

Subject: Re: CRU hack - correspondence related to IPCC?

From: Jonathan Overpeck <jto@email.arizona.edu>

Date: Sun, 22 Nov 2009 09:58:47 -0700

To: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@ocean-klima.de>, Tim Osborn <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk>

CC: Eystein Jansen <Eystein.Jansen@geo.uib.no>, David Rind <drind@giss.nasa.gov>, Bette Otto-Bleisner <ottobli@ncar.ucar.edu>, cddhr@giss.nasa.gov, joos <joos@climate.unibe.ch>, Ricardo Villalba <ricardo@lab.cricyt.edu.ar>, Susan Solomon <Susan.Solomon@noaa.gov>, Jouzel@lsce.saclay.cea.fr, Valerie Masson-Delmotte <Valerie.Masson@cea.fr>, Dominique Raynaud <raynaud@lgge.obs.ujf-grenoble.fr>, jean-claude.duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr, john.f.mitchell@metoffice.gov.uk, peltier@atmosph.physics.utoronto.ca, rramesh@prl.res.in, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], Keith Briffa <k.briffa@uea.ac.uk>, Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk> BC

Hi Stefan and friends - so much for privacy or the law. A new law for these deniers.

I haven't yet found the time to look through these very far, but here's a link of what I think has been stolen from CRU. I don't know if they've been altered. It wouldn't surprise me.

<http://www.anelegantchaos.org/cru/index.php>

You can download files in their entirety, or search them.

Best, Peck

On 11/22/09 5:51 AM, "Stefan Rahmstorf" <rahmstorf@ocean-klima.de> wrote:

Dear Tim,

now the CRU was hacked and many (all?) mails going back to 1996 are published all over the internet, I am wondering whether this concerns all our correspondence in relation to the writing of the AR4. Do you know this yet?

Thanks, Stefan

Jonathan T. Overpeck
Co-Director, Institute of the Environment
Professor, Department of Geosciences
Professor, Department of Atmospheric Sciences

Address (just delete the PO Box if FEDEX):

Institute of the Environment
University of Arizona
845 N. Park Ave. Suite 532
PO Box 210158b
Tucson, AZ 85721
direct tel: +1 520 626-4364
Email: jto@u.arizona.edu
PA Lou Regalado +1 520 626-4345
regalado@email.arizona.edu

Subject: Re: CRU hack - correspondence related to IPCC?

From: Eystein Jansen <eystein.jansen@bjerknes.uib.no>

Date: Sun, 22 Nov 2009 21:31:53 +0100

To: Stefan Rahmstorf <rahmstorf@ozean-klima.de>

CC: Jonathan Overpeck <jto@email.arizona.edu>, Tim Osborn <t.osborn@uea.ac.uk>, Eystein Jansen <Eystein.Jansen@geo.uib.no>, David Rind <drind@giss.nasa.gov>, Bette Otto-Bleisner <ottobli@ncar.ucar.edu>, cddhr@giss.nasa.gov, joos <joos@climate.unibe.ch>, Ricardo Villalba <ricardo@lab.criicyt.edu.ar>, Susan Solomon <Susan.Solomon@noaa.gov>, Jouzel@dsm-mail.saclay.cea.fr, Valerie Masson-Delmotte <Valerie.Masson@cea.fr>, Dominique Raynaud <raynaud@lgge.obs.ujf-grenoble.fr>, jean-claude.duplessy@lsce.cnrs-gif.fr, john.f.mitchell@metoffice.gov.uk, peltier@atmosph.physics.utoronto.ca, ramesh@prl.res.in, [REDACTED], Keith Briffa <k.briffa@uea.ac.uk>, Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk> *BC*

Hi,

The thing is on the news here as well.

I believe from skimming through things that Stefan's assesment is correct.

Yet undoubtedly there will be a number of attempts to misinterpret.

My statement to the local media has been to a) Hacking is a crime, 2) emails are normally written in an informal style, 3) Science is evaluated through published literature.

I assume this will be with us for some weeks and then fade away.

Cheers
Eystein

*→ so, emails
aren't subject to
any scholar's
privilege...*

Den 22. nov. 2009 kl. 19.15 skrev Stefan Rahmstorf:

Thanks for that link, Peck.

Did a quick search for my name and find this stolen archive very incomplete - only a small subset of the mails I have written regarding our IPCC chapter is at this link, only about a dozen. I'm sure you remember I bombarded you with lots more mails...

From what I remember (and from those written by myself that I just checked), I do not think any mails we exchanged are at all compromising - if anything, these mails show a decent and honest discussion about how to write that chapter in a way that does justice to the published literature. If the skeptics were hoping to find any gory details about the corrupt way in which IPCC chapters come into existence, they'll probably be very disappointed.

Cheers, Stefan

—
Stefan Rahmstorf
www.ozean-klima.de
www.realclimate.org

Eystein Jansen, prof., Director
Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research
Allégaten 55
N5007 Bergen
phone: +47-55583491, mobile: + [REDACTED], fax: +47-55584330
eystein.jansen@bjerknes.uib.no
www.bjerknes.uib.no *BC*

Re: [Fwd: RE: Communications Strategy: the University of East An...

Subject: Re: [Fwd: RE: Communications Strategy: the University of East Anglia email hacking]

From: Rick.Rosen@noaa.gov

Date: Sun, 06 Dec 2009 15:02:00 -0500

To: Jennifer.Austin@noaa.gov

CC: "Louisa Koch" <Louisa.Koch@noaa.gov>, Jennifer Austin <Jennifer.Austin@noaa.gov>, "Thomas R. Karl" <Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov>, V Ramaswamy <V.Ramaswamy@noaa.gov>, Chris Miller <Christopher.D.Miller@noaa.gov>, Ahsha Tribble <Ahsha.Tribble@noaa.gov>, "Jonathan Kelsey" <Jonathan.Kelsey@noaa.gov>, Daniel Walker <Daniel.Walker@noaa.gov>, Glenn E Tallia <Glenn.E.Tallia@noaa.gov>, Sharon Leduc <Sharon.Leduc@noaa.gov>, John Leslie <John.Leslie@noaa.gov>, Susan.Solomon@noaa.gov

Jennifer,

I agree with others this is a nice draft. I've made a few editorial corrections to the latest version that Susan worked on. I also comment on statements in the draft about the e-mails involving only a few scientists. The fact is that one of those scientists is the director of the CRU. Recognizing that the global temperature record has been produced by only 3 centers, the skeptics have begun to attack the credibility of the scientists at these centers, not the science. They've managed to injure the credibility of one of the centers (with help from the director of that center) and are now turning their attention to the other two centers (NASA and NOAA). I'd be less concerned about defending the science than defending the integrity of our scientists at NCDCC and the safeguards employed there to ensure the techniques used to process data are credible and transparent. If we affirm that our processes and scientists are unassailable, the science will take care of itself.

Rick

----- Original Message -----

From: Susan.Solomon@noaa.gov

Date: Sunday, December 6, 2009 1:25 pm

Subject: Re: [Fwd: RE: Communications Strategy: the University of East Anglia email hacking]

> Jennifer

> Thanks for this nice start. Attached are a few suggestions added to

> Louisa's.

> best

> Susan

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "Louisa Koch" <Louisa.Koch@noaa.gov>

> Date: Saturday, December 5, 2009 1:05 pm

> Subject: Re: [Fwd: RE: Communications Strategy: the University of East

> Anglia email hacking]

>

>> Jennifer,

>>

>> Nice job. I think the material is in good shape. Attached in

>> track

>> change are my suggestions.

>>

>> Louisa

>>

>>

>> Jennifer Austin wrote:

>>> Hi,

>>>

>>> this is later than I had hoped, but thanks to everyone who

>>> sent

>>> material today, here is a draft attempt at compiling a lot of

>>> the

>>> info

>>> in the context of some of the main questions we have heard.

>>>

>>> Please have a look and let me know what feedback you have

>>> I'll

>>> update

>>> and resend if there are major revisions.

>>>

>>> I am sharing this draft and the attached two fact sheets that

>>> John

>>> Leslie put together, with the DOC folks who were asking for

>>> talking

>>> points.

>>>

>>> I'm reachable this weekend if anyone need me

>>>

>>>

>>> --

>>> Jennifer Austin

>>> NOAA Communications & External Affairs

>>> 202-482-5757 (office) 202-302-9047 (cell)

>>> www.facebook.com/noaa.lubchenco

>>>

>>>

>>> Thomas R. Karl wrote:

>>>> See talking points and data policy paper

>>>>

>>>> Thomas R. Karl said the following on 12/4/2009 12:08 PM:

>>>> For discussion

>>>>

>>>> ----- Original Message -----

>>>> Subject: RE: Communications Strategy: the University of

>>>> East

>>>> Anglia

>>>>
>>>> Typo in number 4: lead should be led.
>>>>
>>>>-----
>>>>
>>>> *From*: Thomas R. Karl <Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov>
>>>> *To*: Mary Glackin <Mary.Glackin@noaa.gov>
>>>> *Cc*: Louisa Koch <Louisa.Koch@noaa.gov>;
>> richard.spinrad@noaa.gov
>>>> <Richard.Spinrad@noaa.gov>; Chester J Koblinsky
>>>> <Chester.J.Koblinsky@noaa.gov>; 'John Gray'
>>>> <John.Gray@noaa.gov>;
>>>> 'Justin.kenney@noaa.gov' <Justin.kenney@noaa.gov>; Ahsha
>>>> Tribble
>>>> <Ahsha.Tribble@noaa.gov>; Jane Chalmers
>>>> <Jane.Chalmers@noaa.gov>;
>>>> Jonathan.Kelsey <Jonathan.Kelsey@noaa.gov>; Payne, Jeff
>>>> <Jeff.Payne@noaa.gov>; William.Brogli@noaa.gov
>>>> <William.Brogli@noaa.gov>; 'mary.beth.ward@noaa.gov'
>>>> <Mary.Beth.Ward@noaa.gov>; 'JToaleisen@doc.gov'
>>>> <JToaleisen@doc.gov>; Monica Medina
>>>> <Monica.Medina@noaa.gov>;
>>>> Margaret Spring <Margaret.Spring@noaa.gov>; 'Alexander E
>>>> MacDonald'
>>>> <Alexander.E.MacDonald@noaa.gov>
>>>> *Sent*: Thu Dec 03 21:59:29 2009
>>>> *Subject*: Re: Communications Strategy: the University of
> East
>>>> Anglia email hacking
>>>>
>>>> Louisa, Rick, John, Ahsha, Chet, and Justin,
>>>>
>>>> See a 1st draft of some talking points.
>>>>
>>>> Tom
>>>>
>>>> Mary Glackin said the following on 12/3/2009 9:55 PM:
>>>>
>>>> Tom, Louisa, Rick, John, Ahsha, Jane, Chet, and Justin,
>>>>
>>>> As you know there has been considerable press resulting from
>>>> the
>>>> hacking of the email at the University of East Anglia
>>>> regarding
>>>> climate findings. To date, beyond the dialog at the
>>>> congressional
>>>> hearing yesterday, DOC/NOAA has not responded to this issue.
>>>> However, it is clear a serious misperception of the state of
>>>> the
>>>> science is being propagated as a result of this incident.
>>>> Dr.
>>>> Lubchenco has asked that we formulate a communications
>>>> strategy
>>>> and
>>>> talking points that would address the misperceptions. To
>>>> accomplish
>>>> this, we need a task team to pull the material together. Tom
>>>> Karl
>>>> has agreed to chair and by copy of this email, I'm asking
>>>> Louisa to
>>>> co-chair. Louisa' perspectives will be particularly valuable
>>>> since
>>>> she is familiar with research processes but was not involved
>>>> with
>>>> the specific work. I've listed below other suggested team
>>>> members
>>>> but would ask Tom and Louisa to finalize and you to confirm
>>>> their
>>>> participation. (I talked to John Gray tonight and he
>>>> confirmed
>>>> Jonathan.). The strategy should address legislative
>>>> outreach,
>>>> public/media outreach, in-reach, and inter-agency
>>>> coordination.
>>>> On
>>>> the latter point, we should use the USGCRP structure.
>>>> However,
>>>> specific communication with OSTP should be addressed.
>>>>
>>>> Finally, it came to my attention this afternoon that some
>>>> individuals identified in the hacked email (not NOAA
>>>> employees)
>>>> have received threats to their lives/safety. I've copied
>>>> Bill
>>>> Broglio and if this group feels it is desirable, we can
>>>> provide
>>>> a
>>>> safety message to all NOAA employees or some smaller group.
>>>>
>>>> We'd like this strategy in place by mid next week in advance
>>>> of
>>>> Dr.

>>>> L's trip to Copenhagen. I've copied Jean from DOC and
> further
>> DOC
>>>> coordination will be conducted prior to any communication.
>>>>
>>>> Suggested team members:
>>>>
>>>> Ahsha Tribble
>>>>
>>>> Glenn Tallia
>>>>
>>>> Jennifer Austin
>>>>
>>>> Jonathan Kelsey
>>>>
>>>> Sharon LeDuc
>>>>
>>>> V Ramaswamy
>>>>
>>>> Susau Solomon
>>>>
>>>> Chris Miller
>>>>
>>>> Dan Walker
>>>>
>>>> Rick Rosen
>>>>
>>>> Mary
>>>>
>>>> --
>>>>
>>>> *Thomas R. Karl, L.H.D.*
>>>>
>>>> Director, NOAA's National Climatic Data Center
>>>>
>>>> Lead, NOAA Climate Services
>>>>
>>>> Veach-Baley Federal Building
>>>>
>>>> 151 Patton Avenue
>>>>
>>>> Asheville, NC 28801-5001
>>>>
>>>> Tel: (828) 271-4476
>>>>
>>>> Fax: (828) 271-4246
>>>>
>>>> Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov <mailto:Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov>
>>>>
>>>> --
>>>>
>>>> *Thomas R. Karl, L.H.D.*
>>>>
>>>> Director, NOAA's National Climatic Data Center
>>>>
>>>> Lead, NOAA Climate Services
>>>>
>>>> Veach-Baley Federal Building
>>>>
>>>> 151 Patton Avenue
>>>>
>>>> Asheville, NC 28801-5001
>>>>
>>>> Tel: (828) 271-4476
>>>>
>>>> Fax: (828) 271-4246
>>>>
>>>> Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov <mailto:Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov>
>>>>
>>>> --
>>>>
>>>> *Thomas R. Karl, L.H.D.*
>>>>
>>>> Director, NOAA's National Climatic Data Center
>>>>
>>>> Lead, NOAA Climate Services
>>>>
>>>> Veach-Baley Federal Building
>>>>
>>>> 151 Patton Avenue
>>>>
>>>> Asheville, NC 28801-5001
>>>>
>>>> Tel: (828) 271-4476
>>>>
>>>> Fax: (828) 271-4246
>>>>
>>>> Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov <mailto:Thomas.R.Karl@noaa.gov>
>>>>
>>>> --

>> Louisa Koch
>> Director of Education
>> National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
>> 14th and Constitution Avenue NW
>> HCHB 6869
>> Washington DC 20230
>> (o) 202 482-3384
>> (c) 301 351-0861
>> (f) 202 482-2663
>>
>>
>>

Q&A_NOAA_Climate_Data_and_Research_Draft_12.04-2_rdr.docx	Content-Type: application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document Content-Encoding: base64
---	---

↓
not provided

Subject: RE: Yes re Supporting the science (fwd)

From: "Shuckburgh, Emily F" <emsh@bas.ac.uk>

Date: Sun, 06 Dec 2009 22:45:06 +0000

To: Michael E McIntyre <M.E.McIntyre@damtp.cam.ac.uk>, "julia.slingo@metoffice.gov.uk" <julia.slingo@metoffice.gov.uk>

CC: "john.hirst@metoffice.gov.uk" <john.hirst@metoffice.gov.uk>, "S.Fueglistaler@damtp.cam.ac.uk" <S.Fueglistaler@damtp.cam.ac.uk>, "A.F.Thompson@damtp.cam.ac.uk" <A.F.Thompson@damtp.cam.ac.uk>, "P.H.Haynes@damtp.cam.ac.uk" <P.H.Haynes@damtp.cam.ac.uk>, "heh1@esc.cam.ac.uk" <heh1@esc.cam.ac.uk>, "cwunsch@mit.edu" <cwunsch@mit.edu>, "d.j.parker@see.leeds.ac.uk" <d.j.parker@see.leeds.ac.uk>, "i.renfrew@uea.ac.uk" <i.renfrew@uea.ac.uk>, "s.e.belcher@reading.ac.uk" <s.e.belcher@reading.ac.uk>, "P.Wadhams@damtp.cam.ac.uk" <P.Wadhams@damtp.cam.ac.uk>, "marshall@atm.ox.ac.uk" <marshall@atm.ox.ac.uk>, "andrews@atm.ox.ac.uk" <andrews@atm.ox.ac.uk>, "a.j.watson@uea.ac.uk" <a.j.watson@uea.ac.uk>, "b.hoskins@imperial.ac.uk" <b.hoskins@imperial.ac.uk>, "jcrh@cpom.ucl.ac.uk" <jcrh@cpom.ucl.ac.uk>, "jgs@noc.soton.ac.uk" <jgs@noc.soton.ac.uk>, "p.m.cox@exeter.ac.uk" <p.m.cox@exeter.ac.uk>, "allen@atm.ox.ac.uk" <allen@atm.ox.ac.uk>, "t.lenton@uea.ac.uk" <t.lenton@uea.ac.uk>, "john.pyle@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk" <john.pyle@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk>, "Glenn.Carver@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk" <Glenn.Carver@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk>, "he101@esc.cam.ac.uk" <he101@esc.cam.ac.uk>, "k.p.shine@reading.ac.uk" <k.p.shine@reading.ac.uk>, "b.j.hoskins@reading.ac.uk" <b.j.hoskins@reading.ac.uk>, "Wilson, Steven" <stwi@nerc.ac.uk>, "Thorpe, Alan J" <hqpo@nerc.ac.uk>, "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>, "simon.tett@ed.ac.uk" <simon.tett@ed.ac.uk> *B6, B7c*, "r.sutton@reading.ac.uk" <r.sutton@reading.ac.uk>, "j.m.gregory@reading.ac.uk" <j.m.gregory@reading.ac.uk>, "tim.palmer@ecmwf.int" <tim.palmer@ecmwf.int>, "n.w.arnell@reading.ac.uk" <n.w.arnell@reading.ac.uk>, "colin.prentice@bristol.ac.uk" <colin.prentice@bristol.ac.uk>, "p.l.vidale@reading.ac.uk" <p.l.vidale@reading.ac.uk>, "l.j.gray@reading.ac.uk" <l.j.gray@reading.ac.uk>, "simon.buckle@imperial.ac.uk" <simon.buckle@imperial.ac.uk>, "stephen@env.leeds.ac.uk" <stephen@env.leeds.ac.uk>, "t.r.wheeler@reading.ac.uk" <t.r.wheeler@reading.ac.uk>, "m.lockwood@reading.ac.uk" <m.lockwood@reading.ac.uk>, "p.j.valdes@bristol.ac.uk" <p.j.valdes@bristol.ac.uk>, "david.frame@smithschool.ox.ac.uk" <david.frame@smithschool.ox.ac.uk>, "paul.hardaker@rmets.org" <paul.hardaker@rmets.org>, "rebecca.green@metoffice.gov.uk" <rebecca.green@metoffice.gov.uk>, "alex.bailey@metoffice.gov.uk" <alex.bailey@metoffice.gov.uk>, "dee.cotgrove@metoffice.gov.uk" <dee.cotgrove@metoffice.gov.uk>, "dave.britton@metoffice.gov.uk" <dave.britton@metoffice.gov.uk>, "susan.solomon@noaa.gov" <Susan.Solomon@noaa.gov>, "Rodger, Alan S" <asro@bas.ac.uk>

Dear All,

RE: Yes re Supporting the science (fwd)

Following on various emails, I think what is required is a statement that is a) simple, b) dispassionate and c) inclusive of the full UK climate-science community.

Many people have said that they are not happy to sign up without a clear statement of what they are signing up to, and many are uncomfortable with directly commenting on the 'climategate' debate.

It would be very helpful for there to be a suggested statement sent early on Monday morning so that mixed messages are not circulating on Monday.

The simplest possible statement is the one that is most likely to gather the widest support, and the whole point of this is to demonstrate the force of numbers who agree on the fundamental issue.

Emily

From: Michael E McIntyre [M.E.McIntyre@damp.cam.ac.uk]
Sent: 06 December 2009 12:11
To: julia.slingo@metoffice.gov.uk
Cc: john.hirst@metoffice.gov.uk; S.Fueglistaler@damp.cam.ac.uk;
A.F.Thompson@damp.cam.ac.uk; P.H.Haynes@damp.cam.ac.uk; heh1@esc.cam.ac.uk;
cwunsch@mit.edu; d.j.parker@see.leeds.ac.uk; i.renfrew@uea.ac.uk;
s.e.belcher@reading.ac.uk; P.Wadhams@damp.cam.ac.uk; marshall@atm.ox.ac.uk;
andrews@atm.ox.ac.uk; a.j.watson@uea.ac.uk; b.hoskins@imperial.ac.uk;
jcrh@cpom.ucl.ac.uk; jgs@noc.soton.ac.uk; p.m.cox@exeter.ac.uk; allen@atm.ox.ac.uk;
t.lenton@uea.ac.uk; john.pyle@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk; Glenn.Carver@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk;
he101@esc.cam.ac.uk; k.p.shine@reading.ac.uk; b.j.hoskins@reading.ac.uk; Wilson,
Steven; Thorpe, Alan J; [REDACTED]; simon.tett@ed.ac.uk; BC
r.sutton@reading.ac.uk; j.m.gregory@reading.ac.uk; tim.palmer@ecmwf.int;
n.w.arnell@reading.ac.uk; colin.prentice@bristol.ac.uk; p.l.vidale@reading.ac.uk;
l.j.gray@reading.ac.uk; simon.buckle@imperial.ac.uk; stephen@env.leeds.ac.uk;
t.r.wheeler@reading.ac.uk; m.lockwood@reading.ac.uk; p.j.valdes@bristol.ac.uk;
david.frame@smithschool.ox.ac.uk; paul.hardaker@rmets.org;
rebecca.green@metoffice.gov.uk; alex.bailey@metoffice.gov.uk;
dee.cotgrove@metoffice.gov.uk; dave.britton@metoffice.gov.uk; Shuckburgh, Emily F;
susan.solomon@noaa.gov
Subject: Yes re Supporting the science (fwd)

Dear Julia,

re your emergency letter to defend reputable climate science

I'll trust you on the wording and pledge my signature but please be careful -- especially to avoid the slightest hint of passion. No needless adjectives, no needless anything.

For instance "unprecedented attack" is not only needless but wrong. It seems to forget that the professional disinformers have been blasting away for many years.

My young colleague Dr Stephan Fueglistaler rightly points out another trap: if we say that ALL scientists involved in the IPCC consensus

| adhere to the highest levels of integrity and honesty |

then all the disinformers have to do is to find a single exception. I'd be happier if we said that the vast majority

involved in the IPCC consensus are honest scientists but above all that the consensus is based on something far greater than any individual, namely, respect for very many lines of evidence only one of which comes from the datasets currently under attack.

And again, we should try to avoid the impression of being self-serving politicians spoiling for a fight ourselves, as in your very understandable; but I'd say dangerous drafting

we come together now to defend our profession against this unprecedented attack to discredit us and the science of climate change.

It'd be wiser to sound more dispassionate -- hard though it is. As we all know, some of the professional disinformers are media stars and masters of the art making scientists, or any other honest person, lose their temper as apparently happened to Andy Watson the other day. It's easy to get angry at their dirty tricks, but we simply mustn't!

I have notes on exactly how on Radio 4 another disinformers, Melanie Phillips, trapped Mike Hulme when he was UEA Climate Director. By using the rhythm of the spoken word to insert a comma, Phillips made a quote from Hulme sound as if HE believed climate scientists to be liars. Conclusion: "omit needless words".

Good luck,
Michael McIntyre

PS Let me dare to have a shot at what might be a slightly safer variant of your draft, also a touch more informative on an extremely important point that I haven't yet heard mentioned at all in the news. It might be useful to be informative and not just defensive, and then I'd be even keener to sign it:

We, the UK science community, have the utmost confidence in the science base that underpins the evidence for global warming. That evidence has been gathered through decades of painstaking and meticulous research by many scientists across the world. The vast majority of these scientists adhere to high standards of integrity and honesty.

The evidence base is far wider, and far deeper, than most people realize. For instance, powerful evidence comes from the laws of physics and chemistry and from independent data recording past climates. See for instance the new book by Professor Archer, a respected carbon-cycle expert, "The Long Thaw: How Humans Are Changing the Next 100,000 Years of Earth's Climate".

Yours sincerely,...

PPS Julia, I'd seriously argue that this last point is important enough to be worth incorporating -- if you possibly can -- even if it reduces the number of signatures. Numbers, as such, are hardly important by comparison with winning the argument.

In case you aren't familiar with Archer's lucid little book -- David Archer not of Ambridge but of Chicago, readable in one evening -- try googling "The Long Thaw" "See especially pages 88-89 on the PETM"

It would be a signal service to science and humanity if that book were advertised as widely as possible, as a matter of supreme urgency.

I expect you're aware that part of our problem is all the eminent physicists, like Freeman Dyson, who appear to be under the (understandable!) illusion that the IPCC consensus is based entirely on dodgy climate models. It seems that even so great an intellect as Dyson might be ignorant of what Archer explains so clearly and quickly.

...
simple statement that we, the UK science community, have the utmost confidence in the science base that underpins the evidence for global warming. That evidence has been arrived at through decades of painstaking and meticulous research by many scientists across the world, who adhere to the highest levels of integrity and honesty, the hallmarks of true scientific endeavour. We come together now to defend our profession against this unprecedented attack to discredit us and the science of climate change.

...

Emeritus Professor M. E. McIntyre FRS,
Centre for Atmospheric Science at the
Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics,
Wilberforce Rd,
Cambridge CB3 0WA,
United Kingdom

Fax +44-1223-760419 and -765900
Tel +44-1223-337871, secretary -337870 (Lorraine Knight)
& +44-1223-363283, mobile/cellphone + [REDACTED] B6
email mem@damtp.cam.ac.uk, secretary L.L.Knight@damtp.cam.ac.uk
<http://www.atm.damtp.cam.ac.uk/people/mem/#co2forever>

Subject: RE: Yes re Supporting the science (fwd)

From: Myles Allen <allen@atm.ox.ac.uk>

Date: Sun, 06 Dec 2009 23:03:29 +0000

To: Michael E McIntyre <M.E.McIntyre@damtp.cam.ac.uk>, julia.slingo@metoffice.gov.uk

CC: john.hirst@metoffice.gov.uk, S.Fueglistaler@damtp.cam.ac.uk,

A.F.Thompson@damtp.cam.ac.uk, P.H.Haynes@damtp.cam.ac.uk; heh1@esc.cam.ac.uk,

cwunsch@mit.edu, d.j.parker@see.leeds.ac.uk, i.renfrew@uea.ac.uk,

s.e.belcher@reading.ac.uk, P.Wadhams@damtp.cam.ac.uk, David Marshall

<d.p.marshall@atm.ox.ac.uk>, David Andrews <andrews@atm.ox.ac.uk>,

a.j.watson@uea.ac.uk, b.hoskins@imperial.ac.uk, jcrh@cpom.ucl.ac.uk,

jgs@noc.soton.ac.uk, p.m.cox@exeter.ac.uk, t.lenton@uea.ac.uk,

john.pyle@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk, Glenn.Carver@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk, he101@esc.cam.ac.uk,

k.p.shine@reading.ac.uk, b.j.hoskins@reading.ac.uk, stwi@nerc.ac.uk, hqpo@nerc.ac.uk,

[REDACTED] simon.tett@ed.ac.uk, r.sutton@reading.ac.uk, 86

j.m.gregory@reading.ac.uk, tim.palmer@ecmwf.int, n.w.arnell@reading.ac.uk,

colin.prentice@bristol.ac.uk, p.l.vidale@reading.ac.uk, l.j.gray@reading.ac.uk,

simon.buckle@imperial.ac.uk, stephen@env.leeds.ac.uk, t.r.wheeler@reading.ac.uk,

m.lockwood@reading.ac.uk, p.j.valdes@bristol.ac.uk, david.frame@smithschool.ox.ac.uk,

paul.hardaker@rmets.org, rebecca.green@metoffice.gov.uk, alex.bailey@metoffice.gov.uk,

dee.cotgrove@metoffice.gov.uk, dave.britton@metoffice.gov.uk, emsh@bas.ac.uk,

Susan.Solomon@noaa.gov

Dear Michael and Julia,

I would certainly be happy to put my name to a joint statement, but Simon is right that it could be counterproductive to react as strongly as many of us would no doubt like to. I notice that the skeptics' camp is clearly anticipating a backlash from the scientific community, and are getting pre-emptive remarks in about "circling the wagons".

I believe our strongest point is simply that no one has yet presented any evidence that a single figure in a published paper or number in a published dataset needs to be revised. If any such evidence were to emerge, even if obtained illegally, we would of course revise the dataset. If the revision were substantial, we would have to re-assess all conclusions based upon it. It would be quite wrong to suggest, as Michael's words might be twisted to imply, that no possible revision of the CRU dataset would cause us to question the importance of human influence on climate: that would imply that our views are immune from data, which is exactly the kind of point the skeptics would like to make.

Likewise, simply re-affirming our confidence in Phil's integrity could also be counterproductive. Science does not depend on any individual's integrity. It depends on evidence, and if anyone has any concrete evidence to suggest the CRU dataset needs substantive revision, let them produce it.

In view of the importance of the CRU dataset, I feel it would be useful if UEA, having announced this enquiry, were to make it clear that, as of this time, there is no concrete evidence that any numbers in the dataset need to be revised, and hence no reason for people to have any less

confidence in it, or papers based upon it, than they did before. This should not be seen as pre-judging the outcome of the enquiry, since UEA could also make clear that if the enquiry, or any other process, were to find fault with the dataset, then it would of course be revised.

Myles

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael E McIntyre [mailto:M.E.McIntyre@damtp.cam.ac.uk]
Sent: 06 December 2009 12:11
To: julia.slingo@metoffice.gov.uk
Cc: john.hirst@metoffice.gov.uk; S.Fueglistaler@damtp.cam.ac.uk;
A.F.Thompson@damtp.cam.ac.uk; P.H.Haynes@damtp.cam.ac.uk;
heh1@esc.cam.ac.uk; cwunsch@mit.edu; d.j.parker@see.leeds.ac.uk;
i.renfrew@uea.ac.uk; s.e.belcher@reading.ac.uk;
P.Wadhams@damtp.cam.ac.uk; David Marshall; David Andrews;
a.j.watson@uea.ac.uk; b.hoskins@imperial.ac.uk; jcrh@cpom.ucl.ac.uk;
jgs@noc.soton.ac.uk; p.m.cox@exeter.ac.uk; Myles Allen;
t.lenton@uea.ac.uk; john.pyle@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk;
Glenn.Carver@atm.ch.cam.ac.uk; he101@esc.cam.ac.uk;
k.p.shine@reading.ac.uk; b.j.hoskins@reading.ac.uk; stwi@nerc.ac.uk;
hqpo@nerc.ac.uk; simon.tett@ed.ac.uk;
r.sutton@reading.ac.uk; j.m.gregory@reading.ac.uk; tim.palmer@ecmwf.int;
n.w.arnell@reading.ac.uk; colin.prentice@bristol.ac.uk;
p.l.vidale@reading.ac.uk; l.j.gray@reading.ac.uk;
simon.buckle@imperial.ac.uk; stephen@env.leeds.ac.uk;
t.r.wheeler@reading.ac.uk; m.lockwood@reading.ac.uk;
p.j.valdes@bristol.ac.uk; david.frame@smithschool.ox.ac.uk;
paul.hardaker@rmets.org; rebecca.green@metoffice.gov.uk;
alex.bailey@metoffice.gov.uk; dee.cotgrove@metoffice.gov.uk;
dave.britton@metoffice.gov.uk; emsh@bas.ac.uk; susan.solomon@noaa.gov
Subject: Yes re Supporting the science (fwd)

BC

Dear Julia,

re your emergency letter to defend reputable climate science

I'll trust you on the wording and pledge my signature but please be careful -- especially to avoid the slightest hint of passion. No needless adjectives, no needless anything.

For instance "unprecedented attack" is not only needless but wrong. It seems to forget that the professional disinformers have been blasting away for many years.

My young colleague Dr Stephan Fueglistaler rightly points out another trap: if we say that ALL scientists involved in the IPCC consensus

{ adhere to the highest levels of integrity and honesty

then all the disinformers have to do is to find a single exception. I'd be happier if we said that the vast majority involved in the IPCC consensus are honest scientists but above all that the consensus is based on something far greater than any individual, namely, respect for very many lines of evidence only one of which comes from the datasets currently

under attack.

And again, we should try to avoid the impression of being self-serving politicians spoiling for a fight ourselves, as in your very understandable, but I'd say dangerous drafting

we come together now to defend our profession against this unprecedented attack to discredit us and the science of climate change.

It'd be wiser to sound more dispassionate -- hard though it is. As we all know, some of the professional disinformers are media stars and masters of the art making scientists, or any other honest person, lose their temper as apparently happened to Andy Watson the other day. It's easy to get angry at their dirty tricks, but we simply mustn't!

I have notes on exactly how on Radio 4 another disinformers, Melanie Phillips, trapped Mike Hulme when he was UEA Climate Director. By using the rhythm of the spoken word to insert a comma, Phillips made a quote from Hulme sound as if HE believed climate scientists to be liars. Conclusion: "omit needless words".

Good luck,
Michael McIntyre

PS Let me dare to have a shot at what might be a slightly safer variant of your draft, also a touch more informative on an extremely important point that I haven't yet heard mentioned at all in the news. It might be useful to be informative and not just defensive, and then I'd be even keener to sign it:

We, the UK science community, have the utmost confidence in the science base that underpins the evidence for global warming. That evidence has been gathered through decades of painstaking and meticulous research by many scientists across the world. The vast majority of these scientists adhere to high standards of integrity and honesty.

The evidence base is far wider, and far deeper, than most people realize. For instance, powerful evidence comes from the laws of physics and chemistry and from independent data recording past climates. See for instance the new book by Professor Archer, a respected carbon-cycle expert, "The Long Thaw: How Humans Are Changing the Next 100,000 Years of Earth's Climate".

Yours sincerely,...

PPS Julia, I'd seriously argue that this last point is important enough to be worth incorporating -- if you possibly can -- even if it reduces the number of signatures. Numbers, as such, are hardly important by comparison with winning the argument.

In case you aren't familiar with Archer's lucid little book -- David Archer not of Ambridge but of Chicago, readable in one evening -- try googling

"The Long Thaw" "See especially pages 88-89 on the PETM"

It would be a signal service to science and humanity if that book were advertised as widely as possible, as a matter of supreme urgency.

I expect you're aware that part of our problem is all the eminent physicists, like Freeman Dyson, who appear to be under the (understandable!) illusion that the IPCC consensus is based entirely on dodgy climate models. It seems that even so great an intellect as Dyson might be ignorant of what Archer explains so clearly and quickly.

...
simple statement that we, the UK science community, have the utmost confidence in the science base that underpins the evidence for global warming. That evidence has been arrived at through decades of painstaking and meticulous research by many scientists across the world, who adhere to the highest levels of integrity and honesty, the hallmarks of true scientific endeavour. We come together now to defend our profession against this unprecedented attack to discredit us and the science of climate change.
...

Emeritus Professor M. E. McIntyre FRS,
Centre for Atmospheric Science at the
Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics,
Wilberforce Rd,
Cambridge CB3 0WA,
United Kingdom

Fax +44-1223-760419 and -765900
Tel +44-1223-337871, secretary -337870 (Lorraine Knight)
& +44-1223-363283, mobile/cellphone [REDACTED] B6
email mem@damtp.cam.ac.uk, secretary L.L.Knight@damtp.cam.ac.uk
<http://www.atm.damtp.cam.ac.uk/people/mem/#co2forever>

... on the head with a hockey stick

Subject: Fwd: hit on the head with a hockey stick
From: "Joseph M. Prospero" <jprospero@rsmas.miami.edu>
Date: Sun, 06 Dec 2009 23:18:52 -0500
To: Susan.Solomon@noaa.gov

Date: Sun, 06 Dec 2009 22:56:06 -0500
To: solomon@al.noaa.gov, martin.manning@vuw.ac.nz
From: "Joseph M. Prospero" <jprospero@rsmas.miami.edu>
Subject: hit on the head with a hockey stick
Cc: jprospero@rsmas.miami.edu

The mess as UEA is a disaster for the climate community. The paleodata always got a lot more attention from the general public than it deserved. And now we pay the price for these guys grabbing so much attention in the past and, especially, now.

But that aside, I think that the climate community is in general doing a lousy job of getting information out to the public. It is worse than lousy - it is appalling. There has to be a broader effort at outreach. When an IPCC report comes out, there are a series of press releases and meetings - and then work starts on the next report. As far as the public is concerned, everything is left to the media to explain, and they often do it badly. Usually it is simplified and exaggerated in such a way as to leave the community open to question - e.g., the hockey stick.

As things stand, the climate community is being clobbered. There are just a few public statements from AAAS, Science, Nature, climate organizations, and others, saying - trust in the report. This is how Gore and Kerry lost the elections, by not responding rapidly and forcefully to accusations. The climate community is handling this issue with the same degree of skill as Kerry handled the gunboat fiasco.

I am hoping that you will tell me that the IPCC and climate community is mounting a coordinated effort to address the current issue and to start on a longer term program to do a better job at outreach to the broader public.

Joe

Joseph M. Prospero
Univ. Miami Distinguished Faculty Scholar
Professor Emeritus, Division of Marine and Atmospheric Chemistry &
The Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies (CIMAS)
Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science
University of Miami
4600 Rickenbacker Causeway
Miami, FL
33149
tel: 305-421-4159
fax: 305-421-4999
[REDACTED] (b)(6)
jprospero@rsmas.miami.edu
Prospero web page:
<http://www.rsmas.miami.edu/divs/mac/People/Faculty/Prospero/Publications/pdfs>
<http://www.rsmas.miami.edu/divs/mac/People/Faculty/Prospero/Publications/>

Joseph M. Prospero
Univ. Miami Distinguished Faculty Scholar
Professor Emeritus, Division of Marine and Atmospheric Chemistry &
The Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies (CIMAS)
Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science
University of Miami
4600 Rickenbacker Causeway
Miami, FL
33149
tel: 305-421-4159
fax: 305-421-4999
[REDACTED] (b)(6)
jprospero@rsmas.miami.edu
Prospero web page:
<http://www.rsmas.miami.edu/divs/mac/People/Faculty/Prospero/Publications/pdfs>
<http://www.rsmas.miami.edu/divs/mac/People/Faculty/Prospero/Publications/>