

Dear Sir Muir Russell,

I feel that the grants received by the CRU should be considered, or at least mentioned in your review. Our UK and EU governments believe in climate change and there would be huge financial implications if evidence were revealed to negate political climate change consensus. Our own Prime Minister calls anyone who queries the 'accepted' science as a 'flat earther'.

A scientific establishment cannot be independent yet, at the same time, have to lobby for research grants. It would be a brave scientist indeed who put at risk millions in funding. The CRU has received nearly £14 millions in funding from governments since 1990. There would also appear to be 'potential funding' from those with a financial interest in promoting "new energy" technologies such as the Carbon Trust. Hence, possible conflicts of interest as regards grant funding should surely be part of your remit?

Also, on your website you state-

/Do any of the Review team members have a predetermined view on climate change and climate science?

/

/No. Members of the research team come from a variety of scientific backgrounds. They were selected on the basis they have no prejudicial interest in climate change and climate science and for the contribution they can make to the issues the Review is looking at.

/

You have 'lost' Doctor Philip Campbell yet, in a speech to the Royal Society of Edinburgh on 29 October 2009, Professor Boulton said:

*"We have the evidence, we have a consensus on scientific interpretation, we have the investment, we know (Stern) that mitigation now rather than later is cheaper. But, we have not sorted out the politics and started to adapt behaviour to minimize risks. We cannot do this without public support. If we fail, we will be risking the consequences of catastrophic climate changes."

*

The Professor would certainly seem to have 'a predetermined view on climate change and climate science'? So perhaps a balance could be provided by enlisting another scientist who has opposing or non-aligned views?

You, yourself, also appear to have no doubts as to the climate change consensus. You ask-

/What is climate change and why is important?

You may find the following links helpful: /

You link to *Wikipedia* but fail to mention a single source of scientific information on the sceptical side. Could I suggest Watts Up With That? <http://wattsupwiththat.com/> simply to provide a semblance of balance.

Yours sincerely, Gill Chant.