

2 June 2010.

Lord Rees
 President
 The Royal Society
 6-9 Carlton House Terrace
 London SW1Y 5AG.

Dear Lord Rees

Science is organized scepticism and the consensus must shift in light of the evidence." Lord Martin Rees, President of the Royal Society (May 28, 2010)

To be sure, what an inspirational message – the more so in the light of another from your manifestly objective predecessor (Oh yes, indeed!) that we should “Respect the facts.” Perhaps you, he or The Royal Society collectively would care to educate and enlighten “crackpots” by defining which facts, or should one perhaps say “Whose facts?”

In the meantime, let us move on. You have been busy of late, and another quotation follows, albeit taken from the verbiage surrounding this letter’s opening statement. You state:

“The Society has always encouraged debate particularly through our discussion meetings and our journals.”
 [My emphasis]

That is a lie. Far from encouraging debate, the RS has proactively done everything within its power to suppress it. For this uncompromising accusation, you are invited to revisit enclosed correspondence from 2007 (below). Let me remind you that, on 31 July 2007, the Society, overnight and without warning, closed down its website forum – not simply the so-called climate change string but in entirety. Why? Because, after a few exchanges, it could not countenance well sourced contra-contributions – as it happens, mostly from me. Specific to this episode, your attention is directed to my letter of 1 August 2007 - for ease of reference enclosed herewith.

But even now you hide behind equivocation and assayed obfuscation.

“It is three years since the Society published a document specifically designed to help the general public get a full understanding of climate change.”

That is a lie. Let me at least use language that is simple, plain speaking and unequivocal. The RS’s “simple guide” was nothing more than an exercise in environmentalist propaganda based upon science that was, at best, incomplete and misleading and, at worst, plainly mendacious. In this regard, you are invited to revisit correspondence between us – from me dated 14, 17, 23 April 2007 and from you dated 20 April. Furthermore, it deliberately misrepresented sceptical arguments. This malfeasance it sought to justify by unsubstantiated and defamatory references to “those who seek to distort and undermine the science of climate change and deny the seriousness of the potential consequences of global warming”.

“Nothing in recent developments has changed or weakened the underpinning science of climate change.”

That is a lie. Neither should the Society flatter itself that the implosion of the “science of climate change”, as defined by it, is a consequence of recent events only - although, to be sure, climate scientists endorsed by the RS have been shown to have:

- consistently ignored and subverted time honoured scientific protocols;
- falsely claimed evidence from peer reviewed sources which were, in fact, fictitious;
- employed tainted and even false data;
- manipulated computational algorithms;
- concocted actual data;
- vandalised contra-indicative indications;
- ignored multi-stranded and irrefutable historical fact;
- wilfully falsified attempts to question their fraudulent orthodoxy;
- subverted scientific journals, hitherto held to be authoritative;
- ensured that so-called peer review was undertaken only within a clique of scientific fraudsters;
- venomously traduced the motives of all who were moved to question their orthodoxy;
- amongst their peers, systematically “sent to Coventry”, career damaged or otherwise tyrannised any who queried their conclusions.

Confirmation of this has come not simply from leaked e-mails or the shamelessly pre-ordained whitewashes flowing therefrom. No, indeed. Confirmation has come from findings of congressional committees, excoriating verdicts from across the world of numerous scientists of impeccable character and immense distinction, including Nobel Laureates as well as one late President of the American National Academy of Scientists. It has come from the “outing” of systematic fraud and grotesque exaggeration from within the IPCC itself. It has come from the relentless failure of AGW science to offer evidence of any kind drawn from the real world either for the role of carbon dioxide in influencing climate change at all or even for any unequivocal increase in global mean temperatures during the last century and a half. However, under your stewardship as well as that of your benighted predecessor, proponents of a spurious science, attracting vast tax payer funding, has been sustained, in no small part, by a veneer of respectability lent to it through the connivance of the RS. With you at the helm, the RS, instead of advancing the precepts of the Enlightenment, has opted rather to try and steamroller a regression to an unquestioning deference to an amorphous and unaccountable authority. Even now honesty is not for you and the RS the product of an innate impulse. Reassessment of the Society’s stance arises only because this has been forced upon it by a small caucus of its own fellows. But for this protest, long overdue one has to add, there is little doubt that it would have continued a policy of unqualified support for the scientific turpitude favoured by the vaunted consensus.

Prof. Richard Lindzen was correct recently in stating that climate change sceptics should no longer be described as such. Why? Because, by implication, the label posited the existence of a plausible hypothesis with which to engage. There has never been a plausible scientific case for AGW, only a pretext for a collectivist, mawkish, pseudo-environmental interference in the democratic process allied to fiscal opportunism. President Vaclav Klaus of the Czech Republic is likewise correct in stating that AGW is not ultimately a scientific issue at all, but an ethical one – the dichotomy between freedom and coercion. So, to the list of adjectives above, let us also add “unscrupulous”, shall we?

In his report of the Society’s re-evaluation of its position, Roger Harrabin writes as follows of one of your colleagues:

“This is a very serious challenge to the way the society operates,” I was told. “In the past we have been able to give advice to governments as a society without having to seek consensus of all the members.”

I am unaware of the identity of this gentleman. I will simply comment by noting that his complaint tends to be one fairly predictable outcome of a reckless squandering of goodwill and trust in what hitherto may have been regarded as a venerable, dispassionate and principled institution. Whilst not overlooking the contributions of other luminaries such as Messrs. Houghton and May for example, that, more than any others, is the baleful legacy of your predecessor and of you yourself.

Well done!

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham

Cc: Prime Minister	Mr. Nick Clegg MP	Mr. C. Huhne MP	Lord Lawson	Lord Leach
Dr. John Pethica, Vice-President, Royal Society,		Sir Alan Rudge	Mr. Mark Thompson,	
Director General, BBC	Sir Michael Lyons, Chairman, BBC Trust		As the spirit moves	

1 August 2007.

Your ref: PRS/CCG

Lord Rees
President
The Royal Society
6-9 Carlton House Terrace
London SW1Y 5AG.

Dear Lord Rees

Yes, WE have caused global warming

With initial incredulity which rapidly turned to merriment, yesterday I entered the RS website's 'Share Your Views' section only to discover that the sub-section to which recently I have been making some fairly chunky contributions had been closed. Not just that. No, indeed; rather the entire section had been shut down! To begin with as well, a rather delicious little legend popped up on to my screen. I was a bit slow witted, and should instantly have copied it, as it mysteriously vanished within just a few minutes - probably wisely. The message, as it appeared, was that depicted above - I cannot answer for the precision of the font or the pantone shade!

Now, I don't wish to flatter myself that it is just I alone who has so shaken the foundations of the great Royal Society that it has felt obliged to conclude that off-message emails were becoming simply too hazardous and too undermining to permit continuation of the debate initiated by the Society itself, no less. What is clear is that a craven decision has been taken, and reasonable grounds exist for entertaining precisely such a conjecture. Well, well!

In any event, certain questions seem to follow. From what sources does the RS derive its own finances? Having initiated a public debate, does it have the right - morally but, more importantly, legally - to deploy arbitrary silencing tactics in the face of contributions which it just happens to find discomfiting? Is the RS collectively a corpus of scientists or of propagandists? Is it independent, or is it hopelessly under the thumb of politicians and outside lobby groups such as Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and others similarly of the enviro-fascist tendency?

Not so long ago, this country possessed two truly great institutions not of the state itself - and this time, unlike the second paragraph, the word "great" is used without sarcasm. They were the Royal Society and the BBC. On the question of global warming (or 'climate change', to use the current spin), both have had their integrity and independence thoroughly compromised and suborned by vested interests. Well, that might yet permanently remain so, but not without protest from some at least.

For the citizen at large, it is difficult to stand in the way of depraved and co-ordinated bias delivered relentlessly by megaphone through every organ of mass communication. I can think of one way only that might stand a remote chance of having a countering effect. That is to go on causing you personally, as well as the RS collectively, the greatest amount of embarrassment that can possibly be contrived. In the light of its shameless stance to date, this may well prove to be quite a challenge. If it is unsuccessful, the present discreditable situation will no doubt persist. If the tactic works, however, then it will achieve what should have been adopted as a modus operandi long ago (not to say ab initio), namely the conduct of an open, honest and professionally courteous debate between you at the RS and your peers of comparable standing, who do not agree with the position taken by the Society. You know, as well as I do, that eminent scientists fitting that description exist in cohorts around the world. THERE IS NO SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS and, even if there was, of itself, on scientific grounds alone that would be an irrelevance anyway.

I look forward to hearing from you, but will not be holding my breath. It would be illuminating to have answers, in particular at this stage, to the questions posed in paragraph 3.

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham

Circulation: As wide as can be contrived.