

Ward,RE

From: STRINGER, Graham <graham.stringer.mp@parliament.uk>
Sent: 10 October 2017 12:54
To: Ward,RE
Cc: FIANDER, Simon; Science And Technology Committee; LAMB, Norman; Benny Peiser; LAWSON OF BLABY, Lord
Subject: RE: Letter to Graham Stringer MP

Dear Mr Ward,

Your letter contains a clear admission that the computer models have predicted more warming than has been borne out in the observational record. It is this crucial point that I referred to in my letter to The Times and article in the Daily Mail. Although you assert that I have made statements that are inaccurate, you have clearly failed to show that this is the case.

The justification for government intervention in this area has been not only that global warming is happening, but that it is happening at a sufficiently dangerous rate. Simply being within a (wide) margin of error is not good enough when it is the precise central forecast that makes the difference between forecasting significant benefits or costs to the global economy. The appropriate policy response rests on this figure, and it is clear from the Nature Geoscience paper that models had predicted too much warming.

Those struggling to meet rising energy bills would be entirely justified in feeling they have been misled. 0.9 degrees of warming is more than 30% lower than expected. Scientists with integrity, such as the authors of this report, respond to such findings by rethinking their assumptions, and endeavouring to learn more. I suggest that you too take such an approach.

You acknowledge that the IPCC's embarrassing prediction that Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035 has now been discredited and disowned by the IPCC. It was this fiasco that I was referring to. Moreover, a more recent study published in *The Cryosphere* journal (Rankl, M. et al, 2014) found that Western Himalayan glaciers were mostly stable or increasing in size.

Your letter fails to recognise that the contribution of Working Group II to the IPCC Fourth Assessment also includes the claim that "Estimates of the additional population at risk for >1 month transmission range from >220 million (A1FI) to >400 million (A2) when climate and population growth are included." This claim and others have been exploited by journalists to imply that climate change is making malaria worse.

I have made no false claims about the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia. The evidence submitted to the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee and the various enquiries held showed that the scientific practices followed by Professor Jones at CRU fell way below acceptable scientific standards. I quote from the Institute of Physics evidence to the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee: "*prima facie* evidence of determined and coordinated refusals to comply with honorable scientific traditions and freedom of information law", "manipulation of the publication and peer review system", and "intolerance to challenge... Which is vital to the integrity of the scientific process".

The Royal Society of Chemistry, again in evidence to the Science and Technology Committee, stated: "Other scientific bodies also raised concerns about how CRU did its science. The Royal Society of Chemistry noted that the "apparent resistance of researchers from [CRU] to disclose research data... may infer that the scientific results or methods used are not robust enough to face scrutiny. This has far-reaching consequences for the reputation of science as a whole."

Professor Kelly of Cambridge University, as part of the Oxburgh inquiry, indicated that Professor Kelly's work was turning 400 years of scientific method on its head. Contrary to your claims that there is a smear against CRU these comments and the evidence of how this unit worked should be made more widely available.

Dr Millar and his co-authors were brave to publish this report, knowing as they must have done the reaction it would generate. Nonetheless, it is not surprising that they would try and distance themselves from some of the conclusions that naturally follow from their findings. Not at all surprising in the atmosphere that exists at present, where it is not enough merely to disagree with those sceptical of climate alarmists, but one must also attack their credibility and force them out of the debate entirely. Theirs and your hypersensitivity to those drawing the 'wrong' conclusions is undoubtedly a reflection of this atmosphere.

You consistently fail to make a distinction between opinions that you disagree with and factual claims. Perhaps you should find a more constructive way to spend your time.

Yours sincerely,

Graham Stringer
MP Blackley and Broughton

From: Ward,RE [mailto:R.E.Ward@lse.ac.uk]
Sent: 21 September 2017 11:49
To: STRINGER, Graham <graham.stringer.mp@parliament.uk>
Cc: FIANDER, Simon <FIANDERS@parliament.uk>; Science And Technology Committee <scitechcom@parliament.uk>; LAMB, Norman <norman.lamb.mp@parliament.uk>
Subject: RE: Letter to Graham Stringer MP

My apologies, please disregard the attachment to my last message which was a draft of the letter. Please find attached the final version.

Bob Ward

Policy and Communications Director
Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
London
UK
WC2A 2AE

Tel. +44 (0) 20 7107 5413
Mob. +44 (0) 7811 320346
Web: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/grantham>
Twitter: @ret_ward

From: Ward,RE
Sent: 21 September 2017 11:45
To: 'graham.stringer.mp@parliament.uk'
Cc: 'fianders@parliament.uk'; 'scitechcom@parliament.uk'; 'norman.lamb.mp@parliament.uk'
Subject: Letter to Graham Stringer MP

Please find attached a letter to Graham Stringer MP, Member of the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology, and copied to the Chair and Clerk of the Committee.

Best wishes,

Bob Ward

Policy and Communications Director
Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment
London School of Economics and Political Science
Houghton Street
London
UK
WC2A 2AE

Tel. +44 (0) 20 7107 5413

Mob. +44 (0) 7811 320346

Web: <http://www.lse.ac.uk/grantham>

Twitter: @ret_ward

UK Parliament Disclaimer: This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.