

Dear Sir Muir Russell,

first, may I apologise in advance for your involvement in what I can only describe as a sordid mess, I can also say with almost complete certainty that you will be heavily criticised after the inquiry. Having spent much time "in" the sceptic community, there's no doubt you will appear to have been biased, because (if I am completely honest) the "sceptics" do not have the resources necessary to put across their real and serious concerns in a way that you would be able to give them the weight they deserve. I also appreciate that a "public" inquiry will be extremely expensive to run, and you will be criticised both for the cost, and for the lack responsiveness to the public - which requires money.

So, the chances of your inquiry coming out with any credibility amongst the "sceptics" is I'm afraid also zero. Please do not take this as any indication of your own credibility, because that will be entirely unjustified!

My own position, is that I used to have a great deal of faith in Hadcrut3, because I thought (mistakenly) that they were produced by the Met Office, and I could not believe the Met Office would fiddle them. However, after following these figures for several years, I became very suspicious with the figures and the emails confirmed my suspicion regarding what I would describe as a "culture of deceit".

Because I'm very interested in the subject of climate, I'm really annoyed with the CRU. I now don't know what is happening to the climate and I would really like to know! Personally, I'm at the stage that I need to see the original data and work out for myself whether the methodology being applied is appropriate.

In particular I wouldn't trust anyone who has ever colluded with website like Realclimate.com or the people who run it like Michael Mann. That very much rules out the bulk of the people mentioned in the emails. I was disgusted with what I read they were saying in private, when we have such a huge publicity machine at their beck and call saying the opposite.

I personally believe the only solution that is going to restore the credibility of the global data is to both:

- publish the raw data in full together with their offsets
- hand the job of processing the data to one of the older established universities with STRONG background in the hard sciences particularly physics (I'm a physicist by training so biased - I also have industrial experience in measurement, particularly temperature measurement including, design of precision measurement equipment, and meteorological measurements for wind sites so I need to see data).

However, I appreciate that political pressures to "back" the science is going to make such radical changes impossible, so we have to play this game whereby you have to do your job and run the inquiry, whilst I will have spend even more time trying to make the case in my own time and at my own expense (And I think I'm justified to be annoyed that this important task is left to unpaid people like me to do it).

However, if I can help you anyway in the inquiry please do contact me.

The website is a very good start! Well done.

regards,

Mike Haseler