

Statement by The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley

The editors of *Physics and Society* were very courageous, and were acting entirely within the spirit of learned discourse, when they decided to invite me to contribute to their journal a statement of the reasons why I considered that the case for climate panic had not been made. I was most grateful for their invitation, and for the professionalism and patience with which they handled my paper, *Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered*, notwithstanding considerable delays caused by an unusually severe outbreak of the incurable illness from which I suffer. The paper was published in July 2008.

The attached reconciliation sheet, which it is my custom to compile when revising a paper in the light of reviewers' comments, shows that the paper was indeed well and thoroughly reviewed, and by no less a person than Al Saperstein, the well-known Professor of Physics at Wayne State U. The only sense in which it could legitimately be said not to have been peer-reviewed is that it was not sent out to a climatologist. However, there was no time for this, because my illness had delayed matters; so, as the reconciliation sheet shows, the reviewer rightly decided that I should explain the source and derivation of every equation so that a non-climatological physicist could grasp what was meant.

I was happy to do as the reviewer so wisely suggested, because the vast majority of the APS membership are not climatologists: therefore it was right that explanations and definitions that might seem superfluous to a climatologist should be added, and – as can be seen from the reconciliation sheet, which lists each of the reviewer's comments and the actions which I took in response – I was happy to comply in all respects with the reviewer's suggestions.

Of course, any errors that remain (and there are a few, because the time constraint imposed by my illness prevented me from checking the page-proofs) are mine and mine alone, and the editors cannot be in any way held to blame for them. It seems to me that they have done us all a service by allowing so full an argument against the now-collapsing "consensus" to be presented; and I think they are subtle enough to realize that, in adding a red-flagged strapline about the absence of peer-review, they are guaranteeing that the paper will get the widest possible circulation.

Certainly, ever since the strapline appeared my mailbox has been jammed by people protesting, rightly, that scientific papers can and should stand on their own merits, and that the strapline – in this sense superfluous – illustrates with great clarity one more attempt by those who are losing the scientific argument to silence all scientific argument on the part of those whom they offensively brand as "deniers".

As you know, the editors were careful to publish an entirely consensual paper taking a view opposite to mine in the same issue. That is the essence of debate. No doubt the debate will rumble on, and no doubt in due course a trenchant rebuttal of my paper will appear. The editors have done the cause of science a great service by standing up to the bureaucrats within the American Physical Society who had lamentably and ignorantly decreed that no scientific debate on the future evolution of a mathematically-chaotic object – the climate – would in future be countenanced. They deserve full credit for that, and I am grateful to them. However, the American Physical Society's churlish public statement about the publication of my paper is contemptible. I call upon the President of the Society to resign.

Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered

Author's reconciliation of reviewer's requested revisions

Reviewer: Professor Alvin Saperstein, Professor of Physics, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

June 2008

Figures and tables

There are no ordinate or abscissa labels on many figures.

All figures now redrawn and relabeled clearly

No clear separation between figure-captions and general text.

Captions now drafted and set in italics

Tbl. 2 I don't understand it.

Table now removed: new Table 2 inserted, captioned, and explained

Fig. 1 appears to contradict Fig. 2: in 1, T_S is going down; in 2 it is going up.

[Comment on this discrepancy, on the actual data of past years, not on the projections].

Explanation now provided that NCDC dataset anomalously shows increase

Fig. 2 can't read figures on left.

Figure now clarified

Fig. 4, 5 can't read at all. Don't understand it, or where it came from. Some hints needed.

Figures now clarified, captioned, and explained fully in the text

Fig. 6 no ordinate labels. Don't understand it, or where it came from. Some hints needed.

Figure now labeled, clarified, captioned, and explained fully in text

Fig. 7 is clear. Make more of it: it contradicts the GW claims.

Discussion paragraph on this figure now added

Fig. 8 has overprinting, making it very hard to read or understand. I don't understand it.

Figure reloaded from original source paper: now clear

Definitions

T_S : People mean different things about T_S ; clarify that further.

Now defined clearly at the beginning of the paper

“radiative forcing” Define it.

Now defined clearly early in the paper

ΔF : Define it. Is it directly measurable? If so, what data do we have?
[you criticize IPCC for not providing such a definition!]

Definition and discussion of this parameter now provided

“other anthropogenic forcings” What is meant by this? Why are they net-negative?

New table and explanation of net-negative forcings provided

“temperature feedback” Define it. Feedback of what to what?

Now defined clearly early in the paper

“unamplified temperature feedback” Define it.

Now defined: i.e. not amplified by other feedbacks

“laboratory experiments” Describe them in outline.

“greenhouse-gas forcing” **Outline now provided in the text**
Define it. How is it distinct from other forcings (what are they)?
Description of distinctions between forcings now clarified
“aggregate forcing” Define it.
Term now defined at point of use
“linear/non-linear feedbacks” I thought feedbacks made all systems non-linear.
Yes: but Bode’s equation addresses initially-linear systems

I don't understand why forcing can't be measured. that shows that I don't understand the difference between solar flux incident on top of atmosphere and "forcing", which takes us back to the initial need for clear explanatory definition.

Now fully clarified in the text

I don't know the difference between "forcing" and "feedback". If "forcing" is not just external energy flux, than I would assume it includes "feedback". What do you mean?

Definitions now lengthened and clarified in the text

Equations

Eq. 1 Where does it come from?

All terms now defined at point of first use

Eq. 2, 3 Are they definitions or are they derived? If the latter, how?

Eq. 2 is in essence the Bode feedback-amplification equation

The source for Eq. 3 is now cited at point of use

Eq. 4, 5 Do they follow from Eq. 2 and 3? If so, say so; if not, hint where they come from.

Eq. 4's value is derived from IPCC central ests. in new Tbl 1

Eq. 5 is the IPCC's definition (IPCC, 2001: ch. 6.1)

Eq. 6's derivation from Eq. 5 is now fully explained

Eq. 11 What does it mean?

This is the CO₂ feedback: now fully explained at point of use

Conclusion should be longer and stronger.

Discussion, conclusion, and acknowledgements now added

References will be needed.

References now added