

## The *Real* Global Warming Swindle – by Channel 4 (cont.)!

### Leading Climate Scientist accused of “A Major Deception”:

In June 1996, Dr Frederick Seitz wrote to the prestigious Wall Street Journal accusing Dr Ben Santer of a major deception in presenting chapter 8 of the UN Intergovernmental Panel Report in 1995, of which he was the lead author. A most serious allegation, attacking the integrity of the scientist involved! Dr Seitz wasn't a climate scientist, wasn't involved in the IPCC procedure and clearly knew little of its rules. Worst of all, he slandered Dr Santer without even having the decency of contacting him or the other senior scientists involved to express his concern and seek an explanation before contacting the non-scientific press!

Dr Seitz objected to certain changes made to a draft version of the chapter during the extensive consultation and revision process laid down by IPCC rules. Of course changes were made - that's what is supposed to happen, “in order to produce the best possible and most clearly explained assessment of the science” (B. Santer)! The fact that the final report was indeed a faithful reflection of the current science was confirmed by 40 other climate scientists, all major contributors to the report, who co-authored Dr Santer's letter to the Wall Street Journal, refuting the allegations. Dr Santer's competence and integrity in his authorship of the chapter were also attested by letters of support from the Chairman and Co-Chairmen responsible for the oversight of the whole report, and by the Executive Committee of the American Meteorological Society and the [U.S.] University Corporation for Atmospheric Research. [I've read these documents for myself.]

The 'Swindle' programme also took exception to the fact that governments and NGOs were involved in the consultation process. Of course they were! This isn't 'Science for Scientists' alone; these documents are meant to form the basis for developing public policy and therefore have to be clear and comprehensible to non-specialists, as well as being faithful to the science.

It beggars belief that Channel 4 should dig up this disgraceful episode with its scurrilous accusations over ten years later, *without once mentioning the strength with which they were rebutted*. As the letter from Dr Santer and his colleagues stated, it can only “reflect an apparent attempt to divert attention away from the scientific evidence of a human effect on global climate by attacking the scientists concerned”. [Remember too that we've had the 2001 and the 2007 IPCC Reports since that time and these have reflected the ever growing confidence of the scientific community in its analysis of the problem.]

David Golding