

### See No Evil at George Mason University

Strange investigations end even more strangely after 2 years

John R. Mashey 03/16/12 (minor update 06/21/12)

#### Executive Summary

Edward Wegman led the 2006 “Wegman Report,” recruited for Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX) and heavily promoted to Congress as “independent, impartial, expert” work by a team of “eminent statisticians,” *mostly false claims*. They were supposed to study the 1999 “hockey stick” of researchers Michael Mann, Raymond Bradley and Malcom Hughes.

In December 2009 Canadian blogger “Deep Climate” (DC) started finding serious problems in the WR, starting with plagiarism of a book by Bradley! DC later kept finding problems in the WR and other related work.

Based on DC’s 2009 discovery, in March 2010 Bradley lodged a complaint with George Mason University (GMU), for 2.5 pages of WR paleoclimate text. In May he added to that complaint with DC’s discovery of WR plagiarism of social networks texts, 5.5 more pages, of which a 1.5-page subset was re-used in a 2008 paper in Elsevier’s *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis (CSDA)*. That thanked 3 Federal funders.

GMU VP of Research Roger Stough gave Bradley little hint of progress on inquiry into the complaint. Although GMU policy required that the first inquiry committee meeting be held by mid-April, that only happened in late August, more than 5 months after the first complaint.

**07/28/10** Stough wrote, *rather misleadingly*

“**The committee** was formed April 2010. Its work was slowed with the checkerboard absence of the faculty members constituting the inquiry committee from campus. I expect **the committee** to complete their work by the end of September 2010.”

**08/16/10** Stough replied to Bradley and lawyer John Fedor:

“we plan to have a report on this by the end of September.”

**08/17/10** Stough wrote, showing that “slowed” meant “have yet to meet”:

“**The initial meeting of the Inquiry meeting is being scheduled for early next week** at which time **the Committee** will go to work on this matter. ... report on the inquiry with recommendations **before the end of September** and sooner if at all possible. **So we are moving with dispatch at this point.**”

**08/21/10** Wegman revealed the complaint on Facebook, *seeming shocked*.

**09/26/10** A 250-page report enumerated 35 pages of plagiarism and many more problems in the WR. This led *USA Today*’s Dan Vergano to ask Bradley if he had filed a complaint. Although under no legal confidentiality obligation, Bradley had patiently kept quiet, despite a 6-month *runaround*. Vergano wrote one article in October and later quoted 3 academic plagiarism experts, who all thought plagiarism was obvious

**10/11/10** Bradley inquired of status. Stough replied the same day: “...our process has taken a bit longer than expected. So it will be a while yet (a few weeks I would guess) before we have completed the review of your plagerism (sic) allegation.”

**05/15/11** Vergano wrote that Elsevier forced retraction of the *CSDA* paper, which took about 6 months from complaint. GMU needed ~2 years to evaluate 9.5 pages from the early complaints, while ignoring numerous further complaints, for a total of ~80 pages. The long interval and anti-diligence both violated GMU’s own misconduct policy.

**02/22/12** GMU Provost Peter Stearns wrote to the faculty, but not Bradley. GMU decided that the WR had no plagiarism, but at the same time, the 1.5-page *CSDA* subset did, *a mystifying contradiction*. Wegman was ordered to apologize to *CSDA* and retract the already-retracted paper. Bradley has so far received zero reports, despite repeated promises, but Stearns blamed him for speaking before the GMU process had finished.

**This report alleges repeated plagiarism and other misconduct, starting no later than 1996, by Wegman and/or some of his students, especially frequent co-author Yasmin Said.** The total so far includes the WR itself, 4 PhD dissertations, several lectures, a patent and 7 papers, including 4 with Federal funding. Two were published in a Wiley journal they co-edit with WR coauthor David Scott. Both incorporated many unattributed Wikipedia pages, sometimes with laughable errors. Wikipedia was better.

The public trusts universities to seek truth and handle academic misconduct well, especially when they receive substantial public funding, as GMU does. Academic freedom is crucial, but responsibility is the other part of the bargain. Most universities take this responsibility seriously. *Readers are invited to assess the evidence here regarding GMU.*

## Table of Contents

### Executive Summary 1

### Table of Contents 2

#### 1 Introduction 4

- 1.1 Plagiarism chains by Wegman and/or his students 4
- 1.2 GMU process, complaints, chronology 5
- 1.3 Plagiarism by copy, paste and trivial change 6

#### 2 Reported by May 2010 to GMU by Ray Bradley 7

- 2.1 WR tree rings, ice-cores and corals [m] 7
- 2.2 WR Social networks analysis [m] 9
- 2.3 Social networks in *CSDA* paper (2008) [n] 10

#### 3 Reported by October 2010 to GMU 11

- 3.1 WR Principal Components Analysis, Noise [m] 11
- 3.2 WR Miscellany and magnets [m] 11
- 3.3 WR Summaries of Important Papers [m] 12
- 3.4 Yasmin Said PhD dissertation (2005) “best of year” [j] 14
- 3.5 Walid Sharabati PhD dissertation (2008) “best of year” [o] 14
- 3.6 Hadi Rezazad PhD dissertation (2009) “best of year” [p] 14
- 3.7 Wegman slides, NCAR, 2007 [q] 14
- 3.8 October 2010 formal complaint on dissertations [j, o, p] 15
- 3.9 October 2010 formal report [j, m, n, o, p, q] 16

#### 4 Reported to GMU by June 2010 17

- 4.1 WR tree rings example of alleged falsification [m] 17
- 4.2 Wegman, then Al-Shammeri copy Grossman PhD [a, b, c] 17
- 4.3 Wegman and Solka(2005) in Rao, Wegman, Solka, Eds [k] 19
- 4.4 Said(2005) article in Rao, Wegman, Solka, Eds [l] 19
- 4.5 WR Bad statistics and cherry-picking 19
- 4.6 Sharabati (2008) additions; Said, et al (2010) [o, s] 20
- 4.7 WIREs:CS Wegman and Said (2011) [d, e, f, g, h, i] 22
- 4.8 WIREs:CS Said and Wegman (2009) [r] 23

#### 5 Reports to others regarding Wegman, Said or GMU 24

- 5.1 Past plagiarism concerns, accreditation by SACSCOC 24
- 5.2 Reporting Editors’ plagiarism to Wiley [i, r] 25
- 5.3 Wegman, Said, Scott and Wiley [i\*, r\*] 25

#### 6 Stearns letter to faculty [STE2012] and commentary 26

#### 7 Conclusion 28

#### A.1 GMU University Policy 4007, nominal chronology 29

#### A.2 Complaint to SACSCOC 01/15/11 34

#### A.3 Email exchanges with Wiley 35

#### A.4 Funding for Wegman, Said 38

#### A.5 GMU funding 39

#### A.6 GMU connections with climate anti-science, funders 40

## Glossary

ARL	Army Research Laboratory
ARO	Army Research Organization
<i>CSDA</i>	<i>Computational Statistics and Data Analysis</i>
DC	Canadian blogger “Deep Climate” (person), <i>Deep Climate</i> (blog)
DHHS	US Department of Health and Human Services
DoD	US Department of Defense
GMU	George Mason University, Fairfax, VA
NIAAA	National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
NSWC	Naval Surface Warfare Center
ORI	Office of Research Integrity, research watchdog of DHHS <sup>1</sup>
SNA	Social Network Analysis, mis-applied in WR and [SAI2008]
WR	Wegman Report (2006) <sup>2</sup>

## Advice on reading this report

Given names and titles are generally omitted for brevity, no discourtesy intended to any. Opinions are *Italicized*, **Emboldening** in quotes is mine. Wiki’s are considered useful reference sources, not authoritative. Most readers might study **§1** and **§2**, then quickly glance through **§3-§5**, included to record 80+ pages of alleged plagiarism, then read **§6**, **§7**, and appendices for backup and possible explanations for GMU’s strange acts.

---

\*Dr. Mashey is an easy-to-Google semi-retired Bell Labs (1973-1983) / Silicon Valley (1983-) computer scientist, corporate executive and a nonprofit Trustee. He has worked with a wide variety of scientists and engineers, many of whom have used software or hardware he helped create. In graduate school, he wrote software used to help educate 10s of thousands of students over the following decade. He has lectured at hundreds of universities, on software, computer architecture or Silicon Valley entrepreneurialism.

He was profiled in *Science* for his efforts against climate anti-science:

[www.desmogblog.com/science-article-recognizes-john-mashey](http://www.desmogblog.com/science-article-recognizes-john-mashey)

He is a member of AAAS, AGU, APS, ACM, and IEEE CS.

JohnMashey (at) yahoo DOT com PLEASE REPORT ERRORS, UPDATES DO OCCUR, 06/21/12 has fixed some URLs broken by a name change, plus a few typos.

<sup>1</sup> [ori.hhs.gov](http://ori.hhs.gov) main ORI page

[ori.hhs.gov/research-misconduct-0](http://ori.hhs.gov/research-misconduct-0) research misconduct

[ori.hhs.gov/case\\_summary](http://ori.hhs.gov/case_summary) case summaries.

2011 plagiarisms include Jagannathan, Lushington, Visvanathan, Weber

<sup>2</sup> [republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/108/home/07142006\\_Wegman\\_Report.pdf](http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/108/home/07142006_Wegman_Report.pdf) 91p

**Frequently-cited references**

MAS2010	03/15/10	Crescendo to Climategate Cacophony <sup>3</sup>
MAS2010a	09/26/10	Strange Scholarship in the Wegman Report <sup>4</sup>
MAS2011	01/04/11	Strange Inquiries at George Mason University <sup>5</sup>
MAS2011a	05/26/11	Strange Tales and Emails – Said, Wegman, et al <sup>6</sup>
MAS2011b	05/27/11	Strange Falsifications in the Wegman Report <sup>7</sup>
MAS2012	02/13/12	Fake science, fakexperts, funny finances, free of tax <sup>8</sup>
SAI2008		Social networks of author–coauthor relationships, <sup>9</sup> <i>CSDA</i> paper
STE2012	02/22/12	GMU Provost Peter Stearns letter to faculty <sup>10</sup>
VER2010	10/08/10	University investigating prominent climate science critic <sup>11</sup>
VER2011	05/15/11	Climate study gets pulled after charges of plagiarism <sup>12</sup>
VER2012	02/22/12	Univ. reprimands climate science critic for plagiarism <sup>13</sup>

**Further reading**

Raymond S. Bradley, *Global Warming and Political Intimidation*, 2011.

Michel E. Mann, *The Hockey Stick and the Climate Wars: Dispatches from the Front Lines*, 2012.

**Acknowledgements.**

Infinite thanks to Canadian blogger “Deep Climate” (DC) for unearthing the first, long-overlooked plagiarism cases, plus many more. None of this would have happened without his discoveries and vast amount of work. Thanks to Rob Coleman and Ted Kirkpatrick for much help over the last few years. Thanks to a community effort by *andrewt*, *terry* and others who helped find more cases, submitted complaints or offered advice. Thanks to several anonymous reviewers.

<sup>3</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/crescendo-climategate-cacophony](http://www.desmogblog.com/crescendo-climategate-cacophony) 185p

<sup>4</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report) 250p

<sup>5</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/gmu-still-paralyzed-wegman-and-rapp-still-paranoid](http://www.desmogblog.com/gmu-still-paralyzed-wegman-and-rapp-still-paranoid) 17p

<sup>6</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/mashey-report-reveals-wegman-manipulations](http://www.desmogblog.com/mashey-report-reveals-wegman-manipulations) 17p

<sup>7</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/wegman-report-not-just-plagiarism-misrepresentation](http://www.desmogblog.com/wegman-report-not-just-plagiarism-misrepresentation) 12p

<sup>8</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/fake-science-fakexperts-funny-finances-free-tax](http://www.desmogblog.com/fake-science-fakexperts-funny-finances-free-tax) 213p

<sup>9</sup> Yasmin H. Said, Edward J. Wegman, Walid K. Sharabati, John T. Rigsby, “Social networks of author–coauthor relationships,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 52 (2008) 2177 – 2184. Recvd 8 July 2007; accepted 14 July 2007.

<sup>10</sup> [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2012/02/george-mason-university-reprimands-edward-wegman/-/1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2012/02/george-mason-university-reprimands-edward-wegman/)

<sup>11</sup> [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/10/wegman-plagiarism-investigation-1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/10/wegman-plagiarism-investigation-1) UPDATE 05/26/11 on Walsch comments

<sup>12</sup> [www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2011-05-15-climate-study-plagiarism-Wegman\\_n.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2011-05-15-climate-study-plagiarism-Wegman_n.htm)

<sup>13</sup> [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2012/02/george-mason-university-reprimands-edward-wegman/-/1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2012/02/george-mason-university-reprimands-edward-wegman/)

**Introduction to the GMU administration – 2011 and 2012**

Wegman is shown twice as per *Connect2Mason*.<sup>14</sup>

*‘Wegman holds a 30 percent appointment in the Department of Statistics, but his 70 percent, majority appointment is in the School of Physics, Astronomy, and Computational Science in the College of Science.’*

Those marked (→) seem required to be involved, others possibly.

The Board of Visitors<sup>15</sup> is led by Rector Ernst Volgenau.<sup>16</sup>

**January 2011, March 2012, with organizational change marked**

→President Alan G. Merten<sup>17</sup>

→Provost Peter Stearns<sup>18</sup>

→VP for Research and Economic Development Roger R. Stough<sup>19</sup>

→Dean, College of Science, Vikas Chandhoke<sup>20</sup>

(2011) Dept. Hd, Computational and Data Sci, D. Papaconstantopoulos<sup>21</sup>

(2012) Director, School of Physics, Astronomy, and Computational

Sciences (SPACS) Michael Summers<sup>22</sup>

→Professor Edward Wegman<sup>23</sup> (70%)

Dean, Volgenau School of Info. Tech. and Engr, Lloyd J. Griffiths<sup>24</sup>

Department Chair, Statistics, William F. Rosenberg<sup>25</sup>

→Professor Edward Wegman<sup>26</sup> (30%)

<sup>14</sup> [www.connect2mason.com/content/university-committee-finds-professor-guilty-research-misconduct-document](http://www.connect2mason.com/content/university-committee-finds-professor-guilty-research-misconduct-document)

<sup>15</sup> [bov.gmu.edu](http://bov.gmu.edu) §A.5 mentions some other members of the Board of Visitors.

<sup>16</sup> [bov.gmu.edu/volgenau.html](http://bov.gmu.edu/volgenau.html)

<sup>17</sup> [www.gmu.edu/resources/visitors/bio.html](http://www.gmu.edu/resources/visitors/bio.html)

He is retiring in the Spring, to be replaced by Ángel Cabrera.

<sup>18</sup> [provost.gmu.edu/stearns](http://provost.gmu.edu/stearns); [provost.gmu.edu/index.php](http://provost.gmu.edu/index.php);

[provost.gmu.edu/integrity/index.html](http://provost.gmu.edu/integrity/index.html)

<sup>19</sup> [research.gmu.edu/ovprecd.html](http://research.gmu.edu/ovprecd.html)

<sup>20</sup> [cos.gmu.edu/about/administration](http://cos.gmu.edu/about/administration)

<sup>21</sup> [cds.gmu.edu/node/15](http://cds.gmu.edu/node/15); as of 03/05/11 [cds.gmu.edu/node/36](http://cds.gmu.edu/node/36)

<sup>22</sup> [spacs.gmu.edu/content/about-spacs](http://spacs.gmu.edu/content/about-spacs)

<sup>23</sup> [cds.gmu.edu/node/40](http://cds.gmu.edu/node/40)

<sup>24</sup> [volgenau.gmu.edu/about\\_ite/dean.php](http://volgenau.gmu.edu/about_ite/dean.php)

He is stepping down, to be replaced August 2012, by Kenneth Ball.

<sup>25</sup> [statistics.gmu.edu/pages/people.html](http://statistics.gmu.edu/pages/people.html)

<sup>26</sup> [statistics.gmu.edu/people\\_pages/wegman.html](http://statistics.gmu.edu/people_pages/wegman.html)

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Plagiarism chains by Wegman and/or his students


This chart alleges a long history of repeated plagiarism by Wegman and some of his students, totaling 80+ pages of text. Bradley sent an earlier revision of this chart to GMU 06/06/11, lacking only details of paper [r], called [n] in the earlier version.

Wegman and some of his students often “borrowed” text with poor or no attribution, then made trivial changes. Sometimes, unattributed Wikipedia text was copied, while adding some of its citations as disconnected references. Errors were often introduced, especially when departing from the original text.

§1.3 illustrates this plagiarism style.

Some parts of the WR seemed to show a kind of falsification, not by faking data, but by plagiarizing, then weakening or inverting expert conclusions without basis.

Wegman and his lawyer Milton Johns claim there has never been plagiarism. *Readers may assess that claim via §2, §3, §4.*



### Relevant summary sources, generally link back to sources of first identification

- a, b, c [deepclimate.org/2010/12/02/wegman-et-al-miscellany](http://deepclimate.org/2010/12/02/wegman-et-al-miscellany)
- a [www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA313999&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA313999&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf)
- d, e, f, g, h, i [deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour](http://deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour) and [deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2](http://deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2)
- j, o, p [deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review)
- m, n [deepclimate.org/2010/07/29/wegman-report-update-part-1-more-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour](http://deepclimate.org/2010/07/29/wegman-report-update-part-1-more-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour)
- m, n, o, p, q [deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report)
- m [deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style](http://deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style)
- q [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf)
- m [www.desmogblog.com/wegman-report-not-just-plagiarism-misrepresentation](http://www.desmogblog.com/wegman-report-not-just-plagiarism-misrepresentation)
- k, l [deepclimate.org/2011/06/07/mining-new-depths-in-scholarship-part-1](http://deepclimate.org/2011/06/07/mining-new-depths-in-scholarship-part-1)
- r [deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship](http://deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship)
- s [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/strange-scholarship-w-5-7a.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/strange-scholarship-w-5-7a.pdf)
- \*l, \*r [deepclimate.org/2012/03/16/wiley-coverup-complete-wegman-and-said-redo-hides-plagiarism-and-errors](http://deepclimate.org/2012/03/16/wiley-coverup-complete-wegman-and-said-redo-hides-plagiarism-and-errors)

Earliest, 4<sup>th</sup> PhD  
 ARMY ARO  
 Successive iterations of course  
 Eventually → WIREs:CS color  
 Said, Sharabati, Rezazad PhDs  
 WR total: 10 pages  
 WR: +25 pages, total 35  
 Bad statistics, cherry-picking  
 MAS2010a p.70 slides (minor)  
 Alleged falsification  
 2 articles in famous series  
 WIREs: CS from Wikipedia  
 Sharabati PhD + new antecedents  
 Cover-up, see §5.3

## 1.2 GMU process, complaints, chronology

§1.1 displayed the chronology of the plagiarism. This section shows chronologies for GMU’s handling of plagiarism complaints.

Figure 1.2.1 is derived from the GMU misconduct policy, §A.1.

Figure 1.2.2 shows the actual history of complaints that began in March-May 2010, covering just 9.5 pages of text from the WR and CSDA, §2.

GMU’s Stough gave the first complainant Bradley inconsistent and sometimes inaccurate stories. The first inquiry committee meeting was held, not by Day 28, but by week of Day 161. A simple plagiarism complaint took almost 2x longer than the nominal time for a complex case. *GMU seemed to have trouble deciding whether it was still in inquiry or investigatory status.* At the end, the number of committees doubled.

Stough several times promised Bradley a report by the end of September,<sup>27</sup> then in October promised him one in late October. **None ever came.** The complaint had been revealed in August by Wegman on Facebook. Although under no legal requirement, Bradley kept collegially quiet about the complaint for over 6 months of delays, excuses and failed promises.

Over time, more plagiarism was documented, §3, §4.

On 05/31/11, GMU *strangely* requested an interview with Bradley .

*Why was an interview needed for a well-documented plagiarism case?*

*If it was needed, why did it take 442 days to ask?*

Through 03/16/11, Wegman wrote/said things *a lawyer might have advised against*, but sometime before 05/15/11, he retained a well-connected lawyer, Milton Johns, and stopped talking. *I cannot know, but might they then asked for an interview hoping to grill Bradley and find problems?*

Bradley sent them an earlier version of chart in §1.1, listing all the known alleged plagiarisms, as well as one alleging falsification, §4.1.

Section §5 describes complaints to other organizations, followed by GMU Provost Peter Stearns’ letter to the GMU faculty, §6. The conclusion, §7 *explains how GMU behavior seems far outside academic norms and offers some possible explanations, such as strong funding by the Kochs.*

<sup>27</sup> GMU policy allowed 60 days for inquiry (E). If the case was complex, that would have required a non-existent late-July meeting.

Figure 1.2.1 Nominal chronology derived from GMU Policy 4007

Date	Elapsed Days	Nominal Interval	Stage	GMU policy timeline, approximate, given (as soon as possible) everywhere, challenges.
<b>Derived</b>				
03/15/10	0	0	A	Allegation
03/29/10	14	14	B	See if inquiry warranted
04/12/10	28	14	C	If so Provost appoints committee; challenge?
04/12/10	28		D	First meeting of inquiry committee
06/11/10	88	60	E	Inq. Com. completes report. Investigate? (Y/N)
06/25/10	102	14	F	Dean/Director determines. Investigate? (Y/N)
07/25/10	132	30	G	VP convenes investigation committee
11/22/10	252	120	H	Invest. Comm reports, try 120 days; VP Y/N
12/22/10	282	30	I	Possible appeal
04/01/11	382	100	J	President writes decision on appeal

Figure 1.2.2 Real chronology, see [MAS2011] for early details

Date	Elapsed Days	Stage	Late	GMU Real chronology Events
03/05/10	-10			Letters sent to GMU, Rice
03/15/10	0	A		Allegation 1 received by Rice (+GMU) [m]
03/24/10	9			Rice inquiry done (E), cleared Scott
04/08/10	24	B?		GMU acknowledges
04/12/10	28	C?		Inquiry committee formed, April ??
04/27/10	43			Allegation 2 - SNA, [SAI2008], funding [m. n]
07/17/10	124			Stough: report by end of September (no)
07/28/10	135			Stough: report by end of September (no)
08/16/10	154			emails 08/16-08/17, Elsevier (John Fedor)
08/17/10	155			Stough: report by end of September or earlier (no), "moving with dispatch"
08/21/10	159			Wegman on Facebook: "Want to know a bad week?" [MAS2011, p.9]
08/23/10	161	D	133	First inquiry meeting, early in week [MAS2011, p.9]
09/30/10	199			Stough: report promised on 07/28 for end of September, not sent
10/11/10	210			Stough: report in "a few weeks" (no)
10/24/10	223			Rob Coleman reports PhDs [j, o, p].
10/28/10	227			Formal report to GMU of [MAS2010a] [j, m, n, o, p, q]
01/03/11	294			Unknown ; no report to Bradley yet. MAS2011 ends here.
03/16/11	366			CSDA : Wegman begs Elsevier&Azen for no retraction[MAS2011b, pp.4-10]
05/15/11	426			[VER2011] 1st mention of Wegman's lawyer, Milton Johns
05/16/11	427			Retracted climate critics' study panned by expert, Dan Vergano, USA Today
05/19/11	430			Stough reply to Coleman inquiry on PhDs. "Personnel matter" => no comment.
05/26/11	437			05/26/11 Update to [VER2010]: GMU's Walsch says still in inquiry phase
05/31/11	442			GMU 1st contact Bradley to request interview. Why?
06/06/11	448			Formal report to GMU of [a, b, c,d, e, f, g, h, i, k, l, s; m falsification; r note]
06/07/11	449			Phone interview with Bradley: not completed, since Wegman no-show
02/22/12	709	J	327	Stearns announces result to faculty, complains about Bradley in interview
				"Stearns says the university is not investigating any other complaints."
03/06/12	722			No report to Bradley or others complainants.

### 1.3 Plagiarism by copy, paste and trivial change

Shown below is a sample of DC's earliest side-by-side presentations, followed by July 2010's color updates, **in the style used throughout.**

**Documents with alleged plagiarism always appear at left, the antecedent(s) at right, with similar cyan/yellow highlighting.**

This kind of plagiarism claims no invention or new ideas, but uses near-verbatim text to present an illusion of expertise and credibility.

#### Deep Climate Original presentation, December 2009, Wegman Report ← Bradley(1999)

Wegman – para 1

A cross section of a temperate forest tree shows variation of lighter and darker bands that are usually continuous around the circumference of the tree. *These bands are the so-called tree rings and are due to seasonal effects.* Each tree ring is composed of large thin-walled cells called early wood and smaller more densely packed thick walled cells called late wood. The average width of a tree ring is

Bradley – 10.2

A cross section of most temperate forest trees will show an alternation of lighter and darker bands, each of which is usually continuous around the tree circumference. *These are seasonal growth increments produced by meristematic tissues in the tree's cambium.* When viewed in detail (Fig. 10.1) it is clear that they are made up of sequences of large, thin-walled cells (earlywood) and more densely packed, thick-walled cells (latewood). *Collectively, each couplet of*

#### Deep Climate July 2010 presentation of same text

A cross section of a temperate forest tree shows variation of lighter and darker bands that are usually continuous around the circumference of the tree.

These bands are the so-called tree rings and are due to seasonal effects. Each tree ring is composed of large thin-walled cells called early wood and smaller more densely packed thick walled cells called late wood.

A cross section of most temperate forest trees will show an alternation of lighter and darker bands, each of which is usually continuous around the tree circumference.

These are seasonal growth increments produced by meristematic tissues in the tree's cambium. When viewed in detail (Fig. 10.1) it is clear that they are made up of sequences of large, thin-walled cells (earlywood) and more densely packed, thick-walled cells (latewood). Collectively, each couplet of earlywood and latewood comprises an annual growth increment, more commonly called a tree ring.

DC's early versions are clear enough with careful reading, but this copy-paste-trivial-change process is made rapidly visible by highlighting identical, mostly in-order words in cyan. Once readers accept the cyan's validity,<sup>28</sup> it can be ignored, making trivial changes obvious, yellow. The rest is paraphrasing (which DC often showed in *Italics*) or unidentifiable.

Of the WR's 91 pages, 35 were eventually found to follow this style, also found in other efforts by Wegman and/or his students, totaling 80+ pages. In many cases, ~50% of the words were marked cyan, 20-30% yellow. Trivial changes do not happen by accident. Making enough of them is a minimal-effort way to defeat simpler automated plagiarism checkers.

<sup>28</sup> Later, comparisons were made easier by reformatting texts to align cyan words.

The next sections offer side-by-sides to back the claims of §1.1 They use the same style, except one that highlights alleged likely falsifications red. Cases are gathered into 3 groups, organized by dates by which GMU is known to have been formally notified:<sup>29</sup>

§2 Reported to GMU no later than May 2010.

Color versions appeared by July, were reported to GMU by October.

§3 Reported to GMU no later than October 2010

§4 Reported to GMU no later than June 2011

Wegman has consistently claimed there has been no plagiarism, and GMU mostly agreed. *Academics, especially, might read this and give opinions.*

<sup>29</sup> Many were discussed earlier at *Deep Climate*, which a diligent committee might have monitored. Formal complaints were made by various people.

## 2 Reported by May 2010 to GMU by Ray Bradley

### 2.1 WR tree rings, ice-cores and corals [m]

**WR tree rings, pp.13-14.** This was DC's first discovery, 2009, later colorized.<sup>30</sup> Bradley identified this to GMU in March 2010.<sup>31</sup>

<p><b>Wegman - para 1</b></p> <p>A cross-section of a tree trunk shows the radial variation of radial and tangential growth that are usually continuous around the circumference of the tree.</p> <p>These bands are the so-called tree rings and are due to seasonal growth. Each tree ring is composed of dense, thin-walled cells, called early wood, and wider, more loosely packed cells, called late wood.</p> <p>The average width of a tree ring is a function of many variables including the tree species, tree age, local environmental conditions, and other factors including sunlight, precipitation, temperature, soil water, humidity, and even carbon dioxide availability in the atmosphere. Obviously, there are many confounding factors to the problem as to control the temperature signal and to distinguish the temperature signal from the noise caused by the many confounding factors.</p> <p>Temperature anomalies are usually derived from instrumental observations of the tree width as well as instrumental and tree-ring density variations.</p> <p>These variations are valuable in paleoclimatic reconstructions because they have a statistically significant correlation that is constant from its approximately linear relationship with the high-frequency data from climate records in a given climate record.</p> <p><b>[Key distinction between ring width and density omitted.]</b></p>	<p><b>Bradley - 10.2</b></p> <p>A cross-section of a tree trunk shows the radial variation of radial and tangential growth that are usually continuous around the tree circumference.</p> <p>There are seasonal growth increments produced by woody tissue in the tree's cambium. It is formed by living cells. It is clear that each annual increment of wood has a distinct early wood (lightwood) and late wood (darkwood) boundary. Collectively, each complete annual increment of latewood comprises an annual growth increment, more correctly called a tree ring.</p> <p>The annual width of a tree ring in any one tree is a function of many variables including the tree species, tree age, local environmental conditions, and other factors including sunlight, precipitation, temperature, soil water, humidity, and even carbon dioxide availability in the atmosphere. Obviously, there are many confounding factors to the problem as to control the temperature signal and to distinguish the temperature signal from the noise caused by the many confounding factors.</p> <p>Climate anomalies are most often been derived from instrumental observations of tree width, but there has also been a great deal of work carried out on the use of density variations, both axial and radial density.</p> <p>It has also been shown experimentally that density variations represent a different signal and can be used to estimate long-term climate variations over wide areas (Schweingruber et al., 1993, 1994). Density variations are particularly valuable in dendrochronology because they have a statistically significant correlation (often close to linear) with age.</p> <p>Recent instrumentalization of density data offers more low-frequency climate information to be obtained than is the case with standardized ring width data (see Section 10.3).</p>
--	--

<p>Two values of density are measured: axial density (ring diameter) and radial density (ring width). Both are usually measured in the same tree.</p> <p>Radial density values are strongly correlated with axial density values. This is because the radial density values are a function of the radial density values.</p> <p>Both the axial width and density data are used in combination to estimate the seasonal temperature signal.</p> <p><b>Wegman para 2</b></p> <p>Climate signal is stronger in trees that are wider. Trees growing in sites where climate does not limit growth tend to produce rings that are uniform. Thus, the more uniform the rings, the more uniform the climate signal. Climate variation usually follows annual growth increments.</p> <p>Two types of climate anomalies are measured: seasonal and interannual. These anomalies are measured in terms of the width of the tree rings. The width of the tree rings is a function of the width of the tree rings.</p> <p>However, the historical data from the instrumental period are not the best data for climate reconstruction because they are not the best data for climate reconstruction.</p>	<p>Generally, two values are measured in each growth ring: diameter density and radial density. The radial density is measured in terms of the width of the tree ring, and the diameter density is measured in terms of the diameter of the tree ring.</p> <p>For example, Schweingruber et al. (1993) showed that instrumental density values were strongly correlated with axial density values. This is because the radial density values are a function of the radial density values.</p> <p>However, instrumental density variations may be affected by tree-ring width and density data. To maximize the climate signal, it is best to use both density and width data.</p> <p><b>Bradley - 10.2.1 Sample Selection</b></p> <p>In conventional dendrochronological studies, a given tree's width variations are the source of climate information. Trees are sampled in sites where they are naturally occurring, and the radial density variations of these trees are averaged to produce a single radial density signal. In such situations, climate variations will usually influence radial density variations, and the tree-ring width will be sensitive. In more difficult situations, perhaps, where the width of a tree's growth ring is not the best indicator of climate, the radial density variations may be more sensitive to climate variations. In such cases, the radial density variations may be more sensitive to climate variations than the tree-ring width variations.</p> <p>In regional assessments, two types of climate data are measured: seasonal and interannual. These anomalies are measured in terms of the width of the tree rings. The width of the tree rings is a function of the width of the tree rings.</p> <p>However, other climate factors may be indirectly affected. Biological processes within the tree are affected by climate. For example, the radial density variations may be more sensitive to climate variations than the tree-ring width variations.</p>
--	--

<sup>30</sup> [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/wegman-bradley-tree-rings-v20.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/wegman-bradley-tree-rings-v20.pdf)

<sup>31</sup> MAS2011 p.24.

Highlighting here, as elsewhere: cyan for identical, yellow for trivial changes.

DC's first few posts are noted here,<sup>32</sup> as examples of breakthrough detective work. Although many people had examined the WR, nobody else had noticed these issues, but his discoveries stirred others to look.

<p>Photosynthetically produced are accumulated with the increased availability of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and, hence, it is conjectured that ring growth would also be correlated with atmospheric carbon dioxide. See Graybill and King (1996). In addition, oxides of nitrogen are formed in internal combustion engines that can be deposited as nitrates also contributing to fertilization of plant materials. It is clear that while there are temperature signals in the tree rings, the temperature signal is confounded with many other factors including fertilization effect due to use of fossil fuels.</p> <p><b>Wegman - para 3</b></p> <p>Radial density is the frequency of radial density variations in a tree. Thus, the tree-ring density variations are a function of the radial density variations. In such situations, climate variations will usually influence radial density variations, and the tree-ring width will be sensitive. In more difficult situations, perhaps, where the width of a tree's growth ring is not the best indicator of climate, the radial density variations may be more sensitive to climate variations. In such cases, the radial density variations may be more sensitive to climate variations than the tree-ring width variations.</p> <p>Because the early history of tree rings can be used to estimate long-term climate variations over wide areas (Schweingruber et al., 1993, 1994). Density variations are particularly valuable in dendrochronology because they have a statistically significant correlation (often close to linear) with age.</p> <p>Note: Wegman et al. fail to mention the distinction between individual dendrochronology and tree-ring growth. Appropriate such as BCs. The data are explicitly designed to measure the low-frequency climate signal.</p>	<p><b>Bradley 10.2.3</b></p> <p>It is common for time series of tree width to be correlated with instrumental temperature anomalies. This is because the radial density variations from different cores can be compared. It is not necessary to average the growth function period to that particular tree. Only then can a better chronology be constructed from multiple cores. Growth functions are measured by fitting a curve to the data and dividing each measured ring-width value by the "expected" value on the growth curve (Fig. 10.9). Commonly, a negative exponential function, or a linear digital filter, is applied to the data.</p> <p>The resulting "ring-width curve" provided a target for deriving a mean growth function, which could be applied to all of the individual core segments regardless of length (Fig. 10.11). Averaging together the core segments, standardized in this way by the ring-width curve, produced the record shown in Fig. 10.12. This has far more frequent information than the record produced from individually standardized cores (Fig. 10.12) and retains many of the characteristics seen in the original data (Fig. 10.12).</p>
<p><b>Wegman - para 3 cont</b></p> <p>Once there is reasonable confidence that the tree-ring signal reflects a temperature signal, and then a calibration is performed using the derived tree-ring data and the instrumental temperature data. The assumption is that the tree-ring signal structure observed during the instrumental period that is similar to the tree-ring structure observed in the past. Both will have comparable similar temperature profiles. It is possible that the tree-ring signal is a function of climate variations, but it is not clear that the tree-ring signal is a function of climate variations. See Bradley (1989) for a discussion of the fitting and calibration process for dendro-based temperature reconstruction.</p>	<p><b>Bradley 10.2.4</b></p> <p>Once climate variability is standardized, the resulting ring-width indices have been obtained. The next step is to develop a model relating variations in these indices to variations in climate data. This process is known as calibration. It is a statistical procedure used to find the appropriate function for converting growth width variations into climate anomalies. If an equation can be developed that accurately describes instrumentally observed climate variability in terms of tree growth over the same interval, then paleoclimate reconstruction can be made using only the tree-ring data. In this section, a brief summary of the methods used in tree-ring calibration is given.</p>

The tree-ring discussion had one limiting reference to Bradley.

Non-experts might study the text and be impressed. Experts tend to glance only quickly at introductory material, so apparently no one (not even Bradley!) noticed the numerous problems, which went beyond plagiarism into misrepresentation / falsification.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>32</sup> [deepclimate.org/2009/12/17/wegman-report-revisited](http://deepclimate.org/2009/12/17/wegman-report-revisited)

[deepclimate.org/2009/12/22/wegman-and-rapp-on-tree-rings-a-divergence-problem-part-1/](http://deepclimate.org/2009/12/22/wegman-and-rapp-on-tree-rings-a-divergence-problem-part-1/)

<sup>33</sup> MAS2011b illustrates alleged falsification issues, introduced in §4.1.



2.2 WR Social networks analysis [m]

WR pp.17-22. DC found these April 2010.<sup>37</sup> Bradley forwarded them to GMU in May.<sup>38</sup> The red circle shows a change from “movement between places and statuses” to the silly “movement between places and statues.” This error persisted in 2 PhD dissertations, Sharabati [o] and Rezazad [p].



GMU verdict on WR social networks text above: never mentioned. [STE2012] never mentioned the 5.5-page section of the WR shown here, but only stated the unanimous decision of no plagiarism and no academic misconduct in the Congressional report.

Since the following CSDA article was labeled plagiarism,<sup>39</sup> this finding was an absurd contradiction, as DC explained.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/04/22/wegman-and-saids-social-network-sources-more-dubious-scholarship](http://deepclimate.org/2010/04/22/wegman-and-saids-social-network-sources-more-dubious-scholarship)

[deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/wegman-social-networks-v-2.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/wegman-social-networks-v-2.pdf)

<sup>38</sup> MAS2011 p.30

<sup>39</sup> This was inescapable, since Elsevier had already retracted the paper.

<sup>40</sup> “GMU contradictory decisions on Wegman: Plagiarism in CSDA, but not in 2006 congressional report.”

[deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report](http://deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report)

### 2.3 Social networks in *CSDA* paper (2008) [n]

DC had found [SAI2008] by April 2010<sup>41</sup>, and Bradley mentioned it to GMU in May.<sup>42</sup> It included a 1.5 page subset of the earlier 5.5-pages in the WR, also shown in a 3-way comparison.<sup>43</sup> They did fix the silly “statues” here, but not in the 2 later dissertations.<sup>44</sup> This paper acknowledged funding from 3 Federal contracts, including one covered by the ORI.



### [STE2012] stated:

“Concerning the *Computational Statistics* article, the relevant committee did find that plagiarism occurred in contextual sections of the article, as a result of poor judgment for which Professor Wegman, as team leader, must bear responsibility. This also was a unanimous finding. As sanction, Professor Wegman has been asked to apologize to the journal involved, while retracting the article; and I am placing an official letter of reprimand in his file.”

*CSDA* publisher Elsevier already forced a retraction in May 2011, over strong objections from Wegman and resistance from E-i-C Azen:<sup>45</sup>

“This article has been retracted at the request of the Editor-in-Chief and co-Editors, as it contains portions of other authors' writings on the same topic in other publications, without sufficient attribution to these earlier works being given. The principal authors of the paper acknowledged that text from background sources was mistakenly used in the Introduction without proper reference to the original source. Specifically, the first page and a half of the article (pp. 2177–2178) contain together excerpts from Wikipedia (first paragraph), Wasserman and Faust's “Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications” (pp. 17–20) ISBN 10: 0-521-38707-8; ISBN 13: 978-0-521-38707-1. Publication Date: 1994, and W. de Nooy, A. Mrvar and V. Batagelj's “Exploratory Social Network Analysis with Pajek” (pp. 31, 36, 123, and 133) ISBN 10: 0-521-60262-9; ISBN 13: 978-0-521-60262-4. Publication Date: 2005. The scientific community takes a strong view on this matter and apologies are offered to readers of the journal that this was not detected during the submission process.

One of the conditions of submission of a paper for publication is that authors declare explicitly that their work is original and has not appeared in a publication elsewhere. The re-use of material, without appropriate reference, even if not known to the authors at the time of submission, breaches our publishing policies.”

The 1.5-page [SAI2008] text was plagiarism, but not the 5.5-page WR text from which it was excerpted. “*That doesn't even make good nonsense.*”<sup>46</sup>

**Elsevier verdict on *CSDA*: plagiarism (over Wegman objection)**

**GMU verdict on *CSDA* social networks: plagiarism**

(likely inescapable, but minimized by GMU as “contextual.”).

<sup>45</sup> MAS2011a pp.11-12. Azen is still E-i-C of *CSDA*.

[news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2011/06/journal-retracts-disputed-network.html](http://news.sciencemag.org/scienceinsider/2011/06/journal-retracts-disputed-network.html)

[www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2011-05-15-climate-study-plagiarism-Wegman\\_n.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2011-05-15-climate-study-plagiarism-Wegman_n.htm)

<sup>46</sup> [rabet.blogspot.com/2012/03/that-doesnt-even-make-good-nonsense.html](http://rabet.blogspot.com/2012/03/that-doesnt-even-make-good-nonsense.html)

<sup>41</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/04/22/wegman-and-saids-social-network-sources-more-dubious-scholarship](http://deepclimate.org/2010/04/22/wegman-and-saids-social-network-sources-more-dubious-scholarship)

<sup>42</sup> MAS2011 p.30

<sup>43</sup> MAS2010 pp.118-128

<sup>44</sup> [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/wegman-social-networks-v-2.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/07/wegman-social-networks-v-2.pdf)

### 3 Reported by October 2010 to GMU

#### 3.1 WR Principal Components Analysis, Noise [m]

WR pp.15-17. DC published these 07/29/10,<sup>47</sup> commenting:

“Finally, the PCA and noise model section discussed above clearly contains the least “strikingly similar” material. **But the surprise here is that there is any at all.** Not only that, but changes made by Wegman et al have apparently introduced errors. Moreover, the sheer number of apparent sources and relative brevity of the antecedent passages means that additional antecedents can not be ruled out.”



GMU verdict on WR PCA: never mentioned.

#### 3.2 WR Miscellany and magnets [m]

By July 2010, the public total was 10 pages in WR, 1.5 in CSDA. By then, many other problems had been found in the WR. Of its 80 references, many from grey literature, only 40 were cited.<sup>48</sup> The most bizarre was:<sup>49</sup>

“Valentine, Tom (1987) “Magnetics may hold key to ozone layer problems,” *Magnets*, 2 (1) 18-26.

*This uncited reference alone raises a serious question of basic scholarly competence*<sup>50</sup>. It is utterly bizarre, especially in a report criticizing the quality of review elsewhere. I could not find an online copy, but a 1987 ozone article is at best irrelevant bibliography-padding.

“MAGNETS *In Your Future*” was an obscure fringe-science magazine, for which Valentine wrote articles and later served as Editor. He had a long history of writing on fuel-less engines, psychic surgery (books, see Amazon) and conspiracy theories for a tabloid, *The National Tattler*. His Bio states of that work: “(Miracle editor—had to come up with a miracle a week!)”

Some examples and background are:

[web.archive.org/web/20050208000510/tomvalentine.com/html/about\\_tom1.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20050208000510/tomvalentine.com/html/about_tom1.html) his Biography

[www.rexresearch.com/evgray/1gray.htm#1](http://www.rexresearch.com/evgray/1gray.htm#1) “Man Creates Engine That Consumes No Fuel...”

[www.rexresearch.com/elxgnx/elxgenx.htm](http://www.rexresearch.com/elxgnx/elxgenx.htm) “electrogenic agriculture”

[www.rexresearch.com/nemes/1nemes.htm#magnets](http://www.rexresearch.com/nemes/1nemes.htm#magnets) invention suppression

His later talk show often promoted “black helicopters” conspiracies:

[en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black\\_helicopter](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_helicopter)

For more discussion, and credits to various people, see :

[scienceblogs.com/deltoid/2010/05/wegman\\_and\\_black\\_helicopters.php](http://scienceblogs.com/deltoid/2010/05/wegman_and_black_helicopters.php)

DC’s work had stirred me to examine the WR’s “Summaries of Important Papers,” which were found to be rife with errors, biases and distortions, plus 25 more pages of plagiarism.

Fortunately, it required no sleuthing to discover the relevant papers, just tedious work to analyze and display plagiarism and other problems.

About 50% of the words were colored cyan, i.e., identical, in-order.<sup>51</sup>

*Copy-paste-trivial-change is not proper paraphrasing or summarization.*

<sup>48</sup> This indicates likely *bibliography-padding*.

<sup>49</sup> MAS2010a p.180

<sup>50</sup> It probably deserves a color code all its own.

<sup>51</sup> DC sometimes colored obvious text movements cyan, likely a better hint at the editing process. I usually omitted those in favor of strict in-order selection. Each way has its advantages, but yield ~similar results for this plagiarism style.

<sup>47</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/07/29/wegman-report-update-part-1-more-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour](http://deepclimate.org/2010/07/29/wegman-report-update-part-1-more-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour)

3.3 WR Summaries of Important Papers [m]

Summaries pp.67-92. Uncolored text near bottom of most pages is often not part of the WR, but editorial comment.

By word count, ~50% of the total Summaries text was essentially in-order identical, and another ~30% trivial change plus obvious paraphrase.

p.200 of [MAS2010a]



p.203



p.206



p.209



p.212



GMU's own Writing Center explains good paraphrasing to avoid plagiarism and show understanding.<sup>52</sup> By contrast, this was cut-paste-edit and show ignorance by injecting errors and distortions. As usual, the side-by-side presentation approximately doubles the page count.

p.215



p.218



p.221



p.224




p.227



<sup>52</sup> [writingcenter.gmu.edu/resources-template.php?id=1](http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/resources-template.php?id=1) OR MAS2010a pp. 189-191

p.230



p.248



p.233



Those added 25 more WR pages with substantial plagiarism, thus totaling 35 / 91 WR pages, plus 1.5 CSDA pages. [MAS201a] was mentioned by Dan Vergano at *USA Today* 10/08/26,<sup>53</sup> who contacted plagiarism experts and on 11/22/10 wrote:

“Experts claim 2006 climate report plagiarized:”<sup>54</sup>

“The matter is under investigation,” says GMU spokesman Dan Walsch by e-mail. In a phone interview, Wegman said he could not comment at the university's request. **In an earlier e-mail Wegman sent to Joseph Kunc of the University of Southern California, however, he called the plagiarism charges “wild conclusions that have nothing to do with reality.”**

The plagiarism experts queried by USA TODAY disagree after viewing the Wegman report:

- “Actually fairly shocking,” says Cornell physicist **Paul Ginsparg** by e-mail. “My own preliminary appraisal would be ‘guilty as charged.’”
- “If I was a peer reviewer of this report and I was to observe the paragraphs they have taken, then I would be obligated to report them,” says **Garner** of Virginia Tech, who heads a copying detection effort. “There are a lot of things in the report that rise to the level of inappropriate.”
- “The plagiarism is fairly obvious when you compare things side-by-side,” says Ohio State's **Robert Coleman**, who chairs OSU's misconduct committee.

Vergano continued with “Climate science critic responds to allegations”<sup>55</sup> and “Wegman report round-up.”<sup>56</sup>

**GMU verdict on the 25 pages of WR “summaries” text: never mentioned.**

p.236



p.239



p.242



p.245



<sup>53</sup> [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/10/wegman-plagiarism-investigation-1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/10/wegman-plagiarism-investigation-1)


<sup>54</sup> [www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-21-climate-report-questioned\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-21-climate-report-questioned_N.htm) In May 2011, Walsch then changed to still be in inquiry.

<sup>55</sup> [www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism_N.htm)

<sup>56</sup> [www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism_N.htm)

### 3.4 Yasmin Said PhD dissertation (2005) “best of year” [j]

This was originally identified by *terry*, 08/03/10, causing others to investigate further. DC later offered a detailed analysis.<sup>57</sup> The (cut-paste-trivial-change, with errors, sometimes silly) style was by now familiar. Her PhD used 5 pages from University of Wisconsin Professor Bassam Shakhashiri’s ethanol web page. As often seen elsewhere, 50% of the words were in-order identical and another 20% were trivial changes.



None of this was quoted. Shakhashiri was cited for the graph and twice otherwise, vaguely. Said injected errors, including the conversion of “death” to an “impediment.”

**GMU verdict on Said dissertation: personnel matter, no comment.**

Yasmin Said is a GMU Research Assistant Professor, as of 02/29/12.<sup>58</sup>


<sup>57</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review)

[deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/said-dissertation-shakhashari.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/said-dissertation-shakhashari.pdf)

<sup>58</sup> [peoplefinder.gmu.edu/index.php?search=yasmin+said&group=faculty](http://peoplefinder.gmu.edu/index.php?search=yasmin+said&group=faculty)

### 3.5 Walid Sharabati PhD dissertation (2008) “best of year” [o]

DC had actually identified Sharabati(2008) or [SHA2008] in comments 04/24/10,<sup>59</sup> with more discussion later.<sup>60</sup> The dissertation had ~2.5 pages of the SNA text from the WR<sup>61</sup> given to him by Wegman, who got them from Denise Reese.<sup>62</sup> It also had other issues, such as extreme bibliography-padding. It, the *CSDA* article and WR were compared in a triple side-by-side, with annotations for Rezazad’s dissertation, but are omitted here, since redundant. The overall flow appeared to be:



**GMU verdict on Sharabati dissertation: personnel matter, no comment.**

### 3.6 Hadi Rezazad PhD dissertation (2009) “best of year” [p]

DC discussed [REZ2009], the 4<sup>th</sup> re-use of the WR SNA text(~ 8 pages).<sup>63</sup>

**GMU verdict on Sharabati dissertation: personnel matter, no comment.**

### 3.7 Wegman slides, NCAR, 2007 [q]

Wegman copied a few of Mann’s own slides into a doubt-casting talk to an expert audience. This was minor, but just too ironic to avoid mention.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>59</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/04/22/wegman-and-saids-social-network-sources-more-dubious-scholarship/#comment-3371](http://deepclimate.org/2010/04/22/wegman-and-saids-social-network-sources-more-dubious-scholarship/#comment-3371)

<sup>60</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review)

<sup>61</sup> MAS2010a p.118, 152

<sup>62</sup> MAS2011a p.7

<sup>63</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review)

[deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/rezazad-wegman-social-network.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/rezazad-wegman-social-network.pdf)

<sup>64</sup> MAS2010a p.70

### 3.8 October 2010 formal complaint on dissertations [j, o, p]

10/24/10. OSU Professor Rob Coleman, filed a complaint:

‘**Subject:** alleged plagiarism in GMU doctoral dissertations

**Date:** 24 Oct 2010 14:22:34 -0400 ... (copy to pbecker @ GMU)

Dear Vice President Stough,

I allege plagiarism in three George Mason University doctoral dissertations:

(1) Yasmin H. Said (2005), supervised by Edward A. Wegman;

(2) Walid Sharabati (2008), supervised by Edward A. Wegman;

(3) Hadi Rezazad (2009), supervised by Edward A. Wegman.

These alleged cases of plagiarism have been publicly documented in an extensive analysis by John R. Mashey, which can be found in the [Mashey Analysis](#).<sup>65</sup> This document also contains details of alleged plagiarism by

Professor Wegman, charges I understand are pending at GMU. Additional information and a detailed analysis of the specific instances of alleged plagiarism can be found at this discussion of [GMU Dissertation Review](#).<sup>66</sup>

Specific sections of the Mashey Analysis relevant to the three allegations are (1) Appendix A.9, p.87; (2) Appendix W.5.7, p.152; (3) Appendix W.5.10, p.159. Items (2) and (3) are part of a extensive series of alleged plagiarism summarized in Appendix W.2.3, pp.118-128, and extended in W.5.6, pp.148-151, as the problem appears in a paper by Said, Wegman, Sharabati and (another GMU student) John Rigsby.

Although instances of plagiarism in doctoral dissertations are relatively rare, the consequences can be significant. The Ohio State Committee on Academic Misconduct recently heard such a case, and the sanctions included withdrawal of the Ph.D. degree. (I am Chair of this committee.) Information on this case can be found in this [news article](#).<sup>67</sup> You may also know that an extensive series of plagiarized M.S. theses at Ohio University in Athens, and the extremely poor response by the administration there has made Ohio University a laughingstock with respect to academic integrity.

The information in the above links is extensive and somewhat difficult to wade through. If you require further information from me, if the included links do not work, or if you need a more concise summary, please do not hesitate to ask.

**Robert S. Coleman, Professor and Vice Chair for Graduate Studies,  
Department of Chemistry, Ohio State University**

<sup>65</sup> [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf)

<sup>66</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/15/wegman-report-update-part-2-gmu-dissertation-review)

<sup>67</sup> [www.courthousenews.com/2010/08/26/29882.htm](http://www.courthousenews.com/2010/08/26/29882.htm)

About 8 months later, having heard nothing, Coleman inquired and got:

‘On 5/19/11 6:54 AM, Roger Stough wrote:

Dear Dr. Coleman, thank you for your inquiry regarding this matter. It is **currently treated as a personnel matter** at Mason and thus is confidential. So **I am sorry that I cannot give you more information**. Thanks again, Roger’

05/19/11. Coleman replied, further:<sup>68</sup>

‘Dear Vice President Stough,

Thank you. I should have noted that GMU’s misconduct policy differs from our, in that in the Ohio State policy the Complainant is notified of the results of the initial inquiry and has the right to challenge the decision. We also have a specific process for graduate students, wherein the Complainant is also notified of all decisions along the way.

Rob’

05/19/11. Stough continued:

‘Rob, thank you for letting me know how your suystem works. We are learning that our policies re. Reserch Misconduct need revision. Yor note will be helpful in that. Thanks again. Roger’

*OSU’s policies are well within the norms for research universities and Coleman certainly had experience drafting and implementing them.*

Plagiarized SNA text was used 4 times, in the WR, *CSDA* and Sharabati and Rezazad dissertations. Wegman claimed he thought it was Denise Reeves’ original work, included in the WR and then in the [SAI2008], but without credit.<sup>69</sup> It has now been more than 16 months since Coleman filed these complaints, all for relatively-simple, well-documented plagiarism.

**GMU verdict on dissertations: personnel matter, no comment whatsoever.**

<sup>68</sup> Coleman had written much of the current version of OSU’s misconduct policy, which complies with Federal guidelines. From perusal of a dozen or so policies of well-known research universities, complainants are indeed typically informed of the key decisions, sometimes including membership of an inquiry committee. §A.1 links to a quick sample of misconduct policies. Federal guidelines include: Federal Register / Vol. 65, No. 235 / Wednesday, December 6, 2000, OSTP [frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=2000\\_register&docid=00-30852-filed.pdf](http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=2000_register&docid=00-30852-filed.pdf) pp.76260-76264. The definition of research misconduct is here.

<sup>69</sup> [MAS2011a, p.7, 4]

### 3.9 October 2010 formal report [j, m, n, o, p, q]

**10/28/10.** It is hard to imagine that GMU had overlooked the coverage in *USA Today* and elsewhere, but just in case, during October 2010, I sent formal complaints to GMU regarding the dissertations and other items, which finally seems fair to publish, given:

“Stearns says the university is not investigating any other complaints.”<sup>70</sup>

**From:** Roger Stough <[EMAIL](#)>

**Date:** October 28, 2010 3:54:18 PM PDT

**To:** John Mashey <[EMAIL](#)>

**Subject: Re: Further allegations of plagiarism in Wegman Report**

Dear Dr. Mashey, I have forwarded this information to the appropriate authorities at Mason in accordance with your process for these matters. Thanks for sending this information to us. Sincerely, Roger Stough

On 10/28/2010 11:01 AM, John Mashey wrote:

Dear Sir:

You have probably seen:

[content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/10/wegman-plagiarism-investigation-1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/10/wegman-plagiarism-investigation-1)

I am the author of the 250-page report mentioned there.

Appendix W.2.1 covers the alleged plagiarism of Bradley(1999).

Appendix W.2.3 covers the alleged plagiarism of several social networking texts, including the re-use in a later article and several PhD dissertations, discussed in further detail in Appendix W.5.

I believe you are already aware of those.

Appendix W.2.2 covers alleged plagiarism of several sources on principle components, somewhat marginal by comparison.

As cited there, the sections are discussed in more detail, including inks to highlighted side-by-side comparisons at:

[deepclimate.org/2010/07/29/wegman-report-update-part-1-more-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/](http://deepclimate.org/2010/07/29/wegman-report-update-part-1-more-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/)

In total, those account for about 10 pages of the Wegman Report.

In addition, my 60-page Appendix W.11 alleges plagiarism of 25 more pages, showing the cut--paste nature of the Summaries of Important papers. Of the total words, about 50% are exact, locally in-order copies of text (highlighted cyan), and another 30% are trivial changes, rearrangements, etc. All the text is shown in highlighted side-by-side comparisons.

In addition, while it is sometimes difficult to draw the line between incompetent error and deliberate misrepresentation, many changes shown in W.11 seem more likely to be the latter.

Likewise, some changes made to Bradley's text might be judged either misrepresentation or fabrication, difficult to distinguish given the vague citation. If needed, a more detailed analysis is under way and can be provided later.

Appendix A.11 mentions relevant files that disappeared from GMU servers sometime between August 16 and August 23. Presumably these can be obtained from backups, but if not, I do have copies of them all.

Sincerely

John R. Mashey, PhD

GMU thus had complaints alleging substantial plagiarism by obvious copy-paste-trivial-change, all presented in colored side-by-sides:

- ~35 pages in WR
- ~1.5 pages in *CSDA* article, which acknowledged Federal funding
- ~5 pages in Said dissertation (2005)
- ~2 pages in Sharabati dissertation (2008)
- ~8 pages in Rezazad dissertation (2009)

That totals 50+ pages, another 30+ would be found later.

Misrepresentation/fabrication was also mentioned above, as DC had identified dubious problems in 2009. Since GMU never contacted me for more information, it was months before a reasonably simple example was created. It often takes some knowledge of the domain and literature to recognize misrepresentation / falsification / fabrication. Complainants assumed that the plagiarism would be obvious enough, so no one bothered with falsification. Much of the WR was arguably falsification or misrepresentation of various kinds, but a just one example is given, next. Meanwhile, DC and others kept looking and yet more was to come.

<sup>70</sup> VER2012

### 4 Reported to GMU by June 2010

On 06/06/11, for an investigatory committee conference call the next day, Bradley sent:

- An earlier plagiarism graph,<sup>71</sup> where [n] was Said and Wegman (2009), identified and reported to Wiley, but not yet completely documented.
- A link to [MAS2011b] discussed next.

A copy of *andrewt*'s notes, see §4.2 at right. By some date/time mix-up, Wegman did not appear, so no interview occurred then, or for other reasons, later. But the committee was informed.

#### 4.1 WR tree rings example of alleged falsification [m]

**WR pp.13-14.** Plagiarism is much easier for non-experts to see than falsification. This report<sup>72</sup> illustrated the latter (red) and compared different kinds of falsification, with examples from Ward Churchill's case. One kind of falsification is obvious when non-experts copy text and then **weaken or invert** conclusions in the plagiarized expert's known text: The last red sentence directly contradicted Bradley's book, with no basis. Note: This is highlighted WR text, not a side-by-side comparison.



GMU verdict on alleged falsification: never mentioned.

<sup>71</sup> [i40.tinypic.com/311ru6q.jpg](http://i40.tinypic.com/311ru6q.jpg)

<sup>72</sup> MAS2011b p.6. The 12-page discussion is too long to include here.

#### 4.2 Wegman, then Al-Shammeri copy Grossman PhD [a, b, c]

On 12/02/10, DC reported some earlier findings, started by *andrewt* 11/29/10, and color-formatted on next page.<sup>73</sup>

'We also had *andrewt*'s discovery of two paragraphs<sup>74</sup> from a 1995 GMU PhD dissertation, showing up (decidedly out of context) in a 1996 article on statistics software by Wegman and several of his proteges. David Grossman's dissertation *Integrated Structured Data and Text: A Relational Approach* is here,<sup>75</sup> while the technical report *Statistical Software, Siftware and Astronomy* by Wegman et al can be found here,<sup>76</sup> with an unformatted version here.<sup>77</sup>

And to top it off, the same two paragraphs, plus seven more from Wegman et al, can be found almost verbatim as section 1.4.2 in Wegman student Faleh Al-Shameri's 2006 PhD dissertation. That **dissertation is embedded in their joint patent application**<sup>78</sup> for "Automated generation of Metadata" (for use in a data and text mining context) .

Some people had conjectured that the pervasive plagiarism style seen so often first appeared with Yasmin Said's dissertation in 2005, but in fact, a similar cut-paste-trivial-change approach is seen in the next page. This acknowledged funding from ARO 32850.12-MA, i.e., the Army Research Office (ARO), Funding Number DAAH04-94-G-0267.

*Andrewt* reported this to GMU in December 2010, but Bradley also sent GMU the (non-colored) text June 2011.

The following page converted *andrewt*'s texts to cyan/yellow display.

<sup>73</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/12/02/wegman-et-al-miscellany](http://deepclimate.org/2010/12/02/wegman-et-al-miscellany)

<sup>74</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style/#comment-6606](http://deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style/#comment-6606)

<sup>75</sup> [citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.54.1326&rep=rep1&type=pdf](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.54.1326&rep=rep1&type=pdf)

<sup>76</sup> [www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA313999](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA313999)

May 1996

<sup>77</sup> [www.galaxy.gmu.edu/papers/astr.html](http://www.galaxy.gmu.edu/papers/astr.html) seems to have disappeared, for whatever reason. [www.webcitation.org/5y4y1UmYs](http://www.webcitation.org/5y4y1UmYs) is an archived copy.

<sup>78</sup> [www.freepatentsonline.com/y2010/0223276.html](http://www.freepatentsonline.com/y2010/0223276.html) pp.103-104 of PDF [dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1145152](http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1145152) is reference to dissertation of same title

Wegman, Carr, Ring, Miller, Poston, Solka, Wallin  
 “Statistical software, software and astronomy,”  
 GMU Technical Report No, 128, pp.27-28 (1996)  
 in *Statistical Challenges in Modern Astronomy II*, pp.27-28 (1997)

Both DBMS and information retrieval systems provide some functionality to maintain data. DBMS allow users to store unstructured data as binary large objects (BLOB) and information retrieval systems allow users to enter structured data in zoned fields. However, DBMS offer only a limited query language for values that occur in BLOB attributes. Similarly, information retrieval systems lack robust functionality for zoned fields. Additionally, information retrieval systems traditionally lack efficient parallel algorithms. Using a relational database approach to information retrieval allows for parallel processing since almost all commercially available parallel engines support some relational database management system.

An inverted index may be modeled as a relation. This treats information retrieval as an application of a DBMS. Using this approach, it is possible to implement a variety of information retrieval functionality and achieve good run-time performance. Users can issue complex queries including both structured data and text.

The key hypothesis is that the use of a relational DBMS to model an inverted index will:

- 1) Allow users to query both structured data and text via standard SQL. In this fashion, users may use any relational DBMS that supports standard SQL;
- 2) Allow implementation of traditional information retrieval functionality such as Boolean retrieval, proximity searches, and relevance ranking, as well as non-traditional approaches based on data fusion and machine learning techniques;
- 3) Take advantage of current parallel DBMS implementations so that acceptable run-time performance can be obtained by increasing the number of processors applied to the problem.

David Grossman, *Integrated Structured Data and Text: A Relational Approach*, PhD Dissertation, Fall 1985, GMU. pp.1-2

Both DBMS and IR systems provide some functionality to maintain data that is not intuitive to their approach. DBMS allow users to store unstructured data in Binary Large Objects (BLOB) and IR systems allow users to enter structured data in zoned fields. However, DBMS offer only a limited query language for values that occur in BLOB attributes. Similarly, IR systems lack robust functionality for zoned fields. Additionally, IR systems traditionally lack efficient parallel algorithms.

An inverted index may be modeled as a relation. This treats IR as an application of a DBMS. Using this approach, it is possible to implement a variety of IR functionality and achieve good run-time performance. Users can issue complex queries including both structured data and text.

A request to find articles containing vehicle and sales published in journals with over 5,000,000 subscribers requires a search of unstructured data to find the keywords vehicle and sales, and structured data to locate circulation data.

Our key hypothesis is that the use of a relational DBMS to model an inverted index will:

- Allow users to query both structured data and text via standard SQL. In this fashion, users may use any relational DBMS that supports standard SQL. Allow implementation of traditional IR functionality such as Boolean retrieval, proximity searches, and relevance ranking.

Take advantage of current parallel DBMS implementations so that acceptable run-time performance can be obtained by increasing the number of processors applied to the problem.

GMU verdict on plagiarism of Grossman: never mentioned.

#### 4.3 Wegman and Solka(2005) in Rao, Wegman, Solka, Eds [k]

DC analyzed 2 articles, 06/07/11<sup>79</sup> in the *Handbook of Statistics: Data Mining and Data Visualization* (Elsevier, 2005), edited by C.R. Rao, Edward Wegman and Jeffrey Solka.<sup>80</sup> DC writes of Wegman and Solka (2005):

‘Sections 3 (The Computer Science Roots of Data mining ), 5 (Databases), 6.2 ( Clustering) and 6.3 (Artificial Neural Networks) **appear to be largely derived from unattributed antecedents**; these include online tutorials and presentations on data mining, SQL and artificial neural networks, as well as Brian Everitt’s classic Cluster Analysis. All the identified passages, tables and figures were adapted from “copy-paste” material in earlier course lectures by Wegman. ... *Several errors introduced by editing and rearrangement of the material are identified, demonstrating the authors’ lack of familiarity with these particular subject areas.*’

This was a more complex use of material for which no simple side-by-side was done, but DC observed this was another article with Federal funding.<sup>81</sup>

‘The work of E.J.W. was supported by **the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency via Agreement 8905-48174** with The Johns Hopkins University. This contract was administered by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research. The work of JLS was supported by the Office of Naval Research under “In-House Laboratory Independent Research.”’

GMU verdict on Wegman and Solka(2005) plagiarism: never mentioned.

<sup>79</sup> [deepclimate.org/2011/06/07/mining-new-depths-in-scholarship-part-1](http://deepclimate.org/2011/06/07/mining-new-depths-in-scholarship-part-1)

A version had been available several days earlier, although perhaps not publicly, explaining the 06/05/11 date in [i40.tinypic.com/311ru6q.jpg](http://i40.tinypic.com/311ru6q.jpg).

<sup>80</sup> This is one of long series edited by Rao, a truly eminent statistician. Solka had been a student of Wegman’s, now at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, which also employed John T. Rigsby III, a coauthor of the *CSDA* article and acknowledged for help with the WR. No claim is made of plagiarism by Solka, since this material came through Wegman’s course.

<sup>81</sup> [deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-12109](http://deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-12109)


#### 4.4 Said(2005) article in Rao, Wegman, Solka, Eds [l]

This covered the 2<sup>nd</sup> article, “On Genetic Algorithms and their Application.”

DC detailed some errors and changes that worsened the text, but said

‘At least this time, she managed to interweave strikingly similar material from three different sources, instead of just copying one.’

His side-by-side analysis of some text showed a familiar cut-paste-edit pattern.<sup>82</sup>



GMU verdict on Said (2005) article plagiarism: never mentioned.

#### 4.5 WR Bad statistics and cherry-picking

DC showed<sup>83</sup> that only did the WR use bad statistics, but in fact, most of it was taken directly from Steve McIntyre’s analysis, which used a 1:100 cherry-pick to select “hockey-stick” graphs. This was much more specific than [MAS2010a, p.134], in which I had written:

“Given all this, I had resolved to avoid the real statistics analysis in the WR, *but eventually realized there was none.*”


*This topic is too technical to discuss here, but readers with relevant mathematical backgrounds might study DC’s analysis.*

<sup>82</sup> [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/said-genetic-algorithms-v10.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/said-genetic-algorithms-v10.pdf)

<sup>83</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style](http://deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style)


**4.6 Sharabati (2008) additions; Said, et al (2010) [o, s]**  
 [MAS2010, §W.5.7]<sup>84</sup> had documented Sharabati's re-use of SNA text in his PhD, called [SHA2008] below. Later, *andrewt* found additional sources that got documented in an expanded §W.5.7.<sup>85</sup>  
 The previously-found antecedents of [SHA2008] were joined by [HAN2005], which got re-used in [SHA2008, p.8, then pp.124-125].

W.5.7.2 [SHA2008, pp.124-125 ← p.8] ← [HAN2005]



Then, [SHA2008] included material from [BAR1999, WIK2007]


July 29, 2011. Archived a document that these two unacknowledged sources appeared in the article [SAI2010] discussed later in W.5.7.A  
 Further investigation found that these had been incorporated in to [SHA2008] first, and that [SAI2010] was derived entirely from the dissertation, with minor edits. The black outlined paragraphs appear verbatim in the latter.<sup>86</sup>



<sup>84</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report)  
<sup>85</sup> [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/strange-scholarship-w-5-7a.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/strange-scholarship-w-5-7a.pdf)

[SHA2008, §4.3, pp.128-144] was converted to a conference paper year, and later published in the proceedings.<sup>86</sup> Sharabati was a co-author, so the transformation itself might plausibly not be considered plagiarism.<sup>87</sup>

Unlike the SNA text re-used often elsewhere, [BAR1999, WIK2006] did flow through [SHA2008] into [SAI2010], leading to claim of plagiarism in the latter.



PhD students reasonably adapt parts of their dissertation to create publishable papers and sometimes supervisors become coauthors. **Here, the authorship order was Said, Wegman, Sharabati, although the work originated almost entirely from Sharabati's dissertation.**


They acknowledged the same 3 Federal contracts as in [SAI2008]:  
 “Acknowledgements The work of Dr. Said is supported in part by Grant Number F32AA015876 from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. The work of Dr. Wegman is supported in part by the Army Research Office under contract W911NF-04-1-0447. Both were also supported in part by the Army Research Laboratory under contract W911NF-07-1-0059.”

Black boxes at left show [SHA2008] ← [BAR1999, WIK2007].  
 The boxes on next page show same text, [SAI2010] ← [SHA2008].

<sup>86</sup> [SAI2010] Yasmin H. Said, Edward J. Wegman, and Walid K. Sharabati, “Author–Coauthor Social Network and Emerging Scientific Subfields,” F. Palumbo et al. (eds.), *Data Analysis and Classification*, Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization, DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-03739-9\_30, ©Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2010, pp.257-268.  
<sup>87</sup> Of course it copied the [BAR1999, WIK2007] plagiarism problems.

[SAI2010] is now compared to [SHA2008]. **Only the black-boxed texts are alleged to be plagiarism, of [BAR1999, WIK2007].**

The rest are included to show the clear derivation from [SHA2008]. Subsections were reordered. Minor edits made some improvements, some marginal. "I" was changed to "we" everywhere. Citations were fixed to match the journal style. Some references were made more precise. *The paper was effectively a part of Sharabati's (unreferenced) dissertation.*



On 06/06/11, the new [MAS2010, §W.5.7] was reported to GMU.

GMU verdict on [SAI2010] plagiarism: never mentioned.

The article was published by Springer-Verlag in a proceedings issue.

Plagiarism was alleged, with reference to [MAS2010, §W.5.7]:

On 06/10/11, this was emailed to the Proceedings Editors:

Francesco Palumbo, Carlo Natale Lauro and Michael Greenacre.

On 06/18/11, that email was forwarded to the Series editors:

Hans-Hermann Bock, Wolfgang Gaul, and Maurizio Vichi

On 10/14/11, the 2<sup>nd</sup> email was forwarded to Springer Editorial Director:

Martina Bihn


Editors, Springer verdict on [SAI2010]: no acknowledgement of receipt.

#### 4.7 WIREs:CS Wegman and Said (2011) [d, e, f, g, h, i]

DC found<sup>88</sup> that a Wegman lecture on color [d, 2002] was derived from various antecedents, poorly referenced, used by him and Jeff Solka in a course for the Army [e, 2002]. The lecture evolved [f, 2005] → [g, 2008] → [h, 2010]. Then in 2011, this was converted to an article in Wiley's *WIREs: Computational Statistics*, (WIREs:CS), a "peer-reviewed" journal **edited by Wegman, Said and David Scott**.<sup>89</sup>

This plagiarism was far more complex than the others. DC's overview explained:<sup>90</sup>

'A recent article by Wegman and Said in WIREs Computational Statistics opens up a whole new avenue of inquiry – and reveals a remarkable pattern of "flow through" cut-and-paste that goes even beyond Said et al 2008. *Colour Design and Theory* (published online in February) is based largely on a 2002 course lecture by Wegman. However, this is no case of simple recycling of material, for most of the earlier lecture material came from obscure websites on colour theory and was simply copied verbatim without attribution. Now much of it has shown up, virtually unchanged, nine years later. And the old material has been augmented with figures and text from several more decidedly non-scholarly sources, including – wait for it – five different Wikipedia articles. This tangled web is probably best approached with a flow diagram showing the relationship of the two works in question, along with the main unattributed antecedents (taken from the introduction to [my detailed analysis of Wegman and Said 2011](#)).<sup>91</sup>



<sup>88</sup> [deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour](http://deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour)

<sup>89</sup> The WR authorship was Wegman, Scott and Said, although Scott is believed to have only written a few pages. He has remained silent about WR issues.


<sup>90</sup> [deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour](http://deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour)

<sup>91</sup> [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/wegman-said-color-theory-and-design-antecedents-v12.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/wegman-said-color-theory-and-design-antecedents-v12.pdf)

As seen in the above figure, the unattributed antecedents of Wegman and Said 2011 fall into two distinct groups:

1. **More than 90% pages of content in Wegman 2002 contain content identical to six online sources available at that time**, including a Kodak tutorial on digital colour and a web page on color theory by Ted Park. In turn, much of this material found its way into Wegman and Said 2011, again unattributed for the most part.
2. **Additional unattributed material in Wegman and Said 2011, both text and figures, can be traced to five different Wikipedia articles**, as well as other non-academic online sources, such as All Experts and Wiki Graphics. '

Read DC's detailed analysis for the real thing, but this is the general idea, as usual, with cyan highlight for identical text and yellow for trivial edits:



DC's further discussion<sup>92</sup> enumerated various additional problems and hinted at other issues with WIREs:CS that had been discovered.

On 06/06/11, this was reported to GMU.

**GMU verdict on Wegman and Said (2011) plagiarism: never mentioned.**

<sup>92</sup> [deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2](http://deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2)

#### 4.8 WIRES:CS Said and Wegman (2009) [r]

Although published earlier, this<sup>93</sup> was found later, in April 2011 and reported to Wiley then (as per next section), but not until October 4 did DC produce a complete public analysis.<sup>94</sup> DC summarized:

‘As the title implies, the article was meant to provide a broad overview of mathematical optimization and set the stage for subsequent articles detailing various optimization techniques. However my analysis, entitled *Suboptimal Scholarship: Antecedents of Said and Wegman 2009*,<sup>95</sup> demonstrates the highly problematic scholarship of the “Roadmap” article.

- No fewer than 15 likely online antecedent sources, all unattributed, have been identified, including 13 articles from Wikipedia and two others from Prof. Tom Ferguson and Wolfram MathWorld.
- Numerous errors have been identified, apparently arising from mistranscription, faulty rewording, or omission of key information.
- The scanty list of references appears to have been “carried along” from the unattributed antecedents; thus, these references may well constitute false citations.’

People expect review articles to be written by those who have at least demonstrated mastery of a field. Here, 2 of the Editors-in-Chief stitched together Wikipedia pages to create an error-plagued article,<sup>96</sup> whose “peer review” if any must surely have been managed by the remaining E-i-C. DC’s 34-page analysis explains many errors and problems beyond the pages at right.<sup>97</sup> Cyan highlights identical text, yellow trivial edits.

This issue was on the chart sent to GMU 06/06/11, and had they asked, early analyses were available. Dan Vergano inquired later about this.<sup>98</sup>

<sup>93</sup> Yasmin H. Said and Edward J. Wegman, “Roadmap for Optimization”, *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics [WIRES Comp Stat]*, Volume 1, Issue 1, pages 3-11, July/August 2009. Online July 13, 2009.

<sup>94</sup> [deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship](http://deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship)

<sup>95</sup> [deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/said-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship-v12.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/said-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship-v12.pdf)

<sup>96</sup> *The quality of the Wikipedia pages was higher.*

<sup>97</sup> For DC’s detailed discussion of other problems, background in the relevant mathematics and computing topics is helpful or necessary. For example, experts might be surprised to find “iterative” and “recursive” treated as synonyms. Plagiarism is easier to see for domain non-experts.

<sup>98</sup> [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/10/more-wikipedia-copying-from-climate-critics/1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/10/more-wikipedia-copying-from-climate-critics/1) Neither GMU nor Wegman replied to requests.

p.7 of DC analysis



p.11



p.15



p.19



p.23



p.27



These 2 articles were reported to Wiley, as described shortly. As with GMU Rice (for Scott on WR) and Elsevier (*CSDA*), the reports were originally kept confidential to await reasonable progress in their handling. Rice and Elsevier did so expeditiously, Elsevier against strong resistance. **GMU verdict on Said and Wegman (2009): never asked for information.**

## 5 Reports to others regarding Wegman, Said or GMU

### 5.1 Past plagiarism concerns, accreditation by SACSCOC

The following includes (good) GMU advice from 2001:

**"The major conclusion of the Task Force was that large segments of both students and faculty ignore the Code's provisions.** We need to remedy this. George Mason is, and will remain, an honor code university. The university maintains an active Honor Code committee, and it does take action after appropriate inquiry. ... Finally, it is essential the faculty themselves set a high standard in academic integrity. **We are periodically reminded that researchers and teachers do not always live up to the norms we urge on our students.**"<sup>99</sup>

"Foreign students should be given guidance/direction on the criteria surrounding plagiarism. Explain the differences between plagiarism and reciting. ... One way to assist the international student population is to carefully educate them early in their first semester about American definitions of plagiarism, cheating and academic dishonesty. **Teaching students to paraphrase, and to cite all sources, including work found on the Internet, should reduce plagiarism charges.**"<sup>100</sup>

[MAS2011] noted that GMU's next accreditation review was Spring 2011,<sup>101</sup> that GMU's handling of complaints might be an issue, and that a review of PhD supervision practices seemed in order.<sup>102</sup>

In May, 2011, *Nature* urged GMU to speed its investigation, noting:<sup>103</sup>

'Perhaps it should fall to accreditation agencies to push for speedy investigations. **Tom Benberg**, vice-president of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools — the agency that accredits George Mason University — says that **his agency might investigate if the university repeatedly ignored its own policies on the timing of misconduct inquiries.** To get the ball rolling, he says, **someone would have to file a well-documented complaint.**'

<sup>99</sup> [provost.gmu.edu/integrity/index.html](http://provost.gmu.edu/integrity/index.html)

<sup>100</sup> [provost.gmu.edu/integrity/jf.html](http://provost.gmu.edu/integrity/jf.html)

<sup>101</sup> [provost.gmu.edu/accredit](http://provost.gmu.edu/accredit)

<sup>102</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report](http://deepclimate.org/2010/09/26/strange-scholarship-wegman-report), W.5.2, W.5.7,

W.5.10, It also seems strange to have a postdoc co-supervising a dissertation.

<sup>103</sup> [www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html)

**05/25/11.** That seemed promising, so I emailed Dr. Benberg: VP of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), copying its President Belle Wheelan.

'I had discussions with Dr. Cravey in January, who kindly explained the procedures, and I submitted 2 paper copies<sup>104</sup> of relevant materials to Dr. Whelen,<sup>105</sup> before January 15, but have never heard anything back, and forgotten about it in the press of other issues.'

I explained the materials sent and brought him up to date with the *CSDA* retraction and related issues. SACSCOC published a process for third-party comments, which I had followed<sup>106</sup> in my original complaint, **§A.2.**

On 05/31/11 I got a letter from Dr. Wheelan noting that SACSCOC had indeed received my material in January and later forwarded it to GMU.

Of course, GMU already had seen most of the material, but this certainly assured formal delivery, including [MAS2011], which had recorded the details of their handling through January 2011.

On 12/05/11, SACSCOC quietly reaffirmed accreditation for GMU,<sup>107</sup> among other schools.

**SACSCOC** has a policy on integrity and accuracy in institutional representation,<sup>108</sup> *but that may apply only to a school's relationship with SACSCOC, not with the school's own integrity in dealing with complaints.*

**As of 06/21/12 I have heard nothing else from SACSCOC.**

**SACSCOC verdict: accreditation renewed, no feedback on complaint.**

<sup>104</sup> That was the format SACSCOC required, rather than electronic. I had several email exchanges with Dr. Cravey, who was helpful.

<sup>105</sup> Sic. Dr. Belle Wheelan is the President of SACSCOC.

<sup>106</sup> [www.sacscoc.org/pdf/Third%20Party%20Comment%20by%20the%20Public-Final.pdf](http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/Third%20Party%20Comment%20by%20the%20Public-Final.pdf)

<sup>107</sup> [www.sacscoc.org/2011%20December%20Actions%20and%20Disclosure%20Statements/11cract%20december.pdf](http://www.sacscoc.org/2011%20December%20Actions%20and%20Disclosure%20Statements/11cract%20december.pdf)

<sup>108</sup> [sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/integrity.pdf](http://sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/integrity.pdf)

## 5.2 Reporting Editors' plagiarism to Wiley [i, r]

When substantial plagiarism is found in 2 articles by 2 Editors-in-Chief and third E-i-C is a long, close associate, the only recourse is the publisher, details in §A.3.

03/28/11 I sent email to Wiley, including:

"I am writing to report massive plagiarism in an article by Wegman and Said, "Color theory and design" in the recent issue of this journal they edit with long-time associate David Scott."

03/30/11 Wiley's Stephen Quigley<sup>109</sup> replied, copying Janet Bailey.<sup>110</sup>

"We are in receipt of your email dated March 28, 2011 regarding "substantial plagiarism by editors Wegman and Said."

04/24/11 I sent more issues to Quigley, including:

'I am afraid further problems have appeared, ...

1) Problem: Dr Yasmin Said's affiliations on WIRES:CS masthead are either false or obsolete.

2) Problem: Further plagiarism has been found in WIRES:CS Vol 1, Issue 1, Said and Wegman, "Roadmap for optimization."

04/26/11 Quigley replied, copying Bailey:

'Please be advised that we are in receipt of your second email on various issues dealing with the editors of WIRE: Computational Statistics. We are reviewing the facts. **Should any changes to the record be warranted, those will be made on the record.'**

05/09/11 Kirkpatrick sent Wiley more detailed analysis of Said and Wegman

05/15/11 I emailed to Quigley:

'1) Further information on the "Color article" is:  
[deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2/](http://deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2/)

09/08/11 I emailed Quigley:

'Now that it has been 5 months, might I assume that Wiley has determined that no changes to the record are warranted\*? ... \* That is:

1) Wegman and Said (2011)

2) Said and Wegman (2009), as documented in more detail by Ted Kirkpatrick

3) Said's claimed Professorship at Oklahoma State University. '

09/15/11 Quigley replied:

**'In response to your most recent email (of September 9), it is against Wiley policy to comment on editorial processes to third parties, but, rest assured that any changes to the record will be made on the record.'**

10/04/11 DC published the detailed analysis,<sup>111</sup> covered by Vergano.<sup>112</sup>

<sup>109</sup> Associate Publisher, Wiley-Blackwell, Marblehead, MA.

<sup>110</sup> I think she is/was Vice President and Publishing Director, Physical Sciences Books and References, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ. She was copied on email exchanges.

<sup>111</sup> [deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship](http://deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship)

## 5.3 Wegman, Said, Scott and Wiley [i\*, r\*]

DC just made another surprising discovery.<sup>113</sup> Wegman and Said quietly reworked their papers to reword copied text, include more citations and fix the errors enumerated by DC and others. The only comments were:

Wegman and Said, Color Theory and Design [i] → [i\*] PDF mod 01/03/12

'This article, first published online on February 4, 2011 in Wiley Online Library (<http://www.wileyonlinelibrary.com>), **has been revised at the request of the Editors-in-Chief and the Publisher.** References and links have been added to aid the reader interested in following up on any technique.' ...

'ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

**As with any overview article, this discussion was synthesized from many sources including the cited Wikipedia articles.** Early discussion in the sections on Human Visual System and Color Theory were based on Park2 and Eastman Kodak,<sup>5</sup> which are now no longer directly accessible. Much of the discussion in the section on 'Color Deficiencies in Human Vision' and the subsection on 'Hardwired Perception' is based on material in Green. The inspiration of Marc Green is hereby gratefully acknowledged.'

Said and Wegman, Roadmap for Optimization [r\*] PDF mod 01/10/12

'This article, first published online on July 13, 2009 in Wiley Online Library (<http://www.wileyonlinelibrary.com>), has been revised at the request of the Editors-in-Chief and the Publisher. References and links have been added to aid the reader interested in following up on any technique.' ...

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

**As with any overview article, this discussion was synthesized from many sources including the cited Wikipedia and Mathematica articles.** There is no intent in this article to claim that this article represents original research work on our part, but this article is offered with the intent of providing the Roadmap to the field. **We are grateful to the two external referees who reviewed this article and whose suggestions have much improved the discussion.'**

<sup>112</sup> [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/10/more-wikipedia-copying-from-climate-critics/1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/10/more-wikipedia-copying-from-climate-critics/1)

<sup>113</sup> [deepclimate.org/2012/03/16/wiley-coverup-complete-wegman-and-said-redo-hides-plagiarism-and-errors](http://deepclimate.org/2012/03/16/wiley-coverup-complete-wegman-and-said-redo-hides-plagiarism-and-errors) (URL fixed) Since Wegman, Said and David Scott co-edit WIRES:CS, it seems Scott would have managed any peer review for articles by Wegman and Said. The E-i-C's have written at least 7 articles for WIRES:CS.

## 6 Stearns letter to faculty [STE2012] and commentary<sup>114</sup>



All Faculty Announcement  
February 22, 2012  
Dear Colleagues,

Office of the Provost

4400 University Drive, MS 3A2, Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
Phone: 703-993-8776; Fax: 703-993-9645

I write concerning the scientific misconduct charges leveled at Professor Edward Wegman. Charges were made from several sources, concerning an article Professor Wegman co-authored in *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, and concerning a report to a congressional committee entitled “Ad Hoc Committee Report on the ‘Hockey Stick’ Global Climate Reconstruction”. **As the University’s scientific misconduct policy Number 4007 stipulates, both charges were submitted (each separately ①) to a committee of inquiry, which found that the actions warranted an investigation. Each charge, again separately ①, was then submitted to a faculty investigatory committee.** These committees, after careful consideration, have just returned their findings; these findings have been upheld by the President.

While University actions to this point have been confidential, as our policy properly stipulates, the case has received wide publicity from other sources, however inappropriately. ② **The University has been publicly criticized for its failure to render judgment and even for not caring much about the charges.** ③ **While our procedure is indeed prolonged, in part because of federal requirements and in part to assure due process, any implication of lack of concern is entirely misplaced.** ③

The committee investigating the congressional report has concluded that no scientific misconduct was involved. ④ Extensive paraphrasing of another work did occur, in a background section, but the work was repeatedly referenced and the committee found that the paraphrasing did not constitute misconduct. **This was a unanimous finding.**

Concerning the *Computational Statistics* article, the relevant committee did find that **plagiarism occurred in contextual sections of the article,** ⑤ as a result of **poor judgment** for which Professor Wegman, as team leader, must bear responsibility. This also was a unanimous finding. As sanction, Professor Wegman has been asked to **apologize to the journal involved, while retracting the article; and I am placing an official letter of reprimand in his file.** ⑥ Finally, because of the nature of the offense and its impact on the University, I am issuing this public statement. I believe that given the details in the committee report, these sanctions are appropriate to the nature and level of misconduct involved.

Sincerely,  
Peter N. Stearns, Provost’

Copy-paste-trivial-change plagiarism may hard to find, but once found and displayed must be the simplest form of academic misconduct to evaluate as the texts are their own witnesses. People might argue over which author(s) actually plagiarized, but the team leader is generally held responsible as well. The early complaints covered 9.5 pages of text (8 WR, 1.5 CSDA).

For context, the reader might review §A.1’s excerpts of GMU Policy 4007, its nominal timeline versus real chronology. This should have taken no longer than ~382 days (April 2011), even allowing 100 days for President Merten to consider appeal. Instead it took 709 days (February 2012), and the *result fell far outside the norms of credible academic practice.*

① Policy 4007 does **not** mandate  $2 \times 2 = 4$  committees,<sup>115</sup> of which this was the first mention in 2 years. VP Research Roger Stough always wrote of “a committee” or “the committee” at each stage<sup>116</sup> as did his assistant Donna Sherrard, in setting up 06/07/11 conference call with Bradley.

② There was no legal requirement for confidentiality by outside parties. Bradley acted collegially, kept silent, even after being *stonewalled*<sup>117</sup> for 6 months and even being misled. VP Stough emailed him 07/28/10: ““The committee was formed April 2010. **Its work was slowed** with the checkerboard absence of the faculty members constituting the **inquiry committee** from campus. I expect the committee to complete their work by the end of September 2010.” **The committee had not yet even met.**

③ **It took 160+ days from Bradley’s March complaint until first meeting of the inquiry committee in late August, versus a nominal 28.**

② Wegman himself revealed the complaint in August, via Facebook. Bradley said nothing about this *nonsense* until Dan Vergano called him. After 2 years, GMU has yet to send Bradley any sort of report.

④ **§2.1:** 2.5-page WR paleoclimate seemed clear enough, but:

④ **§2.2:** 5.5-page WR SNA text was ruled not plagiarism

⑤ **§2.3:** 1.5-page WR SNA subset re-used in CSDA, was plagiarism *Was the strange 2X committee structure created for the contradictory innocent verdict for the WR ④ and the inescapable guilty for §2.3 ⑤?*

⑥ *Perhaps academics might calibrate the severity of this punishment.*

<sup>115</sup> *Would evaluation of the chart in §1.1 require 2 X 21 committees?*

<sup>116</sup> MAS2011, pp.31-32.

<sup>117</sup> MAS2011, p.8, 07/28/10; p.9 08/16/10, ⑥ *Bradley’s patience was amazing.*

<sup>114</sup> [retractionwatch.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/stearnslettermashey.pdf](http://retractionwatch.files.wordpress.com/2012/02/stearnslettermashey.pdf) earlier

A student publication, *Connect2Mason*<sup>118</sup> added:

“The conduct applied to introductory elements of an article **not to the essential research findings** of the article,” said Stearns. “Had it been a more serious case, the sanctions would have been more serious.”

*There were no essential research findings in WR or CSDA* [MAS2010a]. SNA experts strong “panned” the SNA work [MAS2011a, p.7, ②].

[VER2012] sheds additional light on this whole process.

“**We took these charges very seriously**,”<sup>119</sup> Stearns said, in a telephone interview, adding that the university will forward the investigation reports to federal authorities. ...<sup>120</sup>

A university spokesman, Dan Walsch,<sup>121</sup> said the university would not release the investigation reports to the public. He partly blamed the length of the investigation on appeals of the committee findings that traveled to the office of GMU President, Alan Merten. “**They released it all very suddenly**,” said Walsch.

One committee unanimously found no academic misconduct in the WR, which leaves the *CSDA* decision already made by Elsevier in May 2011.<sup>122</sup> GMU policy gave 100 days for President Merten to rule on an appeal, but GMU had already been criticized for its tardiness.<sup>123</sup> *None of this makes much sense, including the “sudden release.” Perhaps ORI wrote to them?*

<sup>118</sup> [www.connect2mason.com/content/university-committee-finds-professor-guilty-research-misconduct-document](http://www.connect2mason.com/content/university-committee-finds-professor-guilty-research-misconduct-document)

<sup>119</sup> *Does the reader believe that?*

<sup>120</sup> This is required, but of course, they also had to do so at the time when the inquiry committee(s) found that investigation was needed.

<sup>121</sup> Walsch has often seemed to have been confused:

[www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism_N.htm) “GMU spokesman Dan Walsch said in an e-mail that the university is investigating the matter.”

VER2010a ‘[Update: GMU spokesman Dan Walsch clarified in the May 26, 2011, *Nature* journal that the year-old investigation is still in its preliminary “inquiry” stage, rather than a full investigation.’ GMU policy specified 60 days for completion of an inquiry, or 88 elapsed from receipt of complaint.

*How could it still be in an inquiry stage ~440 days after the original complaint?*

<sup>122</sup> MAS2011a pp.6-9 annotated Wegman’s attempt to avoid a retraction by Elsevier, who obviously did not accept it. See also VER2011 and [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/05/retracted-climate-critics-study-panned-by-expert-1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/05/retracted-climate-critics-study-panned-by-expert-1)

<sup>123</sup> [www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html)

[VER2012] continues:

“In the phone interview, GMU’s Stearns complained that Bradley had discussed the plagiarism publicly after filing his complaint, ” instead of allowing the university process to be completed.”<sup>124</sup> Stearns added that in the future his university would look for steps to streamline such investigations, as this one took about two years.

Although a number of reports by Columbia University statistician Andrew Gelman and others have noted more instances of possible plagiarism in work by Wegman and his team, Stearns says the university is not investigating any other complaints.’

GMU has ignored all the other complaints, of which 3 more included Federal funding [a, k, s].

§A.1 quotes the relevant parts of GMU’s policy, including:

“**In conducting the investigation, the committee –**

- (a) **Uses diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations;**
- (b) **Interviews each respondent, complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent; and**
- (c) **Pursues diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continues the investigation to completion.**

GMU received multiple well-documented complaints, but delayed, broke its own policies on intervals and process, made false promises and represented “not having yet met” as “slowed.” *GMU seemed unable or unwilling to handle simple misconduct cases, but managed to defend the major missions of the WR*<sup>125</sup> by declaring no problems there. Then GMU blamed a victim for the long delays.

<sup>124</sup> MAS2011 recorded the process in detail, including relevant emails. *It is hard to see how October 2010 publicity delayed the first meeting from April to August.*

<sup>125</sup> MAS2010a, p.1. ‘the real missions were: #1 claim the “hockey stick” broken and #2 discredit climate science as a whole.’ Bradley’s March complaint dealt in part with #1 and his May complaint on SNA encompassed #2.

## 7 Conclusion

Academics need to evaluate this whole process, *but GMU's response to a relatively-simple complaint seems absurd.* Academics of my acquaintance express disbelief, in particular, that any university would seem to trifle with the NHHS research watchdog ORI, which is relevant to two complaints [n, s]. Likewise, other funding agencies may take a dim view. *Other academics may want to offer opinions as it could tarnish the "brand" of academe as a whole, even though it should not.*

**No over-generalization should be made about GMU faculty as a whole,**<sup>126</sup> but top GMU administrators had to be involved throughout.

- Bradley's original complaint went to President Merten, he was copied by Stough 04/08 and he handled the appeal.
- Provost Stearns formed the inquiry committee and announced the end.
- VP Research Stough was the primary contact for complaints.
- One of the Deans, presumably Papaconstantopoulos, needed to recommend an inquiry. See Stough's 08/17 email.
- GMU Assistant Attorney General **Thomas Mancure** was CC'd.

***Why has GMU behaved so far outside academic norms?***

At least 4 hypotheses have been proposed for this bizarre behavior.

- ***A wish to defer this until after SACSCOC accreditation last year.***  
*Normal process would have been fine. Accreditation occurred anyway.*
- ***GMU may have broken its rules in such a way as to incur threat of legal action by Wegman, using a well-connected lawyer.***  
*GMU was already moving glacially long before Johns appeared.*
- ***The WR may well have been part of an effort to mislead Congress, possibly a felony [MAS2010a, p.88]. Perhaps someone thought admission of misconduct in WR would open the door to worse charges. That is also speculation, but GMU did have [MAS2010a].***
- ***GMU may be so enmeshed in funding by Kochs, Scaife, Searle, etc and involved with thinktanks and politicians pursuing climate anti-science, that it simply could not allow criticism or retraction of the WR. Obviously, that has to be speculation, but see §A.5, §A.6.***

<sup>126</sup> Unlike the WR, no guilt-by-association whatsoever is implied here. I have met and communicated with credible GMU academics and have heard of many others. *Some parts of GMU entities seem to be run policy advocacy, not research.*

**GMU faculty, administration, Board** *From the data, I would guess that:*

- *Some are 100% with Wegman and verdict of "no misconduct in WR."* §A.6 offers a few examples of GMU people involved with funders or thinktanks who promote climate anti-science..
- *Some faculty may not find the verdict relevant, as GMU is large.*
- *Some are likely appalled, but so far few if any have spoken publicly, perhaps fearing consequences. I sympathize, but schools must handle misconduct to keep their bargain with the public and its financing.*

**GMU students.**

A few current GMU students (or people claiming to be) seem unhappy.<sup>127</sup> Others seem fairly supportive of Wegman.<sup>128</sup> GMU has earlier recognized plagiarism issues. *The reader might wonder if GMU handles student plagiarism the same way or much more harshly. Either answer implies serious problems of different sorts.*

Generally the authors included in §1.1 have yet to speak about this and the 4<sup>th</sup> original member of the WR team is yet unknown [MAS2010a, p.91].

**WHAT NOW?**

*GMU has badly broken the bargain that American universities make with their funders and the rest of academe. Taxpayers may be unhappy funding research at a school whose administration that has shown that it could not:*

- handle even the simplest misconduct complaint
- follow its own policies on intervals, but take 2 years to assess 9.5 pages
- follow its own policies on diligent investigation, but ignore complaints
- say anything on complaints on 4 PhDs except "Personnel matter"
- treat a distinguished academic with normal courtesy, but instead tell him almost nothing, mislead him on status, break promises, and not even copy him on letter sent to GMU faculty, much less give him a report.

***Perhaps it is time to consider a first-ever institutional debarment until GMU has demonstrated willingness to act within academic norms.***<sup>129</sup>

<sup>127</sup> [deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-11957](http://deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-11957)

<sup>128</sup> [www.connect2mason.com/content/university-committee-finds-professor-guilty-research-misconduct-document](http://www.connect2mason.com/content/university-committee-finds-professor-guilty-research-misconduct-document)

<sup>129</sup> I know this would be a hardship, but he many honest academics at GMU might take existing grants elsewhere for the their sake and the sake of their students.

### A.1 GMU University Policy 4007, nominal chronology

The text<sup>130</sup> is annotated with event labels [A] and nominal elapsed days [+N days], ignoring the many “as soon as possible” notes and possibilities of challenges. For something as simple as a few pages of obvious copy-paste-trivial change plagiarism, one would expect this to go much faster. The rest should be assumed as quoted except for red annotations in [brackets]. Bold is mine. The interested reader should consult the actual Policy, which is much longer.

Under “Results of Inquiry” is found:

“(f) A recommendation as to whether the complainant should be notified of the results of the inquiry...”

And under “The committee then prepares a final investigation report to the Vice President” is found:

“(h) Includes a recommendation as to whether the complainant should be notified of the results of the investigation”

*GMU procedures seem to allow zero notification to a complainant.*<sup>131</sup>

A quick sample of 6 research universities showed that all required that the complainant be notified of the results of inquiry and investigation.<sup>132</sup>

Many allowed comments at various stages on drafts and told complainant of committee memberships as those were determined.

*By comparison, GMU policy seems quite opaque, allowing GMU to tell complainants almost nothing about intermediate decisions or schedules, making it almost impossible to know if complaints are actually being taken seriously or ignored.. It is unclear if students get analogous treatment.*

<sup>130</sup> [universitypolicy.gmu.edu/4007res.html](http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/4007res.html) The current version is Sept 22, 2011, but a quick scan of the quoted text showed no obvious changes since January 2011 when this text was excerpted and one would assume the original version applied.

<sup>131</sup> To date, Bradley has received no notice and GMU claims not to be investigating other complaints, so of course no one else has gotten anything.

<sup>132</sup> [guru.psu.edu/policies/Ra10.html](http://guru.psu.edu/policies/Ra10.html) Pennsylvania State U  
[www.upenn.edu/almanac/v49pdf/030506/misconduct.pdf](http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/v49pdf/030506/misconduct.pdf) U Pennsylvania  
[orc.osu.edu/files/2011/01/Misconduct\\_Policy.pdf](http://orc.osu.edu/files/2011/01/Misconduct_Policy.pdf) Ohio State U  
[www.research.northwestern.edu/ori/misconduct](http://www.research.northwestern.edu/ori/misconduct) Northwestern U  
<https://policy.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id=RES-004> U Virginia  
[www.president.umd.edu/policies/docs/III-110A.pdf](http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/docs/III-110A.pdf) U Maryland

’Subject: Misconduct In Research and Scholarship

Responsible Parties: Vice President for Research and Economic Development, Deans and Institute Directors, Provost, President ...’

‘Research misconduct’ means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

- (a) Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- (b) Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
- (c) Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.’

‘Notifying Federal agencies as required

For proceedings that involve Federal support and research misconduct as defined by the funding agency, the university meets the reporting requirements of the funding agency relating to the decision whether an investigation is warranted. The university may be required to provide the research records and evidence reviewed during the inquiry, transcripts or recordings of any interviews, and copies of all relevant documents, among other materials. The university also meets the reporting requirements of the funding agency pertaining to –

- (a) Any plans to close a case at the inquiry, investigation, or appeal stage on the basis that the respondent has admitted guilt, a settlement with the respondent has been reached, or for any other reason than a finding that an investigation is not warranted or that no misconduct occurred; and
- (b) The outcome of the investigation and any administrative actions against the respondent.’

### 2. Conduct of research misconduct proceedings.

Making an allegation

[A] [0 assumed when complaint reaches right person, can take ~week ]

‘An allegation of research misconduct may be made by disclosing the alleged misconduct to the respondent’s Dean or Institute Director, the Vice President for Research and Economic Development, or any other member of the university’s administrative or professional faculty (or, if the allegation involves Federal support and research misconduct as defined by the funding agency, to an official of that agency) through any means of communication. Allegations received by a person other than the respondent’s Dean or Institute Director should be promptly referred to the Dean or Director.

The complainant has a duty to make the allegation in good faith. Bad faith allegations will be treated seriously. If at any point in a research misconduct proceeding the Vice President or the respondent's Dean or Institute Director believes that the allegation was not made in good faith, that official refers the matter for appropriate handling under existing university procedures. In addition, if the respondent is a member of the faculty, he or she may bring a grievance under the grievance provisions of the Faculty Handbook.

#### Eligibility to conduct a research misconduct proceeding

Only university employees may serve on an inquiry or investigative committee in a research misconduct proceeding. However, the university may obtain the advice of non-employees with relevant expertise at any stage of the proceeding, including the preliminary assessment of the allegation. Except in extraordinary circumstances, the majority of a committee's members are tenured faculty.

#### Preliminary assessment of allegation

**Within 14 days of receiving an allegation of research misconduct** (or as soon as possible if this time limit cannot be met), the respondent's **Dean or Institute Director assesses the allegation to determine if an inquiry is warranted** and notifies the Vice President and the Provost of his or her determination.'

**[B] [+14 days]**

'Except in extraordinary circumstances, an allegation that is not made in writing or subsequently reduced to writing and supported by specific evidence does not warrant an inquiry. An inquiry is warranted if the alleged conduct meets the definition of research misconduct in this policy and is sufficiently credible and specific so that potential evidence of research misconduct may be identified. If the alleged conduct fails to meet these criteria, no inquiry is conducted. If the alleged conduct meets these criteria, the Dean or Director determines if it involves Federally-supported research, as described in the regulations of the funding agency, or other support under an agreement between the university and another party.

**A research misconduct proceeding is not discontinued as a result of the termination of a respondent's employment or the respondent's refusal to cooperate in the conduct of the proceeding.**

#### Initiation of inquiry

The purpose of an inquiry is to conduct an initial review of the evidence to determine whether to recommend that an investigation be conducted. **Within 14 days of receiving a determination that an inquiry is warranted** (or as soon as possible if this time limit cannot be met), the **Provost appoints an**

**inquiry committee and a chair of that committee** from among individuals who do not have real or apparent conflicts of interest in the case, are unbiased, and have the necessary expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation. **The Dean or Institute Director then makes a good faith effort to provide notice to the presumed respondent, if any.** This notice includes a statement of the allegation, a description of the inquiry process, the identities of the members of the inquiry committee, and all applicable university policies.

**[C] [+28 days]**

The respondent may challenge a member of the inquiry committee on the basis of conflict of interest or bias by submitting the challenge in writing to the Provost within five days of receiving the notification. The Provost determines whether and with whom a challenged member is replaced. The respondent may challenge the replacement in the same manner. If the inquiry subsequently identifies additional respondents, the Dean or Director promptly provides notice to them in the same manner.

#### Inquiry process

**[D] [+28 days]**

**At the inquiry committee's first meeting, the Dean or Institute Director reviews the charge with the committee and discusses the allegations, any related issues, the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry, and the timeframe for completing it.** The committee reviews the evidence and may interview the complainant, the respondent, and others with knowledge of relevant circumstances. After completing its initial review of the evidence, the committee prepares a draft inquiry report and gives the respondent a reasonable opportunity to provide written comments on it. **The inquiry committee completes the inquiry, including the preparation of a final inquiry report that includes any comments received from the respondent, within 60 days of the committee's first meeting** unless the Dean or Director determines, and documents in the inquiry record, that the circumstances warrant a longer period.'

**[E] [+88 days]**

#### Results of inquiry

The inquiry committee prepares an inquiry report to the Dean or Institute Director in which it recommends whether an investigation should be conducted. An investigation is warranted if there is a reasonable basis for concluding that the alleged conduct falls within the definition of research misconduct under this policy and preliminary information-gathering and preliminary fact-finding from the inquiry indicates that the allegation may have substance. The committee's inquiry report contains the following:

- (a) The name and position of the respondent;
- (b) A description of the allegations of research misconduct;
- (c) Any Federal or other external support involved, including, for example, grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing that support;
- (d) The basis for recommending that the alleged actions warrant an investigation;
- (e) Any comments on the report by the respondent;
- (f) **A recommendation as to whether the complainant should be notified of the results of the inquiry and, if so, which parts of the report, if any, should be included in the notification and whether the notification should require that the information be maintained confidentially;** and
- (g) Any recommendations the committee may have to refer any of its findings to other university officials for appropriate action, if the committee does not recommend that an investigation be conducted.

University determination based on inquiry

**Within 14 days of receiving the inquiry report (or as soon as possible if this time limit cannot be met), the Dean or Institute Director determines whether to conduct an investigation,** provides notice to the respondent of this determination, provides the respondent a copy of the inquiry report and this policy, acts on the other recommendations of the inquiry committee, and notifies the Vice President of the determination and provides the Vice President with a copy of the documentation. The university counsel reviews the determination for legal sufficiency.'

**[F] [+102 days]**

Initiation of Investigation

**The purpose of an investigation is to determine whether research misconduct, as defined in Part II, occurred and, if so, by whom and to what extent. A finding of research misconduct requires that –**

- (a) The misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and
- (b) The allegation be proven by a preponderance of the evidence; and
- (c) There be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community.

The university has the burden of proof in making a finding of research misconduct. The respondent has the burden of going forward with, and proving by a preponderance of the evidence, any affirmative defenses and any mitigating factors relevant to a decision to impose administrative actions.

**Within 30 days after determining that an investigation is warranted, the Vice President begins the investigation by convening the first meeting of an investigation committee.**

**[G] [+132 days]**

'The Vice President appoints the investigation committee and a chair of that committee from among individuals who do not have real or apparent conflicts of interest in the case, are unbiased, and have the necessary expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation. **Members of the inquiry committee may not serve on the investigation committee unless their expertise is essential.**

The Vice President provides notice of the commencement of the investigation to the respondent within seven days after determining that an investigation is warranted. This notice includes a statement of the allegation, a description of the investigation process, and the identities of the members of the investigation committee. The respondent may challenge a member of the investigation committee on the basis of conflict of interest or bias by submitting the challenge in writing to the Vice President within five days of receiving the notification. The Vice President determines whether and with whom a challenged member is replaced. The respondent may challenge the replacement in the same manner.

Investigation process

**At the investigation committee's first meeting, the Vice President reviews the following: the allegations, the findings of the inquiry, the procedures and standards for conducting the investigation, confidentiality obligations, the need for an investigation plan, the possible penalties for a finding of misconduct, and the timeframe for completing the investigation.** The university counsel accompanies the Vice President at the first meeting of the investigation committee and remains available to advise the committee during its investigation.

If the investigation discloses any allegation against the respondent not addressed during the inquiry or in the initial notice of the investigation or any allegation against an additional respondent, the committee reports the allegation to the Vice President, who refers it to the respondent's Dean or Institute Director for a preliminary assessment of the allegation and other appropriate steps as provided in this policy. If that officer finds that the allegation meets the definition of research misconduct in this policy and is sufficiently credible and specific, he or she provides the respondent against whom the allegation is made notice of the decision to pursue the allegation within a reasonable time.

**In conducting the investigation, the committee –**

- (a) Uses diligent efforts to ensure that the investigation is thorough and sufficiently documented and includes examination of all research records and evidence relevant to reaching a decision on the merits of the allegations;**
- (b) Interviews each respondent, complainant, and any other available person who has been reasonably identified as having information regarding any relevant aspects of the investigation, including witnesses identified by the respondent; and**
- (c) Pursues diligently all significant issues and leads discovered that are determined relevant to the investigation, including any evidence of additional instances of possible research misconduct, and continues the investigation to completion.**

The committee ensures that any interview conducted during the investigation is recorded, that a transcript of the recording is prepared, that the interviewee is provided a copy of the transcript for correction and the opportunity to comment on its contents, and that the transcript and any comments of the interviewee are included in the record of the investigation. The respondent may attend interviews of the complainant and witnesses and direct questions to them.

**The committee notifies the respondent at least 14 days in advance of the scheduling of his or her interview and any interview he or she is entitled to attend so that the respondent may prepare for the interview and arrange for the attendance of legal counsel or another authorized representative to advise the respondent at the interview, if the respondent wishes.**

Results of investigation

After gathering and examining the relevant evidence, the investigation committee –

- (a) Prepares a draft investigation report;
- (b) Gives the respondent a copy of the draft report, and, concurrently, a copy of, or supervised access to, the evidence on which the report is based; and
- (c) Provides notice to the respondent of his or her opportunity to **provide written comments on the draft report within 30 days of the date on which he or she received it.**

The committee ensures that any comments submitted by the respondent are considered and included in the final investigation report. The committee also gives the university counsel a copy of the draft investigation report to review for legal sufficiency.

**The committee then prepares a final investigation report to the Vice President.** In the report, the committee –

- (a) Describes the nature of the allegations of research misconduct;

- (b) Describes and documents any Federal or other external support, including, for example any grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing that support;
- (c) Describes the specific allegations of research misconduct considered in the investigation;
- (d) Includes the university policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted;
- (e) Identifies and summarizes the research records and evidence reviewed, identifies any evidence taken into custody but not reviewed, and summarizes the reasons why any evidence was not taken into custody;
- (f) Provides a finding as to whether research misconduct did or did not occur for each separate allegation of research misconduct identified during the investigation, and if misconduct was found, (i) identifies it as falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism and whether it was intentional, knowing, or in reckless disregard; (ii) summarizes the facts and the analysis supporting the conclusion and considers the merits of any reasonable explanation by the respondent and any evidence that rebuts the respondent's explanations; (iii) identifies the specific Federal or other external support, if any; (iv) identifies any publications that need correction or retraction; (v) identifies the person or persons responsible for the misconduct; and (vi) lists any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the respondent or respondents have pending with any Federal agency;
- (g) Includes and evaluates any comments made by the respondent on the draft investigation report;
- (h) **Includes a recommendation as to whether the complainant should be notified of the results of the investigation and, if so, which parts of the report, if any, should be included in the notification;**
- (i) Includes any recommendations it may have for administrative actions relating to the conduct found; and
- (j) Includes any recommendations it may have to assist the complainant or any other person who was harmed by the conduct found.

**The committee uses its best efforts to complete the investigation within 120 days of the date on which it began.** For proceedings that involve Federal support and research misconduct as defined by the funding agency, if the committee is unable to complete the investigation within the time prescribed by the funding agency, the Vice President communicates with the agency regarding any requirements relating to an extension. For other proceedings, the Vice President grants an extension for good cause.

**[H] [+252 days]**

University determination based on investigation

**Upon receiving the final investigation report, the Vice President reviews the report and makes a determination on behalf of the university as to whether research misconduct occurred and, if so, by whom, and whether the university accepts the findings of the investigation.** The Vice President recommends to the Provost what administrative actions, if any, the university should take against the respondent, taking account of the recommendations in the final investigation report. The university counsel reviews the determination and the recommendation of the Vice President for legal sufficiency. **The Provost determines what administrative actions, if any, the university takes against the respondent, except that the provisions of the Faculty Handbook regarding a dismissal for cause apply to that action.**

**The Vice President provides a copy of the final investigation report and the university's decision to the respondent.** If the decision is that the respondent committed research misconduct, the Vice President provides notice to the respondent that he or she may appeal the decision by filing a request for reversal or modification of the decision and grounds for that request with the President within 30 days of receiving the university's decision.'

**[I] [+282 days]**

'The President generally issues a written decision on the appeal, including the reasons for the decision, **within 100 days** of the date the appeal is filed. If the university is unable to complete the appeal within the time prescribed by a funding agency, the Vice President communicates with the agency regarding any requirements relating to an extension. The Vice President provides notice of the President's decision to the respondent.'

**[J] [+382 days]**

## A.2 Complaint to SACSCOC 01/15/11

This was the text of actual complaint of the Third Party Comment form.<sup>133</sup>

### A. Provide a clear statement describing the institution's performance in terms of compliance with the Commission's standards for accreditation, the Principles of Accreditation.

1) **GMU appears to have an integrity problem in handling a well-documented complaint of obvious plagiarism against GMU's Prof. Edward Wegman.** After almost 10 months, complainant Prof. Ray Bradley of UMass-Amherst has yet to receive even a simple \*inquiry\* report. GMU does not seem to be following its own standard policies.

2) **Prof. Wegman has publicly promoted (in USA Today) a view of plagiarism that totally contradicts normal academic practice.** GMU has yet to repudiate this view after almost 2 months.

3) **Plagiarism appears in a paper funded by 3 Federal agencies, none relevant to the paper. This was reported in May 2010 to GMU.**

4) **There seems to be pattern of lax supervision of PhD dissertations around Wegman.**

Cut-and-paste plagiarism appears in PhD dissertations of 4 of Wegman's students [4a\*, 4b\*, 4c\*, 4d] of whom 3(\*) received departmental "best dissertation of year awards."

The first dissertation with plagiarism, that of Yasmin Said (2005) seemed weak. As a post-doc, she later co-supervised with Wegman 3 dissertations, Sharafi (2007, D.A.), Sharabati (2008, PhD), Belayneh (2008, PhD). Many schools would not allow such supervision by a young, non-tenure-track research assistant professor. I know policies vary.

Some social networks material was plagiarized 4 times, including an article and 2 dissertations, Sharabati(2008) and Rezazad (2009). Less than half of Sharabati's references were ever cited, but he included several absurd statements. Either no one noticed any of this or objections were overridden.

#### SUMMARY:

Counting 2 complaints by Bradley (March/May), the 4 PhD dissertations, and another complaint regarding another 25 pages plagiarism in the "Wegman Report," at least 7 academic misconduct cases have been filed, all but one at least 2 months ago. The original cases and the laggardly handling were profiled in USA Today, a strong incentive to handle related cases expeditiously, but this does not seem to be happening. By contrast, Rice University handled a similar, related case with alacrity and integrity.

**GMU policies easily allow an inquiry report within the 2 months for simple cases, if treated seriously. As of this writing, none have yet**

**appeared.** As is clear from the documentation, key people in GMU administration must have known about this for a long time. The PhD supervision issues are also part of a worrisome long-term pattern. Of course, this might be isolated to Wegman and his students or it might be more pervasive.

Thus, **the issue is the pattern of GMU's poor handling** of very straightforward plagiarism cases against faculty members and PhD students. I have not been an academic since I finished by PhD, but have spoken at hundreds of universities, have many senior academic friends, visit the Stanford campus almost every week, and people are generally fairly surprised by all this, as it harms the general "brand" of academe as a self-policing community.'

### B. Describe the documentation produced to support your comments

'Paper copies are provided. Pointers to online versions to allow easy checking of backup sources,

1) John R. Mashey, Strange Inquiries at GMU ... and even stranger comments, 01/04/11, 45 pages. (SIGMU2 hereafter)

[www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/strange%20inquiries%20v2%200\\_0.pdf](http://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/strange%20inquiries%20v2%200_0.pdf)

2) Dan Vergano, USA Today, Wegman report round-up, 11/23/10.

[content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/11/wegman-report-round-up/1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2010/11/wegman-report-round-up/1)

Dan Vergano, USA Today, Climate science critic responds to allegations, 11/22/10.

[www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-22-plagiarism_N.htm)

3) John R. Mashey, Strange Scholarship in the Wegman Report, 09/26/10, 250 pages. SSWR.

[deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf)

The following are the most relevant excerpts, provided on paper. They are embedded in a complex story, so the URL above is provided just in case. The print package includes pp.1-7 (Cover sheet, Contents, Executive Summary, Glossary, Key people), plus:

pp.148-151 (next), but covered briefly in SIGMU2, pp. 3, 8, 30.

4) SSWR, as above.

4a) p.87, A.9, Said (2005) dissertation, alcohol plagiarism.

4b) W.5.7, p.152 Sharabati (2008) dissertation, which also has other oddities indicating poor supervision or inattention on the part of the committee. Social networks plagiarism.

4c) W.5.10, p.159 Rezazad (2009) dissertation. Social networks plagiarism.

4d) Al-Shameri dissertation (2006). This was discovered after SSWR was written, documented in several blog discussions, from which I've excerpted the relevant parts. [deepclimate.org/2010/12/02/wegman-et-al-miscellany/](http://deepclimate.org/2010/12/02/wegman-et-al-miscellany/)

<sup>133</sup> [www.sacscoc.org/thirdparty/Third-Party%20Comment%20Form.doc](http://www.sacscoc.org/thirdparty/Third-Party%20Comment%20Form.doc)

### A.3 Email exchanges with Wiley

When substantial plagiarism is found by 2 Editors-in-Chief and the 3<sup>rd</sup> is a long-time close associate of theirs, the only recourse is the publisher.<sup>134</sup>

A history of interactions with Wiley follows:

On **03/28/11**, I sent email to Wiley, including:

"I am writing to report massive plagiarism in an article by Wegman and Said, "Color theory and design" in the recent issue of this journal they edit with long-time associate David Scott.

[onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wics.v3.2/issuetoc](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wics.v3.2/issuetoc)

Normally, I would report such to the editors, but that didn't seem likely to be useful in this case.

If I need to send this elsewhere, please advise. ...

3) The plagiarism was discovered and exhaustively documented by Canadian blogger "Deep Climate," a fine investigator who prefers to remain anonymous. Of course, near-verbatim plagiarism is easily demonstrable, and he has done a detailed analysis, posted publicly at:

[deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour](http://deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour)

It includes a 22-page side-by-side analysis of the paper with the antecedent texts:

[deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/wegman-said-color-theory-and-design-antecedents-v12.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/wegman-said-color-theory-and-design-antecedents-v12.pdf)

This plagiarism chain started in 2002, with material used in lectures, an Army ACAS course, and finally in Wegman and Said (2011). Commenters on that post have already identified Wegman/Said plagiarism in two more articles.

4) Wegman and his students now have a long history of using other people's work, usually via cut-and-paste with a little editing, with at-best vague and often zero citation. In addition to various articles and book chapters, the 2006

<sup>134</sup> In the *CSDA* case, E-i-C Stanley Azen was an old associate of Wegman's and wrote, MAS2011a, p.11:

'So, I have two thoughts. The first thought is to have Ed's response reviewed by an expert (e.g. lawyer, or ethics person) at Elsevier, with the goal of helping Elsevier make the appropriate decision as to whether additional "punishment" (e.g., withdrawing the paper) is needed. The 2nd thought is that we agree that proper "punishment" has already occurred, and we go forward with Ed's recommendation of providing an errata sheet for publication in *CSDA*.'

There, Elsevier followed normal policy, drove the process and eventual retraction.

Wegman Report for Congress, this includes 4 PhD dissertations, including Said's.

5) That issue of the *WIRES* journal has 10 articles, of which:

3 are by Wegman's past students: Martinez, Moustafa, Chow

1 is the Wegman and Said article

1 is by Scott

1 is by a colleague of Scott's at Rice, Wickham

---

All this may be perfectly fine, but is somewhat disconcerting to see such a concentration of authors."

On **03/30/11**, Wiley's Stephen Quigley<sup>135</sup> replied, copying Janet Bailey.<sup>136</sup>

"We are in receipt of your email dated March 28, 2011 regarding "substantial plagiarism by editors Wegman and Said." Before we initiate an internal investigation, we need specific evidence of your claim since, as I am sure you are aware, we do not take such an allegation lightly."

On **03/30/11**, I replied to Quigley, including:

"Sir: thank you for your prompt attention to a circumstance whose distressing nature I understand.

I suggest reading 2 recently-posted files:

[deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/](http://deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/)

That gives an overview, context and some examples and I would suggest reading that first.

Then see:

[deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/wegman-said-color-theory-and-design-antecedents-v12.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2011/03/wegman-said-color-theory-and-design-antecedents-v12.pdf)

That is a 22-page detailed writeup, summarizing the various antecedents of Wegman&Said(2011), including 16 detailed pages of side-by-side comparison, using a color scheme that quickly shows the cut-and-paste/edit work, and that Deep Climate and I have employed in earlier analyses, including the one that led to:

[www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-21-climate-report-questioned\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2010-11-21-climate-report-questioned_N.htm)"

<sup>135</sup> Associate Publisher, Wiley-Blackwell, Marblehead, MA.

<sup>136</sup> I think she is/was Vice President and Publishing Director, Physical Sciences Books and References, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ. She was copied on all email exchanges after the first.

On **04/24/11**, I sent more issues to Quigley, including:

'I am afraid further problems have appeared, beyond the plagiarism reported to Wiley 03/28/10, detailed in:

[deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/](http://deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/)

I sympathize with the awkwardness of all this and I apologize for any errors, as this was assembled in some haste.

#### OVERVIEW

1) Problem: Dr Yasmin Said's affiliations on WIRES:CS masthead are either false or obsolete.

2) Problem: Further plagiarism has been found in WIRES:CS Vol 1, Issue 1, Said and Wegman, "Roadmap for optimization."

Much of it seems cut-and-paste from Wikipedia articles. ...

3) There are also some disquieting concerns, which may or may not rise to actual problems. Wiley may want to check the review processes at WIRES:CS and clarify how this really works, as there seems to be confusion. About 28% of the papers are authored by the Editors themselves or people with obvious close ties. The scope of WIRES:CS seems a bit broad for good review coverage, even understanding the interdisciplinary approach.

1) PROBLEM: DR YASMIN SAID'S AFFILIATIONS ARE EITHER FALSE OR OBSOLETE

[onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291939-0068/homepage/EditorialBoard.html](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291939-0068/homepage/EditorialBoard.html)

[www.wiley.com/bw/editors.asp?ref=1939-5108&site=1](http://www.wiley.com/bw/editors.asp?ref=1939-5108&site=1) both show:

"Yasmin H. Said, Professor, Oklahoma State University, Ruth L. Kirschstein National Fellow, George Mason University"

a) Said has **\*never\*** been an employee of OSU and certainly not a Professor. She was offered an Assistant Professor job in March 2009, for Fall 2009. She later requested a lighter teaching load, granted by OSU. Then, around August, she asked to defer her arrival by a semester, which was not agreed, so she resigned that position. For a few months, both she and OSU did think she would be starting there in the Fall. For background, see Appendix A.6.5, "Odd loose ends at Wiley Interscience" p.83 of:

[deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf](http://deepclimate.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/strange-scholarship-v1-02.pdf)

If confirmation is needed from OSU, I can provide relevant contacts. ...

2) PROBLEM: FURTHER PLAGIARISM: WIRES:CS Vol 1, Issue 1, Said and Wegman, "Roadmap for optimization" (SW2009)

[onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wics.16/abstract](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/wics.16/abstract)

Part of this article seemed to have come from Wikipedia, but more has been found since:

[deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/#comment-8486](http://deepclimate.org/2011/03/26/wegman-and-said-2011-dubious-scholarship-in-full-colour/#comment-8486)

I think a thorough comparison document will be prepared by an associate in next week or two, but a few hours' efforts sufficed to find Wikipedia pages, circa mid-2009, all of which have text with striking similarities, although SW2009 occasionally has extra errors.

[en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Karush%E2%80%93Kuhn%E2%80%93Tucker\\_conditions&oldid=303189545](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Karush%E2%80%93Kuhn%E2%80%93Tucker_conditions&oldid=303189545)

[en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Linear\\_programming&oldid=302228577](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Linear_programming&oldid=302228577)

[en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Simplex\\_algorithm&oldid=269565766](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Simplex_algorithm&oldid=269565766)

[en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Karmarkar%27s\\_algorithm&oldid=292855439](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Karmarkar%27s_algorithm&oldid=292855439)

[en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Simulated\\_annealing&oldid=301539847](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Simulated_annealing&oldid=301539847)

For example, here is a cut-and-paste with minimal trivial edits, a plagiarism style seen often involving Said:

Said and Wegman: p.9 Simulated annealing (zero citations)

"Simulated annealing is a probabilistic metaheuristic global optimization algorithm for locating a good approximation to the global minimum of a given function in a large search space. For many problems, simulated annealing may be more effective than exhaustive enumeration provided that the goal is to find an acceptably good solution in a fixed amount of time, rather than the best possible solution."

[en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Simulated\\_annealing&oldid=301539847](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Simulated_annealing&oldid=301539847) (July 2009)

" **Simulated annealing (SA)** is a generic **probabilistic metaheuristic** for the **global optimization** problem of **applied mathematics**, namely locating a good approximation to the **global minimum** of a given **function** in a large **search space**. ... For certain problems, simulated annealing may be more effective than **exhaustive enumeration** — provided that the goal is merely to find an acceptably good solution in a fixed amount of time, rather than the best possible solution."

One might ask if **anyone** actually reviewed this paper, as it has problems beyond plagiarism. The approach seems to take uncited Wikipedia pages, copy a few of the references found in Wikipedia, but often detached as "further reading" or equivalent. ...'

On **04/26/11**, Quigley replied, copying Bailey:

‘Please be advised that we are in receipt of your second email on various issues dealing with the editors of WIRE: Computational Statistics. We are reviewing the facts. Should any changes to the record be warranted, those will be made on the record.’

On **05/09/11**, Kirkpatrick sent Wiley a more detailed analysis of Said and Wegman(2009)

On **05/15/11**, I emailed to Quigley:

‘1) Further information on the “Color article” is:  
[deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2/](http://deepclimate.org/2011/05/15/wegman-and-said-2011-part-2/)  
 2) Also, while not involving Wiley, you may want to be aware of USA Today article:  
[www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2011-05-15-climate-study-plagiarism-Wegman\\_n.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2011-05-15-climate-study-plagiarism-Wegman_n.htm)  
 Said, Wegman, Sharabati, Rigsby(2008) to be retracted from Computational Science and Data Analysis.’

On **05/26/11**, I emailed Quigley, labeled “FYI, NO REPLY NEEDED”

‘Again, while not directly involved in the Wegman/Said issues with Wiley, additional context from the Elsevier case may be useful to you:  
 3) Followup to USA Today article, i.e., text for which there was insufficient room in print version.  
[content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/05/retracted-climate-critics-study-panned-by-expert-1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/05/retracted-climate-critics-study-panned-by-expert-1)  
 4) An annotated analysis of Wegman’s email to Elsevier that was mentioned in Vergano’s article.  
[www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/strange%20tales%20v%201%202001.pdf](http://www.desmogblog.com/sites/beta.desmogblog.com/files/strange%20tales%20v%201%202001.pdf)  
 5) A related Editorial in Nature yesterday.  
[www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html)’

On **09/08/11**, I emailed Quigley:

‘Now that it has been 5 months, might I assume that Wiley has determined that no changes to the record are warranted\*? ...

\* That is:

1) Wegman and Said (2011)  
 2) Said and Wegman (2009), as documented in more detail by Ted Kirkpatrick  
 3) Said’s claimed Professorship at Oklahoma State University.  
[onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291939-0068/homepage/EditorialBoard.html](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1002/%28ISSN%291939-0068/homepage/EditorialBoard.html) ‘

On **09/15/11**, Quigley replied:

‘In response to your most recent email (of September 9), it is against Wiley policy to comment on editorial processes to third parties, but, rest assured that any changes to the record will be made on the record.’

In early September, by **09/16/11**, the masthead changed Said’s identification from:  
 “Professor, Oklahoma State University” to:  
 “Professor, George Mason University” and then later to:  
 “Assistant Professor, George Mason University”<sup>137</sup>

On **10/04/11**, DC published the detailed analysis,<sup>138</sup> and as often occurred at *Deep Climate*, interesting comments added more data.

On **10/05/11**, Dan Vergano wrote on the topic,<sup>139</sup> noting:

‘Now, following work by Columbia University statistician Andrew Gelman<sup>140</sup> finding more botched copying of Wikipedia in a separate 2009 WIREs CompStats review article by Wegman, *Deep Climate* has released an analysis finding 13 blocks of copied Wikipedia text in the review article. Other text appears lifted from another researcher’s textbook and Wolfram MathWorld. (Wegman and Said are editors in chief of the journal in which the review article appears, incidentally.)  
 Wegman and his attorney, Milt Johns, have not replied to an e-mailed request for comment on the complaints about the *WIREs CompStat* article. Johns has previously denied any plagiarism by the researchers. ...  
 George Mason University, under fire for an 18-month investigation<sup>141</sup> into acknowledged copying in the retracted study, did not reply to a request for comment on the latest news. ...  
 All told, at least five published papers by Wegman and Said appear to suffer from plagiarism-related defects, summarizes the analysis. “It’s a dismal chronology,” concludes the *Deep Climate* blogpost.’

<sup>137</sup> She is a GMU Research Assistant Professor. She never took the job at OSU.

<sup>138</sup> [deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship](http://deepclimate.org/2011/10/04/said-and-wegman-2009-suboptimal-scholarship)

<sup>139</sup> [content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/10/more-wikipedia-copying-from-climate-critics/1](http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2011/10/more-wikipedia-copying-from-climate-critics/1)

<sup>140</sup> [andrewgelman.com/2011/09/another-wegman-plagiarism-copying-without-attribution-and-further-discussion-of-why-scientists-cheat](http://andrewgelman.com/2011/09/another-wegman-plagiarism-copying-without-attribution-and-further-discussion-of-why-scientists-cheat)

<sup>141</sup> [www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v473/n7348/full/473419b.html)

#### A.4 Funding for Wegman, Said

American universities are envied worldwide. Students and their families may sacrifice for the chance to get good educations and earn degrees kept credible by universities who reward honest work and discourage cheating.<sup>142</sup> Any student who takes the long road to a PhD deserves good supervision and the knowledge that other PhDs were earned.<sup>143</sup>

Our universities also perform a great deal of crucial research,<sup>144</sup> often funded publicly. Academic freedom is important and often universities lead in discovering truths, some awkward. *But there is a bargain:*

- The public expects agencies to allocate funds well and monitor them competently. By definition, some research fails, as expected. “Golden Fleece” award were sometimes unfair, but agencies should fund those with plausible competence who might produce useful work.
- Research misconduct inevitably happens, but good universities jealously guard their reputations. They have clear policies for investigating complaints and **they actually follow those policies.**<sup>145</sup> When needed, they take strong actions. Most researchers at a school may well be honest, but if a school cannot follow academic norms for misconduct, how can anyone trust it? *A few bad apples can ruin trust for the rest.*

<sup>142</sup> When teaching computer science years ago, I told students I would flunk anyone caught cheating. Every term, a few tried and I flunked them. Hardworking students told me how much they appreciated that, because they had earned their grades and potential employers knew that.

<sup>143</sup> This report alleges plagiarism and possible other quality issues in 4 PhD dissertations, of which 3 got “Best Departmental Dissertation of Year” awards.

<sup>144</sup> University research has necessarily grown to try to fill gaps left by downsizing of research in industrial R&D groups like Bell Laboratories.

<sup>145</sup> MAS2011 applauded Rice for its alacrity. GMU’s *opaque, confused, glacially-slow, process-violating* treatment of well-documented plagiarism complaints can be contrasted with Penn State’s transparent handling of a noisy batch of ill-formed accusations against Michael Mann.

*As a Penn State grad, I might be biased, but readers can compare the cases.*

11/22/09 Barrage of emails, letters, phone calls

[guru.psu.edu/policies/Ra10.html](http://guru.psu.edu/policies/Ra10.html) policy

02/03/10 [www.research.psu.edu/orp/documents/Findings\\_Mann\\_Inquiry.pdf](http://www.research.psu.edu/orp/documents/Findings_Mann_Inquiry.pdf)

06/04/10 [live.psu.edu/pdf/Final\\_Investigation\\_Report.pdf](http://live.psu.edu/pdf/Final_Investigation_Report.pdf)

Papers [a, k, n, s] acknowledged Army funding, §1.1. Papers [n, s] included NIAAA funding for Said.<sup>146</sup> It is hard to understand why either Army or NIAAA should fund work [SAI2008] [n], which:<sup>147</sup>

- was a baseless attack on scientists in another field
- plagiarized SNA text, poorly, with errors
- was written by people with little or no credible experience in SNA
- was sent to journal that did not publish SNA, just a friendly Editor
- was strongly criticized by real SNA experts

Wegman and Said acknowledged funding from the same agencies for [SAI2010] [s]. Again the relevance is unclear and the paper was a section of Sharabati’s dissertation, §4.5. *Why was the government paying?*

Wegman part-time students Denise Reeves (MITRE) and John T. Rigsby III (Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC)) helped with the WR. If they did the work as GMU students, they should have been so listed.<sup>148</sup> If they did the work on MITRE/NSWC time, *there could be a funds mis-use.*

NSWC may be involved in another way.<sup>149</sup> David Ritson quoted Wegman:

“Our report was review of those papers and was not federally funded. Our report called for disclosure of federally funded work. Material based on our report is being prepared for peer review journals at present. It is not clear to me that before the journal peer review process is complete that we have an academic obligation to disclose the details of our methods. Nonetheless, I assure you that as soon as we are functional again, **I will create a website that fully discloses all supporting material related to our report to the extent possible. (Some of the code we used was developed by former and current students working at the Naval Surface Warfare Center in Dahlgren, Virginia and may not be disclosed without approval through the Navy’s public release process.)**”

That website never happened. *This certainly hid the code until DC found Steven McIntyre’s original equivalent 4 years later.*<sup>150</sup> *Was this mis-use of Federal resources? Either this was student work or NSWC was involved.*

<sup>146</sup> MAS2010a §A.6, §A.7 discussed the Army and other funding known then.

<sup>147</sup> MAS2011a p.6, p.7 ② Two SNA experts derided this paper publicly.

<sup>148</sup> NSWC and MITRE labels obscured the fact that WR was almost entirely done by GMU people, including a new PhD (Said) and grad students Reeves, Rigsby.

<sup>149</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/10/24/david-ritson-speaks-out](http://deepclimate.org/2010/10/24/david-ritson-speaks-out)

David Marchette and Jeffrey Solka were past students.

<sup>150</sup> [deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style](http://deepclimate.org/2010/11/16/replication-and-due-diligence-wegman-style)

### A.5 GMU funding

Like many universities, GMU gets most of its research funding from the Federal Government, directly or indirectly, as shown at right.<sup>151</sup> Unlike most schools, it is conveniently located next to Washington, D.C., which surely helps get Federal funding.

GMU appeared often in the tobacco archives, [legacy.library.ucsf.edu](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu), but its biggest funding source is for health research, an odd juxtaposition.

At the same time, GMU has a strong political Libertarian/small-government theme, especially clear in the Mercatus Center, Institute for Humane Studies, Economics, Law and Economics Center, Public Policy, and perhaps the Law School, whose most famous graduate may be VA AG Ken Cuccinelli, §A.6.

GMU gets a very small fraction of its funding from private industry, *which seems curious, given the strong free-market/private enterprise claims.*

**GMU is strongly** connected with thinktanks and others that do climate anti-science and help tobacco companies. Much more analysis is needed, but frequent funders of climate anti-science [MAS2010,MAS2012] *seem influential here:*

~\$ in 1,000s to GMU	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
C. G Koch F + C. Lambe F		350	408	2,873	5,119		8,650
S. Scaife F + Carthage F	350	350	200	200	250	250	1,600
Searle Freedom Trust		145	174	269	173	170	931
L&H Bradley F		95	85	90	90	65	510
DONORS CAPITAL+TRUST	164	3					167

~\$ in 1,000s to Mercatus	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
C. G Koch F		3,900	2,683	1,050			7,633
Searle Freedom Trust		100	150	230	250		730
DONORS CAPITAL+TRUST	1	3	276	156	107		543
S. Scaife F	80	80	80	80	50	50	420

~\$ in 1,000s to InstHum	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
C. G Koch F		1,082	886	1,169	2,461		5,598
DONORS CAPITAL+TRUST	14	18	1,107	748	27		1,914
Searle Freedom Trust	315	245	73	250	300		1,183
S. Scaife F	50	50	50		35	35	220
L&H Bradley F	15	35	40	30	25	5	150

TABLE 8.1 Expenditures by Sponsor Type, FY 2008-2010 (Dollars)

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
<b>Federal Sources</b>			
Federal	50,170,120	67,336,712	69,949,715
Federal funds passed through state	4,418,057	6,014,699	5,265,661
Federal funds passed through industry, non-profit and universities	6,410,378	10,097,690	10,211,352
Federal funds passed through local governments/schools	201,833	163,562	292,488
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>61,200,388</b>	<b>83,612,664</b>	<b>85,719,417</b>
<b>Other Sources</b>			
Associations/Non-Profit	2,250,184	3,373,951	1,826,373
CIT (Center for Innovative Technology)	31,700	0	0
Foreign Entities	3,739,799	3,105,348	2,118,304
<b>Foundations</b>	<b>5,453,358</b>	<b>6,718,537</b>	<b>6,642,356</b>
<b>Industry</b>	<b>812,694</b>	<b>1,309,144</b>	<b>759,540</b>
Local Government/Schools	741,328	705,633	776,799
Revenue/Other Governments	110,044	405,429	339,892
State (Including SCHEV)	5,139,257	1,490,083	1,619,730
Universities	404,485	443,809	489,165
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>18,682,855</b>	<b>16,551,932</b>	<b>14,567,159</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$79,883,243</b>	<b>\$100,164,596</b>	<b>\$100,286,575</b>

TABLE 8.2 Expenditures by Federal Agencies at George Mason, FY 2008 - FY 2010 (Dollars)

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Agency for International Development	5,877	25,654	0
Department of Agriculture	458,512	376,524	307,434
Department of Commerce	3,399,218	3,521,837	4,353,119
Department of Defense	12,446,794	13,200,642	17,106,725
Department of Education	2,194,879	3,036,451	2,998,257
Department of Energy	2,411,621	2,182,675	2,168,787
Department of Health and Human Services*	5,824,345	20,483,668	18,093,719
Department of Homeland Security	134,839	849,247	1,302,938
Department of Interior	352,643	630,765	325,796
Department of Justice	789,268	1,296,177	1,405,123
Department of State/USA	50,629	140,079	813,240
Department of Transportation	2,742,963	1,558,790	1,403,620
Environmental Protection Agency	17,889	10,032	0
USMC	42,119	17,638	30,688
General Services Administration	789,164	758,590	689,396
NASA	9,588,796	9,116,130	8,234,626
National Endowment of Humanities/Arts	281,218	575,085	332,961
National Science Foundation	6,069,721	5,888,252	6,364,194
Small Business Administration	2,069,264	2,320,792	2,639,130
Other Federal Agencies **	520,963	1,386,689	979,944
<b>Subtotal Direct Federal Funds</b>	<b>50,170,120</b>	<b>67,336,712</b>	<b>69,949,715</b>
<b>Federal Funds Passed Through State</b>	<b>4,418,057</b>	<b>6,014,699</b>	<b>5,265,661</b>
Federal Funds Passed Through			
1) Industry	4,481,589	7,266,862	6,777,265
2) Associations/Non-profits	659,956	1,002,570	805,251
3) Local Governments and Schools	201,833	163,562	292,488
4) Universities	1,268,833	1,828,258	2,629,036
<b>Subtotal Federal Funds Passed Through 1,2,3 and 4</b>	<b>6,612,211</b>	<b>10,261,252</b>	<b>10,504,040</b>
<b>Total Federal Agencies Expenditure</b>	<b>\$61,200,388</b>	<b>\$83,612,664</b>	<b>\$85,719,417</b>

\*FY10 expenditure total includes \$1,543,050 from construction grant for Regional Biocommunity Lab (RBL).  
 \*\*FY08: US Institute for Peace, Library of Congress, National Archives, Securities & Exchange Commission, JMWGS, NASA, Veterans Affairs, Congress, and National Gallery of Art  
 \*\*FY10: Smithsonian, Securities & Exchange Commission, Central Intelligence Agency, USDO, USDO, Federal Trade Commission, Library of Congress, NHPNC, DHS  
 Note: Numbers may not add up; subtotals/totals due to rounding

TABLE 8.3 Expenditures by Defense Department Agencies\*, FY 2008 - FY 2010 (Dollars)

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
US Air Force	2,598,415	2,437,048	4,186,084
US Army	3,621,656	3,002,335	2,345,401
US Navy	52,466	434,723	817,252
Office of Naval Research	723,630	2,597,570	5,424,575
Navy Research Laboratory	1,806,776	2,653,182	2,616,614
<b>Other Defense Department Agencies</b>			
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency	65,790	119,293	0
Defense Information Systems Agency	0	0	0
Defense Logistics Agency	363,087	407,910	532,438
National Security Agency	345,067	289,042	273,542
Other Defense Agencies **	2,189,468	1,259,119	910,820
<b>Total Department of Defense Expenditure</b>	<b>\$12,446,794</b>	<b>\$13,200,642</b>	<b>\$17,106,725</b>

\*Excludes pass-through funds  
 \*\*US DoD, DTRA, and OIGDA/NASA

<sup>151</sup> [irr.gmu.edu/factbooks/1011/Factbook1011\\_Sponsored.pdf](http://irr.gmu.edu/factbooks/1011/Factbook1011_Sponsored.pdf) p.2-3


### A.6 GMU connections with climate anti-science, funders

GMU is tightly integrated into the climate and tobacco anti-science machinery described in [MAS2010, MAS2012]. It and its Mercatus Center, Institute for Humane Studies, Center for Media and Public Affairs (CMPA), and Statistical Assessment Service (STATS) have gotten substantial money from the same funders as shown in [MAS2012, Figure ES-1], which highlighted flows of money and memes. This chart replaces (red) memes with (grey) relationships. A few (CSCDGC, NCPPR, TASSC) were kept for the context of actions favored by the funders, even though no direct connections with GMU were found yet.

GMU and its faculty do have many relationships with the think tanks here, most covered in [MAS2010, A.6.1], including CEI and GMI, whose efforts led to the WR. "Other think tanks" is a reminder that this is just a small subset of the connections, [MAS2012, §0.6].

The funders give money to support widespread anti-science advocacy. *Do they fund GMU for science and education? Or for advocacy?*

*Readers can ignore details in this complex chart in favor of the message: parts of GMU are big gears in the machinery of anti-science advocacy.*



GMU and its institutes are well-connected<sup>152</sup> with climate anti-science funders and advocates, especially the **Koch** brothers,<sup>153</sup> who have also provided some funds for Cuccinelli,<sup>154</sup> along with other energy companies. **Richard Fink** is the President of the Charles G. Koch Foundation, Cofounder of GMU's Mercatus Center<sup>155</sup> and Director of GMU's Institute for Humane Studies,<sup>156</sup> among others.<sup>157</sup> Koch's **Kevin Gentry** was also involved.<sup>158</sup>

Many thinktanks involved in climate anti-science have long taken tobacco money [MAS2012] and became well-practiced in doubt creation. GMU is well-located geographically to interact with many of the most active think tanks.<sup>159</sup> GMU and economist Robert Tollison are found often in the tobacco archives.<sup>160</sup>

GMU's Law and Economics Center was consistently funded by Roy Marden of Philip Morris [MAS2012 Fig. F.4], \$165K 1993-2001<sup>161</sup> and presented as one of the "Key Allies."<sup>162</sup> Mercatus appeared less often, but certainly got tobacco money,<sup>163</sup> as did the Institute for Humane Studies.<sup>164</sup>

<sup>152</sup> [mediamattersaction.org/transparency/organization/George\\_Mason\\_University/funders](http://mediamattersaction.org/transparency/organization/George_Mason_University/funders)  
[mediamattersaction.org/transparency/organization/Mercatus\\_Center/funders](http://mediamattersaction.org/transparency/organization/Mercatus_Center/funders)  
[mediamattersaction.org/transparency/organization/Institute\\_for\\_Humane\\_Studies/funders](http://mediamattersaction.org/transparency/organization/Institute_for_Humane_Studies/funders)

<sup>153</sup> [www.newyorker.com/reporting/2010/08/30/100830fa\\_fact\\_mayer?currentPage=all](http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2010/08/30/100830fa_fact_mayer?currentPage=all)

<sup>154</sup> [www.vpap.org/committees/profile/money\\_in\\_industry2/2038?end\\_year=2010&filing\\_period=all&lookup\\_type=year&sector=6&start\\_year=2008](http://www.vpap.org/committees/profile/money_in_industry2/2038?end_year=2010&filing_period=all&lookup_type=year&sector=6&start_year=2008) Energy -> Gas

<sup>155</sup> [www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Mercatus\\_Center](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Mercatus_Center)

<sup>156</sup> [www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Institute\\_for\\_Humane\\_Studies](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Institute_for_Humane_Studies)

<sup>157</sup> [www.cgkfoundation.org/about/foundation-staff/14/](http://www.cgkfoundation.org/about/foundation-staff/14/)

<sup>158</sup> [www.cgkfoundation.org/about/foundation-staff/15/](http://www.cgkfoundation.org/about/foundation-staff/15/)

<sup>159</sup> [maps.google.com/maps/ms?hl=en&ie=UTF8&msa=0&msid=107940825189517771981.0004815492d08b0c445f9&ll=38.882481,-76.978455&spn=0.771829,1.253815&z=10](http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?hl=en&ie=UTF8&msa=0&msid=107940825189517771981.0004815492d08b0c445f9&ll=38.882481,-76.978455&spn=0.771829,1.253815&z=10)

<sup>160</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu) search for Tollison or George Mason University, each gets more than 10,000 hits.

<sup>161</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/oqe79h00](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/oqe79h00) \$10K 1999 actual for example.

<sup>162</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/smj61b00](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/smj61b00) p.10, note says "train judges"

### In 1999, Joseph Bast's letter to Marden mentioned GMU's David I. Fand and Walter Williams as members of Board of Advisors.<sup>165</sup>

Marden spoke at GMU 04/19/01:<sup>166</sup>

"The changes I've seen at Philip Morris over the last 17 years . . . and especially the last few . . . aren't cosmetic . They don't just run skin-deep - they cut to the heart and soul of who we are, and want to be, as a corporation . . . a corporation that wants to succeed in the court of public opinion as well as in the marketplace . And I think our actions over the last few years reflect that desire ."

### GMU Board (of Visitors)

**Kimberly Dennis**<sup>167</sup> chairs Searle Freedom Trust, which donated specifically to Heartland for climate anti-science.<sup>168</sup>

She is Chair for DONORS TRUST and Vice-Chair for DONORS CAPITAL FUND,<sup>169</sup> which also played major roles in funding Heartland's climate anti-science.

**Nancy Mitchell Photenhauer**<sup>170</sup> was a grad assistant for GMU's Walter Williams, ran the Independent Women's Forum<sup>171</sup> and then worked for Koch Industries.

**Mark F. McGettrick**<sup>172</sup> is Executive VP and CFO of Dominion Resources, a large energy and utility company.<sup>173</sup>

<sup>163</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/npo83c00](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/npo83c00) for example. \$10K in 1999

<sup>164</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/tgs57c00](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/tgs57c00) \$25K in 1991, claim \$50K in 1992.

That was found only after writing MAS2012, but means HIS gets added to the list of tobacco-related groups.

<sup>165</sup> <http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/yiv90h00>

<sup>166</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/orh12c00](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/orh12c00)

<sup>167</sup> [bov.gmu.edu/bios/dennis.html](http://bov.gmu.edu/bios/dennis.html)

<sup>168</sup> MAS2012 p.58

<sup>169</sup> MAS2012 p.66

<sup>170</sup> [bov.gmu.edu/bios/pfotenhauer.html](http://bov.gmu.edu/bios/pfotenhauer.html)

<sup>171</sup> [www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Independent\\_Women%27s\\_Forum](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Independent_Women%27s_Forum)

Also mentioned in MAS2012. It was involved with the Koch-funded AFP

<sup>172</sup> [bov.gmu.edu/bios/mcgettrick.html](http://bov.gmu.edu/bios/mcgettrick.html)

<sup>173</sup> [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominion\\_Resources](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dominion_Resources)

**GMU J.D.s**

GMU graduates<sup>174</sup> Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli and assistant Wesley Russell have spent nearly 2 years<sup>175</sup> driving dubious attacks on the University of Virginia and climate researcher Michael Mann, with the most recent relying heavily on the WR.<sup>176</sup>

This was recently rejected, with prejudice, having cost U VA half a million dollars for defense and an unknown amount to VA taxpayers.<sup>177</sup> Cuccinelli has gotten funding from the Kochs, Dominion and other coal and gas interests.

Another effort continues, via The American Tradition Institute (ATI), with Chris Horner (CEI) and especially David Schnare<sup>178</sup>, another GMU J.D.

**Milton Johns is also a GMU J.D. who had been Cuccinelli's law partner and has been representing Wegman and Said Since May 2011 or earlier.**<sup>179</sup>

**GMU Faculty (past or current)**

This section does not claim wrongdoing on anyone's part, but simply shows that GMU faculty have been well-connected with thinktanks involved with tobacco or climate anti-science [MAS2010, MAS2012]. *Some economics professors seem to espouse strong opinions that contradict mainstream climate science, which they are certainly free to do. Likewise, others are free to say that such opinions are at best worthless. They are also free to help tobacco companies, as some have done. This was a quick search.*

**R. Warren Anderson** Professor of Economics, published *Fire and Ice* via Heartland and contributed to Fred Singer's Heartland NIPCC reports.<sup>180</sup>

**Peter J. Boettke**, Professor of Economics, is listed as a Heartland Institute Policy Advisor.

**Donald J. Boudreaux**, was Chairman of the Economics Department 2001-2009,<sup>181</sup> is now Director of the Center for Study of Public Choice,<sup>182</sup> is a Heartland Expert, a CATO Adjunct Scholar, an Adjunct Analyst at CEI, and spoke at Heartland's 2008 climate conference.<sup>183</sup>

**Francis H. Buckley** is<sup>184</sup> or was<sup>185</sup> Director of the Law and Economics Center and is a Heartland Policy Advisor.<sup>186</sup>

**Tyler Cowen** is a Professor of Economics, the general director of the Mercatus Center<sup>187</sup> and an Adjunct Scholar at the CATO Institute.

**William H. Lash, III** Professor of Law, is on the Advisory Board of CFACT<sup>188</sup> and attended the interesting meeting described later.

<sup>174</sup> [politics.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/john-farrell/2010/05/18/Virginia-AG-Cuccinellis-Questionable-Campaign-Contributions.html](http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/john-farrell/2010/05/18/Virginia-AG-Cuccinellis-Questionable-Campaign-Contributions.html) See Terry Wolfe.

<sup>175</sup> [www.ucsusa.org/scientific\\_integrity/abuses\\_of\\_science/va-ag-timeline.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/scientific_integrity/abuses_of_science/va-ag-timeline.html)

<sup>176</sup> [voices.washingtonpost.com/virginiapolitics/New%20Mann%20CID.PDF](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/virginiapolitics/New%20Mann%20CID.PDF)

[www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2010/10/cuccinelli-goes-fishing-again](http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2010/10/cuccinelli-goes-fishing-again)

<sup>177</sup> [www.ucsusa.org/scientific\\_integrity/abuses\\_of\\_science/va-ag-timeline.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/scientific_integrity/abuses_of_science/va-ag-timeline.html)

<sup>178</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/david-schnare](http://www.desmogblog.com/david-schnare)

<sup>179</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/curious-coincidences-george-mason-university-ed-wegman-milton-johns-and-ken-cuccinelli](http://www.desmogblog.com/curious-coincidences-george-mason-university-ed-wegman-milton-johns-and-ken-cuccinelli)

<sup>180</sup> MAS2012 pp.35-36

<sup>181</sup> [economics.gmu.edu/people/dboudrea](http://economics.gmu.edu/people/dboudrea)

<sup>182</sup> [www.gmu.edu/centers/publicchoice](http://www.gmu.edu/centers/publicchoice)

Robert Tollison used to run this and it had a long history with tobacco.

<sup>183</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/donald-j-boudreaux](http://www.desmogblog.com/donald-j-boudreaux)

<sup>184</sup> [www.law.gmu.edu/faculty/directory/fulltime/buckley\\_francis](http://www.law.gmu.edu/faculty/directory/fulltime/buckley_francis)

<sup>185</sup> [web.archive.org/web/20100823025829/www.lawecon.org/about](http://web.archive.org/web/20100823025829/www.lawecon.org/about)

<sup>186</sup> [heartland.org/fh-buckley](http://heartland.org/fh-buckley)

<sup>187</sup> [mercatus.org/tyler-cowen](http://mercatus.org/tyler-cowen)

**Jeremy Rabkin** is Professor of Law<sup>189</sup> and Adjunct Scholar at CEI.<sup>190</sup>

**Scott Talkington**, GMU PhD, was/is Research Professor of Public Policy, was a Research Director for the National Association of Scholars.<sup>191</sup>

**Robert Tollison**, past director of GMU's Center for the Study of Public Choice spoke at a 02/08/00<sup>192</sup> Frontiers of Freedom<sup>193</sup> meeting that included attendees:

ALEC: 1;

Americans for Tax Reform: 1;

CATO Institute: 1,

ExxonMobil: Randy Randol [MAS2012 p.29],

Federalist Society: 1,

Frontiers of Freedom: 3 (SPPI's Robert Ferguson was later at FoF),

GMU Law School: Prof. William Lash,

Heritage Foundation: 1,

Philip Morris: 3, including Roy Marden [MAS2012].

**Walter E. Williams** of the GMU Economics Department heavily involved with Koch-funded groups, such as AFP.<sup>194</sup>

He also promoted climate anti-science. As of 11/04/10,<sup>195</sup> of the 17 items on his home page, 4 were:

***“Global Warming: The Other Side*** This is another look at manmade global warming and expose of U.S. government data manipulation.

***Truth About Global Warming: Weather Channel Founder John Coleman Update: More Than 700 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims Global Warming Petition Project?***

<sup>188</sup> [www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Committee\\_for\\_a\\_Constructive\\_Tomorrow](http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Committee_for_a_Constructive_Tomorrow)

<sup>189</sup> [http://www.law.gmu.edu/faculty/directory/fulltime/rabkin\\_jeremy](http://www.law.gmu.edu/faculty/directory/fulltime/rabkin_jeremy)

<sup>190</sup> <http://cei.org/adjunct-scholar/jeremy-rabkin>

<sup>191</sup> [www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=WX10L13](http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?i=WX10L13); [chronicle.com/blogs/innovations/guest-post-bottling-nonsense-mis-using-a-civil-platform](http://chronicle.com/blogs/innovations/guest-post-bottling-nonsense-mis-using-a-civil-platform) on NAS

<sup>192</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/dvd62c00/pdf](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/dvd62c00/pdf)

<sup>193</sup> FoF was quite active in climate anti-science.

<sup>194</sup> [www.everydaycitizen.com/2010/01/under\\_melting\\_ice\\_with\\_walter.html](http://www.everydaycitizen.com/2010/01/under_melting_ice_with_walter.html)

<sup>195</sup> [web.archive.org/web/20101104201441/http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew](http://web.archive.org/web/20101104201441/http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew) [econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew/](http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew/) accessed 11/05/10, but then it changed. It was:

However, by 02/04/11, the first 2 had disappeared and somewhat later, the others, so by now they are all gone.<sup>196</sup> The timing might be accidental, or might be interesting, in light of the publicity GMU was getting in late 2010 regarding the Wegman Report.

He attended a 1994 CATO meeting “Cutting through the smoke.”<sup>197</sup> He was also on Philip Morris's list of helpers that included Heartland's Joseph Bast and others on the earlier chart.<sup>198</sup>

### **Well-known climate anti-science advocates – Singer and Michaels**

Both are especially well-connected at GMU.

**Fred Singer** cosponsored a 1993 event with GMU there:

‘SIPP1993 – Singer, GMU, Moore, GMU International Institute– 06/24/93 —Scientific Integrity in the Public Policy Process’

[www.sepp.org/Archive/conferences/conferences/sipp.html](http://www.sepp.org/Archive/conferences/conferences/sipp.html)<sup>199</sup>

People: This was Singer's first listed conference; speakers included Fred.Smith (CEI), Peter Huber (Manhattan), Jastrow, Lindzen, Singer, Robert Hahn (AEI). Seitz attended.’

Singer then affiliated with Institute for Humane Studies 1994-2000. He spoke in a colloquium series at GMU 02/29/12.<sup>200</sup>

For 2008-2009, his IRS forms claimed Frederick Seitz as Chairman of his SEPP thinktank,<sup>201</sup> working an hour a week, although deceased early 2008.

**Patrick J. Michaels**<sup>202</sup> is affiliated with CATO and as a Distinguished Senior Fellow in the School of Public Policy, taught a GMU Public Policy course in 2010.<sup>203</sup>

<sup>196</sup> [econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew](http://econfaculty.gmu.edu/wew) accessed 03/04/12.

<sup>197</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/ocq44b00](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/ocq44b00)

<sup>198</sup> [legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/lsk01b00](http://legacy.library.ucsf.edu/tid/lsk01b00)

<sup>199</sup> Broken link. Use [www.webcitation.org/5nSKrv8oZ](http://www.webcitation.org/5nSKrv8oZ)

<sup>200</sup> [deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-12186](http://deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-12186)

<sup>201</sup> MAS2012 p.22

<sup>202</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/patrick-michaels](http://www.desmogblog.com/patrick-michaels)

[www.desmogblog.com/skeptics-prefer-pal-review-over-peer-review-chris-de-freitas-pat-michaels-and-their-pals-1997-2003](http://www.desmogblog.com/skeptics-prefer-pal-review-over-peer-review-chris-de-freitas-pat-michaels-and-their-pals-1997-2003)

<sup>203</sup> [policy.gmu.edu/portals/0/syllabi/2010\\_2/PUBP710.pdf](http://policy.gmu.edu/portals/0/syllabi/2010_2/PUBP710.pdf)

DC found the syllabus<sup>204</sup> for *Environmental Economics* 335,<sup>205</sup> in whose recommended reading list both Singer and Michaels appear. For Week 10, on “Global warming, Ozone Hole and Acid Rain” suggested books are:

Patrick Michaels, *Meltdown*

Patrick Michaels, *Sound and Fury: The Science and Politics of Global Warming*

Robert Balling, *The Heated Debate*

Dixy Lee Ray, *Trashing The Planet*

S. Fred Singer, *Global climate change, Human and Natural Influences*<sup>206</sup>

### Others

NCPA’s H. Sterling Burnett has often written for Heartland’s Environment and Climate News, coauthored a report in 2006<sup>207</sup> with Richard Simmons, who had been at the Mercatus Center and was then with ALEC.

### SPECULATION

*The incredible misconduct process may be normal at GMU or not.*<sup>208</sup>  
*GMU is funded by the same foundations that fund climate anti-science, cooperates with the key thinktanks, hosts some of well-known anti-science advocates. GMU and its subsidiaries also have long histories of cooperation with tobacco companies, side-by-side with the other think tanks who did so.*

*The VA lawyers leading attacks on climate scientists are GMU graduates. GMU may well know Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX) and Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK).*

*It seems unlikely any of these would have wanted criticism of the WR.*

*Thus, parts of GMU get funded to do science, other parts and allies get funded to attack science whenever convenient, as in climate or tobacco.*

*Academic freedom is crucially important to protect, but if funders want to pay academics to attack science and scientists, can they do that tax-exempt? Does the US support universities for research and education or for advocacy?*

*Free speech is guaranteed, but not tax-free funding of advocacy, which is a revocable privilege.*

<sup>204</sup> [deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-12185](http://deepclimate.org/2012/02/22/gmu-contradictory-decisions-on-wegman-plagiarism-in-csda-but-not-in-congressional-report/#comment-12185)

<sup>205</sup> [economics.gmu.edu/system/syllabuses/5964/original/Rustici%20335%20001.pdf?1327592471](http://economics.gmu.edu/system/syllabuses/5964/original/Rustici%20335%20001.pdf?1327592471)

<sup>206</sup> [www.desmogblog.com/skeptics-prefer-pal-review-over-peer-review-chris-de-freitas-pat-michaels-and-their-pals-1997-2003](http://www.desmogblog.com/skeptics-prefer-pal-review-over-peer-review-chris-de-freitas-pat-michaels-and-their-pals-1997-2003) p.6 shows relationships.

*These students are not learning science, but anti-science.*

<sup>207</sup> [www.ncpa.org/pub/st291?pg=8](http://www.ncpa.org/pub/st291?pg=8)

<sup>208</sup> Napoleon gave good advice on malice versus incompetence, but both happen.