

John (Jack) R. Venrick

From: "John (Jack) R. Venrick" <jacksranch@skynetbb.com>
To: "AJack R. Venrick" <jacksranch@skynetbb.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 2:22 PM
Subject: 12-3-09 Climategate Spreading to NASA?

----- Original Message -----

Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2009 6:13 PM
Subject: Climategate Spreading to NASA?

[Climategate Spreading to NASA?](#)

by [Greg Knapp](#) <http://biggovernment.com/2009/12/03/climategate-spreading-to-nasa/#more-40582>



I see nothing....

It's not just the scientists at the Climate Research Unit of East Anglia University who may have criminally violated the Freedom of Information Act (some professors in the UK and some in the USA), [NASA has been stonewalling a FOIA request](#) as well... for years.

Chris Horner, a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, said NASA has refused for two years to provide information under the Freedom of Information Act that would show how the agency has shaped its climate data and would explain why the agency has repeatedly had to correct its data going as far back as the 1930s.

"I assume that what is there is highly damaging," Mr. Horner said.

11/3/2010

“These guys are quite clearly bound and determined not to reveal their internal discussions about this.”

NASA’s Goddard Institute for Space Studies is saying they’re “working on” the FOIA request.

Right. For two years?!

The public affairs guy at GISS is using the [Sgt. Schultz defense](#) (“I hear nothing, I see nothing, I know nothing!”)

He said he was unfamiliar with the British controversy and couldn’t say whether NASA was susceptible to the same challenges to its data. The White House has dismissed the British e-mails as irrelevant.

What we are seeing is in total contradiction to the scientific method. Honest scientists don’t [delete their data](#) or use [tricks to hide data they don’t like](#). They don’t insist the science is settled and that anyone who questions them is a nut. They gladly release their data to other scientists so their results can be replicated or errors can be corrected.

Once upon a time the “science was settled” that the world was flat. The “science was settled” that the world was the center of the universe. Whoops.

Much of the data used for the “consensus” that manmade global warming is real came from the CRU and NASA’s GISS. If that data is not accurate and/or has been manipulated it undermines everything. When you consider the [trillions of dollars at risk here](#) by [policy pushed](#) by this “science,” it’s understandable that Christopher Booker is calling it [The Worst Scientific Scandal of Our Generation](#).

11/3/2010