates that he will no longer be associated with a particular scientific research journal, *Climate Research*, unless an editor, who Dr. Jones believed was responsible for allowing contravening research to be printed, was removed: "I will be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor."¹³⁶

¹³¹ (Vol I, Comment 1-20)

¹³² (Vol I, Response 1-20)

¹³³ 74 Fed. Reg. 66,500 (Dec. 15, 2009)

¹³⁴ Email from Phil Jones to Michael E. Mann, March 31, 2004, available at <http://www.eastangliaemails.com/emails.php?eid=407&filename=1080742144.txt> (last visited Feb. 16, 2010).

¹³⁵ Fred Pearce, *Climate Change Emails Between Scientists Reveal Flaws in Peer Reviews*, THE GUARDIAN (February 2, 2010), available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/02/hacked-climate-emails-flaws-peer-review> (last visited Feb. 16, 2010).

¹³⁶ Email from Phil Jones to Michael Mann, March 11, 2004 available at <http://www.eastangliaemails.com/emails.php?eid=295&filename=1047388489.txt> (last visited Feb. 16, 2010).