

HEARING ON ALLEGATIONS OF POLITICAL  
INTERFERENCE WITH THE WORK OF  
GOVERNMENT CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENTISTS

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

House of Representatives,  
Committee on Oversight and  
Government Reform,  
Washington, D.C.

"This is a preliminary transcript of a Committee Hearing. It has not yet been subject to a review process to ensure that the statements within are appropriately attributed to the witness or member of Congress who made them, to determine whether there are any inconsistencies between the statements within and what was actually said at the proceeding, or to make any other corrections to ensure the accuracy of the record."

**Committee Hearings**

of the

**U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**



**OFFICE OF THE CLERK**  
**Office of Official Reporters**

1 Court Reporting Services, Inc.

2 HGO030000

3 HEARING ON ALLEGATIONS OF POLITICAL  
4 INTERFERENCE WITH THE WORK OF  
5 GOVERNMENT CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENTISTS

6 Tuesday, January 30, 2007  
7 House of Representatives,  
8 Committee on Oversight and  
9 Government Reform,  
10 Washington, D.C.

11 The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in  
12 Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Henry  
13 A. Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.

14 Present: Representatives Waxman, Kucinich, Cummings,  
15 Davis of Illinois, Tierney, Clay, Watson, Lynch, Higgins,  
16 Yarmuth, Braley, Norton, McCollum, Cooper, Van Hollen, Hodes,  
17 Murphy, Sarbanes, Welch, Davis of Virginia, Shays, Platts,  
18 Cannon, Duncan, Turner, Issa, Foxx, Sali

19 Also Present: Representative Gilchrest.

20 Staff Present: Phil Schiliro, Chief of Staff; Phil

21 | Barnett, Staff Director/Chief Counsel; Kristin Amerling,  
22 | General Counsel; Greg Dotson, Counsel; Jeff Baran, Counsel;  
23 | Earley Green, Chief Clerk; Teresa Coufal, Deputy Clerk; David  
24 | Marin, Minority Staff Director; Larry Halloran, Minority  
25 | Deputy Staff Director; Jennifer Safavian, Minority Chief  
26 | Counsel for Oversight and Investigations; Keith Ausbrook,  
27 | Minority General Counsel; Ellen Brown, Minority Legislative  
28 | Director and Senior Policy Counsel; Mason Alinger, Minority  
29 | Deputy Legislative Director; A. Brooke Bennett, Minority  
30 | Counsel; Allyson Blandford, Minority Professional Staff  
31 | Member; Jay O'Callaghan, Minority Professional Staff Member;  
32 | Kristina Husar, Minority Professional Staff Member; Larry  
33 | Brady, Minority Senior Investigator and Policy Advisor;  
34 | Patrick Lyden, Minority Parliamentarian and Member Services  
35 | Coordinator; Brian McNicoll, Minority Communications  
36 | Director; and Benjamin Chance, Minority Clerk.

37 Mr. WAXMAN. The meeting of the Committee will come to  
38 order.

39 I want to welcome everyone to today's meeting. It is  
40 the first hearing we are having this year, and it focuses on  
41 one of the most important issues facing our Nation and the  
42 world, global warming.

43 Most of my colleagues know that I bring some strong  
44 views to the subject. I have been working on global warming  
45 for almost 20 years and introduced the first comprehensive  
46 global warming bill in 1992. I believed then that the  
47 science on global warming was compelling enough to warrant  
48 action, and in the years since 1992, I believe the science  
49 has grown more and more compelling.

50 But despite my strong views, I would never want  
51 scientists to manipulate research so that they can tell me  
52 what they think I want to hear. I don't want politically  
53 correct science. I want the best science possible, and that  
54 is what today's hearing is about.

55 For several years, there have been allegations that the  
56 research of respected climate scientists was being distorted  
57 and suppressed by the Bush Administration. Some of these  
58 reports claim that Phil Cooney, a former lobbyist for the  
59 American Petroleum Industry, was put in charge of the Council  
60 on Environmental Quality and imposed his own views on the  
61 reports scientists had submitted to the White House.



62           The last Congress, under the leadership of Tom Davis,  
63 this Committee took the appropriate step and began  
64 investigating whether the Bush Administration was interfering  
65 with the science of global warming for political reasons. I  
66 joined with Chairman Davis in requesting routine documents  
67 from the White House's Council on Environmental Quality.  
68 When the White House resisted, we narrowed our request. When  
69 the White House resisted again, we scaled back what had  
70 already been a reasonable request, and when the White House  
71 resisted a third time, we again tried to accommodate the  
72 President.

73           In addition to repeatedly narrowing our request, we  
74 extended the deadlines we had suggested to the White House.  
75 But even after all those courtesies, we have received  
76 virtually nothing from this Administration.

77           Last evening, we finally received a total of nine  
78 non-public documents. Unfortunately, they add little to our  
79 inquiry. In some cases, they do not even appear to be  
80 records we were seeking.

81           It is a privilege to chair this Committee. The  
82 Oversight Committee is charged with an essential  
83 responsibility, bringing accountability to our Government.  
84 We take this very seriously. As Chairman, I intend to be  
85 fair to every witness and to invoke the Committee's broad  
86 powers only when absolutely necessary, but I also intend to

87 | be thorough, to insist on Congress' right to receive relevant  
88 | information and to do everything possible to meet the  
89 | important obligations we have to the American people.

90 |         In this instance, the Committee isn't trying to obtain  
91 | state secrets or documents that could affect our immediate  
92 | national security. We are simply seeking answers to whether  
93 | the White House's political staff is inappropriately  
94 | censoring impartial Government scientists.

95 |         Last fall, our staffs viewed some of the documents the  
96 | Committee is seeking in camera. As a result of this review,  
97 | we know that the White House possesses documents that contain  
98 | evidence of an attempt by senior Administration officials to  
99 | mislead the public by injecting doubt into the science of  
100 | global warming and minimizing the potential dangers. I  
101 | believe Congress is entitled to this information and to these  
102 | documents.

103 |         According to the documents we reviewed, Administration  
104 | officials sought to edit an EPA report, one, to add  
105 | ``balance'' by emphasizing the ``beneficial effects'' of  
106 | climate change. Secondly, they tried to delete a discussion  
107 | of the human health and environmental effects of climate  
108 | change. Thirdly, to strike any discussion of atmospheric  
109 | concentrations of carbon because carbon levels are not a  
110 | ``good indicator of climate change,'' and four, to remove the  
111 | statement that ``changes observed over the last several

112 | decades are likely mostly the result of human activities.''

113 |       Some of the most questionable edits were urged by  
114 | Phillip Cooney, the former oil industry lobbyist who was the  
115 | Chief of Staff to the White House Council on Environmental  
116 | Quality.

117 |       Today, Ranking Member Davis and I are sending a letter  
118 | to the White House about these documents to urge the White  
119 | House to reconsider the confrontational approach it is now  
120 | taking.

121 |       I am looking forward to hearing the testimony of today's  
122 | witnesses. We are fortunate the Union of Concerned  
123 | Scientists here and to have the opportunity to review their  
124 | new report on political interference in the scientific  
125 | process.

126 |       I also want to welcome Dr. Drew Shindell to the  
127 | Committee. Dr. Shindell is a top climate researcher at  
128 | NASA's Goddard Center. He will testify about the  
129 | difficulties he has faced in alerting the public to his  
130 | important climate research. Dr. Shindell is testifying on  
131 | his own behalf today, and he has earned our gratitude for  
132 | having the courage to step forward.

133 |       I would also like to note that Rick Piltz is testifying  
134 | today for the first time. Mr. Piltz is the Government  
135 | employee who publicly objected when the Council on  
136 | Environmental Quality starting overruling the views of

137 climate scientists.

138 We are pleased that Roger Pielke is able to join us.

139 All of us have a right to our own views about the  
140 seriousness of global warming, but we don't have a right to  
141 our own science. This hearing and the Committee's ongoing  
142 investigation into political interference is aimed at  
143 ensuring the American people receive the best possible  
144 science.

145 That concludes my statement.

146 [Prepared statement of Mr. Waxman follows:]

147 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

148 Mr. WAXMAN. I want to recognize Mr. Davis.

149 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
150 and my best wishes to you as you bring your first oversight  
151 hearing to order.

152 I should note the irony of having a global warming  
153 hearing today on the coldest day of the year. In fact, one  
154 of my colleagues remarked it is so cold today that  
155 Congressmen have their hands in their own pockets just to  
156 keep warm.

157 [Laughter.]

158 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Seriously, though, I am pleased  
159 that in our first hearing, we are continuing the Committee's  
160 work on climate change. Last year, we directed the Committee  
161 to address this weighty and politically charged issues in a  
162 non-partisan way.

163 I am proud that we are able to strip away partisan  
164 differences and tackle an issue which most other committees  
165 had steered well clear of. Our approach earned accolades  
166 from groups like the Pew Center on Global Climate Change  
167 which called our hearings, ``some of the balanced and  
168 informative climate change hearings in memory,`` and  
169 newspapers like the Washington Post which described our work  
170 as ``responsible.``

171 The Committee's reputation is based on its commitment to  
172 fair and responsible oversight, and I look forward to

173 continuing that tradition with you.

174 Mr. Chairman, I am no climate change denier. In fact, I  
175 believe it is one of the most urgent matters we face. As I  
176 have said before, there aren't many people left these days  
177 who would argue global warming isn't happening per se. There  
178 is widespread agreement that global mean temperatures  
179 increased over the past century and that carbon dioxide in  
180 the atmosphere has contributed to this warming.

181 Furthermore, like you, I think it is important to  
182 determine whether the Administration or anyone else has  
183 attempted to quash scientific findings. That is why together  
184 we have requested documents from the Council on Environmental  
185 Quality and why together we remain disappointed in the  
186 lackluster production of those documents.

187 But, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned this morning that the  
188 pendulum may swing too far in the opposite direction, that  
189 is, I am concerned that we have gone from legitimate  
190 conversations about politicizing science to a potentially  
191 dangerous dynamic that not only condones but heralds the  
192 suppression of scientific dissent. For some it seems freedom  
193 of speech implies only to those that agree with you. Let me  
194 explain.

195 We are seeing a dangerous trend toward inflammatory and  
196 counter-productive hyperbole. When a top climatologist at  
197 the Weather Channel calls for stripping meteorologists who

198 | express any skepticism about man's contributions to climate  
199 | change of their certifications, we have probably gone too  
200 | far. When so-called eco experts liken skeptics to Holocaust  
201 | deniers, we have definitely gone too far.

202 |         This Committee has earned a reputation as a  
203 | truth-seeking body. We are gatherers of fact. We let the  
204 | chips fall where they may. Knowledge, Mr. Chairman, is  
205 | refined through continuous inquiry and, yes, through  
206 | skepticism.

207 |         Second, one of our witnesses will discuss this morning  
208 | the issue of politicizing science. But has it itself become  
209 | politicized? The title of today's hearing is telling. The  
210 | mere convergence of politics and science does not in itself  
211 | denote interference. I would caution the Committee and  
212 | policymakers everyone not to contribute to the naive notion  
213 | that science and politics can somehow be kept separate.

214 |         Should it really surprise anyone that leadership at a  
215 | Federal agency manages information in pursuit of their  
216 | interests or their agenda?

217 |         Is the choice of phraseology, for example, climate  
218 | change versus global warming, the province of science alone  
219 | or can it be allowed to reflect political as well as  
220 | scientific considerations?

221 |         Third, science, as we all know, evolves, living and  
222 | breathing through the power of evidence. Policy needs to

223 | evolve along with it. Some in this room appear to believe we  
224 | have reached the end of scientific continuum, but scientific  
225 | consensus is not science. Sometimes it is nothing more than  
226 | the best guess of the group that gets the microphone first.

227 |       More than once strong scientific consensus of the past  
228 | now lies in history's mass grave of disproved crackpots. The  
229 | miasma theory of disease prevailed for a time because cholera  
230 | outbreaks seemed to be associated with bad-smelling water.  
231 | Less fetid water, though it reduced outbreaks, appeared proof  
232 | of cause and effect until the germ theory identified the real  
233 | culprit.

234 |       The 19th Century rain follows the plow theory attributed  
235 | increased rain in arid areas to increased agricultural  
236 | activities by man. Today it is understood that increased  
237 | vegetation and urbanization have only limited and local  
238 | effects on overall precipitation's level.

239 |       So in the debate about climate change attribution,  
240 | determining the role of human activity on measurable climate  
241 | changes, all of us--policymakers, scientists and those  
242 | fortunate enough to be neither--should take pains to maintain  
243 | the healthy skepticism that is at the heart of good science  
244 | and good policy. Without constant constructive doubt, both  
245 | sides would have us take leaps of faith over the science to  
246 | politically convenient conclusions.

247 |       A wise man once wrote that science is facts. Just as



248 | houses are made of stones, so is science made of facts. But  
249 | a pile of stones is not a house and a collection of facts is  
250 | not necessarily science.

251 |         Mr. Chairman, I requested the documents from CEQ because  
252 | I wanted to learn more about the allegations that  
253 | Administration officials were trying to minimize the  
254 | significance of climate change. I requested them because I  
255 | care about climate change and, like you, want to do something  
256 | about it.

257 |         I am no denier, but I am troubled by stories of  
258 | scientists unable to publish or even complete their research  
259 | because they are perceived as having the wrong answers or  
260 | being on the wrong side of the science, or the leveling of  
261 | accusations that rely on innuendo and inference to prove  
262 | scientists' intentions is nefarious when in fact often these  
263 | scientists' only crime is associating with ideas that  
264 | conflict with those of their accusers, or the notion that X  
265 | policy action or inaction must follow from Y scientific  
266 | finding without regard to other scientific findings or policy  
267 | considerations just as economic inhibitors or geopolitical  
268 | concerns.

269 |         This Committee takes very seriously its responsibility  
270 | for ensuring individuals remain able to speak freely. Under  
271 | my chairmanship and with your leadership, Mr. Chairman, we  
272 | passed hallmark whistleblower legislation which enhanced the

273 | rights of Federal whistleblowers, giving them protection and  
274 | confidence as they speak up. The monumental challenge of  
275 | climate change is the latest test of free speech and  
276 | whistleblower protections.

277 |         Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this  
278 | important hearing.

279 |         [Prepared statement of Mr. Davis of Virginia follows:]

280 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

281 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Davis.

282 I would like to ask, without objection, that we now call  
283 on members in order of seniority in which they appeared at  
284 this hearing for an opening statement, should they wish to  
285 make one not to exceed three minutes. Without objection,  
286 that will be the order.

287 I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from  
288 Maryland, Representative Gilchrest, be permitted to  
289 participate in this hearing and in accordance with our  
290 Committee practices, he will be recognized for the purpose of  
291 an opening statement and questioning after members of the  
292 Committee have been recognized. Without objection, so  
293 ordered.

294 I want to call on Mr. Cummings. Is he here?

295 Mr. Cummings?

296 Mr. CUMMINGS. I am.

297 Mr. WAXMAN. Okay.

298 Mr. CUMMINGS. I will submit a statement for the record.

299 [Prepared statement of Mr. Cummings follows:]

300 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

301 Mr. WAXMAN. Opening statements maybe submitted by any  
302 member for the record, and we will keep the record open for  
303 that purpose.

304 Mr. Davis, do you have an opening statement?

305 Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Yes, thank you very much, Mr.  
306 Chairman, and I shall be brief.

307 Global warming is a serious issue and has overarching on  
308 our Nation and our world citizenry for we have only one  
309 Mother Earth. There is no doubt that we must take measures  
310 to look into this. We cannot and must not let politics trump  
311 science. Too much is at stake.

312 Ask those sufferers of environmental catastrophes from  
313 an extraordinarily strong hurricane season, most notably  
314 Katrina, to families who were victims of sound pesticide  
315 regulation, whose children have suffered from the adverse  
316 effects on brain development in fetuses and children.

317 Numerous well regarded and credible scientists have  
318 issued reports with regards to climate change and its far  
319 reaching consequences. Any effort by the White House Council  
320 on Environmental Quality to alter or undermine the integrity  
321 of such fact-finding is detrimental. We must take into full  
322 account the sound scientific evidence that some of our best  
323 minds have to offer and begin to comprehensively treat this  
324 problem immediately.

325 Ask the thousands of rescue workers in the World Trade

326 | Center who were told by the EPA that the air was safe.  
327 | Imagine what would happen if political tampering of  
328 | scientific data is acceptable. This proclamation appears to  
329 | be premature as our Nation's heroes are now plagued by  
330 | chronic and crippling long ailments. There are grave  
331 | consequences from such action.

332 |         Again, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking  
333 | Member Mr. Tom Davis, for holding this hearing today. It is  
334 | long overdue, and I look forward to the expert panel of  
335 | witnesses who have come to share with us.

336 |         I yield back any additional time.

337 |         [Prepared statement of Mr. Davis of Illinois follows:]

338 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

339 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Davis.

340 Mr. Shays?

341 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

342 Quickly, I want to say climate change and global warming  
343 are one and the same for me. When the President submitted,  
344 President Clinton was negotiating the Kyoto agreement, the  
345 Senate 100 to 0 said don't exclude China and India. The  
346 treaty came back excluding China and India, and there were  
347 only about five members of the Senate who supported it.  
348 President Clinton never asked for a vote in the Senate.

349 My big regret is that President Bush, whatever his  
350 feelings were about the treaty, should have submitted it to  
351 the Senate for its consideration without prejudice because I  
352 believe frankly that there would have been less than 20  
353 members of the Senate who would have supported the treaty,  
354 but now it is like all of them would have.

355 I just conclude by saying that anyone who alters  
356 scientific research, particularly on issues as important as  
357 this, should quit or should be fired.

358 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

359 [Prepared statement of Mr. Shays follows:]

360 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

361 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Shays.

362 Mr. Tierney?

363 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

364 I will submit my remarks for the record. Thank you.

365 [Prepared statement of Mr. Tierney follows:]

366 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

367 Mr. WAXMAN. Okay.

368 Mr. Clay?

369 Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Chairman Waxman and Ranking Member  
370 Davis for holding today's hearing.

371 I welcome our witnesses and commend Mr. Piltz and Dr.  
372 Shindell on their courage in coming before this Committee to  
373 testify about their experiences with the Bush  
374 Administration's policy of misrepresenting global warming  
375 data for political reasons. It is apparent that you are both  
376 committed to fully disclosing the facts about global warming.

377 It is imperative that the integrity of scientific  
378 research on global warming is ensured and that we do  
379 everything possible to give our children and our  
380 grandchildren a healthy environment. Reports that scientists  
381 working for Federal agencies have been asked to change data  
382 to fit policy initiatives are seriously disturbing and given  
383 the enormous health risks posed by global warming, it is  
384 unconscionable that any scientists would participate in such  
385 a dangerous plan.

386 Emerging threats to health from climate change include  
387 malaria, lime disease and an alarming increase in asthma  
388 incidences in the U.S. The American Public Health  
389 Association found that smog, increased pollen and carbon  
390 dioxide are fostering an epidemic in asthma in America's  
391 cities. The highest incidences of asthma in the U.S. is



392 | among African American toddlers and low income toddlers.  
393 | Inner city children are most at risk for getting asthma due  
394 | to poor air quality, increasing temperatures and the high  
395 | concentration of carbon dioxide.

396 |         Political appointees have no business distorting the  
397 | facts or denying the realities of global warming. Global  
398 | warming is not a myth or a distant threat. It is a reality  
399 | that demands immediate action from our Government.

400 |         We must implement policies to develop more renewable  
401 | energy resources to drastically reduce automobile emissions  
402 | and to end our dependence on oil and other fossil fuels.

403 |         Unfortunately, the Bush Administration has shown a  
404 | blatant disregard for the health of the American people.  
405 | They have shown they would rather safeguard the interests of  
406 | big oil than preserve the future of planet Earth. This  
407 | Administration has not only failed to address the assault on  
408 | climate change, they have contributed to this crisis.

409 |         Global warming poses an overwhelming challenge to our  
410 | responsibility to protect the earth for future generations.  
411 | I look forward to today's testimony and working with my  
412 | colleagues to meet this challenge and to put an end to this  
413 | Administration's efforts to deny or undermine scientific  
414 | knowledge about the global warming crisis.

415 |         Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and  
416 | submit my statement for the record.

417 [Prepared statement of Mr. Clay follows:]

418 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

419 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Clay.

420 Mr. Cannon?

421 Mr. CANNON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

422 There is some feedback happening in our mic system, I  
423 think. Am I the only one hearing that? It would be really  
424 nice to correct that if we have somebody available to do  
425 that.

426 Mr. WAXMAN. We have people working on it. Let me just  
427 ask if all members have their mics off in case any mic is on  
428 that might be causing it.

429 Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, my mic, when it is off, still  
430 works, or so the switch is. I am not sure if we have a more  
431 fundamental problem here.

432 Mr. WAXMAN. You ought to be careful what you say when  
433 your mic might be on.

434 Mr. CANNON. It might be me.

435 [Laughter.]

436 Mr. WAXMAN. Well, we will make the best of it. We have  
437 our best people working on trying to correct the problem.

438 Mr. CANNON. One would hope that those would be at least  
439 of the equality of some of the climate change scientists we  
440 have in the world today.

441 I wanted to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this  
442 hearing and also associate myself with the remarks of the  
443 Ranking Member and Mr. Shays, in that the fact is I believe

444 | there is global warming and therefore it is a global problem,  
445 | not just an American problem. On the other hand, I think  
446 | there are some serious questions as to whether or not global  
447 | warming is actually caused by man or how much of global  
448 | warming is caused by man.

449 |         What a relief. We can now think. This is all a plot to  
450 | distort the thinking of our panel members, I am sure.

451 |         I would like to submit a statement for the record, Mr.  
452 | Chairman, and not belabor this but point out that science is  
453 | by nature, especially when science needs to be funded, it is  
454 | political. Suppression happens all over the place, and  
455 | unfortunately suppression is complicated by bad science done  
456 | by not very smart scientists who have an agenda that is more  
457 | a matter of belief of emotion than it is clarity of thinking.  
458 | In this whole process, I hope we come to be able to  
459 | distinguish between what is an agenda and what is science and  
460 | what is the data and how do we draw conclusions from that  
461 | data.

462 |         With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

463 |         [Prepared statement of Mr. Cannon follows:]

464 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

465 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Cannon.

466 Now we go to Ms. Watson.

467 Ms. WATSON. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for  
468 convening today's hearing and your timeliness on this issue.

469 The United States has only 2 percent of the world's oil  
470 reserves but accounts for 25 percent of the world's energy  
471 demand. Of the global supply, we consume 43 percent of motor  
472 gasoline, 25 percent of crude petroleum, 25 percent of  
473 natural gas and 25 percent of electricity. Currently,  
474 American demand for all these commodities is rising  
475 dramatically.

476 The Administration announced in 2002 that reducing  
477 greenhouse emissions and increasing spending on climate  
478 research to reduce emission 18 percent by 2012 was a top  
479 priority, but their actions have not matched this pledge.  
480 Funds have been redirected for these purposes to spend on  
481 nuclear power and other non-renewable programs that do not  
482 reduce emissions.

483 In addition, the allegation of political interference  
484 with the work of Government scientists is an additional  
485 example of how this Administration is not taking the threat  
486 of global warming seriously. Global warming is occurring at  
487 a rapid pace today, and the consensus of the worldwide  
488 scientific community is that it will accelerate during the  
489 21st Century.

490 Global warming and our related energy policies also  
491 raise National security concerns. One such concern is the  
492 prospect of international destabilization caused by the  
493 consequences of global warming such as the loss of land area  
494 or the loss of water resources.

495 Mr. Chairman, as I have stated in previous hearings on  
496 this issue, we have a chance to start again to create  
497 adequate climate change research and development that we can  
498 help our world in the future. Political interference on this  
499 critical issue is unacceptable. We all live under the same  
500 skies. We are here today to investigate and resolve these  
501 allegations, and politics has no place in science.

502 Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back the  
503 rest of my time.

504 [Prepared statement of Ms. Watson follows:]

505 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

506 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. Watson.

507 Mr. Duncan?

508 Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

509 Richard Lindzen, who is a professor of atmospheric  
510 science at MIT, a few months ago wrote in the Wall Street  
511 Journal about what he called the alarmism and feeding frenzy  
512 surrounding the climate change/global warming debate, and he  
513 said this. He said, ``But there is a more sinister side to  
514 this feeding frenzy. Scientists who dissent from the  
515 alarmism have seen their grant funds disappear, their work  
516 derided and themselves libeled as industry stooges,  
517 scientific hacks or worse. Consequently, lies about climate  
518 change gain credence even when they fly in the face of the  
519 science that supposedly is their basis.''

520 Professor David Deming, a geophysicist said, ``The media  
521 hysteria on global warming has been generated by journalists  
522 who don't understand the provisional and uncertain nature of  
523 scientific knowledge. Science changes.''

524 Robert Bradley, President of the Institute for Energy  
525 Research, wrote this in the Washington Times. He said ``The  
526 emotional, politicized debate over global warming has  
527 produced a fire, ready, aim mentality despite great and still  
528 growing scientific uncertainty about the problem.''

529 He went on to say, he said, ``Still, climate alarmists  
530 demand a multitude of do-somethings to address the problem

531 | they are sure exist and is solvable. They pronounce the  
532 | debate over in their favor and call their critics names such  
533 | as deniers, as in Holocaust deniers. This has created a bad  
534 | climate for scientific research and for policymaking. In  
535 | fact, the debate is more than unsettled.''

536 | I appreciate your calling this hearing. This issue has  
537 | become very politicized and emotional. It appears that most  
538 | of those who support and say most of the alarmists about  
539 | global warming are people who are funded directly or  
540 | indirectly by the Federal Government. So we need to look  
541 | into these things and see what the real truth is in this  
542 | situation.

543 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

544 | [Prepared statement of Mr. Duncan follows:]

545 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*



546 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you for your comments.

547 Mr. Lynch?

548 Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to the  
549 Ranking Member for holding this hearing.

550 I am going to submit my official remarks in the interest  
551 of time to the record, but I do want to say thank you to the  
552 panelists for coming before this Committee and helping us  
553 with our work.

554 With all due respect to my colleague who spoke  
555 previously, this is not a hearing on alarmism or the quality  
556 and integrity of the information that has been delivered to  
557 the Congress and to the White House by the scientific  
558 community. This is a hearing that will investigate  
559 allegations that attorneys, not scientists, attorneys  
560 formerly employed by the American Petroleum Institute, edited  
561 scientific documents that were meant to alert the public and  
562 alert the Congress to the effects of global warming. This is  
563 a hearing that will look into whether or not that data, that  
564 information, that scientific information that we would rely  
565 upon was distorted by this White House. That is what we are  
566 investigating here.

567 We appreciate the courage of the panelists that have  
568 stepped forward to help Congress in making that decision.  
569 This is very troubling, not only in the sense that scientific  
570 data had been distorted and there had been an attempt to

571 | misinform the American people but also the concerted pattern  
572 | and practice of this White House to censor these scientists  
573 | has a chilling effect not only on these individuals but on a  
574 | wider scientific community.

575 |         We are here to exercise the right of the American people  
576 | to get the truth. That is what we are here for today. It is  
577 | not to debate the degree to which the atmosphere is warming  
578 | or the extent to which global warming will impact us over the  
579 | coming years and decades. This is really a question about  
580 | governmental integrity and whether we are partners with our  
581 | scientific community to protect the interests not only of the  
582 | American people but our partners around the world.

583 |         I appreciate that this Chairman has had the courage to  
584 | put this issue right out in front. It is the first hearing  
585 | of this Committee, and I think it sends a great message to  
586 | the American people and to the scientific community that the  
587 | work that they do is greatly appreciated and welcomed by this  
588 | Congress.

589 |         With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back the balance  
590 | of my time.

591 |         [Prepared statement of Mr. Lynch follows:]

592 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

593 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

594 Mr. Issa? Mr. Issa?

595 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I think he stepped out.

596 Mr. WAXMAN. Oh, he stepped out. Then we will go to Ms.  
597 Foxx.

598 Mr. Platts?

599 Mr. Gilchrest, okay.

600 Mr. GILCHREST. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just a very  
601 brief comment that is a little off topic but it sort of is  
602 relevant to this issue of whether or not there is enough  
603 scientific evidence to display for the Administration or  
604 anybody else that there is human activity causing the climate  
605 to change.

606 I would urge my colleagues to contact National  
607 Geographic. They have a genographic program where they have  
608 converged anthropologists and geneticists to see where your  
609 ancestors came from, and I participated in that, gave my DNA  
610 and the markers in my DNA went from here to Ireland to Spain  
611 all the way to Ethiopia about 50,000 years ago. The way they  
612 were able to do that, and by the way they spent about 5,000  
613 years in Iran about 35,000 years ago before they migrated  
614 further west.

615 The point is that there are DNA markers in human DNA  
616 that can actually be traced over millenniums back thousands  
617 and tens of thousands of years if we converge those two

618 | scientists, anthropologists and geneticists.

619 |         If we do the same thing with the atmosphere, we converge  
620 | meteorologists, atmospheric scientists with chemists and a  
621 | variety of other people, you can trace the markers in CO2 or  
622 | methane or any one of the other atmospheric gases back not  
623 | thousands of years but millions of years. When you look at  
624 | those markers, those radioactive isotopes, 800,000 years ago  
625 | to just today, you can tell where the CO2 comes from.

626 |         Does it come from a volcano? Does it come from  
627 | soybeans? Does it come from burning forests? They all  
628 | produce CO2. The markers, the distinctive markers, burning  
629 | gasoline produces a marker in the CO2 that is different from  
630 | the marker in CO2 coming out of volcanos.

631 |         The point is there is an extraordinary amount of science  
632 | that an individual, a member of Congress, for example,  
633 | pursuing an objective analysis can make a fairly quick  
634 | determination by talking to a variety of interests in the  
635 | scientific community to, yes, determine that the natural  
636 | range of fluctuation has been interrupted, disrupted in the  
637 | last hundred years to produce a huge increase in CO2 from  
638 | burning fossil fuel, and the markers are present there.

639 |         Is science 100 percent? There is a principle of  
640 | uncertainty that has been in the scientific community for  
641 | quite some time, and the principle of uncertainty is that  
642 | science is always working in the edge of the unknown. So a

643 | sense of tolerance to that result by us, I think, is pretty  
644 | vital.

645 | I really appreciate the fact that the Chairman and the  
646 | Ranking Member are holding this hearing today.

647 | Thank you.

648 | [Prepared statement of Mr. Gilchrest follows:]

649 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

650 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Gilchrest.

651 Mr. Higgins?

652 Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

653 I have no opening statement. I thank you for calling  
654 this hearing, and I look forward to the testimony of the  
655 expert panel that you have assembled.

656 [Prepared statement of Mr. Higgins follows:]

657 \*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

658 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

659 Mr. Braley?

660 Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman?

661 Mr. WAXMAN. Yes.

662 Mr. SALI. May I be recognized for an opening statement?

663 Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

664 Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Davis, it is a pleasure  
665 for me to join this distinguished Committee. I look forward  
666 to serving with you as we do what we have been charged with,  
667 to examine fairly and honestly Government programs, contracts  
668 and expenditures.

669 Today we begin these activities in the new Congress by  
670 reviewing the Administration's actions with respect to the  
671 study of global climate change, but as all of us know, the  
672 issue before us is not really climate change itself. It is  
673 whether the Bush Administration has manipulated facts,  
674 prevented scientific investigation or otherwise obstructed  
675 honest study of this critical issue.

676 Mr. Chairman, I must say that the idea the  
677 Administration has stifled inquiry and action is a bit hard  
678 for me to swallow. From 2001 through 2006, this  
679 Administration devoted more than \$25 billion to programs  
680 related to climate change, \$25 billion, and where I am from  
681 in Idaho, that is a pretty good chunk of change. In  
682 addition, in 2003 and 2004 alone, in part due to the

683 Administration policies, U.S. greenhouse gas intensity  
684 dropped by about 4.5 percent. In the 2005 Energy Bill, the  
685 Administration obtained \$5 billion in tax incentives over a  
686 five year period for what it calls, ``go clean energy systems  
687 and highly efficient vehicles, mandatory renewable fuel and  
688 energy efficiency standards.''

689 The Bush Administration's Advanced Energy Initiative is  
690 increasing by 22 percent Department of Energy research  
691 funding to help refine clean energy technologies to the point  
692 that they can be used effectively and at a modest price by  
693 ordinary Americans.

694 Mr. Chairman, these actions are not the hallmarks of an  
695 administration that is seeking to curtail research or force  
696 certain results. President Bush and his team are committed  
697 to serious, effective and practical research and action.  
698 They put a lot of Federal money where the public commitments  
699 have been made, a lot of money. This Administration has been  
700 working to safeguard our resources, reduce greenhouse gas  
701 emissions and at the same time help American manufacturing  
702 and mining and metal industries remain strong and competitive  
703 in the global marketplace.

704 To cripple our industrial sector in the name of  
705 environmental quality is not good public policy or good  
706 science. It is mere ideology, zealotry in the name of  
707 environmental extremism. The Bush Administration has taken a



708 | much more balanced course, and I applaud it.

709 |       Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the tenor of this  
710 | hearing, with the general approach we will be taking in the  
711 | next two years. I believe in oversight, in asking hard  
712 | questions and in demanding appropriate accountability, but  
713 | today's hearing seems less about finding answers than making  
714 | an argument. I hope that perception is incorrect or if it is  
715 | accurate, I hope it is not a foretaste of a partisan  
716 | contention that will be cloaked as oversight.

717 |       Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

718 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Sali follows:]

719 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

720 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

721 Mr. Braley?

722 Mr. BRALEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you,  
723 Ranking Member Davis, for giving us the opportunity to  
724 discuss these important issues today.

725 With all respect to my distinguished colleague from  
726 Idaho, I think that one of the biggest problems that we have  
727 right now with the Bush Administration is captured in this  
728 Congress Daily A.M. headline, Panel Steamed Over Withheld  
729 Documents, which focuses on respect for the rule of law,  
730 respect for the jurisdiction of this Committee and the  
731 deliberate withholding of information requested over a six  
732 month period in a bipartisan spirit, not just by this  
733 Committee Chair but by the former Chair and the Ranking  
734 Member, and that sets a tone that I think should cause us all  
735 concern about the impact that the Administration is having on  
736 the conduct of oversight in this Congress.

737 I have a portrait in my office of one of my heroes,  
738 Clarence Darrow, someone who stood up for the integrity of  
739 the scientific inquiry and academic freedom and stood up for  
740 accountability and the rule of fact over fiction. I had the  
741 great privilege of graduating from the Iowa State University  
742 of Science and Technology where the first digital computing  
743 system was invented, and one of the things I know is that  
744 people who work in an academic environment need to have

745 | assurances that their inquiries will be free from political  
746 | influence. That is what distinguishes us from other  
747 | countries around the world and gives us the opportunity to  
748 | make great advances as we have seen over the entire history  
749 | of this Country.

750 |         One of the things I also know is that the Federal court  
751 | system has set up a gatekeeping system to make sure that  
752 | testimony presented in a court of law has the credibility of  
753 | scientific inquiry behind it. Things like making sure that  
754 | those scientific theories have been tested through peer  
755 | review journals is an indication of what stands for academic  
756 | freedom, stands for preservation of the integrity of the  
757 | scientific process and the free marketplace of ideas. We  
758 | need to get back to that system. We need to diminish the  
759 | role of politics so that our scientists have the ability to  
760 | give us the great discoveries we have come to depend upon  
761 | them in making this Country the place that it is.

762 |         I look forward to working with the Committee, and I also  
763 | want to comment on how much appreciation I have for our  
764 | witnesses today. I know what it is like to represent clients  
765 | who have sat in your shoes. It doesn't take a lot of courage  
766 | to sit back here and make comments and ask questions. It  
767 | takes a tremendous amount of courage to sit where you are,  
768 | and we appreciate your willingness to come and share your  
769 | thoughts with us.

770 I yield back the remainder of my time.

771 [Prepared statement of Mr. Braley follows:]

772 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

773 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Braley.

774 Mr. Issa?

775 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

776 I too want to echo earlier remarks that this has been a  
777 Committee that on a bipartisan basis has been frustrated by  
778 an inability, not just in this area but in a number of areas,  
779 to get the kind of candid response and respect for the  
780 oversight responsibility of the Congress. I certainly hope  
781 today that this hearing will deal with the facts as to  
782 whether or not oversight is going to be properly done and  
783 respected in the future, and I say so for a couple of  
784 reasons.

785 First of all, I think that the people out in the  
786 hinterland watching this, even the people in the gallery here  
787 today, understand that global warming is not a secret hidden  
788 from the American people by the Government. Certainly, Mr.  
789 Sali said it very well. There have been huge amounts of  
790 money, huge amounts of awareness as to global warming. There  
791 is a debate going on as to what part the human being plays in  
792 it and how much of it is simply us coming out of a mini ice  
793 age, and I believe good science should be used, employed,  
794 paid for and deliver us answers so that we can make  
795 intelligent decisions.

796 Additionally, this Committee in the last Congress spent  
797 a lot of time through our oversight hearings, realizing that

798 CO2 was only going to be beat by non-CO2 products which  
799 includes nuclear, a subject that often is by the same people  
800 who insist on ending global warming is also rejected. I am  
801 hoping we can do that and more.

802 I do recognize that this is a highly charged political  
803 subject, but it is my sincere hope that this Committee will  
804 continue working on a bipartisan basis to recognize that as  
805 Presidents come and go, as Congresses change from one side to  
806 the other side having the Chairman's gavel, that this  
807 Committee has an ongoing responsibility, we take it seriously  
808 and we expect to get answers to our questions from whomever  
809 occupies the Oval Office or more specifically by the  
810 bureaucrats who stay there throughout one administration  
811 after another and tend to resist. That is what we are here,  
812 I hope, today to do is to recognize that it is time for us to  
813 assert our oversight role and insist on it.

814 With that, I yield back and thank the Chairman.

815 [Prepared statement of Mr. Issa follows:]

816 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

817 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa.

818 Ms. Norton?

819 Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this hearing,  
820 but I am sure that millions of Americans thank you for this  
821 hearing. I appreciate that you have made this your first  
822 hearing. So far as I know, it is the first hearing on global  
823 warming to be held in the House this session, and I know you  
824 have not simply gone down a list and picked this one out.

825 This issue, the fate of the planet itself, simply has no  
826 rival in importance. Because the issue has somehow in our  
827 Country become controversial--I am not sure that is true in  
828 most advanced countries--such a hearing might be perceived as  
829 blame-laying, but the reason for this hearing for Congress is  
830 surely to make sure that actions are taken and that  
831 information is not ever again suppressed. We need to be full  
832 speed ahead on this one. The elements that comprise global  
833 warming have a huge head start on this hearing.

834 Mr. Chairman, the independence of church and state is  
835 gospel in our Country. Well, the independence of science  
836 from politics ought to be the same in Government. We have  
837 the best science in the world. Its word has always been its  
838 bond. When we consider the dangers to public health and to  
839 the planet itself, the politicization of science is itself a  
840 catastrophe that simply must be avoided.

841 Apparently, there had been one peer study, over against

842 | the hundreds, that said there wasn't global warming, but this  
843 | Administration chose to side with those who said no. There  
844 | were no nuances apparent in its view.

845 |         At the moment, the Administration is defending in the  
846 | Supreme Court of the United States, the position that CO2 is  
847 | not covered by the Clean Air Act. Without getting into the  
848 | technicalities, that takes a huge stretch if you know  
849 | anything about the Act. Now the courts have to decide the  
850 | issue, and if I know the courts, they will try to find some  
851 | procedural way to avoid a scientific issue that shouldn't be  
852 | there and shouldn't be in politics at all.

853 |         We do not have the luxury, Mr. Chairman, of making up  
854 | for lost time on this one. We have done that historically:  
855 | disregard the losses; there will be more where that came  
856 | from. Already, my great fear is that it is too late when you  
857 | see glaciers melting. I know of no science that is likely to  
858 | refreeze the glaciers or to reproduce their majesty.

859 |         Mr. Chairman, I live and hope and only hope it is not  
860 | already too late as I thank you again for this hearing.

861 |         [Prepared statement of Ms. Norton follows:]

862 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*



863 | Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Ms. Norton.

864 | Ms. McCollum?

865 | Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your  
866 | leadership on this important issue.

867 | I would also like to express my appreciation to the  
868 | witnesses with us here today for their efforts in calling  
869 | attention to the disturbing pattern of interference and abuse  
870 | of science surrounding global climate change. I applaud each  
871 | of you for having the courage to have your voice heard.

872 | In my home State of Minnesota, we are uniquely affected  
873 | by changing climate patterns because of our geography. We  
874 | are at the intersection of three major ecosystems. Minnesota  
875 | and Minnesotans are experiencing the effects of climate  
876 | change, and my constituents are demanding action. Global  
877 | climate change is one of the greatest challenges facing this  
878 | Nation. We know that meaningful solutions will demand  
879 | unprecedented cooperation, innovation, commitment and  
880 | urgency.

881 | Over the past six years, enormous scientific consensus  
882 | supporting the reality of global climate change did not fit  
883 | the Administration's agenda. As we have seen in other  
884 | situations when reality doesn't fit the script, the White  
885 | House rewrites reality to fit the script. Tragically, the  
886 | Bush Administration has led an effort to suppress and distort  
887 | the science of global warming while providing protection and

888 | ensuring massive profits for the petroleum industry.

889 |       Is this why the Bush Administration feels so threatened  
890 | by the issue of climate change that it engages in a  
891 | calculated campaign to manipulate scientific documents and  
892 | intimidate science? What justification does the  
893 | Administration give us for these actions?

894 |       Congress has the responsibility and the duty to find the  
895 | answers as to why the Administration officials acted as they  
896 | did, but the impacts of the Administration's interference  
897 | with the science of global climate change are already known.  
898 | It is undermined the integrity of numerous Federal agencies.  
899 | It has recklessly harmed the careers of many respected  
900 | professionals. It has delayed popular consensus on the need  
901 | to take action against global warming. I fear America will  
902 | look back on the bush Administration as the lost years: lost  
903 | talent, lost time, lost solutions.

904 |       While there is a need for science in the realm of  
905 | political debate, we must fiercely guard against the  
906 | intrusion of politics into scientific research and discovery,  
907 | and that is why today's hearing is an essential first step.  
908 | Through transparency, we will find accountability. Through  
909 | accountability, we will create a new and higher standard, one  
910 | in which science is required and the science that is given to  
911 | the American people is correct and accurate.

912 |       Thank you, Mr. Chair.

913 [Prepared statement of Ms. McCollum follows:]

914 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

915 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Ms. McCollum.

916 Mr. Cooper?

917 Mr. COOPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

918 First, for the record, I would like to take note of a  
919 recent book called The Republican War on Science by Chris  
920 Mooney. It is excellent reading. I can't help but note it  
921 has a blurb on the back from our distinguished Chairman  
922 recommending that people read it.

923 Second, let me mention a dinner party I attended about  
924 two months ago here in Washington. The honoree was John  
925 Negroponte who was then the Director of National  
926 Intelligence. He was there to receive an environmental award.

927 It was very interesting because in anticipation of his  
928 remarks, words slipped through the crowd that he was not  
929 allowed to utter the words, global warming, at least not in  
930 the same sentence. Apparently, he was allowed to say the  
931 word, global, in a separate sentence and warming in a  
932 separate sentence, but not together. It sort of became a  
933 little parlor game during his remarks to see how closely he  
934 would fit the words, global and warming and not incur the  
935 wrath of the White House.

936 I thought this was a sad statement of the current  
937 condition of our scientific community when a top and very  
938 eminent statesman like John Negroponte would be so hamstrung  
939 by the Administration that he would not be allowed to utter

940 | the two words in conjunction. I thought that was an  
941 | indignity to Mr. Negroponte and a sad comment on the level of  
942 | the Bush Administration to so hamstring its talented and  
943 | capable appointees. Sadly, this is an effort on the part of  
944 | the Administration that has been going on for a long time.

945 |       Another must read book is by Christine Todd Whitman, the  
946 | former EPA Administrator, entitled It's My Party Too. In  
947 | this book, she chronicles how President Bush promised in the  
948 | campaign to do something about carbon emissions, then  
949 | reversed his promise at the urging of four Republican  
950 | Senators who were named in the book: Chuck Hagel, Jesse  
951 | Helms, Larry Craig and Pat Roberts. This reversal took place  
952 | while Christine Todd Whitman was negotiating on behalf of the  
953 | United States in Trieste in Europe. So before she flew back,  
954 | her legs were completely cut out from underneath her,  
955 | embarrassing America and undercutting science in our  
956 | community.

957 |       This is not a Democratic diatribe. This is a Bush  
958 | cabinet official's memoirs. What a sad condition our Country  
959 | has fallen into.

960 |       I commend the scientists who have testified today. I am  
961 | sorry I was not able to be here for your entire testimony,  
962 | but I look forward to reading it in detail.

963 |       I thank the Chair.

964 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Cooper follows:]

965 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

966 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

967 Mr. Hodes?

968 Mr. HODES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling this  
969 hearing.

970 In New Hampshire, we talk a lot about the weather, and  
971 folks where I come from notice that the weather is changing.  
972 We don't have a lot of snow this year. But we are not here  
973 to talk about the weather, and we are not here to talk about  
974 money spent or unspent. We are here to investigate rank  
975 political abuse.

976 We live in an information age. When we as a Nation and  
977 as global citizens face rapidly changing climatic conditions,  
978 the integrity of scientific research is critical to wise  
979 policymaking.

980 Before coming to Congress, I read numerous articles  
981 documenting concerns about the interference by the Bush  
982 Administration with the conclusions of Government scientists.  
983 Allowing politics to trump science is dangerous business.  
984 Disinformation was once thought of as a fictional Orwellian  
985 construct. If it has happened here, we need to bring it out  
986 in the open and help restore good scientific practices  
987 without fear of retaliation, reprisal and control by  
988 political officials.

989 The American people need good data and good science, not  
990 disinformation. If we are to effectively address global

991 | warming and make the right policy decisions, we need science  
992 | unimpeded by political concerns.

993 |       I thank the panelists for appearing. It takes courage  
994 | to come and tell the truth, but the American people want it,  
995 | they need it and, as members of Congress, we expect it. So,  
996 | thank you very much.

997 |       I yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

998 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Hodes follows:]

999 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*



1000 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you for your statement.

1001 Mr. Murphy?

1002 Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1003 Mr. Chairman, on my walk to the Capitol this morning, I  
1004 passed a line of cherry trees that up until a few weeks ago  
1005 had been blooming. Frankly, the sight of a cherry tree in  
1006 the middle of winter, blooming, concerns me and a lot of us  
1007 very deeply. I know why the tree was blooming. The high  
1008 temperature on the first of December was 75 degrees. The  
1009 high on the sixth of January was 70 degrees and 67 on the  
1010 15th. Whether this is an anomaly of the season or a sign of a  
1011 trend, I don't know, but today it feels like winter and I am  
1012 pretty relieved.

1013 There is unequivocal scientific evidence that the earth  
1014 is warming due to human activities, specifically to the  
1015 release of carbon dioxide emissions in the air. One would  
1016 think that given these facts, the President would appoint  
1017 someone amongst the talented pool of scientists in this  
1018 Country to look into the question. But proving once again  
1019 that this President never misses an opportunity to miss an  
1020 opportunity.

1021 Who does he appoint? A lawyer with no scientific  
1022 training, a former oil industry lobbyist whose primary  
1023 responsibility on certain days seemed to be disproving the  
1024 link between greenhouse gases and the companies he was

1025 | representing.

1026 |       If you look at the EPA's web site on climate change, you  
1027 | will read ``that a causal link between the build-up of  
1028 | greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and the observed climate  
1029 | change during the 20th Century cannot be unequivocally  
1030 | established.'' Given the data that this Committee, Mr.  
1031 | Chairman, has uncovered into the Bush Administration's  
1032 | political interference in the scientific community, we should  
1033 | not be surprised.

1034 |       I thank the panel for having the courage to be here with  
1035 | us today. I look forward to your testimony, and I yield back  
1036 | the balance of my time.

1037 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Murphy follows:]

1038 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1039 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

1040 Mr. Sarbanes?

1041 Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank  
1042 you for holding this hearing today on the science of global  
1043 climate change. This is the first substantive hearing I have  
1044 had the opportunity to participate in as a newly elected  
1045 member of this body, and I believe the subject matter could  
1046 not be more appropriate.

1047 In my own State of Maryland and especially within the  
1048 Third Congressional District, we have a strong tradition of  
1049 environmental advocacy rooted in a passion for the Chesapeake  
1050 Bay, but the Chesapeake Bay, which is our Nation's largest  
1051 estuary, does not escape the consequences of global warming.  
1052 In fact, as a result of global warming, sea levels in the  
1053 Chesapeake Bay area have risen at alarming levels over the  
1054 last 100 years. If continued unchecked, this phenomenon will  
1055 cause entire bay islands to be submerged and destroy diverse  
1056 plant and wildlife habitat across the bay watershed. Such a  
1057 calamity would have a profound environmental and ecological  
1058 impact but would also devastate Maryland's tourism and  
1059 seafood industries.

1060 The scope of the challenge of global warming is  
1061 international, but its impact on people in communities can be  
1062 seen in how it has affected areas like the Chesapeake Bay  
1063 region. Likewise, change must begin by examining our own

1064 | personal behaviors and our own National energy policy which  
1065 | overwhelmingly depends on fossil fuels. Promoting change  
1066 | will be difficulty, however, if the Administration continues  
1067 | its systematic effort to understate the threat of global  
1068 | warming.

1069 |       Mr. Chairman, effective and responsive governance at all  
1070 | levels depends on receiving accurate and timely information.  
1071 | All too often, this Administration has disregarded or in some  
1072 | cases suppressed information that does not support its  
1073 | particular ideological or political agenda. We have seen  
1074 | this pattern in the run-up to the Iraq War, in the crafting  
1075 | of the Medicare prescription drug legislation and, as is  
1076 | being demonstrated today, in the approach to global climate  
1077 | change.

1078 |       Today's hearing marks the beginning of a march back to  
1079 | fact-based decision-making at the highest levels of our  
1080 | Government.

1081 |       Mr. Chairman, thank you for your efforts to illuminate  
1082 | the true science of global climate change. I look forward to  
1083 | working with my colleagues to address this problem in a  
1084 | meaningful way. Today's hearing is not just about preserving  
1085 | our natural climate. It is about preserving the climate for  
1086 | open and honest scientific research and discussion.

1087 |       Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1088 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Sarbanes follows:]

1089 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1090 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sarbanes.

1091 Mr. Welch?

1092 Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1093 For decades, the issues of climate change has focused on  
1094 debate about science, and today the overwhelming scientific  
1095 research shows that global warming is real, it is urgent and  
1096 it requires immediate action. That consensus has not always  
1097 been present with only a shrinking minority remaining as  
1098 skeptics, but more often than not that skepticism has been  
1099 driven by politics or economic motivations, not the facts.  
1100 We have learned that outspoken scientists dedicated to  
1101 following the facts where they lead have had their sound  
1102 conclusions altered by those motivated by politics, not the  
1103 truth, and scientists at eh seven agencies that study climate  
1104 change have reported such widespread abuses.

1105 Politically-motivated suppression of science is not only  
1106 irresponsible but highlights a careless and reckless  
1107 disregard for the public that all of us are here to serve.  
1108 We have an opportunity to investigate that because it is  
1109 critically important to our future. The true test of  
1110 leadership for scientists, for people in politics is an  
1111 ability to face directly the realities that are often times  
1112 difficult. To help us do that, we need honest scientific  
1113 conclusions.

1114 I applaud the gentlemen who are here today to testify

1115 | and provide us with their best scientific evidence.

1116 |       Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield the balance of my  
1117 | time.

1118 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Welch follows:]

1119 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1120 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Welch.

1121 Mr. Yarmuth?

1122 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1123 I am anxious to hear the witnesses, so I would like to  
1124 submit my prepared remarks for the record.

1125 But I would just like to add that one thing I think we  
1126 all can agree on is that in the area of global climate  
1127 change, the Government, the Federal Government, has a  
1128 critical role to play. Therefore, when it speaks, it has to  
1129 speak with complete authority and credibility, and that can  
1130 only be achieved if it is unduly influenced by personal  
1131 political agendas or by the agenda of special interests. I  
1132 think these hearings can contribute to a large extent to  
1133 creating that degree of credibility when the Government does  
1134 speak on climate change, and I commend the Chairman for  
1135 organizing these hearings.

1136 I yield back.

1137 [Prepared statement of Mr. Yarmuth follows:]

1138 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*



1139 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Yarmuth.

1140 Mr. Kucinich?

1141 Mr. KUCINICH. I thank the Chair for holding this  
1142 hearing. One has to ask: do you have to be a scientist to  
1143 know that there is something quite unusual going on with our  
1144 global climate? Do you have to be a member of Congress to  
1145 understand it?

1146 All over the world, people have seen the effects of  
1147 global climate change: the intensity of storms, the frequency  
1148 of droughts, the destruction of crops, rising sea levels,  
1149 changes in migration patterns. I don't need a scientist to  
1150 tell me this is happening because I see it myself.

1151 The problem comes when you get scientists who tell you  
1152 something that is different from what you are seeing with  
1153 your own eyes. Why do we even get trapped into that type of  
1154 thinking?

1155 Remember the long parade of witnesses who used to come  
1156 in front of Congressional committees, generations ago and put  
1157 TV commercials on the air that would tell people smoking was  
1158 good for them. It was glamorous, sexy. That was backed by  
1159 science.

1160 Today we have a planet that is smoking, and we are told  
1161 that, don't worry, be happy. Yet we have seen scientific  
1162 evidence presented and then subverted by this Administration.  
1163 We paid for the scientific studies, and then when the studies

1164 | come forward, they are dismissed. We are not even getting  
1165 | what we are paying for.

1166 |         We are all citizens of the same planet, at least we  
1167 | would hope we are. We have a common destiny. We should  
1168 | share common concerns about the stability of the global  
1169 | climate and act to protect our planet. We need to challenge  
1170 | the type of thinking which separates us from our natural  
1171 | environment.

1172 |         Almost 30 years ago, a philosopher by the name of Morris  
1173 | Berman wrote a book called The Reenchantment of the World,  
1174 | who talked about the fundamental problem which comes from  
1175 | when human beings separate themselves from the very  
1176 | environment in which they breath in, in which they drink in.  
1177 | That type of thinking, that us versus them type of thinking,  
1178 | that dichotomist type thinking not only separates us from  
1179 | each other, but it is a precursor of war itself.

1180 |         This hearing becomes important when we understand our  
1181 | common aspirations to aspire to a stable global climate,  
1182 | about our common concerns which should be expressed, about  
1183 | great fluctuations in temperatures and the regular weather  
1184 | patterns. These changes in weather patterns, the more intense  
1185 | storms including hurricanes, Hurricane Katrina, ought to  
1186 | cause us to seek out scientists who are free to give us their  
1187 | best advice.

1188 |         There is substantial scientific certainty about climate

1189 | change. Scientists are confident that global warming is  
1190 | happening. The vast majority of experts on the issue agree  
1191 | that human activities are to blame. I mean this is a call  
1192 | for leadership which unites the American people in taking a  
1193 | new direction for not just energy conservation but the  
1194 | development of alternative energies, green energies. But  
1195 | what happens is because scientific information is brought  
1196 | forward which disputes global climate change, the kind of  
1197 | massive unity that we need to take a new direction is slowed.

1198 |       I thank the Chair for holding this hearing and for his  
1199 | consistent leadership over the years to reclaim human  
1200 | dignity. Thank you.

1201 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Kucinich follows:]

1202 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1203 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your testimony.

1204 Unfortunately, one of the glitches of this hearing today  
1205 is that that green light seems to be on forever even if the  
1206 time is expired. We will try to work that out, but at least  
1207 we stopped the static for everyone.

1208 Mr. KUCINICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Everywhere I go  
1209 in life, there is a green light. I appreciate that.

1210 [Laughter.]

1211 Mr. WAXMAN. To close out the opening statements, I want  
1212 to call on the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Van Hollen.

1213 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you  
1214 for your leadership in this very important issue.

1215 I think we can all agree that everybody is entitled to  
1216 their own opinions, but not everybody is entitled to their  
1217 own facts. We as a Nation invest billions of dollars every  
1218 year in scientific research, whether it is at NIH, whether it  
1219 is at EPA, whether it is at NOAA, and that is an investment  
1220 made by the taxpayers and that investment is only as good as  
1221 the reliability of the science that comes from that  
1222 investment.

1223 That is why it is essential that the science that we do  
1224 as a Federal Government is done free from political  
1225 interference because if facts become twisted by the politics,  
1226 then that is money wasted, taxpayer money wasted. I am  
1227 afraid that over the past many years we have seen that kind

1228 | of political interference. We all know of political science  
1229 | as one realm of inquiry. Under this Administration,  
1230 | unfortunately, much more of science has become political  
1231 | science, and it is not just in the area of global climate  
1232 | change although that has been exhibit A.

1233 |         Here on Capitol Hill, the tone with respect to that  
1234 | debate was set by people like one of our colleagues on the  
1235 | Senate side who used to chair the Senate Environment and  
1236 | Public Works Committee, Senator Inhofe, who said, ``Global  
1237 | warming is the greatest hoax ever perpetuated on the American  
1238 | people.``

1239 |         This Congress in the past and the Administration helped  
1240 | set the tone at the top that was placed over our scientists,  
1241 | our public servants who do this work day by day, trying to  
1242 | get at the right answers. The result has been a twisting of  
1243 | the science, not just in the area of global climate change.

1244 |         The Government Reform Committee looked at this question  
1245 | when it came to mercury control and regulations. In fact,  
1246 | the Inspector General, the independent Inspector General at  
1247 | the EPA found just more than a year ago that there had been  
1248 | interference through the political process on the science of  
1249 | mercury poisoning, the development of regulations in that  
1250 | area. This has been a problem endemic from the top in this  
1251 | Administration.

1252 |         I represent a lot of Federal employees. I happen to

1253 represent a district that includes NIH, that includes NOAA,  
1254 that includes the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, many others.  
1255 Those are good people who are just trying to do their work  
1256 and get at the facts and get the science for the benefit of  
1257 the American people. I can tell you when I am able to talk  
1258 to them one on one, when the political minders are not  
1259 around, they tell me about the chilling effect from the top  
1260 on the work that is done and on the influence that is brought  
1261 to bear from the top on their work. I think it is high time  
1262 that we had a thaw in that chilling influence, and I think  
1263 this hearing and this new day on Capitol Hill is part of  
1264 setting that new tone.

1265 Science should be fact-driven. We should not be driven  
1266 by the political vagaries of any Administration, whether it  
1267 be Republican or Democrat. I think that is the message that  
1268 we want to send to the good people in our Government who are  
1269 working every day on behalf of the American people to get the  
1270 answers.

1271 Mr. Chairman, let me just close on this. Yesterday  
1272 evening, we had a hearing in Montgomery County, a bipartisan  
1273 hearing, on legislation that has been proposed in the  
1274 Congress on mental health and insurance coverage for mental  
1275 health. Congressman Patrick Kennedy and Congressman Jim  
1276 Ramstad, Democrat and Republican, had been going around the  
1277 Country on these issues.

1278 We invited a member, a representative from the National  
1279 Institutes of Mental Health to testify, and that individual  
1280 wanted to testify and two weeks ago was preparing testimony.  
1281 We asked them only for their testimony on the science, mental  
1282 health issues, the science of the brain. We weren't asking  
1283 them to take a position on the legislation. We wanted to  
1284 hear about the science. They were prepared to come.

1285 Yesterday just before we had the hearing, they were  
1286 notified by their political minders at NIH that they could  
1287 not come to a hearing attended by members of Congress,  
1288 Republicans and Democrats alike.

1289 It seems to me if the people in this Country are making  
1290 the kind of investment they are at NIH, that we should be  
1291 able to have the benefit of their testimony, whether that  
1292 hearing is held here in the United States Congress by members  
1293 of the Committee or in our districts, especially when the  
1294 representative from NIH is an expert in the field and leader  
1295 in the field and was eager to testify. It is just another  
1296 example, it seems to me, of the politics getting in the way  
1297 of allowing our public servants to inform the public about  
1298 the best results from their scientific inquiry.

1299 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing. I  
1300 thank the witnesses for being here.

1301 [Prepared statement of Mr. Van Hollen follows:]

1302 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*



1303 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Van Hollen.

1304 I thank all the members for their opening statements.

1305 We are now going to hear from the witnesses who have  
1306 been described as courageous, but I also want to describe  
1307 them as patient. Let me introduce the witnesses.

1308 We have Dr. Francesca Grifo, Senior Scientist and  
1309 Director of the Union of Concerned Scientists, Scientific  
1310 Integrity Program. She has over 20 years of experience  
1311 directing science-based projects and programs. She holds a  
1312 Ph.D. in botany from Cornell University.

1313 Rick Piltz is the Director of Climate Science Watch, a  
1314 program that aims to hold public officials accountable for  
1315 using climate research with integrity and effectiveness in  
1316 addressing the challenge of global climate change. From  
1317 April, 1995 until March, 2005, Mr. Piltz worked at the U.S.  
1318 Climate Change Science Program where he coordinated  
1319 scientific research on climate change.

1320 Dr. Drew Shindell is an atmospheric physicist who  
1321 studies climate change in atmospheric physics. He has worked  
1322 at NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies for the last 12  
1323 years. In 2004, Scientific American Magazine named Dr.  
1324 Shindell one of the top 50 scientists in the Country.

1325 Dr. Roger Pielke is a political scientist who has been  
1326 on the faculty of the University of Colorado since 2001. He  
1327 is a professor in the Environmental Studies Program and a

1328 fellow of the Cooperative Institute for Research in the  
1329 Environmental Sciences.

1330 It is our practice in this Committee to swear in, so if  
1331 you would please rise, I would like to administer the oath.

1332 [Witnesses sworn.]

1333 Mr. WAXMAN. The record will note that each witness  
1334 answered in the affirmative.

1335 I would like to ask each of the witnesses to give a  
1336 brief summary of their testimony, to keep this summary under  
1337 five minutes duration. Unfortunately, that light may not  
1338 tell you when the five minutes is up, but I will let you know  
1339 when the five minutes is up and then we would appreciate a  
1340 concluding statement. Your written testimony that has been  
1341 submitted in advance will be made part of the record in full.

1342 We thank you for being here.

1343 Dr. Grifo, why don't we start with you.

1344 STATEMENTS OF FRANCESCA GRIFO, SENIOR SCIENTIST AND DIRECTOR  
1345 OF THE SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY PROGRAM, UNION OF CONCERNED  
1346 SCIENTISTS; RICK PILTZ, FORMER SENIOR ASSOCIATE, U.S. CLIMATE  
1347 CHANGE SCIENCE PROGRAM; DREW SHINDELL, GODDARD INSTITUTE FOR  
1348 SPACE STUDIES, NATIONAL AERODYNAMICS AND SPACE  
1349 ADMINISTRATION; ROGER PIELKE, JR., PROFESSOR, ENVIRONMENTAL  
1350 STUDIES PROGRAM, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AND FELLOW,  
1351 COOPERATIVE INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL  
1352 SCIENCES

1353 STATEMENT OF FRANCESCA GRIFO

1354 Ms. GRIFO. Good morning, and thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
1355 members of the Committee for the opportunity to be here and  
1356 address you. I come representing the Union of Concerned  
1357 Scientists and scientists across the Country.

1358 Political interference is harming Federal science and  
1359 threatening the health and safety of Americans. Over 1,800  
1360 Federal scientists from multiple agencies have reported  
1361 concerns. Six hundred and ninety-nine scientists, that is 39  
1362 percent of our respondents across nine agencies have reported  
1363 that they fear retaliation for openly expressing their  
1364 concerns about mission-driven work of their agencies.

1365           Four hundred and thirty-two scientists from five  
1366 agencies reported that they were not able to publish work in  
1367 peer review journals if it did not adhere to agency policies.  
1368       That was 25 percent of our respondents.

1369           From the report we are releasing today, 150 Federal  
1370 climate scientists report personally experiencing at least  
1371 one incident of political interference in the past five years  
1372 for a total of at least 435 incidents.

1373           All branches of Government must have access to  
1374 independent scientific advice. The thousands of scientists  
1375 in the employ of the Federal Government represent a  
1376 tremendous resource. We need strong action to restore  
1377 integrity to Federal science in order to be prepared to face  
1378 the complex challenges ahead of us.

1379           The Union of Concerned Scientists has documented scores  
1380 of examples of such abuses in our online A to Z Guide to  
1381 Political Interference in Science. This interference can  
1382 take many forms from censorship and suppression of Federal  
1383 science to dissemination of inaccurate scientific results and  
1384 science-based information to the manipulation of scientific  
1385 advice. Over 11,000 scientists including 52 Nobel laureates  
1386 and numerous other luminaries and science advisors to both  
1387 Republican and Democratic presidents dating back to the  
1388 Eisenhower Administration have signed our statement calling  
1389 for a restoration of scientific integrity.

1390 Our investigations demonstrate that the problem goes  
1391 deeper than just the high profile incidents and includes new  
1392 examples from NOAA and NASA as well as the voices of hundreds  
1393 of climate scientists from seven Federal agencies. Our  
1394 investigations found high quality science struggling to get  
1395 out. Nearly half of all respondents perceived or personally  
1396 experienced pressure to eliminate the words, climate change,  
1397 global warming or other similar terms from a variety of  
1398 communications. Forty-three percent personally experienced  
1399 or perceived changes or edits during the review of documents  
1400 that changed the meaning of scientific findings.

1401 Barriers to communication hinder our National ability to  
1402 prepare and respond to protect future generations from the  
1403 consequences of global warming. Our investigation uncovered  
1404 numerous examples of public affairs officers at Federal  
1405 agencies taking an active role in regulating communications  
1406 between agency scientists and the media, in effect, serving  
1407 as gatekeepers for scientific information. We found agency  
1408 climate scientists who had their press inquiries routed to  
1409 other scientists whose views more closely matched  
1410 Administration policy and who routinely encountered  
1411 difficulty in obtaining approval for official press releases.

1412 Two-thirds of respondents said that today's environment for  
1413 Federal Government climate research is worse compared with  
1414 five years ago and ten years ago. Both scientists and

1415 | journalists report that restrictive media policies and  
1416 | practices have hampered the communication between Government  
1417 | scientists and the news media. This limits the extent to  
1418 | which new scientific findings can enter the public and policy  
1419 | debate.

1420 |         The report includes a model media policy which  
1421 | encompasses the following: whistleblower protections,  
1422 | Congress must act to protect scientists who speak out when  
1423 | they see interference or suppression of science and all  
1424 | agency policies must affirmatively educate their employees of  
1425 | their rights under these statutes.

1426 |         Scientific freedoms, Federal scientists have a  
1427 | constitutional right to speak about any subject, so long as  
1428 | the scientists make clear that they do so in their private  
1429 | capacity. Scientists must also have a right of last review  
1430 | on agency communications related to their research.

1431 |         Scientific openness, scientists should not be subject to  
1432 | restrictions on media contacts beyond a policy of informing  
1433 | public affairs officials in advance of an interview and  
1434 | summarizing the interaction for them afterwards. Federal  
1435 | agencies should support the free exchange of scientific  
1436 | information in all venues.

1437 |         I just want to close with a quote from a NASA scientist  
1438 | from our survey. ``Civil survey scientists and engineers can  
1439 | and should be an unbiased reservoir of insights into

1440 | different questions. If we can't be trusted to give insights  
1441 | on global change and funded to do so, who in the world will  
1442 | do it?''

1443 | Thank you.

1444 | [Prepared statement of Ms. Grifo follows:]

1445 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1446 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your testimony.

1447 Before calling on Mr. Piltz, I understand that in order  
1448 to get the timer to register on the front table, there needs  
1449 to be an adjustment and we are going to have one of our  
1450 people make that adjustment. I understand there may be a  
1451 loud pop, so please don't get excited.

1452 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, it took us most of those 12  
1453 years to get that working right, so good luck.

1454 Mr. WAXMAN. Well, we are going to do it in one minute,  
1455 we hope.

1456 [Laughter.]

1457 Mr. WAXMAN. If not, we expect to have 12 years to work  
1458 on it, at least.

1459 Mr. Piltz, we will now hear from you. We welcome you  
1460 here.

1461 Let me, just for housekeeping purposes, ask unanimous  
1462 consent that all of the statements submitted by our witnesses  
1463 will be made part of the record. Without objection, that  
1464 will be the order.

1465 Mr. Piltz?



1466 STATEMENT OF RICK PILTZ

1467 Mr. PILTZ. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Davis, members  
1468 of the Committee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to  
1469 present testimony at this hearing, and there is considerable  
1470 more detail in my written testimony.

1471 I endorse all of the conclusions and recommendations in  
1472 the Joint Union of Concerns Scientists Government  
1473 Accountability Project Report and to complement that, my  
1474 testimony will focus on the Administration's treatment of the  
1475 National Assessment of Climate Change Impacts and the problem  
1476 of the White House Council on Environmental Quality.

1477 From April, 1995 until March, 2005, I worked in the  
1478 Coordination Office of what is now called the U.S. Climate  
1479 Change Science Program, the Federal multi-agency Federal  
1480 program that supports the scientific research on climate and  
1481 associated global environmental change. I had various  
1482 responsibilities and worked on many projects during those 10  
1483 years. I worked directly with the agency leadership and with  
1484 the senior professional staff in the Coordination Office.

1485 One key ongoing project for which I was responsible  
1486 involved coordinating the development of and editing nine  
1487 editions of the annual report to Congress, Our Changing  
1488 Planet, which represents the government-wide research

1489 program. In doing that, I would compile and edit into  
1490 accessible language the contributions of about 90 scientists  
1491 and science program managers in the Federal agencies and  
1492 labs. Those reports were carefully reviewed and vetted and  
1493 signed off on by the Agency experts, and then they would go  
1494 to the Executive Office of the President for final editing  
1495 and the review and clearance before publication.

1496       During the 2001-2005 timeframe, I came increasingly to  
1497 the conclusion that the Administration was acting to impede  
1498 forthright communication of the state of climate science and  
1499 its implications for society and that the politicization of  
1500 climate science communication by the current Administration  
1501 was undermining the credibility and integrity of the Climate  
1502 Change Science Program in its relationship to the research  
1503 community, to the program managers, to policymakers and to  
1504 the public. So in March 2005, I left the program office,  
1505 resigning my position in protest.

1506       I saw that the problem was manifested especially at the  
1507 points at which scientifically-based information regarding  
1508 climate change was communicated to a wider audience, to  
1509 Congress, to the public. It wasn't so much a matter of  
1510 interfering with what scientists were publishing in  
1511 geophysical research letters or other technical journals. It  
1512 was when the science would come forward into to be  
1513 communicated to a wider audience, that the political

1514 | gatekeepers would step in.

1515 |         Now, I am not a climate scientist by academic training,  
1516 | and I don't debate technical issues. I will leave that for  
1517 | Dr. Shindell and other eminent climate scientists, but I can  
1518 | tell you what happens when the climate science comes forward  
1519 | into this arena of wider communication and the collision  
1520 | between science and politics.

1521 |         Really among the issues that I regard as politically  
1522 | significant, particularly significant in this politicization,  
1523 | was the Administration's treatment of the National Assessment  
1524 | of Climate Change Impacts which was carried in the 1997-2000  
1525 | timeframe pursuant to the Global Change Research Act of 1990.  
1526 | This was a report that was developed by a panel of climate  
1527 | and ecosystem scientists and other experts that is to this  
1528 | day the most systematic and comprehensive effort to assess  
1529 | the potential implications of global warming and climate  
1530 | change for the United States. The report identified a range  
1531 | of likely adverse societal and environmental impacts.

1532 |         This report has essentially been made to vanish by the  
1533 | Bush Administration, all reference to it by Federal agencies  
1534 | has been prohibited. All use of it in reports to Congress  
1535 | and other climate change communications has been suppressed.  
1536 | The scientist stakeholder networks that developed this report  
1537 | have been abandoned and no follow-on work of a comparable  
1538 | sort has been undertaken.

1539 I discuss this in considerably greater detail in my  
1540 written testimony, but starting in 2002, the White House  
1541 Council on Environmental Quality placed Phillip Cooney as  
1542 Chief of Staff at the table as part of the governance of the  
1543 U.S. Climate Change Science Program. Now CEQ is a policy  
1544 shop, not a science office. It is my understanding that Mr.  
1545 Cooney was the proximate agent of the White House's directive  
1546 to the Federal agencies to suppress the National Climate  
1547 Assessment. Of course, he was not acting independently. He  
1548 was an operative in a chain of command leading up to CEQ  
1549 Chairman on to the President, but there are many aspects of  
1550 the way CEQ intervened to manipulate communication on climate  
1551 change and this was one example.

1552 In conclusion, in addition to the UCS GAP  
1553 recommendations, I would recommend it is very important to  
1554 revitalize this national assessment process. Every member, I  
1555 think, has a vital interest in this regional level, sectoral  
1556 level analysis of putting the top experts together with  
1557 direct communication with policymakers and other stakeholders  
1558 to diagnose the problems and develop solutions. What you  
1559 need, I think, is this direct unimpeded communication between  
1560 the experts and policymakers and get the gatekeepers out of  
1561 the way.

1562 [Prepared statement of Mr. Piltz follows:]

1563

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1564

Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Piltz.

1565

Dr. Shindell?

1566 STATEMENT OF DREW SHINDELL

1567 Mr. SHINDELL. Good morning, and I thank the Committee.

1568 Mr. WAXMAN. There is a button at the base of the mic. Is  
1569 that on?

1570 Mr. SHINDELL. Thank you. Good morning. I would like to  
1571 thank the Committee for the opportunity to testify this  
1572 morning about climate change science and my personal  
1573 experiences with communication of climate science.

1574 As Mr. Chairman noted, I have been a researcher at  
1575 NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies for some time, and  
1576 I am a lecturer at Columbia University as well, but today I  
1577 am speaking here as an individual.

1578 Scientists provide information to policymakers and the  
1579 public on issues affecting society. Climate change is  
1580 clearly such an issue and one for which it is especially  
1581 critical that decisions be made using the best available  
1582 scientific information because the potential costs to society  
1583 of action or of inaction are large.

1584 The earth as a whole is unquestionably warming, and  
1585 virtually all climate scientists believe that the evidence  
1586 regarding a human role in this warming is clear and  
1587 compelling. Multiple lines of evidence based on

1588 | measurements, theory and modeling support these conclusions.  
1589 | The scientific evidence indicates that the earth is now  
1590 | warmer than at any time during the last thousand years.  
1591 | While continued warming is inevitable, the seriousness of the  
1592 | consequences of climate change will depend upon societal  
1593 | action to limit the emissions of greenhouse gases and  
1594 | pollutants that are the dominant cause of global warming.  
1595 | These consequences include droughts and flood, increased  
1596 | severity of summer heat waves and rises in sea level that  
1597 | could devastate low-lying coastal areas.

1598 |         Although the scientific basis for the conclusion that  
1599 | human activities are altering Earth's climate is extremely  
1600 | strong, there are questions that are still raised over  
1601 | whether current scientific understanding justifies societal  
1602 | action. One of these arguments has concerned Antarctic  
1603 | temperature trends. While most of the planet has warmed  
1604 | rapidly during the past several decades, much of the  
1605 | Antarctic Continent has, by contrast, cooled. Lack of an  
1606 | adequate explanation for this has been cited as evidence that  
1607 | scientific understanding of climate change is simply too  
1608 | incomplete to warrant taking action to mitigate global  
1609 | warming.

1610 |         In the fall of 2004, a team I led at NASA published a  
1611 | paper providing an explanation of how ozone depletion over  
1612 | Antarctica and increasing greenhouse gases could together



1613 | account for this observed cooling of Antarctica. The study  
1614 | was the first to look at how these two factors work together  
1615 | to influence Antarctic temperatures. It not only helped to  
1616 | explain the observed cooling but also predicted a warmer  
1617 | future for Antarctica based on projections of continued  
1618 | increases in greenhouse gases. This has clear implications,  
1619 | both for the debate on global warming and for potential sea  
1620 | level rise as Antarctica contains an enormous reservoir of  
1621 | water in its ice sheets.

1622 |         The NASA press corps and I wrote a press release on  
1623 | these findings to convey them to the broader public. While  
1624 | previous to this time, press releases had been issued rapidly  
1625 | and with revisions from headquarters that basically were made  
1626 | to improve clarity and style, this release was repeatedly  
1627 | delayed, altered and eventually watered down. When we at  
1628 | GISS inquired of those higher up the NASA chain what was  
1629 | going on, we were told in the fall of 2004 by the press corps  
1630 | that releases were being delayed because two political  
1631 | appointees and the White House were now reviewing all  
1632 | climate-related press releases.

1633 |         Scientists do not simply explore what we are most  
1634 | curious about. We know that our research is funded by the  
1635 | public, and we go to great lengths to provide policy-relevant  
1636 | information to support decision-making. While it was  
1637 | frustrating for me to see my work suppressed, even more

1638 | importantly, it is a disservice to the public to distort or  
1639 | suppress information needed.

1640 |         But that experience is only one example of a series of  
1641 | actions that attempted to suppress communication of climate  
1642 | science to the public. Also during the fall of 2004, NASA  
1643 | headquarters insisted that a NASA press officer be present to  
1644 | monitor all interviews, either in person or in the phone, a  
1645 | measure most of us felt was unbecoming of a Democratic  
1646 | society. As with the interference with press releases, the  
1647 | restrictions were not imposed on other parts of NASA such as  
1648 | space science or even other areas of earth science outside of  
1649 | climate research.

1650 |         NASA's new written policy of openness regarding press  
1651 | conferences and releases has been a welcome first step. This  
1652 | clearly defined policy is rather unique among Federal  
1653 | scientific agencies and should be emulated at others. As  
1654 | this policy seems to have come about in large part in  
1655 | response to scrutiny of political interference in  
1656 | communication, I hope that the interest evidenced by this  
1657 | morning's hearing will lead to continued improvements in  
1658 | policies to protect the integrity of Government science and  
1659 | its communication to the public.

1660 |         Even with the best possible information, policymakers  
1661 | must make subjective decisions in the face of uncertainty,  
1662 | but these types of decisions go on around us all the time,

1663 | for example, when a doctor decides on treatment based on the  
1664 | best medical evidence, despite the fact that medical science  
1665 | doesn't know everything there is to know about human  
1666 | physiology. The public must trust the evaluation of the  
1667 | evidence by policymakers in the same way that patients must  
1668 | trust their doctors.

1669 |       Suppression of scientific evidence has undermined the  
1670 | trust between the public and policymakers and between  
1671 | scientists and policymakers. Cases where scientific  
1672 | uncertainties were exaggerated by political appointees have  
1673 | been equally troubling. Restoring the necessary trust will  
1674 | require the highest standards of scientific integrity and  
1675 | transparency in policies regarding scientists' interaction  
1676 | with the public and in decision-making on the urgent issue of  
1677 | climate change.

1678 |       I thank the Committee for holding this hearing.

1679 |       [Prepared statement of Mr. Shindell follows:]

1680 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1681 | Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Shindell.

1682 | Mr. Pielke?

1683 STATEMENT OF ROGER PIELKE, JR.

1684 Mr. PIELKE. I thank the Chairman, the Ranking Member and  
1685 the Committee for the opportunity to offer testimony this  
1686 morning.

1687 My main point today is that politics and science cannot,  
1688 in practice, be separated. Consequently, policies for the  
1689 production, promotion and use of information in  
1690 decision-making should be based on the realities of science  
1691 and politics, not on the mistaken impression that they  
1692 somehow can be kept separate. Efforts to separate them will  
1693 in most cases only contribute to the pathological  
1694 politicization of science.

1695 Now imagine the following situation: the President has  
1696 in his Administration a range of scientific experts on the  
1697 most important policy issue of the day. However, the  
1698 President is denied access to that advice by the manipulative  
1699 actions of one of his primary advisors who we will call the  
1700 Admiral. It turns out that the Admiral has the President's  
1701 ear on matters of science, but he himself in fact has no  
1702 formal scientific training. He justifies his actions on the  
1703 belief that the United States is engaged in a fundamental  
1704 religious, political and economic conflict between good and

1705 | evil.

1706 |         When two leading Government scientists seek to provide  
1707 | advice to the President that differs from that being offered  
1708 | by the Admiral, the Admiral asks the FBI to open  
1709 | investigations of these scientists. One of the scientists  
1710 | subsequently faces hearing to consider his lack of loyalty to  
1711 | the United States, and he never again works as a Government  
1712 | scientist.

1713 |         The other scientist warns that this case indicates to  
1714 | scientists that ``Scientific integrity and frankness in  
1715 | advising Government on policy matters of a technical nature  
1716 | can lead to later reprisals against those whose earlier  
1717 | opinions have become unpopular.``

1718 |         One of the Nation's leading scientists writes that the  
1719 | relationship between Government and scientists has been  
1720 | gravely damaged because the Government has given the  
1721 | impression that it would ``exclude anyone who does not  
1722 | conform to the judgment of those who in one way or another  
1723 | have acquired authority.``

1724 |         The year, 1954; the President, Dwight Eisenhower; the  
1725 | Admiral, Lewis Strauss; the scientists, Robert Oppenheimer,  
1726 | Hans Bethe and Vannevar Bush.

1727 |         This vignette drawn from Benjamin Green's excellent new  
1728 | book on Eisenhower's science policy along with the other  
1729 | examples recounted in my written testimony that discuss

1730 | issues of science and politics from Richard Nixon through  
1731 | Bill Clinton show that science and politics have always been  
1732 | of concern for policymakers, and the subject of today's  
1733 | hearing indicates that today is no different.

1734 |       There are, however, reasons why today's conflicts are  
1735 | receiving more attention from scholars, political advocates  
1736 | and politicians. I will just quickly go through these.  
1737 | There are an increasing number of important issues that are  
1738 | related to science and technology. Policymakers and advocacy  
1739 | groups alike increasingly rely on experts to justify their  
1740 | favorite course of action. Congress, at least for the past  
1741 | six years and perhaps longer, has been derelict in its  
1742 | oversight duties, particularly related to issues related to  
1743 | science and technology.

1744 |       Many scientists are increasingly engaging in political  
1745 | advocacy. Some issues of science have become increasingly  
1746 | partisan as some politicians sense that there is political  
1747 | gain to be found on issues like stem cells, teaching of  
1748 | evolution and climate change. Lastly, the Bush  
1749 | Administration has indeed engaged in hyper-controlling  
1750 | strategies for the management of information.

1751 |       Now, I will just give a few very short vignettes to  
1752 | illustrate how fundamentally science and politics are  
1753 | inter-related. The language of science in public discussion  
1754 | lends itself to politicization. The New York Times reported

1755 | last year that NASA scientists at the Jet Propulsion  
1756 | Laboratory had complained because they had been instructed to  
1757 | use the phrase, climate change, rather than the phrase,  
1758 | global warming. A Republican strategy memo did indeed  
1759 | recommend the use of the phrase, climate change, over global  
1760 | warming, and environmental groups have long had the opposite  
1761 | preference. Another Federal scientist in NOAA described how  
1762 | he was instructed by superiors not to use the words Kyoto or  
1763 | climate change.

1764 |         To cite another example, several years ago, the Union of  
1765 | Concerned Scientists, as part of its advocacy campaign on  
1766 | reducing greenhouse gas emissions, recommended use of the  
1767 | word, harbinger, to describe current climate events that may  
1768 | become more frequent with future global warming.  
1769 | Subsequently, scientists at NOAA, the National Center for  
1770 | Atmospheric Research, and the Fish and Wildlife Services  
1771 | Polar Bear Project began to use the phrase in public  
1772 | communication in concert with advocacy groups like  
1773 | Greenpeace. The term has also appeared in official  
1774 | Government press releases.

1775 |         Policymakers and their staff are, of course, intimately  
1776 | familiar with these dynamics. We have just recently seen  
1777 | them in practice as Republicans and Democrats have battled  
1778 | over framing President Bush's proposed troop increases as a  
1779 | surge or an escalation.



1780           An example of how easy it is to misrepresent science in  
1781 a political setting, consider the memorandum prepared last  
1782 week by the majority staff of this Committee to provide  
1783 background information on this hearing. The memorandum  
1784 states quite correctly that a consensus has emerged on the  
1785 basic science of global warming. It then goes on to assert  
1786 that ``Recently published studies have suggested that the  
1787 impacts of global warming include increases in the intensity  
1788 of hurricanes and tropical storms.''

1789           It supports this claim by citing three papers, but what  
1790 the memorandum does not relate is that the authors of each of  
1791 the three cited papers recently participated with about 120  
1792 experts from around the world to prepare a consensus  
1793 statement under the auspices of the World Meteorological  
1794 Organization which concluded, ``No consensus has been reached  
1795 on this issue.''. The WMO statement was subsequently endorsed  
1796 by the Executive Council of the American Meteorological  
1797 Society.

1798           Thus, the science cited in the Committee memo is  
1799 incomplete and misleading. Such cherrypicking and  
1800 misrepresentations of science are endemic in political  
1801 discussions involving science. What has occurred in the  
1802 preparation of this memorandum is in microcosm the exact sort  
1803 of thing we have seen with heavy-handed Bush Administration  
1804 information management strategies which include editing

1805 Government reports and overbearing management of press  
1806 releases and media contacts with scientists. Inevitably,  
1807 such ham-handed information management will backfire because  
1808 people will notice and demand accountability. This oversight  
1809 hearing today is good evidence for that.

1810 My written testimony goes into far more detail on issues  
1811 of press releases, agency media policies, empanelment of  
1812 Federal advisory committees and other subjects which I would  
1813 be happy to discuss with your further.

1814 Thank you.

1815 [Prepared statement of Mr. Pielke follows:]

1816 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

1817 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you for your testimony.

1818 This Committee has been trying to get documents from the  
1819 Administration since last July, and we have made requests on  
1820 a bipartisan basis when Mr. Davis was Chairman and I was the  
1821 Ranking Member. Now that I am chairman and he is the Ranking  
1822 Member, we are still making those requests.

1823 We have sent today a letter to Mr. James L. Connaughton,  
1824 Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, asking  
1825 again for the information we requested. Without objection  
1826 from any member of the Committee, I would like to put the  
1827 letter by Congressman Davis and myself in the record.

1828 Furthermore, the staffs of our Committee, Democratic and  
1829 Republican, were allowed to view these documents that we have  
1830 requested in camera. They weren't allowed to take them out.  
1831 I have a memorandum which provides additional information  
1832 about the documents from the White House Council on  
1833 Environmental Quality being sought by this Committee, and I  
1834 seek to make this memorandum part of the record as well.  
1835 Without objection, that will be the order.

1836 The Chair recognizes himself to start off the questions.

1837 I thank all of you for your testimony.

1838 Many experts are telling us that global warming is one  
1839 of the most severe environmental threats facing this Nation  
1840 and the world. The challenges confronting us are enormous  
1841 potentially. Therefore, I think policymakers have an

1842 obligation to understand the science, and we need to get that  
1843 scientific information without any manipulation of the  
1844 science, without any suppressing of the reports or misleading  
1845 the public about the issues which seems to be would be a  
1846 breach of the public trust. So we have been asking for this  
1847 information.

1848 Dr. Shindell, you are one of the Nation's leading  
1849 climate change scientists, and I want to discuss some of the  
1850 documents that the Committee staff reviewed and ask whether  
1851 you are concerned about the issues in these documents.

1852 First of all, let me begin by asking you about some of  
1853 the edits urged by the White House Office of Management and  
1854 Budget. OMB asked that an EPA report be rewritten to remove  
1855 the statement that global warming may ``alter regional  
1856 patterns of climate'' and ``potentially affect the balance of  
1857 radiation.'' Dr. Shindell, do you think this was an  
1858 appropriate change in the document?

1859 The statement in the EPA draft was that climate change  
1860 can alter regional climates and affect the balance of  
1861 radiation. Is there any scientific justification for  
1862 removing these assertions?

1863 Mr. SHINDELL. No. That is a very well supported  
1864 statement. For the change in the energy balance of the  
1865 planet, we have satellite data that have measured that  
1866 balance directly for decades now, and we can see it changing,

1867 | and it is extremely well documented and uncontroversial.

1868 |       As far as regional patterns, I mentioned before,  
1869 | Antarctica has gone the other way from the rest of the globe.  
1870 | Different areas have warmed more, others less. It is quite  
1871 | clear that this is happening.

1872 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Another edit deleted the phrase, ``changes  
1873 | observed the last several decades are likely mostly the  
1874 | result of human activities,`` and that phrase was replaced  
1875 | with a phrase that said, ``a causal link between the build-up  
1876 | of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and the observed  
1877 | climate changes during the 20th Century cannot be  
1878 | unequivocally established.`` Is this an appropriate change?  
1879 | Does the rephrasing accurately represent the science or does  
1880 | it mislead the public?

1881 |       Mr. SHINDELL. I would say that that is also a misleading  
1882 | statement. While technically true, the first statement that  
1883 | human activities play the dominant role is a much, much more  
1884 | accurate picture of the science.

1885 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Some of the edits we reviewed were made by  
1886 | CEQ Chief of Staff Phillip Cooney. Now Mr. Cooney is not a  
1887 | scientist by training. Instead, he is a lawyer who was  
1888 | working as a lobbyist for the American Petroleum Institute  
1889 | before he was appointed to his position at the Council on  
1890 | Environmental Quality. I would like to ask you some  
1891 | questions about his edits.

1892 In one document, Mr. Cooney deleted a reference to the  
1893 National Research Council's finding that human activities are  
1894 causing temperatures to rise. Obviously, the National  
1895 Research Council is this Country's premier scientific body.  
1896 Can you tell us if there is a scientific basis for deleting a  
1897 reference to this finding?

1898 Mr. SHINDELL. No. That is again a well supported  
1899 statement.

1900 Mr. WAXMAN. In the same document, Mr. Cooney deleted the  
1901 phrase ``climate change has global consequences for human  
1902 health and the environment.'' Is there anything  
1903 scientifically questionable about this phrase?

1904 Mr. SHINDELL. Again, no.

1905 Mr. WAXMAN. Yet another edit, Mr. Cooney wrote that  
1906 satellite data disputes global warming. Is this  
1907 scientifically valid?

1908 Mr. SHINDELL. No. There was for many years a  
1909 controversy where satellite data showed warming but to a  
1910 different degree than was seen at the surface or that was  
1911 predicted by models higher up in the atmosphere. It never  
1912 disputed global warming, and that controversy has since been  
1913 resolved.

1914 Mr. WAXMAN. If climate changes offer us an incredibly  
1915 serious problem, then we need to get the facts and rely on  
1916 Federal scientists and agencies to give Congress and the

1917 public the true facts about this global threat. Yet the  
1918 preliminary evidence we are seeing from the White House  
1919 suggests that the Administration may have taken a very  
1920 different approach. If the documents we have seen so far are  
1921 representative, it appears that the White House installed a  
1922 former oil industry lobbyist as the Chief of Staff for the  
1923 Council on Environmental Quality and then systematically  
1924 sought to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from  
1925 reporting on dangers to health, the environment and the  
1926 economy. In effect, it appears that there may have been an  
1927 orchestrated effort to mislead the public about the threat of  
1928 global climate change.

1929         These are serious allegations, and they are ones that we  
1930 will be exploring in detail in this hearing and in our  
1931 ongoing investigation.

1932         I thank the witnesses very much for answering my  
1933 questions. I do have further questions, and we will have a  
1934 second round for members who wish to pursue a second round.

1935         Mr. Davis, I yield to you.

1936         Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you.

1937         Dr. Shindell, let me just say I am not asking and you  
1938 can't produce it today, but I would be very interested in  
1939 looking at the initial drafts that you had on the press  
1940 releases and then at the end result. It would give us, I  
1941 think, a clue in terms of what the Administration did. I

1942 | don't have copies of that, but if you could produce that,  
1943 | that would be helpful.

1944 |       Mr. SHINDELL. Sorry, I didn't follow.

1945 |       Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. The initial drafts of press  
1946 | releases that came out that you said were manipulated and  
1947 | changed over time, I would be interested in seeing the draft  
1948 | that came from the scientist and the end result that came  
1949 | out. I think that would give the Committee a good clue in  
1950 | terms of what transpired in between.

1951 |       Mr. SHINDELL. Yes, and there is more detail about that  
1952 | in my submitted written testimony.

1953 |       Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I understand that, but if you  
1954 | could produce the document, that would be helpful to us as we  
1955 | work forward.

1956 |       Mr. SHINDELL. Okay.

1957 |       Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you.

1958 |       Dr. Pielke, let me just ask you. In your testimony, you  
1959 | talk about scientists or advocacy groups or even politicians  
1960 | cherry-picking the best facts and using them in a way that is  
1961 | most advantageous to their argument. This is also been  
1962 | called fact-slinging. Why is this approach wrong and harmful  
1963 | to the process?

1964 |       Mr. PIELKE. Well, I think it is inevitable.

1965 |       Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Push your button there.

1966 |       Mr. PIELKE. I think it is inevitable. I think whenever



1967 | people make an argument for a particular course of action,  
1968 | they are going to frame their perspective in the best light  
1969 | possible. When you go out on that limb and you present  
1970 | information selectively or, worse, you misrepresent it, you  
1971 | will get called on it. It will damage your own credibility.  
1972 | So I think advocates of all stripes, it is unavoidable to be  
1973 | selective in presentation of information.

1974 |         Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. I guess we would like to navigate  
1975 | away from that environment and the reason I have joined Mr.  
1976 | Waxman in a request for documents from the Administration, we  
1977 | need to get everything laid out in fact. I think there is  
1978 | some cherry picking going on back and forth. It doesn't help  
1979 | when we can't get them all, but it is important to get  
1980 | everything out there so we can get a complete picture and  
1981 | then make an appropriate analysis of what has and hasn't  
1982 | happened.

1983 |         I wonder if you could discuss the policy reasons for  
1984 | executive agencies vetting the work of their employees before  
1985 | public comment is made on behalf of the agency.

1986 |         Mr. PIELKE. Well, there is a long--

1987 |         Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Is this a new process?

1988 |         Mr. PIELKE. It is not. For example, the Office of  
1989 | Management and Budget has, at least since the 1920s, gone  
1990 | over witness testimony from Government employees. The reason

1991 | -

1992 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Of both parties, right?

1993 Mr. PIELKE. Of both parties, and the reason for this is  
1994 that the governance of the United States would be impossible  
1995 if every Government employee were able to go out and  
1996 interpret the laws, policies in the way that they saw them.  
1997 Imagine if officials at the State Department below the top,  
1998 every single one of them were going out and voicing their  
1999 views on Iran or the Israeli-Palestine conflict. It would  
2000 be, it would be chaos, complete chaos. So at some level from  
2001 the standpoint of policy, Government has to coordinate its  
2002 actions.

2003 This becomes difficult when science is involved because  
2004 the view is that we can somehow separate science and  
2005 politics. Let scientists only talk about science. Let the  
2006 policy, political appointees only talk about the politics.  
2007 But the reality is science and politics are intermixed. A  
2008 phrase like dangerous climate change relates to the framework  
2009 convention on climate change. So if scientists in their  
2010 official remarks say that phrase, they are engaging in a  
2011 political discussion.

2012 I should point out NOAA and NASA have- FE

2013 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. They may or may not be right, but  
2014 that is their opinion and not the opinion the elected  
2015 leaders.

2016 Mr. PIELKE. I want to point out NOAA and NASA have two

2017 | different approaches to how scientists communicate with the  
2018 | public. NASA has said that its scientists can take off their  
2019 | agency hat and speak as individuals. NOAA has said in its  
2020 | media policy that they always speak for the agency. This is  
2021 | a perfect topic for Congressional oversight. What makes the  
2022 | most sense? Does it makes sense to have scientists take off  
2023 | their hat or not?

2024 | I don't have an answer for that, but we do have  
2025 | inconsistencies across the different agencies.

2026 | Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. We don't either, and our goal  
2027 | here, I think, is to just get the facts and lay them out and  
2028 | then the public can judge appropriately where truth lies.

2029 | This age-old process may qualify as politicization, but  
2030 | it also can reflect a rational policy by a presidential  
2031 | administration in both parties as well to carry out what they  
2032 | perceive as their mandate.

2033 | Mr. PIELKE. Yes. Now let me say politics is how we get  
2034 | done the business of society, and in popular parlance with  
2035 | the public, politics has kind of a pejorative, negative  
2036 | notion. But I think the Government funds about \$140 billion  
2037 | worth of scientific research, so it will be relevant to  
2038 | politics.

2039 | Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. In one of your writings, you  
2040 | stated that well-regarded scientists who are known believers  
2041 | of global warming is happening also believe the debate will

2042 | not be settled for more than a decade. If that is the case,  
2043 | then why is it the only scholars we hear from are the ones  
2044 | that believe it is so glaringly obvious that only a fool or  
2045 | an idiot could question it?

2046 |         Mr. PIELKE. The statement you refer to is with respect  
2047 | to the debate over tropical cyclones and climate change, and  
2048 | indeed I think the general consensus that it is going to take  
2049 | some more research on that topic.

2050 |         On the issue of global warming generally and  
2051 | particularly global average temperatures, I point you to the  
2052 | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC, and Dr.  
2053 | Shindell can probably represent that better than I.

2054 |         Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Well, Mr. Connaughton was up here  
2055 | before us, and he admitted that there was climate change or  
2056 | warming going on, that in fact it was manmade. I think we  
2057 | need to get to once we establish those parameters, then we  
2058 | can make intelligent policies in terms of how we deal and  
2059 | what are the ramifications with it. But there was no denial  
2060 | in the Administration when they were up here last year as  
2061 | well. I hope we will get them back once they produce the  
2062 | documents, and they can more fully talk about what their  
2063 | edits are and the like, and we can have a better opportunity  
2064 | to address that.

2065 |         It looks like my time is up.

2066 |         Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis.

2067 Mr. Davis on our side.

2068 Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Thank you very much, Mr.  
2069 Chairman, and I want to thank all of the witnesses for  
2070 appearing.

2071 Mr. Piltz, let me ask you. You worked as a senior  
2072 associate in the Federal Climate Change Science Program.  
2073 This is the office that coordinates Government climate  
2074 research. You resigned in March of 2005 after 10 years in the  
2075 office. Can you basically tell us why you resigned?

2076 Mr. PILTZ. YES. I had increasingly come to see that the  
2077 Administration was politicizing the communication of the  
2078 climate research. It is a \$2 billion a year research program  
2079 involving 12 agencies, and from time to time this research  
2080 gets put together and assessments reports to Congress and so  
2081 forth, communicating to a wider audience. That is the point  
2082 at which Administration political gatekeepers would step in  
2083 to either ignore the report if they couldn't stop it from  
2084 being published and misrepresent the intelligence in it if  
2085 they needed to or just flat out directly edit it if they  
2086 could.

2087 I was particularly concerned with this communication  
2088 function. That was what I was doing, and it became  
2089 increasingly impossible to work in that environment and to  
2090 see this going on.

2091 Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Now let me ask you. You were

2092 | there for 10 years.

2093 |       Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

2094 |       Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Which means that you were there  
2095 | prior to the current Bush Administration.

2096 |       Mr. PILTZ. That is right, five years under the previous  
2097 | administration and five years under the Bush Administration.

2098 |       Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. So how does this action or  
2099 | activity compare with that of the previous administration?

2100 |       Mr. PILTZ. It is a good question, and let me say first  
2101 | of all that no administration is above criticism, but I do  
2102 | think that there was a significant difference under the  
2103 | previous administration. The key liaison to the Climate  
2104 | Change Research Program was the white House Science Office.  
2105 | Those were scientists, and they, their way of thinking and  
2106 | talking and writing about climate change was well within the  
2107 | mainstream of the climate science community which I think  
2108 | they were trying to feed into the policy process.

2109 |       This was a different situation under the current  
2110 | Administration where you had people who were not scientists,  
2111 | whose concern was not to make the communication clearer and  
2112 | more accurate but to spin it politically so that the science  
2113 | would not be communicated in such ways to threaten the  
2114 | Administration's political position. The Administration had  
2115 | made a decision up front it would not support a regulatory  
2116 | constraint on greenhouse gas emissions, and it seemed to me

2117 | that they were uncomfortable with any straight forward  
2118 | presentation of the growing body of scientific evidence about  
2119 | global warming.

2120 |         Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Now let me ask you. You also  
2121 | discussed editing in your testimony.

2122 |         Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

2123 |         Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Mr. Phillip Cooney was the Chief  
2124 | of Staff at the White House Council on Environmental Quality.  
2125 | We have established that he was a lawyer and not a scientist.  
2126 | Until 2001, he worked at the American Petroleum Institute as  
2127 | a lobbyist and as their climate team leader.

2128 |         You testified that Mr. Cooney made handwritten edits to  
2129 | several science program reports in 2002 and 2003. Is that  
2130 | correct?

2131 |         Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

2132 |         Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Generally, what type of edits  
2133 | were these?

2134 |         Mr. PILTZ. It was a very large number of edits. They  
2135 | came at the twelfth hour, the process after all of the career  
2136 | assignments people had signed off and it never went back to  
2137 | them. They had the aggregate effect of creating an enhanced  
2138 | manufactured sense of fundamental scientific uncertainty  
2139 | about global warming, of toning language about observed  
2140 | warming and impacts, of basically discarding any idea that  
2141 | climate models were useful and deleting language about the

2142 | observed or projected impacts of climate change.

2143 |       Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Let me just ask you.

2144 |       Mr. PILTZ. Sure.

2145 |       Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Was it part of your  
2146 | responsibility to help prepare these documents or similar  
2147 | documents, so you are testifying on the basis of firsthand  
2148 | knowledge, not on the basis of something that you heard, read  
2149 | or were told about?

2150 |       Mr. PILTZ. No. I had to deal with the edits directly,  
2151 | yes, sir.

2152 |       Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Thank you very much.

2153 |       Mr. Chairman, I suspect that my time is up.

2154 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Yes, thank you very much.

2155 |       Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Thank you.

2156 |       Mr. Issa?

2157 |       Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2158 |       I know it is anecdotal, but how many scientists can  
2159 | raise their hand here on the dais? Just checking. I won't  
2160 | ask how many lawyers up here. That would be telling.

2161 |       Mr. Piltz, I think I will start with you. Your degrees  
2162 | and background are political science?

2163 |       Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

2164 |       Mr. ISSA. So you are not a scientist.

2165 |       Mr. PILTZ. No, I am not a climate scientist.

2166 |       Mr. ISSA. Would it be fair to say you are no more



2167 | qualified to evaluate these edits than the petroleum lawyer,  
2168 | is that right? I mean in the greater world of scientist,  
2169 | non-scientist.

2170 |         Mr. PILTZ. I think that climate scientists who look at  
2171 | the edits would regard them as, in the aggregate, pretty  
2172 | egregious, but I am not arguing particular points.

2173 |         Mr. ISSA. I appreciate that. I just wanted the simple  
2174 | answer. We have been trashing a lawyer I have never met, and  
2175 | I am happy to trash all lawyers, but what it comes down to is  
2176 | he wasn't a scientist, you are not a scientist.

2177 |         My understanding is Mr. Cooney's edits or proposed edits  
2178 | were then reviewed by a scientific committee convened by the  
2179 | National Research Council, and many of his edits were then  
2180 | disregarded.

2181 |         Mr. PILTZ. No.

2182 |         Mr. ISSA. I will be very surprised if my staff is  
2183 | somehow misunderstanding the fact that his edits were not the  
2184 | last word. In fact, there was further scientific review that  
2185 | I am missing in your testimony.

2186 |         Mr. Chairman, I hope we can get to the bottom of that  
2187 | because I am not sure that that discrepancy can be easily  
2188 | worked out by witnesses.

2189 |         Dr. Grifo, I know you are fairly new to UCS. You have  
2190 | been there, what, about a year, something like that?

2191 |         Ms. GRIFO. A little longer.

2192 Mr. ISSA. And you come out of Columbia.

2193 Ms. GRIFO. Yes.

2194 Mr. ISSA. But do you know the history of the  
2195 organization?

2196 I am trying to understand a little bit more. My  
2197 understanding is UCS was formed at MIT to oppose the Vietnam  
2198 War in 1968. Is that roughly correct?

2199 Ms. GRIFO. No, sir, that is an incorrect  
2200 characterization.

2201 Mr. ISSA. Was it formed in 1968?

2202 Ms. GRIFO. Yes, sir.

2203 Mr. ISSA. Was it formed at MIT?

2204 Ms. GRIFO. Yes, sir.

2205 Mr. ISSA. Did it oppose the Vietnam War?

2206 Ms. GRIFO. I have no idea, but that was not its purpose  
2207 in its forming.

2208 Mr. ISSA. Well, moving down a little bit, you would  
2209 characterize your group as a peer watchdog organization?

2210 Ms. GRIFO. No, sir. We are a science-based non-profit.

2211 Mr. ISSA. You do a study that sends out from a list that  
2212 you generate. You send out 1,600 questionnaires by email.  
2213 You get back 19 percent of them. Then you come up with a  
2214 whole series of assumptions, and you bring them here and say  
2215 this is what the science community says.

2216 I may not be a scientist. Matter of fact, I am

2217 definitely not a scientist or a lawyer, but I will tell you  
2218 here today because I am very concerned about what is being  
2219 brought to us as science. If I take all of the subjective  
2220 answers to emails, press statements, et cetera that come into  
2221 my office anecdotally from my constituents, I would find 100  
2222 percent chance that they want all illegals taken out of the  
2223 Country and no guest worker program because there is almost  
2224 100 to 0 response. Self-selected, those are the people I  
2225 hear from. The people who think maybe a guest worker program  
2226 wouldn't be bad, you have to really tear it out of them.

2227 I would only say that in the future if you are going to  
2228 bring us studies that they live up to, let us say, the  
2229 standards of John Zogby and not some sort of an email  
2230 self-serving response. I was very disappointed in seeing  
2231 that.

2232 Ms. GRIFO. Excuse me. May I respond?

2233 Mr. ISSA. Of course.

2234 Ms. GRIFO. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

2235 Our methodology was in fact quite a bit more complex  
2236 than the way that you have characterized it. We spent an  
2237 enormous amount of time and energy looking through the  
2238 climate documents of the Climate Change Research Group, web  
2239 sites. The Government does not publish in fact a directly of  
2240 its Federal climate scientists. So we did in fact have to go  
2241 through and produce a list. We had very strict criteria for

2242 | which scientists we included on this list. We had strict  
2243 | criteria for their backgrounds and so on.

2244 |       Mr. ISSA. Okay, and I appreciate that. Can you make  
2245 | that available to us?

2246 |       Ms. GRIFO. Absolutely.

2247 |       Mr. ISSA. Is there peer review scientific oversight of  
2248 | your selection and was there an offset to say that your  
2249 | selection was valid or invalid? In other words, Dr. Pielke,  
2250 | would he in fact have had a chance to say, oh, this is a bad  
2251 | list, you missed 300, 400? Was there any kind of an  
2252 | independent review?

2253 |       Ms. GRIFO. Yes, sir.

2254 |       Mr. ISSA. And by whom?

2255 |       Ms. GRIFO. By a number of climate scientists across the  
2256 | community, and in fact Mr. Piltz was one, and there were  
2257 | several others. I can get you that list.

2258 |       Mr. ISSA. Mr. Piltz is a political scientist.

2259 |       Ms. GRIFO. But he is aware of who are the Federal  
2260 | climate scientists doing that kind of research, and he was  
2261 | one of many individuals that looked at it.

2262 |       Mr. ISSA. I appreciate it. I am afraid I don't think  
2263 | that you have made your case.

2264 |       Ms. GRIFO. I am not quite done, sir.

2265 |       Mr. ISSA. Dr. Pielke, you said in your statement, and I  
2266 | think it is very notable, that there is going to be politics

2267 | in all of this.

2268 |       Mr. Chairman, how is my time?

2269 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Go ahead and finish your question.

2270 |       Mr. ISSA. Let me just ask one simple question. During  
2271 | the Eisenhower period you mentioned, isn't true that while  
2272 | President Eisenhower was leading the war against the Soviets,  
2273 | he was in fact downplaying the risk and the threat while  
2274 | funding the very things that allowed us to win the Cold War?  
2275 | Isn't that essentially the story of Eisenhower's managing of  
2276 | things like that threat?

2277 |       Mr. PIELKE. I think, essentially, in a soundbite  
2278 | fashion, that is accurate, but the story of Eisenhower and  
2279 | particularly the nuclear test ban efforts--this was before my  
2280 | time in academic literature--is that there was tremendous  
2281 | conflict among competing scientists, all very preeminent,  
2282 | about the politics of whether we wanted to engage in a  
2283 | nuclear test in the atmosphere or not illustrate how science  
2284 | came to become very politicized even 50 years ago.

2285 |       Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2286 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa.

2287 |       Ms. Watson?

2288 |       Ms. WATSON. I want to thank all the witnesses that are  
2289 | here today for being direct and answering the questions  
2290 | directly. There is no attempt to intimidate. We are trying  
2291 | to get information. So my questions go to Dr. Grifo.

2292 Making available the study results lead me to raise  
2293 these questions. What percentage of the scientists  
2294 personally felt pressured to eliminate the words, climate  
2295 change, global warming or similar terms from their scientific  
2296 communications?

2297 I have been told as a member of Congress, do not use the  
2298 word, global warming. Well, they are telling me? They don't  
2299 know who I am. And so, can you answer that, please?

2300 Ms. GRIFO. Yes, thank you very much. Forty-six percent  
2301 perceived or personally experienced pressure to eliminate  
2302 those words, and I would say that is a total of 147 climate  
2303 scientists. So that number should be zero.

2304 Ms. WATSON. Those are Government scientists who felt  
2305 pressured to avoid even using the words, climate change or  
2306 global warming?

2307 Ms. GRIFO. Yes.

2308 Ms. WATSON. That is the number?

2309 Ms. GRIFO. Yes.

2310 Ms. WATSON. Because I know what I was told. Okay, thank  
2311 you.

2312 Did any scientists see their work or the work of others  
2313 changed or edited during reviews in ways that changed the  
2314 meaning of their scientific findings?

2315 You might have referred to that. I happened to be in  
2316 the back. I had a conference. And so, could you respond?

2317 Ms. GRIFO. Yes, thank you. Forty-three percent which  
2318 was over two in five of our respondents, and I would also say  
2319 that is 128 Federal climate scientists who personally  
2320 experienced or perceived changes or edits during review that  
2321 changed the meaning of their findings.

2322 Ms. WATSON. Were there scientific findings ever  
2323 misrepresented by agency officials?

2324 Ms. GRIFO. Yes, in fact, 37 percent of our respondents  
2325 which is 110 Federal climate scientists perceived or  
2326 personally experienced agency misrepresentation of their  
2327 findings.

2328 Ms. WATSON. How many total instances of political  
2329 interference did Government climate scientists report?

2330 Ms. GRIFO. That was 400, at least 435. We had a range  
2331 in each of the questions that they could answer. So that is  
2332 the smallest number. It may indeed be much higher.

2333 Ms. WATSON. How many Government scientists personally  
2334 experienced political interference?

2335 Ms. GRIFO. Personally experienced, I will have to get  
2336 you that number. I don't have it in front of me, but it is a  
2337 large percentage

2338 Ms. WATSON. Now let me ask Mister- FE

2339 Ms. GRIFO. A hundred and fifty, thank you.

2340 Ms. WATSON. One hundred and fifty, okay, thank you.

2341 Mr. Piltz and Dr. Shindell, do these numbers surprise

2342 | you? First, Mr. Piltz.

2343 |       Mr. PILTZ. They surprise me a little bit that it is  
2344 | quite so high. I was aware of particular case studies, but  
2345 | this shows me that this s a much more pervasive pattern  
2346 | throughout the agencies than even I was aware of before.

2347 |       Ms. WATSON. Dr. Shindell?

2348 |       Mr. SHINDELL. Yes, I had been aware of this mostly  
2349 | amongst the most prominent, the lab directors at the various  
2350 | research institutes. So this indicates that it is more  
2351 | widespread than I expected as well.

2352 |       Ms. WATSON. I am wondering, Dr. Grifo, if we could  
2353 | actually get some of the scientific reports that have been  
2354 | changed, the wording has been changed. Can we get those? I  
2355 | think there was a request from the minority Ranking Member,  
2356 | and if we could get that, it would certainly help.

2357 |       I think this kind of thing must stop. I have witnessed  
2358 | the Administration politicizing factual information and  
2359 | misleading the Americans. I will not be misled, and I would  
2360 | like the facts in front of me. The interpretation of the  
2361 | facts is what we need to hear and see because I think many of  
2362 | us are being misled. We cannot stand for.

2363 |       I want to thank you very much and thank you, Mr.  
2364 | Chairman.

2365 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. Watson.

2366 |       Mr. Sali?



2367 Mr. SALI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2368 For Mr. Shindell, Mr. Shindell, every office that is  
2369 represented by the membership on the dais up here has a  
2370 vetting process for every statement that goes out of our  
2371 offices. Of course, everyone would agree that that tends to  
2372 be political in nature, and we want to make sure that the  
2373 political discussion ends up with one voice that represents  
2374 the top of the heap, if you will. I don't suppose that there  
2375 is anybody on this dais that would think that is problematic.  
2376 However, when we talk about this issue and the matters that  
2377 go on in this hearing, we are going to be issuing similar  
2378 statements.

2379 Do you have any guidance for this Committee about how we  
2380 might make that transition from science to politics to get  
2381 the truth out to the people, recognizing that there will be  
2382 dramatically different statements coming out of the various  
2383 offices?

2384 Mr. SHINDELL. Well, I think that the scientific  
2385 community has managed to convey the general viewpoint or the  
2386 mainstream viewpoint quite well in numerous venues already,  
2387 and that has taken place when the President called for the  
2388 National Academy to look at climate change after the last  
2389 IPCC assessment report and later this week the next IPCC  
2390 report will be issued. I think these are really  
2391 authoritative reports.

2392           It is really, in many ways, it is a wonderful thing. If  
2393 you had a problem and you were able not just to get the  
2394 advice of one or two people but to get the best experts in  
2395 that particular area from all over the world to look at the  
2396 evidence and really present what their best evaluation is, I  
2397 think you would be very pleased. I think we as the public  
2398 would be very lucky to have.

2399           Mr. SALI. Would it be correct to say that the opinions  
2400 coming out of the scientific community are uniform then with  
2401 regard to climate change or global warming?

2402           Mr. SHINDELL. Pardon?

2403           Mr. SALI. With regard to climate change or global  
2404 warming or whatever you want to call it, is it your  
2405 contention then that the opinions within the scientific  
2406 community are unanimous?

2407           Mr. SHINDELL. Well, that would certainly depend on the  
2408 particular details of which issue is being discussed, but in  
2409 general there is never unanimity in science. It is a back  
2410 and forth of ideas. Scientists, by nature, are skeptical,  
2411 always doubting what everybody else is saying, and a  
2412 consensus emerges over time.

2413           Mr. SALI. So then is it your further contention that  
2414 somehow the minority opinions aren't worthwhile in the  
2415 discussion, that we ought to just disregard those?

2416           Mr. SHINDELL. I don't think that those, that anybody's

2417 | views are disregarded as long as they go through the standard  
2418 | scientific process which is peer review. So papers and  
2419 | documentation must or claims of scientific nature must be  
2420 | validated, and they must be supported, and that support has  
2421 | to be evaluated by scientists.

2422 |         Claims are submitted every once in a while. There are  
2423 | papers that come into the same journals that mainstream  
2424 | climate scientists publish in, and those are evaluated by  
2425 | scientists. The problem is that these claims don't pass  
2426 | muster. They don't have the scientific evidence to back them  
2427 | up, so they are not making into the debate because they are  
2428 | not judged to be, to have adequate support. So those that do  
2429 | get published are included in reports like the IPCC, the  
2430 | National Assessment, the Academy reports, anything that gets  
2431 | through the process is completely validated.

2432 |         Mr. SALI. Okay, so I want to make sure I am getting this  
2433 | now. Are you saying that there is no disagreement among the  
2434 | scientific community regarding global warming or climate  
2435 | change, yes or no?

2436 |         Mr. SHINDELL. There is no restraint?

2437 |         Mr. SALI. That there is no disagreement.

2438 |         Mr. SHINDELL. No, I am not saying that there is no  
2439 | disagreement. I am saying that what -

2440 |         Mr. SALI. Then are you saying that those in the minority  
2441 | view ought to be disregarded out of hand?

2442 Mr. SHINDELL. I do not think that anybody's viewpoint  
2443 needs to be disregarded, but I would say that when the vast  
2444 majority of the community comes down on one side and there  
2445 are remarkably few voices on the other side that are able to  
2446 adequately back up the claims that they make, then I think  
2447 the conclusion is pretty clear of where our best judgment of  
2448 what is going on lies.

2449 Mr. SALI. Correct me if I am wrong. Then you are saying  
2450 that the real scientists all agree about global warming and  
2451 climate change.

2452 Mr. SHINDELL. No. I wouldn't disparage any scientists'  
2453 claims based on their background or what they believed.  
2454 Somebody mentioned Richard Lindzen from MIT earlier. He is  
2455 an eminent scientist, has done great work in the past. He is  
2456 free to publish anything he likes as long as it gets through  
2457 the same process that everybody else uses, and that process  
2458 is the best way we have had for centuries now to really give  
2459 science the rigorous evaluation it needs to determine which  
2460 theories went out and which evidence is strong enough that we  
2461 believe it is most likely to be true, and that has come down  
2462 on the side of mainstream scientists.

2463 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sali. Your time has expired.

2464 I want to call on Mr. Tierney. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2465 Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Shindell, I am impressed that you have  
2466 taken the time personally to come here today. You are here,

2467 I understand, on your own as a scientist, am I correct? You  
2468 have no political agenda or do you?

2469 Mr. SHINDELL. That is correct.

2470 Mr. TIERNEY. That you are here as a scientist?

2471 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes. Yes, I am here to testify about  
2472 climate science and I can relate my personal experiences.  
2473 That is all.

2474 Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

2475 Mr. Piltz, when Mr. Issa was questioning, there was some  
2476 inference, I thought, that Mr. Cooney made edits and I think  
2477 he was implying or at least asking whether or not there was  
2478 another round of production on that, but we have documents  
2479 that indicate, one note directly from Mr. Cooney saying that  
2480 these changes must be made.

2481 Then we have the EPA memorandum itself where the staff  
2482 gives just three options to the administrator to choose. One  
2483 is that you accept everything CEQ and OMB submit. The second  
2484 option was you remove the climate section altogether. The  
2485 third was that you go back and forth and try to reach some  
2486 compromise which they decided would antagonize the White  
2487 House and likely wouldn't be feasible to negotiate an  
2488 agreeable text. So they opted for just taking the climate  
2489 change out of the report.

2490 Do you have a different recollection of that? Was there  
2491 in fact any additional back and forth after Mr. Cooney made

2492 | his edits?

2493 |       Mr. PILTZ. I wasn't involved in that EPA report, but  
2494 | analygously from my own experience with Climate Change  
2495 | Science Program reports, the reports would be drafted and  
2496 | reviewed and vetted and approved by a large number and layers  
2497 | of career science people and Federal science program  
2498 | managers. That is what I worked on. All of my stuff had to  
2499 | be approved before it could go forward. The White House  
2500 | would come in after that process and intervene, and it would  
2501 | never have to go back for clearance with the scientists.

2502 |       As for the Academy, the Academy of Sciences reviewed the  
2503 | program's strategic plan and in general praised it but  
2504 | criticized it for the vanishing of the National Assessment of  
2505 | Climate Change Impacts, criticized it over and over again as  
2506 | a conspicuous and unwarranted omission. The Administration  
2507 | has stonewalled the Academy of Sciences since the Academy  
2508 | said that and has offered not defense, no response in its own  
2509 | defense.

2510 |       Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

2511 |       We have obtained, the Committee has obtained some  
2512 | documents, surprisingly enough. We have obtained email  
2513 | correspondence between NOAA and White House employees, and  
2514 | they indicate quite an involvement of the White House with  
2515 | the press contacts of NOAA scientists. I think they show a  
2516 | kind of political interference that we are talking about here

2517 | today, and it is not really the results of a couple of low  
2518 | level or over-zealous press officials but direct involvement  
2519 | by the White House. I want to go through just a couple of  
2520 | these emails if I could and then ask some of the panelists  
2521 | about it. All of these emails are from June of 2005.

2522 |         The first email is from an environmental reporter. The  
2523 | reporter requests an interview with a NOAA scientist about  
2524 | how climate change science has become politicized.

2525 |         The second email, the scientist responds that the  
2526 | reporter will need to ask the NOAA press corps.

2527 |         In the third email, the NOAA press officer writes to the  
2528 | White House Council on Environmental Quality and says the  
2529 | press officer expressed concern that the reporter may fish  
2530 | for the answers she is looking for but knows that the NOAA  
2531 | scientist ``knows his boundaries.'' Then the press officer  
2532 | asks for the White House instructions by the end of the day.

2533 |         The next email from the NOAA press officer states, if we  
2534 | have CEQ approval to go ahead, then that would be good.

2535 |         In another email, the NOAA press officer reports that  
2536 | CEQ and the White House Office of Science and Technology  
2537 | Policy have given the green light for the interview. The  
2538 | press officer then states, the CEQ officials want me to  
2539 | monitor the call and report back when done.

2540 |         So my question, Mr. Piltz and Mr. Shindell, are you  
2541 | surprised that the NOAA press officers were reporting back to

2542 | the White House about the content of press interviews with  
2543 | Government climate scientists and do you think it is  
2544 | appropriate for the White House to decide whether or not a  
2545 | Government scientist can speak to the press?

2546 |       Mr. PILTZ. I am not surprised. I do not think it is  
2547 | appropriate. I don't think that when the press makes an  
2548 | inquiry to the Federal Climate Change Science Program, that  
2549 | everything should have to be routed to the NOAA press office  
2550 | which has been politically compromised by the Administration  
2551 | officials who are at the head of NOAA. We need a different,  
2552 | more unimpeded type of communication out of the Climate  
2553 | Change Science Program.

2554 |       Mr. TIERNEY. Dr. Shindell, your comments?

2555 |       Mr. SHINDELL. Well, I am not terribly surprised either  
2556 | because it sounds very similar to what we were told at NASA  
2557 | was happening when we were inquiring as to why we were having  
2558 | so much difficulty communicating, that this was coming from  
2559 | the White House. So it sounds very similar, and I don't  
2560 | think it is appropriate.

2561 |       Mr. TIERNEY. Dr. Pielke made a comment that the Office  
2562 | of Management and Budget looks at witness testimony for  
2563 | Administration policy consistency and would seem to say that  
2564 | was a reason why all of this was okay. Am I wrong to think  
2565 | that there has got to be some distinction between a policy  
2566 | and somebody's comment on science, their conclusions based on



2567 fact, Dr. Grifo?

2568 Mr. PIELKE. Well, let me correct an impression, if I  
2569 gave it, that it was okay. It is not okay.

2570 Mr. TIERNEY. Dr. Grifo is a ventriloquist. I am sorry.

2571 [Laughter.]

2572 Mr. TIERNEY. Go ahead, you can answer, but I had asked  
2573 Dr. Grifo the question. Do you want to answer it? Do you  
2574 want to go ahead?

2575 Mr. PIELKE. I am sorry. I thought you were talking to  
2576 me.

2577 Mr. TIERNEY. No, but I will give you the chance if you  
2578 want to have something to say on that.

2579 Mr. PIELKE. No. Go ahead. My apologies.

2580 Mr. TIERNEY. Okay, thank you. Dr. Grifo?

2581 Ms. GRIFO. Thank you. I think that when you get that  
2582 Ph.D., when you become a scientist, you do not give up  
2583 your--I mean I think that. I know that. You don't give up  
2584 your constitutional rights. You maintain your right as a  
2585 citizen of free speech, and I think that is incredibly  
2586 important that we remember that this is discussions about  
2587 science.

2588 I would like to say that the results that we found, our  
2589 experience with this issue is really a small part of what Mr.  
2590 Pielke is talking about. He is talking about a very  
2591 interesting topic which is the role of science in public

2592 | policy, fascinating, but that is not what our program is  
2593 | really focusing on. We are looking at the science that is  
2594 | changed, that is manipulated, that is somehow touched in a  
2595 | way that alters it before it even gets into that public  
2596 | policy arena. What we are calling for is that scientists are  
2597 | allowed to speak about their scientific results and get that  
2598 | information out to the taxpayers that are paying for it, to  
2599 | the community at large, to policymakers, to everyone that  
2600 | needs to really understand this issue.

2601 |       Mr. TIERNEY. Is it a fair statement to--

2602 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Tierney?

2603 |       Mr. TIERNEY. Sorry?

2604 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Your time has expired.

2605 |       Mr. TIERNEY. Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2606 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Lynch?

2607 |       Mr. LYNCH. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2608 |       Earlier in this hearing, there was the suggestion of  
2609 | bias on the part of the Union of Concerned Scientists because  
2610 | of a position that the organization may or may not have taken  
2611 | in 1968 on the Vietnam War. I hope I am not the only one in  
2612 | this hearing to point out the elephant in the room.

2613 |       Perhaps it is just me, but we have a situation here  
2614 | where the Bush Administration chose as its Chief of Staff for  
2615 | the White House Council on Environmental Quality, a person  
2616 | who had led the oil industry's fight against limits on

2617 | emissions of greenhouse gases. This is someone who worked  
2618 | for the American Petroleum Institute. So I scratch my head  
2619 | to say why. Why would the Administration put someone who was  
2620 | so vehemently biased in an important role like this?

2621 |         Mr. Piltz, the analogy of the fox in the hen house is  
2622 | not appropriate, I believe in this case. Mr. Piltz, in your  
2623 | responsibility in your official capacity prior to resigning  
2624 | in protest, you were responsible for editing a document  
2625 | called Our Changing Planet, is that correct?

2626 |         Mr. PILTZ. Yes, the annual report to Congress.

2627 |         Mr. LYNCH. Right, and just to clear something up, your  
2628 | role there was to take information from 90 scientists, the  
2629 | reports of those scientists, contributions made by them and  
2630 | put it in a forum that is usable by Congress.

2631 |         Mr. PILTZ. That is right and to then fact-check with  
2632 | them before it went forward.

2633 |         Mr. LYNCH. So these weren't your own opinions.

2634 |         Mr. PILTZ. No.

2635 |         Mr. LYNCH. These were bonafide scientists with obviously  
2636 | scientific research to back up their opinions.

2637 |         Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

2638 |         Mr. LYNCH. Now, what I would like to do is get on the  
2639 | record. You have talked generally about what was done by Mr.  
2640 | Cooney. It is my understanding that after he resigned, he  
2641 | went back to work for Exxon Mobile. That is the information

2642 | that I have from majority staff.

2643 |         But I would like to talk about some specific instances  
2644 | of his editing and what that might have reflected. Can you  
2645 | give us a few specific examples of edits by Mr. Cooney to  
2646 | this report to Congress?

2647 |         Mr. PILTZ. Yes, I can do that and you know. If I may  
2648 | just preface that for a moment by saying that I really have  
2649 | tried to emphasize what seems to me the illegitimacy of the  
2650 | whole process by which this happened rather than arguing  
2651 | particular edits, and in many cases these hundreds of edits  
2652 | would just change a word or two, but you know what happens  
2653 | when you change shall to may.

2654 |         Mr. LYNCH. Right.

2655 |         Mr. PILTZ. But there are other places where whole chunks  
2656 | of text are deleted. For example, there is one passage where  
2657 | it came to him saying, warming will also cause reductions in  
2658 | mountain glaciers and advance the timing of the melt of  
2659 | mountain snow packs in polar regions. In turn, runoff rates  
2660 | will change. Flood potential will be altered in ways that  
2661 | are currently well understood. There will be significant  
2662 | shifts in the seasonality of runoff that will have serious  
2663 | impacts on native populations that rely on fishing and  
2664 | hunting for their livelihood. These changes will be further  
2665 | complicated by shifts in precipitation regimes and a possible  
2666 | intensification and increased frequency of extreme

2667 hydrological events.

2668 That was deleted.

2669 Mr. LYNCH. Now did Mr. Cooney ever give a plausible  
2670 reason why he would extract a warning of snow melt and  
2671 degradation of glaciers which we are seeing now? Did he ever  
2672 give a plausible reason why he would remove that warning to  
2673 Congress?

2674 Mr. PILTZ. He called it speculative musing.

2675 Mr. LYNCH. Speculative musings.

2676 Mr. PILTZ. Speculative musing.

2677 Mr. LYNCH. Are there other documents or other instances  
2678 you can point to that would help us?

2679 Mr. PILTZ. Yes, there was in another passage, the draft  
2680 said, with continued perturbation of the earth's radiative  
2681 balance, climate model projects based on a range of possible  
2682 scenarios such as a doubling of atmospheric carbon dioxide  
2683 suggest that during the 21st Century, climate changes due to  
2684 human influences will be substantially larger than what has  
2685 been identified up until now.

2686 Mr. LYNCH. Again, if I could just pause there.

2687 Mr. PILTZ. He said delete. He said delete.

2688 Mr. LYNCH. It sounds like you are saying that the amount  
2689 of carbon and that measurement is very important. What was  
2690 his response to that assumption or that projection?

2691 Mr. PILTZ. The models don't all give the same result, so

2692 | it is inappropriate to speak in summary terms about this type  
2693 | of outcome.

2694 |       Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

2695 |       Mr. PILTZ. I could go on but that sort of thing.

2696 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Lynch.

2697 |       Mr. Higgins?

2698 |       Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2699 |       Mr. Piltz, I would like to ask you about the National  
2700 | Assessment on Potential Consequences of Climate Variability  
2701 | and Change. Your office was involve din putting this  
2702 | document together in 2001. You have described it ''as the  
2703 | most comprehensive and authoritative scientifically-based  
2704 | assesment of the potential consequences of climate change in  
2705 | the United States.''

2706 |       In it, there are projections of potential temperature  
2707 | increases and the consequences those increases would have on  
2708 | our natural environment. This is obviously an important  
2709 | report. Why haven't we heard more about it?

2710 |       Mr. PILTZ. Well, it was distributed to every member of  
2711 | Congress around the end of 2000, 2001, but very early on in  
2712 | 2001, about the same time that the Administration was pulling  
2713 | back from the Kyoto Protocol talks, we were directed by the  
2714 | White House Science Office to start deleting all references  
2715 | to the National Assessment, in the first instance to the  
2716 | annual report to Congress and then in the later in the

2717 | strategic plan for the Climate Change Science Program.

2718 |       There were lawsuits filed, attempting to suppress the  
2719 | National Assessment and even remove the links to it from a  
2720 | Government web site, although it was a taxpayer-funded study,  
2721 | filed by the Competitive Enterprise Institute which is an  
2722 | Exxon Mobile-funded policy group. The lawsuits were  
2723 | dismissed, in one case with prejudice, but the Administration  
2724 | awarded the political victory to the litigants by back  
2725 | channel without much of a paper trail, instructing the  
2726 | Federal agencies just to stop using this report and going  
2727 | forward with any analogous activities.

2728 |       I think it is because this process of putting of  
2729 | scientists in direct communication with policymakers and  
2730 | stakeholders, region by region, sector by sector, generated a  
2731 | type of dialogue that probably was going to lead to greater  
2732 | public pressure for taking the global warming problem  
2733 | seriously and doing something about it, and this was a type  
2734 | of discourse that the Administration just did not want to see  
2735 | happening, in my judgment.

2736 |       Mr. HIGGINS. In this instance and others that you have  
2737 | referenced in your testimony, this is not isolated. This is  
2738 | systemic.

2739 |       Mr. PILTZ. That is right. But I think that this is, I  
2740 | regard this as the central climate science scandal of the  
2741 | Bush Administration because it so pervasively shut down a

2742 | widespread process of intelligence gathering and national  
2743 | preparedness, and we now have six years without high level  
2744 | support for this type of process for linking science to  
2745 | society, and we are losing something because of that.

2746 |         Mr. HIGGINS. Do you have any evidence that that policy,  
2747 | that attitude has changed?

2748 |         Mr. PILTZ. No.

2749 |         Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you.

2750 |         Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Higgins.

2751 |         Mr. Shays?

2752 |         Mr. SHAYS. Thank you.

2753 |         Mr. Piltz, I want to state from the start I believe  
2754 | there is a global climate change. I believe I would call it  
2755 | global warming. I don't get to exercise which term I use. I  
2756 | think it is manmade, and I think it stared us in the face for  
2757 | years. So I disagree with the position and policy of this  
2758 | Administration, but I find myself being a little defensive  
2759 | about whether we are talking about changes in scientific  
2760 | reports or disagreements over policy. I came here thinking I  
2761 | would be more inclined to say change in scientific reports,  
2762 | and as I listen, I find myself FE-I don't know if I am  
2763 | feeling defensive here for the Administration or just really  
2764 | saying let us be fair.

2765 |         The bottom line is you are not a scientist, correct?

2766 |         Mr. PILTZ. That is right. I am not a climate scientist.



2767 Mr. SHAYS. You are not a scientist.

2768 Mr. PILTZ. Right.

2769 Mr. SHAYS. Climate scientist or anything, you are not a  
2770 scientist, correct?

2771 Mr. PILTZ. No. I try to communicate with and represent  
2772 the scientists.

2773 Mr. SHAYS. Why did you even say you are not a climate  
2774 scientist? That give the impression that you are a  
2775 scientist. He is a political scientist.

2776 Mr. WAXMAN. He is a political scientist.

2777 Mr. PILTZ. A social scientist by academic training, yes.

2778 Mr. SHAYS. I find myself being defensive because I feel  
2779 like you are trying to give an impression that is a little  
2780 false to me.

2781 There are 90 reports, 80 reports, whatever. You took  
2782 these reports and you synthesize. That is your term. It is  
2783 editing. You take some of what they did and leave something  
2784 out, correct?

2785 Mr. PILTZ. Well, yes, to try to clarify the  
2786 communication, yes.

2787 Mr. SHAYS. You don't even have to clarify it.

2788 Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

2789 Mr. SHAYS. Because the bottom line is you want to use  
2790 the word, synthesize because that is a more comfortable word  
2791 for you to use than edit. The bottom line is you edit it.

2792 | You as a non-scientist took scientific reports and you edited  
2793 | them down to a position that you felt was respectful of what  
2794 | they did.

2795 |         Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

2796 |         Mr. SHAYS. And I understand that, but you are not a  
2797 | scientist and you edited it. The bottom line is you have  
2798 | come to the conclusion that when another non-scientist took  
2799 | this, he chose to say well, which report, which scientist you  
2800 | are listening and which aren't. Somebody who also wasn't a  
2801 | scientist said we don't want you to make this comment and  
2802 | this description. I think they were wrong. I think that  
2803 | they made a policy decision that ultimately may even be  
2804 | destructful. So I am not even going to argue about that.

2805 |         I just don't like the fact that we are basically trying  
2806 | to give the impression that somehow you are a scientist and  
2807 | you came in and you described it all, and then this  
2808 | non-scientist disagreed with you. That is the feeling that I  
2809 | came with before this hearing. I respect you for your  
2810 | convictions. I respect you for even resigning if you think  
2811 | you weren't being treated fairly or positions were being  
2812 | distorted, but I still come down to the points I have just  
2813 | made.

2814 |         Now what would you like to tell me?

2815 |         Mr. PILTZ. Well, first of all, I worked with,  
2816 | collaborated with the scientists and had their sign-off. I

2817 | was not at war with the mainstream science community. That  
2818 | is one.

2819 | I did not write or edit the National Climate Assessment.  
2820 | If you look at the panel of eminent people who wrote it, it  
2821 | is a very impressive group of people. It is not junk  
2822 | science. It is stuff that should not be suppressed.

2823 | Mr. SHAYS. I understand that.

2824 | Mr. PILTZ. Okay. I don't know. Nobody was telling the  
2825 | scientists what they could publish in the technical journals.  
2826 | This was about communication, but it wasn't just policy. It  
2827 | was spinning the scientific, the state of knowledge,  
2828 | statements about science for political effect.

2829 | Mr. SHAYS. Let me ask you. Were there any scientific  
2830 | reports that you chose to not discuss because they were in  
2831 | conflict with a majority of the position? Was there any  
2832 | scientific--

2833 | Mr. PILTZ. Normally, I worked- FE

2834 | Mr. SHAYS. Let me ask the question and be very clear.  
2835 | Was there any scientific data that you looked at that you did  
2836 | not include because it wasn't with the mainstream?

2837 | Mr. PILTZ. I don't think so. I worked with what was  
2838 | passed forward to me by the career science people.

2839 | Mr. SHAYS. Well, that is important. You are saying that  
2840 | all the scientific data that was provided you, you included  
2841 | and didn't leave any out.

2842 Mr. PILTZ. Generally speaking, there was editing for  
2843 length, but if you look at the reports that I worked on, it  
2844 is generally speaking, non-controversial material. It is  
2845 pretty straight forward, descriptions of research highlights  
2846 and program plans and so forth.

2847 Mr. SHAYS. My time has come to an end, but I just want  
2848 to be clear on this thing. Were you selective in the  
2849 scientific comments that you provided? Did you make any  
2850 decision to include this scientific data and not this  
2851 scientific data? That is really what I am asking.

2852 Mr. PILTZ. Yes, I engaged in some editorial selection,  
2853 as I say, but everything I did was in collaboration with the  
2854 scientists, was reviewed, revised, edited and approved by the  
2855 career science people before it could go forward.

2856 Mr. SHAYS. Okay, thank you.

2857 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Shays.

2858 Ms. McCollum?

2859 Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2860 I was really surprised just how widespread this problem  
2861 was. Last week, my office had an opportunity to speak with a  
2862 climate scientist who is now working in Minnesota, formerly  
2863 employed by the Federal agency and she saw the suppression of  
2864 climate change research firsthand. In her words, ``We were  
2865 told the answers to our analysis before we conducted our  
2866 research.''

2867 I remember from my science classes, going through  
2868 scientific discovery, that you set up the hypothesis and then  
2869 you proved it right or wrong, not the other way.

2870 Mr. Shindell, can I ask you for some help? The  
2871 Committee staff reviewed some CEQ offices that they looked at  
2872 some documentation. In one of the documents, CEQ Chief of  
2873 Staff Phil Cooney informs Kevin O'Donovan who is in the  
2874 Executive Office of the President that they will start to use  
2875 a recent paper by Willie Soon and Sally Baliunas to rebut the  
2876 views of the National Academy of Sciences Intergovernmental  
2877 Panel on Climate Change. Now, apparently, this Soon-Baliunas  
2878 paper asserts that the 20th Century is probably not the  
2879 warmest climate period of the last millennium. Are you  
2880 familiar with this paper?

2881 I might be saying the one person's name wrong too. You  
2882 might want to correct that for the record.

2883 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes, I am familiar with that.

2884 Ms. MCCOLLUM. Now I served on the Education Committee,  
2885 and one of the things that the President and the  
2886 Administration was very focused on was that teachers would  
2887 teach to the subject that they were trained in. Can you tell  
2888 us about this paper?

2889 My understanding is that using this paper to rebut the  
2890 National Academy and the IPC, maybe these weren't the best  
2891 scientists to do that.

2892 Mr. SHINDELL. This was an interesting paper, and I think  
2893 it demonstrates the point that came up in one of the other  
2894 member's questioning about what is allowed. Really, whatever  
2895 stands up to scientific scrutiny is allowed, and it is not  
2896 dependent on the views of the scientist.

2897 So Soon and Baliunas are both astronomers. They are not  
2898 climate scientists, but that is okay, as long as their work  
2899 stands up. Basically, what that paper was, there is no  
2900 original research. It is instead a survey of other climate  
2901 scientists' work where they basically took all of the  
2902 uncertainties and caveats, things that were not included in  
2903 the studies, compiled them and said that then, given that  
2904 there were so many uncertainties and things that were not  
2905 fully understood, we could not say much of anything about  
2906 climate change. However, that is in complete contrast to the  
2907 views of nearly every expert in climate science.

2908 So I think that that is not at all representative, and I  
2909 would not say that one alternative paper undermines the  
2910 thousands of papers that go into a document like the IPCC  
2911 report.

2912 Ms. MCCOLLUM. They are scientists. They are entitled to  
2913 their own opinion, but this is not their field of expertise,  
2914 climate change.

2915 Mr. SHINDELL. That is correct.

2916 Ms. MCCOLLUM. It is my understanding that the paper led

2917 | to a lot of controversy. Press reports indicated that the  
2918 | study was funded by the oil industry and that the editor in  
2919 | chief of the journal resigned when the owners of the journal  
2920 | refused to allow him to publish an editorial saying that the  
2921 | paper in fact was flawed. Is that your understanding?

2922 |         Mr. SHINDELL. Yes, I believe that is correct.

2923 |         Ms. MCCOLLUM. One of the more troubling aspects of this  
2924 | document seems to be that it reflects on what amount of  
2925 | strategy decision that the White House had in part, in fact,  
2926 | that the White House was going to use this study to rebut the  
2927 | prevailing scientific reviews. Do you find this troubling to  
2928 | you as a scientist to have a person who is a scientist but in  
2929 | a totally different field, not an expert in what you are  
2930 | working on, be given the same weight and credibility in  
2931 | rebutting what you are saying rather than a peer in the same  
2932 | field of science?

2933 |         Mr. SHINDELL. I do find that quite troubling. I used  
2934 | the analogy in my testimony of a patient having to trust  
2935 | their doctor, and this would be tantamount to you having a  
2936 | heart condition and getting reports from heart experts all  
2937 | over the world, giving you their best opinion of all the  
2938 | medical data, and then somebody coming on and saying, why  
2939 | don't you look at what these skin doctors have to say. They  
2940 | are a couple of people, you know. I think let us throw out  
2941 | this assessment by all the world's experts and let us take

2942 | this one instead.

2943 | I think it would be very foolish for anybody to do such  
2944 | a thing.

2945 | Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank you for that.

2946 | I am very concerned in looking on page 21 of the  
2947 | document, Atmospheric Pressure. To quote here on page 21:  
2948 | ``I have perceived in others or personally experienced  
2949 | changes and edits during the review that changed the  
2950 | meaning--that changed the meaning--of scientific findings.''

2951 | Further on the page, it says, ``Statements by officials  
2952 | at my agency that misrepresented FE-misrepresented FE-a  
2953 | scientist's finding.''

2954 | I can look at the color of your blue tie, sir, and I can  
2955 | say it is robin's egg blue or I can say it is baby blue. But  
2956 | a scientist could look at that tie and tell me exactly what  
2957 | color it is by science, and that is indisputable. The other  
2958 | two items are my opinion, but the other one is science.

2959 | I thank you so much, Mr. Shindell. What would you say  
2960 | about the credibility?

2961 | Mr. WAXMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired.

2962 | Mr. SHINDELL. I would just say that that is an  
2963 | interesting counterpoint to some of the cases that were  
2964 | raised before where there were synthesis documents. The  
2965 | cases where there was interference at my agency were specific  
2966 | scientific reports. There was no policy involved. They were



2967 | simply this is the result of a particular set of observations  
2968 | for a particular modeling study, and those were nevertheless  
2969 | edited when they showed the dangers of climate change.

2970 | Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2971 | Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

2972 | Mr. Sarbanes?

2973 | Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2974 | I have just a couple of questions that are  
2975 | inter-related. The first is, and this may sound a little  
2976 | naive but what I am trying to get to is your understanding.  
2977 | Mr. Piltz, I think you are in the best position to address  
2978 | this, your understanding of what was motivating inside the  
2979 | CEQ, inside the White House.

2980 | I guess the range of options could include that you had  
2981 | a small handful of people that had sort of been given license  
2982 | within this office to exercise their own personal ideological  
2983 | political perspective and that is what they were doing and/or  
2984 | they were responding, and this would be sinister, to pressure  
2985 | from external influences and/or that they were carrying out a  
2986 | fairly specific and focused policy agenda coming even from  
2987 | higher levels. Based on your observation of this conduct  
2988 | that was occurring in the CEQ, can you speak to that at all?

2989 | Mr. PILTZ. Well, I wasn't in the room with them while  
2990 | that was being worked out, so I have to analyze it from a  
2991 | step back, but as a political scientist, I would say that

2992 | there are elements of all three of those to explain this.

2993 |       I think the Administration came in with predetermined  
2994 | political agenda on greenhouse gas emissions and the global  
2995 | warming problem that it was not going to support a regulatory  
2996 | policy. The willingness to allow political operatives to  
2997 | engage in misrepresenting the intelligence on the science  
2998 | side, the spinning of the politics back into the science  
2999 | communication is a problem. I think that they were  
3000 | representing particular stakeholder interests, political,  
3001 | particularly in conjunction with political allies. Also, it  
3002 | just seemed to me that they brought with them some kind of  
3003 | animus toward proactive government problem-solving and  
3004 | preparedness to deal with consequences of decisions or not  
3005 | making decisions and have left us in this position.

3006 |       So somehow this global, the way the global warming issue  
3007 | has been handled is somehow indicative to me of a modus  
3008 | operandi that we have seen across a range of issues, and this  
3009 | is the global warming piece of it.

3010 |       Mr. SARBANES. Right.

3011 |       Mr. PILTZ. Did that make any sense.

3012 |       Mr. SARBANES. It does. I think you are saying it is  
3013 | symptomatic of an attitude that cut across other ways that  
3014 | the Administration has handled things.

3015 |       Let me ask you this. I am trying understand the purpose  
3016 | of a retrospective like this, I think is to inform what goes

3017 forward. I am struggling to understand for myself the point  
3018 at which one can say that the scientific inquiry for the  
3019 moment is concluded. I understand this is ongoing and it  
3020 changes every day but where you feel comfortable as a  
3021 scientific community coming forward and saying this is what  
3022 we know and it has reached the point where the political  
3023 aspect of it ought to be kept at bay because people will say,  
3024 well, we are just trying to bring more balance, we are just  
3025 trying to complete the picture.

3026 So is it at the point where the National Academy of  
3027 Sciences, for example, says there is a strong, almost  
3028 unprecedented consensus on this issue, that one can feel  
3029 comfortable that this represents good science and we ought to  
3030 accept it as such? Where is that line?

3031 Mr. PILTZ. You can't. You can't try to make the science  
3032 community say that they are absolutely certain about  
3033 something. When they say something is very likely, you ought  
3034 to take it seriously. The science community has a lot of  
3035 integrity and owning up to their own uncertainties and they  
3036 are always asking the next question, but you always make your  
3037 policy decisions in the face of some uncertainty about the  
3038 implications. What happens is people with political agendas  
3039 come in, who have a predatory relationship to that  
3040 uncertainty language and they use it for reason in a way that  
3041 is different from the way the scientific community uses it.

3042 | So you know you will not get them to say we are 100 percent  
3043 | certain.

3044 | I always cringe when somebody says the science is in.  
3045 | It is time for action.

3046 | I mean we have a National research program that is our  
3047 | basic intelligence capability for understanding what we are  
3048 | doing to Planet Earth. That needs to be supported. It has  
3049 | always had strong bipartisan support regardless of political  
3050 | debates about the policy implications, and that scientific  
3051 | research needs to go on. But while it is addressing whatever  
3052 | questions need to be addressed, policymaking has to proceed  
3053 | in tandem with that, not at the end of some science process.  
3054 | The two have an ongoing interplay.

3055 | Mr. SARBANES. That is a powerful phrase, predatory  
3056 | relationship to the uncertainty of the science. I will use  
3057 | that if you give me permission.

3058 | Thank you very much.

3059 | Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Sarbanes.

3060 | Mr. Welch?

3061 | Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3062 | Dr. Pielke, I noticed in your written testimony, you  
3063 | made a claim that the memo that was prepared by the Committee  
3064 | staff for this hearing is ``exactly the same sort of thing  
3065 | that we have seen with heavy-handed Bush Administration  
3066 | information strategies,`` and I take the charge that you make

3067 | very seriously. You are, if I understand it, essentially  
3068 | accusing the Committee of the conduct that it is  
3069 | investigating.

3070 |         You took specific offense with the memo's discussion of  
3071 | the state of science regarding the connections between global  
3072 | warming and hurricanes, where the memo notes, recently  
3073 | published studies have suggested that the impacts of global  
3074 | warming include increases in the intensity of hurricanes and  
3075 | tropical storms.

3076 |         So, taking this seriously, we asked the Committee staff  
3077 | to contact these leading researchers to follow up to see if  
3078 | there is anything we should be concerned with in that memo.  
3079 | Dr. Judith Curry, as you know, a leading researcher, told us  
3080 | that all the research scientists working in the area of  
3081 | hurricanes agree that average hurricane intensity will  
3082 | increase with increasing tropical sea surface temperature.  
3083 | Theory, models, observations all support this increase. She  
3084 | tells us that the recent research indicates an impact of  
3085 | global warming is more intense hurricanes. The current  
3086 | debate and lack of consensus is about the magnitude, she  
3087 | says, of the increased intensity, not its existence.

3088 |         Dr. Michael Mann, also a prominent researcher, tells us  
3089 | that in his view, you have misinterpreted the WMO report in  
3090 | arguing that it somehow contradicts information provided in  
3091 | the scientific background of the hearing memo that you had a

3092 | chance to review. He says, the current state of play with  
3093 | the science on this is accurately summarized in the hearing  
3094 | memo.

3095 |         Now, given all the testimony that we have received  
3096 | today, I am wondering whether you stand by your statement  
3097 | which is essentially a challenge to the memo of this  
3098 | Committee. We have heard evidence of hundreds of incidents  
3099 | of political interference. We have heard very direct  
3100 | testimony from some of the people here and others that the  
3101 | White House did edit documents to introduce doubt where  
3102 | essentially no doubt existed. We have heard scientists'  
3103 | contacts with the press were in fact being monitored by the  
3104 | White House.

3105 |         In light of today's testimony and the information  
3106 | provided to the Committee by Drs. Curry and Mann, is it still  
3107 | your belief that the Committee's hearing memo is, to quote  
3108 | you, ``exactly the same sort of thing'' the Bush  
3109 | Administration has done?

3110 |         Mr. PIELKE. I thank you for the opportunity to clarify,  
3111 | and I did say the word, in microcosm. This is, I think, and  
3112 | I will stand by exactly what I said, and I am happy to talk  
3113 | about the science and impacts of hurricanes as long as you  
3114 | would like because it is an area I have been researching for  
3115 | about 15 years. The memo includes the statement, recently  
3116 | published studies have suggested that the impacts of global

3117 | warming include increases, and it cites three papers that  
3118 | look retrospectively back in time. So it is not talking  
3119 | about projections in the future. So the statement by Dr.  
3120 | Judy Curry who is a great scientist, who I have a lot of  
3121 | respect for, isn't on point here.

3122 |       I want to make a point that I hope everyone recognizes.  
3123 | The same dynamic that we just saw, talking about the  
3124 | Soon-Baliunas paper as the one outlier contradicting the  
3125 | consensus. We see this on the exact other side. Now there  
3126 | was 120 scientists that includes Kerry Emmanuel and Greg  
3127 | Holland who were co-authors of those three papers cited here,  
3128 | came up with a consensus statement on hurricanes and climate  
3129 | change. That is analogous to the IPCC. Subsequently, the  
3130 | American Meteorological Society has endorsed that statement.

3131 |       Now I am not a climate scientist and just like I accept  
3132 | the consensus of the IPCC, I am compelled to accept the  
3133 | consensus of the hurricane community. Now it is very easy to  
3134 | pick out a Soon and Baliunas paper or selectively email a  
3135 | scientist and say, what is your view?

3136 |       I respect Dr. Mann and Dr. Curry have their views about  
3137 | what the statement says, but I am absolutely 100 percent  
3138 | certain that the statement that is in your background memo  
3139 | does not faithfully represent the science. It selects among  
3140 | the science perspectives, and that is inevitable, and we have  
3141 | to recognize that, and no one is immune from it. It doesn't

3142 | not excuse the Bush Administration from their actions, of  
3143 | course, but let us not pretend that somehow we can separate  
3144 | out scientific truth from political preferences. The reality  
3145 | is they are always going to be intermixed.

3146 |         Mr. WELCH. The memo, the Committee memo, states very  
3147 | specifically that the evidence suggests that link.

3148 |         Mr. PIELKE. That is true.

3149 |         Mr. WELCH. The evidence is there.

3150 |         Mr. PIELKE. Yes, it is there.

3151 |         Mr. WELCH. You are now taking the leap to suggest that  
3152 | the Committee memo is similar to the conduct of interfering  
3153 | with scientific debate that we have heard testimony about  
3154 | from these scientists.

3155 |         Mr. PIELKE. In microcosm. In microcosm, it shows how  
3156 | easy and simple it is to selectively report scientific  
3157 | information to favor a particular agenda, absolutely. The  
3158 | statement in there is accurate. It is just like what we have  
3159 | heard about some of the changes. The statement that Mr.  
3160 | Cooney made, some them were judged to be accurate but  
3161 | misleading. This is exactly the same sort of thing.

3162 |         Mr. WELCH. Thank you very much.

3163 |         I wonder, Dr. Grifo, if you could respond if you have  
3164 | any different point of view than Dr. Pielke.

3165 |         Ms. GRIFO. I would just respond by saying that, you  
3166 | know, peer review is the gold standard and that this is



3167 something that, you know, science will resolve. Ultimately,  
3168 you know, as the scientific process continues to study  
3169 hurricane intensity and what that means and what it doesn't  
3170 mean, you know, we still have all these other lines of  
3171 evidence that really point us in the direction that we have  
3172 all been talking about here today which is that this is a  
3173 huge and serious problem and we need to get on it.

3174 Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Welch, will you yield to me?

3175 Mr. WELCH. I yield to the Chairman, yes. Thank you.

3176 Mr. WAXMAN. Doctor, you are a doctor, but you are not a  
3177 scientist. You are a political scientist.

3178 Mr. PIELKE. I am a political scientist. That is  
3179 accurate.

3180 Mr. WAXMAN. And you said you are absolutely certain that  
3181 you are right on this issue and that Dr. Curry and Dr. Mann  
3182 are wrong in their statement. Isn't that quite a statement  
3183 for you to make? No scientist here has been willing to make  
3184 any statement that there is absolute certainty because the  
3185 process of science continues to evaluate things.

3186 Dr. Shindell, you are familiar with Dr. Curry and Dr.  
3187 Mann, is that correct? Dr. Shindell, are you familiar with  
3188 those two?

3189 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes.

3190 Mr. WAXMAN. Are they somewhat isolated in the field with  
3191 their own theories at odds with the majority of scientists?

3192 Mr. SHINDELL. No. They are quite within the mainstream.

3193 Mr. WAXMAN. In fact, isn't Dr. Mann one of the leading  
3194 scientists in global warming issues?

3195 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes. Yes, he is.

3196 Mr. WAXMAN. And Dr. Curry as well?

3197 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes.

3198 Mr. WAXMAN. So I am just wondering whether we should  
3199 believe them or the certainty of Dr. Pielke that they are  
3200 wrong.

3201 Mr. PIELKE. May I clarify, Mr. Waxman?

3202 Mr. WAXMAN. Yes, please.

3203 Mr. PIELKE. My certainty is as to what the WMO hurricane  
3204 consensus says. Let me say I have led two inter-disciplinary  
3205 papers including climate scientists, peer-reviewed, reviewing  
3206 the science of hurricanes and climate change that were  
3207 published in the Bulletin of the American Meteorological  
3208 Society in 2005 and 2006, and the summary that is in those  
3209 papers has stood up to the WMO and AMS consensus points. So  
3210 it is fair to say your background means that you can't speak  
3211 on this topic and so on, but do recognize that scholars today  
3212 work on inter-disciplinary teams and there is literature that  
3213 Dr. Shindell would accept as being in the mainstream  
3214 peer-reviewed journals.

3215 Mr. WAXMAN. I don't dispute your ability to study the  
3216 field and make comments on it except when we say that

3217 | evidence suggests something which seems to be backed by Dr.  
3218 | Mann and Dr. Curry for you to say they are wrong. We didn't  
3219 | reach the conclusion. We said evidence suggests this.

3220 |         Mr. PIELKE. Let me clarify again. I did not say that  
3221 | they are wrong. I said that their views are not consistent  
3222 | with the mainstream consensus in the community. I am 100  
3223 | percent sure of that statement.

3224 |         Mr. WAXMAN. Do you know whether that is true, Dr.  
3225 | Shindell, on that?

3226 |         Mr. SHINDELL. I believe that their views are consistent  
3227 | with the mainstream consensus, and I think that we are having  
3228 | a slight semantic argument over what the mainstream consensus  
3229 | is. Is it that hurricanes have increased in severity in the  
3230 | past? Will they increase in the future? I think it is an  
3231 | interesting issue, this one, because unlike some of the other  
3232 | aspects of global warming that are better understood, there  
3233 | is some legitimate controversy, and so it can lead to these  
3234 | kinds of discussions.

3235 |         But one of the interesting things about uncertainty,  
3236 | there is two points. One is that scientists are very open  
3237 | about the uncertainty and that is what leads to these kinds  
3238 | of statements saying yes, we don't know everything about it.

3239 |         Another is that while we have been looking at model  
3240 | projections to inform us about the kind of world we are  
3241 | likely to live in, when you look at these studies of

3242 | hurricanes, they are suggesting that maybe the models are  
3243 | drastically under-predicting what is likely to happen. These  
3244 | studies that are referred to in your statement from this  
3245 | Committee are showing much, much stronger increases than  
3246 | anybody's model guess.

3247 |         So, yes, there is uncertainty, but that cuts both ways.  
3248 | It might mean we don't understand everything, and so it could  
3249 | be better. It might also mean that things might end up far  
3250 | worse than what we are saying they are likely to be.

3251 |         Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

3252 |         Mr. Welch, do you want to conclude your questioning?

3253 |         Mr. WELCH. I will just finish by going back to Dr.  
3254 | Pielke.

3255 |         What I understand is you are acknowledging that the  
3256 | Committee memo does cite mainstream science, correct?

3257 |         Mr. PIELKE. Absolutely, it does.

3258 |         Mr. WELCH. What I want to know, after we have been  
3259 | through this, is this, are you standing by your position that  
3260 | this memo that cites mainstream science is exactly the same  
3261 | kind of conduct as what we have heard occurred in the Bush  
3262 | Administration where there was direct interference with  
3263 | independent conclusions reached by scientists following the  
3264 | scientific method?

3265 |         Mr. PIELKE. I will repeat exactly what I said in my  
3266 | written testimony. In microcosm, this shows how in political

3267 | settings, which the preparation of Government reports is, how  
3268 | easy, enticing it is to selectively present scientific  
3269 | results to buttress a political perspective.

3270 |         Mr. WELCH. Would you say there is a difference between  
3271 | citing mainstream science in a public memo as opposed to  
3272 | altering science as presented to a PR person?

3273 |         Mr. PIELKE. Not much difference, no.

3274 |         Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

3275 |         Mr. Yarmuth?

3276 |         Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

3277 |         Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3278 |         I would stipulate for the record that I am not a  
3279 | scientist either, but I am journalist by background and an  
3280 | editor, so I would like to pursue a line of questioning that  
3281 | Mr. Shays had with Mr. Piltz.

3282 |         When I was editing stories, I basically looked for two  
3283 | things. One was whether the message was communicated clearly  
3284 | and secondly whether claims made in the article or the  
3285 | document were backed up by any evidence. If I saw something  
3286 | that I suspected might have been speculative musing or  
3287 | something of that nature, I would have gone to the author and  
3288 | asked the author to show me the documentation or the  
3289 | supporting or the interviews or whatever sources he or she  
3290 | might have had for writing that.

3291 |         I am taking it from this discussion that Mr. Cooney made

3292 | no particular effort to determine whether in fact there was  
3293 | something substantive behind the portions of those reports  
3294 | that he excised.

3295 |         Mr. PILTZ. That is correct.

3296 |         Mr. YARMUTH. So, essentially, what he did was interpose  
3297 | judgment for the scientists who wrote the report.

3298 |         Mr. PILTZ. For the career science people, yes.

3299 |         Mr. YARMUTH. Dr. Grifo, you have a report coming out  
3300 | today, and it includes some extensive interviews with about  
3301 | 40 Government global warming scientists. I would like to  
3302 | focus on one. Dr. Pieter Tans, who was the Chief Scientist  
3303 | for NOAA's Global Monitoring Division, was asked back in  
3304 | October of 2004 to do a press conference with the BBC or an  
3305 | interview with the BBC. That was a month before the  
3306 | Presidential election. How long did it take for Dr. Tans to  
3307 | receive approval to give that interview?

3308 |         Ms. GRIFO. The interviews were not approved until  
3309 | February of 2005.

3310 |         Mr. YARMUTH. 2005, so it took four months to approve the  
3311 | interviews.

3312 |         Ms. GRIFO. Well, that was the approval. They didn't  
3313 | actually take place until even a month after that.

3314 |         Mr. YARMUTH. Is that a normal cycle for approval of an  
3315 | interview from a media outlet? My experience would say that  
3316 | would be an extraordinarily long period of time.

3317 Ms. GRIFO. That would be consistent with my experience,  
3318 yes.

3319 Mr. YARMUTH. Just in terms of other interviews hat  
3320 scientists might have given, and any of you can answer, would  
3321 it take four months for even a Government agency scientist to  
3322 agree to do an interview or turn down an interview?

3323 Ms. GRIFO. To me or to them?

3324 Mr. YARMUTH. Whomever.

3325 Mr. SHINDELL. We had cases at NASA where a request would  
3326 come in, say from CNN, to talk about the latest global  
3327 temperature changes. Our public affairs officer would relay  
3328 that to us and by the time we got back, they would say  
3329 headquarters has already told them that nobody is available  
3330 and there will not be such an interview. So those things did  
3331 happen.

3332 Mr. YARMUTH. Was there- FE oh, I am sorry.

3333 Ms. GRIFO. I just was letting him go first. Can I just  
3334 hop in, back in?

3335 Mr. YARMUTH. Sure.

3336 Ms. GRIFO. I mean our report indicates a large number of  
3337 those instances happening. I mean there is a number that are  
3338 described, anonymous scientists from NOAA, Christopher Milly,  
3339 Dr. Shindell's case, Richard Weatherall. There are many of  
3340 these that have been documented, so it is not an isolated  
3341 incident.

3342 Mr. YARMUTH. Were there conditions placed on the  
3343 approval of the interview with Dr. Tans?

3344 Ms. GRIFO. Just there was a minder. There was a public  
3345 affairs officer, and in fact he flew across the Country and  
3346 even to Mauna Loa, Hawaii in order to be there for those  
3347 interviews.

3348 Mr. YARMUTH. Did he serve any useful purpose as far as  
3349 you can tell? Is that standard operating procedure when a  
3350 scientist is interviewed?

3351 Ms. GRIFO. I think what is important here is that  
3352 scientists coordinate with the agency, that they let the  
3353 agency know an interview is taking place and that they report  
3354 back on this interview after the interview has taken place.  
3355 That is what the critical role and the relationship should be  
3356 between a scientist and a public affairs officer.

3357 Mr. YARMUTH. Basically, the taxpayers paid to send  
3358 someone along over the globe to just watch Peter Tans give  
3359 an interview.

3360 Ms. GRIFO. Yes, sir, they did.

3361 Mr. YARMUTH. That is all I have. I yield back, Mr.  
3362 Chairman.

3363 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Yarmuth.

3364 Mr. Issa?

3365 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3366 Mr. WAXMAN. You are recognized for second round.



3367 Mr. ISSA. Thank you and thank you so much for calling  
3368 this hearing. As I mentioned as a sidebar, this is at least  
3369 two great hearings wrapped into one, perhaps three. I will  
3370 try to get through just a couple more points.

3371 Mr. Piltz, my understanding is that you were a strong  
3372 supporter, remain a strong supporter of the 2000 National  
3373 Assessment on Climate Change.

3374 Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

3375 Mr. ISSA. Both you and Dr. Pielke, I am sure are  
3376 familiar with James Hansen.

3377 Mr. PILTZ. Yes.

3378 Mr. ISSA. Also, well-respected, and my understanding is  
3379 he vehemently disagreed with the assessments, felt that the  
3380 models were flawed, leading to overly pessimistic views and  
3381 said so in a number of writings. Is that roughly correct?

3382 Mr. PILTZ. I am not aware of Dr. Hansen's specific  
3383 comments on the National Assessment, but I think that every  
3384 scientist had an individual opinion about how he might have  
3385 done it better.

3386 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Pielke, are you familiar with that?

3387 Mr. PIELKE. I am not familiar with that.

3388 Mr. ISSA. I will quote him briefly. He said, "The  
3389 predicted 1 percent per year or 2 to 3 full 21st Century  
3390 increases in CO2 assumed in the study may be pessimistic."  
3391 Then he goes on and does a little more than may, but it was

3392 | interesting that he used may, something that sometimes people  
3393 | object to. That study turned into a lawsuit and the  
3394 | Government, this Clinton Administration assessment which you  
3395 | support, which James Hansen had doubts about, in fact, turned  
3396 | out by an admission of the Administration to be flawed and is  
3397 | no longer in widespread use.

3398 |         In a nutshell, you end up with you can have the  
3399 | Government do work. The science can have problems in the  
3400 | model. It can be questioned by a minority of the science  
3401 | community. It can go through, in this case, a lawsuit, and  
3402 | an Administration can recognize that in fact some of the  
3403 | assumptions or models were flawed and therefore overly  
3404 | pessimistic. That is the assessment I find on that, but I  
3405 | want to continue on to Mr. Piltz a little bit because  
3406 | certainly Mr. Cooney deserves -

3407 |         Mr. PILTZ. If I could respond to that, it would be FE  
3408 | Mr. ISSA. We will.

3409 |         He deserves to be considered as to whether his edits  
3410 | were proper or not. In your resignation letter from June  
3411 | 1st, 2005, you did a fairly extensive memo, and I appreciate  
3412 | that, but one of the things you said on page 11, speaking of  
3413 | Mr. Cooney's edits, most of the more problematic CEQ comments  
3414 | were not adopted. Some were and the damage to the document  
3415 | was significantly limited.

3416 |         Now earlier I asked you about whether or not there was

3417 further review. If I read this correctly and your own  
3418 statements, what we really have is we have an editor editing  
3419 your edit and then his edits being further edited, and each  
3420 of you, I am sure, like the pride of an author, would say I  
3421 didn't like his edits.

3422 I will mention for the record that I once had dinner  
3423 with Francis Ford Coppola, and it took the entire dinner for  
3424 him to tell me how rotten a job they did screwing up his  
3425 great work on the Godfather series and each of them would  
3426 have been better if they had just left it alone. You don't  
3427 even want to get into his idea of colorization of old films.

3428 I think the point is we are having an argument over  
3429 edit, edit, edit when in fact science is, by definition, not  
3430 perfect or infallible, and certainly the 2000 National  
3431 Assessment proves that you can have bad assumptions even in a  
3432 Government document.

3433 Back to Dr. Grifo--thank you--your study, this 19  
3434 percent response rate, doesn't it fly in the face of OMB's  
3435 own requirement for an 80 percent response in fact to have a  
3436 study be considered to be reasonable survey results? I will  
3437 just note that a study done at the request of the Urban  
3438 Institute and the United Way in June of 2003 for non-profits  
3439 found in fact that low rate of return raises concerns about  
3440 potentially serious, non-responsive bias. Claims from a  
3441 survey project with low return rates are frequently viewed

3442 | with skepticism and even rejected by the scholarly community.  
3443 |       Isn't it fair to say that your organization,  
3444 | notwithstanding the question of the Vietnam War, if you will,  
3445 | that is a little old history, but your organization which  
3446 | released a major study just today, that had been embargoed,  
3447 | that reaches a strong position on global warming is in fact  
3448 | an advocacy group, and moreover the Pew Charitable Trust,  
3449 | which I respect a great deal, gave you \$1 million to promote  
3450 | getting the Nation's commitment to energy efficiency and  
3451 | renewable energy as a corner stone policy?

3452 |       Isn't fair to say that your organization is in fact an  
3453 | advocacy group and that when we are sitting here today, what  
3454 | we are seeing is several advocates of positions against a  
3455 | question of whether the Administration has a right to balance  
3456 | that advocacy?

3457 |       Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. I want to  
3458 | give Dr. Grifo a chance to respond and Mr. Piltz a chance to  
3459 | respond as well.

3460 |       Ms. GRIFO. Thank you very much. Yes, sir, we are  
3461 | advocates for good science. That is what we are advocates  
3462 | for, for getting that information out into the public realm.  
3463 | Furthermore, I would say that all those other surveys that  
3464 | you have mentioned did not have the primary consideration  
3465 | that we did which was protecting the anonymity of the  
3466 | scientists that we surveyed. That was paramount to us. That

3467 | was absolutely incredibly important because of the chilling  
3468 | effect that we are all here to discuss. /Mr. Piltz, you seem  
3469 | to want to respond to Mr. Issa's question.

3470 |         Mr. PILTZ. Well, first of all, on the National  
3471 | Assessment briefly, it was not a Clinton report. It was  
3472 | prepared by an independent panel of eminent scientists and  
3473 | handed to the Government without any Government vetting.

3474 |         The Bush Administration has never said anything about to  
3475 | criticize the National Assessment, never given any  
3476 | intellectual or scientific rationale for what, if anything,  
3477 | is wrong with the. They just deep-sixed it.

3478 |         The National Academy of Sciences has praised it as a  
3479 | seminal, important, credible, exemplary study. That is the  
3480 | bottom line on that.

3481 |         As for Mr. Cooney's edits, in one report in the final  
3482 | technical review draft of the Climate Change Program's  
3483 | Strategic Plan, at the twelfth hour, he came in and proposed  
3484 | more than 400 text edits in the document that in the  
3485 | aggregate would have pervasively changed the tone of the  
3486 | document to manufacture an enhanced sense of uncertainty. It  
3487 | caused so much consternation on the inside that there was a  
3488 | pushback from the director of the Climate Change Science  
3489 | Program, and a solution was negotiated at the political level  
3490 | that a lot of these edits would not be taken. However, the  
3491 | banishing of the National Assessment remained.

3492 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

3493 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent to  
3494 submit for the record the proof that the Clinton  
3495 Administration did in fact settle and that the 2000  
3496 assessment has been disregarded as the result of flaws.

3497 Mr. PILTZ. The Bush Administration settled.

3498 Mr. WAXMAN. You want to submit?

3499 Mr. ISSA. I will submit it for the record.

3500 Mr. WAXMAN. You will submit some documents for the  
3501 record?

3502 Mr. ISSA. I will submit the documentation. I do believe  
3503 it is the Clinton Administration. I will submit it for the  
3504 record.

3505 Mr. WAXMAN. We will be pleased to receive whatever  
3506 documents you wish to submit for the record.

3507 Mr. ISSA. Thank you.

3508 Mr. WAXMAN. Then we will make our own judgment whether  
3509 it proves something or not. Thank you.

3510 Mr. Lynch?

3511 Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3512 Dr. Shindell, I just wanted to go over another specific  
3513 example of political interference. Now you have been at  
3514 NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies for 12 years, is  
3515 that correct?

3516 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes.

3517 Mr. LYNCH. You were there in the later nineties.

3518 Mr. SHINDELL. That is correct.

3519 Mr. LYNCH. When you completed important studies in the  
3520 late nineties, did you submit press releases for  
3521 distribution?

3522 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes, I did many times.

3523 Mr. LYNCH. Did you have any problems such as has been  
3524 described here earlier in the hearing, any problems in terms  
3525 of editing of those press releases?

3526 Mr. SHINDELL. On the contrary, I found the comments from  
3527 headquarters and the press corps to be helpful in clarifying  
3528 the results.

3529 Mr. LYNCH. In September of 2004, you submitted a press  
3530 release to announce the findings of your new study on  
3531 Antarctica. You suggested a title for the press release, and  
3532 I will quote it here: ``Cool Antarctica May Warm Rapidly This  
3533 Century, Study Finds.``

3534 First of all, can I ask you, was this a significant  
3535 study?

3536 Mr. SHINDELL. Well, as I mentioned in my oral testimony,  
3537 I thought it was significant, both because this was an  
3538 unexplained feature of the world's temperature trends, why  
3539 Antarctica was going the other way from the rest of the  
3540 planet, and it is an area we worry about quite a lot for  
3541 possibility of contributing to sea level rise as the ice

3542 sheets melt. So in that yes, it was.

3543 Mr. LYNCH. Now, can I ask you, was your press release  
3544 accepted?

3545 Mr. SHINDELL. No. It was delayed several times and then  
3546 came back altered, and the title that we had, as you  
3547 mentioned that we had suggested was especially objected to.  
3548 So we worked for some time on that and came up with another  
3549 title which we thought might be more palatable which was NASA  
3550 Scientists Expect Temperature Flip-Flop in the Antarctic.  
3551 That, too, was rejected.

3552 After more complaints and questions as to who was  
3553 editing these things without ever getting a direct response,  
3554 word came back from above that the title should be Scientists  
3555 Study Antarctic Climate Change, with no possibility of  
3556 revision. So, as you might imagine, that doesn't really  
3557 attract the attention of most people. The public, you as  
3558 members of Congress are not out there reading geophysical  
3559 research letters. If a study says we look at climate change  
3560 in Antarctica, it drew very little media interest. It didn't  
3561 get out into the public debate, and I think that is harmful  
3562 to informing the public debate about global warming.

3563 Mr. LYNCH. Right, I just want to go back again. The  
3564 phrase, rapid warming, was deleted.

3565 Mr. SHINDELL. Yes.

3566 Mr. LYNCH. Instead, it just indicates Scientists Predict



3567 | Antarctic Climate Changes, a rather neutral, rather vague  
3568 | title. Were you uncomfortable with that title?

3569 |       Mr. SHINDELL. I was not comfortable with that. I  
3570 | thought it was so watered down that it would be of little  
3571 | interest to anybody after all the time and effort we went to,  
3572 | to make this release and communicate the results that that  
3573 | would do a very poor job of doing so. But when I objected,  
3574 | there was no response, and I was told that it had to be that  
3575 | title. Indeed, there was little media reporting.

3576 |       Mr. LYNCH. Let me ask you quickly. Press interviews,  
3577 | what was the procedure under the Clinton Administration in  
3578 | the late nineties for press interviews?

3579 |       Mr. SHINDELL. The public affairs office worked to  
3580 | facilitate our contacts with the media, and when inquiries  
3581 | came into public affairs, they would simply relay them to us  
3582 | and say, do you have a chance to talk to this person? Go  
3583 | ahead. Contact them.

3584 |       Mr. LYNCH. What was the most recent process under the  
3585 | Bush Administration?

3586 |       Mr. SHINDELL. In the fall of 2004, that was when there  
3587 | was imposed this rule that press officers or minders, if you  
3588 | will, had to be present supposedly for our benefit to protect  
3589 | us from being misquoted, although there was no feeling within  
3590 | the agency that this was actually a problem.

3591 |       Mr. LYNCH. Okay, I will yield back.

3592 Mr. SHINDELL. Instead, it had a chilling effect.

3593 Mr. LYNCH. Thank you.

3594 Mr. WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

3595 Mr. Murphy?

3596 Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3597 I just had a few questions for Dr. Grifo.

3598 We have been talking today obviously about the very  
3599 unique question of global warming and the impact of political  
3600 decisions made in Washington upon scientific opinion, but I  
3601 think we might be remiss in leaving this hearing if we didn't  
3602 admit that there is a creep of political influence into other  
3603 areas of this Administration as well.

3604 We certainly understand the long term ramifications of  
3605 global warming on the health of our Nation, but there are  
3606 more potentially immediate consequences of the political  
3607 decisions made within this Administration when it comes to  
3608 the Food and Drug Administration. I understand that the  
3609 Union of Concerned Scientists have done some work into  
3610 surveying the opinions of those working in and around the  
3611 Food and Drug Administration, and I might just ask you a few  
3612 questions about some of your work there to maybe educate our  
3613 panel and Congress on some of the ancillary implications  
3614 beyond the subject of global warming.

3615 When you did this survey of FDA scientists, it would be  
3616 interesting to know if you heard from any of those scientists

3617 | whether they were asked for non-scientific reasons to  
3618 | inappropriately exclude or alter any technical information or  
3619 | conclusions in any of the documents that the FDA was  
3620 | providing to Congress or to other agencies. Did you get a  
3621 | sense from FDA scientists whether they were asked, in  
3622 | essence, to censure the information they provided for those  
3623 | documents?

3624 |         Ms. GRIFO. Yes, sir, and in answer to the actual survey  
3625 | instrument that was mailed to them anonymously again with an  
3626 | anonymous return, and I would also say that the FDA  
3627 | scientists came back to us with 69 pages of essays, 69 pages  
3628 | of their own words, irrespective of the questions we asked.  
3629 | Their hearts have really been poured out into that document,  
3630 | and that is on our web site, and we can make that available.

3631 |         But I would say that, you know, 145 FDA scientists had  
3632 | been asked to alter info or conclusions for non-scientific  
3633 | reasons, and I think even more frightening is that 461 of  
3634 | them knew of cases where commercial interests had  
3635 | inappropriately intruded into that process. These are the  
3636 | decisions that profoundly and very directly affect our health  
3637 | and the health of our children.

3638 |         I would just add that I had a personal experience with  
3639 | Ketek, a drug that really never should have come onto the  
3640 | market and because of the manipulation of the science, did.  
3641 | In fact, this was a drug that caused profound liver failure

3642 | and was prescribed to my son for an infected hangnail. I  
3643 | mean this is the risk that we encounter with this kind of  
3644 | interference.

3645 |         Mr. MURPHY. You gave sort of the gross numbers of those  
3646 | that responded. What percentages of the respondents are you  
3647 | talking about that either believed that they were forced into  
3648 | making decisions for commercial rather than scientific  
3649 | reasons or even felt pressure?

3650 |         I mean to the extent that people actually changed their  
3651 | input or changed the recommendations they were making, but  
3652 | then there is also simply the issue of those in the agency  
3653 | that felt that they were pressured to make those different  
3654 | decisions. Do you have a sense of what percentage of  
3655 | scientists answered in the affirmative to those types of  
3656 | questions?

3657 |         Ms. GRIFO. Yes, and again we went to great lengths to  
3658 | determine who were the scientists and made sure that they  
3659 | were the respondents. We had a high level of Ph.D.s, a high  
3660 | level of high GS scientists responding and a very high level  
3661 | of 10 and 15 years at the agency. So these were the cream of  
3662 | the crop, if you will. Sixty percent knew of cases where  
3663 | commercial interests inappropriately induced or attempted to  
3664 | induce changes to FDA decisions or actions, and again 61  
3665 | percent of all respondents knew of cases of inappropriate  
3666 | political interference.

3667 Mr. MURPHY. In your experience of surveying different  
3668 agencies and departments of the Administration, how does the  
3669 concern of those scientists and the pressure put upon the FDA  
3670 officials and scientists, how does that compare with some of  
3671 the other issues that we have been talking about today or  
3672 other experiences that you have had from other departments  
3673 and agencies within the Administration?

3674 Ms. GRIFO. I think one of the most frightening ones has  
3675 to do with fear of retaliation, that we had 396 scientists at  
3676 the Food and Drug Administration who could not publicly  
3677 express concerns about public health without fear of  
3678 retaliation and that 357 of them, that would be 36 percent of  
3679 our respondents, could not even express those concerns within  
3680 the agency.

3681 As I started off in my testimony, the total number from  
3682 across the Federal Government and the number was, when we  
3683 look at retaliation, 699 scientists. That is 39 percent  
3684 across 9 agencies have reported that they fear retaliation  
3685 for openly expressing their concerns about the mission-driven  
3686 work of their agencies.

3687 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Murphy. Your time has  
3688 expired.

3689 Mr. MURPHY. Thank you very much.

3690 Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Braley?

3691 Mr. BRALEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3692 I am very concerned that even if the White House and  
3693 Administration political appointees can't edit every  
3694 scientific report and press release, they are sending a  
3695 strong signal to Government scientists that the threat of  
3696 global warming should be played down and science should get  
3697 as little attention as possible. Because of that, good  
3698 scientists who do important research may worry about voicing  
3699 their concerns or publicizing their findings.

3700 Mr. Piltz, I am going to start with you. Are you  
3701 personally worried about the chilling effect or  
3702 self-censorship that this environment breeds and if so, can  
3703 you share with us how that manifests itself in the way you  
3704 and your colleagues do your work?

3705 Mr. PILTZ. That is an excellent question, and I think it  
3706 is a key point really and one I haven't had a chance to  
3707 emphasize. I know I cited the marked-up documents that came  
3708 fairly early on as graphic illustrations of a pervasive  
3709 pattern, but you know once this heavy-handed censorship  
3710 signal is sent, the career people in the Federal agencies,  
3711 they defer to the White House. They have their antenna out.

3712 What could be career limiting? Don't rock the boat.  
3713 They are great public servants, but what sets in if you know  
3714 that what you are writing has to go through a White House  
3715 clearance before it can be published, people start writing  
3716 for the clearance, toning down, steering away from and kind

3717 | of anticipatory self-censorship sets in among the career  
3718 | Federal program managers.

3719 |         Maybe not on--the FDA scientists and some of the other  
3720 | agencies, their scientific conclusions feed directly into  
3721 | regulatory decision-making. So the pressure is right on  
3722 | their scientific conclusions. Since we don't really have a  
3723 | regulatory regime on climate change, the interference tends  
3724 | to be more with the communication that might influence the  
3725 | way people think about the issue, but it is the same. It is  
3726 | an analogous dynamic. People censor themselves, and there is  
3727 | a chilling effect, certainly.

3728 |         Mr. BRALEY. Thank you.

3729 |         Dr. Shindell, what about you? Have you seen or heard  
3730 | about any of your colleagues responding to expected political  
3731 | pressure by censoring themselves or just giving up on a press  
3732 | release or a press contact?

3733 |         Mr. SHINDELL. Yes, both of these things, I think that  
3734 | people are aware that releases would be delayed so long if  
3735 | they tried to talk about global warming and climate change  
3736 | that it was left out. I have seen people talk much more  
3737 | favorably about the environment at universities now where  
3738 | they encourage outreach as opposed to what is going on in the  
3739 | Federal Government.

3740 |         Mr. BRALEY. Thank you.

3741 |         Dr. Grifo, the Union of Concerned Scientists and the

3742 Government Accountability Project interviewed 40 Government  
3743 climate scientists. Were any of these scientists worried  
3744 about the Administration learning of their conversations with  
3745 you?

3746 Ms. GRIFO. Yes, and in fact the number that the study  
3747 began with was much higher. It was more than 150, almost 200  
3748 scientists, and out of that large group that were contacted  
3749 for the study, we really only ended up with 5 or 6 that were  
3750 willing to go on the record, a significant drop, obviously  
3751 because of their fear of retaliation or other problems.

3752 Mr. BRALEY. I am going to offer this question to the  
3753 entire panel. As someone who started out in a very  
3754 challenging engineering curriculum and later switched to a  
3755 political science degree, one of the things I know is that  
3756 the heavy emphasis on math and science often times makes it  
3757 impractical to educate scientists on some of the  
3758 constitutional protections they have in terms of freedom of  
3759 speech, freedom from interference with voicing their opinions  
3760 in a setting similar to what we are talking about.

3761 Dr. Grifo, one of the things you had talked about was an  
3762 increased need for whistleblower protections and also  
3763 insuring that scientists have a constitutionally protected  
3764 right of free speech. What, if anything, do we need to be  
3765 doing to educate scientists to make sure that they understand  
3766 the constitutional basis for their free speech protections



3767 | and arm them with the knowledge so they can be more forceful  
3768 | advocates to speak out and have the courage to do what is  
3769 | necessary to make sure that we become aware of these  
3770 | concerns?

3771 |         Ms. GRIFO. I think one of the key things that we need to  
3772 | do is to affirmatively educate. We cannot assume that in  
3773 | fact these scientists know what these things mean. In our  
3774 | experiences, our conversations with scientists, anecdotally  
3775 | as well as in the essays and the other ways that we receive  
3776 | communications have told us over and over that the line is  
3777 | gray to them, and so because of that grayness, they are  
3778 | taking giant steps backward from what they are actually able  
3779 | to do.

3780 |         What we are asking for very simply is that these things  
3781 | come out, that we have clear policies. We have a model media  
3782 | policy that is appendixd to the report which clearly lays  
3783 | out yes, there are roles for public affairs officers.  
3784 | Coordination is important. We are not saying that you don't  
3785 | have to play by some rules. But what we are saying very  
3786 | loudly, very clearly I hope, is that you don't give up your  
3787 | constitutional rights when you become a Federal scientist,  
3788 | that in fact there are protections and statutes that need to  
3789 | be communicated and enforced, and the scientists need to know  
3790 | where that line is so that they can be at that line and not  
3791 | self-censoring themselves away from it.

3792 Mr. PILTZ. If I could add just one other quick point,  
3793 the last four pages of my written testimony has memoranda  
3794 prepared by the legal director at the Government  
3795 Accountability Project on how even the NASA media policy,  
3796 which is an upgrade, falls short in terms of the  
3797 Whistleblower Protection Act protections, the Anti-Gag  
3798 Statute and things that make it clear that scientists don't  
3799 give up their freedom of speech when they become Federal  
3800 employees. There are some specific issues and legislative  
3801 points raised in that, that I think I would commend to the  
3802 Committee's attention.

3803 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Braley.

3804 Mr. SHINDELL. I would say that I agree with the  
3805 statement of the other witnesses, and I would also like to  
3806 mention that there is a second issue here. With NASA, for  
3807 example, we do have this new openness policy which is a great  
3808 first step, but what we are seeing in the future is we may be  
3809 able to communicate information but we may not have any  
3810 information because all of the budget for earth observations  
3811 is being gradually shifted within NASA whose budget is  
3812 staying high, but it is being shifted to other areas. It is  
3813 being out of science and especially out of earth science. So  
3814 we are likely five years to ten years from now to have far  
3815 less ability to even observe our own planet than we do now.

3816 Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you.

3817 Mr. Welch?

3818 Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3819 In February of 2006, the New York Times reported that  
3820 political appointees in the NASA press office were in fact  
3821 exerting strong pressure during the 2004 Presidential  
3822 campaign to cut the flow of news releases on climate change  
3823 in the article entitled Call for Openness at NASA Adds to  
3824 Reports of Pressure. I would like to ask that that be made  
3825 part of the record by Mr. Chairman.

3826 Mr. WAXMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

3827 [The referenced information follows:]

3828 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

3829 Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

3830 Dr. Shindell, listening to your testimony, I can't help  
3831 but wonder if your personal experience is related to that  
3832 broader story. What can you tell us about your experiences  
3833 with NASA in the run-up to the 2004 election and does the  
3834 Times article appear consistent with your own experience?

3835 Mr. SHINDELL. Well, obviously, it is difficult to know  
3836 what intentions were behind policies that you didn't see  
3837 formulated, but I would certainly agree that it is  
3838 consistent. All of these new restrictions that I was talking  
3839 about on press releases and the imposition of minders to be  
3840 present at interviews, all of that took place in the fall of  
3841 2004 just before the election.

3842 Mr. WELCH. Dr. Grifo, do you have anything to add on  
3843 this point?

3844 Ms. GRIFO. Not to comment on the timing, but just simply  
3845 to say that there are six categories of things that we saw  
3846 and that we documented in the GAP portion of the report,  
3847 press release delays, the presence of minders, preapproval  
3848 for interviews and rerouting of interviews, overall decreased  
3849 media contact, altering of documents.

3850 Perhaps also intimidating really had to do with the  
3851 requirement that scientists prepare Q and As. They had to  
3852 anticipate what questions were going to come up in these  
3853 interviews and in fact you might think so what is so bad

3854 | about that. Well, in fact, what was happening was that the  
3855 | information in those Q and As was used to actually determine  
3856 | whether or not the interviews were granted or to feed into  
3857 | that process of decision-making.

3858 |         Mr. WELCH. Were there any resources that reported what  
3859 | you just described?

3860 |         Ms. GRIFO. All of these, yes. I mean, they are. I can  
3861 | give you, you know, pages of documentation that we have. I  
3862 | mean we have the interviews. But I think also very  
3863 | interestingly a lot of this work was based on documents  
3864 | obtained through the Freedom of Information Act, and I think  
3865 | really interestingly is that in response to very broad  
3866 | queries about climate and climate change and very, very broad  
3867 | questions, we received 2,000 pages of documents. The  
3868 | Government Accountability Project, I should say, received  
3869 | 2,000 pages of documents from NOAA, 9 pages from NASA and no  
3870 | pages from the EPA.

3871 |         Mr. WELCH. One other question, later this week, the  
3872 | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or the IPCC is  
3873 | going to release its latest scientific assessment about our  
3874 | understanding of climate change science. The IPCC, as you  
3875 | know, it includes hundreds of the world's finest scientists.

3876 |         In light of that, I notice that the IPCC is mentioned in  
3877 | the CEQ documents reviewed by the Committee staff. In one  
3878 | document, the CEQ Chief of Staff, Mr. Cooney, informs another

3879 | White House staffer that they will use a controversial paper  
3880 | to rebut the IPCC, and in the EPA memo, an EPA staffer  
3881 | notices this might be a problem and saying that the EPA will  
3882 | take responsibility and severe criticism from the science and  
3883 | environmental community for poorly representing the science.

3884 |       I want to ask the panelists, is the credibility of the  
3885 | IPCC in doubt? Does it make any sense for our Government to  
3886 | seek to actively undercut this body of scientists?

3887 |       Dr. Grifo, perhaps you could start.

3888 |       Ms. GRIFO. Yes, I think what I would like to say about  
3889 | the IPCC is that, you know, it is one of the most extensive  
3890 | transparent, you know, examples of iterate peer review. I  
3891 | mean I think it is a document that has reviewers and review  
3892 | editors and many processes of meetings and conversations in  
3893 | order to have this process move forward. I think that what  
3894 | is really extraordinary about it is that all of the authors  
3895 | of each chapter must agree that all sides of the science have  
3896 | been fairly represented, and I think that really gets to the  
3897 | heart of the openness of the scientific exchange that it  
3898 | represents.

3899 |       But I think furthermore 2,500 scientific expert  
3900 | reviewers, 800 contributing authors, 450 lead authors from  
3901 | 130 countries, 6 years of work. I think it is an amazing  
3902 | piece of work and will be received in that way.

3903 |       Just if I might add one other note. I want to say that

3904 | there is more information. I mean there, we are continuing  
3905 | and the Government Accountability Project is continuing to  
3906 | work on this and on the documentation, and there is to be  
3907 | another report in about a month's time.

3908 |       Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

3909 |       Briefly, yes.

3910 |       Mr. PILTZ. Yes, I would say that when the science  
3911 | community comes together and produces these comprehensive  
3912 | assessments and they do have synthesis and policymaker  
3913 | summaries that are readily understandable, that this is what  
3914 | those of us who are not technical experts should use,  
3915 | basically. This is the well vetted assessment. Even after  
3916 | we have lifted the heavy hand of censorship, there is still  
3917 | the matter of taking these findings, learning them, adopting  
3918 | them, using them, embracing them and translating them into  
3919 | the appropriate policy responses.

3920 |       Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

3921 |       Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Welch.

3922 |       Dr. Shindell, did you want to add anything to the  
3923 | question on the IPCC?

3924 |       Mr. SHINDELL. I would agree that this is the most  
3925 | authoritative document we have, and I would say that it does  
3926 | not exclude anybody that wants to participate. The paper  
3927 | that you referred to that supposedly would undermine it,  
3928 | those authors are free to join in the process as well to

3929 | offer their comments and criticism, and their documents were  
3930 | taken into account with everybody else. All of the available  
3931 | research is evaluated, and so this is really a wonderful  
3932 | thing for policymakers to have everybody sit together and  
3933 | look and get the best evidence.

3934 |         The only drawback that I can see with this process is  
3935 | that it takes so long that by the time it comes out, some  
3936 | things can be out of date. What we have seen, for example,  
3937 | is that the melting agreement has been accelerating so  
3938 | incredibly rapidly, that the IPCC report that will come out  
3939 | next week will already be out of date in predicting likely  
3940 | sea level rise which will probably be much worse than is  
3941 | projected in the IPCC report.

3942 |         Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Welch.

3943 |         Mr. Yarmuth, do you wish a second round?

3944 |         Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3945 |         We have heard some very disturbing testimony today about  
3946 | political interference in the area of climate science, but  
3947 | the politicization of science isn't limited under the Bush  
3948 | Administration to climate change. We have heard all sorts of  
3949 | evidence regarding endangered species and food and drug  
3950 | safety as well.

3951 |         Dr. Grifo, the Union of Concerned Scientists has  
3952 | surveyed other scientists in the past. You have a February,  
3953 | 2005 survey of fish and wildlife scientists that included



3954 | hundreds of biologists, ecologists and botanists. When you  
3955 | asked those scientists, was there evidence that they felt  
3956 | that had been directed for non-scientific reasons to refrain  
3957 | from making scientific findings that would protect endangered  
3958 | species?

3959 |         Ms. GRIFO. Yes, sir, and I would say in that survey,  
3960 | actually the return rate was almost 30 percent, so it was a  
3961 | higher rate if that matters, but 44 percent of the endangered  
3962 | species scientists reported being directed for non-scientific  
3963 | reasons to refrain from findings protective of species.

3964 |         Mr. YARMUTH. Were scientific conclusions reversed or  
3965 | withdrawn because of the business interests in any instances?

3966 |         Ms. GRIFO. Well, what we saw was that 70 percent of the  
3967 | scientists reported or knew of cases where political  
3968 | appointees had injected themselves into those ecological  
3969 | services determinations.

3970 |         Mr. YARMUTH. Based on your survey, it is clear that  
3971 | there was political interference and that it was widespread  
3972 | when it comes to science surrounding endangered species. How  
3973 | did this affect the outcome of policymakers and  
3974 | decision-makers? Was there any evidence based on your survey  
3975 | that decision-makers made decisions differently based on this  
3976 | suppressed science, if you will?

3977 |         Ms. GRIFO. I think there are a couple of aspects to that  
3978 | question. I mean one is that self-censorship that we keep

3979 | returning to. I mean I think when I go to scientific  
3980 | meetings such as my discipline, and fish and wildlife  
3981 | scientists come up to me, then express very clearly their  
3982 | experiences and their hesitation to bring forward this kind  
3983 | of information.

3984 | I think in addition to that, I mean obviously there are  
3985 | things in the survey, but overall I mean what we have seen is  
3986 | a very large drop in the number of species that end up being  
3987 | listed. Whether or not you agree or disagree with that, the  
3988 | fact is that the science is not coming out. Again, there are  
3989 | problems with being able to publish results in peer review  
3990 | literature. There are problems with these basic scientific  
3991 | freedoms amongst the scientists in fish and wildlife. Again,  
3992 | these species are important for various reasons, and they  
3993 | have consequences for the American people.

3994 | Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, this hearing is appropriately  
3995 | focused on how the Bush Administration officials have  
3996 | repeatedly tried to muzzle Government climate scientists and  
3997 | distort their findings. We need to remember that this is  
3998 | part of a larger pattern of politics trumping science  
3999 | throughout the Bush Administration. I commend you once again  
4000 | for holding these hearings.

4001 | Mr. WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Yarmuth.

4002 | I want to thank each of the witnesses for your  
4003 | presentation today. You are very distinguished scientists

4004 | with a great deal of integrity.

4005 |         Policymakers must have good science, unfiltered,  
4006 | unaltered scientific information especially when taxpayers'  
4007 | dollars are being used to pursue that information. Even, of  
4008 | course, if it is coming from the private sector, if  
4009 | information is being sent to us, it ought to be the  
4010 | information that the scientists have agreed upon.

4011 |         I think this hearing today will further our ability to  
4012 | deal with the issue of climate change, and of course the big  
4013 | issue before us is to get the Administration to move from a  
4014 | confrontation to cooperation. We have been trying on a  
4015 | bipartisan basis for six months to get the information from  
4016 | the Council on Environmental Quality. I expect to get that  
4017 | information and any other information that is pertinent to  
4018 | the representatives of the American people.

4019 |         That concludes our hearing, and we stand adjourned.

4020 |         [Whereupon, at 1:47 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

\*\*\*\*\*  
CONTENTS  
\*\*\*\*\*

STATEMENTS OF FRANCESCA GRIFO, SENIOR SCIENTIST AND DIRECTOR OF THE SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY PROGRAM, UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS; RICK PILTZ, FORMER SENIOR ASSOCIATE, U.S. CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE PROGRAM; DREW SHINDELL, GODDARD INSTITUTE FOR SPACE STUDIES, NATIONAL AERODYNAMICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION; ROGER PIELKE, JR., PROFESSOR, ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES PROGRAM, UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AND FELLOW, COOPERATIVE INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

	PAGE	70
STATEMENT OF FRANCESCA GRIFO		
	PAGE	70
STATEMENT OF RICK PILTZ		
	PAGE	76
STATEMENT OF DREW SHINDELL		
	PAGE	82
STATEMENT OF ROGER PIELKE, JR.		
	PAGE	88

\*\*\*\*\*  
INDEX OF INSERTS  
\*\*\*\*\*

***** INSERT *****	PAGE	7
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	13
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	14
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	16
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	17
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	18
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	21
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	23
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	25
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	27
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	29

***** INSERT *****	PAGE	32
***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****	PAGE	33
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	36
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	39
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	41
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	43
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	46
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	49
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	51
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	53
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	56
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	58
***** INSERT *****	PAGE	59

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 62

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 67

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 74

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 80

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 86

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 93

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 174