

Following on from published harassment of the BBC by Greenpeace.

8 April 2008.

Lord Butler
Master
University College
Oxford
OX1 4BH.

Dear Robin

Roger Harrabin, BBC Environmental Reporter & Jo Abbess, Greenpeace 'Climate Activist'
<http://www.jennifermarohasy.com/blog/archives/002906.html>

Thank you for your letter of 2 April in reply to mine of 31 March. In responding to it now, I have no intention of seeking to lure you into an extended and unwelcome correspondence; indeed, I had not planned to write again at all. However, in the last forty eight hours, a story has hit the streets, as it were, about which you may as yet be unaware. It speaks directly to the main substantive point of your letter. On my printer it doesn't reproduce well, so the link is given above.

Any concern, needless to say, is not about Ms. Abbess. She is sanctimonious, ignorant and shrill to be sure, but only one of innumerable just like her within the ranks of fascist environmentalism. What is outrageous is the BBC, for what this little exchange of disreputable messages demonstrates is that:

- a collusive dialogue routinely exists between the BBC and pressure groups like Greenpeace;
- the BBC is quite willing to treat assertions by such groups unquestioningly;
- for no other reason than to accommodate the prejudices of an activist from such a pressure group, the Corporation is willing to alter a significant news report hitherto considered balanced, appropriate and justified;
- the journalist in question is plainly supine, and is willing to allow himself to be browbeaten;
- the BBC is plainly failing in its duty to provide impartial news coverage;
- it is now questionable whether the BBC can be said to be in control at all of its own affairs and its own ethos.

That honest controversy enriches academic debate is incontrovertible. However, there is an implied condition to the truth of this statement, is there not? Pursuing an honest dialectic is one thing. Pursuit of a spurious dialectic involving fraud and intellectual chicanery is another. One is the province of academic freedom and honesty, the other of hucksterism. Would the university, for example, endow a chair or establish a post devoted to the promotion of intelligent design? I rather think not.

As was implied in my earlier letter, anthropogenic global warming has a provenance about equivalent to that of creationism. The appointment of David King lends to it the respectability of the oldest university in the English speaking world. As Ms. Abbess's excesses reveal, she and her friends abhor debate. What they want is conformity to the damaging mythology espoused by King. The notion of Little Red Books emerging under the imprint of the OUP is, no doubt, an extravagant conceit. That it might be fancifully entertained at all is a sign of the times, perhaps.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

R.C.E. Wyndham

Cc: As the spirit moves

See also: http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/letters/Butler_letter_31032008.pdf