Re: feedback on a paper of yours

[redacted]
Wed 7/6/2011 9:50 AM

To: [redacted]@niwa.co.nz>
Cc: [redacted]@niwa.co.nz>

1 attachments (2 MB)
(2008) Lorrey et al 2008 (QI).pdf;

Hi there [redacted],
I received an email today from a scientist in Minnesota, who has asked for a copy of a paper I wrote and my opinion about how it pertains to some material in blogs that was posted in years past. [redacted] who requested this work, has engaged in the climate change debate. From my Google search, I can see he has recently rebuttled climate change denial work done by Christopher Monckton. Unfortunately for me, I have a relative who has mis-interpreted my research in the past, and who posted widesweeping opinion pieces repeatedly saying my research is a 'line of evidence against AGW'. This sentiment was put forth against my wishes, and was buried for a while, but now appears to have emerged again. I have crafted a letter back to Dr. [redacted] below, but need to know if I am allowed to send it from a company policy point of view.

http://climatechangepsychology.blogspot.com/[redacted]

from looking at this blog (link above), it appears [redacted] is doing due diligence and checking up on the references cited as being 'evidence against anthropogenic global warming'.

please advise.

cheers
[redacted]

HI [redacted]
Please find the publication attached.

The paper I wrote certainly does not disprove AGW, and it does nothing to approach that particular subject of climate science. The comments about the work I had published with my coauthors were made in blogs and the opinions espoused were most likely instigated by a relative of mine. I have not spoken with him for nearly half a decade or more because of this issue, and I don't expect to ever again. He has made erroneous and far-fetched claims in the past, most being completely inaccurate. The citation of my work in skeptics blogs was an attempt to generate 'mana' for my relative, the weakest way to try and estabish an 'authoritative opinion' based on a direct association between us (ie getting the story 'from the horse's mouth" must be good inside information). This couldn't be farther from the truth. Any opinions that have been expressed in those blog fora are not my own, and I do not subscribe to the conclusions that have been so uncarefully drawn from my work.

In 2003 or 2004, while still a student at university, I asked my relative (and implored others close to him) that he not make these comments. He disregarded my requests. As a result, I chose to disregard him, and I have nothing more to do with him. He has since continued this behaviour. He has also done similar things with research undertaken by my sister, so you might consider his lengthy stream of opinion-pieces as not being part of an isolated incident. I don't choose to understand what motive or reason he might have decided on for continuing this type of behaviour.

The question about the global extent of the MWP or MCA is still very much being researched by the international palaeoclimate community, and those here in New Zealand. As you have suggested we are finding out more details about the spatial variability during this important period, and putting signals we see

in proxies for warm and cold intervals into context. We also have a long way to go to understand the dynamics between the hemispheres that existed at that time and why the patterns existed and changed. Understanding the natural variability of the past is one key component to preparing for future changes, including the changes expected from global warming. My job is to establish as best possible what the past was like, and that is all the paper I wrote sought to achieve.

cheers,
[redacted]

>>>[redacted] 6/07/2011 8:48 a.m. >>>

Dear Dr. [redacted],

Pardon this intrusion but I've come across some of your publications recently. One, in particular, has caught my attention. It is:

Lorrey, A., Williams, P., Salinger, J., Martin, T., Palmer, J., Fowler, A., Zhao, J.-X. and Neil, H. 2008. Speleothem stable isotope records interpreted within a multi-proxy framework and implications for New Zealand palaeoclimate reconstruction. *Quaternary International* **187**: 52-75.

The reason this is of interest to me is that a group is claiming that your work showing the presence of a MWP disproves AGW theory. I know that a MWP certainly existed and its magnitude varied spatially, that is not in doubt. I just wonder though, would you agree with the claim that the MWP was "global in extent and warmer than today's temperatures"? Also, do you believe your work "disproves" AGW?

Thanks for the response. I look forward to receiving it and reading your research in the future.

[redacted]

response to Lord Monckton

[redacted]
Mon 7/18/2011 8:25 AM

To: [redacted]@niwa.co.nz>
Cc: [redacted]@niwa.co.nz>

I see I wasn't the only one who's work was misrepresented.

http://www.skepticalscience.com/news.php?n=879

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: And more rubbish from the "Climate Realists"
Date: Tuesday, 7 May 2013 5:29:00 PM

An interesting newsweekly article, with several very curious aspects:
* article is dated May 11, 2013, although already published online, so when did Monckton actually write the piece?
* he states the TV channel failed "to give me any opportunity to appear on the program or to reply". But he DID appear in a May 3 interview,
http://www.ch9.co.nz/interviews
* I was amazed to learn that "The world warmed by 5 C° in just three years at the end of the last Ice Age 11,400 years ago." Wow, that would be some warming if it actually applied to the globe as a whole!

And, BTW, I thought [redacted] gave an excellent interview - very thoughtful and calm.

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] [mailto [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 7 May 2013 3:08 p m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: And more rubbish from the 'Climate Realists'

On 7/05/2013, at 2:57 PM, [redacted] <[redacted]gmail.com> wrote:

> Monckton sums up his tour
> takes more swipes
>
> http://www.newsweekly.com.au/article.php?id=5559

Blimey.

> If neither the chancellor nor (in due course) the police will act, I shall return to New Zealand and lodge a private prosecution.

Since he's still busy libelling the VUW 3, surely it's time for VUW to issue a "cease and desist" letter?

--
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] orcon.net.nz) [redacted]
Subject: FW: DomPost Letter on Monckton
Date: Tuesday, 16 April 2013 11:09:00 AM
Attachments: 3900_001.pdf

From: printer@niwa.co.nz [mailto:printer@niwa.co.nz]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 April 2013 11:13 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: Attached Image

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] ([redacted]niwa.co.nz)
Subject: RE: Monckton complaint to VUW
Date: Tuesday, 16 April 2013 9:51:00 AM

Hi [redacted]

Are you asking me if I have received such a letter?

No, I haven't. And in any case, I would think a complaint would be lodged with [redacted] or [redacted] rather than a letter directly to me. I asked [redacted] about this yesterday, and he is not aware of anything.

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 16 April 2013 9:42 a m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Monckton complaint to VUW

And on it goes....

Have you received a similar letter?

My advice would be for everyone to ignore his complaints.

Doing anything else is just giving him more air time - which is what he's aiming for.

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 15 April 2013 3:03 p m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Monckton complaint to VUW

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Monday, 15 April 2013 2:41 p m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Monckton complaint to VUW

[redacted]: http://hot-topic.co.nz/moaning-minnie-monckton-attacks-academic-freedom-support-the-vuw-three/

About as predictable as Monckton, I am...

[redacted] I've saved your libel story for later...

On 13/04/2013, at 5:21 PM, [redacted] <[redacted]gmail.com> wrote:

> Hi [redacted]
>
> I could say more, but (ironically) I am flat out with IPCC editing today, and the next month - final draft

deadline is 13 May. Monckton is the tedious distraction I just don't need - and you can quote me on that! I'll get back to you with more info, if I have some "down time" [redacted]
>
>
> Cheers
> [redacted]
>
>
> On 13 April 2013 09:49, [redacted] < [redacted] wrote:
> On 12/04/2013, at 2:12 PM, [redacted] < [redacted] gmail.com> wrote:
>
> > presumably you've seen this?
> > http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO1304/S00138/lord-monckton-complain
> > t-to-victoria-university htm
> >
> > [redacted] VUW might want to discuss with UTAS as Monckton did similar
> > complaint there. See Graham Readfearn's blog
> > http://www.desmogblog.com/2013/03/02/lord-monckton-threatens-climate
> > -scientists-again
> >
> > I'm in Sydney, but still on the case
>
> Good morning all (NB I've added [redacted] to the list),
>
> What a remarkable piece of work is Monckton...
>
> I see Stuff has picked up on this:
> http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/8545516/Sceptics-ire-amuses-
> but-views-retain-sting
>
> I'd really like to ignore this episode, since it's all about attention-seeking by the potty peer, but I'll have to do something on [redacted]. I have in mind a "Support the VUW three" (*) post, pointing out the inanity and hypocrisy of the good Lord's complaints. (I have a youtube clip of him claiming he's been bullied!). Accusing [redacted] of fraud for using an IPCC graph is about as cogent as his supposed "expert review" of WG1, which on reading appears to only refer to the SPM!
>
> If the three have passport-style mugshots they could send me, that would be very helpful...
>
> Let me know if you have any extra info (background, off the record etc, all grist to the mill).
>
> [redacted] can I go public with his libel threat to you?
>
> Cheers
>
> (*) Sorry [redacted] but the [redacted] is just too insider for a wide
> audience... ;-)
> --
> [redacted] Any original statements
> contained herein I place in the public domain, and may be reproduced,
> modified, quoted or misquoted in or out of context in whole or in part
> for any purpose, even just for the hell of it, and without attribution
> or obligation to me. Which is more or less how the internet works
> anyway. [Brian Dodge]
>
>
>
>
>
> --

[redacted]

> Check out 'CITY BACH' (Super-central short-stay accommodation in
> Downtown Wellington)
>
>
>

[redacted]

"Let's think the unthinkable, let's do the undoable, let's prepare to grapple with the ineffable itself, and see if we may not eff it after all." (Douglas Adams)

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Friday light relief
Date: Friday, 12 April 2013 2:36:00 PM

Hi [redacted]
Geez! And I'm sure [redacted] is quaking in his boots over the accusation of promoting a fraudulent IPCC graph. How often have we seen the IPCC 1990 (Lamb) graph of the Medieval Warm Period used to argue the MWP was warmer than 'today'. [redacted] was telling me that apparently Monckton had a few slides devoted to him (northern [redacted] in the presentation, and would like to find out what they are. Also heard Monckton is accusing NIWA of faking our temperature data to create lager warming. (Sorry, that should be "larger" – the beer fumes are getting to me already).
And, no, I have not heard anything about a letter to the NIWA Board/CEO about me. [redacted] & [redacted] are back today from a 3-day JMT meeting in Auckland, and they haven't said anything. Perhaps my letter's in the mail.
Cheers
[redacted]

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2013 2:24 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Friday light relief
Oops – attachment there this time. Must be confused and stressed out by my need to apologise to Lord M.
--
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2013 2:16 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Friday light relief
Beautiful [redacted] You'll have heard about the attached (which I suppose I shouldn't send to you...) – has [redacted] received a similar letter about your disgraceful conduct?
I am definitely having a drink tonight!
Cheers
[redacted]
--
[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]niwa.co.nz]
Sent: Friday, 12 April 2013 1:25 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: Friday light relief

http://ideamighty.co.nz/sacha-baron-cohen-to-tour-new-zealand-as-lord-monckton/

[redacted]

--

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Possible Media Enquiries re Lord Monckton
Date: Thursday, 11 April 2013 4:59:20 PM
Attachments: Potential responses to Monckton-related Questions 10 Apr 2013[1][1].docx

---

We've received some enquiries from media and through the NIWA Facebook page regarding Lord Moncktons' visit / talks. If you do receive such an enquiry, please refer the caller (or email) through to [redacted] and she will either deal with it herself or farm it out to me or [redacted].

For your information, I've attached some notes [redacted] and I have prepared together, to help us with enquiries (Lord Monckton's NZ tour lasts through to the end of April). What we do NOT want to do is get drawn into a fruitless media or internet debate (for the reasons outlined in the note) - any responses will be designed so as not to open a bunch of further questions. Likewise, we would not accept an invitation to participate in face-to-face debates.

Regards - [redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Draft answers to Facebook and Media Questions
Date: Wednesday, 10 April 2013 4:02:39 PM

Many thanks [redacted]

As discussed - happy to have requests for comment on Monckton forwarded to me first, to give you time to prepare your answers and then call the reporter back.

I will keep an eye on media coverage as well and let you both know if anything of particular interest comes up.

Kind regards
[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 10 April 2013 10:10 a m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Draft answers to Facebook and Media Questions

Hi [redacted]

I've attached a suggested version which accepts most of your comments (including [redacted] suggestions about material to remove). My main substantive suggestion is to reword [redacted] sentences regarding scientists' disagreement with Monckton's interpretation of their work in a way which "reports" this through reference to documentation of such disagreement.

Regards - [redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Draft answers to Facebook and Media Questions
Date: Tuesday, 9 April 2013 3:40:43 PM
Attachments: Proposed Responses to Monckton-related Questions_BM_GS.doc

---

Hi [redacted] and [redacted],
I agree – what you have written is very good [redacted]. I have made a few comments in the attached version for your consideration.
Thought you might also like this: http://sciblogs.co.nz/griffins-gadgets/2013/04/08/moncktons-nightmare-week-in-new-zealand/
Kind regards
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 9 April 2013 12:31 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Draft answers to Facebook and Media Questions
Hi [redacted]
What you have written is fine. I have added some extra comment.
Also see second attached file, which is an extract from ClimateConversation
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 9 April 2013 2:27 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: Draft answers to Facebook and Media Questions
[redacted]
As promised this afternoon, I've attached my draft attempt at an answer to the facebook question, and at some answers to potential media questions related to Lord Monckton's speaking tour.
I look forward to your ideas for improvements.
Regards - [redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Monckton again
Date: Friday, 5 April 2013 3:15:48 PM

Hi [redacted]
No – hadn't seen that latest NZ Herald article.
I'm not sure I would describe it as a back down by the Herald. They would probably say it provides the balance that Monckton accused them of not having in the first place – the irony being that it does him no favours at all.
It is a difficult one to balance – if you engage with him the resulting "debate" can generate more publicity for him (as in this case) but to not comment can result in one-sided stories in his favour.
Hopefully the initial media interest in him being here again will soon subside – but you can guarantee that he try hard to ensure it doesn't by being as alarmist/challenging/threatening as he can.
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 12:46 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: Monckton again
Hi [redacted]
You may have seen the following back-down from the Herald, which has got the emails flying this morning:
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10875414
Also, here is a good perspective on debating Monckton from his 2011 visit:
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=10742945
[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton
Date: Friday, 5 April 2013 1:43:22 PM

Hi [redacted]
We completely understand the general position and policy around discussing climate-related issues in the media sphere. Social media, however, works rather differently. There, silence when asked a direct question is deafening, and is generally taken by people as a sign of disingenuity, arrogance, or fear (or a mixture of these), all of which carry reputational risks for NIWA and can add further to the flames of our critics' fires.
To that end, [redacted] thought (with [redacted] agreement) that it would be good to have one simple, tweet-length (120-130 characters) statement which we could use on our social media channels whenever asked a question over the next few weeks about Monckton and related matters.

The thought process behind the simple (and vanilla very much on purpose) statement we developed is that it doesn't specifically address any particular people, is positive rather than negative, and can address a wide variety of questions.
The other thing to bear in mind with social media is the very fast timelines which occur – taking 24 hours to respond is seen as a long time, and timelines stretching to almost a week are, again, generally viewed negatively.
Hopefully that puts everything into context a little better :)
Regards
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 4 April 2013 8:20 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton
Hi,

My default response is not to engage on something this politically loaded, particularly when the question is very open ended. My understanding is that this is the policy in the climate area. If there are significant risks for NIWA I'm happy to revise this decision, if these risks can be explained.

Alternatively, I'm happy to pass the decision onto [redacted] on Monday

Cheers

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 4 April 2013 5:02 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi [redacted]
I Talked to [redacted] and explained our interest in providing a reply. I think your extended version is too long and [redacted] thought it went further away from actually address the points raised in the interview. Are we OK to post [redacted] and my version? [redacted], you're [redacted] in [redacted] absence, so I thought I should bring you in the loop.

cheers,
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, 4 April 2013 9:33 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi [redacted]
I don't know if you have replied as yet, but I see no point if you are going to make such a vanilla statement. Why should we care what 'Jamie Dickens' thinks?
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 5:50 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi all,
[redacted] and [redacted] - I agree with the idea that engaging with Monckton wWill only create more publicity for him but I also agree with [redacted] that we should try to respond to social media comment in a timely manner.
What about "We welcome scientific debate but the evidence is clear that climate change is occurring. Part of NIWA's role is enable New Zealanders to adapt to the impacts and exploit the opportunities of climate change. We are continue to do that."
[redacted] - I know its too long but something that conveys sentiment?
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 4:51 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi All,
[redacted] and I came up with
"We welcome scientific debate, but the evidence is clear that climate change is occurring and primarily anthropogenic. "
As a general social media response on the subject. What does everyone else think?
cheers,
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 4:20 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi [redacted]
We prefer not to engage in any debate, so I think the best thing is not to respond. [redacted] – what do you think?
Thanks
[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 2:35 p.m.
To: [redacted]; [redacted] [redacted]
Subject: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi all

We've had a message on Facebook about our feelings on Monckton and his visit...

Jamie Dickens

- *whats your opinion on this*
  http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/auckland/player/ondemand/tfapr3monck

There's a Stuff article out which quotes [redacted] basically saying Monckton's full of it.
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10874950&ref=rss

Do we want to respond at all? I always thing we should (even with something very simple) rather than just remaining silent, but climate is something of a fraught topic...

I imagine Monckton's visit may engender quite a lot of attention for NIWA anyway, so in case we haven't yet, perhaps we should prep something anyway in response to his, um, points?

Regards

[redacted]

From: [redacted]gmail.com on behalf of [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Herald/APNZ climbdown
Date: Friday, 5 April 2013 1:06:32 PM

Hi all,

please keep this to yourself, but this is APNZ [redacted] explanation for the follow-up piece about Monckton:

"We were caught between the proverbial rock and a hard place.

"Lord Monckton wanted a right of reply, which I felt he deserved after reviewing the story.

"The original story didn't appear in print so the print Herald wouldn't publish his letter. Online doesn't publish letters full stop so the compromise was to put his right of reply into story form."

APNZ screwed up by not at least attempting to approach Monckton to respond to the claims levelled at him in the first piece. I suspect they feared a Press Council complaint and loss (and the resulting obligatory retraction) over that and felt the best way to deal with it was to do the follow up article.

Not ideal either way - the reporter could have covered himself with a cursory attempt to contact Monckton. Even if he wasn't able to reach him, it would have ticked the box for the Press Council reviewing a story for "balance".

[redacted]

On 5 April 2013 11:50, [redacted] <[redacted]gmail.com> wrote:

> You're right, [redacted]
>
> The problem here is that if media get scientists to refute Monckton's claims, then they feel they can run the story, as they have sought "balance". Responding to his claims to the media is precisely the sort of "debate" that Monckton craves.
>
> In Australia, the scientific community has firmly rejected engaging with Monckton on any level. And this works. It gives him less oxygen.
>
> Regarding the Pachauri claim, this appeared in the Australian newspaper, cooked up by one of the worst journalists in Australia, and it wasn't a quote. He didn't say it. Am still trying to get a response from the IPCC so that we can refute it.
>
> But arguing science, point-by-point, in a blog or indeed in a news story, is simply going along with the denier strategy. Doubt is their product. The public won't understand the intracacies of the debate, they're just left thinking there's still a debate.
>
> Steve Lewandowsky's piece in the Herald last time was perfect:

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=10742945

sigh
[redacted]

On Fri, Apr 5, 2013 at 11:36 AM, [redacted] <[redacted]niwa.co.nz> wrote:

> Hi all
>
> (Sorry - been in a management meting all morning and just catching up on the correspondence).
>
> And this is LM's most laughable objection to original Herald piece:
> "The unevidenced statements that I say things scientists 'know are not true' and `pick data and statistics to suit [my] argument' are inaccurate."
>
> Listening to him yesterday on Leighton Smith's show, he kept hammering home the meme of 'global warming has stopped' which is hugely misleading.
> Based on only 17 years (1996-2012), the trend in global-annual average surface temperature lies between 0 and +0.2 deg C per decade.
> So one can assert as a null hypothesis that the trend is zero, and this cannot be refuted (based on a short period of data). If you wanted to be equally perverse, you could assert that global warming had accelerated, and this could not be refuted either. While Moncton does not say explicitly that the 'global warming has stopped' claim is proven (this would be a lie), I think much of his audience will take this interpretation. Skeptics and the business community just don't get the logic of hypothesis testing.
>
> [redacted]
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]
> Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:38 a.m.
> To: [redacted]
> Cc: [redacted]
> Subject: RE: Herald/APNZ climbdown
>
> I'm intending to write something about balance and science on the back of Peter Gluckman's report this week.
>
> It f*&^s up my plans for the day, but it's probably worth doing.
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]
> Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:28 a.m.
> To: [redacted]
> Cc: [redacted]
> Subject: Re: Herald/APNZ climbdown
>
> On 5/04/2013, at 9:18 AM, [redacted] <[redacted]gmail.com> wrote:
>
> > http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10875414

>
> this is unbelievable.
>
> [redacted] any chance of going back to APNZ about this? This is appalling. They have caved to Monckton's threats and run this terrible piece.
>
> Did anyone talk with APNZ about Monckton's letter yesterday?
>
> [redacted]

Just to underline [redacted] point, the "reply" gives Monckton room to lie about his qualifications, as well as what he argues in his talks.

I can only imagine that APNZ/Herald got some stick from Bryan Leyland, and decided that hiding a climb down on the web site was easier than putting up with his nagging.

--

[redacted]

--

--

[redacted]

--

[redacted]

[redacted]
www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz
www.sciblogs.co.nz

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Herald/APNZ climbdown
Date: Friday, 5 April 2013 11:50:45 AM

You're right, [redacted]

The problem here is that if media get scientists to refute Monckton's claims, then they feel they can run the story, as they have sought "balance". Responding to his claims to the media is precisely the sort of "debate" that Monckton craves.

In Australia, the scientific community has firmly rejected engaging with Monckton on any level. And this works. It gives him less oxygen.

Regarding the Pachauri claim, this appeared in the Australian newspaper, cooked up by one of the worst journalists in Australia, and it wasn't a quote. He didn't say it. Am still trying to get a response from the IPCC so that we can refute it.

But arguing science, point-by-point, in a blog or indeed in a news story, is simply going along with the denier strategy. Doubt is their product. The public won't understand the intracacies of the debate, they're just left thinking there's still a debate.

Steve Lewandowsky's piece in the Herald last time was perfect:

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/world/news/article.cfm?c_id=2&objectid=10742945

sigh
[redacted]

On Fri, Apr 5, 2013 at 11:36 AM, [redacted] <[redacted]niwa.co.nz> wrote:

> Hi all
>
> (Sorry - been in a management meting all morning and just catching up on the correspondence).
>
> And this is LM's most laughable objection to original Herald piece:
> "The unevidenced statements that I say things scientists 'know are not true' and `pick data and statistics to suit [my] argument' are inaccurate."
>
> Listening to him yesterday on Leighton Smith's show, he kept hammering home the meme of 'global warming has stopped' which is hugely misleading.
> Based on only 17 years (1996-2012), the trend in global-annual average surface temperature lies between 0 and +0.2 deg C per decade.
> So one can assert as a null hypothesis that the trend is zero, and this cannot be refuted (based on a short period of data). If you wanted to be equally perverse, you could assert that global warming had accelerated, and this could not be refuted either. While Moncton does not say explicitly that the 'global warming has stopped' claim is proven (this would be a lie), I think much of his audience will take this interpretation. Skeptics and the business community just don't get the logic of hypothesis testing.
>
> [redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:38 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Herald/APNZ climbdown

I'm intending to write something about balance and science on the back of Peter Gluckman's report this week.

It f*&^s up my plans for the day, but it's probably worth doing.

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:28 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Herald/APNZ climbdown

On 5/04/2013, at 9:18 AM, [redacted] <[redacted]gmail.com> wrote:

> http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10875414
>
> this is unbelievable.
>
> [redacted] any chance of going back to APNZ about this? This is appalling. They have caved to Monckton's threats and run this terrible piece.
>
> Did anyone talk with APNZ about Monckton's letter yesterday?
>
> [redacted]

Just to underline [redacted] point, the "reply" gives Monckton room to lie about his qualifications, as well as what he argues in his talks.

I can only imagine that APNZ/Herald got some stick from Bryan Leyland, and decided that hiding a climb down on the web site was easier than putting up with his nagging.
--
[redacted]

--
Please consider the environment before printing this email.
NIWA is the trading name of the National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd.

--

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Herald/APNZ climbdown
Date: Friday, 5 April 2013 11:36:00 AM

Hi all

(Sorry - been in a management meting all morning and just catching up on the correspondence).

And this is LM's most laughable objection to original Herald piece:
"The unevidenced statements that I say things scientists 'know are not true' and `pick data and statistics to suit [my] argument' are inaccurate."

Listening to him yesterday on Leighton Smith's show, he kept hammering home the meme of 'global warming has stopped' which is hugely misleading.
Based on only 17 years (1996-2012), the trend in global-annual average surface temperature lies between 0 and +0.2 deg C per decade.
So one can assert as a null hypothesis that the trend is zero, and this cannot be refuted (based on a short period of data). If you wanted to be equally perverse, you could assert that global warming had accelerated, and this could not be refuted either. While Moncton does not say explicitly that the 'global warming has stopped' claim is proven (this would be a lie), I think much of his audience will take this interpretation. Skeptics and the business community just don't get the logic of hypothesis testing.

[redacted]

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] [mailto [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:38 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Herald/APNZ climbdown

I'm intending to write something about balance and science on the back of Peter Gluckman's report this week.

It f*&^s up my plans for the day, but it's probably worth doing.

-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted] [mailto [redacted]
Sent: Friday, 5 April 2013 9:28 a.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Herald/APNZ climbdown

On 5/04/2013, at 9:18 AM, [redacted] <[redacted]gmail.com> wrote:

> http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10875414
>
> this is unbelievable.
>
> [redacted] any chance of going back to APNZ about this? This is appalling. They have caved to Monckton's threats and run this terrible piece.
>
> Did anyone talk with APNZ about Monckton's letter yesterday?
>
> [redacted]

Just to underline [redacted] point, the "reply" gives Monckton room to lie about his qualifications, as well as what he argues in his talks.

I can only imagine that APNZ/Herald got some stick from Bryan Leyland, and decided that hiding a climb down on the web site was easier than putting up with his nagging.

--

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton
Date: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 5:50:26 PM

Hi all,
[redacted] and [redacted] - I agree with the idea that engaging with Monckton wWill only create more publicity for him but I also agree with [redacted] and [redacted] that we should try to respond to social media comment in a timely manner.
What about "We welcome scientific debate but the evidence is clear that climate change is occurring. Part of NIWA's role is enable New Zealanders to adapt to the impacts and exploit the opportunities of climate change. We are continue to do that."
[redacted] - I know its too long but something that conveys sentiment?

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 4:51 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi All,
[redacted] and I came up with
"We welcome scientific debate, but the evidence is clear that climate change is occurring and primarily anthropogenic. "
As a general social media response on the subject. What does everyone else think?
cheers,
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 4:20 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton
Hi [redacted]
We prefer not to engage in any debate, so I think the best thing is not to respond. [redacted] – what do you think?
Thanks
[redacted]

[redacted]
NIWA
Private Bag 14901
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 2:35 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: Question on Facebook about Monckton
Hi all
We've had a message on Facebook about our feelings on Monckton and his visit...
Jamie Dickens

- *whats your opinion on this*
  http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/auckland/player/ondemand/tfapr3monck

There's a Stuff article out which quotes [redacted] basically saying Monckton's full of it.
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10874950&ref=rss
Do we want to respond at all? I always thing we should (even with something very simple) rather than just remaining silent, but climate is something of a fraught topic...
I imagine Monckton's visit may engender quite a lot of attention for NIWA anyway, so in case we haven't yet, perhaps we should prep something anyway in response to his, um, points?
Regards
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: FW: Question on Facebook about Monckton
Date: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 5:00:00 PM

Hi Guys
Just listened to Monckton's interview on newstalkszb – responding to the NZ Herald article to some degree. Called us liars and politicians.
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 4:20 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi [redacted]
We prefer not to engage in any debate, so I think the best thing is not to respond. [redacted] – what do you think?
Thanks
[redacted]

[redacted]
NIWA
Private Bag 14901
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 2:35 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi all
We've had a message on Facebook about our feelings on Monckton and his visit...
Jamie Dickens

- *whats your opinion on this*
  http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/auckland/player/ondemand/tfapr3monck

There's a Stuff article out which quotes [redacted] basically saying Monckton's full of it.
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10874950&ref=rss
Do we want to respond at all? I always thing we should (even with something very simple) rather than just remaining silent, but climate is something of a fraught topic...
I imagine Monckton's visit may engender quite a lot of attention for NIWA anyway, so in case we haven't yet, perhaps we should prep something anyway in response to his, um, points?
Regards
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton
Date: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 4:55:00 PM

Hi [redacted]

My opinion is that we don't want to give Monckton's tour any publicity. I felt it necessary to give an initial response (to the APN journalist), but there is no point in endlessly recycling the same thing.

- Thanks for link to newstalkzb; I'm listening to it now.

He is emphasising the old logical error that lack of significant warming in the last 17 years means that warming has stopped.

Think about the old adage "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence".

Using a period as short as 17 years, we cannot DISprove the null hypothesis that the trend is zero (no warming), but equally we cannot disprove the hypothesis that the trend is +0.2 degrees Celsius per decade (ie, higher that the last 50 years of the 20th century). Basically, 17 years is too short to disprove anything (except cooling). And why is ~17 years used anyway? Because near the beginning of this period is the huge temperature spike of 1998, which at the time was unprecedented in 150 years of instrumental observations. But we have now beaten the 1998 record twice – in 2005 and 2010!

Just finished listening to Monckton – called us all liars, and politicians not scientists. If I was as dishonest as him, I could claim that global warming had accelerated in the last 17 years, because you cannot disprove that statement either.

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 4:20 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi [redacted]

We prefer not to engage in any debate, so I think the best thing is not to respond. [redacted] – what do you think?

Thanks

[redacted]

[redacted]
NIWA
Private Bag 14901
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 2:35 p.m.
To: [redacted]
Subject: Question on Facebook about Monckton

Hi all

We've had a message on Facebook about our feelings on Monckton and his visit...

Jamie Dickens

- *whats your opinion on this*
  http://www.newstalkzb.co.nz/auckland/player/ondemand/tfapr3monck

There's a Stuff article out which quotes [redacted] basically saying Monckton's full of it.
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10874950&ref=rss
Do we want to respond at all? I always thing we should (even with something very simple) rather than just remaining silent, but climate is something of a fraught topic...
I imagine Monckton's visit may engender quite a lot of attention for NIWA anyway, so in case we haven't yet, perhaps we should prep something anyway in response to his, um, points?
Regards
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: Monckton briefing
Date: Wednesday, 3 April 2013 11:35:00 AM
Attachments: Monckton NZ brief-2013.docx

Hi [redacted]

See attached – something I came across on the internet

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Comment to [redacted] on Monckton and climate change
Date: Tuesday, 2 April 2013 11:44:00 AM

Hi [redacted]

I've just spoken to a [redacted] of APN who is writing an article for tomorrow's papers on Monckton's tour. He wanted to get NIWA's side on climate change, and is seeking other comment from GNS and universities.

I tried to be careful with my response - and thanks, [redacted] for the 'heads-up' ([redacted] contacted [redacted] first, who passed him to me).

I wrote a number of statements down before calling the journalist back, and even read some of them in response to his line of questions.

[redacted] seemed genuinely sympathetic to the science viewpoint.

Cheers

[redacted]

[redacted] – cc'ed to you for information, as [redacted]]

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
NIWA
Private Bag 14901
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: Debunking sceptics
Date: Friday, 5 October 2012 5:39:00 PM

Hi [redacted]
See these links and links therein:
http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2009/05/moncktons-deliberate-manipulation/
http://www.skepticalscience.com/monckton-misleads-CA-lawmakers-now-its-personal-part2.html
Cheers
[redacted]

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
NIWA
Private Bag 14901
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Responding to letter to Gisborne Herald about NIWA "s Temperature Series report
Date: Thursday, 8 September 2011 4:51:43 PM
Attachments: DRAFT Gisborne Herald response Sept 2011.doc
Henderson letter to Gisborne Herald Sept 2011.docx

Dear [redacted]

[redacted] and I discussed this over afternoon tea. I've produced a revised version of the draft I circulated this morning, picking up on their points. I've also produced a shorter second option. Both are in the attached document - labelled Draft Version 1, and Draft Version 2. I've also reattached a copy of Mr Henderson's letter to the Herald.

Our preference would be to go with Version 1, but I'd like to discuss this with both of you from the perspective of the Judicial Review case etc. Hopefully we can come to a decision in the morning ?

Regards - [redacted]

>>> [redacted] 9/8/2011 10:18 AM >>>
Hi [redacted]
Looks good - happy to discuss this afternoon, when you're free.
Cheers
[redacted]

[redacted]
NIWA
Private Bag 14901, Wellington
[redacted]
[redacted] niwa.co.nz

>>>

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Date: 8/09/2011 10:01 a.m.
Subject: Re: Fwd: FW: NIWA letter to Gisborne Herald
Thanks [redacted]

I've attached a possible draft response - which we could discuss (along with whether to send it, and if so any possible changes) this afternoon. I'm leaving now for my SMT meeting.

Regards - [redacted]

>>> [redacted] 9/8/2011 9:31 AM >>>
Hi [redacted] and all

I reattach the Letter to the Gisborne Herald which was not in [redacted] email.

I would point out, for those who are not aware of it, that Neil Henderson along with his wife Esther form the climate skeptics group "Climate Realists", http://www.climaterealists.org.nz/node/1.
They are quite active, frequently writing to the Gisborne Herald. They gained recent notoriety by organizing the visit of Lord Monckton in August this year.

If you want me to compose a draft response, let me know.
There are a number of incorrect claims besides the 'audit of the audit' results that could be picked up.

Cheers
[redacted]

>>> [redacted] 8/09/2011 8:25 a.m. >>>
Hi [redacted]

Thanks for circulating this. I will be tied up in a Science Management Team meeing much of today. We need to consult with [redacted] & [redacted] on how best to proceed.

Rgds - [redacted]
-----Original Message-----
From: [redacted]
To: [redacted] niwa.co.nz>
To: [redacted] niwa.co.nz>

Sent: 8/09/2011 7:58:09 a.m.
Subject: Fwd: FW: NIWA letter to Gisborne Herald

Hi chaps:

Do we want to respond to this? If yes, it would be good to follow the line used in your "audit of the audit", [redacted]

Cheers
[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

NIWA

Private Bag 14901, Wellington

[redacted]

[redacted]niwa.co.nz

>>>

From: Editor - The Gisborne Herald <editor@gisborneherald.co.nz>

To: [redacted]niwa.co.nz>

Date: 8/09/2011 7:32 a.m.

Subject: FW: NIWA letter to Gisborne Herald

Hi [redacted] an opinion piece here from Neil Henderson on the NZ temperature record

would someone at Niwa be able to respond please?

regards

[redacted]

Editorial Department

The Gisborne Herald Company Ltd

64 Gladstone Road

PO Box 1143

Gisborne 4040

Phone 8690 600

www.gisborneherald.co.nz

P Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: FW: A Cool Look at Global Warming
Date: Friday, 19 August 2011 5:26:31 PM
Attachments: Comment_re-Lavoisier-presentation_Aug2011.DOCX

Hi [redacted]
Thanks for the copy of this Lavoisier Group presentation. There are a number of such presentations out there, and also lots of debunking responses.
For example, do a Google search for "Lord Monckton" (another skeptic) and "John Abraham" (who has shot down Monckton's presentations).
The Lavoisier claims actually don't seem "fair enough" to me.
I think in the interest of fairness, perhaps you could also circulate links clarifying just who the Lavoisier group is, and links debunking the many repetitious claims by skeptics (see attached).
In the interests of (my) time, just consider a couple of points:
1) "CO2 essential to life and ridiculous to be considered a pollutant": does this make sense if you replace "CO2" by "water"? This isn't science at all, just illogic.
2) Anthropogenic input of CO2 is only 3% - this deliberately conflates an annual flux with a reservoir concentration to downplay the human factor:
i.e., anthropogenic contribution to annual flux of CO2 into the atmosphere is indeed only 3%, but this is 3% on top of the '100% in' and '100% out' that was in balance before the industrial age. Thus, ALL the atmospheric increase (of about 30% since pre-industrial times) is due to this extra anthropogenic CO2.
Check the realclimate.org and skepticalscience.com web sites for lots of other good science.
Cheers
[redacted]

[redacted]
NIWA, Private Bag 14-901
Wellington, New Zealand
[redacted]
Email: [redacted] niwa.co.nz
Street Address:
NIWA, Brodie Building
301 Evans Bay Parade
[redacted] Wellington 6021
www.niwa.co.nz
>>> [redacted] 8/19/2011 8:35 a.m. >>>
Hi,
This was distributed by email at my work (Waikato Regional Council) it all seems fair enough to me.
But I was wondering if you saw any majorly misleading info?
If you do could you let me know and I can pass this on to those distributing the presentation.
I am not contracting you to do this work, just asking if you have time for a brief comment out of my interest.
Cheers
[redacted]

[redacted]
Waikato Regional Council
[redacted]
Private Bag 3038, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton 3240
Please consider the environment before printing this email

****

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Fwd: Mediaportal Alert - NIWA Press - here THE STORY FROM WEEKEND HERLAD
Date: Monday, 18 July 2011 12:40:34 PM

Hi [redacted]
Yes, I was forewarned about the piece on de Freitas and so bought a copy of the Weekend Herald on Saturday. So I have the clipping.
And re Monckton, we don't want to be drawn into a sideshow on the NZCSC's terms that just provides publicity for their views.
Having said that, can you please provide me with a disguise, an ACT supporter's badge, and duct tape (for my mouth!). Thanks. Oh, plus $150 entry fee to the talk.
[redacted]

>>> [redacted] 7/18/2011 10:21 a.m. >>>
thanks [redacted],
good piece.
Also, I totally agree with [redacted] response to the invitation to debate global warming with Monckton - the time for debate has long passed, and to do so would merely give the visit credibility it did not deserve. No question it would an interesting experience, but not one that would serve us well.
it would be interesting to hear him speak, but it might require wearing a disguise, biting one's tongue, and sitting on one's hands. A bit like a United supporter visiting Anfield - one wouldn't want to be seen doing so.
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Subject: Re: The good lord taketh away...
Date: Thursday, 14 July 2011 10:11:10 PM
Attachments: IMAGE.jpg
IMAGE.png
IMAGE.jpg
IMAGE.xxx
IMAGE.xxx
Header

Campbell doesn't interview visiting celebs any more - I was given a firm shove from them when I made the approach for Jim Hansen.? It's Sainsbury who could, and we need to see that off.

Kim Hill, if briefed, could take him apart.?? But still a risk.

Perhaps NZ climate scientists could write - and sign on to - a similar open letter to that published by the Australian lot on The Conversation.? To be published a few days before he arrives.? NOT mentioning Monckton.?

But while it might be tempting, a debate is exactly what Monckton wants, so we need to ensure that it's exactly what he doesn't get.? He loves the stage; he is highly skilled, which is why he is flown around the world to debate people, and why he continues to challenge those who refuse to.
http://wn.com/Debate_Lord_Monckton!

Have a listen to this http://blogs.abc.net.au/nsw/2011/07/lord-christopher-monckton-interview.html

Then these comments afterward from Karl Braganza (Aust met office) - not for distribution of course:

"For my mind it just reinforces that this person should not be given oxygen and that those on the side of good science continue to struggle to take hold of the scientific framing and an appropriate policy agenda. Why was he interviewed?

I have my own (willing) test subjects - and they reported that they got nothing out of this interview other than that scientists were arguing about the science. They found it difficult to follow most of the interview. The differentiation between real academic qualifications and made up ones had no cut through at all. Monckton sounds like he knows his subject- yes he sounds slippery, but that was hard to judge.

I've been doing this for about 3 years. My test subjects (taken from my martial arts club, so extremely varying levels of education, including not finishing high school) are only just now becoming compromised as a control group- through exposure to the material I send them. That has taken three years- i.e. they pretty much retained nothing from the science material they have been exposed to over two years.

I have found through the same anecdotal process that messages with the biggest cut through are all simple appeal to authority. This is well known in PR, and it is why the skeptics go in hard against statement that appeal to authority.

For example- no one understands the micro-biology or medical risk- they just accept the authority. If you asked any person outside medical research exactly what it is about

asbestos that is dangerous, they couldn't tell you."

On Thu, Jul 14, 2011 at 9:56 PM, [redacted] niwa.co.nz> wrote:

> How about John Campbell/TV3,?since you mentioned Ken Ring..?
> ?
> ?
> ?
> ---
> [redacted]
> niwa.co.nz
>
> ?
>
> >>>
>
> **From:** [redacted] sciencemediacentre.co.nz>
> **To:** [redacted] niwa.co.nz>
> **CC:** [redacted] gmail.com>, [redacted] niwa.co.nz>, [redacted] niwa.co.nz>
> **Date:** 14/07/2011 9:47 p.m.
> **Subject:** Re: The good lord taketh away...
>
> I think we can expect to see a Wishart-penned cover story in Investigate and the Climate Sciene Coalition, Leighton Smith, ACT etc will be in top gear.
>
> But what will be interesting is if Close Up etc decide to have a go. Knowing Mike Valentine, Close Up producer, he'd go for it in a blink of an eye, but it would depend on Monckton and his supporters proactively pitching it, as Monckton is unlikely to be on the radar of the main news producers.
>
> I reckon it could go either way - he'll either just attract the likes of Wishart and the Climate Conversation = so fringe media and blogs, or if he does the groundwork he could alternatively get prime time exposure. Just look at the attention Ken "Moon man" Ring has been receiving (most recently on Close Up).
>
> In general the media is suffering climate fatigue (though we did have a good turn

out for our briefing today on extreme weather and climate change - thanks
[redacted]

Happy for the SMC to help out in anyway - definitely worth strategising around this if it appears from stories foreshadoing his arrival that he is likely to get serious airtime...

cheers

[redacted]

[redacted]

Science Media Centre

[redacted]
www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz

[redacted]

On 14 July 2011 21:16, [redacted] niwa.co.nz> wrote:

> Hi [redacted]
> Well, well. It'll be interesting to see how his trip goes across...
> [redacted] and [redacted] comments are good ones - is Kim Hill going to interview him?
> I'll be away when he's here, so won't be a lot of help. If there's anything written I can provide, let me know.
> Cheers
> [redacted]
> ---
> [redacted]
> NIWA
> Private Bag 14901, Wellington
> [redacted]
> [redacted] niwa.co.nz

>>>

From: [redacted] <[redacted]

To: [redacted] niwa.co.nz>, [redacted] <[redacted] sciencemediacentre.co.nz>, [redacted]

CC: [redacted] <[redacted] gmail.com>

Date: 14/07/2011 8:18 p.m.

Subject: The good lord taketh away...

http://www.climateconversation.wordshine.co.nz/2011/07/monckton-to-visit-new-zealand/

Aaargghhh.

We need a carefully coordinated response. We can't afford to be reactive - we need to be proactive.

I am at your collective disposal, but will unfortunately be leaving NZ on Aug 3 for an overseas trip. But [redacted] can be primed and ready to go with whatever's necessary.

Cheers

--

[redacted]

> NIWA is the trading name of the National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd.

--

[redacted]

www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz

www.sciblogs.co.nz

[redacted]

Science Media Centre

[redacted]

www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz

*The **Science Media Centre** is an independent source of expert comment and information for journalists covering science and technology in New Zealand. Our aim is to promote accurate, bias-free reporting on science and technology by helping the media work more closely with the scientific community.*

[redacted]

Signature powered by **WiseStamp**

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NIWA is the trading name of the National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd.

--

[redacted]

follow me on twitter @[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: The good lord taketh away...
Date: Thursday, 14 July 2011 9:46:49 PM
Attachments: Header

I think we can expect to see a Wishart-penned cover story in Investigate and the Climate Sciene Coalition, Leighton Smith, ACT etc will be in top gear.

But what will be interesting is if Close Up etc decide to have a go. Knowing Mike Valentine, Close Up producer, he'd go for it in a blink of an eye, but it would depend on Monckton and his supporters proactively pitching it, as Monckton is unlikely to be on the radar of the main news producers.

I reckon it could go either way - he'll either just attract the likes of Wishart and the Climate Conversation = so fringe media and blogs, or if he does the groundwork he could alternatively get prime time exposure. Just look at the attention Ken "Moon man" Ring has been receiving (most recently on Close Up).

In general the media is suffering climate fatigue (though we did have a good turn out for our briefing today on extreme weather and climate change - thanks [redacted]

Happy for the SMC to help out in anyway - definitely worth strategising around this if it appears from stories foreshadoing his arrival that he is likely to get serious airtime...

cheers

[redacted]

[redacted]

Science Media Centre

[redacted]
www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz

*The **Science Media Centre** is an independent source of expert comment and information for journalists covering science and technology in New Zealand. Our aim is to promote accurate, bias-free reporting on science and technology by helping the media work more closely with the scientific community.*

[redacted]

On 14 July 2011 21:16, [redacted] niwa.co.nz> wrote:

> Hi [redacted]

?

Well, well. It'll be interesting to see how his trip goes across...

?

[redacted] and [redacted] comments are good ones - is Kim Hill going to interview him?

?

I'll be away when he's here, so won't be a lot of help. If there's anything written I can provide, let me know.

?

?

Cheers

[redacted]

?

?

[redacted]

[redacted]

NIWA

Private Bag 14901, Wellington

[redacted]

[redacted] niwa.co.nz

?

>>>

From: [redacted] <[redacted]

To: [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]
[redacted] niwa.co.nz>, [redacted]
<[redacted], [redacted]
<[redacted] sciencemediacentre.co.nz>, [redacted] [redacted]
[redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

CC: [redacted] <[redacted] gmail.com>

Date: 14/07/2011 8:18 p.m.

Subject: The good lord taketh away...

http://www.climateconversation.wordshine.co.nz/2011/07/monckton-to-visit-new-zealand/

Aaargghhh.

We need a carefully coordinated response. We can't afford to be reactive - we need to be proactive.

I am at your collective disposal, but will unfortunately be leaving NZ on Aug 3 for

> an overseas trip. But [redacted] can be primed and ready to go with whatever's necessary.
>
> Cheers
>
> [redacted]
>
> Any original statements contained herein I place in the public domain, and may be reproduced, modified, quoted or misquoted in or out of context in whole or in part for any purpose, even just for the hell of it, and without attribution or obligation to me. Which is more or less how the internet works anyway. [Brian Dodge]

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

NIWA is the trading name of the National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd.

--

[redacted]

www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz
www.sciblogs.co.nz

[redacted]

Science Media Centre

[redacted]

www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz

*The **Science Media Centre** is an independent source of expert comment and information for journalists covering science and technology in New Zealand. Our aim is to promote accurate, bias-free reporting on science and technology by helping the media work more closely with the scientific community.*

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Monckton document - includes NZ series
Date: Wednesday, 3 February 2010 12:56:39 PM
Attachments: Monckton-Caught Green-Handed Climategate Scandal.pdf

---

See attached for a PDF sent to me by Vince Gray - attributed to Lord Monckton/Nigel Lawson. Some of the graphics are the same as in a PPT of his that I came across on the web the other day. It's stirring stuff, including the section on the nefarious activities of NIWA. Could we sue?!?
Cheers,
[redacted]

[redacted]
NIWA
Private Bag 14901, Wellington
[redacted]
niwa.co.nz

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Monckton
Date: Sunday, 24 February 2008 12:40:40 PM
Attachments: Header

Hi [redacted]

As promised earlier this month, here are my answers to your questions.

Regards - [redacted]

At 11:36 AM +1300 1/2/08, <[redacted]> wrote:

> Dear [redacted]
>
> I would appreciate your help on two points to aid my understanding of climate change.
>
> 1. At the Bali proceedings, Christopher Monckton claimed IPCC were in error by a factor of twenty, through ignoring (repealing, I think he said) the Stephan-Boltzmann equation.
>
> Has there been a response to this? It seems to me that if he is wrong, he iis easily demolished? The worry is that silence can imply that there is none, and he is right.

There have been various postings on the internet addressing Monckton's claims about climate sensitivity and the Stephan-Boltzmann law. Most of them track back to an article by Gavin Schmidt on realclimate.org (see http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2006/11/cuckoo-science/), and some of them mix "scientific" rebuttal of Monckton's claims with personal criticism of Monckton (which might put you off a bit).

The argument appears to be around the "climate sensitivity" ie the equilibrium global surface mean air temperature change for a given change in radiative flux at the tropopause (10-12 km altitude) (units of climate sensitivity are °C change per W/m2 forcing).

The Stephan-Boltzmann law gives a relationship between change in temperature and change in radiation for a black body. (A black body absorbs all radiation incident upon it and re-radiates energy which is characteristic of this radiating system only, not dependent upon the type of radiation which is incident upon it).

However as Schmidt explains in the RealClimate posting, the Earth is NOT a black body because of a multitude of feedbacks occurring in the troposphere (e.g. ice-albedo feedback, water-vapour feedback, cloud feedback etc) which affect the relationship between change in radiative forcing at the tropopause and change in surface-averaged temperature. These effects lead to a climate sensitivity significantly higher than what you would obtain from a simple application of the Stephan-Boltzmann law.
The other point Schmidt makes is that climate sensitivity is an equilibrium concept - in his words "it tells you the temperature that you get to eventually". He points out that in a transient situation (such as we have at present), there is a lag related to the slow warm up of the oceans, which implies that the temperature takes a number of decades to catch up with the forcings. If you don't take that into account it will make the observed 'sensitivity' smaller than it should be (because you are dividing by an "observed" temperature change which is less than the eventual "equilibrium" temperature change).

So the work assessed by the IPCC has not "ignored" or "repealed" the Stephan-Boltzmann law. It has tried to deal properly with the radiation physics etc in order to incorporate the effects discussed above.

At 11:36 AM +1300 1/2/08, <[redacted]> wrote:

> 2. I am still not clear how the CO2 - and other GHGs - control effects when water vapour is the main absorber, as I understand it. Is there a model or somesuch which explains it in terms this long-retired scientist can understand.

Here is my attempt at a relatively simple explanation.
First of all, the effect of water vapour is taken into account directly in estimating the "natural greenhouse greenhouse effect" contribution to temperature one would expect for the earth's surface in the absence of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions. Water vapour contributes of the order of 60-70% of the "natural greenhouse effect".

However, when it comes to considering changes, water vapour is dealt with as a feedback rather than as a forcing. There are huge sources of water vapour around the globe (e.g. the oceans) and processes which efficiently remove water vapour from the atmosphere (e.g. rain). Over time scales of a year or so, the amount of water vapour in the earth's atmosphere is essentially determined by the planet's temperature. (All other things being equal, extra water vapour tends to fall out as rain).

However, if the temperature of the atmosphere is increased by some process (e.g. radiative forcing from increasing greenhouse gas concentrations, or changes in energy impinging on the earth from the sun), then the overall amount of water vapour in the atmosphere is expected to increase. (This is partly because the "saturation" amount of water vapour which the air can hold goes up with temperature). Because water vapour is an effective greenhouse gas, this provides a "feedback" which would increase the temperature change for a given forcing from e.g. an increased concentration of anthropogenic greenhouse gases, or an increase in solar radiation arriving from the sun. These effects are included in the calculations which run within GCMs.

The eruption of Mt Pinatubo provided a test (in the opposite direction) of some of these effects, since the injection of volcanic aerosols into the stratosphere provided a negative forcing - ie cooling effect. Modelling which incorporates water vapour feedback makes a reasonable job of simulating the effect of the Mt Pinatubo eruption on global temperatures.

As I said above - this is my attempt at a simple explanation. There are various complications - e.g. clouds, vertical transport, ... There is a lot of discussion in Chapter 8 of the latest IPCC Working Group 1 report (Sections 8.6.3.1 and 8.6.3.2), which you can download from www.ipcc.ch

Regards - [redacted]

--

==========

[redacted]
NIWA, Private Bag 14-901
Wellington, New Zealand

[redacted]
email: [redacted] niwa.co.nz

Street address: Allen Building, NIWA
301 Evans Bay Parade, Wellington

==========