

01 October 2010

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

Dear Lord Rees

Let me begin by quoting in part a letter from you to me dated as long ago as 20 April 2007. You wrote:

"We have on our website a detailed response to some of the comments made in the Channel 4 programme last month. The issues are sufficiently important that they deserve wide discussion, but this should be on the basis of the best scientific evidence."

During the intervening three and a half years, in essentials, "the best scientific evidence" has changed hardly at all. In colloquial terms, a trace gas, amounting to less than 1/400th part of a single percentage point by volume of the atmosphere, continues to be branded as "the Great Satan". As such tens, nay hundreds, of billions of taxpayers funds in consequence continue to be squandered.

So, there's the background. Now, though, from the Royal Society, we have this morning the following:

"It is not possible to determine exactly how much the Earth will warm or exactly how the climate will change in the future."

"There remains the possibility that hitherto unknown aspects of the climate and climate change could emerge and lead to significant modifications in our understanding."

There is also the acknowledgement that any warming "trend" seemingly represented by the 80s and 90s has ceased during the past decade.

In reaction to its freshly acknowledged epiphany, the new RS guidelines also note:

"The size of future temperature increases and other aspects of climate change, especially at the regional scale, are still subject to uncertainty."

"There is little confidence in specific projections of future regional climate change, except at continental scales."

"It is not possible to determine exactly how much the Earth will warm or exactly how the climate will change in the future."

"There remains the possibility that hitherto unknown aspects of the climate and climate change could emerge and lead to significant modifications in our understanding."

Really?

Hitherto, you wrote to me as follows:

"The point on which we, at the Royal Society, are very firm is that the science, despite the wide range of uncertainties, gives sufficiently strong evidence of the likelihood of drastic climate change that the way to deal with it should be high on the political agenda." [My underlining]

Inconsistencies can be allowed to speak for themselves. In any event, however, whilst the change of tone may warrant a tepid welcome, it should not be forgotten that, for years now under your stewardship, the Royal Society stands accused of having done everything in its power to obstruct legitimate questioning of AGW orthodoxy and to stifle debate surrounding the science. Furthermore, even now, it continues to peddle falsehood. In relation to climate models, for example, its stance continues to be predicated on their essential reliability, when it is abundantly clear that they are even now highly subjective, and have been in the recent past manifestly fraudulent. As much to the point also, of course, is the fact that the IPCC has publicly acknowledged that general circulations models are unreliable. Malign human influence on climate remains the theme, but actual mechanisms are carefully skirted.

In my reply to your 20 April 2007 letter, amongst other things, I wrote as follows:

"An important cause is at stake here, and it is not global warming. It is nothing less than the truth allied to the integrity of the scientific endeavour. It may surprise you to learn that there are people in the world outside of science, as well as inside (pray God!), who consider that to be quite important."

Three and a half years later, I see no reason to alter a syllable of that conclusion.

Yours sincerely

R.C.E Wyndham

Cc: Prime Minister Deputy Prime Minister Mr. C. Huhne MP Lord Lawson Lord Leach
Archbishop of Canterbury Bishop of London Archbishop of Westminster Lord Sachs
As the spirit moves