

Dear Sir

For your enquiry to carry any weight whatsoever the need for impartiality is paramount. The appointment of individuals such as Dr. Campbell as a noted supporter of AGW and defender of the UEA CRU is seen as a deliberate attempt to cover up or "whitewash" the investigation. Thankfully he has seen fit to resign in order to try and restore some credibility, although I fear some damage has already been done.

From my own perspective although not a scientist, I have spent over three years researching and reading ALL evidence pertaining to man made climate change and, for what its worth have reached the conclusion that there is substantial evidence, which has been systematically suppressed by groups such as the CRU scientists, to suggest that the so called "skeptics" make many valid points. The suppression of evidence contrary to their own view including redefining the peer review process and refusing FOI requests is totally unacceptable and clearly from the email chain a common practice. What kind of scientists (or human beings for that matter) would gloat over the death of one of their opponents?

Clearly this group and their wider cohorts have taken an epistemological and ontological stance within their research which had lead them to a point of arrogance and disdain for the scientific process. Anyone who has studied research methodology is aware that the scientific conclusions are nearly always influenced by the beliefs of the researcher.

In response to your remitt I would say the following:

1. Yes - there is evidence of data manipulation, selectivity and suppression which calls into question their impartiality
2. Yes - the peer review process has been corrupted by allowing only scientists with common shared views to peer review
3. Yes - there is clear evidence that FOI requests were ignored or refused on spurious grounds

May I suggest you consult A W Montford who writes the 'Bishop Hill Blog' who with the help of many contributors carefully and analytically investigates the practices, research and conclusions of the AGW scientific community, detailing many anomalies within areas such as statistical analysis of data and the lax scientific rigour behind many of the claims made. His 'Hockey Stick Illusion' book should also be on your reading list.

My suggestions for the recommendations in your report:

1. An independent UK review panel for all climate science research papers consisting of "neutral" members
2. A new scientific review process which is open to scrutiny and which all researchers will adhere to
3. A review of the UK governmental and scientific links to the IPCC and the funding thereof
4. An investigation of the links to "commercial interests" by members of the IPCC
5. A review of research funding for climate research groups with potential punishment for those do not comply with any new practices or panel review process
6. A call for all of the scientific community (alarmists and skeptics) to integrate and co-operate

I could go on but I'm sure some of these are already in the investigative teams thoughts.

Yours Sincerely

A MacIntyre - MBA