



Climategate Reloaded

Plots, Politics, and Predetermined Outcomes

The Following e-mails are from an internet list server maintained by the Nation Academies of Sciences for its members. Section 63 is for Academy members of its environmental science and ecology division. For CEI's analysis and commentary, see: <http://cei.org/news-release/2010/03/05/climategate-reloaded>

For more information contact Myron Ebell at 202-331-2256 (o) or 202-320-6685 (m)

Date: Fri, 26 Feb 2010 22:14:13 -0500
Reply-To: NAS Section 63 Discussion
<<mailto:SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXXSECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX
Sender: NAS Section 63 Discussion
<<mailto:SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXXSECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX
From: Paul Falkowski

Dear All

We are facing an increasingly ill informed, hostile public regarding two areas in which we have expertise:

Obviously one is climate change.

The second is energy.

They obviously are connected and the NAS has not done a good job of selling the former to the latter.

Anyone looking at blogs on climate change thinks that the "climategate" debacle and at the hacking of UEA has undermined the scientific basis of climate change.

Combined with the snows in the Northeast, many people may think the arguments about climate change are dead.

Very discouraging.

I would like to invite all members of the NAS (Ralph - please send this to all sections) - to sign a declaration that there is clear scientific evidence that burning of fossil fuels by humans will alter the climate. I want that to be on the back page of the NYT and other newspapers in the US, sponsored by the NAS- without any outside contributions - unless they sign a contract making it clear that the NAS will not endorse any private companies.

For this - I offer \$1000.00 of my personal funds- but I will

only donate these funds if 50 members of the NAS come with matching funds.

I will accept corporate sponsorship at a 5 to 1 ratio; but only to be sure that the corporate funds sponsor the NAS. .

Second, we are facing an incredible misunderstanding of key issues in science across the the spectrum of science.

We have no PBS program on science.

I want the NAS to begin discussions with PBS on developing a national science program for prime time.

I want science to be on Thursdays at 8 PM - and repeated for all schools across the nation - streaming.

I want us to find government and corporate sponsorship.

I think, from private conversations with producers in Hollywood, there is an opportunity.

But, even if not, we need to develop a face on TV and Radio that is real science -

My big conversation

I want the NAS to be a transformational agent in America -

Paul

--

At 07:49 AM 2/27/2010, Susan Kieffer wrote:

Hi, all,

I'd like to remind you that in 1992 1500 scientists signed the "World Scientists' Warning to Humanity", including many NAS members. I think, but can't remember details, that it was on the back of the NYTimes. Here's a link to it that includes signatories:

<<http://www.worldtrans.org/whole/warning.html><http://www.worldtrans.org/whole/warning.html>

Those of us who signed it were, of course, disappointed as we look back over the past 20 years (and more). We do need to keep getting this message out, and especially fight the downturn in public interest and loss of trust in scientists.

Sue

From: "Paul R. Ehrlich" <XXX@XXXXXXXXX.XXX

To: SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX

Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2010 10:59:17 AM GMT -05:00 US/Canada Eastern

Subject: Re: [FOR_SECTION_63] Fwd: [FOR_SECTION_63] a separate discussion

Although the World Scientists Warning didn't get the PR we all (and UCS) hoped for, it has proven immensely helpful to me and others in books, speeches, etc. I think the present effort could play the same role. How can we sit back while many of our colleagues and science as a whole is under massive attack???

Paul

At 09:41 AM 2/27/2010, Robert Paine wrote:
Hi Paul,

i'll put my money where other's mouths have been, so count me in for 1K also. The beltway's foolishness about climate change seems especially ironic given the snowless plight of the Vancouver Olympics.

bob

----- Original message -----

Date: Sat, 27 Feb 2010 10:37:43 -0700

<mailto:SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX>From: NAS

Section 63 Discussion

<<mailto:SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXXSECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX<mailto:XXX
XXXXXXXXXX@XXXXXXXXXX.XX

(on behalf of David Schindler

<<mailto:XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX@XXXXXXXXXX.XX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX@XXXXXXXXXX.XX)

Subject: Re: [FOR_SECTION_63] a separate discussion

<mailto:SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX>To:

<mailto:SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXXSECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX

I'd add that Edmonton is near snowless and has been shirtsleeve weather for most of 2010 instead of the usual -40C.... but of course there are no major media here, so only the locals know! I'm happy to commit \$\$, but am not sure that a newspaper page is the best way to spend it. We could probably sponsor 20 or more public lectures in key places for the same money, and have some dialog with people as well, and much more/broader newspaper coverage. I talked briefly to Ralph in January at a Royal Society event in London, and know that he is as frustrated as all of us are, especially because not only climate science, but all science, is being publicly viewed as untrustworthy. My own feeling is that we need to put a human face to science, & newspaper ads do not do that.

I recall an event at the Smithsonian a couple of eons ago that I thought did a great job, & got lots of media coverage. AL Gore spoke, and several of us did too. It was broader than climate, covering stratospheric ozone, acid rain, etc. but the profile was there, and it might be worth repeating with a climate/climate effects focus, to display the many disciplines and approaches that lead us all to have come to very similar conclusions.

In any case, the bottom line should be a strategic plan first, to have the most effect. It should be led by Ralph, not only is he our head, but one of the most knowledgeable on both the topic and the strange workings of beltway brains.

Dave S

At 01:32 PM 2/27/2010, William Jury wrote:
Colleagues:

I share David's belief that a well-planned and publicized symposium would have more impact than an ad in the NYT. I've been quite active in the community since I retired in 06 and I can attest that the publicity surrounding the hacking and its aftermath has had a devastating effect on the attitudes of the average citizens I call my friends and neighbors. Even worse, I am seeing formerly committed public sector leaders backing off from positions aimed at reducing our fossil fuel dependence. People who have an open mind are wondering about the absence of any coordinated and publicized response to recent anti GW advocates on the part of the mainstream scientific community. As a result, I suspect that there is a widespread belief among non-specialists that a) the last 10 years have been cooler; b) climate scientists have no idea why, because this contradicts their model predictions; c) science is deeply divided about the importance of anthropological global warming; d) climate scientists are working

together to silence opposition. e) the IPCC report was sloppy science, standing behind such unproven hypotheses as disappearance of the Himalayan glaciers.

I've given about 5 climate change education talks around Redlands to service clubs and other community groups, and have been at least partially successful at changing attitudes such as those listed above. But I do get a lot of questions along the lines of: If the recent charge by anti warming people aren't true, why is nobody coming forth to prove it to us? Nothing short of a massive publicity campaign to educate the citizenry about what our best science is saying and why will reverse this trend. That's why I favor David's approach. That said, count me in, whatever we decide.

Bill Jury

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

On Feb 27, 2010, at 6:19 PM, David Schindler wrote:

I too have given several talks, with reaction almost identical to what Bill describes.
D

<mailto:XXXXXX@xxxxxx.xxxxxxx.xxx> On Sat, Feb 27, 2010 at 6:16 PM, Paul Falkowski

<<mailto:XXXXXX@xxxxxx.xxxxxxx.xxx
XXXXXX@xxxxxx.xxxxxxx.xxx wrote:

Dear All,

Al Gore has a very well written article in the NY Times

<[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/opinion/28gore.html?hp](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/opinion/28gore.html?hphttp://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/opinion/28gore.html?hp)

My idea was to do exactly what Bill suggests

People who have an open mind are wondering about the absence of any coordinated and publicized response to recent anti GW

advocates on the part of the mainstream scientific community.

Clearly a paid advertisement in the NYT will

help us get our opinions out unimpeded. I will enquire about the cost of this on Monday - the cost will depend on the day of the week, and the level of the circulation (I assume we would want national coverage). Simultaneously, I will also ask David Shipley, the Op-Ed editor if he will give us space on the OP-ed page - which would be much cheaper and, in some ways easier. We obviously can give talks to the public and have a symposium. Those forums reach fewer people, but should be also pursued - and in so far as one or more of us steps up to help coordinate that effort, so much the better. I will try to contact Ralph off line over the next few days to seek his advice and council. On Monday, I will enquire about forming a non-profit corporation, to which we can contribute funds, and is overseen by a volunteer CPA (this will not be onerous).

On Feb 27, 2010, at 6:19 PM, David Schindler wrote:

I too have given several talks, with reaction almost identical to what Bill describes.
D

At 06:20 PM 2/27/2010, Susan Kieffer wrote:
I agree that both approaches should be used. I am wondering, however, if we aren't 'preaching to the choir' a bit in our choice of the NYTimes. Is this effort going to be restricted to Section 63? I suspect that Sections 15 and 16 would be supportive. I also know that some retired NAS members who are/were affiliated with Section 16 aren't getting these emails.

Thanks all!

On Feb 27, 2010, at 8:58 PM, Steve Carpenter <<mailto:XXXXXXXXXX@XXXX.XXX
XXXXXXXXXX@XXXX.XXX wrote:

Colleagues,

Paul raises an important point about the need for NAS to speak out on grave issues. Dave Schindler and Bill Jury point out that scientists in personal conversation with the public have great impact. I agree, and I think our efforts as NAS members are better spent supporting the speech of such scientists vs. using our trivial personal funds for ephemera such as newspaper ads.

We need a report with the authority of NAS that summarizes the status and trends of the planet, and the logical consequences of plausible responses. The report should be short, factual and written for a broad audience. Necessary technical material should appear in an appendix that refers to key sources such as IPCC-4, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, and any new peer reviewed syntheses that appeared after these most recent global assessments. NAS would not conduct new synthesis or new research to produce this report; rather we would summarize and affirm the key points. The report should be accompanied by a speakers' guide, excellent graphics and slides for use by speakers. The report and supporting materials should be freely available on the internet.

Such a report would meet recent calls from many sources for a nimble, authoritative updating process to supplement or even replace massive international assessments. See for example the 11 February issue of Nature; similar ideas for reforming the global assessment process have been circulating in grey literature of the political science and assessment communities for a long time, in response to concerns about the vulnerabilities of the assessment process.

A "Synthesis of Syntheses" with the authority of NAS would generate press attention and provide talking points, graphics and slides to ourselves and many of our colleagues outside NAS who are meeting personally with the

public, 'where the rubber meets the road'.

My two cents worth – thanks for an important discussion.

Steve

On Feb 27, 2010, at 9:34 PM, David Tilman wrote:

I like Steve's suggestion. I feel that we would have the greatest impact with a factual re-evaluation of the evidence done as an NRC fast and short report. In that way there is no need for an NAS formal consensus. It would seem wise to have the panel not include IPPC members.

Dave

From David Tilman via iPhone

At 08:04 PM 2/27/2010, Paul Falkowski wrote:

Dear All

I think every approach along these lines is necessary to help excise a poison that has been poured into the well of rational thought and scientific facts over the past 20 or more years. Over that period of time, a term entered the political parlance: "junk science". That term was used to expel scientific, valid conclusions from the political dialogue - and to claim every scientific discussion required an alternative viewpoint, regardless of how absurd the argument. This type of ambivalence, even negativity, about scientific data has entered our common lives in many ways, from education about evolution in high schools across the nation to the issue of climate change. I am not trying to be a saint - I am trying to get the NAS members with whom I am associated to be proactive about the issues that are critical to our children's children. Two things are at stake here.

One is the integrity of science, writ large. That is threatened by unbridled, well funded lobbyists for (in this case) the coal, oil and gas industries - that seek to make sure that all science about climate change is "uncertain" - and more recently "biased" in the reports from the IPCC. I personally find such threats to the scientific process we all adhere to more than unsettling. If the public loses faith in scientists, we can see the inevitable consequences. H1N1 vaccines were taken a plot to kill our children. Regardless of the evidence, cell phones cause brain cancer. The political dialogue is course - but scientists are being treated like political pawns - and it is not acceptable. One result is that fewer and fewer Americans want their children to be scientists. And, at least at my university, fewer and fewer American children are enrolling in science programs at the graduate level. In my opinion, the public has lost faith in science because scientists do not speak out to the public and scientists are increasingly viewed as "cooking the books" by the public - i.e., not being honest brokers. The "climategate" issue is one of the most recent aspects of this issue. This has to be stopped - Scientific integrity is something we all worry about - but the issue at hand is not integrity of the IPCC- it is making sure that the public is aware of OUR concerns for all of our futures. The second issue is the boundary conditions of the NAS. As Dave Tillman alludes - the NAS requires a formal consensus for producing a report. I want to help develop a collective, independent voice as NAS members - outside of the NAS boundaries - on the critical issue of climate change and the urgency of developing a national energy strategy and an international engagement to radically reduce carbon emissions. An NRC report would be helpful. A set of symposia would be great. Op eds in the NYTimes and other national newspapers would be also great. An ad in the NYT with 50 to 100 names from NAS members would certainly create some stir. All of these, and other outreach issues are

useful - and that is exactly what I am trying to help foment.

I do not think that the NAS can provide the scientific leadership this country needs without a push from the members - and a parallel drive by individual members working collectively.

That is what I am proposing.

Over the past 24 h I have been amazed and encouraged at the support my proposal has received by the members of Section 63 and beyond.

We have had about 15 pledges for \$1000!

I want to build on that good will and make sure that the facts about the climate system are presented to a very large section of the public - unfiltered by the coal, oil and gas industries (who, ironically, are running commercials on NBC for the winter olympics, while the weather is so warm that snow has to be imported to some of the events).

I realize that my initiative is probably unsettling for some, and possibly downright unseemly. If so, I do not apologize.

I feel I must help us use our scientific expertise and prowess to push back against the wall of disinformation and lies that has come to be the common forum of what is the news and information flow. We need to develop a strategy to deal with this and possibly other issues - both as individual members of the NAS (which gives us some freedom) and as the NAS per se.

I am trying to develop the discussion as a member of the NAS to other members - and not speaking about how the NAS can find a voice on these matters. Ralph gave an eloquent speech at the National meeting last year about this very topic - and it was carried by the news for a day or so. We need to develop a relentless rain of science and scientific dialog on the incredible, destructive demagoguery that has invaded the airwaves, the news media and the public forum and has prevented a rational discussion about political solutions to human perturbations on the environment. I urge all of us to think of these issues and to come with constructive comments.

Inevitably - we will need funds to make something happen.

With my deepest regards,
Paul

- From: "Paul R. Ehrlich" <XXX@XXXXXXXXX.XXX>
To: SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX
Sent: Saturday, February 27, 2010 11:29:39 PM GMT -05:00 US/Canada Eastern
Subject: Re: [FOR_SECTION_63] a separate discussion

Dear Friends,

It will come as no surprise to those who know me that I'm on Paul's side. He came up with a good idea, and as soon as the 501-3C is set up we'll send our check for the ad. But let's not turn this into a debate on what to do -- let's organize what ELSE we can do, asap. Most of our colleagues don't seem to grasp that we're not in a gentlepersons' debate, we're in a street fight against well-funded, merciless enemies who play by entirely different rules. Science is getting creamed with no effective response, and our colleagues involved with the IPCC are getting threatened with prosecution by the likes of Inhofe. It is not clear whether the NAS can ever be an effective voice, but if we don't start some action it surely never will be.

Thanks for listening.

Paul

On Feb 28, 2010, at 7:16 PM, Simon Levin wrote:dear

From George Woodwell:<mailto:XXXXXX@XXX.XXX.XXX>
XXXXXX@XXX.XXX.XXX

Agreed on all points and pleased with the outrage. But what shall we say? Some will remember that famous, ringing phrase of a past president: "I

am not a crook" and how it was heard as an assertion that he was, in fact just that.

We are dealing with an opposition that is not going to yield to facts or appeals from people who hold themselves in high regard and think their assertions and data are obvious truths. There are lessons to be learned from the legal profession for defending one's professions. Take any challenge, not as something to be addressed directly, but as an opportunity to add substance to the case. If the opposition opens an issue, make the issue theirs, and so hot that they have to let go.

Those who stole the e-mails were criminals, not those who wrote them, and the argument must be for jailing the criminals, not investigating the scientists, all of whom were doing their jobs properly, sorting perspectives, data, analyses of data and how to proceed logically and forthrightly. We must make the issue what it is, the most troubling environmental and political challenge the world has ever faced. Those who deny the biophysical facts of the world would deny the reality of the law of gravity. The product of such denials is systematic progress in destroying this civilization. If one wants a view of where that process leads, take a quick look at Haiti at the moment.

The University's response to the challenges of Mann were totally wrong, misguided confessions that they have doubt as to the University's wisdom in employing and supporting him. And we, the scientific community, in an equally misguided effort at showing reasonableness and objectivity, participated.

Has any economist or business professional in a business school been so pilloried? Or lawyer? Ken Starr has just become the President of Baylor!

Yes, you will blast me for such an outlandishly aggressively partisan approach, but you are wondering how to be effective against an enemy that is very skillfully using our classical reasonableness against us and our influence and insights.

One essential political step is to take the money out of politics. We should be thinking and acting to do just that in the interest of defending truth in government, our core business.

If anyone has read this far, thanks. I will participate in a forthright attack on villains. GMW

<ForwardedMessage.eml

Paul Falkowski
Board of Governors' Professor of Marine, Earth and Planetary Sciences
Rutgers University
xx xxxxxx xxxx
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
<mailto:XXXXXX@xxxx.xxxxxxxx.xxx XXXXX@xxxx.xxxxxxxx.xxx

At 05:15 PM 2/28/2010, you wrote:

Dear All:

Can we agree on a name of a non-profit for the voices of our scientists.

Scientists Informing Public Policy (SIPP)

Paul

----- Original Message -----

From: "Paul R. Ehrlich" <XXX@XXXXXXXXX.XXX

To: SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX

Sent: Sunday, February 28, 2010 8:17:53 PM GMT -08:00 US/Canada Pacific

Subject: Re: [FOR_SECTION_63] Fwd: FW: Rejected posting to
SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX

Fine by me. Paul

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Stephen H Schneider" <XXX@XXXXXXXXX.XXX

To: SECTION63@XXX.XXX.XXX

Sent: Monday, March 1, 2010 2:39:37 AM GMT -05:00 US/Canada Eastern

Subject: Re: [FOR_SECTION_63] Section 63 Action Agenda Reconsidered

Hello all and deep thanks for the support. As one of the gang of 17 Inhofe-listed potential climate "criminals" I appreciate your outrage and action orientation. So too I expect does Susan Solomon (who I will cc on this), who is on the Inhofe list--that is beyond absurd as Susan is always fighting--sometimes with me!--for high confidence IPCC conclusions--and one more on the Inhofe list who is not quite one of us yet--Ben Santer--and can we please get that finally done next year!!

I will paste in below for background a piece of some emails I am sending to media, NGOs etc to get them to mobilized on this neo-McCarthyism behavior, but I have some hesitations as to the directions of the Section 63 conversations so far as not nearly as

potentially productive than other approaches I hope you will consider--more on that later, and sorry this is so long an email knowing how busy you all are. First here is what I said to alert about a score of editors and the few remaining good science/environment journalists I know still left out there to the absurdities of the past few months of coverage of climate science and its implications for policy discussions:

Hi all, sorry to bug such busy people as you. After 3 months of damage control trying to remind folks that despite regrettable errors that need process changes to have a better chance to catch similar ones in advance next time, IPCC has many hundreds--I haven't counted them yet (probably many more than that)--of unshaken conclusions and its batting average--despite disinformation engines powered by the usual suspects millions and working at breakneck speed to find more--is absolutely remarkable among any complex institution for assessment accuracy. Certainly the worlds of finance, security and health have nowhere as good a percentage of unchallenged conclusions with that kind of high probability of getting it right. I wish that part of the story would be told in every report, not just the Man Bites Dog part in which the temple of high science is caught in error--which it indeed is, just like all human institutions--but the proper empirical question is by how much relative to all other ways of knowing. Enough of that.

This epistle is about a different kind of "climategate"--maybe I should call it the "NeoMc-Gate"?? That is, Senator Inhofe, in a very good impression of the infamous Joe McCarthy, has now named 17 leading scientists involved with IPCC as potential climate "criminals". Aside from the sheer and transparent attempt at intimidation--which will not work on any of the 17 I suspect--some of the names make me think Inhofe is the unchallenged front runner for the Bring Back Joe McCarthy prize. To me, Inhofe and his staff have lost it, even for them--a very high bar. They name Susan Solomon--who in my opinion--and I tell stories of this in my Science as a Contact Sport--has been the straightest shooter on the block for conservative interpretations of the science at IPCC. That name on the already outrageous list is so outrageous it simply makes most of us laugh out loud. But given that this could turn into an ugly and divisive movement with ditto heads and tea partys crashing our events and sending amazingly hateful emails by the hundreds as they are already doing (or even worse), it may not end up as funny as clear thinking folks may think it is now, so that is what this email is about [especially if the congressional leadership changed and the likes of Barton or Inhofe had subpoena power again].

I am hopeful that all the forces working for honest debate and quality assessments will decry this McCarthyite regression, and by name point out what this Senator is doing by a continuing smear campaign. I think it is high time for some editorializing on the need for civil discourse and process here, and hopefully it will come from senior senators saying the ghost of McCarthy is not welcome in the US Senate. Will they have the courage? That remains to be seen. Many of you could ask them! Will the media have the fortitude to take this on--I'm betting a resounding "yes!". Please don't make me miss yet another prediction!@#\$\$% I have to live with cooling to warming "flipflop" every day, phony as that frame is given the history in Chapter 1 of my book.

Cheers and thanks for listening--and hopefully acting--to expose this UnAmerican tactic for what it is--a smokescreen of denial and deceit. As usual, I never tell you what I really think. Steve

Just so you see the list who have testified to congress on IPCC which Inhofe alleges was a deliberate felony to deceive congress--with no evidence cited of course--here are the proud conspirators (maybe a pretty good recruitment list for us one day?):

#####3

- Raymond Bradley
- Keith Briffa
- Timothy Carter
- Edward Cook
- Malcolm Hughes
- Phil Jones
- Thomas Karl
- Michael Mann
- Michael Oppenheimer
- Jonathan Overpeck
- Benjamin Santer
- Gavin Schmidt
- Stephen Schneider
- Susan Solomon
- Peter Stott
- Kevin Trenberth
- Thomas Wigley

#####

OK, now to what I think needs to be done by us and others. First, we need to push getting a restoration of civility and honest discourse so the national business can proceed without the poisons of Inhofe and his ilk. We need several groups to do that:

- 1-Senior respected members of congress--know any? Suggest it to them. I have.
- 2-Retired officials from congress, Joint Chiefs, Cabinet Secretaries, Ambassadors etc to also decry the horrible state of discourse and its lowering by Inhofe et al. Know any? Suggest it please! I have to a few of them.
- 3-Media needs to rediscover it's lost compass and become the 4th estate again, not just a business in search of ratings driven by focus group preferences. I have tried to wake up that group (see email between stars above), but if you know some ask them to become their old selves again and do their important jobs like Ed Murrow used to. Without it I can't see how democracy can flourish in an age of Wiki and elliptical blogs.
- 4-NGOs need to do it too, but without their usual shrillness, but stressing civil dialogue and national reconciliation. We all know them--and I have had many email exchanges on

this already with enviro NGO folks--but can they get together and do it with grace and not divisive hostility--remains to be seen.

5-National Academies need to be part of this call for civil discourse on science and policy, but collectively and as voices of trusted reason in many countries. I don't think ad hoc groups like us--Sec 63--can be very effective doing that with newspaper ads that will be swamped by all the misinformation hurled out there by the millions of dollars backing that propaganda by the usual suspects--we simply can't beat them at their game, but we can at our game--credibility and telling it straight. For that we need the next point where I hope all of you will work very hard:

6-Scientific societies. It is imperative that leading scientific societies coordinate a major press event--maybe at National Press Club this week--to jointly decry the state of science and decision making in the US and that the problem is spreading elsewhere like to Australia and the UK these days. As credible keepers of the scientific establishments in their fields, a collective response of leading societies saying "enough is enough; lets put the country and planet first, and do it by credible reporting of our state of knowledge, not selective citation of information pushing one sided agendas." That could do alot--would be newsworthy. It would be great if we got AMS,AGU, APS, AMA, Geographers' associations, economic associations ESA, Ecol Econ, COn Bio etc to coordinate this.

Section 63 folks are in a very good position to do the latter and that is what I think is most effective from us--not a straw in the wind newspaper ad trying to out do the distortion set with big budgets for ads on TV and the net and the print venues--could you match the millions they just spent on the Olympics propaganda ads on oil and gas??. Hardly! Beat them with creditability and honesty, not with another ad hoc group that won't get heard above the political noise level.

I do not mean to be unappreciative for the wonderful outpouring of outrage and action orientation I have read so far in your many emails, and thanks to Paul F for getting the ball rolling. But I do think we need to focus our actions on positive changes in the currently badly broken social contract between science and some important policy makers and to build on our character, and show how much the other bunch of shrill distortionists and dividers lack that character. That might just--and I admit I might be naive here--be our best card to play right now--build coalitions and put on a collective show of solidarity with honest science and open dialogue without intimidation and innuendo of criminality for whichever "gang of 17" it is next time in the way of the agendas of the defenders of the status quo.

Regardless, many thanks personally to all of you for what you have been doing, and please try to get others to align with you, especially scientific societies you are close with. Collectively we can turn it around--by ourselves, doubtful, I am afraid.

Cheers and best wishes,

Steve

Stephen H. Schneider

Melvin and Joan Lane Professor for Interdisciplinary Environmental Studies,

Professor, Department of Biology and
Senior Fellow, Woods Institute for the Environment

Mailing address:

xxxx x xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx x xxxxxxx xxxxxxxx - xx xxxx

xxx xxx xxxxxx

Ph: xxx xxx xxxx

F: xxx xxx xxxx

Websites: climatechange.net
patientfromhell.org