

After receiving a request for donations from his University Master, Rupert Wyndham explains a few facts to the Master as to why donations might not be forthcoming this year. A lesson for all graduates.

31 March 2008.

Lord Butler
Master
University College
Oxford
OX1 4BH

Dear Robin

Thank you for your letter last week on the subject of fund raising for the College. When last we exchanged correspondence about this, attention was drawn to the fact that contributions had been made on a number of occasions in the past, and I looked forward to gifting further in the future. However, as I also mentioned, just at this precise moment, I am already fairly heavily committed. In short, there are a dozen small (and now not so small) waifs in Chiangmai, orphaned by AIDS but not themselves carriers of the virus, who depend on me directly for a significant part of their welfare, especially educational.

There is, however, another factor, which I should like to draw to your attention. I ask your indulgence if this letter turns out to be a little long, but think you'll see why. Anyway, a little background history is called for. Four years ago Dr. Andrei Ilarionov, then chief economic adviser to Vladimir Putin, decided to cross check the advice coming to him from the Russian Academy of Sciences on the subject of global warming. Its members had opined that it would not be significant and would pose no threat. To this end, and here I quote from an impeccable source, "*he looked around for the sappiest, laziest, most acquiescent, most true-believing government in the world, and settled upon the UK..*" The then Foreign Secretary was invited to a meeting avec entourage, including the then Chief Scientific Adviser, Sir David King. Unbeknown to them, six of the world's most eminent sceptical scientists had also been invited.

Let me continue by further quoting my source: "*Sir David King, not realizing he had been ambushed, launched into his usual exaggerated, alarmist presentation (he actually knows remarkably little about the science of climate, and makes an ass of himself every time he opens his mouth on the subject). The six sceptics heard him politely until one of them, who told me the story, could contain himself no longer. When Sir David said that the snows of Kilimanjaro were melting because of "global warming", my informant pointed out that, in the 30 years since satellite monitoring of the summit had begun, temperature had at no instant risen above -1.6°C , and had averaged -7°C (Molg et al., 2003); that the region around the mountain had cooled throughout the period (Cullen, 2006); that the recession of the glacier had begun in the 1880s, long before any anthropogenic influence (Robinson, Robinson & Soon, 2007); and that the reason for the long-established recession of the Furtwangler glacier at the summit was ablation caused by the desiccation of the atmosphere owing to the regional cooling. It had nothing to do with global warming.*"

Fortuitously, it just so happens that I am a child of empire, one of the last, and this rings a bell entirely personal to me. You see, as a small boy in either Kenya or Uganda, I remember Kilimanjaro (as well as what I now know to be the Furtwangler Glacier) being discussed at my father's dinner table. Of course, I do not remember the detail of the grown-up conversation nor would I have understood it all, but its essence I do remember. It was a speculation about the apparent diminution of ice at the summit.

So, to return: "*Sir David King, embarrassed at having been caught out, said he had never been so insulted in all his life. He flounced out of the meeting, followed by the rest of the British delegation. To Dr. Ilarionov, two conclusions were evident: first, that the supporters of the "consensus" position had based their argument on known scientific falsehoods and were accordingly unable to argue against the well-informed sceptics; secondly, that, as he put it at the time, the British Government were behaving like old-style imperialists. The breakdown in relations between the UK and Russia began at that moment.*"

I will not comment on the conclusion contained in the last sentence, save to say that it wouldn't surprise me any more than would the italicised part of paragraph 2 above.

So, what is the point of all this? The point is a simple one. It is that anthropogenic global warming, now spun to climate change, has not a scintilla of authentic scientific evidence to support it. Likewise, there is not a scintilla of authentic scientific evidence to support the plethora of catastrophic phantasmagoria which the likes of David King and Al Gore are determined to promote as fact. In other words, King, himself a distinguished chemist if not scientist, is content not simply to watch the corruption of scientific method, and therefore the scientific endeavour generally, but to act as an enthusiastic participant. This issue, we are admonished ad nauseam, is the defining challenge to the species in the 21st century. Intellectually, however, it is no more than a vast inverted pyramid constructed on the summit of a sand dune. Let me go a step further and suggest that it is so manifestly shoddy, mendacious and corrupt that it is simply not possible for AGW science to be pursued disinterestedly and with honesty of purpose. At a macro level, Nigel Lawson has called for the dissolution of the IPCC. He's right to do so. You may or may not agree with the proposition just put, but it represents my carefully considered conviction and, moreover, I believe it to be supremely important on many levels. I am not alone.

So, where does that leave us or, more accurately, where does it leave me? Well, I find myself confronted with an uncomfortable dilemma. In general terms, do I consider that donating to the University in one guise or another is 'a good thing'? Yes, of course. Do I, on the other hand, really feel in good conscience that financial support should be given to an institution, which not only promotes the self-preening of a vain man, but actually goes further by installing him in a sinecure calculated to allow him to further his malignant proselytising endeavours.

No doubt, in the fullness of time, the ethical conundrum will resolve itself in my mind – perhaps to the benefit of the university and/or college, perhaps not. Either way, in purely monetary terms, the effect will be insignificant. In the long run, I am not so sure that that it will remain so with regard to the appointment of the Director of the Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment at the University of Oxford.

We shall see.

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham

Cc: Sir David King	Lord Rees	Prime Minister	Mr. David Cameron MP	Mr. Nick Clegg MP
Ms. Julia Goldsworthy MP		Lord Lawson	Mr. Mark Thompson, Director General, BBC	
Mr. John Humphrys, Today Programme, BBC			Editor, Daily Telegraph	As the spirit moves

NOTE by the webmaster:

See also: http://www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com/pdf/BBC_and_Greenpeace.pdf
For further observed evidence of the origins of the BBC bias.