

Bad Data

Remember when kids used to tell their teachers, “the dog ate my homework.” Well now we’ve got some climate change scientists who might as well be saying the same thing about the raw data backing up their research. A lot of the data is incomplete, inconsistent and just flat out wrong.

It’s no laughing matter because this research is being used as justification for spending trillions of dollars on policies that probably won’t do anything more than bankrupt the world.

Here’s a recent example. Perhaps you saw a headline that said global warming was heating the oceans faster than scientists had thought. The New York Times, Washington Post and BBC ran hyperbolic headlines warning of planetary doom. Except... it’s not true. Independent scientist Nic Lewis started reading the study published in a prestigious scientific journal and quickly discovered a significant math error... on the very first page. The error completely invalidated the conclusions of the research.

As bad as that is... it’s really only like a chihuahua peeing on the carpet compared to this next example... which is more akin to an elephant rampaging through your house.

An Australian researcher recently audited the HadCRUT4 dataset and found 70 areas of concern. 70! This is no ordinary collection of data. It is one of the most cited and important global databases used in climate modeling and is relied upon by the United Nation’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to push policies that would cost tens of trillions of dollars.

In Dr. McLean’s 121-page report he reveals some truly astonishing incompetence, if not malfeasance. In one case McLean found a town in Columbia had a three-month average temperature of more than 80 degrees Celsius, or an impossible 180 degrees Fahrenheit. One town in Romania recorded a temperature of minus 46 degrees Celsius in 1953, more than 100 degrees colder than the norm. An Island in the Caribbean was reported to be freezing for the month of December in 1981 and in 1984. And McLean found many other errors like these... such as when sea surface measurements came from ships in port, which were logged at locations more than 80 kilometers inland where waters are warmer. One of the most disturbing discoveries is in the area of temperature gathering.

In many cases temperature recording stations have to be moved, or the structures repaired, and equipment replaced. McLean found that the method used to adjust the temperature readings after the stations were moved or repaired was badly flawed and resulted in new readings that show an exaggerated warming trend.

Some of the other big takeaways from McLean's audit: poor data quality, relevant data missing, inconsistent file formats, different depths of measurements at sea and different heights on land, temperature anomalies in the same grid varying widely. According to McLean, the lack of data is the real problem. Data reports prior to 1950 aren't reliable because there were so few recording stations.

McLean's conclusion is that "The very large uncertainties about the HadCRUT4 dataset mean that it cannot be accepted as an accurate temperature record." And it concludes, "Government commitments, policies and spending on climate issues based on such reports appear to have been made without proper due diligence."

This wouldn't surprise us, though. We've seen lots of these kinds of dodgy distortions for years. The former head of the UN Climate panel declared global warming was his religion. And former Vice President Al Gore conceded in 2018 that the UN reports were...in his words... "torqued up." Gore asked, "How [else] do they get the attention of policy-makers around the world?"

Do you get the sense that Climate Change is about a lot more than just climate?

For the Clear Energy Alliance, I'm Marc Morano, Power On.

CLEAR ENERGY
ALLIANCE