

At the Crossroads III: Energy and Climate Policy Summit

Monday, 9 January 2017 7:17 PM

Willie Soon talks about climate intimidation

[Part 4 - At the Crossroads III: Energy and Climate Policy Summit](#)

Posted Dec 9, 2016



1:00:00

Yes, I'm going to speak about a subject which I hope that I will speak only for the first time and then it will be the last time for me. It's a very uncomfortable subject, obviously, is to speak about all this very, very bad thing in climate science, especially as I see it, as I experience it. Because I've been living under the dark cloud of censorship and intimidation as soon as I started my post-doc career at the Centre for Astrophysics in 1992.

Then, of course, the famous one, which is February 22nd, 2015, and the front page of the New York Times, on Sunday. I would like to tell you, oh, I woke up in the morning, had a coffee and then was really shocked about all this (but) it's just not true so I will tell the truth.

1:00:45 - Unfortunately, by December, 2009, a number of us, including Professor David Legate, had been receiving this strange email request using FOI law to our institutions asking for all our emails because, in November 2009, if any of you know the major event that happened then, it is of course ClimateGate. The emails of all these other scientists have been released, so therefore they must, and demand to see our emails.

1:01:14 - It's just unfortunate, in terms of my own institution, that they wouldn't fight and bring peace, and then they choose to release some of the emails, and of course I had nothing to hide. I was a bit mad but then I say, "Wow, what a good-looking guy [looking at a photo of himself] so maybe I'll just say to Greenpeace and the New York Times, I forgive you." [laughter] But as my mum taught me as a young kid, you forgive all the bad people, but then you never forget.

1:01:42 - Because the reason is that—this is why I'm here today—I wanted to make sure that this whole story is known at least to some of you, and hopefully will spread the message, and if this thing is recorded, things will be, I guess, learned for the history, that such a thing is really terrible and shall not be repeated again.

1:01:59 - Of course, you won't be a big deal until you get MoveOn.org, right? Myron, I saw the one on MoveOn.org they only got like 2000 people on you and then of course Steve Bannon will

be a few hundred thousand. I got only up to 8000 signatures, so I was not so successful.

1:02:16 - [shows photo of gold-plated toilet, explaining he created this for Greenpeace, it's the secret money I've been receiving all these years - laughter]

1:02:24 - It is a serious subject, so no more joking after this. My friend was telling me to get rid of all the slides but that, as I say, we have learned from the lesson that should go off script more often if you possibly can. So that's what I'm doing here.

1:02:37 - I'm going to point out three cases that I directly experienced. It's quite uncomfortable but it is something that's really worthy to look into a little bit more detail. So I'm going to spend a few minutes explaining what is happening behind the scenes. This is the first case. It's actually on a paper that I published in 2003. It's on the 1000-year climate history. And then relate it to the high drama, really, to the editor-in-chief, Hans von Storch, who's trying to get me banned permanently from those publications.

1:03:07 - And then you have the incidents of amazing stuff from AGU, which is the American Geophysical Union. For most of you, who may not know what AGU is, they are the largest union of professional membership for earth scientists on the planet Earth. So it's very significant that we got the session proposal go through, and then they would last minute just cancel or simply they give us all kinds of strange excuses which I'll detail, whether you see it's justified or not.

1:03:36 - Then finally we have the PNAS, which is the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, which is trying to prove a standard I hope should never occur to anyone, including my own enemy. So I just hope that you stay tuned and have a look at what I have to say.

1:03:51 - Ok, the first case. I did publish a paper in 2003. It's indeed on climate history and trying to look into all the different indirect measurements of climate, in terms of temperature of the station, but looking at archives that are available, like tree rings, lake sediment, ocean sediment, all this kind of stuff, to try to learn something about the climate history of the past thousand years or so.

1:04:20 - Just a disclaimer of why the origin of the paper. Actually, I did not really want to write this paper. But as a professional scientist, the phenomenon that happened in between let's say 2001 to 2003 is highly strange. When you try to publish a paper at that time, if you don't cite those famous papers, like the famous hockey-stick paper, properly, you will be actually taken to task, rather seriously, actually, or else your paper will be rejected. This is the kind of coercion that should not be allowed in open science, but unfortunately they prevail, so I decided I had to do something about it, so I wrote a paper. And then, of course, five editors resigned.

1:05:02 - Remember, if this were to be just one case, ah, who's Willie Soon, [dismissive, indistinct] but it does happen to quite a few people. The first guy is Roy Spencer, who's sitting here. There are people who resigned over his paper, so, Roy, it's not only me that's bad.

1:05:18 - And then you've got Syun-Ichi Akasofu. If some of you who may not know him, go and look him up. In fact, he worked with Al Gore to create this international Arctic research centre at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks. You go to the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, you will see there's a Syun-Ichi Akasofu building. He's so prestigious, he's actually one of those guys who really mastered the subject of aurora, right? This phenomenon that happens in high-latitude regions where you see light dancing around in the upper atmosphere, which he tried to seek scientific understanding and explanation of in relation to, let's say, the solar activity output.

1:05:56 - But of course, when he tried to write a paper explaining that some of the climate varied naturally, he had to resign. This is the kind of treatment you get.

1:06:07 - The quick one on my paper: That is one of these emails that really, really was issued by the publisher of Climate Research who actually said, first, the reviewer has been consulted

about my paper. By the way, this is really also unprecedented, because I really think that it's really bad form. They never informed or asked me that they would look at this background stuff. Because it's a holy, holy thing that you don't touch, you know, and it [indistinct] the peer review system. But then they open up all my cases, they look through it without my permission, without asking me for anything. They say the reviewer has been giving a detailed discussion, and then the editor's done a proper job, and then the author has revised the manuscript accordingly. Therefore it's published.

1:06:50 - Ain't that simple, right? You've got 48 co-editors being copied here. Which one of them stand up and tell the truth, eh? And then of course you have this quote from the [designated] editor-in-chief, Professor Hans von Storch, of Germany, who actually was saying that, you know, this Willie Soon is such a bad guy: he actually tried to gain extra publication, so we have this paper in Climate Research and now you have another paper in a journal called Energy and Environment. And because he had that copy, so something's wrong with the [indistinct], like maybe he should be barred from future publication. I will explain, of course, that in a minute.

1:07:31 - And then, of course, you will see what Hans von Storch is all about, if he's really so much concerned about science. It's really not true, because from that kind of email—by the way, all this stuff came out in the Climategate emails, if you look carefully or you know where to look—that he was actually under pressure from the then Senator Jeffords, who passed away, from Vermont who actually asked him just to clarify the stuff on publication and review [indistinct]. And then he said wow, we gotta get this thing going now, we'd better publish this editorial to try to denounce how my paper slipped through the process, so on and so forth. It's been so bad that it has no scientific value and couldn't be reaching the kind of conclusion that I reached.

1:08:50 - Here's the paper. It's the one they published in 2003 — January, it appeared in Climate Research. And then I also put out a paper in Energy and Environment. So what's going on, really? Am I so bad? I tell you that I have never said this in public, so I'll say it for the first time: that, ultimately, that version that published in Climate Research was a hoax. It is a hoax in the sense that if you went through the peer review process by that time I was fed up enough, put it that way.

1:00:00 - It's always "if you don't do this, you don't remove all these other 40 pages, you will not get published." Really? As if I give a damn about having another paper in publication. Except that it was sensitive material — it was all mostly criticism on the publication of MBH99, which is a Nature paper published by Michael Mann, Bradley and Hughes. That's the only explanation I can give you. I have no other defence because I'm sick and tired of this system of collusion and coercion.

1:09:19 - And then you know the real reason why they need some kind of attack on me. It was mainly because guys like these [displaying photos of Mark Eskin, NOAA, and David Halpern, NASA], who shall be nameless [laughter], you read it yourself, who at that time actually was also working for NOAA and as I said were funding some of those guys, like Michael Mann and all that, on paleoclimate studies, were saying look man, we need some kind of cogent reply, some kind of serious critical discussion so that they could pass on to somebody in OSTP. OSTP, as I hope most of you know, is the Office of Science and Technology Policy of the President. And to say that, oh, we've got to have something going! Let's go and attack this Willie Soon!

1:09:53 - Really? Let's see. What else? What other science they can do? If you want to know who is copied on this email, this is really the hall of fame, hall of shame, actually, with Tom Wigley, Phil Jones, and so on and so forth, and then the most important name I want you to remember is Ellen Mosley-Thompson. I'm sorry I have to name names, because this thing has never been told properly. Then you have the choo-choo train guy, Pachauri. Mosley-Thompson, by the way, is the editor of the American Geophysical Union Eos journal, in which Michael Mann and those guys were actually commissioned to write the rebuttal and got it to appear in ten

days, because they were rushing it for the purpose of showing off at the Senate EPW hearing where Senator Inhofe was chairing on July 29, 2003. I know all those dates clearly.

1:10:40 - Then you can see this is [a quote] where they say that they were really working with mostly Townson and they've got all this stuff going, things are looking good, we're going to get it published, right, so we're going to put Willie Soon under the grave real quick. But then you notice that it is really not about the science and I want to point that out. This kind of a letter is basically one of the core authors by the name of Professor Ray Bradley from UMass Amherst was actually saying, look, we'd better not put in this particular result from one of this paper, because they're really rubbish, they're really bad stuff and we shouldn't get it in.

1:11:20 - It doesn't matter, you see. They still published that with the result in there because Michael Mann was able to persuade all of them, just give me your signature. This is how science works, right? Because Willie Soon is so bad, no matter what the cost is, even a junk, bad result you should publish. I'm just trying to illustrate to you the quality of their argument, right? If you've got anything to say, would you please say it to me in front? And then you can see. Oh, then Michael Mann was concerned that I was already able... I was so powerful that I could hijack the whole Harvard press office. Of course, nothing further from the truth, what a joke.

1:11:54 - Then, finally you get a quote from Tom Wigley. By the way, for those of you who might not know Tom Wigley, he's a pretty senior guy. He came from the UK, from the East Anglia Climate Research Unit group, and he took over the place from Professor Hubert Lamb, one of those fathers of climatology in some sense. Where he says you know, Mike, by chance that this Willie Soon and those guys may have got this thing right, but we don't want to let anybody know that, so that they could have some claim of anything. I don't need to claim anything. All I care about is to publish what I learn from this and as far as I know, if I'm wrong, I'm just wrong. If I'm right, okay, so be it.

1:12:37 - And then you also have these facts. This fact, actually, was discovered by Steve McIntyre, of Canada, who was able to find that AR5, which is one of those United Nations reports that was published in 2013, was able to confirm that we're kind of right. But then, of course, you must not let anyone know about this. Don't ever cite Soon and Baliunas or Soon and Legates and all.

1:13:04 - And then let me move to AGU. Indeed, in 2009 we were able to come up with this particular programme. We invited Dicklinson, Christopher Essex, many of these good scientists to come along and discuss climate science. Then we wanted to cover an area of climate, I'll explain what it is, and also we had this particular title, Diverse video view from Galileo's window, so we needed to study this process carefully. We worked with Professor Sultan Hamud, from Stony Brook.

1:13:35 - This is the timeline we proposed early on and then by July 17 we got it approved and then by September 24 they said you've got to group with another group so we had 27 papers in our session, which is not too bad. Then by September 29 to 30 they dissolved our session and we asked for reinstatement and they said no. No. Simply because they said that our subject is so dangerous for the union [AGU]. Then, if you want to see the quote from the rejection, this guy obviously was not even reading and he was alone responsible for approving or disapproving a session, he was claiming none of our paper was actually studying Galilean moons on Saturn. This guy's really out of this world! And, believe me, he worked at NASA, chief scientist. What a title, this guy.

1:14:24 - As you all know, climate is such a complicated subject. I want to remind you what climate actually is, what kind of expertise. If you want to study climate just because of carbon dioxide, I'm sorry, it's still not enough to study only the atmosphere. You gotta know all of this bunch of stuff. This is part of the reason why the struggle for answers is so high. We may never know the answers, but then we've got to keep trying to follow the scientific method, please.

List of subjects involved in climate studies

- Astronomy
- Solar physics
- Geology
- Geochronology
- Geochemistry
- Sedimentology
- Tectonics
- Palaeontology
- Paleoecology
- Glaciology
- Climatology
- Meteorology
- Oceanography
- Ecology
- Archaeology
- History

Those things [emails and events in which Willie was poorly treated] that I showed you, they're not the scientific method, obviously. Then, just to show you, is it really nothing to do with terrestrial climate, you see the list of papers and submissions that we have are all about climate science, but from different areas, some from geology, some from oceanography, some from atmospheric sciences, some from the theoretical aspect of things, and so on and so forth.

1:15:12 - Then, of course, the sad part about my own career is that I don't take any blame because since 2004 I just consciously [did] not want to get any more funding from the federal government, so I stopped applying to NASA, NSF, all those things. I quit, put it that way. So I'd rather seek all my funding from private sources, private donations. Then by 2012 this particular reality sank in, in the sense that I could no longer work on anything on sun and climate together but I [could] work on the sun only. This is the reality that sets in. I fully accept that, but I want to tell you if you want to study anything about climate, if you don't study sun/climate, I don't know what I'm supposed to study. So it is really not so free if you want to study this. This sort of restriction, I think, especially for scientists like myself, should not happen.

1:16:02 - I'm very close to the end. Now I want to talk about this big-time bully in the National Academy of Sciences. In 2015 we were writing a small little note correcting something that we think is not right. The content doesn't matter, if you want to know, of course, ask me or David Legates, and Willie [Jacksonbuck - indistinct], one of the volunteers, actually. He has no proper science title but he's a good scientist. So we work on this stuff and guess what happened? We claimed that this is our free time—it took, like, less than a day. Well, we wrote this letter, it got published, then, you have this editor-in-chief of PNAS sending me some kind of warning. That you didn't tell the truth, you didn't declare. Let me blow this up. Trying to put a yellow star on my jacket.

1:16:48 - He's trying to say we're going to put this note in saying that you have not disclosed your conflict of interest, that you were funded by funding from Southern Company, for example. Things like that. And I repeatedly told him. So now I have never had the opportunity to publicly thank my lawyer, who is Gordon Todd, [indistinct], who cannot be here because they have to make a living, they're working, {Jake Pierre-Zolo indistinct}. Jake Pierre-Zolo was the guy who reined in the gangster from Boston mafia, [Wiley Bowger indistinct]. So this guy worked for free for me. Obviously I had no money, please, there's no legal defence fund. But then they fire back by saying please don't do that, because I've told them that this is short-term work, it's just a letter, it was not funded by anything, it's a volunteer work. Call it a service to science because I care about science and then [they said]: you can't do this.

1:17:46 - You have to know. If you want to know [about] equal treatment, Professor Carry Minogue [indistinct] of MIT so happened, if you guys don't know about Junk Science, which is a group led by Steve Milloy, he actually contacted PNAS on another paper that Carry Minogue published on hurricane prediction of the future and he did not have to make the disclosure, according to PNAS. So you can see that this kind of treatment is rather biased, according to their book. Then, Professor David Legates quickly realised that even Mann and Gleick have published in PNAS and they clearly have conflicts of interest in terms of the subject, in terms of the stuff, the stuff that they're receiving money, for doing what the work is.

1:18:34 - Michael Mann, as you all know already, who is, but Peter Gleick is another [scientist] who is such a disgraceful guy, who used a stolen identity to the Heartland Institute to get these internal documents [so] he can circulate them. It's no way close to Wikileaks or things like that. Anyway, he actually committed a fraud in some sense.

1:18:56 - Then, I also wrote a letter, I say you know you got all your guns loaded. Can you take your loaded gun away, don't point [it] in my direction. Now the guy just went completely silent and refused to answer and all that, as if nothing happened and [indistinct] really threaten you. But your letter is still there, you're still threatening me. I really do demand something in answering. This is a paper I published with a group of colleagues—distinguished colleagues, from China, from Hawaii, from everywhere, Germany, in 2009.

1:19:26 - And then, by 2013 you can see they couldn't handle the heat. So they insisted on publishing a note on things that [are] not true. Obviously it's their journal, I can say nothing. They insist that that work was also sponsored by Southern Company under that proposal, so and so forth. But that work was only my part-time work, I really have spent no time [on this], on my free time I do that work, I publish and then they insist that way. So it is a yellow star on my jacket.

1:19:54 - Let the [indistinct] history be known: if AMS people want to talk to me, please come. They just don't want to listen. And then I say never mind all these journals. Michael Mann himself is in charge of a Southern Journal, by the way. In 2004 David Legates and I realised that there was something seriously wrong with Michael Mann's work, another aspect of it. Which is the instrumental temperature record, how he smoothed the data.

1:20:18 - So, we get it published, and he promised it will be printed January 29, then January 29 comes, I wait a week, two weeks, it's still not there. What happened? I call the office and they say oh, there are copyright issues and all that. Then finally they say we should not have taken Michael Mann's word for it. Of course, this is only my word, but the sweetest thing about this Climategate is that there is proof that Michael Mann did that.

1:20:46 - And here's the result, actually, something very strange. In 2002 he produced a curve here. I want you to focus only on the smooth red curve, and then in 2003 he got that curve up, and then by 2003 with Jones, the thing go up completely. By the way, science is all about replication, right, then open data access and things like that? We were able to recover what he said he did in 2002, so that curve is okay. Then it just completely cannot explain within this one year that the trend was going up if you really want the numbers, it's actually rising at the rate of 10° to 25° Celsius per century. It's really strange, okay, this is completely made-up stuff. And they are still letting the result stand, putting a graph like this as if it doesn't matter. But you don't put things like that into your publication and we caught him actually pants down, I'm sorry Michael Mann.

1:21:41 - And then, this is the proof. It turns out that one of those volunteers was able to find this particular proof. That Michael Mann was boasting that he was able to stop this production process, blah, blah, blah, copyright violation, but the sweetest thing is that by that time I was smart enough to tell, you know, I was able to get all the copyright of all those graphs ahead of time. So the matter was resolved very, very quickly. It is a very, very bad thing that happened to me. But it's okay, I'm still around, right?

1:22:13 - So my basic conclusion is very simple. That you have this dark cloud of censorship and intimidation that has really inundated the climate science for a long time now. Climate science as we know it has been dangerously corrupted by scientism. All these bullies of censorship, including the scientists, the scientific institutions, even the funding agencies, continue to hijack science for their own gain. So they must be stopped. I hope we can stop, of course. Hopefully with a political wind which shall not depend on politics, that we can do something about this.

1:22:46 - One final thing is that I really think that science is in serious trouble. This is another last case. To show you that, look, our funding agencies, instead of focusing on the science, are focusing on your form size. So, recently, a particular decision got nine of the proposals rejected, because they didn't do the form size correctly. I mean, this is really a very sad state, laughing aside. How could it be? It's just out of this world. I'm sorry that it looks like a dirty laundry thing, but, you know, sometimes you really have to clean this stuff up before you can really correct yourself.

1:23:22 - Finally, if anybody is interested in any sense of solution or some positive outlook, what to do next, I highly recommend work by my good friend Scott Armstrong, from the University of Pennsylvania, and Kersten Green. They've actually come up with a quite interesting list of ideas and suggestions which is called Guidelines for Science, essentially it's just a checklist. You have 25 checklists for scientists, then you've got seven checklist recommendations for basically legislators, politicians, policymakers and all these other people to at least go through this to see whether this science makes sense or not, or is it scientific.

1:24:00 - I think I'm done. Yes, thank you.