

CONTROLLING THE SCIENCE: NATIONAL ACADEMIES AND CONSENSUS

by Dennis Ambler



SPPI ORIGINAL PAPER



December 8, 2010

CONTROLLING THE SCIENCE: NATIONAL ACADEMIES AND CONSENSUS

by Dennis Ambler | December 8, 2010

Former Republican Congressman and former chairman of the House Committee on Science, Sherwood Boehlert, launched an attack last week on the Republican Party and its stance on global warming science. He made great play of the contributions of Climate Scientists and National Academy of Sciences reports on climate matters. It seems he does not have much idea of the make-up of the NAS panels and how they are stacked with activist scientists and NGO's to deliver the right message, whilst carrying the scientific imprimature of the NAS. Here are some of Mr Boehlert's comments, (*my emphases*):

[SCIENCE THE GOP CAN'T WISH AWAY](#)

By Sherwood Boehlert, Washington Post, Friday, November 19, 2010

“Watching the raft of newly elected GOP lawmakers converge on Washington, I couldn't help thinking about an issue I hope our party will better address. I call on my fellow Republicans to open their minds to rethinking what has largely become our party's line: **denying** that climate change and global warming are occurring and that they are largely due to human activities.

National Journal reported last month that 19 of the 20 serious GOP Senate challengers declared that the science of climate change is either inconclusive or flat-out wrong. Many newly elected Republican House members take that position. It is a stance that **defies the findings of our country's National Academy of Sciences, national scientific academies from around the world and 97 percent of the world's climate scientists.**

Why do so many Republican senators and representatives think they are right and the world's top scientific academies and scientists are wrong? I would like to be able to chalk it up to lack of information or misinformation.

I can understand arguments over proposed policy approaches to climate change. I served in Congress for 24 years. I know these are legitimate areas for debate. What I find incomprehensible is the dogged determination by some to **discredit distinguished scientists** and their findings.

In a trio of reports released in May, the **prestigious and non-partisan National Academy** concluded that “a strong, credible body of scientific evidence shows that climate change is occurring, is caused largely by human activities and poses significant risks for a broad range of human and natural systems.” Our nation's most

authoritative and respected scientific body couldn't make it any clearer or more conclusive.

Today, **climate scientists** - careful as ever in portraying what they know vs. what they suspect - report that **the body of scientific evidence supporting the consensus on climate change** and its cause is as comprehensive and exhaustive as anything produced by the scientific community.”

The **National Academy reports** concluded that “scientific evidence that the Earth is warming is now overwhelming.” Party affiliation does not change that fact.

An extract from the introduction to the report that he is referring to, from “**America's Climate Choices - Advancing the Science of Climate Change**” is shown below. As usual in this new age of science, it starts with a conclusion and proceeds to find the evidence to support the conclusion, that evidence of course being the IPCC reports.

“Climate change is occurring, is caused largely by human activities, and poses significant risks for-and in many cases is already affecting-a broad range of human and natural systems. The compelling case for these conclusions is provided in **Advancing the Science of Climate Change**, part of a **congressionally requested suite of studies known as America's Climate Choices.**”

Boehlert describes the National Academy as prestigious and non-partisan. He really should have a look at the composition of the panels that produce the reports. This particular one is the [Panel on Advancing the Science of Climate Change](#), which is a sub-panel of the NAS “America's Climate Choices” panel. The reports are basically a re-hash of IPCC reports, which is not surprising when so many IPCC authors are on the panel, but with few actual climate scientists on-board.

WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

It includes for example **Dr Richard H Moss**, who is Vice President and Managing Director for Climate Change at the **World Wildlife Fund**. He is a former Senior Director for Climate Change and Energy, **United Nations Foundation**. The UNF was founded in 1998 with \$1billion from Ted Turner, its President is Timothy Wirth, who helped to launch James Hansen into global warming fame in 1988.

Moss has been a member of the IPCC since 1993. He is a **Review editor** for IPCC AR5 WGII Ch. 14, “Adaptation needs and options”. From 2000 to 2006, he served as director of the coordination office for the **United States Climate Change Science Program**.

*The story on
“Ocean
Acidification” is
already in place and
again starts with a
conclusion.*

His doctorate is in Public and International Affairs.

So here we have an outright NGO activist helping form US climate policy, yet Mr Boehlert would have us consider him a distinguished and non-partisan “climate scientist”.

The chair of the committee, Dr Pamela Matson is on the Board of Trustees of the **World Wildlife Fund** and was a Lead Author, for the **IPCC TAR**, WG1 Chapter 4. She is a Biologist.

Climate Scientist **Dr Ken Caldeira**, at the Department of Global Ecology, Carnegie Institute at Stanford was a contributing author for the 2001 **IPCC** assessment report and a **coordinating**

The oceans are not acidic, are never likely to be and warmer oceans release CO₂, so this is yet another example of distortion of science in the IPCC reports.

lead author of a chapter on ocean storage of carbon in the 2005 Special Report on “Carbon Capture and Storage”. He is a Lead Author for **IPCC AR5**, WG1 Chapter 12: Long-term Climate Change: Projections, Commitments and Irreversibility. He is mainly responsible for the unsupportable claim that “ocean acidification has increased by 30% since the Industrial Revolution”, but he is an activist scientist and was a major participant in the **National Resources Defense Council** 2009 propaganda film on [Ocean Acidification](#), "Acid Test: The Global Challenge of Ocean Acidification".

NRDC is a major NGO, and also had representation on IPCC AR4. Dr Chris Field, the founding director of the Stanford Global Ecology Centre where Dr Caldeira works, is an AR5 working group II co-chair. The Technical Support Unit for WGII Impacts and adaptation, will also be based at Stanford Carnegie Institute.

[The story](#) on “Ocean Acidification” is already in place and again starts with a conclusion, strongly disputed beyond the confines of the IPCC, that “**increasingly acidic seas** are reducing coral reef health and changing ocean ecosystems. But will the increasing CO₂ uptake by the ocean and warmer oceans also bring risks for all life on Earth?”

The oceans are not acidic, are never likely to be and warmer oceans release CO₂, so this is yet another example of distortion of science in the IPCC reports. However, according to ex-congressman Boehlert’s assertions, the scientists are “as careful as ever in portraying what they know vs. what they suspect.”

EPA SHOULD REGULATE CO₂

Another activist scientist on the panel is **Dr. Inez Y. Fung**, who is Professor of Atmospheric Science and co-director of the Berkeley Institute of the Environment. Her research expertise

is in large-scale numerical modeling of biogeochemical cycles and their interaction with climate. She was a contributing author to both the **IPCC Third and Fourth Assessment** reports.

In 2006, she joined with 17 other climate scientists to file an [amicus curiae](#) brief in [Massachusetts v. EPA](#) to **support the need for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to regulate carbon dioxide emissions.**

CARB REPRESENTATION

Dr. John P. Weyant is a Review Editor for **IPCC AR5 WGIII**, Ch6. “Assessing Transformation Pathways”. He is Professor of Management Science and Engineering and Director of the Energy Modeling Forum (EMF) and Deputy Director of the Precourt Institute for Energy Efficiency at Stanford University. His doctorate is in **Management Science**.

Significantly, he is a member of the **California Air Resources Board's** Economic and Technology Advancement Advisory Committee (ETAAC), which is charged with making recommendations for technology policies to help implement AB 32, The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.

Of the twenty panel members, one can find at best only four actual atmospheric scientists.

Of the twenty panel members, one can find at best only four actual atmospheric scientists, including Dr's Caldeira and Fung mentioned above. There are PhD's in Political Science, Management Science, Public Policy and International Affairs, Ecology and Biology, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering and Sociology. It cannot be surprising that people are starting to ask questions about the findings of “our country's National Academy of Sciences”.

This is only a sub-panel of the main committee, namely the [The Committee on America's Climate Choices](#), where there are more interesting names:

How surprising to find **WWF** here again, this time **on the main NAC Climate Committee**, in the form of **Carter Roberts**, President and CEO of World Wildlife Fund-United States. The Washington Examiner recently highlighted the remuneration of some of the Chief Executives of the big environmental NGO's. Roberts came in near the top of the list with \$486,394, including a salary of \$439,327 and other compensation of \$47,067.

He was beaten by another of “America's Climate Choices” committee members, head of **Environmental Defense**, **Fred Krupp**, who receives total compensation of \$496,174, including \$446,072 in salary and \$50,102 in other compensation.

The Washington Examiner recently highlighted the remuneration of some of the Chief Executives of the big environmental NGO's. Roberts came in near the top of the list with \$486,394, including a salary of \$439,327 and other compensation of \$47,067.

How many people realize that Sherwood Boehlert's **prestigious and non-partisan National Academy**, has major NGO representation, who are influencing the Energy Policy of the United States? I would think that even fewer people realise that these two activists also have a direct feed into the climate policy of the UK government, which in turn is a major player in EU Energy Policy and the IPCC.

BILLIONAIRE FUNDING

Both WWF and Environmental Defense receive funding from US hedge fund billionaire Jeremy Grantham's Grantham Foundation. He is the **chairman and co-founder of [GMO](#)**, a \$140 billion global investment management company based in Boston with offices in London, San Francisco, Singapore, Sydney and Zurich.

Around three years ago, Grantham set up two Climate Institutes in the UK at the London School of Economics (LSE) and Imperial College, London, for about \$35 million. They have direct input to UK environment policy and Grantham is on the joint strategy board with Krupp and Roberts.

A fuller description of the power and influence of the scientists and economists at the Grantham Institutes can be found in this SPPI posting, [A Nest of Carbon Vipers](#). They have direct influence on UK climate legislation, the most socially and economically damaging in the world, and are well represented within the IPCC, the World Bank and the UN.

Another famous name on the main Climate Choices Committee is **Jane Lubchenco**, head of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. She serves, or has served until her NOAA appointment, on the boards of **World Resources Institute, Environmental Defense**, and on advisory committees for the National Research Council, the National Science Foundation and the **United Nations Environment Programme**.

She was a contributor to the 1991 report of the National Research Council, [Policy Implications of Greenhouse Warming](#), along with Stephen Schneider, Maurice Strong,

Both WWF and Environmental Defense receive funding from US hedge fund billionaire Jeremy Grantham's Grantham Foundation.

Tom Karl, William Nordhaus and others. She is a long time associate of John Holdren and was mentioned for her contribution to [The Meaning of Sustainability: Biogeophysical Aspects](#) by John P. Holdren, Gretchen C. Daily, and Paul R. Ehrlich, 1995. Distributed for the United Nations University by The World Bank Washington, D.C. This paper benefited greatly from interactions with R. Cicerone, A. Coale, T. Dietz, P. Gleick, R. Heal R. Lenski, M. McDonnell, **J. Lubchenco** (and others)

She was, again until 2008, and maybe still is, an Advisory Board Member of [Diversitas](#), a UN linked, international-government funded diversity institute, along with **Paul Ehrlich**, of Stanford. Its Scientific Committee is chaired by Harold Mooney, of Stanford University.

In 2009 in the European Union, some \$60 billion in stimulus packages was earmarked for green measures. The problems of carbon trading threaten the future of that funding and the only way to maintain the impetus is to get a global price on carbon. This is where the IPCC reports are used to ramp up the scares of impending doom, in a bid to “knee jerk” politicians into signing global agreements.

She is joined on the committee by her long time associate **John Holdren**, Director of President Obama’s Office of Science and Technology Policy. He was described in [Forbes magazine](#) as the “most dogmatic member of Obama's Green Dream Team.

PEW CENTRE ON GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Providing yet more activist input to the “Committee on Climate Choices” is **Eileen Claussen**, President of the **Pew Center** on Global Climate Change and Strategies for the Global Environment. She is a former Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, former Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Global Environmental Affairs at the National Security Council. (*Clinton Administration*).

She is also a former Chairman of the UN Multilateral Montreal Protocol Fund and former Director of Atmospheric Programs at the U.S. EPA. In addition she is a member of the **Council on Foreign Relations**, (*as is John Holdren*), the Singapore Energy Advisory Committee, and the **General Electric Ecomagination Advisory Board**.

She has also been a member of the China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and Development, (**CCICED**), together with **Dr Rajendra Pachauri**, Chair of the IPCC and **Sir Crispin Tickell**, who has had a major influence on UK climate policy and was a former advisor to Margaret Thatcher.

[Maurice Strong](#) was highly involved in CCICED until only a very few years ago.

Continuing the international theme we have Climate Choice Committee member, **Robert H. Socolow**, Professor of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering at Princeton University, School of Engineering and Applied Science, and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

He also serves on the **Deutsche Bank Climate Change Advisory Board** with **Rajendra Pachauri**, Chairman of IPCC, **Lord Oxburgh**, ex Shell, now director of Climate Change Capital, an environmental investment manager and advisory group, **Lord Browne**, ex BP, now MD of Riverstone Holdings LLC, an energy and power-focused private equity firm founded in 2000 and Professor **John Schellnhuber** of the German Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, advisor to German Chancellor Merkel and EU Commission President Manuel Barroso.

In 2009 in the European Union, some [\\$60 billion](#) in stimulus packages was earmarked for green measures. The problems of carbon trading threaten the future of that funding and the only way to maintain the impetus is to get a global price on carbon. This is where the IPCC reports are used to ramp up the scares of impending doom, in a bid to “knee jerk” politicians into signing global agreements.

Another Climate Choices member, **Jonathan B. Wiener**, is a Professor of Law at Duke Law School, Professor of Environmental Policy at the Nicholas School of the Environment, and Professor of Public Policy Studies at the Sanford Institute of Public Policy, at Duke University.

He worked on U.S. and international environmental policy at the White House Council of Economic Advisers, at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, and at the US Department of Justice, serving in both the first Bush and Clinton administrations. **He helped negotiate the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, at the Rio Earth Summit in 1992.**

The list goes on, of yet more advocates running this committee, such as **Heidi Cullen**, of Climate Central, **Jonathan Schrag**, Executive Director of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, Inc and **Robert Fri** of the NGO, Resources for the Future.

It seems that a mix of economists, social scientists, engineers, NGO's and corporations in receipt of government funding, form the main strength of these particular committees.

How can this National Academy Committee be described as an objective scientific body, when it is plainly controlled by the main AGW protagonists, who wish to globalise US energy policy, in order to re-distribute investment to the expanding economies of India and China?

From 2005 to 2007, Mr. Schrag was an Assistant Director of the **Earth Institute** at Columbia University, where both Rajendra Pachauri and George Soros are on the external advisory board.

Has Sherwood Boehlert any idea of any of this?

I doubt a dissenting voice on “the science” is ever heard in their deliberations. As can be seen, climate scientists are very much in the minority. It seems that a mix of economists, social scientists, engineers, NGO’s and corporations in receipt of government funding, form the main strength of these particular committees.

How can this National Academy Committee be described as an objective scientific body, when it is plainly controlled by the main AGW protagonists, who wish to globalise US energy policy, in order to re-distribute investment to the expanding economies of India and China? Large corporations such as GE already have local facilities there and will receive much of

that investment in the form of “clean development money” for the “green” energy projects they are involved with:

[Jeff Immelt Seeks to Map Out GE's Future Beyond America](#)

“We will be a global company with incredible growth prospects outside the US. We will have to explore and decide on our structures and about how we operate the company going forward, there's no doubt about it. We've always been a company that's not been rigid about how we evolve and change.

Our leadership team will be increasingly non-US citizens and will look like the opportunities we face," says Mr Immelt.”

When we are told that National Science Academies endorse the findings of the IPCC it can now be of no surprise, because as we see, they are very often the same people. They are unlikely to produce a report that kills the cash cow known as “climate change”, when they intend to milk the poor beast for a long time to come.



Cover photo of the National Academy of Sciences building
in Washington DC from physics.about.com.



Science & Public Policy Institute
"Science-based policy for a better world."

Robert Ferguson
SPPI President
bferguson@sppinstitute.org
202-288-5699

P.O. Box 209
5501 Merchants View Square
Haymarket, VA 20169

www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org

