

Little Killivose, Killivose, Camborne, Cornwall
TR14 9LQ
Tel: 01209 610104 Mbl: 07775605116 & 07732491781
E-m: rupertwyndham@googlemail.com & lizzieglynn@googlemail.com

11 November 2008.

Mr. Stewart McCullough
 Complaints Co-ordinator
 BBC Complaints
 British Broadcasting Corporation
 201 Wood Lane
 London W12 7TS

Dear Mr. McCullough

Re: Global warming, systemic BBC bias and Earth - The Climate Wars

At the outset let me begin by stating that I would like this letter and its attachments to be treated as a formal complaint.

I was abroad during the screening of the documentaries titled above, but have now managed to download them as µTorrent files. This has certain benefits - sections can be revisited and a timer is also incorporated. For someone who repeatedly draws attention to his scientific credentials, Dr. Iain Stewart's presentation is astoundingly inept. However this series may have been advertised (I am told as an even handed survey of the science), from the outset it becomes clear that it will amount, in reality, to a one sided propagandist polemic. Views alternative to anthropogenic global warming orthodoxy (AGW) will be misrepresented, airbrushed, or belittled. Even though, tellingly, swathes of evidence are omitted, the three episodes cover a fair amount of ground, and are replete with distortion, misrepresentation and suppression of countervailing data. For these reasons, this letter will be long and detailed. Even then, it will necessarily have to be selective. Bracketed numbers denote minutes and seconds into the film.

Episode 1: The Battle Begins

So, let's start at the beginning. Stewart explains the purpose of the series. At (1.42) he states: ***"In this series I'm going to explore some simple big questions. How do we know the climate's warming up? How do we know humans are causing it? And how do we know what's going to happen next?"*** (Cue in tendentious footage of storms, sea ice and melodramatic catastrophist music.) ***As the story of global warming has unfolded, we've learnt of the very nature of scientific truth, and about how that has been falsified, manipulated, twisted and even bought. "***

At (2.54), this is followed up by the introduction of Stewart's children on a beach with the reminder that, as a husband and a father (well, a 'dad' actually), he has both a professional and a personal interest in global warming. Not unrelated to this at (9.31) we have the introduction of Dr. S. Schneider, who at (12.12) is exonerated from his earlier spectacular failures as a scientific investigator. Was there some purpose in including Stewart's meandering reminiscences and his magnanimous absolution of Schneider? The answer, of course, is "Yes". These were/are rhetorical propagandist ploys. In contrast, perhaps, to the self-serving motives of AGW dissenters (a thought as yet unspoken, not that that will last long) they are designed, in the case of the former, to create in the minds of viewers an impression of altruistic disinterestedness and an honest quest for truth. In the case of Schneider, the conclusion we are expected to draw is that we have here a man of intellectual integrity and personal modesty. It would be churlish not to sidestep lightly the weasel words actually employed, which can be summarised as: "Not my fault! I just paint pictures. Can't help it, if somebody else misinterpreted what I said".

Save to note the depths which the BBC and Dr. Stewart are willing to plumb in order to promote their propagandist agenda, I will make no further comment about the inclusion of his offspring. Of Dr. Schneider, let me offer a different and more apposite interpretation, however. This is a man who has made a career, and

much lucre, out of promoting extreme environmentalist claims and, in the process, has demonstrated little hesitation in hopping from one conveniently passing gravy train to another. Given that the BBC has a legal as well as a moral obligation to respect its own Editorial Standards, perhaps it should be reminded whence this gentlemen and his friends come, a stand point which your presenter evidently endorses. *“To capture the public imagination, we have to offer up some scary scenarios, make simplified dramatic statements and little mention of any doubts one might have. Each of us has to decide the right balance between being effective and being honest.”* May, Houghton, Rees and King would probably approve, but straight dealers would not! In any event, whether that is so or no and whether it likes it or not, the BBC is legally obligated to be fair, even handed and accurate as far as it is possible to be.

Now to more specific matters. At (20.34) we have the statement: *“This relentless year on year rise in carbon dioxide is the one undisputed piece of evidence in the whole global warming debate.”* On the contrary, it is perhaps the one undisputed item of data. It is evidence of nothing, save that the atmosphere is marginally altering the mix of its chemical constituents. The attempt to link it with global warming is the product of computer modelling not of observation in the real world, which contains none of the signatures required by AGW theory. Does Stewart mention the absence of such signatures? He does not. Why? Because, of course, that would be fatal to his and the BBC’s cultist orthodoxy.

At (20.56) we begin a sequence involving a demonstration of such spectacular ineptitude that it leads to only one possible conclusion, namely that this entire series has propaganda as its driver - that and only that. What then does he do? He shows how a candle flame gradually vanishes as he fills a glass tube with CO₂. As a simulation of the atmosphere this is about as real as is a bath tub toy to a nuclear submarine. Although totally inaccurate and misleading, it is designed, of course, to imply a linear relationship (ie for the casual viewer, a simple, straight forward relationship) between CO₂ concentration and warming of the planet. In ‘An Inconvenient Truth’, Gore was keen to make the same mendacious connection. Indeed, says Stewart at (22.13) *“That’s exactly how CO₂ works in the atmosphere.”*

What he is careful to avoid saying, even if he knows it, is that the forcing effect of CO₂ is logarithmic not linear. This is well known and, as far as I am aware, not actually challenged even by the discredited panjandrums of The Royal Society or the IPCC. The attached diagram illustrates the point but, for your benefit and that of the counterpart panjandrums in BBC News, in plain English, the first 1.5°C arises from the first 20 ppm (parts per million) of CO₂. The next 1.5°C requires a further 400 ppm and the next 1°C calls for a further 1000 ppm. Put it another way. By the time we get to the current level of 384 ppm, a 100 ppm increment will produce only about 0.1°C of warming from CO₂. With atmospheric carbon dioxide rising at about 2 ppm per annum, temperature will rise at 0.1°C after 50 years - less with each additional 100 ppm increment. Look at the numbers! Note please that the attachment forms an integral part of this complaint.

In the meantime, it is worth adding that even this account of the logarithmic relationship may well overstate the radiative potential of CO₂. For the much needed illumination of both Dr. Stewart and the BBC, what follows are renditions of three e-mails sent to me by a proper scientist, Dr. Brian Valentine, Energy & Technology Programs Consultant, US Dept. of Energy and Adjunct Professor of Engineering, University of Maryland:

I am not sure who prepared it (the attachment above - in fact prepared by another proper scientist, Dr. David Archibald, an Australian academic), **but it is easy to see what it is based upon - namely, a logarithmic cumulative effect with constant absorptivity (chemists would identify the constant as the "Beer-Lambert constant for a fixed wavelength"). The base line at 20 ppm (probably derived from the Stefan relationship for a participating gas) is way too high.**

Why is it too high? It is too high because the wavelengths for which absorption has been assumed to occur, would be absorbed by water vapour in the atmosphere; the re-radiation would be absorbed by some more water again, and so on.

[This I believe to be one of the radiation errors in the GCM that the IPCC reported on. For that reason, and some others, their projections of temperature rise were right off the reservation.]

Think of a vial of clear, colourless water. Pass a light beam through the vial of water of visible wavelengths (obviously, the water doesn't absorb the light) - then the absorbance,

defined as the logarithm of the ratio of the intensity of the incident light to the intensity of the transmitted light, is zero.

Put a small quantity of dye (say red dye) in the water. This dye absorbs some colours of the visible spectrum, and reflects some other colours. (The dye appears red because it absorbs other wave lengths of visible light and reflects red wave lengths of light). Pass the light beam through the vial with the red dye solution - and the intensity of the transmitted beam is smaller than the intensity of the incident beam.

At dilute concentration, the absorbance is proportional to the concentration of dye. (This is the Beer-Lambert law.)

Double the concentration of dye - and the absorbance is doubled (assuming Beer's law still holds). So the intensity of the transmitted light is one hundred times smaller than the incident light, compared with the initial dilute solution of red dye.

The same relation holds in the infra red as well.

In the infra red, the absorbance of a participating gas (meaning it absorbs IR radiation) is also a function of the temperature of the gas. The cumulative effect on temperature over all IR wave lengths, is related to the logarithm of the ratio of the intensity of incident IR radiation to the intensity of the transmitted IR radiation.

But to return to Dr. Stewart. A man of his pretensions should be aware that, even to make a superficially plausible case for CO₂ induced warming, a positive feed-back mechanism is required. For this water vapour has been enlisted as the agent - Yes, by AGW promoters! Why? Because it is:

- overwhelmingly the most important of the greenhouse gases (GHGs) by volume;
- responsible for 95% of the Greenhouse Effect (GHE); Why?
- Because, unlike CO₂, which absorbs infra-red radiation over only one or two narrow ranges (notably the 15 micron band), H₂O absorbs over almost the entire IR band width.

But this, of course, is only the start. The atmosphere is a complex, chaotic system with thousands of variables. By definition, therefore, any discrepancy, however small, can have down stream consequences of great magnitude - what your well read and learned scientific/environmental journalistic colleagues relish knowingly referring to as "the butterfly effect". Even the IPCC itself (2001) accepts that climate "is a complex, non-linear, chaotic object....and that long-term prediction of climate states is impossible." (My emphases)

References by Stewart to any of this? Well, just a peep in Episode 3 on the issue of chaos, but that alone! Moreover, on this point, the overall concentration of CO₂ in the atmosphere amounts to c0.0385%, ie a minute fraction of a single percentage point! Even a superficial resemblance here to Stewart's simulated atmosphere saturated with CO₂? Of course not! Either he is a charlatan or he doesn't know his business. Either way the BBC is to be faulted for being inaccurate and misleading - grotesquely so, in fact.

Lastly, on the subject of the sorely maligned CO₂, nowhere does Stewart disclose that ice core analyses, both low resolution but especially more recent high resolution ones, demonstrate beyond much doubt that global temperature changes drive changes in atmospheric CO₂ concentrations **not** the other way about. Moreover, other temperature proxies (sea/lake bed cores, for example) suggest much the same thing. In what is advertised as a dispassionate review of the evidence, why such omissions? The reason, of course, is simple enough - off message!

At (22.9) Stewart begins his attempt to explain the cooling of the 50s & 60s, which he attributes to aerosols. He does not mention that this hypothesis is no more than a speculative explanation from the IPCC with no empirical evidence whatsoever to support it. In fact, the role of both aerosols and of water vapour is still poorly understood, and has never been confidently incorporated into General Circulation Models (GCMs). In other words, the aerosol explanation is supposition only. Does Stewart say so? He does not. Instead we have: ***"It turned out for a while that the cooling effect of soot from smoke stack chimneys had cancelled out the warming caused by CO₂, but that didn't last long. The relentless rise of CO₂ soon took over as the***

dominant factor.” So shameless, indeed, is the BBC that depiction of the vaunted “smoke stack chimneys” were, in reality, predominantly cooling towers and a little later petroleum crackers - not chimneys at all. Any explanation of why cooling supposedly wrought by aerosols suddenly ceased? The heck there is.

Although it would be possible to do so at length, I will not dwell on Stewart’s adolescent, “Boys’ Own” account of Jason save to say that this part of the episode is also riddled with banalities and inaccuracies. Let it suffice to say that, while (according to Stewart) the waters are muddied by politicisation (cue in Reagan), when that politicisation receives a quantum boost with Clinton, Gore and Thatcher pouring rivers of cash into promoting AGW dogma, suddenly it seems to be acceptable. Why is that, may one ask?

Moreover, if the summer of 1976 came as a rude awakening and a fatal blow to the previous global cooling hypothesis, why does not over a decade of temperature stasis/decline in the face of rising CO₂ concentrations not correspondingly undermine the CO₂ warming hypothesis? Even if Stewart thinks that he has an answer why, in his presentation on behalf of the BBC, does he not even pose the question? Well, why indeed! Perhaps it is worth making the point here that, if BBC Editorial Standards are to be respected, **the viewer should not be able to detect the personal views of the presenter.**

Before leaving this appalling travesty of an episode, there remains, however, one egregiously disreputable statement that cannot be allowed to pass unremarked. It is presaged by a sequence, riddled with misstatements and non-sequiturs, involving James Hansen - plainly idolised by the programme presenter. Does Stewart disclose that, in defiance of IPCC guidelines as well as the time honoured protocols of scientific method, Hansen sustains his position by consistently refusing to disclose either his data or his methodology? Hansen, in addition, is an exposed fraudster who, for years, foisted dodgy data into the public arena, only to have to recast the entire 20th century temperature record of the USA, for which GISS has stewardship. As a result, we now know that 1934 not 1998, as previously proclaimed, was the hottest year of the century and ten of the hottest years occurred prior to the 70s. This acknowledgement was finally and reluctantly prised out of GISS on 7 August 2007. Though a momentous event in the context of this controversy, it was not covered by BBC news managers, in spite of having had it flagged up for them.

Hansen is also principal scientific adviser to Al Gore, and has been the recipient of at least one six figure sum from an environmentalist pressure group established by Senator John Kerry, for whom he went on to campaign. Is this relevant? Well, yes, as we shall see, it is highly relevant in the context of what Stewart says very soon after the Hansen excerpt. So, at (57.33) we have: ***“In a way Jim Hansen had been too successful. His high profile testimony galvanised all those who, for whatever reason, disagreed with taking action to prevent climate change. It was the beginning of an organised fight back, driven by a band of maverick scientists supported by powerful businesses and politicians, and they would subject the whole idea of global warming to a new and searching critique.”*** (My emphasis)

Why ‘maverick’ and which ‘powerful businesses and politicians’? Is it the contention of the BBC that a genuine dialectic cannot take place between AGW protagonists and others who may simply wish to question the underlying physics? Evidently so. In short, if you are a questioner and, in that sense, a sceptic, it must be because you have tainted motives - you must be, in the words of Dr. Stewart, a ***maverick scientist supported by powerful businesses and politicians***. This, it is not too fanciful to add, should be read as “suborned”, “paid for”, “bribed”. Is it to this that Dr. Stewart makes reference near the beginning of the episode, when he speaks of science ***“even being bought”?***

To be sure, it is!

And who, precisely, does the BBC/Dr. Stewart have in mind? Off the top of my head, let’s spin a few dissenting names at random, just a few - Akasofu, Landsea, Courtney, Monckton, Gray W, Tennekes, Soon, Michaels, Ball, Carter, Clarke, Spencer, Christy, Robinson, Gray V, Reiter, Kinninmonth, Khandekar, Shaviv, Corbyn, Friis-Christensen, Singer, Seitz, Cripwell, McLean, Starck, Pisarev, Raitch, Endersby, Douglas, Knox, Hathaway, Doran, Bhat, Molg, Pudsey, McKitrick, McIntyre, Keeling, Chylek, Lindzen, Svensmark, Marohasey, Klyashtorin, Pratt, Humlum, Pielke. Tell us please, is it one of these? If not one or more of these, then perhaps the names that Dr. Stewart/the BBC have in mind are to be found amongst the 32,000 odd scientists from countries worldwide, who have publicly registered dissent - in a number of distinguished cases, IPCC lead authors or contributors, with some even describing the AGW hypothesis as

the greatest fraud in the history of science. In the words of one, ***“dressed up as science, but not science at all”***. And, whilst on the subject, this aggregation of 32,000 names, amongst which are some 9000 PhDs, does not include members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, one of the world’s great scientific bastions. Which amongst these legions is a ‘maverick’ scientist, who has trimmed his sails at the behest of commercial interests? Or is it all of them?

In short, **not** defamatory generalisation and slimy innuendo but names and details - **if you please**.

Let us not forget also that many of the names include Titans within their respective disciplines, holding chairs in some of the world’s most prestigious academies - in noteworthy contrast to Dr. Stewart, who is what? A junior lecturer in the University of? Ah yes, of course - Plymouth, wasn’t it!

In short, perhaps it would now be in order to suggest to Dr. Stewart and the BBC that they should either put up, and risk the potential consequences in the courts or, in the alternative, broadcast a prime time apology for malicious insinuation and for impugning the motives of legions of scientists, men and women, with far greater achievements to their names than he exhibits any promise of matching. We, the licence fee paying public, are expected to accept Stewart’s judgement/assertion that the word of an exposed charlatan, Hansen, is to be preferred to NASA prize winning physicists, of the calibre, say, of Christy or Spencer. Why should they be singled out here? Well, of course, only because Dr. Hansen parades the NASA GISS association as his own incontestable seal of authority.

No thank you, I think not.

Episode 2. The Fight Back

My first response to this episode is once again to be struck by the sheer ineptitude of the presenter. My second is more complicated. For some considerable time I have known that the BBC had despatched a representative to attend the Heartland Conference in March (qv my letter dated 14 April to Stephanie Harris). Until seeing this programme, my assumption had been that this representative would have been an environmental reporter - well, so called. It has now become clear that the assumption was wrong and that, in fact, the BBC’s man on the spot was none other than Dr. Stewart. So, rather than acting bona fide in the public interest by reporting an international conference involving major climate science specialists, at licence fee payers’ expense, the BBC instead conspiratorially despatched an observer with the pre-determined objective of garnering material for use in a planned future and strictly one sided pro-AGW polemic. The self-evident premeditation converts what might otherwise have been seen as mere incompetence (well, at a pinch!) into an act of crude moral turpitude.....of the kind, indeed, that the public has come to expect from the BBC across a broad spectrum of its coverage.

So to specifics. The episode opens with the portentous statement that global warming is ***“the defining challenge of the 21st century.”*** Really? How does Dr. Stewart know? We’re not even past the first decade! At (00.48) he goes on to say ***“They are the climate change sceptics, and they’ve turned global warming into the most hotly debated issue that science has ever seen*** (cue in shots of donkey pumps - subtle rhetorical juxtaposition), and at (1.51) ***“This was science’s great battle for the truth.”***

So it is AGW dissenters who have raised the temperature of the debate not, like the BBC, the proponents of speculative and catastrophist scare mongering, not those who, for over thirty years, have made a point of scurrilously impugning the motives of anyone who might even consider the adoption of a questioning stance - not even, necessarily, a sceptical one. The importance of highlighting these opening remarks is, of course, that they establish the tone and the moral launch pad for what, indeed, turns out to be an exercise in propagandist deceit and misrepresentation. In popular parlance, this was no more than a hatchet job. As for balance - heavens, what a preposterous notion!

The passage moves on to consider the putative attacks made by dissidents on the entire structure of AGW science, even to questioning whether mean global temperature had risen at all. At (07.22) Stewart states ***“It seems like such a simple question - is the world getting hotter or colder?”*** Does he, at any time, reflect that reality may be nothing like so simple? Whilst he touches upon possible effects of altered land usage, does he, for example, point to the fact that:

- Hansen himself has publicly acknowledged that arriving at a global mean temperature is an undertaking of extraordinary complexity?
- The globe is covered by sea or large expanses of fresh water to over 70% of its area, so no thermometers over almost three quarters of the earth's surface?
- As the result of global conflict - in the 20th century, in particular - many measuring stations were either destroyed or, at best, were maintained only haphazardly?
- Temperature measuring instrumentation, both historically and geographically, was far from standardised, accurate or reliable? And, in passing for the information of Dr. Stewart, not all were maintained by Jesuit priests!
- Since the world wars and, more recently, the collapse of the Soviet Union, two thirds of the world's measuring stations have effectively ceased to operate?
- Many of these were located amongst the coldest regions on the planet? Would Dr. Stewart continue to take daily readings during a howling blizzard in Siberia - especially if he hadn't been paid for two months and had little prospect of being paid for another two?
- The removal of cold readings from the aggregate will necessarily give rise to an increased average?
- There has been no warming in the 21st century, notwithstanding an increase in CO₂ concentrations of between 4-5%?
- Global mean temperatures have actually been falling for at least the last six years? Who says? Hadley, UAH, RSS and, yes, even NASA - although, admittedly, the last is uncomfortably torn between the espousal of honest scientific measurement and James Hansen?
- Many climate physicists now expect this declining trend to continue?
- Even Hadley is now predicting that warming is unlikely to recommence until 2015 - a hopeful guess; it was previously 2009!

Not at all! Simply for him, at (07.58) ***“You stick them (thermometers) everywhere - all over the world.”*** It is worth noting that the correlation between apparent global mean temperature increases and the number of measuring stations has been plotted, and is in the public domain. A copy is attached as an integral part of this complaint. And Dr. Stewart is supposed to be a scientist in a conscientious pursuit of ***“science's great battle for the truth”***. Gordon Bennett - you don't say!

Between (10.40 & 28.52) there follows a string of, at best, highly questionable statements, with some so vacuous as to be simply breath taking - ***“Welcome to Las Vegas. Like it or not, it's one of the 20th century's greatest achievements.”*** So - not modern physics, splitting the atom, plate tectonics, exploration of the ocean depths, robotics and satellites, mass automobility, transnational electrification, the agronomic revolution, the discovery of antibiotics, eradication of smallpox, mass vaccination, human transplantation, non-invasive surgery, medical diagnostics, the explosion of therapeutic drug availability, radar, radio & television, heavier than air flight, development of reliable rocketry, electronics, the explosion of computing, information technology, the world wide web/internet, analytical chemistry, plastics, mass transport, cracking the DNA helix or unscrambling the human genome! Nope - none of these, but rather **Las Vegas**. Wow!

In the context of the series, however, this pompous and inane declaration does provide one useful insight. It speaks eloquently to the intellectual and academic calibre of the presenter chosen by the BBC as well as of those of its staff, who commissioned him and edited these three programmes. I do not propose to dwell at length on this passage in the film, save to touch briefly upon the inclusion of what, for the most part, were little more than one sentence quotations from an assortment of high profile sceptics. What was interesting from the perspective of an informed viewer was that the presentation was contrived in such a way as to omit context. In fact, each contributor was scarcely given a chance to say anything beyond one or two sentence sound bites. But then, of course, the BBC would not want to interrupt the flowing eloquence of its chosen presenter.

I do not have (and do not need) access to the complete interviews with the scientists involved. Why? Because I know that Dr. Stewart's presentation, deliberately without doubt, was/is a travesty of what these contributors each believes, and is in print as espousing. In other words, it was nothing short of wilful misrepresentation, black propaganda. Let us look at just one example. At around (23.56), we have Dr. Roy Spencer apparently conceding that his satellite measurements were incorrect, and that they now indicated an upward temperature trend. What has actually been acknowledged? The critical sentences are as follows:

“The new global trend from Dec 1978 to July 2005 is + 0.123°C/decade, or + 0.035°C/decade warmer than v5.1. This particular error is within the published margin of error for LT of +/-0.05°C/decade (Christy et al 2003). (My underlinings).

In other words, we are here talking about errors, within declared experimental tolerances, that are so minute as to be almost undetectable. What is Stewart’s take on this? At (23.56), with ersatz sincerity but evident glee, he declares: ***“Oh, you’ve got to feel for him. I mean I’d be absolutely mortified if I had to admit a high profile mistake like that. For me the important thing is that Spencer admitted that he’d made a mistake.”*** Yes, but not the mistake attributed to him by this mendacious presenter. By way of compounding this egregious misrepresentation, he goes on to draw the conclusion that the satellite data were, therefore, unreliable and, indeed, that Mann’s ground temperature data and, by extension the hockey stick, were vindicated. Well, well - this the BBC considers to be impartial reportage!

Instead, let us focus on (28.52), at which point the hero of the hour, Dr. Michael Mann, makes his appearance centre stage. By way of proffering a helping hand, Dr. Stewart introduces him thus: ***“They accused Mann of using faulty data and dodgy statistics to rewrite history.”*** No - surely not! At (36.17) Mann is given leave to make his pitch: ***“I never expected the sort of attacks we were subjected to when I began this work.....If you can’t win your argument on the basis of science, you try to win based on defamation, slander, of - um - rhetoric that sounds convincing, but has no basis in fact.”***

One might fairly begin by noting two things, which are beyond dispute - (1) if Dr. Mann believes himself to have been traduced and defamed, the courts of the United States and elsewhere are there for him to seek redress and (2) for AGW proponents (and, actually, Mann in particular) to accuse others of recourse to ad hominem attacks betokens a level of cynical hypocrisy truly worthy of a Renaissance pope.

And, while we’re on the subject, who precisely are “they”? Stewart, of course, intends the viewer to conclude that they are/were maliciously motivated dissenters. Did he point out that:

- The existence of the Medieval Optimum and the Little Ice Age held centre stage in the first IPCC Assessment Report (AR1) in 1990.
- The hockey stick graph was preceded by a notorious e-mail sent by an AGW protagonist, Prof. Jonathan Overpeck, declaring that ***“We have to get rid of the Medieval warming.”***
- The hockey stick graph had been held up as “the smoking gun” of AGW science in the IPCC’s AR3 but that, by AR4 in 2007, it had surreptitiously been relegated to an inside page.
- The fraud perpetrated by the Mann, Bradley, Hughes troika was exposed by expert statisticians, Profs Steven McIntyre and Ross McKittrick.
- Their findings were independently investigated by the Wegman Committee appointed by the United States Congress.
- This committee totally endorsed their conclusions.
- The National Academy of Sciences of America (NAS) likewise excoriated the MBH hockey stick graph.
- Other similar graphs, supposedly supportive of the MBH hockey stick, and one suspects, used by Stewart in the film (although, conveniently, he provides no provenances), were likewise found to have been fraudulently fabricated by associates of the troika, ie at (39.10) ***“ we now have a whole hockey team’s worth of graphs”.***
- Employment of the methodology used by MBH was found always to yield a hockey stick - even, it has been reported, if fed random “noise” such as numbers from the New York telephone directory.
- In using bristle cone pines as a temperature proxy, he did so in the face of express warnings by the NAS no less that this species was not fit for purpose. Why not? Because it is sensitive to factors other than increases in temperature.
- Having used an unreliable temperature proxy in the bristle cone pine, data were then fraudulently manipulated and/or suppressed with the premeditated intention of ensuring achievement of a hockey stick effect?
- Mann has this year attempted once again to resurrect the hockey stick. This attempt too has been comprehensively discredited by, amongst others, scientists in Finland with an intimate knowledge of that country’s lakes. These, supposedly, had provided Mann with supportive temperature proxies. It

might also fairly be asked why, if the provenance of the hockey stick V.1 was/is as secure as Stewart declares it to be in the film, it is necessary to seek to validate it again now.

- The uncovering of this unsavoury episode was achieved in the face of active and incessant obstruction by MBH and by Nature, the journal which published their paper.
- Like Hansen, in continuous and brazen defiance of the time honoured protocols of scientific method, the MBH troika (a) refuses to make available either data or methodology for verification/replication by other investigators and (b) refuses to be peer reviewed by any but their own nominated cronies/collaborators.

The answer to the multi-part question posed above is, of course, No. In fact, so predictably half baked and maladroit is the hockey stick that, entertainingly, it has been likened to a goat - shove in whatever you like at one end, and what comes out the other is invariably the same!

At around (43.51) we have moved on to Herschel and the possible role of the sun as the principal climate driver. I will by-pass the presenter's puerile reference to Herschel - in case you didn't get the joke, accompanied by telling sardonic smirk! Instead, let us move on to Stewart's plainly deliberate misrepresentation of the graph used in *The Great Global Warming Swindle* to illustrate the correlation between sun spots and global mean temperatures. Because the sun spot line ends in 1980 (though not the temperature line), Stewart insinuates that the makers of *Swindle* were suppressing evidence damaging to the point they were making at this stage in their film. He does not go on to reveal that *Swindle* looked much further with interviews involving Prof. Ergil Friis-Christensen. Nor does he remind viewers of the related and telling evidence involving Profs. Nir Shaviv and Jan Veizer. Such lacunae, of course, were necessary. Had it been otherwise, the point being attempted by Stewart would have been blown out of the water. Worse - it would have revealed the disingenuous motivation of the programme makers. Indeed, so brazen is Stewart's presentation at this juncture (many others too, it has to be said) that at least four questions immediately spring to mind:

- Did the BBC notify the makers of *Swindle* that they intended to refer to and make use of material from it?
- If so, in accordance with Editorial Standards, did they afford the makers of *Swindle* and/or Channel 4 an opportunity to reply?
- If not, do questions of copyright infringement arise?
- Given the fact that Stewart clearly implies wilful deception by the makers of *Swindle*, do issues of defamation arise either in relation to them or to the commissioning broadcasters within C4?

Personally, to the last I would say "Yes". Further, if asked, I would have no hesitation in repeating such a view in a court of law should either or both decide to issue proceedings.

At about (46.57) Stewart states: ***"in fact, since the 1990s, solar activity looks as if it's been on the decline, which should mean that the planet's been getting cooler. Instead, we've reached record temperatures."*** Let us not mince words. This is a bare faced lie. Apart from the 1997/8 El Nino high, there has been no statistically significant rise in global mean temperatures since 1995, and most of the present century has been marked by a declining trend. Who says? All four of the accepted world temperature data repositories - NASA GISS, RSS, UAH and Hadley. As an integral part of this complaint, a graph derived from all of them is attached. In passing, it may be noted that this also belies the contention, more than once heard on the BBC, that sea temperatures have been climbing.

At (54.10) Stewart continues: ***"But as the scientific evidence has accumulated in favour of global warming, it's become harder and harder to claim that there's any real scientific disagreement on the core issues."*** This, once again, is a bare faced lie. An enormous weight of published scientific papers question rather than affirm AGW orthodoxy.

He continues at (54.51): ***"But there are still sceptics who maintain that the science isn't settled, and they explain away the mass of scientific opinion by claiming the whole global warming theory is a fraud."*** If the "mass of scientific opinion" is to be taken as that promoted by the IPCC, then it is appropriate to note the verdict of the late Professor Frederick Seitz, a former President of the NAS, on the IPCC's AR3, to wit that:

“None of the studies above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of green house gases.”

And later

No study to date has positively attributed all or part of the climate change observed to date to anthropogenic causes.”

And later still

“I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer review process than the events that led up to this IPCC report.”

Except in the context of global warming, the notion that “the science is settled” constitutes a strange and unconscionable statement from any scientist. In science no question is ever settled. Who says? Well, to be sure, none other than, to Lord Robert May, a successor President of The Royal Society, Lord Rees of Ludlow. As Prof. John Brignell has crisply and rightly noted: “If it’s settled, it’s not science!” Attached is a copy of a letter from Rees to me, to be regarded as an integral part of this complaint.

Neither, at (54 23), should anyone be impressed by May’s torrid endorsement of Stewart’s line. The RS has for years been prostituted to the dogma of global warming. It has done everything in its power to engineer suppression of debate surrounding AGW orthodoxy. Indeed, I can speak from personal experience. So unsettled were the courageous and worthy denizens of Carlton House Terrace by sceptic contributions of mine to The Royal Society’s website blog that, overnight, it was discontinued - not just the stream relating to AGW, but in entirety! And I do not even claim scientific accreditation! Its position is wholly disreputable - scientifically and in every other way.

The motivation and bona fides of the BBC and of Dr. Stewart have already been touched upon. So central are they, however, to any reasonable assessment of this series, it is worth again highlighting the presenter’s pre-programmed mindset. To this end, attention is drawn to his brief exchange with Viscount Monckton - well, brief anyway, as broadcast. Thus, following on from some actually incontrovertible points put to him by Monckton, at (55.44) we have from Stewart the following: ***“Fraud’s a big word to use in science, and you’ve said it’s littered with it.....It sounds a very demoralising view of science - I just don’t see it..... To me such attacks are a sure sign that the scientific battle is over.”***

Unfortunately for Stewart, he was/is betrayed by his body language. His whole deportment made it abundantly clear that he fully “saw” the force of the reasoning that had been put to him, but was pre-determined to misinterpret, distort and misrepresent it. It was plain, furthermore, that he was pre-programmed to deny any argument, however cogent, that ran counter to the grain of the agenda that had been set for him by those commissioning the series. One might add in passing that his spurious incredulity was also pretty stupid. Anyone with even superficial knowledge, from whose ranks Dr. Stewart’s name needs to be excluded it seems, will be all too uncomfortably aware that the history of science is bestrewn with instances of fraud - from the risible (Piltdown Man), to the tragic (Lysenkoism), to the ultimately murderous (Eugenics). In this litany of infamy, global warming is simply the latest example of skulduggery, albeit to date, also overwhelmingly the greatest.

Episode 3. Fight for the Future

With his characteristic contempt for factual accuracy, Dr. Stewart embarks on Episode 3 with the following declaration: ***“The last thirty years have seen an epic battle over climate change.”*** Since, if only for reasons of age, I have personally been observing this controversy for somewhat longer than he has, it is possible to state with some confidence that, for at least two thirds of that time (and probably more), there has been no debate at all worthy of the name. Instead, the world has been subjected to a megaphone monologue from AGW proponents and the forces of irrational environmentalism - aided and abetted, it must be said, by an idle and compliant media driven by self-interest. Personal denigration and misrepresentation have constituted the weapons of choice to be deployed against anyone, but especially established and respected scientists, who have had the temerity to question the cultist orthodoxy. This moral depravity has extended even to

institutions such as The Royal Society and the BBC, which might once fairly have been seen as two of the glories of the English speaking world. For sure, not any longer!

At (00.33), he continues: ***“But after a monumental struggle what’s emerged is one of the most rigorously tested theories in the history of science.”*** Indeed!

Science is the dialectic opposition between theory and observation, for which elegantly succinct and precise definition I am indebted to Prof. Richard Lindzen. In other words, for the benefit of Dr. Stewart and his cronies at the BBC, the ultimate arbiter (‘test’, if you will) of a scientific hypothesis is observation, of which accurate prediction is a persuasive subset. Climate modelling of itself is not “a new science”, as Stewart claims, any more than is the construction of an atom smasher. It is a new, developing and potentially powerful, scientific technique. Whether or not potential is realised is a product of the quality of the assumptions/data that are fed into it. If what emerges is validated by empirical data derived from the real world, so be it. If not, as ever, the GIGO principle operates - to wit, Garbage In, Garbage Out. Science is **not** a consensus of vested interests underpinned by divination, either in the entrails of a sheep or of a computer!

So, what’s the reality? It is, of course, that:

- observed evidence for AGW in the real world is not just scant, it is totally absent;
- without being fiddled (adjustable parameters), GCMs have been unable to recreate even the known past climate record;
- their success in predicting even immediate future climatic effects has been equally unimpressive;
- as a substitute for intellectual rigour, AGW science has and does deploy unsubstantiated, and frequent flagrantly false, megaphone propaganda invariably of a catastrophist character;
- putative evidence of a general warming is highly ambiguous;
- furthermore, since any that there has been seems to have been confined to the Northern hemisphere, it is not even global;
- even if it is conceded that warming has occurred, strident assertions of possible adverse effects are found upon examination to be baseless. In fact, in the last three or four decades, there has been strong evidence of the beneficial effects to be derived from increased concentrations of CO₂, ranging from increasing agricultural productivity to the greening of the Sahel and even, who knows, just maybe lower cold related human mortality. In passing, it may be noted that recorded deaths resulting from hypothermia have always overwhelmingly exceeded numbers resulting from heat prostration;
- any warming there might have been is devoid of any causal link with CO₂, whether natural or man made;
- claimed evidence for a link is the product of computer modelling, flawed logic (can’t be anything else, so must be CO₂ - a complete non sequitur!) and unsubstantiated assumptions;
- rather, any such link is more demonstrably based upon an elaborate, and often internally inconsistent, tissue of lies and corrupted practice - in a word, fraud, of which the Mann counterfeit is only the most discreditable but, by no means, the sole example.

But still, back to specifics. The by now expected vapid lead-in brings us, at (08.09), to: ***“The thing is, though, there’s a limit to where a dish pan and a Bunsen burner and ice can take you. Simple experiments like these may have helped scientists understand the climate, but they weren’t going to be able to predict the future.”*** But hark - say again! A Bunsen (Boonson?) burner, an external heat source, say you? I may, of course, be wrong (Heavens knows, I often am), but doesn’t this remind one of something?

Moreover, for somebody allegedly equipped to pontificate on this subject, our presenter is strangely reticent about the acknowledged limitations of computer modelling. Does he not know that even the IPCC does not talk of predictions but only of “scenarios”? Is he unaware that the brilliant predictive capabilities attributed by him to GCMs failed totally to foresee the current, and most likely persistent, cooling phase..... to cite but one example?

But there’s no stopping our boy now! Cutlass clenched between gritted teeth, onward he surges until, at (09.28) comes the triumphant denouement: ***“But the computers were not going to be left behind for long. By the 1970s they had finally outpaced the weather. Now scientists were able to move on to their greatest***

challenge - predicting the climate years into the future.” Once again Stewart exhibits fundamental ignorance of what is in the public arena. Is he unaware that weather prediction, and not only in this country, remains highly hit and miss for even 24 hour forecasts. In fact, recently published research in the UK suggests no more than a 70% strike rate, and that’s now with the benefit of quantum leaps in the availability of computing power since the 70s. Longer term forecasts from the UK Met Office? Notoriously and hopelessly unreliable, in fact, worthless - indicating, amongst other things, that the rules governing the climate which, according to Stewart, were laid bare by experimentation in the 50’s, were/are, in reality, not even close to his simplistic description earlier in the episode. Indeed, as is widely known, using different methodology and a tiny fraction of the resources available to the Met Office, Dr. Piers Corbyn has for many years, including 2008, consistently delivered forecasts far more accurate than the Hadley Centre, and almost invariably fundamentally at odds with it. What a surprise!

So, what is left of the rest of this episode. Not much, it has to be said. Most is given over to tendentious speculation or to wilful disinformation. Hansen’s claims for the accuracy of his model, proselytised by Stewart, might have been more persuasive had he been willing to subject it to the scrutiny of his peers. It might fairly be pointed out that the Pinatubo eruption took place seventeen years ago. What’s he done since?

As to the Greenland icecap, on which Stewart dwells at some length, does he at any time tell the viewer that it has been getting thicker for at least ten years? Does he explain that, just as some glaciers are contracting, others are expanding - the Johns Hopkins glacier in Alaska, for example, as well as others in New Zealand, Europe and Asia? Does he explain that numbers of glaciers that, in recent years, have been contracting are once again expanding? Does he make the point that the number of glaciers worldwide is estimated to be around 160,000, of which fewer than a hundred have been studied in any detail? Does he disclose that shrinkage in Gore’s much vaunted Furtwangler glacier at the summit of Kilimanjaro has precisely nothing to do with higher temperatures? As for Antarctica, a hugely bigger and more important factor in the earth’s climate system, not a word - oh, in passing, but also expanding as well as getting dramatically colder!

His comments about the Arctic, which seems to exercise him out of proportion to its importance but which may be superficially arresting, warrant comment really for three reasons only:

1. We are now in early November only, and already Arctic sea ice is at its most extensive for the last six years - see attachment, forming an integral part of this complaint.
2. Few would dispute that the world’s primary authority on the Arctic is Prof. Syunichi Akasofu. He appears not to be disturbed by the flux of the Arctic as manifested by sea ice cover or, come to that, in any other way.
3. The BBC gave huge publicity recently to the antics of a clown set upon paddling his kayak to the Pole, thereby to demonstrate catastrophic polar ice melt. Significantly, it did not report that he got no further than 80° N, several hundred miles short of an almost identical Norwegian effort in 1917. Why might that be? Perhaps you, or someone else in the BBC, might care to tell me.

Summary

In bad faith, this series was commissioned and embarked upon at great expense to the licence fee payer. It set out to be a hatchet job ab initio. Its purpose was never anything other than the furtherance of the propagandist agenda, which the BBC has been pursuing for years. To this end, like other BBC broadcasts on the same theme, it was/is no better than a gallimaufry of wilful misinterpretation, misrepresentation, tendentious cherry picking, scurrilous innuendo and outright lies. Of these, the last are arguably the most serious, so it is worth recapitulating some at least, for which evidence has been supplied with this letter. They are as follows:

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| • The world is getting hotter. | It is not. |
| • CO ₂ is the cause of global warming. | Pure speculation. |
| • Other explanations for climate change have been shown to be false. | Untrue. |
| • GCMs have been shown to be reliable. | Untrue. |
| • Only a tiny minority of scientists disagree with AGW orthodoxy. | Untrue. |

