

[Devious Actions By Warmist Bank](#)

The articles below, published on 14 December in Canada and forwarded to me by one of the authors (David Henderson), reveals an astonishing example of devious behaviour by a warmist. Involving as it does one of the world's leading banks, Deutsche Bank, it also displays the extent to which some leading private sector institutions are prepared to support the warming thesis principally on the basis that it allows them to make money from advising or trading in associated activities. Note that members of the Deutsche Bank's Climate Advisory Board include Dr Pachauri, the infamous chair of the IPCC who was forced to acknowledge the incorrect use by IPCC of data on melting of glaciers supplied by one of his associates without review.

The report by the Deutsche Bank climate change advisors portrays a sign of desperation in that it directly attacks the analysis by Canadian economist Professor Ross McKittrick and presents his conclusions wrongly in what seems to be a deliberately false portrayal. McKittrick has done more than most sceptics in demonstrating that:

1. There are basic errors in the so-called hockey-stick graph used in the DB report as support for the warming thesis (that graph purports to show little or no increase in temperature prior to the industrial revolution followed by a steady upward movement). With colleague Steve McIntyre, McKittrick has demonstrated that the graph had no substantive basis and that analysis was confirmed by statistician Wedgeman in a report commissioned by Congress;
2. The attempt by Phil Jones of the Climate Research Unit at East Anglia University to "hide the decline" in temperatures in the late 20th century by switching from the use of normal temperature records to measurements based on tree rings. (As I have previously reported, in his interview with the BBC environment reporter last February following the Climategate revelations, Jones acknowledged that from 1995 to 2009 there was no statistically-significant global warming).

McKittrick has also published a critique of the official investigations into the activities of the CRU, all of which "cleared" Jones and his colleagues from any serious wrongdoing. McKittrick's conclusion (published in September) was that "the world still waits a proper inquiry into climategate: one that is not stacked with global warming advocates, and one that is prepared to cross-examine evidence, interview critics as well as supporters of the CRU and other IPCC players, and follow the evidence where it leads". I have read only one of those official reports but that was obviously biased.

It is remarkable that the analyses by McKittrick and McIntyre have received almost no attention in Australia. Of course, other analyses by sceptics have also been given only limited attention by comparison with commentary by warmists. But the two are professional economists who have exposed fundamental errors in what is supposed to be based on an analysis by scientists. This exposure shows that the warmist theory can be challenged successfully by non-scientists who are prepared to examine

the statistical data. But the two Ms are Canadian. Why aren't more professional economists in Australia, including in the Treasury in Canberra, able to tackle the issue?

Des Moore

[Corporate Irresponsibility](#) – David Henderson Dec 13th

[Deutsche's Climate](#) – Terence Corcoran Dec 14th