STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES
Unrevised and Unedited
Not for Quotation or
Duplication

***Preliminary Transcript***

ALLEGATIONS OF POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

WITH GOVERNMENT CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE

Monday, March 19, 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 RPTS BINGHAM
2 DCMN NORMAN

3 ALLEGATIONS OF POLITICAL INTERFERENCE
4 WITH GOVERNMENT CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE
5 Monday, March 19, 2007
6 House of Representatives,
7 Committee on Oversight and
8 Government Reform,
9 Washington, D.C.

10 The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
11 Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Henry A.
12 Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.
13 Present: Representatives Waxman, Watson, Yarmuth,
14 Norton, Van Hollen, Welch, Shays, Souder, Cannon, and Issa.
15 Staff Present: Phil Schiliro, Chief of Staff; Phil
16 Barnett, Staff Director and Chief Counsel; Kristin Amerling,
17 General Counsel; Karen Lightfoot, Communications Director and
18 Senior Policy Advisor; Greg Dotson, Chief Environmental
19 Counsel; Alexandra Teitz, Senior Environmental Counsel; Jeff
20 Baran, Counsel; Early Green, Chief Clerk; Teresa Coufal,

21 Deputy Clerk; Matt Siegler, Special Assistant; Caren Auchman,
22 Press Assistant; Zhongrui "JR" Deng, Chief Information
23 Officer; Rob Cobbs, Staff Assistant; David Marin, Minority
24 Staff Director; Larry Halloran, Minority Deputy Staff
25 Director; Jennifer Safavian, Minority Chief Counsel for
26 Oversight and Investigations; Keith Ausbrook, Minority
27 General Counsel; A. Brooke Bennett, Minority Counsel;
28 Kristina Husar, Minority Professional Staff Member; Larry
29 Brady, Minority Senior Investigator and Policy Advisor;
30 Patrick Lyden, Minority Parliamentarian and Member Services
31 Coordinator; Brian McNicoll, Minority Communications
32 Director; Benjamin Chance, Minority Clerk; and Ali Ahmad,
33 Minority Staff Assistant and Online Communications
34 Coordinator.

35 Chairman WAXMAN. Meeting of the committee will come to
36 order. Today the committee continues its investigation into
37 whether the nonpartisan work of climate change scientists was
38 distorted by political interference from the Bush
39 administration. Since our first hearing on January 30th, we
40 have received over eight boxes of documents from the White
41 House Council on Environmental Quality.
42 The document production is not yet complete, but some of
43 the information the committee has already obtained is
44 disturbing. It suggests that there may have been a concerted
45 effort, directed by the White House, to mislead the public
46 about the dangers of global climate change.
47 It is too early in this investigation to draw firm
48 conclusions about the White House's conduct. But today's
49 hearing will help us learn more about those efforts and
50 provide guidance on whether further investigation is
51 warranted.
52 There is a saying in Washington that personnel is
53 policy. The White House appointed an oil industry lobbyist,
54 not a scientist or climate change expert, as chief of staff
55 at the Council on Environmental Quality.
56 We will hear from that former lobbyist, Phil Cooney,
57 today. The documents we have received indicate he was able
58 to exert tremendous influence on the direction of Federal
59 climate change policy and science.

60 One of the key responsibilities given to Mr. Cooney and
61 his staff at CEQ was the review of government publications
62 about climate change.
63 Mr. Cooney and his staff made hundreds of separate edits
64 to the government's strategic plan for climate change
65 research. These changes injected doubt in place of
66 certainty, minimized the dangers of climate change, and
67 diminished the human role in causing the planet to warm.
68 Other key government reports, including an EPA report on
69 the environment and an annual report to Congress on the
70 changing planet were subject to similar edits and
71 distortions.
72 In preparation for this hearing, the majority staff
73 prepared a memorandum for members analyzing the changes made
74 by Mr. Cooney and his staff to these government climate
75 change reports. And I ask that this memorandum and the CEQ
76 documents it cites be made part of the hearing record. I
77 also ask that Mr. Cooney's deposition be made part of the
78 hearing record as well.
79 [The information follows:]

80 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

81 Chairman WAXMAN. Another facet of the White House
82 campaign involved controlling what Federal scientists could
83 say to the public and the media about their work. NASA
84 scientist James Hansen is one of the Nation's most esteemed
85 experts on climate change. George Deutsch is a young and
86 inexperienced former NASA public affairs officer who was
87 tasked with managing the public statements of Dr. Hansen and
88 other NASA scientists. Today we will hear from both of them
89 about their experiences.
90 There is even evidence in the documents we have obtained
91 that the White House edited an op-ed written by former EPA
92 Administrator Christine Todd Whitman to ensure that it
93 followed the White House line about climate change.
94 Our goal in this investigation is to understand what
95 role the White House actually played. It would be a serious
96 abuse if senior White House officials deliberately tried to
97 defuse calls for action by ensuring that the public heard a
98 distorted message about the risks of climate change.
99 In addressing climate change, science should drive
100 policy. The public and Congress need access to the best
101 possible science to inform the policy debate about how to
102 protect the planet from irreversible changes. If the
103 administration turned its principle upside down with raw
104 political pressure, it would put our country on a dangerous
105 course. Today's hearing should bring us closer to

106 understanding whether that is suspicion or fact.

107 I look forward to the testimony of the witnesses and

108 thank them for their cooperation. I want to recognize

109 members for opening statements and to recognize Mr. Issa

110 first.

111 [Prepared statement of Mr. Waxman follows:]

112 ******** INSERT 1-1 *******

113 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I also would
114 ask that the exhibits that go with Mr. Cooney's deposition be
115 entered into the record.
116 Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection, the documents that
117 I requested and the documents you requested will be part of
118 the record.
119 [The information follows:]

120 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

121 Mr. ISSA. Thank you. And I also would like to ask that
122 the Supplemental Minority Memorandum be entered into the
123 record.
124 Chairman WAXMAN. Without objection.
125 [The information follows:]

126 ******** INSERT 1-2 ********

127 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am glad to have
128 the opportunity to continue today with the committee's
129 inquiry into political interference with science. As you
130 know, this investigation began under Chairman Davis. And it
131 is good to see that some projects have carried over to the
132 new Congress.

133 I want to take a moment to point out the title of
134 today's hearing is Political Interference with Science:
135 Global Warming. I am glad the Chairman has made clear from
136 the onset that this investigation is related to process and
137 not the substance of global change science.

138 Today we are not attempting to establish which
139 scientific facts are correct or which policies are better. I
140 commend you for this approach. As you know, this committee
141 has done its job to conduct oversight in an independent and
142 bipartisan way in the past, and I hope we will continue to in
143 the future.

144 But even though this hearing isn't about substance, let
145 me be clear from the beginning. Climate change is an
146 important issue and deserves our level-headed attention.

147 I believe that climate change is happening. I believe
148 global mean temperatures have increased over the past
149 century, and I believe that carbon dioxide is a contributing
150 factor.

151 It wasn't very long ago that scientists were unable to

152 make this statement with certainty because we simply didn't
153 have a sufficient body of knowledge, and it is important to
154 acknowledge that American ingenuity, know-how, and resources
155 make up the foundation of the ever-expanding body of
156 knowledge of climate change.
157 Climate change is too important an issue not to continue
158 backing the research in the billions of dollars that we have
159 done so on a bipartisan basis in the past.
160 And it is essential that policymakers have the absolute
161 best available science to support policy decisions that will
162 impact future generations of Americans and citizens around
163 the world. But, again, we are looking at this as a process
164 issue.
165 So let's turn to the allegation that the Bush
166 administration has silenced scientists and rewritten the
167 science.
168 Dr. Roger Pikey, Junior, testified at our last hearing
169 that the Bush administration probably hasn't done itself any
170 favors with the term "hypercontrolling strategies" for the
171 management of information.
172 I would probably agree.
173 Yet it remains the prerogative of the Bush
174 administration--as with every administration before it and
175 likely after it--to establish policies to ensure that
176 whatever is coming out of Federal agencies is consistent and

177 coordinated.

178 Submitting to those rules is in fact--is a fact of life
179 every Federal employee enjoys or chafes at.

180 I am concerned that many scientists are increasingly
181 engaging in political advocacy and that some issues of
182 science have become increasingly partisan as some politicians
183 sense that there is a political gain to be found on issues
184 like stem cell, teaching evolution, and climate change. I
185 hope we will keep our observations in mind during these
186 hearings and the investigation into allegations of silencing
187 and editing by the Bush administration and Mr. Cooney.

188 I look forward to this hearing and to our witnesses and
189 especially I look forward to hearing from NASA scientist,,
190 Dr. James Hansen.

191 Doctor Hansen, we recognize that you are the preeminent
192 climate change scientist and one of the leading researchers
193 on these issues. We value your contribution to science and
194 the understanding of global climate change. I want to hear
195 about your experience--I want to hear about your experiences
196 with the politicalization of science.

197 However, I also plan to discuss with you your efforts to
198 politicalize science.

199 Mr. Chairman I recognize that I have gone over my
200 intended 5 minutes so I will put the rest of my opening
201 statement in for the record because I see we have a lot of

202 Members here. I will yield back.

203 [The information follows:]

204 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

205 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you. Without objection, your
206 statement and all the opening statements from members of the
207 committee will be permitted to go into the record in their
208 entirety.
209 I would recognize members if they feel that they want to
210 make an oral presentation. Without objection, we will limit
211 it to 3 minutes so we can get on to our panels.
212 Any member here--Mr. Yarmuth, do you have an opening
213 statement?
214 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a brief
215 one. I appreciate that we are renewing these hearings,
216 because in the first hearing we had what we saw was evidence
217 of a clear and disturbing trend in this administration, which
218 is that in many instances commitment to ideology and
219 philosophy and maybe even corporate interests always seems to
220 trump truth.
221 And that is something that should disturb all of us, and
222 I hope that this hearing brings us closer to understanding
223 that we need, in all of our government operations, to have
224 transparency and truth, and that those who would put these
225 other interests ahead of the search for truth are doing this
226 country a great disservice. So I thank you once again, Mr.
227 Chairman, and I look forward to hearing the witnesses.
228 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

229 [The information follows:]

230 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

231 Chairman Waxman. Mr. Cannon, do you wish to make an
232 opening statement?
233 Mr. CANNON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I will submit my
234 statement for the record.
235 [The information follows:]

236 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

237 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Welch.

238 Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman for convening the
239 hearing. The questions before the committee are clear. Are
240 the American people entitled to the benefits of sound
241 scientific research to solve the challenges before us? And
242 is it acceptable for any administration--in this case the
243 administration of George Bush--to alter scientific
244 conclusions by allowing political appointees to edit and
245 alter the independent conclusions of independent scientists?

246 We heard, Mr. Chairman, to our dismay 2 months ago,
247 evidence that the Bush administration, through political
248 appointees, have systematically and relentlessly interfered
249 with independent scientific conclusions, altering them to
250 conform with the political views of their supporters.

251 Dr. Griffo the Union of Concerned Scientists testified
252 that at least 150 Federal climate scientists personally
253 experienced at least one incident of political interference
254 during the past 5 years and received reports of at least 435
255 specific incidents overall. That interference is
256 unacceptable. That interference must end. While political
257 interference in science may serve the interest of the
258 American Petroleum Institute and others who peddle the notion
259 that climate change is a political argument, not a scientific
260 fact, it underestimates the American people. Politically
261 motivated suppression of science is not only irresponsible,

262 but highlights a careless and reckless disregard for the
263 public that we serve.
264 The country knows that the climate change is real,
265 urgent, and requires immediate action. Science must be our
266 friend to help us address global warming directly. Moreover,
267 in facing directly the issue of climate change, we can have a
268 pro-growth, pro-high-tech, pro-environment economy that will
269 benefit all the people of this country.
270 The Bush administration attack on sound science is a
271 loser's game. The job of this Congress and this committee is
272 to restore the full confidence to our scientific community
273 that we need and value their work. They are our partners in
274 facing the problems that confront us. Thank you, Mr.
275 Chairman.
276 [The information follows:]

277 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

278 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

279 Mr. Welch. Mr. Souder, do you wish to make an opening
280 comment? Mr. Souder? Okay, thanks. Ms. Watson.

281 Ms. WATSON. Thank you, very much, Mr. Chairman, for
282 today's hearing. And while I am happy we are holding our
283 second hearing of the year on this issue, I am appalled at
284 the fact that the administration interfered with studies in
285 key departments within our bureaucracy, one of which is NASA,
286 who depends on accurate and concise scientific studies to
287 protect the lives of our astronauts.

288 The administration announced in 2002 that reducing green
289 house gas emissions and increasing spending on climate
290 research to reduce emissions 18 percent by 2012 was a top
291 priority. But their actions have not matched that pledge.

292 Funds have been redirected for these purposes to spend
293 on nuclear power and other nonrenewable programs that do not
294 reduce emissions. In addition, this allegation of political
295 interference with the work of government scientists is an
296 additional example of how this administration is not taking
297 this threat of global warming seriously.

298 Global warming is occurring at a rapid pace today, and
299 the consensus of the world's scientific community is that it
300 will accelerate during the 21st century. Global warming and
301 our related energy policies also raise national security
302 concerns.

303 One such concern is the prospect of international
304 destabilization caused by the consequences of global warming,
305 such as the loss of land area or the loss of water resources.
306 Mr. Chairman, we must start again to create adequate climate
307 change research and development that can help our world in
308 the future.
309 Political interference on this critical issue is
310 unacceptable. And we are here today to investigate and
311 resolve these allegations. Again, thank you for this
312 hearing.
313 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much Ms. Watson.
314 [The information follows:]

315 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

316 Chairman WAXMAN. We are pleased to have three witnesses
317 for our first panel, and I want to welcome them to our
318 hearing today. Philip Cooney was chief of staff of the White
319 House Council on Environmental Quality from 2001 until 2005.
320 Before that he worked at the American Petroleum Institute for
321 15 years. He is now a corporate issue manager at ExxonMobil.
322 Dr. James Hansen is the director of NASA's Goddard
323 Institute for Space Studies. He has held this position since
324 1981. Dr. Hansen is one of the Nation's most esteemed
325 climate scientists.
326 George Deutsch was a NASA public affairs officer until
327 February of 2006.
328 We thank you for your presence. It is the practice of
329 this committee to ask all witnesses that appear before us to
330 take an oath. So if you would please rise and hold up your
331 right hand.
332 [Witnesses sworn.]
333 Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that each of
334 the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

335 STATEMENTS OF PHILIP COONEY, FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE
336 WHITE HOUSE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY; JAMES HANSEN,
337 DIRECTOR, NASA GODDARD INSTITUTE FOR SPACE STUDIES; AND
338 GEORGE DEUTSCH, FORMER NASA PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER

339 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Cooney, why don't we start with
340 you. Your opening statement will be in the record in its
341 entirety and we would like to ask you, if you would, to
342 summarize it or present it to us in around 5 minutes.

343 STATEMENT OF PHILIP A. COONEY

344 Mr. COONEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the
345 committee. Thank you for inviting me to appear before you
346 today. I recognize the important work of this committee to
347 ensure that our government is operating efficiently and
348 properly in performing its valuable work on behalf of the
349 American people.
350 I want to assure you of my full cooperation.
351 Today, more than anything else, I hope to convey to the
352 committee that I held myself to a high standard of integrity
353 in the performance of my duties in the administration.
354 I would like to highlight several points.
355 Point Number one, my reviews of Federal budgetary and
356 research planning documents of climate change were guided by
357 the President's stated strategy on research priorities as set
358 forth in his June 11th, 2001 speech and chapter 3 of the
359 Policy Book that accompanied it. I joined the White House
360 staff 2 weeks later.

361 The President's policy itself was guided by a National
362 Academy of Sciences report that his Cabinet-level Committee
363 on Climate Change had specifically requested, entitled
364 "Climate Change Science: An Analysis of Some Key Questions."
365 That report concluded--and I would like to emphasize
366 this point, quote, making progress in reducing the large
367 uncertainties in projections of future climate will require
368 addressing a number of fundamental scientific questions
369 relating to the buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere
370 and the behavior of the climate system.
371 The National Academy of Sciences report itemized those
372 uncertainties and questions which later guided the
373 administration's prioritization of federally sponsored
374 research.
375 Let me be clear, as this committee addresses my reviews
376 of specific climate change policy documents, that a number of
377 my specific comments were verbatim quotations from the
378 National Academy of Sciences report.
379 My second point is that the documents that I reviewed as
380 part of a well-established interagency review process were
381 not a platform for the presentation of original scientific
382 research. Mr. Piltz, who clarified that he is not a
383 scientist, described his role before this committee as that
384 of, quote, an editor of summaries received from agencies as
385 they related to budget and planning reports.

386 The White House Office of Management and Budget then
387 subjected Mr. Piltz' drafts to formal interagency review and
388 comment by many others, including multiple Federal agencies
389 themselves and the relevant White House offices, including
390 mine.

391 OMB's review was then subjected to a final review and
392 approval by Dr. James Mahoney, who served as the Assistant
393 Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, and was
394 director of the Climate Change Science Program. Dr. Mahoney
395 testified before Congress about this process in July 2005 and
396 confirmed that he had the final word on the final content on
397 all of these documents.

398 Dr. Mahoney's written responses to Senate questions
399 describe that process and stated further that, quote, the
400 edits by CEQ did not misstate any scientific fact. Moreover,
401 many comments, including mine, were not incorporated in final
402 reports.

403 The Council's role in these reviews and that of other
404 White House offices was routine and well established.

405 The annual budget report, Our Changing Planet, was
406 reviewed by my predecessors in the Clinton administration.
407 That is because these were Federal research and policy and
408 budget reports of the executive branch and not scientific
409 research per se.

410 In fact, the transmittal letters to Congress for both

411 the strategic plan and the annual budget reports were signed
412 by the Secretaries of Energy and Commerce and the director of
413 the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy,
414 reflecting their inherent policy nature.

415 To summarize, I had the authority and responsibility to
416 make recommendations on the documents in question under an
417 established interagency review process. I did so, using my
418 best judgment, based on the administration's stated research
419 priorities, as informed by the National Academy of Sciences.
420 Of course I understand that my judgment and the
421 administration's stated goals are properly open to review.

422 I want to make equally clear, however, that I
423 participated in the established review processes in order to
424 align executive branch reports with administration policies.

425 My third and final point is that within a month after my
426 departure in June 2005, all three branches of our government
427 considered climate change science in the course of their
428 decision-making and acknowledged remaining uncertainties in
429 our understanding.

430 There has been on an ongoing basis, active consideration
431 both of the scientific certainties and uncertainties in
432 decision-making on climate change at the highest levels of
433 the Federal Government. For example on July 15, 2005, the
434 United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia
435 Circuit upheld EPA's decision not to regulate carbon dioxide

436 under the Clean Air Act, relying in part on the same
437 uncertainties noted in the National Academy of Sciences
438 report that the administration had requested in June 2001.
439 My point is that the comments and recommendations that I
440 offered in reviewing executive branch policy documents on
441 climate change were consistent with the views and exploration
442 of scientific knowledge that many others in all three
443 branches of our government were undertaking.
444 My most important point is that I offered my comments in
445 good faith reliance on what I understood to be authoritative
446 and current views of the state of scientific knowledge, and
447 for no other purpose.
448 Thank you again for the opportunity to appear before the
449 committee. I look forward to your questions and helping the
450 committee complete its important work.
451 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Cooney.
452 Mr. COONEY. Thank you.
453 [Prepared statement of Mr. Cooney follows:]

454 ******** INSERT 1-3 ********

455 Chairman WAXMAN. Dr. Hansen.

456 STATEMENT OF JAMES E. HANSEN

457 Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman Waxman, for
458 inviting me to testify. I testify today as a private
459 citizen. I have been at a NASA laboratory in New York since
460 I arrived in 1967 as a 25-year-old post doc. And I hope that
461 my observations of changes in the past 40 years are useful to
462 your Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.
463 In my written statement, I describe a growth of
464 political interference with climate change science. The
465 problem has been worst in the current administration. But it
466 will not be solved by an election. There needs to be reform.
467 We cannot count on a new administration to give up
468 powers that have accreted. The growth in political
469 interference coincides with a growth in power of the
470 executive branch. It seems to me that this growth of power
471 violates principles upon which our democracy is based,
472 especially separation of powers and checks and balances.
473 I have no legal expertise but I would like to raise
474 three questions:
475 Number one, when I testify to you as a government
476 scientist, why does my testimony have to be reviewed, edited,

477 and changed by a bureaucrat in the White House before I can
478 deliver it? Where does this requirement come from? Is not
479 the public, who have paid for the research, are they not
480 being cheated by this political control of scientific
481 testimony?

482 Second question: Why are public affairs
483 officers--offices, staffed by political appointees? Their
484 job, nominally, should be to help scientists present results
485 in a language that the public can understand.

486 They should not be forcing scientists to parrot
487 propaganda. Indeed during the current administration, NASA
488 scientific press releases have been sent to the White House
489 for editing, as I discuss in my written testimony. If public
490 affairs officers are left under the control of political
491 appointees, it seems to me that inherently they become
492 officers of propaganda.

493 Point number three, the primary way that the executive
494 branch has interfered with climate science is via control of
495 the purse strings. This is very, very effective.

496 Last February, a year ago, the executive branch slashed
497 the earth science research and analysis budget. That is the
498 budget that funds NASA earth science labs such as mine. They
499 slashed it retroactively to the beginning of the fiscal year
500 by about 20 percent. That is a going-out-of-business level
501 of funding.

502 The budget is an extremely powerful way to interfere
503 with science and bring scientists into line with political
504 positions.
505 Some people have joked that at about the same time, the
506 White House brought in a science fiction writer for advice on
507 global warming. But this is not a joking matter.
508 We need more scientific data, not less.
509 And I am sorry that I don't have time to talk about the
510 science, but if you give me 1 to 2 minutes, I would like to
511 just summarize briefly.
512 The climate has great inertia because of the massive
513 ocean and ice sheets. And it is hard to notice climate
514 change because chaotic weather fluctuations are so large.
515 But climate is beginning to change. And it has become clear
516 that there is a dominance of positive feedbacks. For example
517 as ice melts, as forests move pole-ward, these increase the
518 global warming further. And the upshot of the inertia plus
519 the positive feedbacks is that if we push the climate system
520 hard enough, it can obtain a momentum. It can pass tipping
521 points, such that climate change continues out of our
522 control. That is a condition we do not want to leave for our
523 children.
524 There are many actions we could take to avoid that,
525 actions that would have other benefits, as I discuss in my
526 written testimony. And these are, of course, my opinions as

527 a private citizen. Thank you.

528 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Hansen.

529 [Prepared statement of James Hansen follows:]

530 ******** INSERT 1-4 ********

531 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Deutsch.

532 STATEMENT OF GEORGE C. DEUTSCH III

533 Mr. DEUTSCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is
534 Deutsch. I am 25 years old. I live in Nederland, Texas.
535 Until February of 06 I was a public affairs officer at NASA.
536 I would like to begin by thanking the committee, and
537 specifically Chairman Waxman for allowing me the opportunity
538 to testify. I believe most people would agree that NASA is a
539 place of wonder and excitement. As a young man from a small
540 southeast Texas town near the Johnson Space Center, I saw the
541 opportunity to join the NASA family as a dream come true.
542 My path to NASA began around June of 2004 when I left
543 Texas A&M University, one course shy of graduating, to take a
544 position as an intern in President Bush's reelection campaign
545 and, later, the Inaugural Committee. After the Inauguration
546 I applied for a Presidential appointee position and was
547 offered jobs by NASA and the Department of Labor.
548 To the best of my recollection, I disclosed on various
549 occasions the fact that I had not completed my degree.
550 I accepted an entry-level public affairs position at
551 NASA at the age of 23 and after several months I became a
552 public affairs officer in NASA's Science Mission Directorate,

553 SMD. There I worked in a team with two career civil
554 servants. The most senior civil servant in the group
555 functioned as our team leader. Collectively, it was our duty
556 to facilitate communications between NASA and the public.
557 Not long after joining SMD, I became aware of Dr. James
558 Hansen, a distinguished and internationally renowned climate
559 scientist. I learned that Dr. Hansen disagreed with what I
560 understood to be NASA's standard practices for responding to
561 media requests. Among those practices were the public
562 affairs officer should listen to interviews as they were
563 being conducted, that superiors can do interviews in
564 someone's stead, and that NASA employees should report
565 interview requests to the Public Affairs Office.
566 It was my understanding that these practices all existed
567 prior to my joining NASA and that I and other NASA employees
568 were expected to follow them. The purpose of these
569 guidelines was to encourage Agency coordination and accurate
570 reporting. Sharing interview requests with NASA
571 headquarters, for example, gives headquarters officials a
572 better grasp of what is going on at NASA centers. These
573 practices weren't unique to one individual or group. They
574 were agencywide.
575 Dr. Hansen can certainly address these issues himself
576 today, but as I understood it at that time, he found these
577 practices to be cumbersome. This created a level of

578 frustration among my higher-ups at NASA who wanted to know
579 about interviews before they happened.
580 I have addressed these issues in more detail in my
581 written testimony, but here is one example. On or about
582 December 14, 2005, the Los Angeles Times and ABC News
583 contacted NASA to inquire if the Agency was going to release
584 information addressing whether 2005 was the warmest year on
585 record. In response, headquarters granted the Los Angeles
586 Times an interview with Dr. Waleed Abdalati, a veteran NASA
587 climate scientist. In that interview, Dr. Abdalati stated
588 they could not confirm that 2005 was the warmest year on
589 record. Yet on December 15th, Dr. Hansen appeared on ABC's
590 Good Morning America program and submitted the letter to the
591 Journal of Science, concluding that 2004 tied 1998 as the
592 warmest year on record.
593 Senior NASA officials conveyed to me that they were
594 unaware of the release of this information being coordinated
595 with headquarters or peer-reviewed. That day NASA
596 headquarters received a deluge of media inquiries on the
597 matter, inquiries headquarters was ill-equipped to handle
598 because no one had been briefed on Dr. Hansen's findings.
599 The same senior NASA officials were, to say the least, upset
600 by this procedural breach.
601 Press Secretary Dean Acosta asked me to document these
602 events in a memo that was cosigned by a career civil servant

603 Dwayne Brown. Subsequently, several media reports accused
604 national political appointees and others of censoring Dr.
605 Hansen. I can only speak for myself. I never censored Dr.
606 Hansen and I don't think anyone else at NASA did either.
607 In February of 2006, I learned that the New York Times
608 was looking into whether the resume I submitted to NASA
609 incorrectly stated that I had obtained a degree from Texas
610 A&M University in 2003. I had created that resume sometime
611 prior to 2003. At the time the resume was created, it would
612 have been clear that I was referring to an anticipated
613 degree. My mistake was that when it later came time to apply
614 for jobs, I failed to update the resume to convey that I was
615 one course shy of graduating. As I said, to the best of my
616 recollection, I told the hiring officials I spoke to that I
617 did not have my degree. But I recognize and take full
618 responsibility for the fact that I should have updated the
619 resume to better reflect this point. This was an honest
620 mistake.
621 Rather than see the Agency continue to be tarnished in
622 the media, I resigned in February 2006. Later that year I
623 finished my only remaining class and received my Bachelor of
624 Arts degree from Texas A&M University.
625 Since working at NASA, I have tried my hardest to
626 continue to devote my life to public service. I have done
627 work for a nonpartisan/nonprofit United Way agency in Texas

628 dealing with mental health issues, and I hope to launch a
629 call-in mental health radio program in a local Texas radio
630 station.

631 During my time at NASA, administrator Mike Griffin
632 released a statement on scientific openness in which he said,
633 quote, "It is not the job of public affairs officers to
634 alter, filter, or adjust engineering or of scientific
635 material produced by NASA's technical staff. To ensure the
636 timely release of information there must be cooperation and
637 coordination between our scientific and engineering community
638 and our public affairs officers."

639 These two sentences capture my feelings exactly. Thank
640 you, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to answer your
641 questions.

642 [Prepared statement of George C. Deutsch follows:]

643 ******** INSERT 1-5 ********

644 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Deutsch.
645 I will now proceed to questioning from the members of the
646 panel and two 10-minute rounds controlled by the Chair and
647 the Ranking Member. I will start off first.
648 Mr. Cooney, thank you very much for being here. I
649 appreciate you have taken the time last week to sit with the
650 committee staff in a deposition. And that deposition helped
651 clear up a lot of points which will allow us to focus the
652 major issues today.
653 It is clear from documents that the committee has
654 received that you played a major role in reviewing and
655 editing scientific reports about climate change. And I want
656 to begin my questioning by asking about your qualifications
657 for editing scientific reports. My understanding is that you
658 are not a scientist, that you are a lawyer by training, with
659 an undergraduate degree in politics and economics; is that
660 correct?
661 Mr. COONEY. That is correct.
662 Chairman WAXMAN. And prior to your move to the White
663 House in 2001, you worked for more than 15 years at the
664 American Petroleum Institute; is that correct?
665 Mr. COONEY. That's correct.
666 Chairman WAXMAN. The American Petroleum Institute, or
667 API, is the primary trade association for the the oil
668 industry, isn't it? And they are essentially lobbyists for

669 the oil industry, aren't they?

670 Mr. COONEY. That is a fair characterization, yes.

671 Chairman WAXMAN. My understanding is that your last
672 position with the American Petroleum Institute was as team
673 leader of the climate team. Climate change was a major issue
674 for the Petroleum Institute and they were very concerned
675 about this whole matter from an economic point of view.

676 While you were at the Petroleum Institute, the Petroleum
677 Institute prepared an internal document entitled "Strategic
678 Issues: Climate Change." and this is Exhibit H.

679 [The information follows:]

680 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

681 Chairman WAXMAN. You have seen this document, haven't
682 you, Mr. Cooney?
683 Mr. COONEY. Exhibit H?
684 Chairman WAXMAN. Yes.
685 Mr. COONEY. Yes. I saw this document last week during
686 my deposition.
687 Chairman WAXMAN. This document was prepared during
688 API's budget review while you were employed there. It
689 discusses why climate change is important to API and the
690 strategies API will use to combat governmental action to
691 address global warming.
692 According to this document--and I quote--"Climate is at
693 the center of industry's business interests. Policies
694 limiting carbon emissions reduce petroleum product use. That
695 is why it is API's highest priority issue and defined as
696 strategic."
697 One of the key strategies used by the Petroleum
698 Institute was to sow doubt about climate change science.
699 Member companies and spokesmen for the Petroleum Institute
700 regularly exaggerated the degrees of scientific uncertainty
701 and downplayed the role of humans in causing climate change.
702 What bothers me is that you seem to bring exactly the same
703 approach inside the White House--and I want to ask you about
704 that.
705 We received hundreds of edits that you and your staff at

706 the White House Council on Environmental Quality made to
707 Federal climate change reports. And there seem to be
708 consistent reports to these edits. They exaggerate
709 uncertainties and downplay the contribution that human
710 activities, like burning petroleum products, play in causing
711 climate change.

712 So when I look at the role you played at the American
713 Petroleum Institute and then the role you played at the White
714 House, they seem virtually identical. In both places you
715 were sowing doubt about the science on global warming.

716 I would like you to respond to those concerns. Do you
717 have a comment about my observation? Do you think that I am
718 being unfair to you?

719 Mr. COONEY. I do in some respects, Mr. Chairman. When
720 you characterize the efforts of the American Petroleum
721 Institute, we did have scientists who participated on our
722 multidisciplinary team on climate. We also had economists
723 and press people and lobbyists, of course. Our focus was
724 lobbying on the Kyoto Protocol. But to the extent that our
725 scientists participated in science, often they provided
726 public comments in good faith.

727 For example, on the prior administration's national
728 assessment, our economists and scientists submitted public
729 comments for the record, trying to comment constructively and
730 improve that process, and they had the background to do so,

731 the scientists and economists who were working on that.

732 You know, one thing that was brought to my attention in

733 the deposition was the funding for Carnegie Mellon

734 University. They had an esteemed program on studying, from

735 what I understood--I wasn't very acquainted with it--but it

736 was studying the connection between climate change and

737 potential health impacts and funded MIT, I believe--

738 Chairman WAXMAN. You think I am being unfair to the

739 Petroleum Institute in my characterization?

740 Mr. COONEY. I think we surely were opposed to the Kyoto

741 Protocol, but I do think in many cases our scientists tried

742 to participate responsibly in some of the public dialogue

743 that was going on and to offer legitimate views that weren't

744 merely about sowing uncertainty, as you have described.

745 Chairman WAXMAN. My staff released an analysis of

746 hundreds of changes that you and your staff made to Federal

747 scientific reports. Where the draft reports said that

748 climate change will cause adverse impacts, you changed the

749 text to say that these changes may occur.

750 Where the draft reports said that the climate change

751 would damage the environment, you inserted the qualifier,

752 "potentially."

753 Where the report described adverse economic effects, you

754 modified the text to say that the economic effects could be

755 positive or negative.

756 Mr. Cooney, aren't the edits you were making exactly the
757 kinds of changes the Petroleum Institute itself would have
758 made to these reports?
759 Mr. COONEY. Mr. Chairman, the comments that you
760 described--and really these were recommendations on Federal
761 reports, they weren't hard edits--they were offered within
762 the the context of an interagency review process with a lot
763 of people providing recommendations to Dr. Mahoney. But you
764 know--
765 Chairman WAXMAN. Who is Dr. Mahoney?
766 Mr. COONEY. Dr. Mahoney was at the end of the process
767 and he was the Assistant Secretary at Commerce for Oceans and
768 Atmosphere and the Director of the administration's Climate
769 Change Science Program Office that was ultimately responsible
770 for the publication of the 10-year Strategic Plan and the
771 "Our Changing Planet" report.
772 Chairman WAXMAN. So you were making recommendations to
773 him?
774 Mr. COONEY. Within an established interagency process.
775 And the comments that you are describing that I made, you
776 know, my comments of a scientific nature were really
777 derivative. And as I said in my testimony they relied on the
778 major findings of the National Academy of Sciences, according
779 to the report that it released for the President in June
780 2001. And it talked about many of the localized and

781 regionalized impacts of climate change being very poorly
782 understood and of the inability of climate change models to
783 project impacts at a localized and regional level. And so,
784 for example, the reliance on that type of language would have
785 led to my comments.

786 In the end, Dr. Mahoney didn't take many of my comments.
787 He rejected a number of my comments. And that is the nature
788 of our process.

789 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Cooney, as I understand it, every
790 time the National Academy of Sciences had certainty, you
791 tried to delete that certainty or change it so that it was
792 uncertain.

793 Mr. Hansen, you are one of the Nation's leading experts
794 on climate change. What is your view of the changes made by
795 Mr. Cooney and his staff at the White House? Are they
796 consistent with the types of assertions that the oil
797 companies and the Petroleum Institute were making about the
798 lack of scientific certainty about climate change? Or were
799 they simply trying to making sure that scientific edits
800 confirmed what the National Academy of Sciences was saying?

801 Mr. HANSEN. I think that--I believe that these edits,
802 the nature of these edits is a good part of the reason for
803 why there is a substantial gap between the understanding of
804 global warming by the relevant scientific community and the
805 knowledge of the public and policymakers, because there has

806 been so much doubt cast on our understanding that they think
807 it is still completely up in the air.
808 Chairman WAXMAN. You think the edits raised doubt where
809 there was a consensus?
810 Mr. HANSEN. Because they consistently are always of one
811 nature, and that is to raise doubt.
812 Of course there are many details about climate that
813 remain to be understood. But that doesn't mean that we don't
814 have a broad understanding.
815 Chairman WAXMAN. In a 1998 document from the Petroleum
816 Institute that is called, quote, Global Climate Science
817 Communications Action Planning, end quote--which I would like
818 to make part of the record as Exhibit T--and without
819 objection.
820 [The information follows:]

821 ******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

822 Chaiman WAXMAN. It says and I quote, "Victory will be
823 achieved when average citizens understand uncertainties in
824 climate science, recognition of uncertainties becomes part of
825 the conventional wisdom, and media coverage reflects balance
826 on climate science in recognition of the validity of
827 viewpoints that challenge the current conventional wisdom,"
828 end quote.

829 So when I compare this Petroleum Institute document with
830 your activities at the White House, Mr. Cooney, I find it is
831 hard to see much of a distinction. The Petroleum Institute
832 is defining victory as sowing doubt in the public about the
833 certainty of climate change science, and that is what your
834 edits to Federal climate change reports appear to do.

835 Mr. COONEY. Mr. Chairman, I will try to be concise and
836 say if you look at chapter 3 of the policy book that the
837 President issued on June 11, 2001, in conjunction with the
838 speech he gave in the Rose Garden where he spoke at length
839 about climate change science and the findings at the National
840 Academy, there are at least 50 to 75 direct quotations from
841 the National Academy report that he had requested.

842 And it was part of what he released on June 11th. And
843 that was our foundational document for reviewing these
844 budgetary reports. It had truly nothing to do with my prior
845 employment at the American Petroleum Institute. When I came
846 to the White House, my loyalties--my sole loyalties--were to

847 the President and his administration.

848 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much. Let me just
849 point out, while my time has expired, that the points where
850 you raised uncertainty were the places where the National
851 Academy of Sciences were fairly certain, and the other parts
852 where they were uncertain I don't think that was affected.
853 We will get into that more, I think, in the questioning.

854 Mr. COONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I offer one more thing?

855 Chairman WAXMAN. Certainly.

856 Mr. COONEY. This document from 1998 from the American
857 Petroleum Institute, I don't really recall the whole story
858 except to say that I was not involved on the climate change
859 issue at the time this document was prepared.

860 Chairman WAXMAN. Thanks. Well, that document was
861 prepared--

862 Mr. COONEY. In 1998.

863 Chairman WAXMAN--to express the views of the Petroleum
864 Institute as to what they wanted to do on climate change and
865 that seemed to be consistent when you were there.

866 The National--the President's speech wasn't made--that
867 you are citing as your blueprint--wasn't given while you were
868 at the White House, but submit that that was guiding your
869 policies at the White House.

870 Mr. COONEY. It was given 2 weeks before I joined the
871 Council on Environmental Quality staff. And so it was the

872 roadmap that was established before I arrived.

873 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you. Mr. Issa.

874 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Boy, there is a lot
875 to cover here today, and I hope I get through most of it.

876 Dr. Hansen, let me start with you, because we have been
877 talking about something from the petroleum industry from
878 1998. But in 2000--you, I understand are the author, the
879 proponent for the alternative scenario theory you argued that
880 the rapid warming in recent decades was driven mainly by
881 noncarbon dioxide greenhouse gases, basically the
882 chlorofluoro carbons--methane, nitrous oxide and the like.
883 Do you still hold that 2000--year 2000 view of global
884 warming?

885 Mr. HANSEN. The data in the 2000 paper is very good
886 data, very--we have an accurate knowledge of the forcings by
887 different greenhouse gases. That is one part of the problem
888 which is very well established. We know how much carbon
889 dioxide has increased, how much nitrous oxide and methane
890 chlorofluoro carbons have increased, and the sum of these
891 non-CO2 gases provide forcing approximately the same as that
892 by CO2.

893 Mr. ISSA. Okay. So in 2000 and today, you would say
894 that more than half of global warming--but at that time you
895 said that it was not CO2, but in fact these other gases. Now
896 you would say it is 50/50--

897 Mr. HANSEN. No, I did not say it is not CO2. It is a
898 very qualitative paper. If you look at it, the forcing by
899 CO2 was then about 1.4 watts and the forcing by non-CO2 gases
900 is comparable. And then there are other factors also--
901 Mr. ISSA. I appreciate that. And I will let you be the
902 physicist and I will try to be the guy up here that is trying
903 to muddle through a better understanding of both the science
904 but, more importantly, the policy here.
905 Your quote at the time was that it had not been driven
906 mainly by--it was driven mainly by noncarbon dioxide. So it
907 was getting close to even at that point?
908 Mr. HANSEN. The--it is approximately the same, the CO2
909 forcing and the non-CO2 greenhouse gases. I think that what
910 you may be referring to is the fact that I pointed out that
911 the same burning of fossil fuels, that process produces not
912 only carbon dioxide but aerosols, which are small particles
913 in the atmosphere, and those are also cooling. So if you
914 calculate the net effect of those, that reduces the net
915 fossil fuel effect on a temporary basis. But the problem is
916 these small particles have a lifetime of only 5 days, and we
917 are attempting to clean those up because they are air
918 pollution.
919 Mr. ISSA. Sure. I understand we can cool the
920 environment if we blacken the sky, but that may not be the
921 best way to cool the environment. I am with you on that,

922 Doctor.

923 But I guess when I look back to some of these arguments
924 going on within science--you don't call them arguments but
925 debates--as late as 2000, you and other scholars were
926 debating, you know, in various papers--you were debating the
927 differences of what was causing what. And to a certain
928 extent, you still are. Is that correct?

929 Mr. HANSEN. Oh, sure, that is always going on. Yes.

930 Mr. ISSA. So this isn't settled science.

931 Mr. HANSEN. There are many aspects of it which are
932 settled and--

933 Mr. ISSA. What are those aspects that are totally
934 settled? Name one aspect that is totally settled in the
935 science.

936 Mr. HANSEN. The climate forcing, that which drives the
937 climate change, many parts of that are quantitatively very
938 well settled. And carbon dioxide is the largest forcing, and
939 it is now the fastest growing forcing. And it is going to
940 dominate the future global climate change. That has become
941 very clear.

942 Mr. ISSA. And I appreciate that because I think that is
943 an area that we should all focus on here a lot today
944 because--Mr. Cooney, I am going to go to you for a second.

945 Prior to coming to the White House, you worked for the
946 American Petroleum Industry. We have established that. You

947 were in your role, among other things, an attorney; is that
948 correct?
949 Mr. COONEY. Earlier in my career there, yes.
950 Mr. ISSA. So your client was the Institute.
951 Mr. COONEY. Yes. The members of the Institute.
952 Mr. ISSA. When you came on as--among your other
953 attributes you are an attorney--your client became who when
954 you came to work in Washington for this administration? Who
955 was your client?
956 Mr. COONEY. The President.
957 Mr. ISSA. So, very different loyalties between
958 petroleum and the President, right?
959 Mr. COONEY. Yes.
960 Mr. ISSA. So when the President talks about
961 switchgrass, when he puts forward budgets that include
962 billions of dollars for various areas of climate study,
963 including roughly a billion dollars for the area that Dr.
964 Hansen is most thoroughly involved in, that is your client,
965 right?
966 Mr. COONEY. Absolutely, yes.
967 Mr. ISSA. When the President includes in each of his
968 speeches the need to get unhooked or get rid of the addiction
969 to petroleum, that is your client, right?
970 Mr. COONEY. Correct.
971 Mr. ISSA. And you represent that client and

972 would--wouldn't have a conflict there?

973 Mr. COONEY. My sole loyalty was to the President and
974 advancing the policies of his administration.

975 Mr. ISSA. I don't see a conflict there. I must tell
976 you that I came from an industry where I produced car alarms,
977 and I have no loyalty to the car alarms nor animosity to the
978 car thieves that exist in Washington today. I have moved on.

979 And that will be quoted, I am sure.

980 Dr. Hansen, you have been quoted, speaking of quotes,
981 and correct me if I'm a little off on this, but the way the
982 quote is here it says, "Debating a contrarian leaves the
983 impression that there is still an argument among theorists
984 that science is still uncertain," end quote.

985 You have said that many times, plus or minus a few
986 words.

987 Mr. HANSEN. Yes.

988 Mr. ISSA. Does that mean that your opinion among
989 scientists--because this talks about contrarians, not Mr.
990 Cooney, because he wasn't the decisionmaker, as has been
991 shown by the fact that when it bubbled up to somebody with
992 "doctor" in front of their name, most of it got ignored--
993 among scientists, you appeared to believe that the debate
994 about this--any aspect of science being settled, that you
995 think is settled, has a chilling effect on people's
996 understanding. You said so in your opening remarks here

997 today. Is that--you said that the American people were
998 not--were confused by these contrarian opinions. I guess we
999 would be talking about Senator Jimmy Inhofe who says there
1000 isn't global warming. You say it is settled science; is that
1001 correct?

1002 Mr. HANSEN. I wouldn't state it the way that you just
1003 did.

1004 Mr. ISSA. Please rephrase.

1005 Mr. HANSEN. What I refer to is the fact that very often
1006 the media, sometimes with pressure from special interests,
1007 will present balance. And balance means we have one person
1008 describing the science and one person who disputes it, even
1009 in cases where the science is 99 percent certain.

1010 And both of them speak in a technical language which to
1011 the public often sounds like they are, you know, technical
1012 scientists, and they don't understand the language. And so
1013 it looks like a 50/50 thing, even when it is not.

1014 Mr. ISSA. Okay. Well, you know, having been somebody
1015 that is still befuddled about whether Pluto is a planet or
1016 not, I share that layman's understanding.

1017 But it appears as though you have become an advocate for
1018 limiting that debate to coming up with consensus that certain
1019 things are settled, such as CO2 is a major cause of global
1020 warming and no one should be able to dispute that.

1021 Mr. HANSEN. No, that is not true at all. What I am an

1022 advocate for is the scientific method. And with the
1023 scientific method you present--you look at all sides of a
1024 story equally, without prejudice.
1025 Now, what we have in the case of some of these
1026 contrarians is simply making negative statements
1027 without--without presenting--you know, they act more like
1028 lawyers than like scientists. They present all the evidence
1029 they can think of for one side of the story, rather than
1030 acting like scientists. And that is why I say it is a
1031 mistake to get involved with professional contrarians,
1032 because they are to confuse the public that is basically--
1033 Mr. ISSA. I appreciate that. Last July 20th, you
1034 pulled out of a hearing and it was one in which there was a
1035 peer involved. And my understanding from quotes you made at
1036 the time was that, one, you were infirmed, but you said you
1037 would get out of your sick bed if they were serious about the
1038 science.
1039 Mr. HANSEN. Yes, if they want to speak about science
1040 seriously, that is a different story. But if they just want
1041 to do the contrarian story just for the sake of publicity,
1042 then I don't see much point in that.
1043 Mr. ISSA. So today you are on a panel with no
1044 contrarians, so that is okay.
1045 Mr. HANSEN. Today we are talking about government
1046 reform, and I think that some is needed in this case.

1047 Mr. ISSA. Okay. Well, my time is nearly ended, but Mr.
1048 Deutsch--is my time over?
1049 Chairman WAXMAN. Yes.
1050 Mr. ISSA. Let me ask one final thing. You are very
1051 young. You were 22 years old and plus or minus 3 credits of
1052 being a college graduate. Do you think you may have ruffled
1053 Dr. Hansen's feathers simply because you were young and
1054 inexperienced?
1055 Mr. DEUTSCH. Apparently I did.
1056 Mr. ISSA. Perhaps not skilled in the ways of public
1057 affairs.
1058 Mr. DEUTSCH. I can't speak for Dr. Hansen, but I very
1059 well may have.
1060 Mr. ISSA. I will hold for the second round. Thank you,
1061 Mr. Chairman.
1062 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa. Mr. Welch.
1063 Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1064 Mr. Cooney, you indicated in your statement that your
1065 loyalty was to the President who appointed you, correct?
1066 Mr. COONEY. Correct.
1067 Mr. WELCH. You also indicated that your responsibility
1068 was to align executive branch reports with administration
1069 policy, correct?
1070 Mr. COONEY. Correct.
1071 Mr. WELCH. And the administration had a pretty clear

1072 energy policy during the time of the ongoing energy crisis,
1073 which included recovery in the search for new oil and
1074 petroleum products, correct?
1075 Mr. COONEY. It included that. There were many other
1076 elements.
1077 Mr. WELCH. Well, it included supporting drilling in the
1078 Arctic National Wildlife Reserve, correct?
1079 Mr. COONEY. It did. It included extended--
1080 Mr. WELCH. It included drilling offshore, correct?
1081 Mr. COONEY. I don't recall.
1082 Mr. WELCH. It included maintaining royalty relief for
1083 the oil companies for the recovery of gulf oil, even as the
1084 price of oil increased over $60 a barrel?
1085 Mr. COONEY. I don't recall that that was an element of
1086 the National Energy Policy in the spring of 2001--
1087 Chairman WAXMAN. It included tax breaks that Congress
1088 gave the oil industry at time when they had $125 billion in
1089 profits, correct?
1090 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, I can say that later in my
1091 years in the administration, we opposed oil and tax--excuse
1092 me, tax incentives for oil and gas exploration for the oil
1093 industry--
1094 Mr. WELCH. Let's get real. Let's get real. ANWR,
1095 offshore drilling, tax breaks, all advocated publicly,
1096 aggressively, by the Bush administration, passed by a

1097 Republican Congress; yes or no?

1098 Mr. COONEY. That was an element--

1099 Mr. CANNON. Would the two of you yield? When you're

1100 talking about tax breaks, you're talking about tax breaks

1101 that have been in law for a long time, or since then? I'm

1102 wondering.

1103 RPTS THOMAS

1104 DCMN MAGMER

1105 [11:00 a.m.]

1106 Mr. WELCH. You will have your chance, my good friend.

1107 Mr. COONEY. There were many elements of the policy:
1108 the promotion of nuclear energy, the increase of fuel
1109 economy, standards for light trucks, a mandate for renewable
1110 fuels and the sale of transportation fuels for ethanol which
1111 was enacted in 2005. There were many elements to the policy
1112 that were not necessarily to the advantage of the oil and gas
1113 industry, which were administered policies.

1114 Mr. WELCH. Did that policy of the Bush
1115 administration--and you supported the President in his
1116 policies--include promoting drilling in ANWR?

1117 Mr. COONEY. Yes, Congressman.

1118 Mr. WELCH. Well, did it include support breaks that
1119 were passed by Congress to the oil industry?

1120 Mr. COONEY. I don't recall that being an element.

1121 Mr. WELCH. Let's ask a few specific questions here.

1122 You reviewed the CEQ, and this document is the strategic
1123 plan for the Climate Change Science Program which was issued
1124 in 2003. The committee has multiple drafts. You've seen
1125 them. You have been asked about them in your deposition;
1126 and, in fact, at your deposition, you acknowledged that this
1127 was edited at least five times, on October 28, 2002; May 30,

1128 2003; June 2, 2003; June 16, 2003; and once before the final
1129 version was released. Is that correct? Yes or no?
1130 Mr. COONEY. That sounds correct.
1131 Mr. WELCH. And when we examined your edits, we found a
1132 large number of changes that very clearly had the effect of
1133 emphasizing or exaggerating the level of uncertainty
1134 surrounding global warming science. In your first round of
1135 edits, there were 47 edits that introduced additional
1136 uncertainty; in the second round, you made 28 edits that made
1137 global warming seem less certain, and in your third round of
1138 edits, you made 106 changes that introduced additional
1139 uncertainty. That is a total of 181 edits. I want to ask
1140 you about these edits.
1141 Take a look at Exhibit C. You are ready for this.
1142 When the draft arrived on your desk, lines 40 to 42
1143 read, quote, recent warming has been linked to longer growing
1144 seasons, grass species decline, changes in aquatic diversity,
1145 in coral bleaching. You inserted the words "indicated as
1146 potentially" introducing a greater level of uncertainty into
1147 that report. Right or wrong?
1148 Mr. COONEY. Right. I inserted those words.
1149 Mr. WELCH. And I assume that you referred to some
1150 scientific report for introducing this change that
1151 contradicted the report of the scientists.
1152 Mr. COONEY. This is not a report of the scientists.

1153 Mr. WELCH. Here's a simple question. You made a
1154 change. You had a basis for the change. My question is
1155 this: What was the basis of your change?
1156 Mr. COONEY. It was the National Academy of Science's
1157 June, 2001, report.
1158 Mr. WELCH. And tell us specifically, in that report you
1159 are now referring to, where the National Academy said
1160 "potentially."
1161 Mr. COONEY. Well, the National Academy identified the
1162 uncertainties associated with regional outcomes of climate
1163 change as one of the fundamental scientific questions that
1164 remained and needed to be studied.
1165 Mr. WELCH. My question is simple. It's an important
1166 question. You made a change. You overruled the written
1167 report of a scientist in your department.
1168 Mr. COONEY. I didn't overrule it.
1169 Mr. WELCH. Where specifically can you find support to
1170 authorize the important scientific conclusion on the issue of
1171 climate change?
1172 Mr. COONEY. On page 19 of the report it states, on a
1173 regional scale and in the longer term, there is much more
1174 uncertainty. At page 21 of the National Academy of Sciences
1175 report, it says, "Whereas all models project global warming
1176 and global increases in precipitation, the sign of
1177 precipitation varies among models for regions. The range of

1178 model sensitivities and the challenge of projecting signs of
1179 precipitation changes for regions represents a substantial
1180 limitation in assessing climate impacts"
1181 Mr. WELCH. Dr. Hansen, does this make the slightest bit
1182 of sense?
1183 Mr. HANSEN. I think the connection between warming and
1184 longer growing seasons is very straightforward, and I don't
1185 see the need for this sort of qualification.
1186 Mr. WELCH. Thank you.
1187 Please turn to Exhibit D, Mr. Cooney.
1188 When you received the June 5, 2003, draft, page 294
1189 read, "Climate modeling capabilities have improved
1190 dramatically and can be expected to continue to do so. As a
1191 result, scientists are now able to model earth system
1192 processes in the coupling of those processes on a regional
1193 and global scale with increasing precision and reliability."
1194 The CEQ completely, completely deleted these sentences,
1195 right?
1196 Mr. COONEY. At which line? I am sorry, Congressman.
1197 Mr. WELCH. Page 294.
1198 Mr. COONEY. Yes, Congressman.
1199 Mr. WELCH. All right. Did you refer to some scientific
1200 evidence upon which you would delete the scientific
1201 conclusions that were presented by scientists?
1202 Mr. COONEY. I did, Congressman. At page 16 of the

1203 National Academy of Sciences report, it says, however,
1204 climate models are imperfect. Their simulation skill is
1205 limited by uncertainties in their formulation, the limited
1206 size of their calculation and their difficulty of
1207 interpreting their answers of the exhibit with almost as much
1208 complexity as in nature.
1209 Most importantly, at the end of the National Academy of
1210 Sciences report, it says that a major limitation of model
1211 forecasts for use around the word is the paucity of data
1212 available to evaluate the ability of coupled models to
1213 simulate important aspects of climate change. In addition,
1214 the observing system available today is a composite of
1215 observations that neither provide the information nor the
1216 continuity and data to support measurements of climate
1217 variability. Therefore, above all, it is essential to ensure
1218 the existence of long-term observing systems that provides a
1219 more definitive observational foundation to evaluate decadal
1220 and century scale variability and change.
1221 Mr. WELCH. You heard Dr. Hansen just a moment ago when
1222 he said that said that scientists are different than lawyers?
1223 Mr. COONEY. Yes.
1224 Mr. WELCH. Lawyers find every single possible nuance to
1225 create doubt and uncertainty.
1226 Here's the question, all right? What you deleted was a
1227 straightforward statement that said climate modeling

1228 capabilities have improved dramatically. You have now just
1229 read a statement that says they are not perfect and you have
1230 now edited that report to undercut the conclusion on climate
1231 warming that was reached by our scientists. Yes or no?
1232 Mr. COONEY. No, Congressman, I didn't edit the report.
1233 I made recommendations within an established interagency
1234 review process, and I believed at the time that I made them
1235 that I had a foundation for my comments based in the National
1236 Academy of Scientists.
1237 I am not being lawyerly. I am being--
1238 Mr. WELCH. But you did have a foundation, and it was
1239 admirable loyalty to the person who had appointed you to a
1240 political position.
1241 Here's one of the questions I have as I listen to this.
1242 Whether you call it a recommendation or an edit, we will let
1243 the people of America decide that. You describe candidly
1244 that your job was to align executive reports to
1245 administration policy. Administration's policy was pro-oil,
1246 pro-drilling, pro-API. It created--as the API report said,
1247 its goal was to create uncertainty about the basis of global
1248 warming.
1249 How is what the Petroleum Institute was doing--and these
1250 edits were encouraging--any different than the work of the
1251 so-called scientists during the whole tobacco debate when
1252 they were selling doubt about whether there was any link

1253 between tobacco and lung cancer?

1254 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, I would say that the most
1255 material development was that the President's climate change
1256 committee--Cabinet-level committee itself requested our
1257 latest knowledge, the most current knowledge on the state of
1258 what we know about climate change of the National Academy of
1259 Sciences. That report was delivered to the Cabinet in early
1260 June, 2001, and became the explicit basis for President
1261 Bush's stated policies in June, 2001.

1262 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

1263 Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

1264 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Issa.

1265 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1266 Mr. Cooney, I'll ask you the obvious question. In
1267 retrospect, do you think it would have been better if a
1268 scientist had been in your position doing these edits or
1269 maybe a librarian who had not worked at the Petroleum
1270 Institute?

1271 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, this--all of this, the review
1272 of these reports, the process for the report, is really
1273 controlled by the Global Change Research Act of 1990. It
1274 calls for the Council on Environmental Quality to be
1275 represented on an interagency committee--

1276 Mr. ISSA. I understand.

1277 Mr. COONEY. --with high-ranking individuals.

1278 Mr. ISSA. I am just asking, in retrospect, would a
1279 librarian from East McKeesport been a better choice so that
1280 we would not be talking about past profession?
1281 Mr. COONEY. Perhaps.
1282 Mr. ISSA. Well, hopefully, in the future, Members of
1283 Congress will not come from individual States with their
1284 political bent having served in the legislatures either. But
1285 I am not holding my breath on that.
1286 Dr. Hansen, I have a question for you.
1287 We've been focusing up until now on specifics of a
1288 report and a handful of edits that were mostly not accepted.
1289 Do you feel that you are able to express in a clear way to
1290 the public the real dangers of climate change? Yes or no?
1291 Keep it as simple as you can.
1292 Mr. HANSEN. I wish it were a simple yes or no.
1293 Mr. ISSA. How about if we do this, since it is not that
1294 simple. I did a little quick looking at the stories from
1295 January 1st, 2006, until today. Would you believe I found
1296 1,400 statements in publications distinctly different that
1297 you've done in that period that are available on Google?
1298 That doesn't surprise you?
1299 Mr. HANSEN. No, it doesn't surprise me.
1300 Mr. ISSA. Does it surprise you that you're only 40 or
1301 so--out of that 1,464, you're only about 40 or so behind Dr.
1302 Hale from the shuttle program? And you're only--the two of

1303 you together it takes to get up to the administrator of NASA.
1304 So would you say that more or less a major story each and
1305 every day times two is reasonable access to the media?
1306 Mr. HANSEN. Sure. That is, but this is a story that
1307 needs access to the media.
1308 Mr. ISSA. I don't disagree with you. But, you know, in
1309 January of 2006, you delivered 15 major media interviews; and
1310 in your testimony, or, actually, in some of the other
1311 material related, you said this was a month after Mr. Deutsch
1312 and the administration stifled your ability to speak. So I
1313 guess one of the questions is, when do you have time for
1314 research?
1315 Mr. HANSEN. Well, my wife will tell you that--about 80
1316 or 90 hours a week. It takes a lot of time. If you're going
1317 to spend some time trying to communicate with the public, it
1318 does take away from your research time.
1319 Mr. ISSA. But 15 major media events in 1 month, and
1320 that was the month after the administration put the hammer
1321 down.
1322 Mr. HANSEN. Sure. That is the reason why. As soon as
1323 that became public knowledge, than the media came running.
1324 Mr. ISSA. But did the administration stop you from
1325 doing those 15 major media events?
1326 Mr. HANSEN. No. The NASA Administrator came out with a
1327 very strong statement. To his credit, he said that we were,

1328 in fact, allowed to speak to the public.

1329 Mr. ISSA. Okay. So, notwithstanding the President, the
1330 American Petroleum Institute, Mr. Cooney, the fact is, during
1331 this administration, with people such as the NASA Director,
1332 you have had significant access--as a matter of fact, you're
1333 one of the most easily Googleable human beings on the face of
1334 the earth. So the message is getting out, would you say?

1335 Mr. HANSEN. The message is getting out, but there
1336 remains a gap in the public understanding of where our
1337 knowledge of global climate change is.

1338 Mr. ISSA. Going back to that, this 2000 report, I noted
1339 that in 2000 it was called the Alternative Scenario. Now the
1340 only reason you call it the Alternative Scenario was you were
1341 outside the mainstream, to a certain extent, at least.

1342 Mr. HANSEN. No. Alternative was alternative to
1343 business as usual. That's what it means. Business as usual
1344 has continued an increase in emissions year after year by
1345 larger and larger fossil fuels.

1346 Mr. ISSA. Isn't it true that in 2000 the groups,
1347 including the Union of Concerned Scientists, criticized you
1348 soundly for publishing the Alternative Scenario--

1349 Mr. HANSEN. Yeah, there was--

1350 Mr. ISSA.--because it would confuse the public?

1351 Mr. HANSEN. Because I focused on some of the
1352 contributions of the non-C02.

1353 Mr. ISSA. You were providing ammunition for the
1354 deniers, weren't you?
1355 Mr. HANSEN. No, I was providing science.
1356 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, when you provide an alternative
1357 to what somebody else is doing and add to that body of
1358 debate, you are providing alternatives and moving the debate
1359 when someone else puts a limiting word, it appears; and I
1360 have already written off Mr. Cooney as not a scientist, but I
1361 am trying to understand if--in 2000, you did something very,
1362 very important, which is you said you have got all of those
1363 non-CO2 things that we have been looking at and they have
1364 certain effects and C02 has certain amounts and here is how
1365 we are going to look at it, and you got denounced for it, but
1366 you don't consider that a problem, even though they said you
1367 were confusing part of the public because it was unsettled.
1368 Mr. HANSEN. Pardon?
1369 Mr. ISSA. You were confusing the public as an unsettled
1370 science in 2000; is that right?
1371 Mr. HANSEN. Could you repeat that?
1372 Mr. ISSA. The Union of Concerned Scientists found that
1373 you were confusing the public in 2000 by putting forward this
1374 Alternative Scenario.
1375 Mr. HANSEN. Well, you would have to ask them. I don't
1376 think it was confusing the public.
1377 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, you know--look, I would like to

1378 be with you because you are one of the preeminent scientists,
1379 but, in 2000, you were still looking to add to the body, as I
1380 am sure you are today--
1381 Mr. HANSEN. Sure we are. We always are.
1382 Mr. ISSA. --of science because, until we have all of the
1383 body, we won't have all of the potential solutions for the
1384 problems.
1385 Mr. HANSEN. That doesn't mean we don't know anything.
1386 Mr. ISSA. Of course. I am not saying that. My opening
1387 statement said you are pushing on an open door. I agree with
1388 you on C02, I agree with you on the greenhouse gas, and I
1389 agree with you on the need to change that.
1390 In the last Congress, we had a number of scientists in
1391 my subcommittee, and we were able to get what we think was a
1392 pretty good assessment. It is about $350 trillion if we are
1393 going to get to zero emissions today. And if research--and
1394 do the science. That price goes down, depending on how much
1395 time we have.
1396 The concern that I have is I want your science to tell
1397 us as accurately on a daily, weekly, monthly basis how much
1398 time we have. Because we know we can't spend $350 trillion
1399 to solve this problem, but we know we can't wait forever to
1400 solve it. So, in between, we are trying to figure out how to
1401 apply efficiently the dollars not to collapse our society and
1402 to in fact get to a zero greenhouse gas/also C02 emissions.

1403 Isn't that a common goal that you share with this President
1404 who stated that he wants to get to, in fact, a stable
1405 environment and a cleaner one than we have today?
1406 Mr. HANSEN. If you would look at my written testimony,
1407 you will see that I have some terrific recommendations. The
1408 problem is that our policy now is not going in that
1409 direction. We are continuing to increase our emissions. But
1410 it is clear that we have got to decrease.
1411 Mr. ISSA. I agree. We are doing it.
1412 Mr. HANSEN. The sooner we start on it, the less
1413 expensive it will be. In fact, it may be economically
1414 beneficial.
1415 Mr. ISSA. How much are we spending on sequestration of
1416 C02?
1417 Mr. HANSEN. We are spending quite a lot on clean coal.
1418 Mr. ISSA. Is that a step in the right direction as an
1419 interim to reduce the emissions?
1420 Mr. HANSEN. Sequestration is an important issue, which
1421 it should be.
1422 Mr. ISSA. Secondly, what are we spending on nuclear?
1423 Mr. HANSEN. We are spending a lot.
1424 Mr. ISSA. Is that important to disposable--
1425 Mr. HANSEN. Those are important, but there are
1426 renewables in energy efficiency which have tremendous
1427 potential in this. We are spending chicken feed.

1428 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, that's chicken feed. How much
1429 would you spend?
1430 Mr. HANSEN. It is not up to me to determine how much we
1431 should spend.
1432 Mr. ISSA. How much, if it is up to you to determine--
1433 Mr. HANSEN. And, again, this is my opinion as a private
1434 citizen. It is not--
1435 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, I understand the disclaimer, but
1436 we didn't call you here as a private citizen. You said it
1437 was chicken feed. I am following up on that. If 4, 5, 6, 8,
1438 10 billion dollars in various pockets of the Federal
1439 Government is chicken feed, what do we need to spend in
1440 dollars to move this along? Somewhere between $10 billion
1441 and $350 trillion? Give me a number of an annual amount we
1442 should spend.
1443 Mr. HANSEN. It should be at least comparable to what we
1444 are spending on nuclear--we are subsidizing fossil fuels and
1445 nuclear a lot. We should be spending a lot more on
1446 renewables and energy efficiency. We have tremendous
1447 potential in energy efficiency.
1448 Mr. ISSA. So if nuclear--
1449 Mr. HANSEN. I don't think we are overspending on the
1450 other research. It is very important.
1451 Mr. ISSA. That is a fair answer.
1452 Am I running out of time again?

1453 Chairman WAXMAN. Yup.

1454 Mr. ISSA. Thanks, Dr. Hansen.

1455 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Issa.

1456 Ms. Watson.

1457 Ms. WATSON. Dr. Hansen, as one of the eminent climate
1458 researchers, I want to thank you for being here today.

1459 I don't know the process, but, as I am looking at the
1460 exhibits that have been passed out to us, when you present an
1461 empirical report is it usual or unusual to have whole lines
1462 deleted by someone who is not a scientist?

1463 Mr. HANSEN. Well, I would hope it would be unusual.

1464 Ms. WATSON. All right. It is my understanding that in
1465 late 2002 a NASA public affairs official warned that there
1466 would be dire consequences if you continued to do press
1467 interviews about the threat of global warming. Can you tell
1468 me if this is accurate and, if so, what happened?

1469 Mr. HANSEN. Well, it is accurate in the sense that was
1470 relayed to me. It was an oral threat that was made to the
1471 public affairs person in New York and relayed to me. And as
1472 I described in my testimony today, I think--I don't know if
1473 they were--can be directly related to it, but the
1474 consequences for our budget were pretty dire.

1475 Ms. WATSON. So you worked at NASA for over 30 years, as
1476 I understand, and under several administrations, and was that
1477 kind of explicit threat unusual?

1478 Mr. HANSEN. Yeah. It is unusual that they will make
1479 such an explicit threat. But, as I again mentioned in my
1480 opening remarks, the mechanisms for keeping government
1481 scientists in line with policy are pretty powerful, and they
1482 don't need to make an explicit threat.
1483 Ms. WATSON. I had a confrontation with somebody from
1484 the Department of Commerce when we were in Qatar at the
1485 International Conference on Trade, and he made a statement
1486 about delusionary and mythical global warming. I talked to
1487 him about it afterwards. He was quite curt and rude, and he
1488 is no longer with the Department. He is no longer alive.
1489 But I found that very--in terms of myself as a policymaker,
1490 very insulting.
1491 In December of 2005, National Public Radio wanted to
1492 interview you about global warming science; and this is, of
1493 course, your area of expertise, as I understand. I am very
1494 impressed with your resume. But NASA didn't want you to talk
1495 to NPR, and they wanted Colleen Hartman to do the interview
1496 instead. She was the Deputy Associate Administrator at NASA
1497 and one of your superiors. Do you think there would be a
1498 difference between what you could offer in an interview on
1499 global warming and what she could offer?
1500 Mr. HANSEN. Well, sure, given our experiences. I mean,
1501 I have--
1502 Mr. SHAYS. Let me request that you speak closer to the

1503 mike.

1504 Mr. HANSEN. I have been doing research on that topic
1505 for several decades now, and they explicitly indicated that
1506 they wanted to talk about the climate science research that I
1507 discussed at the AGU meeting that December.

1508 Ms. WATSON. Were you allowed to do the interview?

1509 Mr. HANSEN. No, I was not allowed to do it because
1510 headquarters indicated they preferred that I not be allowed
1511 to speak to NPR because it was described as the most liberal
1512 media outlet in the country.

1513 Ms. WATSON. Do you think the administration was afraid
1514 of having you talk to the press about climate change in your
1515 opinion as a private citizen?

1516 Mr. HANSEN. They were reluctant for whatever reasons.

1517 Ms. WATSON. It seems from this hearing that there was
1518 an attempt to quiet you. I experienced that myself from
1519 someone from this administration, and I don't know how you
1520 skew empirical evidence as a scientist. I would feel that
1521 there should be a report coming from the editors.

1522 If Mr. Cooney, a non-lawyer--Mr. Cooney, if you were to
1523 review this, I would think that, rather than changing words
1524 and editing, that you would write a dissenting report, a
1525 challenge to the findings of Dr. Hansen, rather than
1526 suggesting lines be deleted if you could not find a
1527 scientific base to do so.

1528 Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

1529 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Ms. Watson.

1530 Mr. COONEY. Congresswoman, I did not comment on any of
1531 Dr. Hansen's work. In fact, the record before the committee
1532 shows that I had suggested that he be invited to interagency
1533 committees to brief us on the latest science. So I did not
1534 directly review his work.

1535 Ms. WATSON. Thank you.

1536 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Cannon.

1537 Mr. CANNON. Thank you.

1538 Mr. Cooney, would you mind expanding on what you just
1539 said? My understanding is you have been a big promoter of
1540 Dr. Hansen in many ways; is that not the case?

1541 Mr. COONEY. I think that is true. In the materials
1542 that went up to the committee, you will find in one of the
1543 boxes in the past couple of weeks that I had sent an e-mail
1544 to Dr. Mahoney who, of course, ran the Climate Change Science
1545 Program. It is a one-liner, and you'll find it in the
1546 materials. I said, how about if we get Dr. Hansen to brief
1547 the Deputy Secretary level committee that met every 2 months
1548 on climate change policy, science, technology, mitigation,
1549 international negotiations.

1550 But I have always been of the view that Dr. Hansen is
1551 very eminent. In fact, Dr. Mahoney did not take me up on my
1552 suggestion; and we, at the White House, therefore invited Dr.

1553 Hansen to come and provide a briefing when I was there. I
1554 attended that briefing, and we appreciated his update. In
1555 fact, we were influenced by a lot of what he had to say about
1556 the potential of near-term mitigation from methane, which is
1557 a potent greenhouse gas.

1558 As a consequence and in reliance on Dr. Hansen, to a
1559 large extent, the administration, the President announced in
1560 July of 2004 the methane-to-markets partnership under which a
1561 number of developed and developing countries tackled methane
1562 emissions.

1563 Mr. CANNON. Methane is one of those greenhouse gasses
1564 that we can do something about. Does it bother you that
1565 there is a tendency to be alarmist about the possible
1566 causes--and, Dr. Hansen, I would like you to address this as
1567 well--the possible causes or the possible effect on the
1568 massive inertia, I think you called it, Dr. Hansen, that
1569 these feedback mechanisms might cause? There is a tendency
1570 to focus on those dramatic potential effects but not so much
1571 focus on what we can do to actually solve the probability
1572 containing things like methane.

1573 Mr. COONEY. Well, I think that, as Congressman Issa has
1574 said, we have a time period within which to act, and we want
1575 to act timely, and we want to act cost effectively, and we
1576 want to calibrate our actions to emerging technologies.

1577 So, to be concise, you want to get at the low-hanging

1578 fruit; and Dr. Hansen told us that the low-hanging fruit was
1579 methane emissions. EPA has a tremendous program on methane
1580 emissions, a voluntary program, where actually in the United
1581 States methane emissions is the one greenhouse gas that has
1582 been reduced since 1990. My recollection is that we were
1583 about 5 percent below the 1990 level in methane emissions
1584 because we are capturing methane from coal mines, we are
1585 capturing it from oil and gas systems, and we are capturing
1586 it form landfills and using it for energy. So EPA's
1587 successful program was something that we could take
1588 international and help the developing countries embrace as
1589 well.

1590 Mr. CANNON. I see Dr. Hansen nodding.

1591 Let me just say, I have one of the biggest pig farms in
1592 my district. And, actually, it didn't smell as bad as you
1593 might have expected, but they are now making more money off
1594 of capturing the methane than they are off the 1,500,000 pigs
1595 or so per year that they produce and sell.

1596 Mr. Shays is saying I've got to be kidding. The fact
1597 is, in a very difficult market, they are not making money
1598 from the pigs. They are making money on the methane.

1599 So these are the kinds of things--I see Mr. Hansen
1600 nodding. You are not reflected in the record as smiling and
1601 nodding, Mr. Hansen. It is true there are some things--

1602 Mr. HANSEN. This is a success story, and the

1603 administration should be given credit for it.

1604 Mr. CANNON. I just want to say that I would give Mr.
1605 Capuano the microphone any day to be talking about being
1606 anti-energy or pro-oil or pro-drilling or pro-tax cuts.
1607 Because the people that pay these costs are the poor in
1608 America way disproportionately; and in an environment where
1609 there tends to be an increasing disparity between rich and
1610 poor, I want to be on the side of people getting what they
1611 need in terms of energy.

1612 I notice, Dr. Hansen, you are very positive about some
1613 of these alternatives like methane control on the one hand,
1614 like nuclear on the other hand. And, again, the record
1615 should show that Mr. Hansen is nodding; and, also, what you
1616 are suggesting, we go from chicken feed to more money to
1617 alternatives. There are great potentials there and that--in
1618 fact, let me give you some time to talk, instead of just
1619 nodding, Dr. Hansen.

1620 Your sense is that we have this--and if I can
1621 characterize you--a massive inertia in our oceans and ice
1622 caps and that forces, feedback forces, have a tendency, over
1623 time, to maybe be dramatic. Your concern is to draw people's
1624 attention to the potential problem. Don't you think in that
1625 regard that finding options for what we can do today to
1626 improve the way we affect the atmosphere is important?

1627 Mr. HANSEN. Absolutely. That's the bottom line, and we

1628 need to begin to take those actions now. Because if we stay
1629 on business as usual another decade, it will be very
1630 difficult to avoid the inertia taking over and carrying us to
1631 climate changes that we would rather not have.
1632 Mr. CANNON. How much time do I have left?
1633 Chairman WAXMAN. None.
1634 Mr. CANNON. Mr. Deutsch, I am very impressed by you.
1635 It sounds to me like you have got your resume out there. You
1636 had it prepared in anticipation of graduation. If somebody
1637 ever raised that as a question in your career, I would be
1638 happy to be a recommender for you to straighten them out.
1639 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.
1640 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you. You want to hire him?
1641 Mr. Yarmuth.
1642 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1643 Mr. Cooney, you stated that--and we have repeated it a
1644 number of times--that your primary obligation is to promote
1645 the policies of the administration; is that correct?
1646 Mr. COONEY. Essentially correct.
1647 Mr. YARMUTH. Essentially, that you are a spin doctor,
1648 is that a fair characterization of what you did?
1649 Mr. COONEY. No, I don't think that's fair.
1650 Mr. YARMUTH. I had to get that in anyway. It sounds to
1651 me like a spin doctor.
1652 You said that you were only making recommendations. And

1653 you made recommendations to Mr. Mahoney. Is it fair to say
1654 that, once you got these documents and passed them on, it had
1655 left the realm of science and entered the political process?
1656 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, the documents were inherently
1657 of a policy nature. They related to budgets. They related
1658 to research priorities. They were not a platform for the
1659 presentation of original scientific research. These were
1660 documents called for under the Global Change Research Act.
1661 They were sent to 75 people to review under an
1662 established process at the Office of Management and Budget,
1663 and I was one of 75 who reviewed it, and it came to my
1664 office. I did my reviews. You send it back to OMB. OMB
1665 would synthesize the comments and, in all likelihood, give
1666 them to Dr. Mahoney for a final reconciliation because he was
1667 the head of the program.
1668 Mr. YARMUTH. Are you saying you had no more influence
1669 on what was in the final report than the other 75? You were
1670 in the White House. None of the other 75 in the White
1671 House--
1672 Mr. COONEY. The Office of Science and Technology Policy
1673 staff participated, the Council of Economic Advisors. The
1674 Office of Management and Budget itself reviewed these
1675 budgetary policy research reports. A host of people in the
1676 White House reviewed them. But all of the agencies reviewed
1677 these documents themselves because they affected their

1678 budgets and everyone wanted to be comfortable with what was
1679 expressed.
1680 Mr. YARMUTH. But you made recommendations; and,
1681 according to staff's count, something like 181 of the edits
1682 that you made appeared in the final report. Are you saying
1683 that you didn't have any disproportionate influence?
1684 Mr. COONEY. I was an active participant. There is no
1685 denying that. But if you look at these documents, they were
1686 multiple hundreds of pages, and I don't think it is unfair to
1687 say that 99 percent of the pages had no comments on them.
1688 Where I had a comment, I would make it. But I think it is a
1689 fair characterization to say that 99 percent of the drafts
1690 that came through I had no comment, no recommendation to
1691 make.
1692 Mr. YARMUTH. Let's talk about--you have said on
1693 numerous occasions today that you used, as the basis for your
1694 editing, the National Academy of Sciences and the National
1695 Resource Council documentation; and, in fact, in chapter one
1696 of the draft, where it talks about the issue--called the
1697 issues for science and society, on the page you did have a
1698 footnote and one statement about human activities
1699 causing--whether human activities cause climate change or
1700 global warming.
1701 The NRC elaborated on this point. C-A, next page. And,
1702 in fact, there was a section called, from their report, this

1703 is the NRC, the effect of human activities, which talks about
1704 how the effect of human activities cannot be unequivocally
1705 established; is that correct? So, in fact, you did that
1706 there.
1707 Now, if we can, would you turn to Exhibit A and--because
1708 both in your testimony today and in your deposition, you
1709 talked about this being your guiding document. Will you read
1710 the first sentence of the National Academy Report aloud,
1711 please?
1712 Mr. COONEY. Greenhouse gasses are accumulating in the
1713 earth's atmosphere as a result of human activities causing
1714 surface air temperatures and subsurface ocean temperatures to
1715 rise.
1716 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you.
1717 Now turn to Exhibit B, and this exhibit is your
1718 handwritten edits to the EPA report.
1719 Now on page 3, beginning on line 24, you have deleted a
1720 sentence from the EPA text. Will you please read that
1721 sentence aloud?
1722 Mr. COONEY. I am looking at line 24 on which page?
1723 Mr. YARMUTH. Page 3.
1724 Mr. COONEY. The NRC concluded that the greenhouse
1725 gasses are accumulating in the atmosphere as a result of
1726 human activities, causing surface air temperatures and
1727 subsurface temperatures to rise.

1728 Mr. YARMUTH. Now you replaced this verbatim quote from
1729 the National Academy of Science with your own sentence. This
1730 sentence reads, "Some activities among greenhouse gasses and
1731 other substances directly or indirectly may affect the
1732 balance of incoming and outgoing radiation, thereby
1733 potentially affecting climate on regional and global scales."
1734 That sentence does not appear in the Academy's report.
1735 So you deleted a direct quote from the Academy's report,
1736 which you say is what you relied upon, and replaced it with a
1737 sentence that appears designed to obfuscate the simple
1738 reality that human activities are warming the planet. Why
1739 did you make the change, and why did you not rely on the NRC
1740 report in that situation?
1741 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, I recall this document did
1742 have a number of drafts, and I do recall the viewing
1743 documents that recommended the insertion of a more full
1744 quote, the one that you had referenced before from page 17
1745 about the linkage between observed warming in the 20th
1746 century and human activities not being unequivocally
1747 established because the range of natural variability climate
1748 was not sufficiently known.
1749 In this case, I don't recognize the source of the
1750 comment that I am inserting here on this draft. I don't know
1751 that it is not in the National Academy of Science's report.
1752 I just can't say that it is.

1753 As I said, in most cases, nearly all cases, my comments
1754 were derivative and in reliance on the National Academy of
1755 Science's report; and this may be a quote from that report.
1756 But my concern there was that--in prior drafts, you will
1757 see my concern there was that EPA was, in its draft, was not
1758 being sufficiently expansive on the question of the
1759 connection between human activities and observed warming. It
1760 wasn't using the full benefit of what the National Academy
1761 had said, and I wanted a broad quote because it's an
1762 important question.
1763 The quote on page 17 has the caption The Effect of Human
1764 Activities; and it is there where the National Academy is
1765 purporting to speak very specifically, not from the summary
1766 which is what this sentence is from but very specifically
1767 about the linkage between observed warming and human
1768 activities. I thought that it was more complete to refer to
1769 that quote, and you will find that I did recommend the
1770 insertion of that quote in a number of other drafts.
1771 Mr. YARMUTH. And more supportive of the
1772 administration's policies.
1773 Mr. COONEY. Well, Congressman, again, if you look at
1774 chapter 3 of the policy book that the President himself
1775 released on June 11th, 2 weeks before I got there, the
1776 President has 50 quotes from the National Academy of
1777 Science's report where he prescribes what his research

1778 priorities are going to be.

1779 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

1780 Mr. Souder.

1781 Mr. SOUDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1782 Dr. Hansen, a lot of people believe that money can
1783 influence science. In fact, Mr. Cooney was more or less
1784 smeared for his past ties to the Petroleum Institute. You
1785 received a quarter million dollars from the Heinz Foundation
1786 in 2001. Why shouldn't we believe that influenced your
1787 support for John Kerry for President in 2004?

1788 Mr. HANSEN. The award--the Heinz Environment Award is
1789 an award that is named for John Heinz, a Republican Senator
1790 from Pennsylvania.

1791 Mr. SOUDER. Whose wife is married to John Kerry.

1792 Mr. HANSEN. Yes, that is right.

1793 There is no--as far as I know, there is no political
1794 connection to this award. It is an environmental award, and
1795 it is not--and you know it is--

1796 Mr. SOUDER. I understand the point you are making. It
1797 is not from Theresa Heinz directly or from John Kerry
1798 directly. But the point is that when you smear individuals
1799 based on associations or indirect associations is what has
1800 historically been called McCarthyism and what was done to the
1801 first witness on this panel.

1802 Let me ask you a more precise question.

1803 You have been said publicly multiple times that you were
1804 a consultant on Al Gore's movie An Inconvenient Truth. You
1805 said that Al Gore has a better understanding of the science
1806 of global warming than any politician that you have met.
1807 Given your close ties to former Vice President Gore, how do
1808 you feel about this statement: He said it's appropriate to
1809 have an overrepresentation of factual presentations on how
1810 dangerous it is as a predicate for opening up the audience to
1811 listen to what solutions are and how it is to be helpful.
1812 Do you feel it is okay for politicians to exaggerate the
1813 impact of global warming?
1814 Mr. HANSEN. No, we don't need to exaggerate. The
1815 reality is serious enough. There is no need for
1816 exaggeration.
1817 Mr. SOUDER. I also want to express my concerns that you
1818 didn't submit your testimony. You were told, we understand,
1819 on February 15th that this hearing was coming. I know you
1820 are a busy person. Our committee rules, which are
1821 increasingly being violated, were told that you had 2
1822 business days. Our staff was willing to stay in over the
1823 weekend, and yet we didn't receive the testimony until Sunday
1824 night. It doesn't matter, because there is nothing new in
1825 your testimony. But, as a courtesy, it is helpful for us for
1826 hearings to prepare.
1827 I am more upset that the chairman has not allowed our

1828 Republican witness to speak until the third panel. On a
1829 hearing on censorship, on a hearing of lack of debate, our
1830 witness was denied on the first panel where we could have
1831 debated this. I believe it makes a mockery of a hearing on
1832 censorship to censor the Republican witness.

1833 Now, ironically, Dr. Spencer, who was at NASA for 15
1834 years, who was awarded the Meteorological Society Special
1835 Award for developing a global precise record of the earth's
1836 temperature from operational polar orbiting satellites,
1837 fundamentally advancing our ability to monitor climate--that
1838 is the quote from the award--who receives NASA's exceptional
1839 achievement medal, has views differing from Dr. Hansen.

1840 He also says, Dr. Spencer, "well aware that any
1841 interaction between scientists and the press was to be
1842 coordinated through NASA management and public affairs, end
1843 quote. And he resigned from NASA under the Clinton
1844 administration because of limits on what he could and could
1845 not say as a NASA employee because he felt he was being
1846 restricted by the Clinton administration.

1847 Now, Dr. Hansen, based on your definitions of
1848 censorship, silencing and political interference, whatever
1849 you want to call it, that you allege to have occurred under
1850 the Bush administration, was Dr. Spencer also being censored
1851 by the Clinton administration trying to filter his statements
1852 through NASA when he disagreed with the Clinton

1853 administration?

1854 Mr. HANSEN. I don't have any knowledge of that. I
1855 don't know if he was prevented from speaking to reporters the
1856 way that I was. You would have to ask him about that.

1857 Mr. SOUDER. The major point with this--well, I would
1858 like to ask, because it would be an interesting comparison,
1859 but the majority prohibited us from having him on this panel,
1860 not a contrarian, but, in fact, a well-known researcher who
1861 was at NASA for many years and has received numerous awards
1862 for that.

1863 I think it is appalling that we can't have a discussion
1864 and a comparison. We can have allegations--and that's why
1865 people think sometimes these things are show hearings. We
1866 have can have allegations against one administration, but
1867 when the press is here and when there is coverage on one but
1868 not on the other, in my opinion, it is a set-up, it is
1869 appalling, and we have been deteriorating in our process
1870 here.

1871 I am very, very disappointed, particularly the
1872 questions, to say would--if you altered something from that
1873 is a legitimate debate--from a--to put slight--more vague in
1874 and say that is what the Petroleum Institute would want you
1875 to do would be similar to saying--and a socialist would
1876 rather have you not do that that way or a person who's
1877 anti-capitalist would rather have you not have it that way,

1878 it's an over-simplification. And I just am appalled at the
1879 process here and very disappointed.
1880 I yield back.
1881 Chairman WAXMAN. The only thing I can say to the
1882 gentleman is that we do have the witness that the Republicans
1883 requested here today to testify. We, unfortunately, can't
1884 have everybody testify all at once. We have to take them one
1885 at a time. But, on this first panel, we have two appointees
1886 under the Republican administration sitting on either side of
1887 Dr. Hansen.
1888 The odd thing is that Dr. Hansen is one of the world's
1889 most esteemed scientists on global warming, and the two
1890 people at the table with him wanted to change his comments or
1891 stop him from speaking. It is odd, when you look at their
1892 qualifications, how little qualifications they have for
1893 imposing their views on science over what Dr. Hansen was
1894 doing as a government employee.
1895 Mr. SOUDER. As you know, just a few months ago I was a
1896 chairman. I do not recall you or the Democrats being willing
1897 to accept my definition of who the Democrat witnesses should
1898 be.
1899 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I would point out to the
1900 gentleman that there were times when you would even deny our
1901 witnesses. We have your witness here, and we are going to
1902 hear from that witness on the third panel. I am looking

1903 forward to hearing what he has to say. I will be here. I
1904 think that other members will be here as well.
1905 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, we do--
1906 Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say for the
1907 record, you know, that I never did that in my subcommittee,
1908 that I have never deprived Democrats of the witnesses on the
1909 panel. It may have happened at full committee.
1910 Chairman WAXMAN. I am being informed that it was at the
1911 full committee and not at your subcommittee that we were
1912 denied witnesses.
1913 At any rate, we don't believe in denying witnesses; and
1914 we do have your witnesses here.
1915 Mr. ISSA. I want to thank you that, after your three
1916 witnesses, that our witness will get up in the third panel.
1917 Let's just say let's go forward from here, and I am sure what
1918 we did to you will never happen back to us and vice versa.
1919 Chairman WAXMAN. I don't think Mr. Cooney, Mr. Deutsch,
1920 and Mr. Connaughton are my three witnesses, but they are
1921 witnesses that are appropriately here because they worked for
1922 this administration and we want to hear from them why we have
1923 this odd situation where nonscientists, even--how old were
1924 you at the time, Mr. Deutsch?
1925 Mr. DEUTSCH. Twenty-three, twenty-four.
1926 Chairman WAXMAN. And you were telling Mr. Hansen's
1927 staff that he couldn't go out and make public statements.

1928 Mr. DEUTSCH. I wouldn't go that far. I did relay
1929 information from my higher-ups from NASA about particular
1930 instances.
1931 Chairman WAXMAN. Particular instances.
1932 Mr. DEUTSCH. Sure. Particular interviews.
1933 Chairman WAXMAN. That he would not be able to do.
1934 Mr. DEUTSCH. You are speaking to one interview in
1935 particular, and that is NPR, and we offered them three very
1936 qualified guests.
1937 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, we'll get into that with other
1938 members.
1939 The time now is yielded to the gentlelady from the
1940 District of Columbia, Ms. Norton.
1941 Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1942 I am interested in trying to get at the atmosphere that
1943 has created what would normally be a pretty pristine,
1944 straightforward atmosphere in the scientific agency. I want
1945 to congratulate Mr. Deutsch because, despite his tender years
1946 and perhaps his education, he was able to speak
1947 authoritatively as the spokesman on occasion for the agency.
1948 One of those statements, I would like to ask you about.
1949 It relates to an e-mail to a NASA contractor of October
1950 the 17th. I am going to read part of it. You wanted him to
1951 add the word "theory" to Big Bang. I don't have any problem
1952 with that. We talk about evolution as a theory, although I

1953 am astounded by the lack of understanding about what the word
1954 "scientific" theory means.
1955 In any case, I don't think anybody would have any
1956 problem with that. But you went on to offer further
1957 opinions, and I am giving you what you said in that e-mail
1958 now.
1959 "it is not NASA's place nor should it be to make a
1960 declaration such as this about the existence of the universe
1961 that discounts intelligent design by the Creator.
1962 "The other half of the argument that is notably absent
1963 from any of these three portal submissions, this is more than
1964 a science issue. It is a religious issue. I would hate to
1965 think that young people would only be getting one-half of
1966 this debate from NASA."
1967 Mr. Deutsch, you then were relaying the notion that, in
1968 order to talk about the Big Bang theory, NASA would give or
1969 say words--either say words or give some deference to
1970 intelligent design.
1971 Mr. DEUTSCH. No, ma'am. It is important to note this
1972 e-mail was between me and Mr.--
1973 Ms. NORTON. Excuse me?
1974 Mr. DEUTSCH. I only sent this e-mail to Flint. It was
1975 not a statement on national policy or anything like that. It
1976 was simply--the bulk of that is my personal opinion, my
1977 personal religious views. These I understood Mr. Wild to

1978 share. He is a Christian, and so am I, and we had talked
1979 about that.
1980 Ms. NORTON. I said, it is not NASA's place, nor should
1981 it be. So if it was your own religious views, why did you
1982 cite NASA's place?
1983 Mr. DEUTSCH. Well, again--
1984 Ms. NORTON. A friend of yours. Is this person that you
1985 are e-mailing to a friend of yours?
1986 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, ma'am. I'd agree with you that it
1987 was--work e-mail is a silly place to put this. I agree with
1988 you wholeheartedly. But if you go down to the bottom of the
1989 e-mail, you will read the sentence, "Please edit these
1990 stories to reflect that the Big Bang is but theory on how the
1991 universe began. That is the only change I really want."
1992 And you will see that that is all I was really asking
1993 for, that the word "theory" be added to Big Bang, because
1994 that was the AP style guidelines of 2005.
1995 Ms. NORTON. This perhaps explains why when you--this
1996 kind of personal opinion lurking somewhere, even on e-mails,
1997 in correspondence, official correspondence between a
1998 representative and a contractor, may explain what you mean
1999 when you apparently allege that there was a cultural war in
2000 NASA.
2001 You were interviewed last February on a Texas A&M radio
2002 program; and apparently referring to the scientists at NASA,

2003 you said, "This is an agenda. It is a culture war agenda.
2004 They are out to get Republicans. They're out to get
2005 Christians. They're out to get people who are helping Bush.
2006 Anybody they perceive as not sharing their agenda, they're
2007 out to get." who are you referring to?
2008 Mr. DEUTSCH. Well, Ms. Norton, I have got to say, as
2009 you may imagine, I was very emotional, very upset, very
2010 distraught about the way things went down.
2011 Ms. NORTON. Do you still believe that?
2012 Mr. DEUTSCH. I wouldn't go that far today. No. I
2013 think that I, frankly, said a lot of that stuff out of anger.
2014 It was just an emotional time for me, and I wouldn't say all
2015 of those things today.
2016 Ms. NORTON. Were you sitting next to Dr. Hansen
2017 there--and I am going to allow you to--since you say that is
2018 the kind of thing you would not say today, you said, at the
2019 same time, he wants to demean the President, he wants to
2020 demean the administration, create a false impression the
2021 administration is watering down science and lying to the
2022 public, and that is patently false. And Dr. Hansen is
2023 sitting beside you now. Would you like to say anything to
2024 him about such words that were spoken?
2025 Mr. ISSA. Regular order. I don't believe that our
2026 rules call for a dialogue between witnesses.
2027 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's order is not well

2028 taken. It is the gentlelady's time.

2029 Ms. NORTON. I am simply asking, in light of the
2030 fact--and I ask the question only because I want to give Mr.
2031 Deutsch the opportunity, and he said words like this were
2032 uttered as a matter when he was highly emotional. Those
2033 words also were uttered in this case naming renowned
2034 scientists at NASA. I am not asking you to apologize to him.
2035 But rather than simply reading this statement and saying did
2036 you say this, because I know you said it, I am asking you,
2037 having said something like this in light of your prior
2038 statement that these kinds of statements were made as an
2039 emotional manner, in light of that, what would you like to
2040 say to Dr. Hansen that you happen to be sitting beside him
2041 right now?

2042 Mr. DEUTSCH. I think we all agree that he's been
2043 critical of the administration. But, beyond that, I would
2044 just restate that I wouldn't necessarily make those
2045 statements--comments today, no, ma'am.

2046 Ms. NORTON. I appreciate that answer.

2047 I yield back my time.

2048 Chairman WAXMAN. Before you yield it back, may I ask,
2049 how was he critical of the administration?

2050 Mr. DEUTSCH. I believe the things--you start with the
2051 allegations of censorship and--you know, starting with that I
2052 think is a good place.

2053 Chairman WAXMAN. So Dr. Hansen is being critical of the
2054 administration by not being pleased with your telling people
2055 in his office that he can't go and speak certain places. Is
2056 that being unfair to the administration?
2057 Mr. DEUTSCH. He just made several allegations about
2058 censorship by political appointees, allegations I don't agree
2059 with him on. So I think it is fair to say that is being
2060 critical of the administration, sir.
2061 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, if we look at some of the
2062 changes Mr. Cooney proposed, they were changes in substance
2063 of what the scientists were recommending be in these global
2064 warming climate change positions. And, Dr. Hansen, I think
2065 your criticism is they were substantive changes; is that
2066 correct?
2067 Mr. HANSEN. Yes, that is right.
2068 Chairman WAXMAN. Now if there's substantive changes
2069 coming from a political appointee who used to be at the
2070 American Petroleum Institute and raises the question in his
2071 mind, and I think anybody's mind, Democrat and Republican,
2072 that maybe somebody who is not a scientist, who is a lawyer,
2073 who used to work for the Petroleum Institute, who is a
2074 political appointee is trying to superimpose his views.
2075 Now you, on the other hand, were a public affairs
2076 representative at the age of 23; and you were telling Dr.
2077 Hansen's staff to tell him that the higher-ups didn't want

2078 him to be on National Public Radio; isn't that true?

2079 Mr. DEUTSCH. That is fair.

2080 Chairman WAXMAN. Isn't that interference?

2081 Mr. DEUTSCH. No, I wouldn't go as far to say it was

2082 interference. We had taken that request. I took it to the

2083 ninth floor and discussed it with the higher-ups. They

2084 thought it over and said, hey, you know, we've got three

2085 other qualified people, Dr. Colleen Hartman, who was

2086 mentioned, Dr. Mary Cleave and Dr. Jack Kaye; and those three

2087 were offered.

2088 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

2089 Mr. Shays, do you want your time now or do you want--

2090 Mr. SHAYS. How many more members do you have on your

2091 side?

2092 Okay. I am going to take it now.

2093 RPTS CALHOUN

2094 DCMN ROSEN

2095 [11:56 a.m.]

2096 Mr. SHAYS. I weep that this administration didn't seize
2097 this issue and claim it as its own, and this issue being
2098 climate changes for real, and mankind has had an impact on
2099 it. Are we thinking what this administration could have done
2100 about this issue? So I just want to be on record as saying
2101 that.

2102 I think there are two inconvenient truths in this world
2103 right now, one that unfortunately too many of my Republicans
2104 don't want to deal with, and that's what Al Gore talks about,
2105 and the other is what others have talked about, about the
2106 Islamist threat that too many of my Democratic colleagues
2107 don't want to deal with or are in denial. That's what I
2108 believe. It's my view.

2109 Having said this, when I listen to these hearings, I get
2110 drawn into believing that there are setups here and there are
2111 misimpressions galore, and some of them frankly, Mr. Cooney,
2112 are the result of having someone with your background and
2113 your position. You instantly lose credibility. Not your
2114 fault. It's your background. I might have thought twice
2115 about taking on that assignment because of that.

2116 But when we had Mr. Piltz here last week, or 2 weeks
2117 ago, he was talking as if scientists--his reports were being

2118 changed, as if he was a scientist. I still read in the
2119 newspaper that he's a scientist. He's not a scientist. He's
2120 not a scientist.

2121 Dr. Hansen, you're a scientist. Now let me ask you
2122 about the Academy's report in 2001; not what you believe, not
2123 what you're convinced of, not what you think the science
2124 says, did the National Academy report from 2001 say
2125 conclusively that global warming was for real, case closed?

2126 Mr. HANSEN. I would say yes. By the way, I was an
2127 author, one of the authors of that report.

2128 Mr. SHAYS. You're saying yes to what?

2129 Mr. HANSEN. Global warming is real.

2130 Mr. SHAYS. The report in 2001 said that? Not now.

2131 Mr. HANSEN. Sure. We knew that global warming was real
2132 in 2001, absolutely.

2133 Mr. SHAYS. You knew it was real. So what did the
2134 report say that I could turn to or you could turn to me and
2135 say case closed, issued decided?

2136 Mr. HANSEN. We had a sentence which was just referred
2137 to, it said: Greenhouse gasses are accumulating in the
2138 atmosphere as a result of human activity, causing surface air
2139 temperatures and sub surface ocean temperatures to rise.

2140 It is a very straightforward sentence. It connects
2141 cause and effect, increasing greenhouse gasses, increasing
2142 global temperature. That's a very strong statement.

2143 Mr. SHAYS. Nothing that says this issue has been
2144 decided, there's no question about it, and we need to deal
2145 with it.
2146 Mr. HANSEN. The report certainly concludes that we need
2147 to deal with it, yes. There are always aspects of the
2148 problem which we need to work on more, but this is a very
2149 strong statement.
2150 Mr. SHAYS. It's funny, it doesn't strike me as what I
2151 would think is a strong statement. What would strike me as a
2152 strong statement is to say the issue has been decided, there
2153 is no doubt in our minds, this is the issue, it's caused by
2154 humans, and we need to get on with it. When I hear that
2155 statement, it's saying an issue as of fact as if it's, in my
2156 judgment, part of the problem, but not all of the problem.
2157 I am left with the belief that climate change, there's
2158 no debate anymore, and people would say it in a much more
2159 definitive way.
2160 Mr. Cooney, how would you respond to my question?
2161 Mr. COONEY. Congressman Shays.
2162 Mr. SHAYS. I want you to talk close to the mike. Both
2163 of you are not speaking as loud as I would like.
2164 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, I would refer to you the
2165 quotation on page 17 which is entitled: The effect of human
2166 activities.
2167 Mr. SHAYS. Is this in the 2001?

2168 Mr. COONEY. The June 2001 National Academy Report, and
2169 it speaks to the connection to human activities and it says:
2170 "because of the large and still uncertain level of natural
2171 variability inherent in the climate record and the
2172 uncertainties and the time histories of the various forcing
2173 agents, particularly aerosols, a causal linkage between the
2174 buildup of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere and the
2175 observed climate changes during the 20th Century cannot be
2176 unequivocally established."
2177 It goes on to say that--
2178 Mr. SHAYS. Dr. Hansen, is that just designed to confuse
2179 people like me or is that designed by--sounds like an Alan
2180 Greenspan statement.
2181 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, I had it before me, and I did
2182 it at my desk when I was at the White House, it talked about
2183 major uncertainties with respect to clouds, aerosols, the
2184 natural carbon cycle, the natural water cycle, the difference
2185 between temperature record at the surface and in the
2186 troposphere that was measured by satellites.
2187 It talked about the lack of a global integrated
2188 observation system. A lot of the southern hemisphere was not
2189 really routinely observed in a climate sense in a long-term
2190 sense in manners and using methodologies that are consistent
2191 with the way climate is measured--
2192 Mr. SHAYS. How do you respond to that, Dr. Hansen?

2193 Mr. HANSEN. If you pick out individual phrases or
2194 sentences and compare them, you need to really look at the
2195 entire report. It was a report which made a very strong
2196 statement. The White House had asked for a clarification
2197 because they were uncertain as to whether they should accept
2198 the IPCC document. There were some people who were
2199 questioning the validity, the accuracy of the IPCC report.
2200 I believe that was a primary reason for requesting the
2201 National Academy to look at the problem. They came out with
2202 quite a clear statement.
2203 Mr. SHAYS. My time has run out. Let me just ask Mr.
2204 Cooney just to finish his comment.
2205 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, at page 22 of the report, on
2206 the IPCC report, when it spoke to it, it said: Climate
2207 projections will always be far from perfect. Confidence
2208 limits, probabilistic information with their bases should
2209 always be considered. Without them, the IPCC summary for
2210 policy makers could give an impression that the science of
2211 global warming is settled, even though many uncertainties
2212 still remain.
2213 That is language from the National Academy Of Sciences.
2214 Mr. SHAYS. I'll conclude. Dr. Hansen, I'm not a
2215 scientist, but when I hear that I am not left with a report
2216 that says no, debate is over.
2217 Mr. HANSEN. No, depends on what you mean by debate is

2218 over. The fact that greenhouse gasses are increasing and the
2219 world is getting warmer and there is a causal connection
2220 between them, that debate is over.
2221 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.
2222 Mr. Van Hollen.
2223 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all
2224 for your testimony here today. Mr. Deutsch, I'd like to
2225 follow up a little bit on the questions that were asked of
2226 you earlier. As I understand, you were a public affairs
2227 officer at NASA.
2228 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, sir.
2229 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. And when you arrived at NASA did you
2230 have any expertise in the area of global climate change?
2231 Mr. DEUTSCH. No, sir.
2232 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Would you agree that the American
2233 people should have the benefit of the best scientific views
2234 within the government with respect to climate change?
2235 Mr. DEUTSCH. Sure.
2236 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Who ultimately paid your salary there,
2237 our salaries, everyone's salaries in public service?
2238 Mr. DEUTSCH. That would be the taxpayers, sir.
2239 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Would you agree that given that big
2240 investment that they make in our scientific investigation
2241 that again should have the very best giving them their
2242 opinions on this issue?

2243 Mr. DEUTSCH. Sure.

2244 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Now I want to look at this issue of
2245 sort of the political apparatus sort of governing who can say
2246 what with respect to the science on global climate change and
2247 I want to look through this lens of this NPR interview which
2248 you mentioned before. We have a couple e-mails with respect
2249 to the back and forth in the political apparatus with respect
2250 to how that decision was made. I don't know if we're going
2251 to put them on the screens or you have copies of them in
2252 front of you.

2253 If you could make sure that the witness has copies of
2254 these e-mails from you.

2255 An e-mail request came in from NPR to Dr. Hansen's
2256 office, is that right?

2257 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, yes. Then they sent it to us.

2258 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As you said today in your testimony,
2259 you then discussed that request for an interview with the,
2260 quote, 9th floor, as you describe it in this e-mail of
2261 December 8th. It's on the second page of your packet at the
2262 top. We discussed it on the 9th floor.

2263 And it was decided that we would like you to handle this
2264 interview; you, referring to Colleen, right?

2265 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, sir. Colleen and also Ms. Cleave and
2266 Mr. Kaye were all considered.

2267 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. My question is was who was it that you

2268 discussed this with on the 9th floor and made the decision it
2269 would not be Dr. Hansen?
2270 Mr. DEUTSCH. Specifically that would be Press Secretary
2271 Dean Acosta.
2272 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So the 9th floor was the press
2273 secretary.
2274 Mr. DEUTSCH. That 9th floor, that's sort of NASA slang
2275 for senior leadership at headquarters; they're all on the 9th
2276 floor. The head of public affairs as well.
2277 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. But you meant him specifically in this
2278 e-mail?
2279 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes. Yes, sir.
2280 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. There's another e-mail on the next page
2281 that talks about our main concern is "hitting our messages
2282 and not getting dragged down into any discussions we
2283 shouldn't get into."
2284 What were you worried that Dr. Hansen was going to get
2285 into with respect to the science of global climate change?
2286 Mr. DEUTSCH. I wasn't worried about anything. Dr.
2287 Hansen would say about the science of global climate change.
2288 We had some media practices that we'd been using up to this
2289 time that I think even Dr. Hansen would tell you he didn't
2290 always follow, and so I think that that was a concern that
2291 the 9th floor had.
2292 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It wasn't his immediate--if you go up

2293 to the e-mail above that, it says when asked how you're going
2294 to describe to Dr. Hansen, why he shouldn't be doing this
2295 interview, according to Costa they say right here: Tell them
2296 your boss wants to do.
2297 His boss was Colleen, right? They didn't ask to do
2298 this. In other words, Costa said go ask them to do it.
2299 Isn't that the way it happened?
2300 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, sir.
2301 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. So it wasn't that his bosses wanted to
2302 do it, it was the top press people said we don't want Dr.
2303 Hansen to do this interview, isn't that right?
2304 Mr. DEUTSCH. It was just Dean who said that and again
2305 that was because we'd had some practices that he had not
2306 always been following as far as reporting the interviews et
2307 cetera, and those were some of his frustrations he relayed to
2308 me. We did have a practice known as the right of first
2309 refusal in which the senior people could do these interviews.
2310 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Right. But the decision was made at
2311 the top by the press people that he wouldn't be doing that,
2312 isn't that right?
2313 Mr. DEUTSCH. In this one case, yes, sir.
2314 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. In fact, one looks like Mary and
2315 Colleen are not sure they even want to do it. The point is
2316 you made a decision at the top press level that you didn't
2317 want Dr. Hansen so be giving this interview because you were

2318 concerned about hitting your message and you were concerned
2319 Dr. Hansen wasn't going to hit your message, isn't that
2320 right?
2321 Mr. DEUTSCH. I can't speak for the former press
2322 secretary, you'd have to ask him about that. But that was
2323 what was relayed to me, sir.
2324 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. It's your words here, hitting your
2325 message. Isn't that right?
2326 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, sir.
2327 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Isn't this the definition of political
2328 minding of an expert. In other words, were any of the people
2329 you were offering up more of an expert on global climate
2330 change than Dr. Hansen?
2331 Mr. DEUTSCH. I don't know as far as their level of
2332 expertise. I know the head of NASA's science mission
2333 directorate and the second in line are some pretty good
2334 people to get offered an interview with, I would say.
2335 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Dr. Hansen, is there anybody else at
2336 NASA, or any of these other individuals they were proposing
2337 for the interview, people who had more expertise in the
2338 science of global climate change than you?
2339 Mr. HANSEN. Well, I'm not going to denigrate anyone.
2340 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I'm not asking you to denigrate, I'm
2341 talking about in terms of experience.
2342 Mr. HANSEN. In terms of experience, no.

2343 Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As you look at these e-mails and based
2344 on your concerns at the time, doesn't this appear to be a
2345 perfect example of exactly the concern that you have raised,
2346 which is political interference in the ability of scientists
2347 who are paid for by funds from taxpayers to be able to
2348 present a factual account of global climate change.
2349 Mr. HANSEN. Absolutely. The thing is, this is,
2350 however, a very rare case of where you have got it on paper.
2351 It's going on all the time, but most of the people doing that
2352 are more experienced than George was, and they won't make the
2353 mistake of putting the thing on paper like that.
2354 I pointed out, for example, that press releases were
2355 going to the White House, science press release were going to
2356 the White House for editing. But the process, they're
2357 careful not to have memos like this that describe the
2358 process.
2359 It's very unfortunate. We developed this
2360 politicalization of science. As I mentioned in my opening
2361 comments, public affairs offices should be staffed by
2362 professionals, not by political appointees, otherwise they
2363 become offices of propaganda.
2364 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Van Hollen. Your time
2365 has expired.
2366 Mr. Issa.
2367 Mr. ISSA. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Following up--

2368 Chairman WAXMAN. We're proceeding with the second
2369 round.
2370 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Deutsch, maybe I'll start with you. You
2371 couldn't seem to come up with an answer to that question of
2372 related to anything in the way of disliking the Bush
2373 administration or being political for Dr. Hansen. Are you
2374 aware that Dr. Hansen has called the Bush press office the
2375 office of propaganda, or, it seems more, and I quote: It
2376 seems more like Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union than the
2377 United States.
2378 Are those the kinds of comments you might have been
2379 referring to when you were frustrated. Were you aware of
2380 those comments?
2381 Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes, sir, we were aware of those comments,
2382 and those are unfortunate.
2383 Mr. ISSA. I appreciate your candor. I'm sorry you
2384 didn't come up with those in real-time, because I think that
2385 does go to the question of your youthful indiscretions in
2386 perhaps, in how you handled the senior scientist. I think
2387 you have owned up to maybe not being up to the job.
2388 Dr. Hansen, are those kind of comments appropriate for
2389 somebody who's been on the Federal payroll, who's had your
2390 science paid for for 3 decades? Are those appropriate things
2391 to say about the Bush administration?
2392 Mr. HANSEN. I think that it was--that was in reference

2393 to the fact that scientists were being asked to not speak to
2394 reporters, to report before--to tell reporters I can't speak
2395 to you, I have to get permission, and I have to get someone
2396 on the phone with me to listen in on the conversation.
2397 That's getting to seem a lot like the old Soviet Union to me.
2398 Mr. ISSA. The reference to Nazi Germany because they
2399 want to have somebody who's able to say that the doctor did
2400 or didn't say this to a reporter when it later comes out in
2401 print, is that Nazi Germany? Nazi Germany, I think, is a
2402 pretty strong statement, wouldn't you say?
2403 Mr. HANSEN. I was referring to the constraints on
2404 speaking to the media.
2405 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen--
2406 Mr. HANSEN. It violates the constitution, freedom of
2407 speech.
2408 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, first of all, when you work for
2409 somebody, the question of when you will speak on behalf of
2410 that entity is not a constitutional question, as you and I
2411 both know. You were not being asked by public broadcasting
2412 because you happened to be a smart guy with a good suit, you
2413 were being asked because of your position at NASA.
2414 Now I come back to this again--
2415 Mr. HANSEN. I don't believe that's the case.
2416 Mr. ISSA. You have over 1,400 opportunities that you
2417 have availed yourself to, and yet you call it being stifled.

2418 I'm thrilled--

2419 Mr. HANSEN. Those cases occurred after the NASA
2420 administrator stepped forward and said I should be allowed to
2421 speak, not before. If you look at some of those memos, you
2422 will find that they were intent on me not speaking.

2423 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, you're saying if I went back to
2424 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, that I would find dramatically less
2425 quotes from you?

2426 Mr. HANSEN. In many cases--

2427 Mr. ISSA. Please. Just would I find dramatically less,
2428 yes or no.

2429 Mr. HANSEN. You would find less. I don't know how you
2430 define dramatically.

2431 Mr. ISSA. 1,400 quotes. Would I find that you were
2432 only allowed to speak once, twice, five times, 50 times?

2433 Mr. HANSEN. I'm an American and I exercise my right of
2434 free speech. If public affairs people tell me I can't do
2435 that and I know that they're violating the constitution, I
2436 ignore them.

2437 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, isn't it true that when you
2438 speak, you're speaking on Federal paid time, when you travel,
2439 you're being paid by the Federal Government to travel. Isn't
2440 that true.

2441 Mr. HANSEN. Not always.

2442 Mr. ISSA. Isn't it normally true?

2443 Mr. HANSEN. Normally it is, yes.

2444 Mr. ISSA. So your employer, and your employer happens
2445 to be the American taxpayer, but they're sending you at
2446 government expense to these speaking engagements.

2447 Mr. HANSEN. That's exactly the point. I should be
2448 able, for the sake of the taxpayers, I should be able
2449 to--they should be availed of my expertise. I shouldn't be
2450 required to parrot some company line. I should give the best
2451 information I have.

2452 Mr. ISSA. Dr. Hansen, it's very clear that you do say
2453 what you believe each time you speak.

2454 Let me--do you want to put that up on the board, the
2455 demo.

2456 Dr. Hansen, you speak, and you speak everywhere
2457 regularly, and you speak on the Federal dollar. I guess my
2458 question is do you think that, in fact, the thousands of
2459 scientists all over NASA should have that same right to
2460 travel places and speak.

2461 Before you answer that let me ask a question because I
2462 appreciate public broadcasting, but it every speaking
2463 engagement the one that should be appropriately having Dr.
2464 Hansen on it. Isn't it true that when you're speaking to the
2465 general public often somebody who's a perfectly good speaker,
2466 knows a lot less about the science would be equally good to
2467 answer the basic questions of climate change?

2468 Mr. HANSEN. Sure. I welcome that. I accept only a
2469 very small fraction of the invitations. It's impossible. I
2470 would rather do science. That's always been my preference.
2471 Mr. ISSA. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, if I could just
2472 close here.
2473 Dr. Hansen, I appreciate the science you do, I
2474 appreciate the work you have done for a very long time and I
2475 hope you continue doing it. I would only say that I hope
2476 that the $250,000 you took from the Heinz Foundation, the
2477 campaigning you did for Senator Kerry for his presidential
2478 race, doesn't influence your chafing at this administration
2479 any differently than it might for the next administration and
2480 that your effort to get more dollars for climate change is
2481 done in a constructive fashion under the rest of this
2482 administration and the next.
2483 I yield back.
2484 Chairman WAXMAN. I think the gentleman is smearing Dr.
2485 Hansen.
2486 Mr. ISSA. Are you moving--
2487 Chairman WAXMAN. I think you're smearing Dr. Hansen's
2488 reputation when you allege that he's an activist Democrat and
2489 got that award, the Heinz Award because he's a Democrat.
2490 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, are you making a motion?
2491 Chairman WAXMAN. I'm not making a motion, I'm making a
2492 comment.

2493 Mr. ISSA. Are you recognizing yourself?

2494 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, I will recognize you. I think
2495 you're smearing him. Do you want to comment on that?

2496 Mr. ISSA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

2497 Chairman WAXMAN. I think you're being unfair to him.

2498 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this gentleman's
2499 political activism which is well defined is not, in fact,
2500 affecting his ability to recognize that this Congress, on a
2501 bipartisan basis, has funded a great deal of the research,
2502 with over 1,400 appearances in that year, and I have no doubt
2503 nearly the same for each of the previous years, that Dr.
2504 Hansen, in fact, in his effort to get more money for climate
2505 change, which I commend, would recognize that in every
2506 administration, he's going to have the same chafing and that
2507 it not be chafing more at the Bush administration, which he
2508 clearly dislikes.

2509 You don't compare the Bush administration to Nazi
2510 Germany, and I'm sure the chairman would agree, that you do
2511 not compare anyone to Nazi Germany unless you have real
2512 problems beyond just disagreement on policy.

2513 Mr. HANSEN. Could I correct his statement and comment
2514 on them? First of all, I am not a Democrat, I'm a registered
2515 Independent.

2516 Mr. ISSA. The chairman called you a Democrat, not me.

2517 Mr. HANSEN. Secondly, the time when I said I was going

2518 to vote for John Kerry, I actually said I would prefer to
2519 vote for John McCain but he's not on the ballot, and then I
2520 explained the reason that I would vote for John Kerry was
2521 because of my concern about climate change and the fact that
2522 it was not being addressed by the Bush administration. And I
2523 thought that Kerry would do a better job with that. It had
2524 nothing to do with politics. In fact, I have often said my
2525 favorite politician was John Heinz, who was a Republican and
2526 who gave equal weight to economic considerations and
2527 environmental considerations, and it was a great tragedy when
2528 he lost his life in a small plane crash.

2529 The Nazi Germany thing was completely with regard
2530 to--had nothing to do with President Bush; it was the
2531 constraints on scientists, their ability to speak to the
2532 public and to the media. And when you tell scientists that
2533 they can't speak, they've got to hang up on the reporter and
2534 report this and allow the right of first refusal so someone
2535 else can speak for you, it doesn't ring true. It's not the
2536 American way. And it was not constitutional.

2537 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, both of you. Let me take
2538 my time here.

2539 Dr. Hansen, have you had any examples of people working
2540 in the public relations office within this administration
2541 that wanted to help you further as leading scientist in this
2542 global warming the field the opportunity to talk about the

2543 issue?

2544 Mr. HANSEN. Well, you know, there actually are lots of
2545 opportunities to speak to the public, and the hard thing is
2546 to keep enough time to do science.

2547 Chairman WAXMAN. You didn't think Mr. Deutsch any time
2548 was trying to help you get your views out.

2549 Mr. HANSEN. No, they didn't.

2550 Chairman WAXMAN. Let me go on to other things in the
2551 time I have. Mr. Cooney, I guess what we're trying to figure
2552 is whether what drove the policy and is driving the policy of
2553 this administration on global warming and climate change is
2554 the science or whether it's something called the politically
2555 correct science. And as I look at the edits that you
2556 proposed, I think there were--

2557 Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask.

2558 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman is out of order.

2559 Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, did you recognize yourself
2560 for additional 5 minutes before the rest of the panel has the
2561 chance to question for 5 minutes.

2562 Chairman WAXMAN. No, I did not. I recognized Mr. Issa
2563 first for the second round.

2564 Chairman WAXMAN. You proposed 181 edits to the
2565 strategic plan, 113 edits to the other global warming
2566 reports, there are 3 reports. I guess what I am trying to
2567 find out is whether all of your proposed edits moved in one

2568 direction, which was to increase uncertainty in global
2569 warming science. Would that be a fair statement or an unfair
2570 statement?
2571 Mr. COONEY. I think the fair statement would be that my
2572 comments were aligned with the findings of the National
2573 Academy of Sciences in June 2001 as emphasized by the
2574 President in his policy book in chapter 3 on June 11th, 2001.
2575 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Cooney, you had a senior position
2576 at the White House, but there were officials at the White
2577 House who were more senior to you. Your immediate boss was
2578 James Connaughton, chairman of the White House Council on
2579 Environmental Quality. Was Mr. Connaughton aware of role in
2580 proposed edits for climate change reports?
2581 Mr. COONEY. He knew that they were reviewing reports as
2582 they came in ordinarily from OMB for review.
2583 Chairman WAXMAN. Did he personally review your edits?
2584 Mr. COONEY. No, not most.
2585 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, his boss is behind him and
2586 available.
2587 Chairman WAXMAN. Excuse me, I have the time. I didn't
2588 interrupt you. I waited until you finished and then I
2589 interrupted you.
2590 Did you discuss the edits with him?
2591 Mr. COONEY. No, not ordinarily.
2592 Chairman WAXMAN. Did he give you any instructions about

2593 how any of these three documents should be edited?

2594 Mr. COONEY. No. He understood that my objective was to
2595 align these communications with the administration's stated
2596 policy.

2597 Chairman WAXMAN. And the administration's stated policy
2598 was different than what the scientists were saying in those
2599 documents.

2600 Mr. COONEY. It wasn't even scientists who were saying
2601 it in these documents. It could have been budget people from
2602 the agencies who were just drafting up reports, what they
2603 wanted to see in next year's budget. The material was not a
2604 platform for the presentation of original scientific
2605 research. These were budgeting and--

2606 Chairman WAXMAN. These were statements of science that
2607 you changed, recommended changes.

2608 Mr. COONEY. Well, they came from Mr. Pills himself, who
2609 was an editor who said he received summaries from agencies.

2610 Chairman WAXMAN. Sounds like yours.

2611 Mr. COONEY. It's not clear they derived to scientists
2612 about what I reviewed.

2613 Chairman WAXMAN. Let me go on. Were other officials in
2614 the White House besides Mr. Connaughton and others on the CEQ
2615 staff with whom you discussed climate changes, in other
2616 words, were there other people in the White House, not just
2617 people at the CEQ?

2618 Mr. COONEY. Absolutely.

2619 Chairman WAXMAN. Who were the other people at the White
2620 House outside of CEQ that you discussed this with?

2621 Mr. COONEY. It really depends upon the issue, but the
2622 Office of Science and Technology Policy obviously led by Dr.
2623 Marburger; Kathy Olsen was the Senate-confirmed director for
2624 science, and she had a leadership role.

2625 Chairman WAXMAN. How about Andrew Card? Did you ever
2626 have a conversation with Andrew Card about it?

2627 Mr. COONEY. I did not.

2628 Chairman WAXMAN. How about Karl Rove?

2629 Mr. COONEY. I did not.

2630 Chairman WAXMAN. Kevin O'Donovan? Do you know who he
2631 is?

2632 Mr. COONEY. Yes. He was a staff person in the Office
2633 of the Vice President, and he and I would speak on occasion.
2634 He had the portfolio for energy and natural resource and
2635 environment issues, as I understood it.

2636 Chairman WAXMAN. What did you talk to him about?

2637 Mr. COONEY. He was a colleague in the White House. He
2638 was a colleague and we would talk occasionally as a lot of us
2639 would talk occasionally, pick up the phone, talk about
2640 different things. We were all going to a lot of the same
2641 meetings in some cases.

2642 Chairman WAXMAN. So you had numerous conversations with

2643 him?

2644 Mr. COONEY. Sure. As I did with people in OSTP, OMB,
2645 the Council of Economic Advisors. All of the White House
2646 offices, really. The domestic policy council.

2647 Chairman WAXMAN. When you talked to Mr. O'Donovan, were
2648 they in the Vice President's office or your office?

2649 Mr. COONEY. We usually spoke by phone, really. Our
2650 offices are on Lafayette Square in townhouses and his offices
2651 obviously in the Eisenhower executive office building.

2652 Chairman WAXMAN. Did the Vice President's office, Mr.
2653 O'Donovan or anyone else give you any directions as to what
2654 they thought you ought to be doing?

2655 Mr. COONEY. No, not directions. We would compare
2656 notes. We would consult as colleagues, but I didn't receive
2657 direction from them. It was really, if you look at how
2658 internal White House documents are approved, for example, the
2659 Office of the Vice President reviews it independently, CEQ,
2660 OMB, the Council of Economic Advisors, the Office of Science
2661 and Technology Policy, each office independently reviews
2662 communications, and so we had an independent role for review,
2663 they had an independent role.

2664 Chairman WAXMAN. Did they ever suggest to you that
2665 there may be some value in highlighting the uncertainty of
2666 some of these global climate change issues?

2667 Mr. COONEY. I don't recall specific conversations. We

2668 would talk about matters that were pending. The development
2669 of the 10-year strategic plan obviously was occurring in the
2670 spring of 2003. They were a reviewing office. We would have
2671 had conversations. But I don't remember specifically what
2672 was said.

2673 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you. Mr. Cannon.

2674 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent
2675 that Mr. Cannon have 10 minutes. It would sort of balance
2676 the time.

2677 Chairman WAXMAN. I don't know that it would balance the
2678 time. But let's do it. There are more Democrats here.

2679 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2680 Chairman WAXMAN. Unless anybody is going to ask for 10
2681 minutes for someone else. Mr. Shays might say he's entitled
2682 to more time.

2683 Mr. SHAYS. What is my member suggesting?

2684 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Souder might think he should have
2685 more time. I think they're complaining that I spoke too much
2686 without the timer on. Isn't that right?

2687 Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman--

2688 Chairman WAXMAN. When I reacted to what I thought was a
2689 bit of a smear.

2690 Mr. ISSA. I was just talking about your 5 minutes you
2691 spoke at random, really about 8.

2692 Chairman WAXMAN. I think I have been fair. I have let

2693 some members run over and I think I've tried to be as fair as
2694 possible. I don't interrupt people while there's an answer
2695 being given.
2696 Mr. ISSA. I appreciate that.
2697 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5
2698 minutes. Mr. Cannon.
2699 Mr. CANNON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. By the way, I
2700 appreciate the fairness. This really has to be about getting
2701 information and understanding and not so much wrangling.
2702 Dr. Hansen, in the process here, I'm learning to
2703 understand you, I think, a little better, and I actually
2704 think you're very straightforward. Mr. Cooney obviously
2705 thinks very highly of you and your science.
2706 You indicated here you prefer Senator McCain for
2707 president, would have preferred him in 2001. You supported
2708 Kerry because of his positions, I believe you indicated, on
2709 the environment. But the guy you would really most like to
2710 support is Senator Heinz. Seems to me the most important
2711 thing in your political life is how people are dealing with
2712 this threat to the world that might derive--
2713 Mr. HANSEN. That was one of the two factors. The other
2714 one that I pointed out is obviously in spades today and that
2715 is the need for campaign finance reform. Senator McCain has
2716 made efforts at that, and they haven't, as you know, been
2717 fully successful. I think we really need to solve that

2718 problem and then we'll have a lot easier time.

2719 Mr. CANNON. That one might be more difficult to solve

2720 than global warming. That said, you talked about the

2721 government being evil or you talked about Nazi Germany, which

2722 I take it you view as meaning that this what you later

2723 described as constraints on scientists speaking, I take it

2724 you view that constraint as evil.

2725 Mr. HANSEN. Yes. You know, you have heard of our first

2726 amendment. This is the United States and we do have freedom

2727 of speech here.

2728 Mr. CANNON. Of course, Mr. Issa has pointed out that

2729 you have a lot of opportunity to speak, the question is where

2730 the burden of your duty with the government should constrain

2731 and go through a process as opposed to what you do in the

2732 rest of your life.

2733 Now, what I understand here is that your greatest

2734 concern here is you don't want constrained the ability of

2735 scientists to help bridge--I think you referred to bridging

2736 the gap of understanding by the public of how great the

2737 threat of climate change is.

2738 Mr. HANSEN. Right.

2739 Mr. CANNON. That's not equivocal on your part.

2740 Mr. HANSEN. As I mentioned, I think the public is not

2741 yet fully informed about the dangers.

2742 Mr. CANNON. Any attempt to interfere with your ability

2743 to tell the public about that is evil and would be
2744 represented by a Nazi Germany-type approach.
2745 Mr. HANSEN. No. I was referring to the constraints on
2746 free speech.
2747 Mr. CANNON. That's right, but the free speech you're
2748 most concerned about, indicated by your politics and by your
2749 other statements, is about climate change.
2750 Mr. HANSEN. There's no politics.
2751 Mr. CANNON. You talked about Mr. McCain and Mr. Kerry
2752 and Mr. Heinz all being attractive. Let me finish my
2753 question because I want you to respond. You support those
2754 people largely because of their position on climate change,
2755 with the exception of Mr. McCain who you support also because
2756 of his views on funding of politics. Isn't it true that the
2757 most motivating factor here is the science of climate change?
2758 Mr. HANSEN. No, no. I have the same rights as all
2759 Americans.
2760 Mr. CANNON. We're not talking about your rights, we're
2761 talking about what you're characterizing as evil.
2762 Mr. HANSEN. I was characterizing as evil the
2763 constraints on free speech. That's all.
2764 Mr. CANNON. On all free speech or just on free speech
2765 related to climate change and you?
2766 Mr. HANSEN. Any free speech.
2767 Mr. CANNON. In other words, what I want to know, you

2768 view people on the other side of the climate change argument
2769 as evil?
2770 Mr. HANSEN. No, no I have never said that.
2771 Mr. CANNON. You did call those people Nazi Germany.
2772 Mr. HANSEN. You have taken out of context a statement
2773 about the constraints on free speech. It had nothing to do
2774 with personalities.
2775 Mr. CANNON. But it had everything to do with debate.
2776 Mr. HANSEN. Of any particular people.
2777 Mr. CANNON. It had everything to do with the debate on
2778 global warming and you've got people today characterizing Mr.
2779 Cooney a bad person because he was hired by API before he
2780 went to the CEQ.
2781 Mr. HANSEN. Did I characterize him?
2782 Mr. CANNON. No, you have people in this town doing
2783 that.
2784 Mr. HANSEN. Then you should ask them about that.
2785 Mr. CANNON. No, we're not bantying words here. The
2786 question is, are you mostly concerned about climate change
2787 and your ability to talk about that, and you characterize as
2788 people on the other side of the argument as evil because
2789 they're confusing the issue as you said earlier.
2790 Mr. HANSEN. I have never done that. I don't know where
2791 you get this.
2792 Mr. CANNON. I think I'm quoting you pretty much

2793 directly.

2794 Mr. HANSEN. I didn't characterize anybody as evil.

2795 Mr. CANNON. I used the characterization of evil, you
2796 used the characterization of Nazi Germany, which most
2797 Americans view as equivalent to evil in our society.

2798 Mr. HANSEN. I was referring to the constraints on free
2799 speech, not to a person.

2800 Mr. CANNON. The constraints on free speech, not what?

2801 Mr. HANSEN. I was referring to the constraints on free
2802 speech, not to a person.

2803 Mr. CANNON. Except that you're blaming the constraints
2804 as coming from this administration by way of policy. In
2805 fairness, you characterized this as a developing issue over a
2806 series of administrations, not just this one, in your earlier
2807 statements. But you were characterizing this administration
2808 as being like Nazi Germany, and those reflected a view that
2809 what is going on is evil. Now you're trying to narrow that
2810 evil to the constraints on speech, not to your constraint on
2811 speech about climate change.

2812 Mr. HANSEN. I was referring to constraints of free
2813 speech of government scientists, which is not confined; not
2814 confined to me. I referred specifically to some of my
2815 colleagues and in other agencies likes NOAA and EPA.

2816 Mr. CANNON. How about other issues other than climate
2817 change?

2818 Mr. HANSEN. I don't have--yeah, in fact, I have been
2819 told about National Institutes of Health scientists who have
2820 felt very constrained on their ability to speak freely. I
2821 think this is dangerous in our politics.
2822 Mr. CANNON. If the chairman would just indulge me. We
2823 pay--we tax people, we take money out of the pockets of
2824 Americans and we give it to scientists, and we ought to, at
2825 least, direct where that science goes. The difference
2826 between directing where our science goes and what we search
2827 and free speech is not a simple thing and is subject to
2828 direction by policy.
2829 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.
2830 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Yarmuth.
2831 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Cooney, are
2832 you familiar with a memo that you sent to Kevin O'Donovan of
2833 the vice president's office of April 23rd, 2003. I'll try to
2834 remind you, the subject the Soon and Baliunas paper on global
2835 climate change.
2836 Mr. TUOHEY. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. We've not seen
2837 the memo. We would like to see a copy of it before any
2838 answers are given. We were assured we would receive all
2839 documents before questions were advanced. Can we see it,
2840 please?
2841 Mr. BOLING. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. As the chairman--
2842 Chairman WAXMAN. Could you identify yourself.

2843 Mr. BOLING. Yes. I'm Edward Boling, deputy general
2844 counsel for the Council of Environmental Quality. I would
2845 simply notify the chairman that the document in question as
2846 referenced in Chairman Connaughton's February 9th 2007 letter
2847 to this committee reciting executive privilege--Executive
2848 Office of the President, excuse me, correct myself,
2849 sensitivities with regard to that document. It is an
2850 internal document from the council on environmental quality
2851 to the Office of the Vice President.
2852 Chairman WAXMAN. This is a document that was requested
2853 by this committee, isn't that correct?
2854 Mr. BOLING. Yes, Your Honor. It is one--yes, Mr.
2855 Chairman.
2856 Chairman WAXMAN. You can call me Mr. Chairman.
2857 Mr. BOLING. It is one of--not my usual court of
2858 practice. It is one of the documents referenced in the
2859 chairman's request of CEQ on February--
2860 Chairman WAXMAN. So this document is being withheld
2861 based on executive privilege, is that what you're asserting?
2862 Mr. BOLING. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the
2863 document has not been provided to the committee. We have not
2864 made any affirmative decision with regard to its withholding.
2865 However, it is subject of our ongoing efforts to accommodate
2866 this committee's needs, and it has been shown to committee
2867 staff as part of that accommodation and its status is part of

2868 our ongoing discussions of its status and whether we would
2869 provide it to the committee as part of this rolling document
2870 production.

2871 Chairman WAXMAN. I thank you for that clarification.

2872 We don't have a document to show you, Mr. Cooney, but
2873 the gentleman is recognized to pursue whatever questions he
2874 wants to pursue.

2875 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will proceed
2876 to read excerpts of this. This, again, is a memo from you to
2877 Kevin O'Donovan of the Vice President's office: The recent
2878 paper of Soon-Baliunas contradicts a dogmatic view held by
2879 many in the climate science community that the past century
2880 was the warmest in the past millennium and signals of
2881 human-induced global warming.

2882 Then you say: We plan to begin to refer to this study
2883 in administration communications on the science of global
2884 climate change. In fact, CEQ just inserted a reference to it
2885 in the final draft chapter on global climate contained in
2886 EPA's first state of the environment report.

2887 Then you go on to say: It represents an opening to
2888 potentially invigorate debate on the actual climate history
2889 of the past 1,000 years.

2890 The Soon-Baliunas paper is a public document, is that
2891 correct?

2892 Mr. COONEY. Yes, Congressman.

2893 Mr. YARMUTH. It was funded by the API, is that correct?
2894 Mr. COONEY. It was funded by NASA, NOAA, the Air Force,
2895 and I understood 5 percent funded by the American Petroleum
2896 Institute.
2897 Mr. YARMUTH. So API was a partial funder of this report
2898 which you have inserted into--you said you have inserted into
2899 this report that we are discussing to invigorate the debate.
2900 Let me continue to discuss the EPA's report on the
2901 environment and have you, if you will, turn to exhibit F.
2902 Would you say that your role--you have already said earlier
2903 that your role was to advance the administration's policies.
2904 That was your sole role.
2905 But in terms of handling information and making the
2906 edits that you have made, how would you characterize--would
2907 you characterize that you were, and forgive me for using this
2908 term, trying to reflect a fair and balanced perspective on
2909 what the science on climate change is?
2910 Mr. COONEY. I would say that's exactly what my
2911 objective was, to be fair and balanced.
2912 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you. This document, exhibit F, is
2913 the EPA's staff report to Christine Todd Whitman. On page 2
2914 of this document it says: The text--these are after your
2915 recommended suggestions, edits--the text no longer accurately
2916 represents scientific consensus on climate change. A few
2917 examples are conclusions of the NRC are discarded, multiple

2918 studies indicate recent warming is unusual, the thousand year
2919 temperature record is deleted, and emphasis is given to a
2920 recent limited analysis, I think there is a word missing,
2921 that supports the administration's message. Natural
2922 variability is used to mass scientific consensus that most of
2923 the increase is likely due to human activity.
2924 Then it goes on to say: Numerous technical details
2925 incongruous with the rest of the report on the environment
2926 make the section confusing and seem more uncertain rather
2927 than presenting balanced conclusions about what scientists do
2928 and do not know.
2929 Are you concerned at all that careers professionals at
2930 EPA thought that edits actually were so biased that
2931 incorporating them would make the report scientifically
2932 inaccurate?
2933 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, the memorandum refers to
2934 comments not only provided by CEQ but provided also by the
2935 Office of Science and Technical Policy, the Office of
2936 Management and Budget, the Department of Energy, the Council
2937 of Economic Advisors. A lot of offices had concern with not
2938 only the way EPA was characterizing climate change in a
2939 4-page summary, we were also concerned, I think, at the same
2940 time that the 10-year strategic plan was being developed and
2941 there had been a 1,300 person workshop in December of 2002 at
2942 which scientists from 40 countries came and commented on the

2943 10-year strategic plan.

2944 We thought that that was a fuller--Dr. Marburger has
2945 spoken to this publicly, and you would get his statement from
2946 OSTP, he's the director, but he thought, I think, and he has
2947 said in the aftermath that a fuller exposition of the science
2948 of climate change was in the 10-year strategic plan and in
2949 the end the state of the environment report referred people
2950 to the 10-year strategic plan, which was several hundred
2951 pages. It was a much more complete exposition of climate
2952 change than the 4-page summary that went back and forth
2953 between EPA and reviewing agencies.

2954 Mr. YARMUTH. I'll concede that you were only partially
2955 culpable for these changes that EPA criticized, but my
2956 question was aren't you concerned that the EPA professional
2957 staff thought that this report as edited by you and others
2958 portrayed a scientifically inaccurate perspective on climate
2959 change.

2960 Mr. COONEY. I would say a few things; I'll answer your
2961 question, of course, first. Yes, I am disappointed, and it
2962 is a concern to me. Secondly though, we had at the Council
2963 on Environmental Quality a detailee from EPA who was handling
2964 the coordination of this state of the environment report.
2965 His name was Allen Hecht. And he was coordinating comments
2966 from throughout the Federal Government and within the CEQ and
2967 other White House offices, and he was really the interface

2968 between our office and a lot of the commenting offices and
2969 the Agency itself.
2970 So we had an EPA detailee in our offices at the White
2971 House coordinating the development of this report. And I
2972 would just say that that the development of this report was
2973 not really smooth. There were very many--a number of
2974 iterations and a lot--I think a lot of people felt that EPA
2975 was not sufficiently responsive in the commenting,
2976 interagency commenting process to the comments that it was
2977 receiving, and it was not just our office, as you made clear.
2978 Mr. YARMUTH. Well, I think, in concluding my time, the
2979 important point to make is we're dealing with a process here
2980 and whether or not the process used by this administration
2981 resulted in information that was useful to the public and was
2982 honest and accurate and fair and balanced, and in this
2983 particular case, the process resulted in a document which the
2984 administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency said was
2985 not useful and therefore deleted it, therefore the process
2986 apparently, at least my conclusion, the process was fatally
2987 flawed in that it ended up producing something that was not
2988 useful.
2989 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.
2990 Mr. Souder.
2991 Mr. SOUDER. I thank the chairman. Once again, I want
2992 to point out that the only Republican witness is isolated and

2993 sentenced to the third panel of the wilderness, who actually
2994 controlled similar questions of whether you can speak out
2995 when your policies disagree with administration with the
2996 people who are elected, not unelected, and showed that there
2997 are differences within this agency is isolated to the third
2998 panel. He disagrees on science, he disagrees and would point
2999 out this isn't unique to this administration, but apparently
3000 in a hearing where we're debating whether one side has been
3001 silenced, it's okay to haul out two Republican witnesses to
3002 hound and one who has said he supports Kerry and Gore, did
3003 support apparently a dead Republican, and one who he might
3004 have voted for if he had actually been on the ballot, but in
3005 fact, praised Al Gore, praised John Kerry for whatever
3006 reasons. That's okay. We can discriminate, but on a hearing
3007 where there's discrimination.
3008 I would like to point out on this Nazi comparison that
3009 Dr. Hansen said that part of this, quote, is staffed by
3010 political appointees from the Bush administration; they tried
3011 to stop me from doing so. I was not happy with that and I
3012 ignored the restrictions.
3013 How do you think Nazi Germany would have reacted to
3014 that? Would you admit that that statement was an
3015 overreaction at a time of emotion?
3016 Mr. HANSEN. Well, I thought--
3017 Mr. SOUDER. Nazi Germany did not allow--

3018 Mr. HANSEN. After making the statement, I did regret
3019 the Nazi Germany, so in my revision of that document, which
3020 was published, I changed it to the old Soviet Union because
3021 of the connotations that come with it.
3022 Mr. SOUDER. Do you think Stalin would have let you
3023 ignore those restrictions and not go to a concentration camp?
3024 This is ridiculous that you are working--could we put up the
3025 video of the picture of him speaking.
3026 Part of our concern here is that the challenge here when
3027 you have an elected administration where whether you like it
3028 or not, there is a still a scientific debate, whether that
3029 scientific debate is sometimes funded by organizations that
3030 have concerns about one side is another matter.
3031 Could you read what it says under your name there on the
3032 television? Can you see that?
3033 Mr. HANSEN. Yeah, it has the organization that I work
3034 for, NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies. I can't read
3035 the last word.
3036 Mr. SOUDER. Basically, in your introductions, and when
3037 you travel you're always a public citizen, just like we are.
3038 I must say, and I want to say this for the record, I have
3039 some concerns with the lack of clearance of this
3040 administration for documents to an oversight committee, and
3041 I'm upset that a question was asked without that document,
3042 but I believe the administration should be more forthcoming.

3043 I also believe we need to give more flexibility for people to
3044 speak. But I also believe there are times when any elected
3045 administration has a right to choose and to say there are
3046 policy differences, and they don't have to uniformly allow
3047 everyone to speak in every case.
3048 Now if there's a pattern of misrepresentation and it was
3049 always silence and you didn't have 1,500 chances to do so, it
3050 would have been a different challenge, or if, in fact, you'd
3051 have followed orders, or in fact, you'd gone to a
3052 concentration camp or silenced to Siberia, which you're not.
3053 C-SPAN and other are agencies are not exactly like Siberia,
3054 they are not like a concentration camp. This isn't Nazi
3055 Germany, it's not the Soviet Union. That I do think there
3056 are debates and there needs to be some caution with that, but
3057 I think your overstatements are there.
3058 Furthermore, we have this challenge of Rick Piltz who's
3059 not a scientist who testified in front of this committee and
3060 he admits his group is an advocacy group addressing the
3061 challenge of global climate change, meaning their
3062 ideological. It's very hard to separate this issue from
3063 people who have a vested interest in one side or another.
3064 And while it's clear global warming is occurring, I mean
3065 Indiana used to be covered with glaciers, and it's clear it's
3066 probably growing at an accelerating rate and humans are
3067 challenging and adding to that, I don't think anybody is

3068 disputing those, but the particular policy conclusions on how
3069 it's done have incredible political overtones. What are we
3070 going to do, just shift to China?
3071 How we do it and how precise that science is does have
3072 political consequences, and therefore the elected officials
3073 do have some rights with which to show some of that debate.
3074 Do you want to respond, Dr. Hansen?
3075 Mr. HANSEN. Sure. I have no problem with that. I do
3076 not specify policy or attempt to do that. I do try to make
3077 clear the science that's relevant to policy. What our
3078 administrator has said is that--and it's impossible in this
3079 topic to discuss the topic without having some relevance to
3080 policy, but I simply make clear that if it does touch on
3081 policy as my personal opinion, I'm not representing the
3082 government in that case.
3083 Mr. SOUDER. How would you separate that?
3084 Mr. HANSEN. Pardon?
3085 Mr. SOUDER. How can you possibly separate your personal
3086 views on a subject where your professional responsibility is
3087 this very subject?
3088 Mr. HANSEN. No, I make clear that--some of the
3089 implications of global warming, it has implications for
3090 policy. And, for example, one of the things that people need
3091 to understand is that about a quarter of the carbon dioxide
3092 that we put in the air is going to stay there forever. I

3093 mean more than 500 years.

3094 And what that means is we cannot burn all of the fossil
3095 fuels without producing a radically different planet, which
3096 none of us would like to see, I think, without ice in the
3097 Arctic and with much higher sea levels and things.

3098 These things relate to policy because you're going to
3099 have to do something about it, and there are different things
3100 you can do, you can capture the CO2 and sequester it. There
3101 are different ways to treat this. That's up to the public
3102 and policy makers to decide that, but I need to make clear to
3103 them that there are such constraints and they're going to
3104 have to start to think about that real soon.

3105 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

3106 Mr. SOUDER. Thank the chairman for your indulgence.

3107 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Welch.

3108 Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3109 Mr. Cooney, I would like to ask you about some evidence
3110 that the White House edited an op ed piece written by then
3111 EPA administrator Christine Todd Whitman to ensure that it
3112 followed the White House line on climate change.

3113 In July 2002, there was an ongoing debate about the
3114 Kyoto protocols, as you remember. EPA Administrator Whitman
3115 wrote a piece for Time Magazine about the Bush
3116 administration's record on global warming, defending it more
3117 or less.

3118 My understanding is that the CEQ did play an active role
3119 in reviewing and editing administrator Whitman's op ed. For
3120 example, on July 15th, 2002 Sam Thurstrom of the White House
3121 Council on Environmental Quality distributed a revised
3122 version of the administrator's piece that contained several
3123 significant edits. I will direct you to exhibit L.
3124 According to that document Tom Gibson an associate
3125 administrator at EPA wrote to Mr. Thurstrom, this is in
3126 response to the proposed language to be used by Secretary
3127 Whitman: I can't use the 5 million out of work figure for
3128 Kyoto. It is based on the EIA report that assumed that no
3129 trading would be allowed to implement the Kyoto protocol. It
3130 also is the high end of numbers that were expressed as a
3131 range.
3132 So it's pretty clear that in effect, the high level EPA
3133 administrator was telling CEQ there was simply no basis to
3134 assert that 5 million American jobs would be lost. Of course
3135 that was the heart of the administration pushback on Kyoto.
3136 This figure is taken directly--Mr. Thurstrom responded that
3137 that figure, the 5 million was taken directly from the
3138 President's 2/14 speech and Jim Connaughton's Senate
3139 testimony last week.
3140 Using merely an abstract dollar figure may not be as
3141 compelling. My understanding, Mr. Cooney, is you were copied
3142 on the e-mail, and when you saw the e-mail, did you tell Mr.

3143 Thurstrom that Administrator Whitman's piece should be not
3144 required to include an assertion that her own staff regarded
3145 as baseless, namely this 5 million job loss figure?
3146 Mr. COONEY. Congressman, I don't recall whether I said
3147 anything to Mr. Thurstrom or not. I do recall seeing e-mails
3148 over the weekend where Mr. Gibson responded to Mr. Thurstrom
3149 and I think was persuaded by what he had written, and I can't
3150 remember his exact words but they continue in their e-mail
3151 exchange.
3152 Mr. WELCH. Take a look at exhibit M. In that e-mail
3153 Mr. Gibson from EPA says that administrator Whitman had made
3154 her own edits and struck the reference to the 5 million lost
3155 jobs. And if you turn to exhibit N, this e-mail sent 4 and
3156 1/2 later by Mr. Thurstrom, he put the 5 million lost jobs
3157 figure back in the draft.
3158 Now what they offered as evidence or support for this
3159 was A, the President said it. I assume you don't believe
3160 that if the President says something that is not true, that
3161 makes it true because he's President.
3162 Mr. COONEY. I don't believe that.
3163 Mr. WELCH. It appears that your staff kept insisting on
3164 the inclusion of an erroneous statement about the economic
3165 consequences over the strenuous objection of the EPA.
3166 Mr. COONEY. Strenuous is your words. E-mails tell half
3167 a story often. People pick up the phone and call each other.

3168 They go back and forth, pick up the phone, they'll solve
3169 things. I don't recall how this was solved. I don't
3170 remember it being directly involved in how it was solved.
3171 Mr. WELCH. I would agree e-mails tell half the story.
3172 What I think tells the rest of the story here, its very clear
3173 there was no solid basis for this 5 million job figure.
3174 Mr. COONEY. It was from the energy information
3175 administration 1998 study on the impacts of the Kyoto
3176 protocol on the United States.
3177 Mr. WELCH. Then you had more current information by
3178 your own staff that raised substantial questions about the
3179 legitimacy of that figure.
3180 Mr. COONEY. Mr. Gibson questioned the figure, but the
3181 figure comes from the independent statistical agency of the
3182 Department of Energy, the energy information administration.
3183 It is independent, it's not politically driven, and it came
3184 out with a study in 1998 documenting--
3185 Mr. WELCH. Did that study assume that there would be
3186 trade as was the case under the Kyoto protocols, yes or no.
3187 Mr. COONEY. I don't recall. Mr. Gibson says that it
3188 did not assume trading, but I don't recall. I just don't
3189 have the depth in the study to recall.
3190 Mr. WELCH. In failing to assume trading, which was
3191 inherent in the Kyoto protocol, was it not without any
3192 foundation for the conclusion it was pushing?

3193 Mr. COONEY. I understand Mr. Gibson's comment
3194 essentially as you're saying, is that the Kyoto protocol had
3195 in a written form flexibility mechanisms that might bring
3196 down the costs of complying with Kyoto. There is a record
3197 now about those flexibility mechanisms, and many of them have
3198 not proved efficient at bringing down costs.
3199 Mr. WELCH. Here's where it is frustrating on this side
3200 of the table, and it gets back to what my colleague had
3201 spoken about before. The American people are entitled to the
3202 benefit of the clearest science available, correct?
3203 Mr. COONEY. And economics, from the energy information
3204 administration, which is independent.
3205 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Do
3206 you want to conclude? Go ahead and conclude.
3207 Mr. WELCH. Well, the conclusion here, Mr. Chairman, is
3208 that the science that we were getting was pretty good until
3209 it was altered by folks in the press operation that were
3210 changing it for political considerations.
3211 Mr. COONEY. The editorial was really about climate
3212 change policy, in its whole sense, the President's commitment
3213 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions intensity by 18 percent.
3214 The predominant, if you look at the Time Magazine op ed by
3215 Administrator Whitman, it was not really focused on science
3216 so much as it was on mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions.
3217 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Shays.

3218 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. Dr. Hansen, I think that we
3219 won't have a world to live in if we continue our neglectful
3220 ways, and so I don't disagree one bit with what you believe
3221 and how you're expressing it, I just want to state that.
3222 Frankly, I don't even know if I would have called you to come
3223 before this hearing, but you're here and so I'm going to deal
3224 with what you say because I find it puzzling and I find your
3225 answers candidly inconsistent. It's not "I got you," I'm
3226 just trying to understand.
3227 When Mr. Issa asked you a question you didn't want to
3228 say the imagery to Hitler's Germany was inappropriate, with
3229 Mr. Souder you did, and now you're saying it's only the
3230 Soviet Union.
3231 We have a young man who made a mistake and he said you
3232 know, I made a mistake and let me get on with my life. What
3233 puzzles me is that you don't even want to admit a mistake
3234 when you make them, and you seem to stand up waving the
3235 constitution as if somehow you have no restraints at all.
3236 I'm an American, I can say anything I want.
3237 I'd like to just ask you about that. The old media
3238 policy rules were drafted in 1987. Under section 1213-103A
3239 instructs that all headquarters news releases be issued by
3240 the Office of Public Affairs media service division, section
3241 1213 also requires that press releases originating with field
3242 installations that is have national significance be

3243 coordinated with the associate administrator for public
3244 affairs. That was done in 1987.
3245 Are you saying that that's a policy that shouldn't have
3246 existed in 1987, shouldn't have existed in 1992, shouldn't
3247 exist in 1998, shouldn't exist in 2002; shouldn't exist?
3248 Mr. HANSEN. I haven't said anything about public
3249 affairs press releases. They are handling the public affairs
3250 press releases.
3251 Mr. SHAYS. Would you agree that makes sense, that you
3252 have that?
3253 Mr. HANSEN. Sure.
3254 Mr. SHAYS. That means your right to speak out is
3255 restrained?

3256 RPTS BINGHAM
3257 DCMN BURRELL
3258 Mr. SHAYS. It does. You can't speak out any time you
3259 want. Would you at least acknowledge that.
3260 Mr. HANSEN. Sure. But do you think that these--
3261 Mr. SHAYS. Hold on. There are certain times when you
3262 can speak out and there are other times you can't speak out,
3263 correct?
3264 Mr. HANSEN. Probably that is true.
3265 Mr. SHAYS. Not probably. It is true. How many people
3266 do you have working at your institute?
3267 Mr. HANSEN. What do you mean?
3268 Mr. SHAYS. How many people do you have working at your
3269 institute?
3270 Mr. HANSEN. Approximately 120.
3271 Mr. SHAYS. And you are the Director.
3272 Mr. HANSEN. Yes.
3273 Mr. SHAYS. Do you sometimes edit what they do? Do you
3274 sometimes question what they say? Do you?
3275 Mr. HANSEN. Sure that is a scientist's job--
3276 Mr. SHAYS. That is a scientist's job.
3277 Mr. HANSEN. That is the scientific way, but not--
3278 Mr. SHAYS. Does your staff have the right any time they
3279 want to just say whatever they want about things related to
3280 their work? You know, I just want to say something.

3281 Mr. HANSEN. Within the--

3282 Mr. SHAYS. Before you answer, I want to say to you that
3283 this is not a game. You are under oath. I want an honest
3284 answer.

3285 Mr. HANSEN. I have been giving you honest answers, and
3286 within constraints of what is reasonable, people--I don't try
3287 to change what somebody is saying.

3288 Mr. SHAYS. I didn't ask that question. Do they have
3289 the right to say anything they want any time they want about
3290 issues relating to the institute?

3291 Mr. HANSEN. I have never constrained anyone in that--

3292 Mr. SHAYS. Do they have the right to? So any employee
3293 from this point on can speak out, and if anyone comes to me,
3294 let me say this to you because you are saying this under
3295 oath--if any of your employees say to you they wanted to say
3296 something but you said you shouldn't do it or you can't do
3297 it, you are under oath saying you have never restrained
3298 anything from saying that?

3299 Mr. HANSEN. I have never restrained anybody.

3300 Mr. SHAYS. Let me ask you this. If somebody wanted to
3301 issue a release saying that global warming is getting worse
3302 and worse and they work for you, could they say that is so?

3303 The answer is yes or no.

3304 Mr. HANSEN. Scientists, sure. They can say anything
3305 they can support.

3306 Mr. SHAYS. If someone said that based on my scientific
3307 work at this institute, I believe that global warming is not
3308 getting worse an issue, speak to someone at their desk at
3309 your office, they are allowed to do that?
3310 Mr. HANSEN. Sure, absolutely.
3311 Mr. SHAYS. Okay. So, you have no policy whatsoever?
3312 Mr. HANSEN. No constraints on scientific statements.
3313 Mr. SHAYS. Do you think it is logical for a department
3314 before you issue a release, to have to submit a release--so
3315 let's go back to the first point we had.
3316 You said, in other words, the rules. There are rules.
3317 There are rules that you seem to agree with drafted in 1987.
3318 Mr. HANSEN. Yes, but those rules don't include, for
3319 example, that they should go to the White House for editing.
3320 Chairman WAXMAN. Gentleman's time has expired. Do you
3321 want to conclude, Mr. Shays?
3322 Mr. SHAYS. I would like more time.
3323 Chairman WAXMAN. Wouldn't we all?
3324 Mr. SHAYS. Pardon me? In other words, we can't develop
3325 the idea, so it is pointless to go on.
3326 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, that concludes the questioning
3327 of this first panel and we thank you very much for being
3328 here. And we look forward to further conversations on these
3329 issues.
3330 I would like to now call forward Mr. James Connaughton,

3331 Chairman of the White House Council on Environmental Quality.

3332 I want to welcome you to our hearing. Is it Connaughton

3333 or Connaughton?

3334 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. It is Connaughton. I appreciate that,

3335 Mr. Chairman. It is the Irish.

3336 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. We welcome you to our hearing

3337 today. Your prepared statement will be in the record in its

3338 entirety. We would like to ask you if you would to try to

3339 limit your oral presentation to around 5 minutes. We will

3340 have some leniency on that. It is the policy of this

3341 committee to swear in all witnesses, so I would like to ask

3342 you to rise and hold up your right hand.

3343 [Witness sworn.]

3344 Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that the

3345 witness answered in the affirmative.

3346 Mr. Connaughton--Connaughton--

3347 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Connaughton.

3348 Chairman WAXMAN. Forgive me. You can call me Waxman.

3349 Please go ahead with your oral presentation.

3350 STATEMENT OF JAMES L. CONNAUGHTON, CHAIRMAN, WHITE HOUSE
3351 COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

3352 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and
3353 Members of the committee. It is a pleasure to be back before
3354 you yet again after many appearances. I would notice that
3355 Jack Marburger, the President's Science Adviser, was also
3356 interested in being part of this discussion as he is the
3357 senior scientist overseeing Federal Government policy, and I
3358 am sure he would look forward to working with the committee
3359 as we go forward, as you continue this inquiry.
3360 Over the last 6 years this administration has relied on
3361 the advice of scientists from 13 government agencies, from
3362 the National Academies of Science and, in developing our
3363 10-year strategic plan that you heard about today, from
3364 scientists from 36 countries. Now all of this is in an
3365 effort to guide Federal climate change science, technology
3366 research and policy making.
3367 As you heard earlier, of particular importance to this
3368 hearing is in fact the 2001 National Academy of Sciences
3369 report on climate science commissioned by President Bush.
3370 That report sets the foundation for what we knew about the
3371 climate science at that time and what we still needed to
3372 know.

3373 The questions before this committee are not new,
3374 including those involving CEQ's role in reviewing documents.
3375 With respect to the 2003 climate change science program's
3376 10-year strategic plan, which I am showing you here is about
3377 200 pages long, Dr. James Mahoney, who is a PhD scientist and
3378 the top official overseeing that program, informed the
3379 Congress several times years ago that he was responsible
3380 ultimately for the final content of this report.
3381 To the best of Dr. Mahoney's knowledge quote, no errors
3382 were contained in the two reports, end quote. Dr. Mahoney
3383 further affirmed that edits proposed--affirmed that, quote,
3384 edits proposed by CEQ did not misstate any specific
3385 scientific fact, end quote. Following that, the National
3386 Academies of Sciences wrote the plan, quote, articulates a
3387 guiding vision, is appropriately ambitious and is broad in
3388 its scope.
3389 Now with respect to the 2003 climate budget summary,
3390 also discussed today, and that's called Our Changing
3391 Planet--that is about 120 pages--most of the edits
3392 recommended by CEQ were actually accepted or changed somewhat
3393 by the science program officials responsible for the
3394 document. Only three were not, and CEQ would have no
3395 objection to the fact that they weren't included. Now as to
3396 the early two-page drafts on climate in the 2003 draft report
3397 on the environment, this one is more than 600 pages long. I

3398 don't have the technical appendices here. The relative few
3399 agency comments of interest to some on this committee were
3400 actually of no import because the EPA Administrator decided
3401 to replace the passage with a reference directing the public
3402 to the two much more substantial reports above that came out
3403 at the same time. That is these two reports. These are
3404 huge, hundreds of pages with the entire scientific community
3405 in consensus on the content of these reports.

3406 Now in any event, in my detailed--in my written
3407 testimony when you look at the actual comments being proposed
3408 by the various offices not just CEQ's, most of them either
3409 echoed nearly verbatim, were appropriately reflective of the
3410 substance of the 2001 National Academies of Science report on
3411 climate science.

3412 Now this is a fact that even a cursory direct comparison
3413 or even a Google search revealed, and I did it. I Googled
3414 one of the edits just to see what turned up an expression.
3415 The edit recommended showed up in numerous science documents,
3416 including the National Academy of Sciences.

3417 Finally, the committee's focus on my former Chief of
3418 Staff, Mr. Philip Cooney, who you saw here today is
3419 misguided. And actually I find it a little bit ironic. It
3420 was Mr. Cooney who is responsible for inviting Dr. James
3421 Hansen to the White House in 2003 to brief me and other
3422 senior officials on advances in climate change science. It

3423 was a remarkable and important presentation. It was Mr.
3424 Cooney who is the driving force behind working to ensure that
3425 Federal Government documents and our budgets were actually
3426 responsive to the priority research areas that Dr. Hansen
3427 himself identified along with his colleagues at the National
3428 Academy of Sciences.

3429 Now, it is also Mr. Cooney who, precisely because he is
3430 an expert in the energy sector, who zeroed in on Dr. Hansen's
3431 very useful policy recommendation about the substantial
3432 climate change benefits of aggressively attacking methane
3433 emissions and black soot now, something we can do now. And
3434 therefore it was Mr. Cooney who became the driving force in
3435 creating this international methane-to-market partnership, a
3436 19-nation effort that is going to remove more than 180
3437 million metric tons of CO2 equivalent emissions from the
3438 atmosphere by 2015. Now this is going to come from oil and
3439 gas operations, something Mr. Cooney knows something about,
3440 and mining, something he also knows something about,
3441 landfills and agriculture.

3442 And then it was Mr. Cooney in terms of proactive climate
3443 policy to actually make a difference who helped established
3444 the Climate Vision Partnership and who for the first time
3445 secured industry emission reduction commitments from 14 major
3446 energy intensive industrial sectors, including the Business
3447 Round Table.

3448 I just have to say, I live in two worlds, the world of
3449 reality and the experience on my job and what I have been
3450 hearing a little bit here today. Mr. Cooney is among the
3451 most proactive supporters of both the science enterprise and
3452 advancing it, but more importantly he was one of the most
3453 proactive creators of sensible policies built on the science
3454 that are actually going to help us cut our emissions.
3455 The totality of this administration's record is one of
3456 unparalleled funding, openness and inclusiveness in
3457 confronting the serious challenge of global climate change.
3458 I think the sum of this is I fear that we are sort of
3459 losing the forest for the twigs in this discussion. The
3460 forest is this massive science enterprise. The forest is the
3461 massive technology investments in which the United States is
3462 leading the way in attacking global emissions, not just here
3463 but abroad. And I hope as the committee continues its
3464 inquiry we can begin to lay that information out on the
3465 table.
3466 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
3467 [Prepared statement of Mr. Connaughton follows:]

3468 ******** INSERT 4-1 ********

3469 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Connaughton.

3470 Let me go right to this memo. It was a memo written
3471 from Mr. Cooney to Kevin O'Donovan in the Vice President's
3472 office. We don't have a copy of that memo because it is
3473 being withheld from the committee. But we did have a chance
3474 to review that memo. And it obviously stirred some concern
3475 when we had Mr. Yarmuth, and Mr. Yarmuth pursued a question
3476 about it. The memo refers to a paper by Soon Baliunas that
3477 was funded in part by the American Petroleum Institute. The
3478 paper purports to show that the past century was not the
3479 warmest in the last 1,000 years.

3480 My understanding is that the conclusions of the paper
3481 had been heavily criticized by the scientific community. The
3482 memo to the Vice President's office says, I quote, we plan to
3483 begin to refer to this study in administration communications
3484 on the science of global climate change. In fact, CEQ just
3485 inserted a reference to it in the final draft chapter on
3486 global climate change contained in EPA's first state of the
3487 environment report.

3488 That is the memo to the Vice President's office from Mr.
3489 Cooney. The memo also states that the paper, and I quote,
3490 represents an opening to potentially reinvigorate debate on
3491 the actual climate history of the past 1,000 years, end
3492 quote.

3493 My concern is that the documents suggest that there was

3494 a concerted White House effort to inject uncertainty into the
3495 climate change debate. This communication between Mr. Cooney
3496 and the Vice President's office seems to reflect exactly this
3497 kind of effort.

3498 Did CEQ communicate with the Vice President's office
3499 about how to inject the Soon Baliunas report into the Federal
3500 climate change reports?

3501 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I leave aside for the
3502 moment the issues related to potential executive privilege
3503 which we are still working on with the committee. I will
3504 limit my remarks to commentary on the Soon--

3505 Chairman WAXMAN. Why don't you limit your remarks to my
3506 question? Did the CEQ communicate with the Vice President's
3507 office about how to inject this report into the climate
3508 changes reports?

3509 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. It is my understanding that CEQ did
3510 suggest that the report should be referenced in the new draft
3511 environment, state of the environment report, because in fact
3512 it was a new and major piece of science. At the same time
3513 Dr. Hansen was also introducing some of his new research that
3514 was also high interest.

3515 At the same time we were looking at issues related to
3516 the difference between surface temperatures and ground level
3517 temperatures. So at that time there was a lot of very
3518 interesting development to the science and the Soon Baliunas

3519 report was very important as well. I found it fascinating.
3520 I am not a scientist, so I can't find a conclusive. But I
3521 liken the debate over that report--Mr. Chairman, I just want
3522 to give an example--
3523 Chairman WAXMAN. No. Excuse me, Mr. Connaughton. I
3524 only have a little time. So you thought it was really
3525 interesting and worthwhile bringing it in, that was your
3526 thought as well as Mr. Cooney's, is that right?
3527 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I am not speaking to the
3528 recommendation it be included. I was made aware of this
3529 report and I found it very interesting. I actually did not
3530 have a role at that time in anything having to do with the
3531 edits on the documents.
3532 Chairman WAXMAN. And you did later?
3533 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I did later, yes.
3534 Chairman WAXMAN. And tell us what you did later. What
3535 were the circumstances?
3536 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. When the process was not leading to a
3537 reconciliation of the comments by the various offices in the
3538 White House and from other agencies, I did get on the
3539 phone--actually Governor Whitman called me, EPA Administrator
3540 Whitman called me. We were talking about a range of things
3541 but this is one of the issues that we talked about on how to
3542 reconcile the comments.
3543 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay, now this memo that was sent to

3544 the Vice President's office said this will reinvigorate
3545 debate about whether the planet is warming. This sounds to
3546 me like a play directly out of the Petroleum Institute
3547 playbook. Do you have a comment on that?
3548 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Actually, sir, it strikes me as a
3549 statement of fact. When that report did come out, it
3550 actually did receive, as you indicated, a lot of interest by
3551 the scientific community as to the essentials of the solar
3552 based research that was being conducted and particularly by
3553 Dr. Baliunas, who is actually an internationally renowned
3554 solar scientist.
3555 Chairman WAXMAN. But that report has since then been
3556 strongly criticized by the scientific community and its
3557 conclusions have been rejected.
3558 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. That--actually I do not understand
3559 that that is correct. What I do understand--
3560 Chairman WAXMAN. So is it the position of you and CEQ
3561 that that is a fairer statement of what we know about climate
3562 change than what Dr. Hansen and others were suggesting?
3563 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. No, it is not my position. What I was
3564 going to indicate, Mr. Chairman, the debate that surrounded
3565 that report is very similar to the active one undergoing
3566 right now about the relative contribution of global warming
3567 to hurricane and storm intensity and frequency, very active
3568 points of scientific debate.

3569 Chairman WAXMAN. Excuse me--

3570 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. And that is part of the variety of
3571 viewpoints which we must be incorporating into our process.

3572 Chairman WAXMAN. This memo suggests as well it was
3573 active coordination between CEQ and the Vice President's
3574 office about how to inject debate and uncertainty into
3575 discussions of climate change science. Will you provide this
3576 memorandum to our committee?

3577 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I think that is something for our
3578 lawyers to work out, Mr. Chairman.

3579 Chairman WAXMAN. And unless the White House asserts
3580 executive privilege it should be provided to our committee.

3581 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Again that is something I would defer
3582 to the counsel for the committee and the Council and the
3583 White House.

3584 Chairman WAXMAN. I am requesting--

3585 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I am not in a position to make
3586 that--to take that position personally.

3587 Chairman WAXMAN. I am requesting that CEQ turn over
3588 that memo and also to provide other communications between
3589 CEQ and the Vice President's office.

3590 Were there other communications?

3591 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I am not aware of other written
3592 communications of this type. They could exist. I do not
3593 know.

3594 Chairman WAXMAN. And we would like to see the e-mail
3595 communications as well.
3596 Mr. Issa.
3597 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Connaughton, I
3598 am going to ask a question, and it is probably unfair, but it
3599 is just an impression and I want to get it on the record
3600 somehow. A number of years ago before I was in Congress,
3601 there was a flack under then President Clinton about Speaker
3602 Gingrich being forced to go out of the back of Air Force One,
3603 and Speaker Gingrich seemed to have a real problem with that.
3604 Dr. Hansen is still here. I am not trying to do this
3605 behind his back. But isn't to a certain extent somebody who
3606 appears 1,400 times in clips, who is regularly sort of the
3607 toast of the town as the Speaker, who is asked to consult to
3608 almost anything, including Vice President Gore's movie, isn't
3609 the complaint that you are being muzzled a little bit like
3610 Newt Gingrich complaining about going out of the back of Air
3611 Force One, a plane most of us will never see much less be on?
3612 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I want to start, as I indicated,
3613 having the highest personal regard and professional regard
3614 for Dr. Hansen and his work. My son and I were just watching
3615 him on TV last night on the History Channel. Congressmen,
3616 senior administration officials, highly accomplished senior
3617 scientists, we all chafe at having to talk to our public
3618 affairs people. But the public affairs people are there for

3619 a reason. They are there to organize and be sure that what
3620 we are saying is official government policy, is understood,
3621 and that the people who might have to then respond to those
3622 statements can effectively do so.

3623 This is a process that has been with us for a long, long
3624 time, and it works well. Now we all chafe from it. I can
3625 understand Dr. Hansen especially chafing if it comes from
3626 someone relatively young and inexperienced, but the policy of
3627 public affairs is a very important one.

3628 Now I would note that I am not aware of any instance
3629 where any scientists in pursuing their science, of any
3630 scientist seeking peer review of their science, is in any way
3631 controlled, handled or otherwise managed in their scientific
3632 work. I mean from what I see all over the world and what
3633 people, scientists come and speak their mind, to me they come
3634 and speak their mind to you. What we are talking about is a
3635 science-policy interface and that has significant implication
3636 that requires some level of management.

3637 Mr. ISSA. And if I could follow up on that, in the
3638 previous panel I think there was a lot of discussion about
3639 certainty versus uncertainty. And certainly, your Chief of
3640 Staff was drawn and quartered pretty well for the statement
3641 that he was--or a statement claiming that he was creating
3642 uncertainty.

3643 Is there any uncertainty about man's influence on the

3644 environment at this point from the body of science that you
3645 have been part of putting together? In other words, not the
3646 the nuances but isn't it--and I will lead you for a second.
3647 Isn't it true that this administration has made it very clear
3648 that pollutants, whether we call it that or not, including
3649 CO2, reflect a clear danger to our environment?
3650 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Well, I will put it in the President's
3651 words. The Earth is warming. Humans are part of the
3652 problem. We need to get on with the solutions, and I need to
3653 stick to layman's terms. I am not a scientist. And that was
3654 clearly reflected in the National Academy of Sciences report.
3655 Mr. ISSA. So since it is settled science, at least
3656 settled presidential policy as stated by the President, that
3657 we are--we do have this problem and we need to be part of the
3658 solution, but this question of settled science--and I am just
3659 going to ask you one question--isn't it true that it was only
3660 this last year that the 2001 understanding of the rise in our
3661 oceans has been revised downward, less dramatic than it was
3662 thought to be? Isn't there always new information coming in
3663 that affects one side or the other of speed and so on?
3664 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Well, actually I think Dr. Hansen was
3665 trying to get to this level of complexity in the answer as
3666 well. The top line, there is a lot of agreement around
3667 warming and around the fact that humans play a role. A lot
3668 of agreement. But as you then delve down into the science,

3669 in the National Academy of Sciences report, including the
3670 edits recommended by CEQ and others, as well as subsequent
3671 documents, the most recent being the IPCC report, which is
3672 the international report updating the science, there is a
3673 wide range of uncertainties to which we are dedicating nearly
3674 2 billion a year to attempting to resolve. So there is still
3675 a lot of science to be done.

3676 As I indicated in my written testimony, if all the
3677 science were settled we wouldn't be spending $2 billion of
3678 taxpayer resources every year on it. This is very important
3679 work. One reason for one of the comments is to make sure we
3680 are emphasizing the need to go after some of this research
3681 because that is what the National Academy of Science has told
3682 us we should do.

3683 Mr. ISSA. So I guess I will just finish with one sort
3684 of series of questions, there are thousands of scientists
3685 that work for the Federal Government at all levels and
3686 hundreds, if not thousands of them worked on the Shuttle
3687 program over the years. What would have happened if Dr.
3688 Hansen's policy that every scientist gets to say anything to
3689 the camera any time they want, as long as it is supported by,
3690 quote, their science, that you know what they do, that they
3691 should be able to have an interview any time, anywhere, what
3692 would have happened each time a Shuttle went down? Can you
3693 just give us a little conjecture that, a thousand scientists

3694 working at the various launch facilities, what would have
3695 happened if all of them had responded without checking with
3696 public affairs just done their on camera interviews those
3697 days?

3698 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. You would see the kind of chaos and
3699 confusion that this entire discussion is about trying to
3700 avoid. So chaos and confusion--in public affairs.

3701 Mr. ISSA. In closing, isn't it clear that when you have
3702 dozens or hundreds or thousands of scientists as much as we
3703 want to make sure scientists can argue with each other and
3704 have that freedom of expression, that first amendment, so to
3705 speak, right that there has to be some reasonable limitation
3706 and has been for decades on how many different scientists can
3707 talk at a given time and what they can talk about?

3708 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Clearly scientists are free to pursue
3709 their research. They are free to publish and talk about
3710 their research. Taxpayer funds that all over the world, that
3711 is great. It is when we get into expressions of government
3712 policy or the science policy interface where you need some
3713 level of management. Otherwise you can fall prey to lots of
3714 misinterpretation and misunderstanding about what represents
3715 official government policy.

3716 Mr. ISSA. I hope all our scientists all get a ride on
3717 Air Force One. Thank you, I yield back.

3718 Mr. YARMUTH. [presiding.] Mr. Connaughton, I want to

3719 ask about the EPA's draft report on the environment. We
3720 talked about it already today. EPA professional staff was
3721 deeply concerned about the way the White House handled this
3722 report. And if I may, I would like to refer you to Exhibit
3723 F, which is a memo about the draft report on the environment
3724 from the staff of EPA to Administrator Whitman of the EPA.
3725 It says that as a result of Mr. Cooney's edits the text,
3726 quote, no longer accurately reflects scientific consensus on
3727 climate change. And I read a number of other statements and
3728 there are examples of what they meant. The EPA memo say that
3729 the White House told the EPA that no further changes may be
3730 made.

3731 Did you make the decision that no further changes were
3732 to be made?

3733 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. No, I did not. And I would observe,
3734 Congressman, that the--I only saw this document for the first
3735 time over the weekend. It was not something I saw in my
3736 conversation years ago with Governor Whitman. But I would
3737 observe a number of the items being complained of were
3738 verbatim language from the National Academy of Sciences
3739 report. That told me something else is going on. There is a
3740 pride of authorship going on between EPA and the other
3741 agencies. At the time, by the way, it seemed to me that to
3742 the extent there were editorial differences they should be
3743 reconciled. They weren't being reconciled. That suggested

3744 some back and forth. That is really what Governor Whitman
3745 and I ended up talking about, and the solution she came up
3746 with I thought was perfection.
3747 Mr. YARMUTH. Is it not true that someone advised
3748 Administrator Whitman that no further changes were to be
3749 made?
3750 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. The document I saw--again I only saw
3751 it for the first time over the weekend--was the handwritten
3752 note that says these changes must be made.
3753 Mr. YARMUTH. These changes must be made.
3754 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. But I would note the context of that,
3755 Congressman, was important. What was happening is we have a
3756 process where agencies provide their input to these
3757 documents, and there is a reconciliation process. It doesn't
3758 mean all the comments have to be accepted. You just have to
3759 have a process where you say I accept it or I reject it and
3760 here is why. That wasn't happening on this particular set of
3761 issues. Remember, this document was 600 pages long. I
3762 showed you just a fraction of it. We are talking about a
3763 small number of edits to a two-page passage in an otherwise
3764 massive document. We are just down to the end on this.
3765 So really what was going on--and I thought it was
3766 reasonable at the time--was the notion that we needed some
3767 reconciliation. It was an issue of whether the comments were
3768 in or out. As it happened, by the way, none of the comments

3769 being raised to the committee--none of the comments could
3770 have possibly confused the public because they didn't make it
3771 into the report.
3772 Mr. YARMUTH. That is because EPA found the report to be
3773 so inaccurate that it said that if they released it, it would
3774 cause great confusion in the public, isn't that correct? At
3775 least that is what that memo says.
3776 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I saw the memo. My personal
3777 reflection is it seemed to be a little bit melodramatic. We
3778 have a process for reconciling these kind of returns. That
3779 wasn't happening, which is why it got elevated. Most of what
3780 you are talking about today never got elevated because Dr.
3781 Mahoney on these science documents--these science documents
3782 include expressions of science--Dr. Mahoney had a very
3783 effective process of reconciling comments. Some of them are
3784 included. Some are changed. And some of them are excluded.
3785 And that process wasn't being applied in this particular
3786 instance on the draft environment report. And so we worked
3787 it out.
3788 Mr. YARMUTH. Now you mentioned before that some of
3789 these, all of these changes were based on NRC but in the
3790 EPA--again this memo says that conclusions of the NRC report
3791 were deleted. That is one of their complaints, wasn't it?
3792 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. That is--again, we can get into lots
3793 of back and forth about the particularized edits. I included

3794 that in my written testimony. Others were being asked to be
3795 included.
3796 I think one of the things, Congressman, that went to
3797 your line of questioning earlier, you had these massive
3798 documents, and you have CEQ and other agencies agreeing to 99
3799 percent of them. These have some of the strongest
3800 expressions of why we need to take action on climate, the
3801 effects of global warming on ecological systems, the research
3802 questions on relations of public health. These documents are
3803 full of that. And we didn't have any objections to any of
3804 that.
3805 What these comments went to were certain expressions of
3806 key uncertainties identified by the Academy that were a
3807 qualifier to some absolute--more absolute statements that
3808 appeared to be in the text. Now the National Academy chose
3809 to include those qualifications. It was at least reasonable
3810 for reviewers to suggest that some of those qualifications be
3811 included as well.
3812 Now ultimately the scientists decided which ones were
3813 appropriate, what tone, what weight to give to those. But I
3814 do want to underline what was missing in all of the
3815 questioning before I came up here was the fact that there was
3816 actually massive agreement on, you know, more than 99 percent
3817 of these massive documents.
3818 That is where all the positive heavy duty stuff was on

3819 climate change. These qualifiers were a little teeny piece
3820 of the discussion. So much ado about a very small amount of
3821 qualification.

3822 Mr. YARMUTH. Now thank you. You said that earlier you
3823 did not make the decision that the White House wasn't going
3824 to make any changes, but in your conversations with Ms.
3825 Whitman did she explain to you why she made the decision not
3826 to--that she did not make those changes?

3827 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. As you might expect this was an
3828 executive level conversation. We don't--we weren't into
3829 parsing all the back and forth between the various staffs.
3830 But you asked, I just want to be clear, I was perfectly
3831 content to just get them in a room, especially get the
3832 scientists with them and just reconcile the comments.

3833 She had what I thought was a much better solution. And
3834 that was, we had just spent over a year developing this
3835 document with 1,300 scientists from around the world. Why
3836 not refer the public to that rather than try to collapse this
3837 down to a two-page passage on climate in a document that
3838 otherwise sort of had a rich abundance of detail on a whole
3839 bunch of other issues that were not getting the attention
3840 they deserved? So I thought it was a perfect solution. We
3841 didn't need to talk a lot. I said, that sounds great to me.
3842 Let's just go that way.

3843 Mr. YARMUTH. My time has expired. Mr. Cannon.

3844 Mr. CANNON. Thank you very much. I am having a hard
3845 time trying to figure out what this hearing is all about. I
3846 think, Mr. Connaughton, your term of "melodramatic" probably
3847 fits pretty darn well. You have a 23-year-old young man who
3848 was put on the hot seat, and I think acquitted himself quite
3849 well. Your former Chief of Staff--or the Chief of Staff of
3850 the CEQ--I thought did a remarkable job. I don't think there
3851 was a single question left unanswered very directly by him.
3852 So I am not sure why we had him up and were grilling him to
3853 the degree that we did.
3854 And then of course the third person on the panel is the
3855 guy who had the real questions. And those questions come
3856 down to what I think involved his views were as to good and
3857 evil, people in the administration representing something
3858 akin to Nazi Germany and people who believe as he believes
3859 being good.
3860 I would like to read you a quote by Dr. Hansen from
3861 1998: Injection of environmental and political perspectives
3862 in midstream of the science discussion cannot help the
3863 process of inquiry. I believe that persons with relevant,
3864 scientific expertise should concentrate with pride on cool,
3865 objective analysis, providing information to the public and
3866 decision makers when it is found, but leaving the moral
3867 implications--this is again the person who raised the issue
3868 of the morality of this administration and comparing it to

3869 Nazi Germany--leaving the moral implications for later,
3870 common consideration or, at most, for summary inferential
3871 discussion.
3872 I am not implying bias on the part of any particular
3873 scientist, but the global warming debate has plentiful
3874 examples to illustrate my thesis, especially, at least a per
3875 capita basis among the most vociferous greenhouse skeptics;
3876 i.e., those who challenge the reality or interpretation of
3877 global warming. Many of the participants in this debate have
3878 ceased to act as scientists as defined above but rather act
3879 as if they were lawyers hired to defend a particular
3880 perspective. New evidence has no effect on their preordained
3881 conclusions this is abhorrent to science and spoils the fun
3882 of it.
3883 Now we are not talking about the underlying facts of
3884 global warming or climate change here. We are talking about
3885 the process by which the administration has operated and the
3886 environment in which it has made decisions about how to get a
3887 message out. And with all the claims of big oil and drilling
3888 in ANWR and all the other things that will actually make
3889 America a much better place, with cheaper energy for the
3890 poor, I fail to see where we have made any progress. What we
3891 have really done is tied ourselves up with the beliefs of an
3892 individual who has been very critical of the administration.
3893 Would you like to comment on that or would you just let

3894 my statement stand if you want?

3895 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I would just like to remark. An
3896 important facet of all of this is we need to continue to
3897 encourage a wide diversity of viewpoints. The science
3898 enterprise is to constantly test the received wisdom, and
3899 that goes back and forth.

3900 Now there is a lot of strong agreement on climate
3901 change, on the fact it is occurring and that humans are part
3902 of it. But there are still many, many lines of inquiry that
3903 the scientists are in fact pursuing and they are testing each
3904 other on.

3905 The same is true, by the way, in the policy perspective.
3906 We take the advice of economists. We take advice of
3907 lawyers. We take the advice of policy people. We take the
3908 advice of politicians and communications people. This is an
3909 extremely complicated issue. It is not the province of any
3910 particular professional class.

3911 I actually am pleased at the direction of the National
3912 Academy. They pushed us to create a more integrated process
3913 for linking science with the technology development process.
3914 That did not happen before. We are doing that now.

3915 Those two processes are then working their way much
3916 better, really with the urging of Congress as well, into the
3917 policy development exercise. It requires a lot of people,
3918 providing lots of viewpoints. And then we work to sort it

3919 out. That is what our role is, your role and the senior
3920 administration officials roles.
3921 Mr. CANNON. I would just point out that probably the
3922 most hardest figure in the history of America on
3923 environmental issues was the Moses of the West, Brigham
3924 Young, who took Mormons to Utah which I represent. And he
3925 was very concerned about the environment. And by the way
3926 slightly in a religious context, but it seems to me dogma
3927 ought to be left to the area of religion, and what we ought
3928 to do is look at the science and try to figure out where we
3929 are going, because the decisions are huge. The implications
3930 of eliminating CO2, I think Mr. Issa said earlier, 35
3931 trillion--oh, $350 trillion, roughly more than about 10 times
3932 as much as the total net worth of all of America. These
3933 numbers are astounding. So the question is what do we do as
3934 humans to adapt to deal with that situation. And you have
3935 been leading the fight on this. You have been dealing with
3936 this. You have been in the vortex. Do you have other things
3937 you want to say in comment about that?
3938 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Well, I think we are going back 5
3939 years history looking at individual edits, individual
3940 documents that never made it into most of the reports, at
3941 least the ones of concern. So I much prefer the hearing we
3942 had last summer, which is actually trying to dig into the
3943 detailed solutions to tackling this problem which, by the

3944 way, there is strong bipartisan support, whether it is the
3945 advancement of way out there technologies like fusion,
3946 near-term technologies like hydrogen. The Energy Policy Act
3947 passed bipartisan in both Houses of Congress going after
3948 renewable fuels, going after vehicle fuel--actually the
3949 energy bill didn't include vehicle fuel efficiency. But we
3950 would like the Congress to consider that, as well as billions
3951 of dollars in tax incentives to advance a new generation of
3952 coal that would ultimately be zero emission.
3953 These are the solutions. This is what we should be
3954 working on. I call this, what is it about yes you don't
3955 understand? We have this strong commitment to get on with
3956 the solutions. Let's do that.
3957 Mr. CANNON. Sounds to me--I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, my
3958 time is up. Thank you. I yield back.
3959 Chairman WAXMAN. [Presiding.] Thank you.
3960 Chair yields himself time to pursue a second round.
3961 Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I haven't had a first round
3962 yet.
3963 Chairman WAXMAN. Oh, Mr. Shays.
3964 Mr. SHAYS. No problem.
3965 When Kyoto was negotiated, Senate voted 100 to 1 and if
3966 there was someone absent it was unanimous, don't come back if
3967 you leave out India and China. So the Clinton administration
3968 comes back having left out India and China. Whereupon there

3969 were only about three to five Members of the Senate who said
3970 they supported the treaty.
3971 But given that the President said he was against it and
3972 people are finally facing up to the reality of global
3973 warming, even though Kyoto left out two of the potentially
3974 biggest contributors, every Senator acts like they would have
3975 voted for it.
3976 I wish to God this administration had submitted to the
3977 Senate the Kyoto Treaty without prejudice. There would have
3978 been five members who would have actually voted for it. It
3979 is not unlike the two-thirds of the Congress and
3980 three-quarters of the Senate. Some Members now act like they
3981 never voted for the war in Iraq.
3982 So, now but the sad thing is, Mr. Connaughton, and we
3983 have talked about it more than once, because this
3984 administration wanted to appeal to a narrow base that didn't
3985 believe in global warming, and so therefore was silent about
3986 the need to deal with it early on, you are having to deal
3987 with what you are having to deal with, and that is the
3988 tragedy of this in my judgment. You have done some amazing
3989 bilateral agreements to reduce the impact of global warming.
3990 You will get no credit for it because this administration
3991 early on wanted to give the impression that they didn't
3992 believe in global warming. That is the way I look at it.
3993 And I am sorry that--and then we hire someone who is

3994 very capable, did a nice job in his performance before us but
3995 represented before the petroleum industry, which is not kind
3996 of what you would expect in the position that he was holding.
3997 Wouldn't you agree that, you know, some of what you are
3998 having to deal with is just a bad start?
3999 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Sure. I mean I think, you know, it is
4000 also, though, the challenge of leadership. The prior
4001 administration did not make explicit the fact that the treaty
4002 was not going to work. President Bush did. As indicated in
4003 my written testimony, that did earn the--undeservedly earn
4004 all the ill will that has been directed at the President and
4005 our strategy since then.
4006 That--and it is ironic because actually where I depart
4007 from you when you align the President with some of the
4008 constituencies, it was the President in June of 2001
4009 following the National Academy of Sciences report said, this
4010 is what we know, the Academy has told us about some key
4011 uncertainties. But notwithstanding that, we need to take
4012 action now to begin to address this important problem. And
4013 he set in place a process that I inherited when I came in in
4014 June of 2001 after that of running the policy that led to the
4015 2002 climate policy strategic plan. It is all the more
4016 ironic because the President himself actually--as he should
4017 have--took the advice of the Academy and led probably the
4018 single most aggressive--

4019 Mr. SHAYS. Other ironies. Al Gore is right about
4020 global warming. It is a very real inconvenient truth and it
4021 needs to be dealt with. I would love to compare his house
4022 with President Bush's house. I would love to compare it.
4023 So you have one who advocates dealing with global
4024 warming but doesn't practice it. And you have another,
4025 President, who has been frankly quiet about global warming in
4026 my judgment and practices dealing with it in his own personal
4027 life. That is one of the other huge ironies.
4028 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. There is a wonderful USA Today story
4029 about the President's house down in Texas. It is a model of
4030 green building and environmental conservation.
4031 Mr. SHAYS. Or when we hear the actors and actresses who
4032 complain about Humvees, driving up in long stretch
4033 limousines, flying in airplanes that make Humvees look like
4034 they get tremendous mileage. The irony in this debate, I
4035 hope once we get beyond all this we will start to deal with
4036 the reality of what we need to deal with. And I just say to
4037 you, I think it hasn't happened because of how we stepped
4038 into this debate.
4039 And I am afraid frankly there is some on the religious
4040 right--whatever party--that have denied global warming and
4041 when it finally happens they are going to say, well, this is
4042 the fulfillment of the Bible and the destruction of humanity.
4043 I mean, it is just like I hope we wake up, and I hope we act

4044 soon. And I encourage you to keep doing the good work you
4045 are doing. But I just wish you were more vocal about the
4046 good work you are doing.
4047 Mr. ISSA. Will the gentleman yield?
4048 Mr. Shays. Yes.
4049 Mr. ISSA. You mentioned everything except nuclear.
4050 Wouldn't you say it was notable that Dr. Hansen was very
4051 supportive of nuclear in every round of questioning and yet,
4052 to be honest, Al Gore and his movie and all of the activities
4053 is a pushback from nuclear pretty consistently? Have you
4054 seen that interesting dichotomy that those who want us to
4055 deal with global warming have a tendency to be extremely
4056 anti-nuclear even though it is zero emissions?
4057 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. There is no question that if you were
4058 serious about climate change you have to be serious about
4059 nuclear, at least for the next many decades. It is the only
4060 baseload zero emissions source we have got. It has the
4061 smallest environmental footprint of any source we have got,
4062 and we know how to do it right. We have been doing it right
4063 in America for a long time. And the modern plants are even
4064 better than the old ones. So I use that as a gauge actually
4065 when I deal with people on climate change. If they are not
4066 open to a serious discussion of nuclear, I tend to find that
4067 their interest in the issue is more rhetorical than real.
4068 Chairman WAXMAN. Gentleman's time has expired, and now

4069 the Chair will recognize himself for a second round.

4070 When this administration came in, they rejected Kyoto.
4071 Maybe it couldn't have passed. The Senate probably couldn't
4072 have. But I didn't hear the administration go back and ask
4073 the countries admitting Kyoto to reconvene and see if they
4074 could renegotiate a treaty. Fact number one.

4075 Secondly, you pointed out with pride all of the things
4076 that this administration has done and is doing. But all the
4077 scientists tell us that the emissions of carbon are going up
4078 and not down, which means the planet is going to get in a
4079 more difficult situation in the direction we are moving.

4080 Now, what appears to some of us is that it looks like
4081 the administration's policy was pretty much the petroleum
4082 industry's policy, which is let's sort of, let's try to
4083 confuse things and suggest that there's not such a big
4084 problem of global warming. We'll try to sow some doubt about
4085 it. That is what it appears to many of us.

4086 Now I want to find out whether this was a deliberate
4087 White House strategy to sow doubt, or if I am incorrect about
4088 it. Did you ever have any communications with anybody in the
4089 White House outside of CEQ about the value of emphasizing
4090 uncertainty and climate change?

4091 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I had conversations with people
4092 outside of CEQ about the broad range of science, which
4093 included uncertainties related to issues such as aerosols,

4094 some of the other factors that were in the National Academy
4095 of Sciences report. And the answer to that is yes, with
4096 scientists as well nonscientists.
4097 Chairman WAXMAN. Who are those people in the White
4098 House outside of CEQ?
4099 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Especially the budgeteers. We were
4100 working on the 10-year strategic plan because a lot of--
4101 Chairman WAXMAN. Budgeteers were OMB--exclusively OMB
4102 people?
4103 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. As well as the Office of Science and
4104 Technology people, including Jack Marburger, because 10-year
4105 strategic plan, Mr. Chairman, was all about how are we going
4106 to direct our resources toward these key areas of uncertainty
4107 that the National Academy of Science has identified. So we
4108 had an extensive set of conversations all the way up to the
4109 cabinet level on how to get this 10-year research plan going.
4110 The National Academy of Sciences hailed this plan as having
4111 ambition and vision.
4112 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Connaughton, I have only a limited
4113 period of time so I want to ask you some very specific
4114 questions.
4115 When the White House appeared to edit the climate change
4116 science reports, that was highly controversial. And several
4117 of the changes made front page headlines. Did you have
4118 communications with others in the White House outside of CEQ

4119 about the reaction to CEQ's edits and how to manage that
4120 reaction?
4121 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. First of all, the controversy was
4122 created by media stories, which I think grossly distorted the
4123 actual record of our process and the final documents to which
4124 scientist--
4125 Chairman WAXMAN. You are not answering my question. I
4126 asked you a specific question, and I really want an answer.
4127 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I need to start with disagreeing--
4128 Chairman WAXMAN. Did you have any conversations with
4129 anybody about how to handle the public relations once these
4130 reports were--
4131 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I certainly did. I talked to the
4132 White House communicators because this had achieved national
4133 and actually international stature--
4134 Chairman WAXMAN. Would you tell us who the
4135 communicators were?
4136 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. At the time--I would have to get back
4137 to you on that because I don't know exactly when people moved
4138 in and out.
4139 Chairman WAXMAN. Did you have any communications with
4140 White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card?
4141 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. About?
4142 Chairman WAXMAN. About the global warming reports.
4143 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I only had a conversation with him

4144 after the reports came out.

4145 Chairman WAXMAN. Did you have any conversations with

4146 him as you took your job as to how you were going to handle

4147 your job?

4148 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Yes, I did.

4149 Chairman WAXMAN. And when were they?

4150 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. That would have been in the middle of

4151 June.

4152 Chairman WAXMAN. June, what year.

4153 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. 2001.

4154 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay.

4155 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. That is when I was assigned the

4156 portfolio on climate change, on air pollution and a whole

4157 range of issues, fuel economy and a whole range of issues on

4158 the National Energy Plan.

4159 Chairman WAXMAN. And did he suggest to you some

4160 policies you might pursue or what--tell us about the

4161 conversation as it relates to global warming, climate change.

4162 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Mr. Card was happy to have me on

4163 board. He said there were specific areas we should get into

4164 and we wanted to really focus on the technology. We had been

4165 given this strong advice from the National Academy of

4166 Sciences. And we wanted to make sure also we were advancing

4167 the science in the way the President directed. Mr. Card was

4168 reinforcing for me the agenda that the President had already

4169 clearly laid out in his policy address.

4170 Chairman WAXMAN. Now after the reports were put out you

4171 said you had some communications with him?

4172 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Yes. He wanted to know because what

4173 we had regarded--

4174 Chairman WAXMAN. Could you tell us when that was

4175 approximately?

4176 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I can't recall the specific date.

4177 Chairman WAXMAN. And tell us about that communication.

4178 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. The report--we had scientific sign-off

4179 on the report so when it came out and the media began to

4180 nit-pick--I guess it leaked. The report had been out for

4181 some time. Then someone in the media got ahold of leaked

4182 versions of some of these early edits without even, by the

4183 way, comparing to see if it made it into the final document.

4184 That is what created the media flap. And so there were

4185 questions what was in the report, what was it about. We

4186 actually treated this as a routine publication. It was only

4187 later sensationalized.

4188 Chairman WAXMAN. This was a direct conversation with

4189 Andrew Card?

4190 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I had one direct conversation with

4191 him.

4192 Chairman WAXMAN. On this issue.

4193 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Yes.

4194 Chairman WAXMAN. The reaction to the report.

4195 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Right. This was much later after it
4196 came out and the leaked edits, the leaked edits emerged.

4197 Chairman WAXMAN. And you don't recall the date of that?

4198 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. No, I don't, sir.

4199 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay, did he suggest you do something
4200 other than what you were doing?

4201 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. No. We were actually--

4202 Chairman WAXMAN. Or was he just asking questions about
4203 what you did?

4204 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. He wanted to know what the report,
4205 what the process was, was the process followed. I assured
4206 him it had been followed. I assured him the scientists at
4207 the end of the process had ultimately reconciled all comments
4208 and he was actually--well, I don't want to speak for him.

4209 Chairman WAXMAN. Well, we know that some of the
4210 documents we have seen came from the--related to
4211 communications with the Vice President's office. Did you
4212 talk to anybody in the Vice President's office, including the
4213 Vice President or any of his staff, such as Kevin O'Donovan
4214 or anyone else in that office?

4215 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. About?

4216 Chairman WAXMAN. About global warming, climate change,
4217 the report.

4218 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Sure. I talked with all of the office

4219 of the White House about climate change. It is an issue that
4220 has been with us for 6 years. I can't think of a single
4221 office, including Office of Public Liaison, in which there
4222 hasn't been some interface of one kind or another about
4223 climate change, but really focused on the technology
4224 initiatives of the President much less so on the science.
4225 Chairman WAXMAN. So you had frequent communications
4226 with, was it, Kevin O'Donovan or others in the Vice
4227 President's office?
4228 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. We have a very vigorous interagency
4229 process that includes participation by the various White
4230 House offices as they see fit, as well as all the various
4231 agencies. So you can lump in a dozen agencies and six or
4232 seven White House offices.
4233 Chairman WAXMAN. We look forward to learning more about
4234 those.
4235 Mr. Issa.
4236 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Where are your
4237 offices.
4238 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. On Jackson Place, sir, right in front
4239 of the White House, right on Lafayette Square.
4240 Mr. ISSA. Which is really part of now the White House
4241 complex area?
4242 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. That's correct, sir.
4243 Mr. ISSA. And when did essentially the oversight of

4244 global climate change--when did it move to the White House
4245 area? In other words, how long have the offices that are
4246 overseeing this part of science, how long have they been
4247 within, you know, what we always think of as the White House,
4248 Treasury, Old Executive Office, the various townhouses and of
4249 course the White House itself?
4250 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. My office, the, Council on
4251 Environmental Quality, was created in 1969, so it has been
4252 there for almost 30--40 years. The Office of Science and
4253 Technology Policy I believe was created a few years later
4254 than that. And those are the two primary sort of policy
4255 offices as it relates to energy and environment and natural
4256 resources and some of those matters.
4257 And then there was the Domestic Policy Council of
4258 course, the National Economic Council was created under the
4259 Clinton administration and then during the Clinton
4260 administration they actually had a sub office specifically
4261 focused on climate change where they coordinated all of the
4262 climate change efforts across the Clinton administration. We
4263 decided to consolidate that within CEQ.
4264 Mr. ISSA. Which is also in the White House complex?
4265 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Correct.
4266 Mr. ISSA. So it is fair to say that administration
4267 after administration, this has been something which
4268 has--although it has evolved and it's grown, every

4269 administration has thought it important enough to take up
4270 this very small amount of space available in and around the
4271 White House rather than sending it off to Crystal City or any
4272 number of other large Federal buildings a few miles away that
4273 certainly other things have been pushed out of.

4274 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Well, there has been a Catch-22 to the
4275 discussion we are having today. This issue is very
4276 important. It is presidentially level important. But that
4277 said, we also make clear to do some assignments. So at NOAA,
4278 the head of the Climate Science Program that was housed at
4279 NOAA, so all of our input went to them and they had the final
4280 call on the science documents.

4281 Mr. ISSA. I just want to understand that this is
4282 something where you get to say you are coming from the White
4283 House, because effectively these buildings are--everyone,
4284 everyone except people maybe inside the Beltway, we don't--we
4285 know the difference between the Old Executive Office and
4286 whether or not you have got something in the Roosevelt Room,
4287 wing or whatever, but bottom line is you are right there in
4288 the White House complex, and this administration has kept it
4289 that important.

4290 Let me just follow up on a couple of things. When this
4291 administration--and I realize you weren't with it in the
4292 first days--but you were pretty close. This administration
4293 inherited Kyoto. It was dead on arrival at the Senate, is

4294 that right?

4295 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. That's correct. It was dead 3 years
4296 before that.

4297 Mr. ISSA. So it just hadn't been buried.

4298 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Actually it had effectively because
4299 the prior administration never sent the treaty to the Senate.

4300 Mr. ISSA. So we also--thank you. And we also, this
4301 administration also inherited methyl bromide, the Montreal
4302 Protocol, which exempted all of the third world, is that
4303 right?

4304 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. It actually put them on a delayed
4305 compliance schedule, which they are now beginning to
4306 implement.

4307 Mr. ISSA. This is the year in which they are going to
4308 actually have to cut down their use. But basically they have
4309 been unrestricted and, correct me if I'm wrong, methyl
4310 bromide basically moved from the United States and Europe to
4311 Africa and developing countries in South America who are
4312 unrestricted. The flower industry of Holland mostly moved to
4313 other countries. So this is something that was done in
4314 previous administrations. It sounded good but the bottom
4315 line is it didn't change the emissions of this terrible ozone
4316 depleting material one bit, did it, outside the U.S.?

4317 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Yes, I believe that is--I believe that
4318 is true. The issue you always face in these international

4319 agreements with global emissions is what is called leakage.
4320 If you squeeze the balloon too tight in one place and the
4321 other country is not constrained, you actually get an
4322 increase in those emissions. That is a fundamental issue in
4323 the climate policy debates.

4324 Mr. ISSA. So some of this is what I call unilateral
4325 disarmament on emissions. We stopped, but it didn't change
4326 one bit the amount of emissions.

4327 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. And Congressman, there is a place for
4328 leadership which the U.S. is demonstrating, but you don't
4329 want your leadership to sacrifice your economic objectives to
4330 greater emissions somewhere else.

4331 Mr. ISSA. The United States is leading the world. This
4332 Congress has funded leading the world in cleaning up coal and
4333 other carbon emitters, recognizing without sequestration you
4334 are not getting there, that that has to be part of it. But
4335 isn't it true that China builds basically one coal fired
4336 plant every week, week in and week out, for the last couple
4337 years and plans to continue doing so and that those tend to
4338 be among the dirtiest electric production facilities in the
4339 world?

4340 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Yes. They will build, I am told, 140
4341 in the next 3 years and they are massively industrializing
4342 and picking up a lot of the manufacturing and industrial
4343 output that would otherwise be occurring in places like the

4344 United States and Europe for a variety of reasons.

4345 Mr. ISSA. Then as I yield back, I will simply make the
4346 point that this administration has a bigger problem than just
4347 good research. We have to get it applied around the world or
4348 it won't make a bit of difference in global warming.

4349 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Mr. Issa, to the point that was raised
4350 by the chairman I would sharply disagree. We did reconvene
4351 internationally. We just didn't reconvene in Kyoto. We have
4352 dozens of bilateral partnerships now. And we have many, many
4353 multinational agreements on advancing hydrogen, on advancing
4354 global fuels, on advancing methane capture, as I indicated.
4355 The list is quite lengthy of real international agreement,
4356 the most recent of which is the Asian Pacific Partnership on
4357 Clean Development Climate, which includes India and China and
4358 South Korea, which comes in third in new emissions for the
4359 first time.

4360 So we found a different way to have the international
4361 conversation, and this is a foundation we can build on and,
4362 by the way, Mr. Chairman, California is going to be a huge
4363 beneficiary of that because we are all about opening up
4364 markets for good old-fashioned green technologies from
4365 California and really getting them into these marketplaces in
4366 Asia. That is where the solution lies.

4367 Mr. ISSA. Thank you. I yield back.

4368 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Welch.

4369 Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Connaughton.
4370 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Connaughton, please.
4371 Mr. WELCH. Mr. Connaughton. Welcome.
4372 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Thank you.
4373 Mr. WELCH. I would like to ask, but your decision to
4374 hire Phil Cooney as your Chief of Staff. As you know, Mr.
4375 Cooney was a very successful oil industry lobbyist. He had
4376 worked for the Petroleum Institute in his job there. Among
4377 other things was to stop or delay governmental actions on
4378 climate change. They weren't shy about their point of view
4379 on that, but that obviously is an agenda inconsistent with
4380 the mission of the Environmental Protection Agency.
4381 My question is this, who made the decision to hire Mr.
4382 Cooney?
4383 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I did.
4384 Mr. WELCH. And I assume you were aware of the work he
4385 did at the American Petroleum Institute?
4386 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Yes, I was.
4387 Mr. WELCH. Did you have any concerns about that work
4388 and how it would affect the work that he was to do at the
4389 environmental agency or was that a reason why he was hired?
4390 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. In my many years in Washington, I have
4391 come across a lot of people in the professional world,
4392 lawyers, people from the environmental community and other
4393 places. Of the many people I intersected with in my

4394 professional life, Mr. Cooney is one of the people of highest
4395 integrity that I have run across. He is also an outstanding
4396 manager. And actually I saw it as a great benefit that he
4397 had experience in the energy sector because one of the major
4398 tasks I knew I was going to be taking on was the CEQ portion
4399 of implementing the National Energy Policy.
4400 So it was actually something Mr. Cooney knew something
4401 about. But first and foremost was his commitment to public
4402 service, and actually it was an honor for me to have him join
4403 me. And I have to say, you know, as much as the tone of this
4404 hearing has been what it is, Mr. Cooney is the best in class
4405 individual when it comes to integrity, honesty and ethics.
4406 And I do greatly regret some of the insinuations that I have
4407 heard from some members of this committee about the fact that
4408 Mr. Cooney might have been unable to divorce himself from one
4409 client and take on the role of public servant. I certainly
4410 did. Mr. Welch, I would submit you certainly did when
4411 you--at some point in your life when you became elected. We
4412 are all capable of serving the institutions in which we are
4413 employed.

4414 RPTS THOMAS

4415 DCMN NORMAN

4416 [2:00 p.m.]

4417 Mr. WELCH. I haven't heard anybody raise questions
4418 about Mr. Cooney or anybody else's integrity. What I
4419 understood and I have heard is a fair amount of evidence that
4420 the American Petroleum Institute had a clear point of view on
4421 climate change and a fair amount of evidence that many of
4422 those views on climate change, for one reason or
4423 another--conviction or politics, I am not going to make a
4424 conclusion--found their way into reports through editing; 181
4425 different edits.

4426 Did you have any concern about what signal would be sent
4427 to the American people, really, in hiring a person whose job
4428 it was before taking on the new position to basically
4429 advocate the American Petroleum Institute's position that
4430 climate change was not a problem and that the right approach
4431 on energy policy was to drill in ANWR, to drill more
4432 extensively in the coastal waters, and basically to erase,
4433 and so doubt, about the urgency of addressing global warming
4434 as a problem?

4435 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. You are making some insinuations in
4436 that litany. So let me ask you--this plays against the type
4437 that you are suggesting. Mr. Cooney was involved in the
4438 National Energy Policy that was advancing mandates for

4439 renewable fuels against the interest of the oil companies.
4440 Mr. Cooney was involved in some of the energy policy in which
4441 the Bush administration, for the first time in over a decade,
4442 was implementing new fuel economy standards for vehicles.
4443 Mr. Cooney was involved in the National Energy Policy that
4444 did not support tax breaks for oil and gas. In fact, the
4445 President and his administration were opposed to them and
4446 made that very clear in the run-up to the energy bill in
4447 2005.

4448 I could give you any of a number of additional examples
4449 where Mr. Cooney was actually working against the interest of
4450 the oil and gas industry, and he did it with the highest
4451 integrity in the service of the policy agenda that he was
4452 being directed to implement by the President of the United
4453 States.

4454 Mr. WELCH. Mr. Connaughton, I admire your energy but
4455 not your misstatement of the facts.

4456 The White House opposed the fuel standards that you are
4457 referring to.

4458 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Mr. Welch, you couldn't be more wrong.
4459 In 2001, in the National Energy Plan, it called for
4460 increases in fuel economy standards. It was then that we
4461 initiated a process with the National Academy of Sciences to
4462 get their recommendation on how we could move forward with
4463 new mandatory regulations on fuel economy in the light truck

4464 fleet that would not create the safety hazard the National
4465 Academy of Science had identified.
4466 We subsequently implemented two regulations covering 7
4467 years of light truck manufacturing for the first time in a
4468 decade. During the same period, the President and his
4469 administration called on the Congress to legislate, give us
4470 the authority to do the same thing with respect to passenger
4471 cars, a call on Congress the President most recently
4472 reinitiated in his State of the Union address in which he
4473 committed the Nation to save 8.5 billion gallons of fuel
4474 through new mandatory fuel economy standards if this Congress
4475 will give us the authority to do it right rather than do it
4476 the way it was provided back to us in the 1970s, which
4477 creates a safety penalty and harms drivers.
4478 Mr. WELCH. Were you involved in any one of the 181
4479 changes that were made, the edits that were made, under the
4480 supervision of Mr. Cooney?
4481 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I only had general oversight as that
4482 was working its way through the staff progress. What
4483 typically happens if there's an irreconcilable--
4484 Mr. WELCH. So is the answer yes or no? You have given
4485 a few speeches here but not answered too many questions.
4486 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I think I am doing fine answering
4487 questions.
4488 Mr. WELCH. There were 181 different provisions that

4489 were edited on the global warming report. Were you
4490 involved--that were made under the supervision of Mr. Cooney.
4491 Were you involved in approving those or making those?
4492 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. It was possible that some of those may
4493 have been called to my attention. I don't have a specific
4494 recollection because it was almost 5 years ago.
4495 Nevertheless, I was confident that Dr. James Mahoney, who was
4496 the one leading this process, would do a perfectly great job
4497 reconciling any comments that he thought might be of concern.
4498 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Welch, your time has expired.
4499 Mr. Shays.
4500 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. I am happy people don't talk
4501 about how many times I edited a simple letter, but thank God
4502 for a computer.
4503 Is there anything that you would like to put on the
4504 record before we get to our next witness?
4505 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I want to go back to the basics.
4506 Thank you, Mr. Shays.
4507 These reports are of worldwide significance, and when
4508 they were published they received worldwide acceptance and
4509 praise. The 10-Year Strategic Plan, our annual climate
4510 action reports, these are full policy and budget documents
4511 that contain expressions of the science that the scientific
4512 community itself found worthwhile. If there was something
4513 fundamentally wrong with any of the edits to the extent they

4514 made it into the document, one would have thought that some
4515 scientist somewhere would have said, "Hey, on page 85 you got
4516 it wrong." that didn't happen.
4517 We are looking in this inquiry at early edits to
4518 documents--and documents, you know, before they got into
4519 their final stages. And, again, it is--we are all very busy
4520 people. This inquiry is a bit odd in that we are not looking
4521 at what was in the documents. This is where the real
4522 information to the public is being provided. We are looking
4523 at internal deliberations and contacts and what makes it all
4524 the more ironic is the whole point of the deliberative
4525 process is to encourage the diversity of viewpoints whether
4526 they are wrong or whether they are completely right. And
4527 maybe some of them are wrong and maybe some of them are
4528 right. Maybe Mr. Cooney's edits he made, I maybe had a
4529 question of. I didn't have to, because the context sorted it
4530 out.
4531 So these documents are going to stand the test of time.
4532 This is where we should be concentrating our focus, in my
4533 view, on the budgets we need to answer these key science
4534 questions and the budgets and policies we need to make
4535 meaningful, sensible progress attacking greenhouse gas
4536 emissions in a way that grows our economy and adds American
4537 jobs.
4538 Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hearings we

4539 are having, and I think they are interesting, and I know we
4540 are going to have a lot more. But I hope we start to get
4541 beyond the issues of who said what, when, and that this new
4542 majority will start to lead and deal with the issues of where
4543 we go from here.

4544 I know they are attempting to do that by a special
4545 committee under Mr. Markey, because they are concerned that
4546 the very chairman of that committee, candidly, has been
4547 deleting the opponent--the Dean of the House has been
4548 deleting the opponent against the increasing CAFE standards.
4549 And while I may have some disappointment with this
4550 administration not taking charge and, you know, picking up
4551 the sword and leading us through this, I wish they had--I am
4552 sure if they had, I am sure you would have had a nice job
4553 doing that, Mr. Connaughton.

4554 I do know this: This is a bipartisan problem. It needs
4555 a bipartisan solution, and we need to get beyond the attacks
4556 of this administration. And if we start to work in a
4557 bipartisan way, we might get some things done.

4558 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Dr. Jack Marburger was very interested
4559 in joining, although the committee at this point in time is
4560 not ready to speak with them. I think it would be highly
4561 useful, if we are going to get to more e-mails, science
4562 statements--I am not aware that the committee has assigned
4563 any scientist to actually look at any of this. But I think

4564 it would be much more helpful if you had a scientist from the
4565 committee sitting down with a scientist with the Office of
4566 Science and Technology Policy, and the scientists could find
4567 a Science Office to sort through some of this to see how it
4568 all shaped up. Again, I think it shaped up right but it is--
4569 Mr. ISSA. So, just asking you quick, for emphasis, two
4570 things. I guess we know the culprit here.
4571 Mr. SHAYS. May I say the culprit is that this is
4572 sometimes on even when it's off. So if the committee would
4573 note this has got a problem.
4574 Mr. ISSA. Two things. One, I think you made a good
4575 point that I would hope you would reiterate, that in fact
4576 your final report has never been questioned today. The
4577 output of this process, including Dr. Hansen's complaints,
4578 bears no--no one complained in the final document, including
4579 Dr. Hansen, one; and, two, that up until now, the President's
4580 attempt to modernize the CAFE standards to dramatically
4581 increase the fuel economy that our fleet gets without
4582 penalizing safety has not been answered by this Congress yet.
4583 Would you repeat those two for--clarify them for the
4584 committee?
4585 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. The 10-Year Strategic Plan that has
4586 been of highest interest to this committee so far was roundly
4587 praised by the National Academy of Sciences after two
4588 independent reviews, after they provided it, and it's

4589 actually being used as a basis for research priorities, not
4590 just in America but around the world.
4591 And, secondly, the President in his State of the Union
4592 declared very specifically he wants to end our addiction to
4593 oil. He wants to do it by dramatic increase in mandatory
4594 renewable and alternative fuels, and he wants to do it with a
4595 significant--I would also call it a dramatic--increase in
4596 fuel economy of vehicles across all of the fleet, not just
4597 the big ones. All of them, small ones to big.
4598 And we are prepared to work with the Congress to see
4599 that legislation turned into law.
4600 I would note, by the way, that it has huge greenhouse
4601 benefits, too, and it reduces air toxins substantially at the
4602 same time.
4603 Chairman WAXMAN. Before I recognize Mr. Yarmuth, I want
4604 to state a couple of facts. One, that suggested changes from
4605 C02 were not just early draft, they were continuously pushed
4606 until the final draft, and, in fact, until the final day of
4607 the final draft. And all of those edits were not by
4608 scientists. You say you would like scientists to sit down
4609 with scientists. Let's see who would have preferred your
4610 scientists to have more of a say than your representative
4611 from the oil industry, pushing his view of science over your
4612 scientists.
4613 And then I do want to point out that the administration

4614 has authority to raise CAFE standards for passenger cars
4615 today, and you haven't chosen to do so.
4616 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. The National Academy of Sciences said
4617 if we do so, we will create a safety penalty that causes more
4618 fatalities and more traffic injuries. Certainly we can agree
4619 that is not an outcome we want.
4620 Chairman WAXMAN. I think that is a red herring. I
4621 don't think the National Academy of Sciences has that view,
4622 but certainly the auto industry does.
4623 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. That is not the case at all. The auto
4624 industry is not happy about these standards, Mr. Waxman. In
4625 fact, I would refer this committee and actually ask, if you
4626 would, the committee enter into the record the 2002 National
4627 Academy of Science Report on Fuel Economy Standards. You
4628 should read for yourself what that says.
4629 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Yarmuth.
4630 Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Connaughton, the reason we are here
4631 today is not because we are concerned what came out on the
4632 final report. Fortunately because of Christine Todd Whitman,
4633 we understand that the edits that were made--that many, both
4634 here on this committee and also many in the scientific
4635 community, represented cherry-picking of the evidence, that
4636 she decided that that painted an inaccurate portrait of the
4637 situation with regard to climate change.
4638 And I know you called it in your testimony, your

4639 prepared testimony, an intramural editorial exchange, but we
4640 are concerned here with the process and whether the process
4641 is actually fair to science or not.
4642 And we have heard a lot of evidence about
4643 cherry-picking. You disagree with some of it, but in fact
4644 your own testimony represents, in my opinion--gives an
4645 example of where evidence was cherry-picked. You defended in
4646 White House edits to delete a discussion of the human health
4647 and ecological effects of climate change. In defending that
4648 edit, you cited a 2001 National Academy of Sciences report.
4649 And you quote this sentence from that report: Quote,
4650 "Health outcomes in response to climate change are the
4651 subject of intense debate." clearly they are. But you
4652 omitted from that reference the sentence that immediately
4653 follows it and that sentence reads, quote, "Climate change
4654 has the potential to influence the frequency and transmission
4655 of infectious disease, alter heat and cold-related mortality
4656 and morbidity, and influence air and water quality. And that
4657 same section of the Academy report also says, quote,
4658 "Increased tendency towards drought, as projected by some
4659 models, is an important concern in every region of the United
4660 States. Decreased snow pack and/or earlier season melting
4661 are expected in response to warming because the freeze line
4662 will be moving to higher elevations." and, finally, "The
4663 noted increased rainfall rates have implications for

4664 pollution runoff, flood control and changes to plant and
4665 animal habitat. Any significant climate change is likely to
4666 result in increased costs because the Nation's investment in
4667 water supply infrastructure is largely tuned to the current
4668 climate."

4669 Would you not concede that a--the sentence that you
4670 included as evidence of using the National Academy of
4671 Sciences report paints a slightly different picture than if
4672 you included all of that material after that?

4673 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Actually, Congressman, I became a big
4674 fan of including all of the material, which was why the
4675 decision was made to go ahead and reference all of it.

4676 What I find in these science debates, especially among
4677 nonscientists, is the dangers always come when we try to
4678 summarize, when in fact this is a much more complex issue.
4679 That is where people end up fighting. They fight over little
4680 amounts of space. That's why this was the best solution. I
4681 was inspired by Ms. Whitman. I immediately agreed with it.
4682 This is a great document. I really recommend you to read it.

4683 I would also recommend you to read the entire NAS report
4684 before you reach final judgment. I appreciate the Chairman
4685 in his opening remarks saying there were suspicions but
4686 they're trying to sort out the facts.

4687 I would really appreciate it if you would commit to read
4688 the NAS report, because that is what I did in preparing for

4689 this hearing, because I wanted to see if these edits were in
4690 the realm of the reasonable. You could agree or disagree
4691 with them, but were they within the realm of the reasonable
4692 to be sorted out by the ultimate scientific reviewer? My
4693 judgment is maybe they were. Maybe you will come to a
4694 different one. You seem like a reasonable man. But if you
4695 will look at the whole report you will see what was trying to
4696 happen here.

4697 In addition, again, 99.5 percent already contained all
4698 of what you just described.The issue, what was missing by
4699 some reviewers--it wasn't just Mr. Cooney--it was the Office
4700 of Science and Technology Policy, too. There was missing
4701 some qualification to some of these absolute statements that
4702 justifies beyond these ongoing science investment we're
4703 making.

4704 Reasonable minds could differ over that, but that is
4705 what we should be after. But are we in the realm of the
4706 reasonable in the deliberative process that's there to call
4707 out these different viewpoints? I think so. I am hopeful
4708 that the committee will ultimately find that as well.

4709 Mr. YARMUTH. Do you understand why there is some
4710 suspicion on this committee when virtually every edit that
4711 was suggested tends to minimize the severity of the threat of
4712 global warming?

4713 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. I completely understand that, and the

4714 dilemma was because the rest of it, all of the affirmative
4715 stuff, wasn't objectionable. So you have this issue
4716 of--there was a concern that something was being left out,
4717 and so the nature of the edits was to reflect on that which
4718 was left out, without recognizing that Mr. Cooney and many
4719 others read the rest of this and said wow, this is good
4720 stuff. It's so important about the temperature trends, and
4721 all of the different impacts and the polar area, lots of good
4722 stuff in here, without any negative comment by CEQ or
4723 anything else. That's really what was going on.
4724 Mr. YARMUTH. I yield back.
4725 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Cannon.
4726 Mr. CANNON. Your last answer was really good.
4727 Recasting it, you were asked why it was obvious that you
4728 raised suspicions with edits, and your answer was that there
4729 was so much positive that there was a tendency to focus on
4730 just those things where the certainty wasn't the case. And
4731 frankly, in my last round of questioning, I raised the issue
4732 of why we are actually having this hearing. And now that
4733 we've been through most of it, I've got to say it has been
4734 really interesting.
4735 The gentleman just asked you or just suggested that,
4736 fortunately, Christine Todd Whitman had intervened, that we
4737 came out with a sound report. That is like a vindication of
4738 the process. I don't know what more you could say that is

4739 more vindicating of what you all did. People can disagree
4740 with your beliefs and the policy and a lot of other things,
4741 but it seems to me if the point of this hearing was to talk
4742 about policy, that it has worked pretty well and I--if you
4743 want to comment on that, you have done a pretty good job thus
4744 far.

4745 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. The only thing I would add to that is
4746 by doing a really smart thing, it ended up being portrayed
4747 publicly as an omission from the draft you put in of the
4748 environment and, fortunately, pieces of the draft you put in
4749 of the environment is great. It deals with all kinds of
4750 issues. So the benefit of this report was diminished. And
4751 then the benefit of this report was diminished, and it really
4752 had nothing to do with the merits of the document. It really
4753 had to do with the sensation caused that always happens when
4754 people pull back and get a look at some of the deliberative
4755 processes without focusing on the final product. We like to
4756 focus on the results. The Congress does. We do. Where the
4757 results are on a sale--

4758 Mr. CANNON. Let me talk about--Mr. Issa talked earlier
4759 about all of the power plants, the coal-fired power plants
4760 that are being built in China. And, of course, if we do coal
4761 to liquid here in America, the nice thing about that
4762 technology is you can actually take the C02 stream and
4763 sequester it, not only inexpensively, but maybe at a high

4764 profit because you can use it to enhance oil production and
4765 in other activities or just get rid of it in ways that we are
4766 learning are scientifically sound right now.
4767 So it seems to me that the net of this hearing, if
4768 anything comes out of it, ought to be to shift away from
4769 process and there ought to be a congratulations to the
4770 process used and a shift toward what you have been suggesting
4771 back and forth through your whole testimony, which is what
4772 can we do to actually mitigate the problems that may happen
4773 if man-made gasses are actually affecting the temperature of
4774 the climate as a whole.
4775 And if you just want to take a few minutes to wrap up on
4776 the things we can do, I'd very much appreciate that, because
4777 I think that is what we found in this hearing.
4778 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. Clearly we had an opportunity on
4779 renewables, especially renewable fuels; that is, the
4780 potential that has not been tapped to the extent it can. And
4781 that's why, again, we are pleased by the broad bipartisan
4782 interest in the State of the Union address as well as the
4783 advancement of renewable power.
4784 But coal remains a very important issue. Anything we do
4785 short term to mitigate greenhouse gasses is of relatively
4786 little consequence unless we figure out the zero emission
4787 coal solution. And we have to be very careful about our
4788 policies to be sure we keep an investment towards zero

4789 emission coal, because if we don't, China--and India in
4790 particular--and some other countries, their missions will far
4791 exceed ours starting in about 2008-2009 and it just runs away
4792 from us.

4793 So if we are focusing on climate policy, to me, we have
4794 got to advance this highly efficient zero emission coal
4795 agenda which, again, the Congress, working with the
4796 administration on a bipartisan basis, is doing. And we have
4797 got to bring more nuclear on-line as a hedge while we fill in
4798 with renewable fuels and we fill in even more with renewable
4799 power.

4800 We can get there. It takes some time, but we have got
4801 to sequence this right. And we can't drive our investment
4802 away from coal in America, because if we don't figure it out,
4803 it will be decades before China and India and other countries
4804 figure it out. So we have an imperative to get it right here
4805 first.

4806 Mr. CANNON. And if we get it right here first, and
4807 other nations can copy the technology that we produced and
4808 have the kinds of wonderful things in life that we have in
4809 America without the effect on the environment--

4810 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. And also, again by the way, we are
4811 competing less on the world stage for energy resources. So
4812 countries like Japan, emerging economies, that don't have
4813 access to the same natural resources we do, when we are using

4814 our own smarts, that makes other resources available to other
4815 countries that don't have it. It is good for the global
4816 economies of all, and it will lift billions of people out of
4817 poverty over time.

4818 Mr. CANNON. Poverty is the big polluter. If you don't
4819 believe that, go to Haiti and take a look at the landscape.

4820 You said something about the Federal opaque and this new
4821 chip that has come out that is 40 percent positive, I believe
4822 it is funded in large part by DOE. I think that is one of
4823 the great stories that is ready to happen. We don't know
4824 what it's going to cost yet. It's not commercial--or it is
4825 actually commercial, but not really commercial--and of the
4826 price that will really make sense. But isn't that a direct
4827 result of DOE funding and this administration's initiatives
4828 to do those things?

4829 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. In last year's State of the Union
4830 address, the President called for significant ramp-up in the
4831 research dollars towards some of these advanced solar and
4832 wind technologies. My son dragged me to NexTechs in New
4833 York, sponsored by Wired Magazine. And they had this
4834 nanosolar technology that creates little pyramids on the same
4835 panel. That's a great one.

4836 And then DOE is also looking at lower efficiency but
4837 much cheaper solar panels, so you could actually make a whole
4838 roof out of it but it doesn't cost you very much. So it

4839 might not be as efficient as the glass panels, but you get
4840 more energy from it because you can spread it out on a bigger
4841 surface. Now, that could make it more affordable for the
4842 consumer, and we can get to these zero energy or energy gives
4843 back home.

4844 Mr. CANNON. I recognize my time is almost gone.

4845 The breakthrough you already have on the table is a chip
4846 that will deliver over 40 percent efficiency as opposed to
4847 the 15 or 16 percent that we had historically. That is a
4848 tripling, almost, of efficiency, which means that the
4849 possibility of really using this wildly throughout the world,
4850 not in all uses, but supplementing our uses is close.

4851 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. These things come in waves, and I
4852 think that is a renaissance in that area and that is very
4853 exciting.

4854 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Connaughton.
4855 Thank you for being with us.

4856 We are going to continue this investigation. We expect
4857 cooperation from your office in giving us all of the
4858 information and documents that we feel we are entitled to.

4859 Mr. CONNAUGHTON. You will have our continued
4860 cooperation, Mr. Chairman.

4861 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much. Thank you for
4862 being here.

4863 Our last witness is Dr. Roy Spencer. He is the

4864 Principal Resident Scientist at the University of Alabama in
4865 Huntsville. He worked at NASA for more than a decade.
4866 I want to welcome you to the committee. Your prepared
4867 statement will be in the record in full. We would like to
4868 ask, if you would, to keep your oral statement to no more
4869 than 5 minutes.
4870 It's the policy of this committee that we put all
4871 witnesses under oath. And so if you would please rise and
4872 raise your right hand.
4873 The record will indicate the witness answered in the
4874 affirmative. And we look forward to hearing from you.

4875 STATEMENT OF ROY SPENCER, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, HUNTSVILLE

4876 Mr. SPENCER. I am sorry I wasn't here for--
4877 Chairman WAXMAN. There is a button on the base of the
4878 mike.
4879 Mr. SPENCER. I am sorry I wasn't here for Jim's
4880 testimony. As you can tell, I am not an expert on this. It
4881 has been a few years since I have done this. So I am going
4882 to read my oral testimony verbatim if you don't mind.
4883 I would like to thank the Chairman and members of this
4884 committee for the opportunity to provide my perspective on
4885 political interference on government-funded science.

4886 I have been performing NASA-funded science research for
4887 the last 22 years. Prior to my current position as a
4888 principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in
4889 Huntsville, I was senior scientist for climate studies at
4890 NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center and was an employee of
4891 NASA from 1987 until 2001.

4892 During the period of my government employment, NASA had
4893 a rule that any interaction between its scientists and the
4894 press was to be coordinated through NASA management and
4895 Public Affairs. Understandably, NASA managers do not
4896 appreciate first learning of their scientists' findings and
4897 opinions in the morning newspapers.

4898 There was no secret within NASA at that time that I was
4899 skeptical of the size of the human influence on global
4900 climate. My views were diametrically opposed to those of
4901 Vice President Gore, and I believe that they were considered
4902 to be a possible hindrance to NASA getting full congressional
4903 funding for Mission to Planet Earth.

4904 So while Dr. Hansen was freely sounding the alarm over
4905 what he believed to be dangerous levels of human influence on
4906 the climate, I tried to follow the rules. On many occasions,
4907 I avoided questioning from the media on the subject and
4908 instead directed reporters' questions to my director John
4909 Christie, who was my coworker, still is, and a university
4910 employee.

4911 Through the management chain, in fact, I was told what I
4912 was allowed to say in congressional testimony. My dodging of
4913 committee questions regarding my personal opinions on the
4914 subject of global warming was considered to be quite humorous
4915 by one committee, an exchange which is now part of the
4916 Congressional Record.
4917 I want to make it very clear that I am not complaining.
4918 I am only relating these things because I was asked to. I
4919 was, and still am, totally supportive of NASA's Earth
4920 satellite missions, but I understood that my position as a
4921 NASA employee was a privilege, not a right, and there were
4922 rules that I was expected to abide by.
4923 Partly because of those limits on what I could and
4924 couldn't say to the press and Congress, I voluntarily
4925 resigned from NASA in the fall of 2001. Even though my
4926 research responsibilities to NASA have not changed since
4927 resigning, being a university employee gives me much more
4928 freedom than government employees have in expressing
4929 opinions.
4930 So while you might think that political influence in our
4931 climate research program started with the Bush
4932 administration, that simply isn't true. It is--it has always
4933 existed. You just never heard about it because NASA's
4934 climate science program was aligned with Vice President
4935 Gore's objectives.

4936 The bias started when the U.S. Climate Research Program
4937 was first initiated. The emphasis on studying the problem of
4938 global warming presumes that a problem exists. As a result,
4939 the funding has always favored the finding of evidence for
4940 climate catastrophe rather than for climate stability. This
4941 biased approach to the funding of science serves several
4942 goals which favor specific political ideology.
4943 First, it grows government science, environmental, and
4944 policy programs, which depend upon global warming, remaining
4945 as much of a threat as possible. It favors climate
4946 researchers who quite naturally have vested interests and
4947 careers, theories, and personal incomes, myself included.
4948 And it provides justification for environmental lobbying
4949 groups whose very existence depends on sustaining public
4950 fears of environmental problems.
4951 I am not claiming that global warming science--that the
4952 global warming science program isn't needed. It is. We do
4953 need to find out how much of our current warmth is human
4954 induced and how much of it we might expect in the future.
4955 I am just pointing out that the political interference
4956 flows both ways, but not everyone has felt compelled to
4957 complain about it.
4958 This concludes my oral testimony.
4959 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

4960 [Prepared statement of Roy Spencer follows:]

4961 ******** INSERT 5-1 ********

4962 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Issa.

4963 Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4964 Dr. Spencer, your qualifications--you are a climate
4965 scientist; is that correct?

4966 Mr. SPENCER. Well, at my age, none of us were trained
4967 as climate scientists. We were trained as meteorologists or
4968 atmospheric scientists.

4969 Mr. ISSA. But you are a Ph.D.

4970 Mr. SPENCER. Ph.D. In meteorology.

4971 Mr. ISSA. And if I heard you correctly, what you said,
4972 you chafed at the Clinton administration's tendency to like
4973 Dr. Hansen's ability to get out and say what he thought and
4974 not like what you wanted to say.

4975 Mr. SPENCER. I specifically remember after my
4976 congressional testimony where I was asked to not say anything
4977 beyond something specific about my work, I asked my
4978 management how is it that Jim Hansen gets to say these things
4979 to the press and I don't. And they just shrugged their
4980 shoulders and said he is not supposed to be able to.

4981 Mr. ISSA. So there was a double standard under the
4982 Clinton administration.

4983 Mr. SPENCER. Sure.

4984 Mr. ISSA. Is there a double standard under this
4985 administration?

4986 Mr. SPENCER. Double standard in what way?

4987 Mr. ISSA. If you were still here under this
4988 administration, do you think you would be more free to talk
4989 about things which, let's say, were more aligned with the oil
4990 industry?
4991 Mr. SPENCER. No. I don't think so, because there is
4992 too much pressure to keep the global warming thing going. I
4993 don't want to make it sound like there is no such thing as
4994 global warming. You realize from reading my testimony that
4995 that is not the case. I'm just saying there is a bias that
4996 exists. The bias is pervasive, and in Jim Hansen's case he
4997 has a lot more political capital than I ever had, since he is
4998 Mr. Global Warming. And he--
4999 Mr. ISSA. And before that, he was Mr. Global Cooling.
5000 Mr. SPENCER. Oh, well, I don't know. That goes back
5001 before my time, probably.
5002 Mr. ISSA. So what you're saying, there is politics at
5003 work. There were politics at work in the last
5004 administration, and it's very difficult for scientists to
5005 deal with that, both from the administration but also from
5006 their peer group when one side or the other is sort of
5007 ganging up on the minority.
5008 Mr. SPENCER. That is right.
5009 Mr. ISSA. And this committee is a committee of
5010 jurisdiction over a lot of things in government. We can't
5011 mandate that people get along and play pretty, but we

5012 certainly can set a lot of the rules.

5013 Do you believe this committee should pass legislation
5014 that would change any aspect, and if so, what aspect of how
5015 the Clinton administration, and, I guess, the Reagan
5016 administration, the first President Bush administration, and
5017 the second President Bush administration, has had these
5018 policies since 1987. What would you change or advise us to
5019 change?

5020 Mr. SPENCER. Okay, well, I believe in what Roger Pielke
5021 Junior said in his testimony. I believe it was to this
5022 committee on January 30th or 31st. It was pretty flowery and
5023 maybe a little difficult to follow, but he basically said you
5024 cannot separate politics from science. I agree with that.

5025 [The information follows:]

5026 ******** INSERT 5-2 ********

5027 Mr. SPENCER. I would say if I changed anything, I would
5028 make sure that when science is funded, it does not favor any
5029 particular political or policy outcomes. That is what I
5030 would like to see changed.
5031 Mr. ISSA. I hope we can do that.
5032 Let me ask one more question.
5033 The analogy I used earlier of former Speaker of the
5034 House Newt Gingrich complaining about being put on the back
5035 of the plane of Air Force One in the Clinton administration,
5036 a plane that most people never get to ride on at all, isn't
5037 Dr. Hansen's complaint essentially that he is the most
5038 covered environmental person on the planet and yet he feels
5039 stifled because he can't do more freely?
5040 Mr. SPENCER. I basically agree. He has gotten to say
5041 whatever he has wanted to say about climate change, and the
5042 public can rest assured that they have already heard about
5043 every potential catastrophic climate scenario that anybody
5044 can dream up 10 times over in the media. They haven't missed
5045 a darn thing. So when Jim Hansen finally complained about
5046 some pressure, my first thinking was well, they finally
5047 started asking him to follow the rules.
5048 Mr. ISSA. And last but not least, unfortunately the
5049 600-page findings are no longer here, but you saw them being
5050 referred to by Mr. Connaughton. How do you feel about the
5051 final product on climate change?

5052 Mr. SPENCER. Which final product? That big thick
5053 thing? I didn't read it.
5054 Mr. ISSA. And why not?
5055 I know you are under oath, but honesty is unusual here.
5056 Mr. SPENCER. I spent all of my time trying to go after
5057 what I believe to be the largest uncertainty in global
5058 climate change, because I think it is important especially
5059 for the poor in humanity and I don't--I basically don't spend
5060 much of my time trying to understand all different aspects of
5061 what the administration is currently interested in in terms
5062 of the--
5063 Mr. ISSA. The Chairman is helping with the question,
5064 but it is the right one to ask. What is the greatest
5065 uncertainty right now that you are working on?
5066 Mr. SPENCER. I think the greatest uncertainty, which I
5067 am not alone in this but we are in the minority, is that we
5068 don't understand the way in which the climate system is
5069 naturally controlled by precipitation systems. All the air
5070 that you are breathing, all of the air out there in the sky,
5071 within a few days it all gets cycled through precipitation
5072 systems. Those are the systems that impart upon the air its
5073 greenhouse effect, which is mostly water vaporing clouds.
5074 Everyone admits we really don't understand them very
5075 well, but when you have people that don't have meteorological
5076 training--and I love Jim Hansen, I think he is a fantastic

5077 scientist, but he doesn't have formal meteorological
5078 training--you'll find that meteorologists are very skeptical
5079 about global warming because they understand the complexity
5080 of the atmosphere, the almost biological complexity of the
5081 atmosphere.

5082 And yet modelers come along and say well, we put some
5083 equations in and we put in all the different components and
5084 we think this is--that it's telling us the way the atmosphere
5085 works. Well, there are a lot of us, possibly a silent
5086 majority of meteorologists, that don't believe we know
5087 enough. And I think ultimately getting back to your original
5088 question, it all comes down to precipitation sites.

5089 Mr. ISSA. Isn't it true that we also don't understand
5090 the ocean and its effects? Recently we learned that every 80
5091 miles you have unique DNA in organisms?

5092 Mr. SPENCER. That's true. But also I want to point out
5093 that if global warming is indeed a problem, even though we
5094 don't understand it, we should do something about it to the
5095 extent it makes sense economically. I like to think I am a
5096 pretty good student of basic economics, which I never learned
5097 about until about age 35. I am a student of Thomas Sowell
5098 and Walter Williams, and I think the part of this whole issue
5099 I love more than the science is the economics.

5100 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The
5101 Chair recognizes himself.

5102 So it is your view, Dr. Spencer, that this consensus
5103 that the view we have heard from the National Academy of
5104 Sciences and the international group that has come up with
5105 recent conclusions, that they are incorrect. You have a
5106 dissenting opinion on this.
5107 Mr. SPENCER. Well, I hear a lot about consensus. You
5108 are going to have to tell me which consensus this is.
5109 Chairman WAXMAN. How about the National Academy of
5110 Sciences, They have a consensus point of view. Do you
5111 disagree with that point of view?
5112 Mr. SPENCER. I don't recall what their consensus
5113 happens to be. The consensus I agree with is mankind does
5114 have an influence on climate. To me that is pretty obvious.
5115 Chairman WAXMAN. Is the climate getting warmer?
5116 Mr. SPENCER. Yes.
5117 Chairman WAXMAN. Is that caused by man-made pollutants?
5118 Mr. SPENCER. I don't think we have any quantitative
5119 idea how much of that warming is due to mankind.
5120 Chairman WAXMAN. Do you think that people that disagree
5121 with you are acting more on faith than on science?
5122 Mr. SPENCER. Yes.
5123 Chairman WAXMAN. And what do you mean by that?
5124 Mr. SPENCER. Well, I learned many years ago that there
5125 are some things in science which are difficult to answer,
5126 some questions that are difficult to answer. And some

5127 people--some scientists don't realize to what extent they are
5128 going on faith when they make certain pronouncements. And
5129 it's only human nature. I mean, I don't fault us for it all.
5130 I am saying there is more faith involved in science than
5131 most people are led to believe. So those are not keepers of
5132 the truth.

5133 Chairman WAXMAN. There is such a thing as a scientific
5134 method where they evaluate the evidence and test hypotheses.
5135 Do you think those people who try to follow the scientific
5136 methods and reach the conclusion that we--

5137 Mr. SPENCER. They haven't followed the scientific
5138 method.

5139 Chairman WAXMAN. They have not?

5140 Mr. SPENCER. You cannot put the climate system in the
5141 laboratory. There is only one experiment going on. Mankind
5142 is carrying it out. And there is no way to know how much of
5143 the effect of the warming we have seen is due to radiated
5144 forcing from something like low-level clouds versus mankind.

5145 Chairman WAXMAN. You are definitely outside of the
5146 mainstream of these views on global warming and climate
5147 change. Would you acknowledge that?

5148 Mr. SPENCER. If there was a vote taken, yeah, I would
5149 probably be outside the mainstream. Yes.

5150 Chairman WAXMAN. Now, I want to read something that you
5151 wrote.

5152 "Twenty years ago as a Ph.D. Scientist, I intentionally
5153 studied the evolution versus intelligent design controversy
5154 for about 2 years and finally, despite my previous acceptance
5155 of evolutionary theory as fact, I came to the realization
5156 that intelligent design as a theory of origins is no more
5157 religious and no less scientific than evolutionism."
5158 Is that a correct statement?
5159 Mr. SPENCER. Yes. I still believe that.
5160 Chairman WAXMAN. So as a scientist, you believe that
5161 intelligent design is equal to the doctrine of evolution?
5162 Mr. SPENCER. I consider it to be a better explanation
5163 of origins, and origins are something that science basically
5164 cannot address. There are no naturalistic explanations yet
5165 for the information content of DNA or RNA. There is no
5166 explanation for the Big Bang that doesn't have to invoke new
5167 physics we've never heard of before, we have never seen. To
5168 me, that is as much faith as it is science.
5169 Chairman WAXMAN. And the whole Darwin explanation of
5170 evolution, survival of the fittest--
5171 Mr. SPENCER. Even the evolutionists are having big
5172 problems with neo-Darwinism. They realize it's not
5173 explaining what is going on biologically.
5174 Now, of course, I have got a sister that will beat me
5175 over the head because she disagrees with me on that. But I
5176 still believe that, and there are a lot of scientists that

5177 believe that, including evolutionists.

5178 Chairman WAXMAN. So as a scientist, you are out of the
5179 mainstream on global warming, and would you say you are out
5180 of the mainstream on evolution?

5181 Mr. SPENCER. Yeah, among scientists, sure. I would
5182 also like to point out that there were two medical
5183 researchers from Australia that were out of the mainstream.
5184 They were laughed at for 10 years for believing that stomach
5185 ulcers were due to bacteria. In 2005, they were awarded the
5186 Nobel Prize. So I don't mind being out of the mainstream.

5187 Chairman WAXMAN. There is no question in scientific
5188 history that people who are out of the mainstream later are
5189 proved to be correct, but that was based on scientific
5190 evidence.

5191 Mr. SPENCER. And statistically I probably agree with
5192 you that consensus among scientists usually is more right
5193 than wrong.

5194 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

5195 The gentleman from Utah, Mr. Cannon.

5196 Mr. CANNON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5197 You know, I am wondering how we got to the point of
5198 discussing intelligent design here except to somehow cast a
5199 shadow on the witness' integrity. I think that he has made
5200 casual references to very deep studies, and I would suggest
5201 that the majority look at those studies and deal with that

5202 issue on its own merits, because I think what we are dealing
5203 with here really comes down to the question of should we be
5204 asking questions, especially in an environment so complex as
5205 the Earth's atmosphere, or should we say there is a
5206 mainstream and if you are outside the mainstream, you are not
5207 accepting?
5208 The whole point of the scientific method is to ask, yes,
5209 and the key is to come up with a good question to ask.
5210 And I think, Dr. Spencer, when you talk about there is
5211 only one experiment, that is what is happening around us.
5212 There are things we can measure in that environment, right?
5213 Mr. SPENCER. Yes.
5214 Mr. CANNON. And are we doing some of that measuring?
5215 Mr. SPENCER. I am sorry. You are asking about the
5216 measurements?
5217 We do the satellite temperatures. John Christie and I
5218 were not the only ones, as the Chairman is well aware. There
5219 is another group in California that is also doing that now,
5220 and they get answers very close to us. They get somewhat
5221 warmer global temperatures. There is Jim Hansen and others
5222 that have a global--
5223 Mr. CANNON. And they are measurements, right?
5224 Mr. SPENCER. All of these measurements have errors. We
5225 don't know how big the errors are, but we think we are all in
5226 agreement that all of these measurements do show warming.

5227 There is still some argument about how much warming there is.
5228 Mr. CANNON. There's an argument about how much warming,
5229 about how much that is going to affect the sea level. There
5230 are arguments about everything in the whole system, including
5231 how good the model is that you use to predict.
5232 You said earlier there is only one experiment, and the
5233 model, I think you were going to say, the model is woefully
5234 inadequate in dealing with the reality which we are still
5235 trying to figure out.
5236 Mr. SPENCER. That is my belief, and here's where we hit
5237 faith again. Jim Hansen has faith that he has the important
5238 physics that is necessary to show that you--the climate
5239 system is going to react from addition of man-made greenhouse
5240 gasses. Okay.
5241 Now the climate modelers will tell you that the climate
5242 models do replicate the basic behavior of the climate system.
5243 That is true. I agree with them. They do. The question
5244 is, though, how the atmosphere will change from this very
5245 small amount of rate enforcing that mankind is causing, less
5246 than 1 percent, of the natural greenhouse effect, which
5247 weather has control over. We are putting in our own extra 1
5248 percent. How is the system going to respond?
5249 Jim Hansen and some other modelers think the system is
5250 going to respond by punishing us, that its going to amplify
5251 the little bit of warming from that.

5252 Mr. CANNON. That is a belief you are saying. That is
5253 Jim Hansen's belief.
5254 Mr. SPENCER. It's a belief based on the physics that he
5255 put in his model, that the physics he put in his model are
5256 sufficient to describe how the system is going to react to
5257 our addition of greenhouse gasses.
5258 Mr. CANNON. I think it would have been fascinating to
5259 have a longer discussion with Dr. Hansen, because I believe
5260 you are correct that a large part of what he is doing is
5261 justifying his longstanding view that catastrophic bad things
5262 are going to happen based upon--what do you call them--the
5263 inertia, the massive inertia and these slight changes.
5264 Mr. SPENCER. And I don't mind going on the record
5265 saying he may well be right. As a scientist, he may well be
5266 right.
5267 Mr. CANNON. Isn't that the point? We have to ask the
5268 question, is he right? He has posited an idea and now he has
5269 tried to quash the questions because he's drawn a conclusion,
5270 and that conclusion has become a conclusion of faith instead
5271 of a conclusion of inquiry of science.
5272 Mr. SPENCER. I am sure he doesn't look at that it way,
5273 but I do.
5274 Mr. CANNON. I think he was pretty clear about it and
5275 what is evil and what is good.
5276 Mr. SPENCER. He has done a good job of showing

5277 quantitatively one possible explanation for the warming in
5278 the last century, and that increases his confidence because
5279 he claims if he combines the effects of volcanoes and
5280 aerosols and C02 and he tinkers around enough with the model,
5281 he can actually get something that looks like the temperature
5282 changes over the last century.
5283 So what he has done is come up with one potential
5284 explanation for the current global temperatures and how they
5285 evolved over the last century.
5286 Mr. CANNON. And that becomes an augmentor of his faith,
5287 is what you are saying.
5288 Mr. SPENCER. I wish I could remember the name. There
5289 was a lady who worked at NCAR who did some research, some
5290 sociological research at NCAR about climate modelers, and
5291 what she learned was that they only tend to discuss the big
5292 uncertainties among themselves, but when it comes to public
5293 consumption the uncertainties are greatly--
5294 Mr. CANNON. Mr. Hansen talked about that when he talked
5295 about trying to overcome the gap between what the public
5296 understands about the catastrophic possibilities and the
5297 science. What he meant there is not that they want people to
5298 understand the complexities of the discussion, but he wants
5299 them to understand the conclusion that he believes is
5300 imminent.
5301 Mr. SPENCER. Yeah. From the people I talked to in the

5302 public, I think everyone knows what the consensus view is.

5303 Mr. CANNON. The consensus is out there very loud, and

5304 promoted by people who want a conclusion.

5305 I have some technical questions about what is going on

5306 with global warming, but I do want to ask one other thing.

5307 Mr. Issa, I think, used the expression "gang up." And when

5308 scientists come to a conclusion and gang up, that is some of

5309 a "thugocracy," you know, when thugs have control.

5310 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

5311 Mr. CANNON. This is the end of the question.

5312 In the first place, it means bad science when people get

5313 together and decide who's inside and who is out. And

5314 secondly, it means those who are on the inside continue to

5315 get the money. Isn't that the case?

5316 Mr. SPENCER. Generally, yes. But I don't think you are

5317 going to change scientists. Scientists are human, too, and

5318 they have their own biases and political opinions, as do I.

5319 And you are not going to change that, I think, getting back

5320 to the original suggestion maybe the committee can try to

5321 make sure that different political and policy outcomes are

5322 respected, you know, in funding the science.

5323 Mr. CANNON. Thank you. I yield back.

5324 Chairman WAXMAN. Yes.

5325 Mr. Yarmuth.

5326 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5327 Dr. Spencer, I would like you to either tell me whether
5328 you agree or disagree with this statement: When the
5329 government speaks on science, it should present an accurate
5330 and honest view of the current state of the science.
5331 Mr. SPENCER. That would make sense, yes.
5332 Mr. YARMUTH. And it should, to all extents possible,
5333 prevent ideology, dogma, and corporate considerations from
5334 influencing its description of the current state of the
5335 science?
5336 Mr. SPENCER. I guess, in an ideal world.
5337 Mr. YARMUTH. And while you have some evidence, claim to
5338 have some evidence, that such activity took place or such
5339 influence on undesirable influence took place under the
5340 Clinton administration, you don't have a judgment as to
5341 whether it has taken place or has not taken place under the
5342 current administration.
5343 Mr. SPENCER. No. I don't really have any judgment, but
5344 I wouldn't be surprised. I mean, I don't know whether it has
5345 been mentioned in this hearing, but NASA is an executive
5346 branch agency, and ultimately our boss is the President. And
5347 if something is not agreeing with the President's policy
5348 direction, I can see pressure being made. I mean, as a
5349 scientist, I wouldn't like it. But then I don't have to be a
5350 government employee, do I? So I resigned.
5351 Mr. YARMUTH. I would ask you whether you would consider

5352 it a legitimate role for the Congress to--when it suspects
5353 that such influence has taken place, that it inquire,
5354 investigate whether that is the fact and whether the public
5355 is, in fact, getting a fair and honest and accurate
5356 description of the state of the science.
5357 Mr. SPENCER. Yeah, as long as the Congress does that
5358 fairly.
5359 Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you.
5360 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Spencer. We
5361 appreciate your testimony.
5362 That concludes the hearing for today, and we stand
5363 adjourned.
5364 [Whereupon, at 2:50 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

**********
CONTENTS
**********

STATEMENTS OF PHILIP COONEY, FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE WHITE HOUSE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY; JAMES HANSEN, DIRECTOR, NASA GODDARD INSTITUTE FOR SPACE STUDIES; AND GEORGE DEUTSCH, FORMER NASA PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICER PAGE 20

STATEMENT OF PHILIP A. COONEY PAGE 21

STATEMENT OF JAMES E. HANSEN PAGE 26

STATEMENT OF GEORGE C. DEUTSCH III PAGE 30

STATEMENT OF JAMES L. CONNAUGHTON, CHAIRMAN, WHITE HOUSE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PAGE 146

STATEMENT OF ROY SPENCER, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, HUNTSVILLE PAGE 207

**********
INDEX OF INSERTS
**********

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 4

******** INSERT 1-1 *******

PAGE 6

******** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

PAGE 7

******** INSERT 1-2 ********

PAGE 8

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 12

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 14

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 15

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 17

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 19

******** INSERT 1-3 ********

PAGE 25

******** INSERT 1-4 ********

PAGE 29

******** INSERT 1-5 ********

PAGE 34

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 36

******** COMMITTEE INSERT ********

PAGE 42

******** INSERT 4-1 ********

PAGE 150

******** INSERT 5-1 ********

PAGE 211

******** INSERT 5-2 ********

PAGE 214