

I have already made a submission to the Science and Technology Committee on this subject and would not like to repeat myself beyond making seven points I would be happy to discuss further.

[Submission to the Science and Technology Select Committee can be accessed from the following link.]

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/387b/387we28.htm>

1. Threats of libel were made against me by members of CRU (leaked emails) as editor of a journal I have edited since the mid 1990s. Benny Peiser will inform you about the 'Keenan' case in more details.

2. Before I took over this editorial job on top of teaching environmental management at Hull, I studied the politics of the IPCC under an ESRC grant at SPRU, Sussex University and even acted for a while as a peer reviewer of WG III. The group of energy experts, environmental economists and NGO people provided WG I (science) with (dubious) emission scenarios, and governments with solutions desired by various lobbies and research groups. Their promise was a technical revolution at home and global exports of 'clean' technology. I concluded early on that we were facing a situation in which solutions were looking for, and finding, a problem. The solutions involved nuclear power, renewables, energy efficiency reducing energy demand, the problem dangerous warming caused by emissions from the burning of carbon fuels.

(Before studying the politics of 'climate change' I worked on the politics of marine pollution control and acid rain.)

2. A message was sent to my head of department late last year by Phil Jones in relation to some other matter, which suggested that the University of Hull should dissociate itself from me as editor of Energy & Environment (Multi-Science) as I was causing difficulties for CRU. Professor Graham Haughton replied that academic freedom would prevent him taking action, and I gratefully acknowledge his support, privately shared by many colleagues. However, CRU scientists and their US friends had little regard for a journal which they considered the 'journal of choice for climate sceptics'. As a social scientist with some initial training in climatology and geology, I felt that these IPCC critical voices deserved to be heard, especially as I had already discovered that they were excluded from the IPCC.

4. The journal had been publishing 'climate sceptical' papers since the early 1990s. The CRU people did not like this and refused to meet me for discussion in the mid 1990s, that is after I had completed my research into the politics of the IPCC and from which I emerged as a convinced sceptic. My scepticism arose less from the science itself than observations of how it was funded, used and interpreted by its 'users'.

5. When I took over the editorship of the journal from a former senior DOE scientist, I published several of the major peer-reviewed papers highly critical of the IPCC, including the McKittrick and McIntyre papers (2003 and 2005) which are widely credited with having 'demolished the hockey-stick graph'. I similarly published papers (Henderson and Castles) critical of the economic assumptions underlying emission forecasts feeding into the climate models. The journal has also published a great deal of non-controversial material, but largely

from on-British authors. Its 'bad' reputation has surely harmed it in the UK and possibly Europe as its impact rating has remained low. 'Politically correctness', that is belief in the IPCC and its solutions on climate change, was clearly demanded from energy researchers. Climate sceptical science papers (peer reviewed by sceptics!) and viewpoints, including from Lindzen, Singer, Christy, Kininmonth, Loehle and many others were published as well but as far as I know did not make it into IPCC references.

6. I blame less the scientists working for the IPCC – prestige and funding resulted from having one's work used by this body – than the people putting pressure on scientists to 'deliver' in support of the 1992 Convention on Climate Change. This enshrined in law that climate change was man-made and dangerous, and did this without defining climate. In turn the treaty became the justification for major energy policy decisions (decarbonisation), especially in Europe. In my understanding and experience only those scientists and disciplines which supported this assumptions of this treaty and related policy agendas, would be funded and accepted as contributors to the IPCC.

7. After many years of observing the IPCC and global energy agendas, I never considered the IPCC to be an independent scientific advisory body, but rather saw it as a meeting place for assorted research lobbies, environmental bureaucracies and international lawyers, as a political instrument using and misusing science and the climate threat primarily to 'underpin' other agendas.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen