

3 November 2009.

Archbishop Vincent Nichols  
Westminster Cathedral  
Ashley Place  
London SW1P 1QJ

Dear Archbishop Nichols

Last Friday the airwaves hummed to the news that you, together with your counterparts from other “faith communities” in the country, had collectively lobbied Ed Miliband MP in connection with the forthcoming conference in Copenhagen dedicated to so-called climate change. The BBC for one reported that you had declared it to be “**a moral issue**”. I agree. So much so, in fact, that I venture to proffer the suggestion that the ethical underpinning of the cause to which you have now committed the weight of your office warrants the closest possible scrutiny.

But where to begin? Well, as the beautiful and benign white Witch of the North said to Dorothy, “It’s usually best to start at the beginning”. Good advice! So then, what are we being asked to believe by the proselytisers of anthropogenic global warming, curiously morphed to “climate change” - any idea why? No? Just ask and I’ll deliver chapter and verse from none other than the august Tyndall Centre no less (en passant, Working Paper No. 58). But, anyway, in the sort of transcendental terminology favoured by you and others of a theocratic persuasion, we are being asked to accept that, within the atmosphere, a trace carbon compound, but one which happens also to have been ordained by God to be the fundamental building block of life itself, nevertheless contains within it the seeds of Armageddon. And that by virtue only of what is no more than a minute increase in its overall concentration - how about glaciations (please note not runaway greenhouse effects) in the geological record, during which CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were more than ten times those of today? Does that pass the probability test, shall we call it? Hardly! Or - in the alternative, is the very notion no better than just stark lunacy? Sane persons might well be inclined to think so. Or, in a third alternative, is it just a vast farrago of lies driven by avarice, the lust for power, the lure of fiscal opportunism and the seduction of imposing social control down to the minutest level of detail? Yes, indeed, **THAT overall is a moral issue of some magnitude!**

Let us now shift attention, shall we, to the tactics deployed by the proponents of AGW - most particularly, but by no means exclusively, by those boasting scientific credentials? In furtherance of their latter day, dogma driven ideology (in fact, very ‘latter day’ - let it not be forgotten that forty years ago it was catastrophic global cooling that was the environmentalist flavour of the month!), these intellectual Titans and models of altruistic integrity:

- have sought to suggest that their unsupported word alone must be accepted that the world was/is at a tipping point to destruction and, in consequence, that this was the defining challenge of the epoch. **That is a moral issue.**
- have proposed that, in order to promote their message, factual accuracy (let’s call it the ‘truth’; why not?) should be sacrificed. **That is a moral issue.**
- have diverted rivers of treasure into a self-serving cultist delusion, for which there exists not a scintilla of evidence drawn from the real world - and that, moreover, in one riven by inequality of opportunity, destitution and outright starvation. **That is a moral issue.**
- have instead claimed infallibility for, and derived “evidence” from, highly and necessarily subjective General Circulation Models. **That is a moral issue.**
- in defiance of time honoured scientific protocols, have obdurately refused to share data/computational algorithms with the wider scientific community. **That is a moral issue.**
- have thereby denied the most basic scientific requirement for verification and replication. **That is a moral issue.**
- have made risible claims that lack of resources prevented the scrupulous retention of records and data. **That is a moral issue.**
- have concocted data with nefarious intent. **That is a moral issue.**
- have subverted the much vaunted ‘peer review’ process by the insistence on being assessed only by chosen colleagues/collaborators. **That is a moral issue.**
- have wilfully suppressed data that was inconvenient. **That is a moral issue.**
- have wilfully misrepresented data. **That is a moral issue.**
- have wilfully misrepresented the words and the views of dissenting scientists of great distinction. **That is a moral issue.**
- have actively worked to suppress scientific debate. **That is a moral issue.**

- have ignored/airbrushed/ physically vandalised evidence that might be contra-indicative. **That is a moral issue.**
- have traduced and impugned the motives of anyone, but especially scientific peers, who challenged or even questioned their mendacious orthodoxy. **That is a moral issue.**
- have actively threatened the livelihoods and reputations of scientific practitioners who, for conscientious reasons, have withheld consent to the prevailing fashion. **That is a moral issue.**
- have spuriously claimed overwhelming consensus for their views and denied the existence of disagreement within the scientific community at large. **That is a moral issue.**
- have subverted prestigious scientific journals hitherto generally acknowledged as rigorous and even handed outlets for scientific speculation and debate. **That is a moral issue.**
- have subverted the integrity of universities and academic institutions to the disapproval and even outrage of rank and file members,. **That is a moral issue.**
- have conducted alarmist publicity stunts, whilst simultaneously flatly refusing to entertain expert evidence which counterbalanced the Kafkaesque message. **That is a moral issue.**
- have engaged in child abusive propaganda, the sole aim of which was to instil fear. **That is a moral issue.**
- have striven to brainwash children by disseminating material criticised by a High Court judge, whilst simultaneously failing to disclose the caveats without which he declared that to be unlawful. **That is a moral issue.**
- have persistently promoted the self-serving pronouncements of “scientists” whose only authentic claim to fame has rested on an unblemished record of failure. **That is a moral issue.**
- have continued, at tax payers’ expense, to provide hopelessly flawed weather predictions - in passing, in contrast to equivalent services provided by competitors, whose record has been as conspicuously right as the Hadley Centre’s are invariably wrong. In passing, of course, it has to be acknowledged that the competition does routinely have recourse to grossly underhand tactics such as relying upon plausible physics which, naturally, one recognises is reprehensible. **That is a moral issue.**
- have promoted solutions to a non-problem, which have involved clearing vast swathes of natural habitat to make way for monocultural plantation for so-called bio-fuels. **That is a moral issue.**
- have thereby promoted massive environmental and habitat degradation and, as a consequence, quite likely species endangerment/extinction as well. **That is a moral issue.**
- have made yet more precarious the lives of the dispossessed by diverting land usage away from food production to fuel manufacture. Indeed, for many in the AGW movement, human beings are known to be regarded essentially as a vermin to be culled (though never them, of course). **That is a moral issue.**

So, in summary then, what we have here is a grotesque inverted pyramid of dross constructed on the crest of a sand dune, which drains rivers of treasure and, just as importantly, human attention away from environmental concerns of real and genuine consequence. And, as I say, it is to this that you have lent the weight and prestige of your office albeit, fortunately, not that of the Catholic Church as a whole. For that you must first be elevated to the top job and, in this instance to his great credit, the Bishop of Rome has expressly cautioned against too readily adopting climate change propaganda in the absence of solid scientific evidence to buttress it. Your Brother-in-Christ, George Pell, Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney, has been even more forthright. For him, AGW is at best a delusion, at worst a systematic fraud. He is right - about the latter especially. Has then your politically correct gesture not simply served to muddy the waters? Are you able to define the position of your Church in this, allegedly, “the defining challenge of the age”? Or should we be looking higher up the chain of command?

I rather fancy so. Yes, as you have so tellingly stated, **this is a moral issue!**

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham

Cc: Benedict XVI                      Archbishop of Canterbury                      Archbishop of York                      Bishop of London  
       Abbot, Downside Abbey        Ed Miliband MP                      As the spirit moves