

Email-Chain-Happer-O-Keefe-and-Donors-Trust

10 Pages - Contributed by Damian Kahya, Greenpeace - Dec 07, 2015

Social cost of carbon (p. 1)

new group, the CO2 Coalition, that I helped to organize this past year. Also attached is some testimony I gave a few months ago at a regulatory hearing in St. Paul, MN, on the social cost of carbon.

This refers to testimony provided to a Minnesota state hearing into the social cost of carbon. The US Environmental Protection Agency and other federal agencies "use the social cost of carbon (SC-CO₂) to estimate the climate benefits of rulemakings." Peabody asked several academics to provide testimony at the Minnesota hearing, potentially due to the fact it could set an important state-level precedent.

CO2 (p. 3)

To be sure your client is not misled on my views, it is clear there are real pollutants associated with the combustion of fossil fuels, oxides of sulfur and nitrogen for most of them, fly ash and heavy metals for coal, volatile organics for gasoline, etc. I fully support regulations for cost-effective control of these real pollutants. But the Paris climate talks are based on the premise that CO₂ itself is a pollutant. This is completely false. More CO₂ will benefit the world. The only way to limit CO₂ would be to stop using fossil fuels, which I think would be a profoundly immoral and irrational policy.

A 2013 survey of 12,000 peer-reviewed climate science papers found 97% of scientists agreed global warming was man-made.

Peabody payment (p. 3)

directly to the CO₂ Coalition. This was the arrangement I had with the attorneys representing the Peabody Coal Company in the regulatory hearings in Minnesota. The fee I would have received was sent instead to the CO₂ Coalition, a 501(c)(3) tax exempt educational organization. The CO₂ Coalition covers occasional travel expenses for me, but pays me no other fees or salary.

Professor Happer explains that Peabody Coal paid for his testimony as an expert witness during regulatory hearings in Minnesota. Instead of taking this money himself it was donated to the CO₂ Coalition.

Peabody payment (p. 5)

which I attach again for clarity. My fee for this kind of work is \$250 per hour. The testimony required four 8-hour days of work, so the total cost was \$8,000.

Professor Happer confirms his testimony to a Minnesota state hearing on the impact of CO₂, was paid for by Peabody Energy, who paid \$8,000.

Non-disclosure of funding (p. 5)

If I write the paper alone, I don't think there would be any problem stating that "The author received no financial compensation for this essay." I am pretty sure

Professor Happer replies to the request to keep the fossil fuel companies' name hidden so that the report is more credible

What is peer review? (p. 6)

peer review was that early drafts of Goklany's

Peer review is the process by which submissions to academic journals are reviewed by experts prior to publication. Reviewers are normally anonymous, but know the authors' identities. Sense About Science, a UK charitable trust, describes peer review as the process by which: "scientists submit their research findings to a journal, which sends them out to be assessed for competence, significance and originality, by independent qualified experts who are researching and publishing work in the same field (peers)." The process usually involves varying degrees of anonymity.

Untitled Annotation (p. 6)

reviewer and I know that the entire scientific advisory board of the Global Warming Policy Foundation (GWPF) was asked to submit comments on the first draft. I am also sure that most were too busy to respond. The review of

Sense About Science, a UK charitable trust, has previously warned against such in-house review processes, saying: "sometimes organisations or individuals claim to have put their studies through peer review when, on inspection, they have only shown it to some colleagues. Such claims are usually made in the context of a campaign directed at the public or policy makers, as a way of trying to give scientific credibility to certain claims in the hope that a non-scientific audience will not know the difference."

The Donors Trust (p. 7)

he Donors Trust, he/she can make the

Mother Jones called the Donors Trust "the Dark-Money ATM of the Conservative Movement" while the Guardian found the trust was one of two entities used to channel \$125m to US climate denial groups over three years.

Middle East donation (p. 9)

vice to speak to you today. I hope DonorsTrust can be helpful to your client's

Undercover investigators spoke with the Donors Trust over the telephone where they told us it would be possible to transfer funds from a Middle East oil company to US recipients.