

Evidence of plagiarism and falsification in Schulte[6] Letter

**This section is based on analysis by Tim Lambert:
Lambert[9]:**

scienceblogs.com/deltoid/2007/09/schulte_replies_to_oreskes.php

he following pages are structured in 3 pages from right to left, in chronology to show the information flow:

Peiser[2] Benny Peiser, The letter *Science Magazine* refused to publish, submitted 4 January 2005, plus additional correspondence.¹

Monckton[3] Christopher Monckton, 3rd Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, July 2007, “Consensus”? What “Consensus”? Among Climate Scientists the Debate is not over.²

Schulte[6] Klaus-Martin Schulte, Open Letter in Response to Namoi (sic) Oreskes’ Criticisms, September 3, 2007³

Light blue highlighted text is common to Monckton[3] and Schulte[6], and usually Peiser[2].

Yellow-highlighted text shows trivial edits from Monckton to Schulte.

In 2007, Monckton used Peiser’s best examples, but Peiser had abandoned his complaint by March 2006, because every one either did not fit the criteria or actually failed to contradict the consensuses. Monckton vaguely referenced Peiser, but Schulte methodically removed any such references, and never mentioned Monckton.

In addition, some Peiser’s citations were false, but got copied anyway, implying that Schulte had not seen the abstracts, much less read the papers.

¹<https://web.archive.org/web/20070703081734/http://www.staff.livjm.ac.uk/sp/sbpeis/Scienceletter.htm>

² scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/consensus.pdf
File>Properties>Advanced: Created 7/10/2007 11:14AM from file:
Microsoft Word – Monckton on Oreskes –consensus final 6-21-07

Table 1 – Summary Analysis of Peiser cites used by Monckton/Schulte
Correct Cite

	Correct	Index (Sceince, Not Social Sciencel Research, not Review)	Peer-reviewed	Reject consensus	Correct Cite, Index, Peer, Real Reject	Author, issues
N	Y	Y	N	0	Amman (Oh is actually lead author)	
Y	Y	Y	N	0	Reid	
N	N	Y?	N	0	Kondratyev (wrong year, journal) and Review	
Y	N?	N	Y	0	Gerhard (ISI mis-classified it)	
Y	N	Y	N	0	Fernau	
3	2	4	1	0/5	Total correct	

PDF Created 7/10/2007 1:14PM, with SPPI logos.

³ scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/schulte_letter.pdf
File>Properties>Advanced: Created 9/4/2007 2:46PM, from file:
Microsoft Word – Monckton - Schulte letter to Oreskes cover9-4-07.
[two authors: fascinating title]PDF Created 9/24/2007 4:46PM, with SPPI logos.

Evidence of plagiarism and falsification in Schulte[6] Letter

Schulte[6] 09/03/07

However, since she has seen fit to raise the question of unanimity in the peer-reviewed journals, I have now inspected the **papers**⁴ which she had reviewed.

Schulte keeps trying to convert consensus, with a sample that happened to have no Rejects, into strawman unanimity.

*Did he “inspect” 900+ **papers**? How long would that take for someone unfamiliar with the field?*

*Did he “inspect” **any** papers?*

His list, including false citations, cam from Peiser, who was forced to withdraw all, since some were outside Oreskes’ search criteria

It is alleged that the claim of inspection of Oreskes’s papers is likely to be false, but it is certainly deceptive, because the remaining text came from Peiser via Monckton, and Peiser included papers not in Oreskes, and misclassified others. There is zero evidence Schulte actually inspected any of Oreskes’ papers

Schulte[6] 09/03/07 ← ← ← ←

Some examples of papers which fell within **her** search criterion and within her timeframe, but which do not appear to me, *prima facie*, to support even her limited definition of the “consensus”, are as follows –

➤ AMMANN et al. (2003) detected evidence for close ties between solar variations and surface climate.

Monckton[3] 07/10/07 ← ← ← ←

Some examples of papers which fell within **Oreskes’** search criterion and within her chosen timeframe but which she regarded as supportive of her imagined “unanimous” consensus:

➤ AMMANN et al. (2003) detected evidence for close ties between solar variations and surface climate.

Peiser[2] 01/04/05

C. M. Ammann et al., for instance, claim to have detected evidence for "close ties between solar variations and surface climate", Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics 65:2 (2003): 191-201. **False Citation, Wrong Lead Author**⁵

6

⁴ It is hard enough to review 900+ abstracts, but much more time-consuming to review the papers. Abstracts are freely accessible, papers often are not.

⁵ The real authorship is: **Oh, HS** Ammann, CM Naveau, P Nychka, D Otto-Bliesner, BL

<http://cgi.cse.unsw.edu.au/~lambert/cgi-bin/clima/unclassified/todo/127.html>

Obviously, nobody checked. Anyone familiar with the field would know that Caspar Ammann and Doug Nychka would not be rejecting the consensus. Real

climate scientists include solar variations.

⁶ www.springerlink.com/content/114728q984120156/ The real citation is *Il Nuovo Cimento C*, Marzo–Aprile 1995, Volume 18, **Issue 2**, pp 123-151.

Evidence of plagiarism and falsification in Schulte[6] Letter

Schulte[6] 09/03/07 ← ← ← ←

➤ REID (1997) found that “the importance of solar variability as a factor in climate change over the last few decades may have been underestimated in recent studies”.

➤ KONDRATYEV and Varotsos (1996) criticize “the undoubtedly overemphasized contribution of the greenhouse effect to the global climate change”.

Monckton[3] 07/10/07 ← ← ← ←

➤ REID (1997) found that “the importance of solar variability as a factor in climate change over the last few decades may have been underestimated in recent studies”.

➤ KONDRATYEV and Varotsos (1996) criticize “the undoubtedly overemphasized contribution of the greenhouse effect to the global climate change”.

Peiser[2] 01/04/05

While G.C. Reid stresses: "The importance of solar variability as a factor in climate change over the last few decades may have been underestimated in recent studies." Solar forcing of global climate change since the mid-17th century. *Climate Change*. 37 (2): 391-405

Not Reject⁷

Russian scientists K. Kondratyev and C Varotsos criticise "the undoubtedly overemphasised contribution of the greenhouse effect to the global climate change". K. Kondratyev and C Varotsos (1996). *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment*. 21: 31-67

Review, not in Oreskes, but Not Reject False Citation, Peiser Mis-edited, wrong

⁸

⁷ Peiser ignored the immediately following text in: www.springerlink.com/content/r2n447034x15v087 “suggestion that solar forcing and anthropogenic greenhouse-gas forcing made

roughly equal contributions to the rise in global temperature that took place between 1900 and 1955.” standard part of consensus.

⁸ www.springerlink.com/content/114728q984120156/

The real citation is *Il Nuovo Cimento C*, Marzo–Aprile 1995, Volume 18, [Issue 2](#), pp 123-151.

Evidence of plagiarism and falsification in Schulte[6] Letter

Schulte[6] 09/03/07 ← ← ← ←
Two abstracts, in particular, directly

rejected the “consensus” as Oreskes had defined it.

GERHARD and Hanson (2000):

“The American Association of Petroleum Geologists’
Ad Hoc Committee on Global Climate Issues has studied the supposition of human-induced climate change since the committee’s inception in January 1998. This paper details the progress and findings of the committee through June 1999, At that time there had been essentially no geologic input into the global climate change debate. The following statements reflect the current state of climate knowledge from the geologic perspective as interpreted by the majority of the committee membership. The committee recognizes that new data could change its conclusions. The earth’s climate is constantly changing owing to natural variability in earth processes. Natural climate variability over recent geological time is greater than reasonable estimates of potential human-induced greenhouse gas changes. Because no tool is available to test the supposition of human-induced climate change and the range of natural variability is so great, there is no discernible human influence on global climate at this time.”

⁹ AAPG, not American Associatiomn of Petroleum Geologists. Peiser at least quoted it correctly. Schulte

Monckton[3] 07/10/07 ← ← ← ←
Two abstracts reviewed by Oreskes directly and bluntly

rejected the “consensus” as she had defined it, but she counted them as “consensual” nevertheless:

GERHARD and Hanson (2000):

“The American Association of Petroleum Geologists’
Ad Hoc Committee on Global Climate Issues has studied the supposition of human-induced climate change since the committee’s inception in January 1998. This paper details the progress and findings of the committee through June 1999, At that time there had been essentially no geologic input into the global climate change debate. The following statements reflect the current state of climate knowledge from the geologic perspective as interpreted by the majority of the committee membership. The committee recognizes that new data could change its conclusions. The earth’s climate is constantly changing owing to natural variability in earth processes. Natural climate variability over recent geological time is greater than reasonable estimates of potential human-induced greenhouse gas changes. Because no tool is available to test the supposition of human-induced climate change and the range of natural variability is so great, there is no discernible human influence on global climate at this time.”

obviously did not look at the actual abstract.
aapgbull.geoscienceworld.org/content/84/4/466.abstract

Peiser[2] 01/04/05

Ad Hoc Committee on Global Climate Issues:
Annual report Gerhard LC, Hanson BM
AAPG Bulletin 84 (4): 466-471 Apr 2000
Abstract:
The AAPG⁹

Ad Hoc Committee on Global Climate Issues has studied the supposition of human-induced climate change since the committee’s inception in January 1998. This paper details the progress and findings of the committee through June 1999, At that time there had been essentially no geologic input into the global climate change debate. The following statements reflect the current state of climate knowledge from the geologic perspective as interpreted by the majority of the committee membership. The committee recognizes that new data could change its conclusions, The earth’s climate is constantly changing owing to natural variability in earth processes. Natural climate variability over recent geological time is greater than reasonable estimates of potential human-induced greenhouse gas changes. Because no tool is available to test the supposition of human-induced climate change and the range of natural variability is so great, there is no discernible human influence on global climate at this time.
Not in Oreskes list, not peer-reviewed, ISI misclassified.

Schulte[6] 09/03/07 ← ← ← ←

Monckton[3] 07/10/07 ← ← ← ←

Peiser[2] 01/04/05

FERNAU et al. (1993):

“This article examines the status of the scientific uncertainties in predicting and verifying global climate change that hinder aggressive policy making. More and better measurements and statistical techniques are needed to detect and confirm the existence of greenhouse-gas-induced climate change, which currently cannot be distinguished from natural climate variability in the historical record. Uncertainties about the amount and rate of change of greenhouse gas emissions also make prediction of the magnitude and timing of climate change difficult. Because of inadequacies in the knowledge and depiction of physical processes and limited computer technology, predictions from existing computer models vary widely, particularly on a regional basis, and are not accurate enough yet for use in policy decisions. The extent of all these uncertainties is such that moving beyond no-regrets measures such as conservation will take political courage and may be delayed until scientific uncertainties are reduced.”

FERNAU et al. (1993):

“This article examines the status of the scientific uncertainties in predicting and verifying global climate change that hinder aggressive policy making. More and better measurements and statistical techniques are needed to detect and confirm the existence of greenhouse-gas-induced climate change, which currently cannot be distinguished from natural climate variability in the historical record. Uncertainties about the amount and rate of change of greenhouse gas emissions also make prediction of the magnitude and timing of climate change difficult. Because of inadequacies in the knowledge and depiction of physical processes and limited computer technology, predictions from existing computer models vary widely, particularly on a regional basis, and are not accurate enough yet for use in policy decisions. The extent of all these uncertainties is such that moving beyond no-regrets measures such as conservation will take political courage and may be delayed until scientific uncertainties are reduced.”

Review and Impacts of Climate-change Uncertainties

Fernau ME, Makofske WJ, South DW
Futures 25 (8): 850-863 Oct 1993

Abstract:

This article examines the status of the scientific uncertainties in predicting and verifying global climate change that hinder aggressive policy making. More and better measurements and statistical techniques are needed to detect and confirm the existence of greenhouse-gas-induced climate change, which currently cannot be distinguished from natural climate variability in the historical record. Uncertainties about the amount and rate of change of greenhouse gas emissions also make prediction of the magnitude and timing of climate change difficult. Because of inadequacies in the knowledge and depiction of physical processes and limited computer technology, predictions from existing computer models vary widely, particularly on a regional basis, and are not accurate enough yet for use in policy decisions. The extent of all these uncertainties is such that moving beyond no-regrets measures such as conservation will take political courage and may be delayed until scientific uncertainties are reduced.

Social Science Index, not in Oreskes.

Schulte[6] 09/03/07 ← ← ← ←

I am given to understand that Oreskes has pointed out that the paper by Gerhard and Hansen was not peer-reviewed. However, it is not clear to me that her essay was peer-reviewed either. It was published as an “Essay” in the comment section of *Science* under the subhead “Beyond The Ivory Tower” – an essay series which, according to the editors of *Science*, “highlights the benefits that scientists, science, and technology have brought to society throughout history”.

It may or may not be that the authors of the above-cited abstracts personally believe that humankind is responsible for more than half of the observed warming of the past half century. It may or may not be

that most climate scientists published in the journals believe that.

However, the published papers which I have cited above, and the numerous papers which I have cited in my own study of papers published after the end of Oreskes’ study, do raise grave doubts about the unanimity which Oreskes said she had found in the papers which she had reviewed when preparing her 2004 essay. If unanimity existed in the peer-reviewed literature between 1993 and 2003 – which I have reason to doubt – it certainly no longer exists today.

Monckton[3] 07/10/07

Though Oreskes has challenged Dr. Peiser’s analysis by pointing out that the paper by Gerhard and Hansen was not peer-reviewed,

her essay appears not to have been peer reviewed either.

It may even be the case that the authors of most or even all of the cited abstracts personally believe that humankind is responsible for more than half of the 0.4C observed warming of the past half century. Dr. Peiser accepts, as does the author of the present paper

that most climate scientists published in the journals probably believe that humankind has contributed more than 0.2C of the 0.4C observed warming over the past half century.

But the published papers we¹⁰ have quoted, nevertheless,

raise sufficient doubts about important aspects of the imagined “consensus” to demonstrate the falsity of Oreskes’ claim that not one of the abstracts was counter-consensual.

¹⁰ Who is we?