

This letter is a follow-up of Tim Yeo's letter, where he tells me that he can not change his mind.

6 April 2008

Mr. Tim Yeo MP  
Chairman  
Environmental Audit Committee  
House of Commons  
London SW1A 0AA

Dear Mr. Yeo

My attention has been drawn to your response of 6 March 2008 addressed to Mr. Hans Schreuder. It is not my intention to engage in any detailed way with what was evidently a longer correspondence than simply this reply. I am struck, however, by two observations you make. They warrant comment. They are:

1. *More importantly, the fact remains that the overwhelming scientific consensus takes a different view.*
2. *This is surely not an argument for embracing any of the myriad theories advanced by climate change sceptics.*

I'm intrigued to know why you should think that the first is important. Do you really suppose that science is about consensus? Where do you imagine modern science would be if Copernicus had held to the prevailing consensus? Or Galileo, or Vesalius, or Newton, or Lyell, or Faraday, or Weggenner, or Dalton, or Lavoisier, or Priestley, or Mendeleev, or Darwin, or Pasteur, or Lister, or Einstein, or Boltzman, or Bohr, or Heisenberg, or Planck, or Schrodinger, - or, or, or, or. **Science is not a democracy!** Science is a meritocracy – unpalatable to Labour and LibDem members of your committee, though this may be. Science requires not modelled 'scenarios' mendaciously morphed into predictions by vested interests; it requires empirical, observational evidence - in the AGW hypothesis, conspicuous by its absence.

A very modest increase in average global temperatures since the 1850s, marked by the gradual emergence from three centuries of a little ice age, is taken by the prevailing orthodoxy to be a body in the library. Even if that were true, it proves neither that the cadaver has been murdered nor that the dastardly deed was perpetrated by Col. Mustard. In short, the proposition that global warming has been either dangerous (it hasn't) or is the result of human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> is a non sequitur of truly egregious proportions, given the malignant consequences that flow from it.

With regard to 2, this is not only an amazing sentence but also, given the role of your committee, quite an alarming one. The first thing to be said, of course, is that AGW is not a self-evident hypothesis. It is for those who wish to espouse it to demonstrate its validity, not for sceptics to have to disprove it. Secondly, let me propose a small wager between the two of us. I will bet that you cannot name more than two general prevailing explanations for the modest global warming that has occurred. The first relates to man made emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, for which changes in land uses since the mid-1800s has presented AGW science with unresolved problems. In fact, this anthropogenic effect is probably enough by itself to account for most of the temperature rise of the past 150 years. In any event, the manner of its incorporation into GCMs is highly questionable. The second is natural variation, amongst which the sun is almost certainly the most significant, recent findings of a certain northern university notwithstanding. If you can add even one more to these from amongst "the myriad of theories advanced by climate change sceptics", I will cheerfully donate, say, £100 to a charity of your choice, and be glad of the lesson learned. If you can't, you do likewise towards the welfare of a group of parentless children in Thailand I currently help to sustain. That's pretty fair, isn't it, and not too blanchingly expensive, if either of us loses in a good cause?

What you have written is essentially an appeal to authority not to reason. As such, it is the province of religion not science. If it is authority that your committee craves, in your position, it is incumbent upon you - is it not - to ask why, far from being settled, the science of climate change is in fact a maelstrom of scientific controversy amongst practitioners, many of the highest calibre. Academic sceptics number thousands - from pretty much the entire Russian Academy of Sciences to legions of fellow scientists in the West, many of them IPCC contributors, including lead authors.

If the science is so secure, you might also care to ask yourself a couple of other simple questions, which can legitimately be drawn from the record. There are many more to choose from!

- Why does AGW science require recourse to fraud to buttress its cause, for example the now notorious Mann, Bradley, Hughes hockey stick graph, excoriated by the Wegman Committee appointed by Congress?
- Why should a High Court judge find Mr. Gore's film inaccurate to the extent that the Government was obliged to issue correctives, in order to remain lawful in promoting its use within schools?
- Why does AGW science claim an overwhelming scientific consensus, when this can easily be shown to demonstrably false? Perhaps you're unaware that the UN, for the first time towards the end of 2007, released to the web the comments of reviewers who assessed the drafts of the WG1 report of AR4, together with IPCC editors' responses. Three hundred and eight reviewers commented on WG1, but only thirty two commented on more than three chapters. Only five commented on all eleven chapters. Only half commented on more than one chapter. The critical Chapter 9, in which the near certainty of AGW is asserted, had comments from only sixty two reviewers. Of these, fifty five had self-evident potential vested interests. Four turned out to have less transparent potential conflicts of interest. Two rejected the findings of the report outright, and the last made only a single comment on the entire chapter. Overwhelming scientific consensus? As Mr. McEnroe would have said in his heyday: "You can NOT be serious!"

Lastly, though not of the official record, you may care to know that the mighty Royal Society has been so disquieted by contributions from a non-scientist, that it felt obliged to close its website blog, not just on the topic of global warming itself, but in entirety! "Why?", you may fairly ask - if the science is so secure? Perhaps you'd care to see documentary support for this claim? By all means, just let me know; I'll be happy to supply it. I am that layman.

Your committee serves in a fiduciary capacity of considerable responsibility. It potentially exercises great influence. What is disturbing and rather shocking about your two statements is that they suggest beyond much doubt that, at a personal level, no attempt has been made to engage yourself with the science in any discernable way at all. If this is the case, which I believe it to be, then what is true of you will be true of the rest of your committee members, one imagines. This represents a reprehensible dereliction of duty.

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham

cc: Members of the Committee      Prime Minister      Mr. David Cameron MP      Mr. Nick Clegg MP  
As the spirit moves

Encls: Letters to Lord Butler & Rajendra Pachauri      E-mail to ABC News