



CARIE ❄ RANNOCH ❄ PH17 2QJ

monckton@mail.com

From: The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley

30 May 2010

Father Dennis Dease, President,
St. Thomas' University,
St. Paul, Minnesota.

Via pmsimmons@stthomas.edu

Reverend Father,

Associate Professor John Abraham

I am not sure whether you are aware that one John Abraham, who describes himself as a professor at your university, is using your university's web hosting facilities to mount an academically dishonest personal attack on me. I say "academically dishonest" because, *inter alia*, Abraham repeatedly and grievously misstates and misrepresents points I made in a recent talk at St. Paul, Minnesota (an event unconnected with your university) and then attacks the misrepresentations rather than what I actually said. I shall not at this stage trouble you with the long list of defects in Abraham's presentation, which – upon examination – you will find to have fallen a very long way short of what might be expected of a serious professor at a respectable institution.

There is one matter that you can readily verify for yourself. Though Abraham repeatedly says he has had difficulty tracking down the sources for some of the material I used in my presentation, he did not at any point contact me to ask about those sources. He cannot plead that he could not find me, for he cannot deny he knew I can be reached through the Science and Public Policy Institute, whose website is at www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org.

I am not quite sure how high academic standards are at US universities. At universities here in the UK, artfully dishonest personal attacks such as that which Abraham has directed against me, and which on his own admission has been circulated to a very wide audience, would not be prepared or distributed on the university's time or with its facilities, and could – if found to be serious, as you may well find this one to be – merit dismissal. I have no idea how much of your university's time and resources Abraham has diverted to this project, but I should expect the exercise has cost you a pretty penny.

Would it be possible for you to invite Abrahams to remove his attack on me from the University's servers, pending an opportunity for me to prepare a reply? It does seem to me to have been discourteous, and indicative of the furtiveness and carefully-concealed malice of Abraham's *modus operandi*, that he did not do me the courtesy of letting me know that he was proposing to mount this disreputable assault.

If it is not possible for you to remove Abraham's ramblings from the University's servers, perhaps you will be kind enough to give me your undertaking that you will allow me similar access to the University's servers when I have prepared my reply? Once you have seen my reply (which will take some time to prepare, since Abraham's libel is so lengthy), you may well consider that Abraham's conduct merits disciplinary action on the University's part for failure to observe even the minimum academic standards of courtesy, fairness, honesty, accuracy, and integrity.

A copy goes to the Bishop.

In Christo,

VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

The Rev. Dennis Dease, President, St. Thomas' University, Minnesota.

CONFIDENTIAL UNTIL 10 JULY 2010

Via pmsimmons@stthomas.edu

Reverend Father,

Associate Professor John Abraham

I wrote to you on May 30, three weeks ago, and now write again, to urge you to remove forthwith from the university's servers a widely-publicized 83-minute personal attack on me by Associate Professor John Abraham, entitled "But Chris Monckton Said ...". You have been told of this affair by third parties as well as by me, yet you have not contacted me. From whom should I seek assistance, if not from you?

In my earlier letter, I said I should write again, in detail, once I had had a chance to examine Abraham's talk and 115 slides each bearing the university's imprint, purporting to be a critique of a speech I gave to the Minnesota Free Market Institute in October 2008, eight months ago. For information only at this stage – and, *brevitatis causa*, in summary form only – these are my grounds of complaint against Abraham for what I say is gross academic and professional misconduct on his part. I shall finalize my grounds of complaint in a third letter to you by July 10, once Abraham has had a full month to reply to a letter from me dated 10 June 2010 providing further and better particulars of my grounds of complaint:

- **Bad faith:** It is the usual academic practice for one who seeks to rebut the work of another, particularly when the rebuttal is lengthy and very hostile, to give that other notice of his intention and a fair opportunity both to correct any errors in the rebuttal before publication and to prepare and publish a contemporaneous refutation. Yet Abraham did not contact me at any point during the several months he now admits he spent preparing his attack. Also, though Abraham repeatedly says he cannot identify the sources of the information I presented, not once in eight months did he contact me simply to ask.
- **Malice:** Abraham's attack – justly described by one of your correspondents as "the academic equivalent of a drive-by shooting" – was malicious. Its tone throughout was relentlessly *ad hominem*, when a more measured consideration would be expected from one who was presenting himself as an academic with relevant knowledge correcting an allegedly untutored layman.
- **Appeal to false authority:** Abraham compounded the damage to my reputation by an extended *argumentum ad verecundiam*, an appeal to an authority in the matter of climate that Abraham said he possessed but did not in fact possess, in that he falsely presented himself as an impartial and knowledgeable expert while describing me as an unqualified layman paid and prejudiced by vested-interest lobbyists. Flag 2 outlines some instances of Abraham's ignorance of climate science and even of elementary arithmetic.
- **Mendacity:** Throughout his talk, Abraham either stated what he knew or had good reason to know to be untrue or was recklessly negligent as to whether what he said was true or not, presenting as true what was in fact false and what an academic truly versed in the climate question would have known or verified to be false. Flag 3 describes a small proportion of the falsehoods in Abraham's talk.

Though Abraham did not do me the courtesy of letting me know about his attack on me before it was made, I have thought it right to give him a month to reply before I finalize my complaint and formally invite the university to investigate it. Therefore, my sole purpose in writing now to set out my grounds of complaint is to demonstrate to Abraham's university that his misconduct is grave and to give the university a fair and reasonable opportunity to take down Abraham's talk from its servers, and to invite him to ensure that it is withdrawn from any other place in which it may have been published, pending investigation of my complaint in due course.

For the protection of my reputation, I had already issued a brief statement in response to Abraham's talk. In that statement, I regret that I made some *ad-hominem* remarks of my own that I should not have made, albeit that the provocation was severe. I have apologized to Abraham for those remarks. He has

not yet apologized to me for any of his *ad-hominem* remarks about me – nor, indeed, contacted me at all.

This letter to you, like my letter to Abraham, will remain confidential until July 10. If matters can be resolved by then, my correspondence with you and with Abraham need not become public.

Retraction and apology

I have invited Abraham to retract and apologize for his talk, substantially in the terms set forth *infra*, and to donate \$10,000 to the United States Association of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta for its charitable work in Haiti. I am inviting the university likewise to donate \$100,000 to the Knights of Malta in reparation for its hosting of Abraham's talk, for its having continued to allow him to use its imprint on his 115 slides, for its having failed to take down his personal attack on me when requested, for its failure even to acknowledge my earlier letter to you, for your own failure to contact me when – as can be proven – you first became aware of the problem at the instance of third parties, and for the university's failure to uphold its own principles of the pursuit of truth, of academic excellence, of the use of reason, and of the dignity of each person.

"The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley: a retraction and apology

"We, St. Thomas University, Minnesota, and John Abraham of that University, retract, apologize to Lord Monckton for, and undertake never again to repeat all or any part of, the 83-minute talk with 115 slides entitled "But Chris Monckton Said ..." and bearing the university's imprint, that we prepared without notification to him and then widely disseminated via the University's servers and other media.

"We have agreed that, in token of our good faith, by 30 July 2010 without fail we shall have paid between us US\$110,000 to the United States Association of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta for its charitable work in the reconstruction and relief of Haiti."

Good faith

I shall regard it as a promising sign of good faith if, after reviewing the outline of my complaint that is set forth in this letter and its attachments, the university were to remove Abraham's talk from its servers pending an investigation in due course, and to invite him to see that it is removed from wherever it may have been published or posted.

Circulation

Since I have received no acknowledgement from you or from the university's registrar to my earlier letter, and since you did not contact me when third parties also drew the matter to your attention, and since I have had not so much as an acknowledgement from Abraham of my letter to him dated June 10 2010, I am circulating copies of this second letter not only to the registrar but also to other university officials and to the Bishop of the Diocese, with a request that they should use their good offices to urge you to reply this time.

In Christo,

VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

[No reply was received]

Flag 1

Complaint by The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley against John Abraham

Malice

Abraham's personal attack on Lord Monckton – described by one observer who wrote to the President of the University of St. Thomas as “the academic equivalent of a drive-by shooting” – was malicious and relentlessly *ad hominem*, when a more measured consideration would have been expected from one who was representing himself as an academic with relevant knowledge correcting an allegedly untutored layman. Some of Abraham's malicious remarks are summarized here:

Abraham's talk says that, though he is “a scientist” (at his slide 2) with “a background in the area of energy, heat and fluids, which is germane to the topic of climate change” (his slide 3), and that he has published “in the area” of climate change (3), Lord Monckton is a “well-known climate skeptic” (1) “who has money and no background in science” (29) and “who has not written a single peer-reviewed science paper on any topic” (4) and has “never published a paper in anything” (37); that “we want to think about the backgrounds people have when we ascribe credibility to the comments people make, particularly for Chris Monckton, because if you listen to his talk you will find that he disagrees with every major science organization” (4-5); that Lord Monckton is “paid” and “employed” by the Science and Public Policy Institute (104), which Abraham describe as “an activist organization that is lobbying against dealing with the issue of global warming and trying to sway public opinion” (104); that Lord Monckton's “deep” connections with this “ideological” organization make it “extremely difficult to believe that you can separate your results from the interests of those people funding you” (104); that, by implication, Lord Monckton claims to know things “that everyone else doesn't know”, and “to see things that other scientists haven't seen” (5), and that “maybe” His Lordship claims to “know more than they do” (50); that many of Lord Monckton's statements “sound absurd”, and that Abraham's “feeling is that if statements sound absurd they probably are” (5); that Abraham is proposing to “investigate” what Lord Monckton says (5); that “the number of errors” Lord Monckton “makes is so enormous it would take a thesis to go through every single one of them” (74); that Abraham is going to “help” Lord Monckton with his “math” (74); that Lord Monckton “presented a lot of data with no citations or no explanation” (105), and “if you don't tell us where it's from we can't assess the data” (109); that Lord Monckton's talk contained assertions that were “not accurate” (7), “total nonsense” (21), “just not true” (34), “sleight-of-hand” (35); “sleight-of-hand” again (59); “a complete fabrication” (47); and “a straw man” that “doesn't hold any water” (53); that my “talk of information” has been “shady” (35); that a graph displayed by Lord Monckton was “almost off by 100%” (40); that when reading data Lord Monckton “can't get it straight” (40); that Lord Monckton “tries to confuse” his audience (61); that Lord Monckton “confuses” and “makes mistakes” that “are different from each other” (40); that Lord Monckton “confuses” his “units” (80); that Lord Monckton's “graphs” of his “own data” do not “agree with themselves”, so “how can you trust conclusions drawn from them?” (42); that Lord Monckton “either deliberately or by mistake misrepresented the data” (114), “misstated data” in a paper that His Lordship had cited (81), “made many mistakes with temperature data” (110), “completely misrepresented” the “conclusions” of scientific researchers (20), “misrepresented” another paper His Lordship had cited (67), and made “a very bald misrepresentation” of a scientific society's statements (85) so that the society “were at the very least upset”, and that the author of yet another paper “was pretty upset” at how His Lordship had used his data (83); that a “prediction” Lord Monckton is alleged to have made was “rash” and “a bit like assuming at dusk that the sun will never rise again” (79); that “in some cases” Lord Monckton says “there is no global warming, and then in other cases” His Lordship says “Hey, it is warming” (82); that “you take a look at all this and you gotta ask yourself, who can you trust? ... where can you go, who can you trust?” (114), “who has an agenda?” (115); that “the purpose of my talk is to show how someone who is a very skilled orator can present information intended for an intelligent but very general audience, and ... of course you're going to believe him, I mean, that's a pretty compelling talk; and it takes someone who's got some time and knows how to find the information a while to track down and ferret out the truth of their statements, and you can't expect that everyone is going to have the kind of time that I've put into this rebuttal” (115); and that Abraham does not want to have to spend his time “tracking down the misinformation of folks like Chris Monckton” (115).

Complaint by The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley against John Abraham

Appeal to false authority

Abraham compounded the damage to Lord Monckton's reputation by an extended *argumentum ad verecundiam*, an appeal to an authority in the matter of climate that Abraham said he possessed but did not in fact possess, in that he falsely presented himself as an impartial and knowledgeable expert while describing Lord Monckton as an unqualified layman paid and prejudiced by vested-interest lobbyists. Here are some instances of Abraham's ignorance of climate science and even of elementary arithmetic:

- Abraham was unable to recognize the Hadley Centre's headline graph of global mean surface temperature anomalies, though it is displayed repeatedly in the IPCC's 2007 *Fourth Assessment Report*, from which Lord Monckton took it, and is plainly labeled on my slide as "IPCC, 2007".
- Abraham was unable to deduce that a lower-troposphere temperature graph labeled "UAH" is from the University of Alabama at Huntsville, one of only two sources for regularly-published satellite temperatures.
- Abraham was unaware that, when Lord Monckton referred to two "Canadian researchers" and displayed their slides demonstrating statistical inadequacies in the IPCC's "hockey-stick" graph that falsely abolished the medieval warm period, His Lordship was talking of Mr. Steve McIntyre and Professor Ross McKittrick, whose work is well known in climatological circles.
- Abraham repeatedly and falsely assumed that correlation between two datasets implies that one caused the other, when the mere fact of correlation does not tell us the direction of causation (if any), nor whether a third influence independent of both datasets caused the correlation, nor whether the correlation is mere coincidence.
- Abraham confused global warming and sea-level rise, excoriating Lord Monckton for having said that *global warming* had stopped where His Lordship had said, correctly, that there had been little or no *sea-level* rise for four years.
- Abraham confessed to having been "confused" by a simple graph displaying two clearly-labeled curves of different colors, with ordinate and abscissa explicitly labeled.
- Abraham said global temperatures had been "going up consistently since 1880", when there have in fact been long periods of cooling, most recently the near-decade since the turn of the millennium on 1 January 2001.
- Abraham did not know his Arctic from his Antarctic, unjustifiably citing an irrelevant website comment about the former as the basis for his statement that Lord Monckton had misrepresented the conclusion of a scientific paper about the latter.
- Abraham said the IPCC's sea-level projections "do not include ice-melt" when (excluding only unquantifiable dynamic effects that the IPCC concludes are unlikely to cause major sea-level change "for millennia") they do.
- Abraham repeatedly stated that Lord Monckton had drawn conclusions from unreasonably short periods of data while himself citing a paper giving observations of ice-melt in the Beaufort Sea over a single season as purported evidence against a 30-year graph that His Lordship had presented which showed sea ice growing slightly in the Beaufort Sea.
- Abraham cited a 13-month period of allegedly unprecedented global temperatures, just after having criticized Lord Monckton for having drawn conclusions from periods up to 22 years in length, which Abraham described as too short.
- Abraham criticized Lord Monckton for misstating the growth in CO₂ concentration since 1750 as a percentage of the atmosphere as 0.01%, when it is in fact 0.01%.

- Abraham incorrectly calculated that 0.3 C° of warming over 8 years was equivalent to 0.35 C°/decade, when it is in fact closer to 0.38 C°/decade, and then criticized Lord Monckton for the consequence of his own arithmetic error.

Flag 3

Complaint by The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley against John Abraham

Mendacity

Throughout his talk, Abraham either stated what he knew or had good reason to know to be untrue or was recklessly negligent as to whether what he said was true or not, presenting as true what was in fact false and what an academic truly versed in the climate question would have known or verified to be false. Abraham's falsehoods are very numerous, and it is their cumulative effect that compounds the damage that each on its own is calculated to cause to Lord Monckton's reputation. Here is a small sample of Abraham's falsehoods. The full – and in our experience unprecedented – extent of Abraham's mendacity may best be gaged by reading His Lordship's recent letter asking Abraham questions about his talk.

- 1. Falsehoods in Abraham's account of what Lord Monckton had said:** Abraham frequently misrepresented in his talk what Lord Monckton had actually said, and then unjustifiably criticized His Lordship for having made remarks that His Lordship had not in fact made. On several occasions, Abraham communicated his misrepresentations of Lord Monckton's words to other scientists, obtained highly critical comments from them about remarks that His Lordship had not in fact made, and then reproduced those critical comments in his own talk in a manner calculated unjustifiably to do maximal damage to His Lordship's reputation.
- 2. Abraham's falsehoods to the effect that Lord Monckton had misrepresented scientists' results:** Abraham frequently accused Lord Monckton of having misrepresented the work of scientists whom His Lordship had cited, though Abraham knew either that His Lordship had cited the scientists correctly, or that an interpretation other than that which the scientists in question had chosen could fairly and legitimately be placed on their data or results cited by His Lordship, or – in several instances – that His Lordship had not cited the scientists in question at all, and could not, therefore, have misrepresented them. Abraham's allegations that Lord Monckton had deliberately misstated the work of the climate scientists he had cited, often accompanied by phrases from Abraham such as "misrepresentation", "total fabrication", "sleight-of-hand", "shady", etc., were calculated to do grave damage to His Lordship's reputation.
- 3. Falsehoods by Abraham himself misrepresenting scientists' results:** Abraham frequently misrepresented scientists' results himself, often omitting the passages in their papers that explicitly stated what Lord Monckton had said they had stated, or truncating quotations so as to remove statements by the scientists that evinced support for His Lordship's position. Once again, Abraham's conduct was calculated to damage Lord Monckton's reputation.
- 4. Abraham's falsehoods unjustifiably impugning Lord Monckton:** Abraham frequently and unjustifiably impugned Lord Monckton's integrity, his qualifications, his experience, or his competence, in a manner calculated further to damage His Lordship's reputation.
- 5. Abraham's falsehoods divorcing Lord Monckton's words from their context:** Abraham frequently removed Lord Monckton's words from the context in which they were spoken, and then unjustifiably criticized His Lordship for having made the remarks either in an inappropriate context or *in vacuo*. Abraham knew it was unlikely that any of his listeners would go back to Lord Monckton's talk to check whether Abraham was fairly placing His Lordship's remarks in the context in which they had originally been made. Once again, Abraham's conduct was calculated to damage His Lordship's reputation.

Abraham's falsehoods in his account of what Lord Monckton had said

- Abraham falsely led a third-party scientist, David Hathaway, to believe that Lord Monckton had misrepresented Hathaway as having suggested that solar variability plays a dominant role in climate change, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had not cited any opinion of Hathaway's, merely displaying a graph from a paper by Hathaway and citing not Hathaway's conclusion but that of other authors – specifically Scafetta and West (2008) – as having attributed 69% of recent warming to solar activity.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton to a third-party scientist, David Barber, by saying that “Christopher Monckton is publically [sic] saying that ice in the Beaufort Sea is increasing and that polar bears are thriving in warmer weather” (at Abraham's slide 79), without explaining that His Lordship had cited two sources, a graph not from Barber but from Melling demonstrating that sea ice extent in the Beaufort Sea had indeed increased over several decades, and a graph from a document published by the World Wide Fund demonstrating that where the Arctic had warmed the population of polar bears had indeed increased and *vice versa*.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having said that “the world is not warming” (2 and 82), though Abraham knew that though Lord Monckton had correctly stated that there had been global cooling since the turn of the millennium on 1 January 2001, he had also displayed slides from the IPCC's 2007 *Fourth Assessment Report* showed that the world had warmed at a rate of 0.4 K/century in the 160 years since 1850.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having said that “sea levels are not rising at all” (2; 78-79), though Abraham knew that His Lordship had correctly stated that there had been little or no sea-level rise for four years, that His Lordship had displayed a slide from the University of Colorado showing that sea level had been rising at 1 ft/century since 1993, and that His Lordship had also mentioned the IPCC's projection that sea level would rise by 1 ft 5 in this century.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having said that “ice is not melting” (2), though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had displayed a slide from the University of Illinois to which His Lordship had added that Arctic summer sea ice was “recovering from a 30-year low in 2007”; that His Lordship had stated that the loss of sea-ice extent in the Arctic over the past 30 years had been matched by a gain in Antarctic sea-ice extent over the same period, reaching a peak in October 2007; and that, accordingly, the University of Illinois' graph of global sea-ice extent had shown remarkably little trend since the satellite record began 30 years ago.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having stated that the IPCC had predicted only 6 cm of sea-level rise in the 21st century when it had in fact predicted 20-50 cm, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had said both in his talk and on the relevant slide that the 6 cm sea-level rise represented the contribution from the Greenland and Antarctic ice-sheets alone, since it was those ice-sheets alone whose melting Al Gore had said would cause an imminent sea-level rise, prompting a UK High Court Judge to declare that “the Armageddon scenario that he [Gore] depicts is not based on any scientific view” – a context that Abraham (here as elsewhere) omits.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having stated that “temperatures always change first and CO2 follows” (51), and as having implied that a change in CO2 concentration cannot cause a change in temperature (51), though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had in fact reported that in the palaeoclimate it had always been temperature that had changed first and CO2 concentration that had followed, typically after a lag of 800-2800 years; that at no point had His Lordship said or implied that changes in CO2 concentration could not cause changes in temperature in today's climate; and that the context of His Lordship's remarks, omitted (here as elsewhere) by Abraham in his talk, was a falsehood by the producer of Al Gore's movie, in a children's book, to the effect that in the paleoclimate it was temperature that changed first and CO2 that followed.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton's talk by implying that His Lordship had stated there was a connection between solar cycle lengths and global surface temperature, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had at no point stated or implied that there was any such connection.

Abraham's falsehoods to the effect that Lord Monckton had misrepresented scientists' results

- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having cited a scientific paper, by Monnett & Gleason (2006), in a manner that Abraham said "did not agree with that author, even though he [His Lordship] used the citation in his presentation", in that His Lordship had said that Al Gore's movie had incorrectly cited the paper as evidence that polar bears in the Beaufort Sea had died swimming up to 60 miles to find ice, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had in no way misrepresented the authors, who had written: "We believe that the increased risk of swimming in open water is not likely to result simply from long-distance swimming as polar bears are considered strong swimmers (Oritsland 1969; Burns et al. 1981). Long-distance swims may impose higher metabolic costs than standing or walking on ice even under favorable weather conditions. High mortality in 2004 was more likely related to extreme and metabolically demanding conditions, as high sea states associated with stormy weather."
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having "misinterpreted a researcher's work", though Abraham knew that His Lordship had not mentioned or cited the researcher in question, Dr. David Barber, and that His Lordship could not, therefore, have misrepresented Dr. Barber.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton's evidence that polar bear populations had been shown to increase in regions of the Arctic that had warmed and to decline in regions that had cooled, with no change in regions where temperature had been static, as "totally false" (19), though Abraham knew that His Lordship had correctly reproduced a map demonstrating His Lordship's conclusion.
- Abraham falsely alleged that Lord Monckton had conducted and had then misrepresented the results of a "Google Scholar" search for scientific papers containing all the words "global", "climate", and "change" between 2004 and 2007, also alleging that the quantity of scientific papers retrieved in the search, 539, had been a "complete fabrication" (47) on His Lordship's part, though Abraham knew, because Lord Monckton had said so in his talk and made clear in the relevant slide, that the search had been conducted by Klaus-Martin Schulte, not by His Lordship; that Mr. Schulte's search results had been reported in 2006 in a peer-reviewed journal, from which Lord Monckton had accurately cited a key result; that the database searched was not Google Scholar but the ISI Web of Science database; that the search was not for all of the words "global", "climate", and "change" but for the exact phrase "global climate change" (a phrase that Naomi Oreskes, a historian of science, had previously used); that the search period had not been 2004 to 2007 *simpliciter* but 2004 to mid-February 2007; and that, contrary to Abraham's allegation of "complete fabrication", Mr. Schulte's search had indeed retrieved 539 scientific papers (Oreskes' earlier search of the same database using the same search term had retrieved 928 papers spanning the 11 years 1993-2003).
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having cited a scientific paper by Caillon *et al.* (2003), and as having made a "suggestion" (51) "not in concert" with Caillon's paper, when he knew that Lord Monckton had not cited Caillon's paper; that accordingly His Lordship could not have misrepresented a paper that he had not cited; and that in any event nothing in what His Lordship said had in any way contradicted the paper.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as not having displayed "year-to-year ice-cover variations" (61) when showing a graph from IARC/JAXA that recorded the seasonal changes in the extent of Arctic sea ice, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton's graph had in fact displayed year-to-year ice-cover variations for eight separate years, each with a curve individually colored and labeled.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having misrepresented the findings in a paper by a now-retired scientist, Dr. Schweingruber, to the effect that the medieval warm period was evidenced by higher tree-lines than today in the polar Urals, though Abraham knew that the scientist whom he had cited as challenging Lord Monckton's conclusion had not been an author of Schweingruber's paper, and that that scientist had attempted to rebut Lord Monckton's conclusion without any reference to Schweingruber's paper, relying instead upon an unrelated

(and defective) argument about the inability of climate models to reproduce today' climate except by assuming that the warming effect of CO₂ was as large as the IPCC maintains.

- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having misrepresented the findings in a paper by Dr. Lloyd Kiegwin, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had correctly reproduced a graph from Dr. Kiegwin's paper, and that Dr. Kiegwin's paper had explicitly stated that the northern Sargasso Sea had been 1 C° warmer than today in the medieval warm period, and that Dr. Kiegwin – at any rate as cited by Abraham – did not specifically refute Lord Monckton's use of his graph, resorting instead to a purely *ad-hominem* comment, repeated by Abraham in his talk, that His Lordship was “another one who has money and no background in science”.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having misrepresented the results of a paper by Noon *et al.*, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had correctly reproduced a graph from the paper, and Abraham also that a comment on the internet from one of the authors of the paper, to the effect that the Arctic is today warming rapidly, had little or no bearing on Lord Monckton's use of a graph demonstrating the reality of the medieval warm period in the Antarctic.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having misrepresented the results of a paper by Huang *et al.*, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had correctly reproduced a graph from the paper, and that Huang – in a passage somehow omitted by Abraham in his talk – had explicitly stated that the Holocene Climate Optimum, a period earlier than the medieval warm period, had been 1.5-2 C° warmer than the present.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having put forward a case unsupported by the scientific community, repeatedly citing only those scientific papers that supported his viewpoint, particularly but not exclusively in his discussion of polar bears, of the medieval warm period, and of the connection between the Sun and climatic changes, though Abraham knew or ought to have known that in these and other fields the scientific literature contains many papers by respected scientists supportive of Lord Monckton's opinion, and that Abraham, in the interest of fairness to His Lordship, ought to have made that clear in his talk.

Falsehoods by Abraham himself misrepresenting scientists' results

- Abraham falsely represented the IPCC as saying that, because of unforeseeable dynamic effects, “we just don't know how long it will take for the ice-sheets [of Greenland and West Antarctica] to melt” (6), with the implication that Lord Monckton had misrepresented the IPCC's conclusions in this regard, though Abraham knew or had reason to know – but did not state – that the IPCC had said in its 2001 and 2007 Assessment Reports that neither of the two great ice-sheets would melt unless mean global surface temperatures were sustained well above today's levels “for millennia”.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having “completely misrepresented” (20) the conclusions of the authors of a document issued by the World Wide Fund, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had not cited the authors' opinions: he had merely displayed their map unaltered and had drawn his own conclusion from the data shown on the map.
- Abraham falsely stated that Lord Monckton's global-temperature “numbers don't agree with NASA”, though Abraham knew or had reason to know that His Lordship had repeatedly displayed the Hadley Center/CRU global-temperature dataset, which agrees in all relevant respects with the NASA GISS dataset preferred by Abraham.
- Abraham falsely represented at least two scientific papers as having stated that in the paleoclimate when CO₂ changed the temperature followed, when in fact the scientific literature has long been explicit that in the paleoclimate it was the other way about.
- Abraham cited Solanki *et al.* (2005) as having written, “ ... we point out that solar variability is unlikely to have been the dominant cause of the strong warming during the past three decades” (91), though Abraham knew but failed to read out the first part of Solanki's sentence: “Although the rarity of the current episode of high average sunspot numbers may indicate that the Sun has contributed to the unusual climate change during the 20th century, ...” (91), a

statement lending some support to Lord Monckton's indication that fluctuations in solar activity have the capacity to influence fluctuations in the terrestrial climate.

- Abraham cited Solanki & Krivova (2003) as having written, "The Sun cannot have contributed more than 30%" [of global warming] (95), though Abraham knew that the remainder of the two researchers' sentence, which Abraham failed to read out, said: "... of the steep temperature increase that has taken place since [1976]", and that, therefore, the paper he cited had not ruled out the possibility of earlier solar influence on the Earth's climate.
- Abraham cited Lockwood and Fröhlich (2007) as having written, "... over the past 20 years all the trends in the Sun that could have had an influence on the Earth's climate have been in the opposite direction to that required to explain the rise in global mean temperatures", though Abraham knew that the immediately preceding sentence, which Abraham did not read out, said: "There is considerable evidence for solar influence on the Earth's pre-industrial climate, and the Sun may well have been a factor in post-industrial climate change in the first half of the last century."

Abraham's falsehoods unjustifiably impugning Lord Monckton

- Abraham falsely implied that Lord Monckton would not update his graph of monthly global mean surface temperature anomalies to show the sharp global warming that has occurred since His Lordship's talk, saying that he was "waiting to see when Chris Monckton is going to add this new data to his curve – it's going to shift everything in a positive direction" (35), though Abraham knew or negligently and recklessly failed to verify that the *Monthly CO2 Reports* compiled by Lord Monckton and published on the web at www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org, a website about which Abraham can be proven to have known, are updated monthly, and duly show the naturally-occurring warming that has arisen in response to the current El Niño Southern Oscillation.
- Abraham falsely stated that "Remember, Chris Monckton's never published a paper in anything" (37), when he knew or negligently and recklessly failed to check that – to take two examples – Lord Monckton had published papers on the determination of climate sensitivity in the UK's *Quarterly Economic Bulletin* and in the American Physical Society's reviewed newsletter, *Physics and Society*, and that *inter alia* His Lordship has given faculty-level physics seminars on determination of climate sensitivity as well as public university lectures on the climate, and has led international scientific discussions on climate sensitivity, and has published academic papers on subjects such as the theory of currencies, and has addressed delegates at several UNFCCC climate conferences, and will be presenting a paper on reform of the IPCC at the annual Planetary Emergencies session of the World Federation of Scientists later in 2010.
- Abraham falsely represented two of Lord Monckton's "graphs of his own data" as failing to "agree with themselves" (42), though Abraham knew from Lord Monckton's talk that the first of the two graphs was a composite of four global mean surface temperature datasets compiled by His Lordship for the Science and Public Policy Institute, and was labeled as such; that the second of His Lordship's two graphs was a representation of monthly global mean surface temperature anomalies from the National Climatic Data Center in the United States, and was labeled as such; and that, therefore, the two graphs were likely to be different in small details, though similar in the essential point to which His Lordship had drawn his audience's attention: they both showed a declining trend in global temperatures since 2001.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as possibly having "made up" (109) a graph displaying a recalculation of the temperatures of the medieval warm period, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had stated that it was "two Canadian researchers", McIntyre and McKittrick, who had exposed the medieval temperature reconstruction relied upon by the IPCC as defective.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as possibly not having understood what the ARGO network of bathythermograph buoys was, saying, "ARGO is the name of a float which is used to measure temperature around the world, so maybe Chris Monckton doesn't understand that issue" (77), though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had explained to his audience what the ARGO buoys were and what role they played in measuring, recording, and automatically

reporting via satellite the temperature and salinity of the oceans at depths of up to a mile, and that His Lordship had illustrated his words with an explanatory slide taken from the ARGO project's own website.

- Abraham falsely implied that statements in Lord Monckton's talk to the effect that, as Abraham put it, "scientists are lying" (2) were untrue, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had at least made a stateable case that several falsehoods existed in the documents of the IPCC and in climatological journals, some of which could be proven to have been deliberate.

Falsehoods by Abraham divorcing Lord Monckton's words from their context

- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having said that the IPCC had only cited four scientific papers in its 2007 report, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had in fact stated – both in his talk and in the relevant slide that he displayed – that the IPCC had relied upon only four papers in the scientific literature for its central conclusion as to the magnitude of the three quantities whose product is final or post-feedbacks climate sensitivity. Here, as elsewhere, Abraham divorced His Lordship's words from their context so that he could make them seem absurd.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having used "sleight-of-hand" to demonstrate that "if you use different timescales you can come up with different temperature trends", though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton was in fact pointing out that the IPCC had used an impermissible statistical technique when it had applied multiple trend-lines with arbitrarily-chosen to a single stochastic dataset and in drawing from the ratios of the slopes of its arbitrary choice of trend-lines the conclusion that the rate of "global warming" was itself accelerating.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having asked "I mean, is the IPCC way off? How could they be this wrong? If greenhouse gases are going up, why is the temperature going down?" (38), though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton was at that point demonstrating that Mr. Tom Karl, the director of the US National Climatic Data Center, had misled Congress when, in 2009, he had refused upon questioning to admit that global temperatures had followed a falling trend since 1 January 2001.
- Abraham falsely represented Lord Monckton as having drawn conclusions only about Arctic sea ice, which has been on a declining trend for 30 years, though Abraham knew that Lord Monckton had in fact drawn the correct conclusion that Arctic sea ice had been declining but was now recovering, that Antarctic sea ice had been growing for 30 years, and that, therefore, the global extent of sea ice had shown virtually no trend throughout the 30-year record of satellite observations.

Lord Monckton would be grateful if on July 10, 2010, provided that matters shall not have been amicably resolved between the parties by that date, the University of St. Thomas were to institute appropriate disciplinary proceedings against Abraham in respect of the matters set forth in summary here *brevitatis causae*, and more fully described in His Lordship's letter to Abraham dated 10 June 2010.

June 23, 2010

Dear Mr. Monckton:

I am replying to your letter of June 10, 2010, on behalf of myself and, at his request, Fr. Dennis Dease, President of the University of St. Thomas. I stand by my original position. Point and counterpoint are the standard in academic discourse.

Regards,



Dr. John Abraham
Associate Professor
School of Engineering
University of St. Thomas

MOORE, COSTELLO & HART, P.L.L.P.
A Professional Limited Liability Partnership
ATTORNEYS

REPLY TO
ST. PAUL OFFICE

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER
(651) 602-2649

June 25, 2010

Via Electronic Mail to monckton@mail.com

The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley
Carie, Rannoch, Scotland, PH17 2QJ

Re: University of St. Thomas

Dear Lord Monckton:


Our firm represents the University of St. Thomas. I am writing concerning your recent communications with University President Father Dease, Professor John Abraham and other University personnel relating to Professor Abraham's talk entitled "But Chris Monckton Said..."

It is the University's position that Professor Abraham has done nothing improper or illegal in expressing his ideas and opinions on this matter and that Professor Abraham has not engaged in any academic or professional misconduct. Accordingly, the University will not investigate Professor Abraham's conduct in this matter as you requested, nor will the University issue a retraction or apology for Professor Abraham's talk, comply with any of your other demands, or respond to any further communications from you on this matter.

Further, the University is appalled by your disparaging, outrageous and defamatory comments regarding the University of St. Thomas, President Father Dease, and Professor John Abraham, especially the comments you made during a television interview on June 24, 2010. On behalf of the University of St. Thomas, we demand that you immediately cease and desist making any further disparaging or defamatory comments about the University of St. Thomas, President Father Dease, Professor Abraham, the Archdiocese of Saint Paul and Minneapolis, or anyone else associated with the University. If your inappropriate conduct does not cease immediately, the University of St. Thomas will have no choice but to take appropriate legal action.

Very truly yours,

MOORE, COSTELLO & HART, P.L.L.P.

By 
Phyllis Karasov

Monckton of Brenchley to attorneys for University of St. Thomas, 26 June 2010

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

Your clients the University of St. Thomas

I have had your letter of June 25. I begin by reserving all my rights at law, including the right in due course to institute appropriate proceedings against Professor Abraham, St. Thomas University, and Father D.J. Dease, the university's president, who has behaved lamentably by failing to take down Professor Abraham's dismal talk from the University's servers and by failing to investigate the Professor's conduct as a disciplinary matter.

I have noted on the file that the University instructs you in this matter. I am grateful that you have delicately indicated that the University's position may not necessarily be your position - a wise precaution in the circumstances, one feels.

You have mentioned what you describe as "disparaging, outrageous, and defamatory comments" by me "regarding the University of St. Thomas, President Father Dease, and Professor John Abraham", and you refer in particular to the comments I am said to have made "during a television interview on June 24, 2010".

I should be most grateful if, within seven days, your firm would be kind enough to clarify whether it acts for Father Dease, for the Diocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis (note that in canon law there is no such thing as an "Arch"diocese, though there is such a creature as an Archbishop) and for Professor Abraham, insofar as their interests and those of your clients the University of St. Thomas may diverge.

I should also be obliged if you were to specify which television interview you are referring to (I do not recall having conducted such an interview, so it may have been recorded some time ago), and to set forth a schedule specifying each "disparaging", "outrageous", or "defamatory" comment I am alleged to have made, with a brief indication of why, in each instance, the comment is considered "disparaging", "outrageous", or "defamatory", so that I may reach an informed opinion on whether to repeat or apologize for the comment.

It is also fair that I should draw your attention to a radio interview I gave to the Alex Jones show yesterday, before your present letter reached me. If there are any "disparaging", "outrageous", or "defamatory" remarks therein that you would prefer me not to repeat, perhaps you would be kind enough to say which and why, *ut supra*.

In view of the terms of your letter, I am not sure whether your clients the University of St. Thomas have sent you copies of my letters to Father Dease or of my letter of June 10 to Professor Abraham. It is fair to notify you that I intend widely to publish the full correspondence on July 10, subject to any reasonable requests your clients may make within the next seven days; and also, in due course, to publish a book devoted to an analysis and exposure of the mendacities of Professor Abraham, which follow a pattern that reveals the state of mind, and the tactics, of those whose opinions on the climate he shares, so that his conduct is worthy of a wider international audience. Therefore you may wish to review the correspondence in some detail with your clients and specify to me within seven days any remarks therein which, in your clients' view, are so "disparaging", "outrageous", or "defamatory" that they ought not to be further published, with reasons in each instance *ut supra*.

Until I have heard from you, I shall continue to be entirely free to make whatever comments I please about Professor Abraham, who has only himself to blame for his uncomfortable predicament. I need not, I think, cite the United States Constitution insofar as it touches upon freedom of speech. As you may know, Professor Abraham has made numerous disparaging, outrageous, defamatory, and mendacious remarks about me, and has published them widely. Perhaps you would be kind enough to explain, in your reply to this letter, why your clients consider that Professor Abraham, using the University's logo and facilities and servers, is entitled to persist in publishing these remarks about me, whereas I am debarred from replying. Once I have heard from you, I shall of course consider carefully any representations you may make on your clients' behalf. If I shall not have received any reply from yourselves within seven days of the date of this letter, I shall be entitled to act upon the assumption that your clients, having further considered Professor Abraham's conduct as revealed in the correspondence, have come to the opinion that his position (and theirs in continuing to broadcast his falsehoods from their servers, and in failing to act upon my legitimate request that his lies, conceits and deceits be investigated as a disciplinary matter) is indefensible.

Finally, it is my understanding that the Trustees of the University are the guardians of its integrity when its academic or administrative personnel are thought to have failed in their obligations in respect of the University's mission statement, as I consider them to have failed in the present case. I should be grateful, therefore, since you

say your clients will not answer any further correspondence from me, if you would be kind enough to supply on behalf of your clients the name and contact details of each Trustee. I ask because, though I have contacted that diocesan Bishop who is a member of the Board of Trustees to ask for his assistance, I have not yet received a reply.

Yours faithfully,

VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

MOORE, COSTELLO & HART, P.L.L.P.
A Professional Limited Liability Partnership
ATTORNEYS

REPLY TO
ST. PAUL OFFICE

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER
(651) 602-2649

June 28, 2010

Via Electronic Mail to monckton@mail.com

The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley
Carie, Rannoch, Scotland, PH17 2QJ

Re: University of St. Thomas

Dear Lord Monckton:


We received your e-mail response to our June 25, 2010, letter. The University of St. Thomas respects your right to disagree with Professor Abraham, just as the University respects Professor Abraham's right to disagree with you. What we object to are your personal attacks against Father Dease and Professor Abraham, your inflammatory language, and your decision to disparage Professor Abraham, President Father Dease, and the University of St. Thomas.

Please be advised that neither we nor the University of St. Thomas will communicate with you any further about your decision to sully the University of St. Thomas, Professor Abraham, and others rather than to focus on the scholarly differences between you and Professor Abraham.

Very truly yours,

MOORE, COSTELLO & HART, P.L.L.P.

By


Phyllis Karasov

115848.1

Monckton of Brenchley to Moore, Costello (attorneys): 29 June 2010

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

Your clients the University of St. Thomas

I have had your reply to my earlier email, in which you disingenuously talk of mere “disagreement” and “scholarly differences” between me and Professor Abraham. If Professor Abraham’s misconduct had amounted merely to a “scholarly difference”, I should not have needed to ask for your clients’ assistance in investigating it. As you can plainly see from the face of the correspondence, I have with good reason and upon detailed evidence accused – and on July 10, subject to anything that your clients may say, shall publicly accuse – the Professor of academic dishonesty in the shape of material, serial, serious mendacity. It is Professor Abraham’s lies, as well as his bad faith and his assumption of a spurious authority, that I am asking your clients to investigate.

In your latest communication you have not answered, and I should now be grateful if you were to answer, the following questions from that email –

Primo, please clarify whether you act for any person other than the University of St. Thomas. Otherwise, please inform me of the co-ordinates of any professional or regulatory body which has power of supervision over your firm.

Secundo, please specify the “disparaging”, “outrageous” or “defamatory” remarks by me to which your clients (whoever they are) object, and let me know which television interview on St. John’s Day you were talking about.

Tertio, please confirm that your clients have no objection to the terms of the correspondence in this affair, which I intend to publish widely on July 10, including throughout your clients’ campuses. If you do not answer on this point, I shall be entitled to take it that your clients are content in all respects that the entire correspondence should be made public, so that Professor Abraham’s lies may be seen by all for what they are, and the intellectual cowardice of Father Dease, who disfigures his calling, disregards the mission statement of his own institution and does a disservice to the Catholic Church by failing to investigate those lies, will also be exposed.

Quarto, please explain why your clients consider that Professor Abraham, using the University’s logo and facilities and servers, is entitled to persist in publishing his lies about me, whereas I am debarred from replying with the truth.

Quinto, please supply the names and addresses of each of your clients’ Trustees. This is a straightforward, factual request with which you and your clients should surely be able and willing to comply. I wish to ask the Trustees to investigate this affair, since Father Dease seems disinclined to do so, and additionally to investigate Father Dease’s unwillingness to do his duty in accordance with your clients’ mission statement.

I reiterate that once I have heard from you I shall of course consider carefully any representations you may make on your clients’ behalf. If I shall not have received any reply from yourselves within seven days of the date of this letter, I shall be entitled to act upon the assumption that your clients, having further considered Professor Abraham’s misconduct as revealed in the correspondence, have come to the opinion that his position (and theirs in continuing to broadcast his falsehoods from their servers, and in failing to act upon my legitimate request that his lies, conceits and deceits be investigated as a disciplinary matter) is indefensible.

I have given you and your clients the plainest and fairest notice of how I intend to proceed, so that, in the event that your clients have any specific objections to anything that I propose, they will be able to let me know in good time. – Monckton of Brenchley

Monckton of Brenchley to Moore, Costello (attorneys): 29 June 2010

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

Your clients the University of St. Thomas

I have had no reply to my email to you dated 29 June 2010 in response to your letter to me of 28 June 2010. I now attach the full correspondence between me and your clients, with the sole exception of the long letter from me to Professor Abraham dated 10 June 2010, of which your clients have no doubt supplied you with a copy.

I have given you plain and fair warning of my intentions in regard to the libels that your clients have perpetrated at the instigation of Professor Abraham. The attached press statement now be issued, together with the full correspondence, and the file will now be passed to my Minnesota lawyers. Even at this late stage, your clients may find it advisable to ensure that the libels circulated under their imprint and on their servers are taken down, retracted, and apologized for.

Since you have still not clarified whether you are acting not only for the University of St. Thomas but also for Professor Abraham, Father Dease, and the Diocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis insofar as their interests may diverge from those of your clients, I shall assume that you are not acting for them but only for the University of St. Thomas, and I shall contact the other parties separately to keep them informed.

It is disappointing that your clients have not acted as a proper academic institution would have acted in these circumstances. Perhaps I can appeal to them, via yourselves, one last time to do the decent thing?

Yours faithfully,

Viscount Monckton of Brenchley