

4 July 2008.

BBC Ref: 15439897

Mr. Bruce Vander  
Complaints Manager and Secretary to the ESC  
BBC Trust  
Room 211  
35 Marylebone High Street  
London W1U 4AA.

Dear Mr. Vander

### **Global warming and systemic BBC bias**

I am writing yet again to complain about the BBC's failure to treat the issue of global warming objectively, not to say with the gravity it deserves by addressing the evidence - as opposed to propaganda disseminated by self-interested pressure groups, environmentalist and otherwise. This letter will be longish, because there is so much hard data that the BBC elects to censor, even though provenance is impeccable. An initial complaint addressed to BBC Complaints, per your procedures, is inappropriate. This letter is concerned not with what has been broadcast but by what has not. As a *mise en scene*, let me begin with a quotation from Stephanie Harris's letter of 31 March. She wrote:

*"we must ensure that we avoid bias or an imbalance of views on controversial subjects" and, given the weight of scientific opinion, the challenge for us is to strike the right balance between mainstream science and sceptics since giving them equal weight would imply that the argument is evenly balanced.*

*There may be now a broad scientific consensus that climate change is definitely happening and that it is at least predominantly man-made.....the weight of evidence no longer justifies equal space being given to the opponents of the consensus."*

The BBC has never given "equal space to opponents of the consensus" but, for present purposes, let us by-pass the unblushing hypocrisy inherent in "no longer justifies". Rather let us focus on what has actually been happening in the last few weeks. Why? Because developments have been released to the public domain which:

- have been significant in the context of the debate;
- have related not to "views" or "opinions", per Ms. Harris's statement, but rather to hard empirical evidence born of observation in the field - not computer games;
- have been systematically ignored by the BBC.

So, what then are these developments? Allow me to elaborate:

**The Manhattan Declaration on Climate Change & The 2008 Oregon Petition.** These declarations have now been signed specifically by scientists in numbers that, when last I looked, had run to many thousands – over 31,000, if memory serves, amongst them over a thousand PhDs. It should be made clear that these legions of educated people mainly from the USA, but also from over 40 countries in total, are notable not just for quantity but also for quality. Names include the most distinguished names in the field of climate physics. Many self-proclaimed experts, of course, have not signed and, in the face of the facts, even decline to acknowledge that serious dissent exists. Such brave souls have a simple option open to them. They can publicly debate the issues with their dissenting peers. It can safely be predicted that this they will avoid doing at all costs, as will equally courageous spokesmen from within the ranks of fascist environmentalism, to whom the BBC pays homage..

**Temperature stasis.** No-one except a born again AGW cultist or scientist/environmentalist defending patent vested interests would now seriously ignore the reality of a leveling off of global mean temperatures, indeed a continuing declining trend, even in the face of rising CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations. Only a fool too would deny that this declining trend is precisely what the best science, emerging from the Russian Academy of Sciences and elsewhere, is now predicting. In any event, reality has now been confirmed by all recognized data repositories - Hadley, RSS, UAH, WMO and even NASA. May was the coldest in the Northern hemisphere for decades, and the seven months leading up to it saw average mean temperatures reverting to the level at which they stood when the orchestrated scare mongering began. A state of emergency has been declared in half of Peru's administrative departments brought about by temperatures plunging to minus 22°C.

**The sun.** Heavyweight climate scientists in increasing numbers have in the past weeks declared their conviction as to the primary role of our neighbouring star is influencing climatic change - and, in passing, not just on this planet! Many have now recently come out and frankly stated the AGW is fraudulent. In passing, given the record of GISS and such luminaries as Mann, Bradley and Hughes, is true beyond reasonable doubt. Again we are here talking about genuine practicing scientists not those who believe that science is appropriately conducted by cooking up scenarios in the guts of computers.

**Sea temperatures and sea levels.** It has been announced that the ARGO network of ocean buoys has disclosed falling sea temperatures with sea levels, if anything, in decline - as indeed might be expected in the circumstances. Further work will probably be necessary to confirm this apparent trend, but it is firmly based on observation in stark contrast to Mr. Gore's mendacious assertions.

**Sea ice.** The winter of 2007 saw the greatest accretion of Antarctic sea ice since records began in 1979. That has been added to dramatically in 2008. Contrary to tendentious reports in *The Independent*, Arctic sea ice has not melted. On the contrary, June saw reports of the entrapment for no less than seven days of a large Russian ice-breaker in the NW Passage. The enclosure with this letter is not very well written. Nevertheless, it too properly draws attention to the shambolically slapdash standards applied by BBC environmental journalists, of which I too have complained repeatedly.

**Destruction of records.** It is a requirement of the IPCC (not to mention plain, honest science and ordinary common sense) that data and records should be preserved and be made available for others to study. Of course, it is well known that, within the AGW fraternity, this stipulation is honoured more in the breach than in the observance. Nevertheless, stories of deliberate destruction of records by a major AGW proponent in this country are unusual, but have recently been circulating. I have not been able to check for myself, and so make no comment as to their reliability. However, on the day that sad news of the demise of a genuinely great BBC journalist has broken, perhaps this is something that one of Charles Wheeler's successors might care to investigate - assuming, that is, that journalists of comparable calibre still exist within the BBC - or, at any rate, amongst its environmentalist cadre.

**Conclusion.** As I stated in my letter dated 2 June 2008, the issue is not whether AGW is true. I am personally satisfied that it is a fraudulent fabrication. Nevertheless, my mind is open to change as and when evidence becomes available. In the interests of "calibration", the BBC chooses to ignore what it chooses to regard as dissenting views or opinions, albeit with little real justification. Well, so be it. For willfully ignoring hard facts, however, there is no justification, only prejudice and propaganda. So, for the license fee payer, the issue remains whether the BBC has exercised proper professional standards, especially of impartiality but also of veracity, in its coverage of so-called climate change. It has not. These latest examples of willful censorship serve to reinforce the point.

In the interests of fairness, I will end with one small caveat. Travel recently has precluded keeping in touch with BBC coverage, not that I've felt greatly impoverished thereby. Modest attempts have been made to discover whether or not the Corporation has covered newsworthy developments in relation to some/any of these topics. I have been told that the last two weeks have seen nothing but the usual tendentious claptrap. Nobody will be more pleased than I if you can tell me that this information is incorrect.

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham