

22 July 2008.

Sir Michael Lyons  
 Chairman  
 BBC Trust  
 Room 211  
 35 Marylebone High Street  
 London W1U 4AA

Dear Sir Michael Lyons

**Re: The Great Global Warming Swindle: Ofcom adjudication & systemic BBC bias**

Like others I have absorbed the thrust of this august determination with a mixture of irritation and wry amusement. When otiose verbiage and Pharisaic logic chopping have been stripped away, what remains is a vindication of The Great Global Warming Swindle. Far from being misleading as claimed by Houghton and organs of the environmentalist press, in particular, it has been found to have been a finely crafted and effective documentary. Furthermore, it has made a major contribution towards introducing at least a semblance of balance into a controversy overwhelmingly dominated by abrasive and unsubstantiated assertion as well as, not infrequently, mendacity, suppression of data and outright fraud. Ofcom has acknowledged, quite rightly, the continuing importance of commissioning such programming. It is very much to be hoped that Channel 4 will pick up the baton once more.

The documentary could be faulted only on the grounds that one or two primly hypersensitive souls and the IPCC felt affronted. Oh dear, oh dear! Moreover, since publication of the report, the record has unfolded, and disclosed that all three complainants have been economical with the truth:

- **Wunsch.** It is abundantly clear that he was fully apprised in advance of the nature of the piece in which he was being invited to participate and, in any case, then said on screen nothing that could be regarded even remotely as contentious or unfair. His complaint was without foundation. It was a lie.
- **King.** It is equally clear that what King actually said in the past was so close to the words attributed to him in the programme by Fred Singer that the two could be separated by not so much as a width of a tissue paper. His complaint was a lie.
- **IPCC.** Lastly, it is clear that the IPCC was invited to comment, and declined. As I and others know from experience, the IPCC routinely ignores all contra-indications to its fraudulent orthodoxy, no matter what their provenance. Such censorship extends to highly reputable scientists in numbers who, in the past, participated as lead authors and contributors, and had been dismayed by the embedded chicanery they encountered all about them. To pretend that the IPCC is other than exclusively political in its make-up and objectives is too laughable to merit further comment. In short, its complaint too was a lie.

That such flimsy objections should have been upheld is indicative of one thing only, namely external interference.

However, as it happens, I am more interested in what Ofcom has highlighted as guiding principles to be followed by all broadcasters. One presumes that the BBC is included as well, notwithstanding the fact that it benefits from the inestimable advantage that it is counsel, jury and judge in its own cause. Never mind - let me quote from the Ofcom report, and comment on each rule in turn:

*In particular it referred to the following rules:*

- *Rule 2.2, which states that “Factual programmes or items or portrayals of factual matters must not materially mislead the audience”;*
- *Rules 5.11 (due impartiality must be preserved on matters of major political controversy and major matters relating to current public policy), and*
- *Rule 5.12 (in dealing with such major matters, an appropriately wide range of significant views must be included and given due weight in each programme or in clearly linked and timely programmes.)*

**Rule 2.2.** On almost a daily basis the BBC is in breach of this rule. Reports are broadcast with no reference to factual data. It is enough that a story is sourced from any environmentalist pressure group with no reference whatsoever to factual accuracy. For the BBC, hearsay and conjecture are quite sufficient. In consequence the Corporation routinely engages in materially misleading its audience. From me you have plenty of substantiated examples. You could have had countless others.

**Rule 5.11.** Current public policy decisions are being driven by the government as well as by the EU, which will have incalculable economic consequences. They are driven by stated adherence to AGW doctrine. The deliberate abrogation by the BBC of even the suggestion of impartiality or investigative curiosity in its coverage is a scandal.

**Rule 5.12.** Even more now do we come to the crux of the issue. In relation to important matters “*an appropriately wide range of significant views must be included and given due weight in each programme or in clearly linked and timely programmes.*” (My emphases). Let us contrast this with what the BBC asserts. In her letter to me dated 31 March 2008, Ms. Harris writes:

**BBC News currently takes the view that our reporting needs to be calibrated to take into account the scientific consensus that global warming is man made. The BBC’s Editorial Guidelines, issued to all editorial staff, state that “we must ensure that we avoid bias or an imbalance of views on controversial subjects” and, given the weight of scientific opinion, the challenge for us is to strike the right balance between mainstream science and sceptics since to give them equal weight would imply that the argument is evenly balanced.**

*There may now be a broad scientific consensus that climate change is definitely happening and that it is at least predominantly man-made...the weight of evidence no longer justifies equal space being given to the opponents of the consensus.”*

These extracts, courtesy of Ms. Harris, are wholly incompatible with Rule 5.12, as stated above. They are based, moreover, on false premises - speaking personally, I would say wilfully so. In any event, there is:

- No broad scientific consensus (and quite probably never has been). Not only I but many others, Lord Leach amongst them to my certain knowledge, have repeatedly pointed this out.
- Even if there was or had been such a consensus, it would have been an irrelevance. All that counts is empirical evidence born of observation.
- For AGW dogma there is none.
- The science has moved on, and the AGW case gets weaker (and more tawdry) by the day. Eminent scientists now have increasingly little hesitation in describing it as a fraud. Tens of thousands have signed up in opposition.
- The BBC has never so much as attempted to strike a balance or give equal weight (“calibrated” or otherwise) to scientific dissent, no matter how eminent the dissenters might be. In passing, as a matter of hard fact, dissenters have tended to be significantly more eminent than proponents.
- I have already commented elsewhere (letter to Mr. Vander dated 4 July 2008) on the brazen hypocrisy implicit in “no longer justifies”.
- And that is not all. Not only is the BBC systemically biased, it is also pusillanimous. It is quite happy materially to amend its coverage at the behest of environmentalist extremists, even those who are self-evidently ignorant, sanctimonious and shrill. It occasions the BBC no shame at all that thereby it incurs the well justified contempt and derision of professional peers - both in this country as well as overseas.

You and your fellow trustees exercise a fiduciary role on behalf of licence fee payers. It would be agreeable to witness some indication that your responsibilities are being taken seriously.

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham

Cc: Prime Minister      Mr. D. Cameron   Mr. N. Clegg      Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, IPCC   Mr. Mark Thompson,  
BBC   Mr. Hamish Mykura, Channel 4   Lord Lawson   Lord Leach   Lord Monckton   Lord Rees   Lord Currie,  
Ofcom   Sir David King   Prof. Carl Wunsch      As the spirit moves