

Date: Thu, 06 Nov 2003 12:38:57 -0500
From: Raymond S. Bradley <rbradley@geo.umass.edu>
To: Sonja.B-C@hull.ac.uk
Cc: mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu, wigley@ncar.ucar.edu,
mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu, shs@stanford.edu
Subject: clarification

In a recent email to Mike Mann you ask:
"journals like mine are surely permitted to ask and who is funding the 'global warming' modelling community ". It is public knowledge that almost all of the modeling research in the US is funded by a government firmly committed to NOT adopting the Kyoto protocols. If your argument is that we are all somehow brainlessly following the dictates of our funding, would it not follow that we would all be publishing results that support this government position? Apparently we are not. Could it be that the entire research community is perversely seeking to have their funding terminated, or perhaps that 100% of the community are Democrats? This seems inherently unlikely..... Scientists seek to publish what they discover, wherever the chips may fall, and other scientists (NOT selected by the authors) review their procedures and data, then recommend whether the research should see the light of day. This is known as peer review. If other scientists then find fault with the published research, they are free to write a critique which is always --ALWAYS-- sent to the original authors to assess and respond to BEFORE it is published. You apparently do not follow such procedures, which clearly demonstrates that you are not interested in an open dialogue, but only concerned with pushing your own political agenda--the very criticism that you seem to level at climate scientists who worked on the IPCC research assessment. As for the McIntyre and McKintrick paper that you published as a "correction" to our work, following an "audit" of our data and procedures, you have done the research community a great disservice by giving voice to a flawed and erroneous study which neither correctly "audited" our work, nor "corrected" it. Furthermore, you did not give us the common courtesy of seeing the paper before it was rushed into print. Had you done so, we would have pointed out the errors and misunderstandings that pervade their study. Let me emphasise that I believe anybody has the right to carry out a climate reconstruction and submit their results for publication, but nobody has the right to claim they have undertaken an audit when they have manifestly not done so. I'd have thought that a company CEO like McIntyre would understand what the word audit meant even if you do not. Since you clearly "do not claim that I or my reviewers can arbitrate on the 'scientific' truth of publications that the IPCC selects" I really think it would be best if you don't stray into that arena and stick to what you feel you can best evaluate. I suspect you would not appreciate an evaluation of your work published in the Journal of Geophysical Research. Sincerely

Raymond S. Bradley
University Distinguished Professor
Director, Climate System Research Center*
Department of Geosciences
Morrill Science Center
611 North Pleasant Street
AMHERST, MA 01003-9297

Tel: 413-545-2120

Fax: 413-545-1200

*Climate System Research Center: 413-545-0659

<<http://www.paleoclimate.org>>

Paleoclimatology Book Web Site:

<http://www.geo.umass.edu/climate/paleo/html>