

Mr Graham Stringer MP  
Select Committee on Science and Technology  
House of Commons  
London  
SW1A 0AA

13 October 2017

Dear Mr Stringer,

Many thanks for your email message of 10 October, responding to my letter of 21 September. I am disappointed that you have chosen not to acknowledge and withdraw any of the false claims contained in your article for the 'Daily Mail' and letter to 'The Times' on 20 September. I think most researchers would regard your continued promotion of these false claims as reflecting poorly on you, not just as a Member of Parliament but also as a member of the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology.

The authors of the paper by Millar et al. were clear and explicit in their letter to the 'Daily Mail' on 21 September: "Graham Stringer MP misrepresents our study to claim global temperatures are not rising as fast as predicted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and suggests that action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is therefore no longer urgent". Your insinuation that their letter was a response to pressure put on them is, frankly, as offensive as it is obviously untrue. As a result of the misrepresentation by you and others of their paper, the authors also published a statement on the website of the Oxford Martin School at the University of Oxford (<http://www.oxfordmartin.ox.ac.uk/opinion/view/379>). It states: "A number of media reports have asserted that our recent study in Nature Geoscience indicates that global temperatures are not rising as fast as predicted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and hence that action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is no longer urgent. Both assertions are false."

Your message of 10 October falsely claimed that my letter of 21 September "contains a clear admission that the computer models have predicted more warming than has been borne out in the observational record". In fact, my letter explicitly pointed out that the paper by Millar et al. indicated their estimate of global mean surface temperature in 2015, based on HadCRUT4, lay within the range projected by the CMIP5 model ensemble. The authors were clear that CMIP5 models take into account uncertainties in future projections of temperature. Climate scientists do not claim to be able to precisely predict future warming, and there is no scientific basis for your assertion that "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". Hence, your attempts to justify your misrepresentations of the paper by Millar et al. simply compound the harm caused by your erroneous article and letter.

**LSE**  
**Houghton Street**  
**London WC2A 2AE**  
  
**+44 (0)20 7107 5027**  
**+44 (0)20 7107 5440**

**[gri@lse.ac.uk](mailto:gri@lse.ac.uk)**

**[lse.ac.uk/  
granthaminstitute](http://lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute)**

**Chair:**  
**Professor Lord Stern  
of Brentford**

Your message also did not retract the untrue assertion in your 'Daily Mail' article that : "The International [sic] Panel on Climate Change warned that the Himalayan glaciers were melting away, a claim that it later admitted was false". As my letter of 21 September explained, the IPCC continues to warn of the loss of glaciers from the Himalayas. You also did not withdraw your inaccurate statement that "Similarly, it was argued that global warming would bring a new wave of malaria sweeping across the world". Instead, your message cherry-picked the following sentence from IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: "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". However, this was not a quote from the overall conclusion of the report but instead was taken from the summary of one of many studies taken into account in Chapter 8. Furthermore, your quote provided a misleading impression of that study by omitting the sentence that followed it in on page 409 of the IPCC report: "The global estimates are severely reduced if transmission risk for more than 3 consecutive months per year is considered, with a net reduction in the global population at risk under the A2 and B1 scenarios".

In addition, you have refused to withdraw your very serious allegations against the scientists at the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia. Instead you cite controversial submissions by the Institute of Physics and the Royal Society of Chemistry in February 2010 to the Select Committee's first inquiry into the hacked emails and other documents from the Unit. As you know, these submissions, which preceded the conclusion of the many inquiries into the emails, were strongly criticised at the time by many of the learned society members for attempting to prejudge the investigations. None of the independent inquiries found evidence to support your allegation of "scientific manipulation".

Finally, I note that your message copied in Lord Lawson of Blaby and Dr Benny Peiser, who are, respectively, Chair and Director of the Global Warming Policy Foundation. However, your message does not explain why you chose not to disclose in your article and letter that you are a trustee of the Foundation, and only cited your membership of the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology.

I am copying this letter to the Chair and Clerk of the House of Commons Select Committee on Science and Technology.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "R.E.J. Ward". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized, with the first letters being larger and more prominent.

Bob Ward  
Policy and Communications Director

Tel: 07811-320346  
Email: r.e.ward@lse.ac.uk