

My submission to the review is a simple one.

The review team should take cognisance of the meticulous analysis carried out by Gavin Schmidt at the following website of the most contentious of the emails. I am sure there will be other interpretations of the emails referred to but I would be surprised if any provide a better analysis in context:

<http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2010/02/the-guardian-disappoints/>

I am not a climate scientist but take an interest in the debate because the science is so very important to the future of human life. I am also very concerned at what feels at times like a huge effort to discredit the science - the most serious of which was the theft and public release of the private emails of the scientists working at the CRU. I don't believe this effort is concerted or conspiratorial. It has, however, received its greatest boost by the release of these emails. It is important that the analysis of the emails take place carefully: I believe, to repeat, that the best and most careful analysis of the most contentious of them can be found at the website above.

Regards

Dr. Henry Barnard