



CARIE ❁ RANNOCH ❁ PH17 2QJ
01882 632341 ❁ FAX 632776 ❁ MOBILE 07980 634784

monckton@mail.com

From: The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley

19 July 2008

Arthur Bienenstock, Esq., Ph.D.,
President, American Physical Society,
Wallenberg Hall, 450 Serra Mall, Bldg 160,
Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA 94305.

By email to artieb@slac.stanford.edu

Dear Dr. Bienenstock,

Physics and Society

The editors of *Physics and Society*, a newsletter of the American Physical Society, invited me to submit a paper for their July 2008 edition explaining why I considered that the warming that might be expected from anthropogenic enrichment of the atmosphere with carbon dioxide might be significantly less than the IPCC imagines.

I very much appreciated this courteous offer, and submitted a paper. The commissioning editor referred it to his colleague, who subjected it to a thorough and competent scientific review. I was delighted to accede to all of the reviewer's requests for revision (see the attached reconciliation sheet). Most revisions were intended to clarify for physicists who were not climatologists the method by which the IPCC evaluates climate sensitivity – a method which the IPCC does not itself clearly or fully explain. The paper was duly published, immediately after a paper by other authors setting out the IPCC's viewpoint. Some days later, however, without my knowledge or consent, the following appeared, in red, above the text of my paper as published on the website of *Physics and Society*:

The following article has not undergone any scientific peer review. Its conclusions are in disagreement with the overwhelming opinion of the world scientific community. The Council of the American Physical Society disagrees with this article's conclusions.

This seems discourteous. I had been invited to submit the paper; I had submitted it; an eminent Professor of Physics had then scientifically reviewed it in meticulous detail; I had revised it at all points requested, and in the manner requested; the editors had accepted and published the reviewed and revised draft (some 3000 words longer than the original) and I had expended considerable labor, without having been offered or having requested any honorarium.

Please either remove the offending red-flag text at once or let me have the name and qualifications of the member of the Council or advisor to it who considered my paper before the Council ordered the offending text to be posted above my paper; a copy of this *rapporteur's* findings and *ratio decidendi*; the date of the Council meeting at which the findings were presented; a copy of the minutes of the discussion; and a copy of the text of the Council's decision, together with the names of those present at the meeting. If the Council has not scientifically evaluated or formally considered my paper, may I ask with what credible scientific justification, and on whose authority, the offending text asserts *primo*, that the paper had not been scientifically reviewed when it had; *secundo*, that its conclusions disagree with what is said (on no evidence) to be the "overwhelming opinion of the world scientific community"; and, *tertio*, that "The Council of the American Physical Society disagrees with this article's conclusions"? Which of my conclusions does the Council disagree with, and on what scientific grounds (if any)?

Having regard to the circumstances, surely the Council owes me an apology?

Yours truly,

THE VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

Climate Sensitivity Reconsidered

Author's reconciliation of reviewer's requested revisions

Reviewer: Professor Alvin Saperstein, Professor of Physics, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

June 2008

Figures and tables

Labeling: There are no ordinate or abscissa labels on many figures. **All figures now redrawn and relabeled clearly**

Figure captions: No clear separation between figure-captions and general text. **Captions now drafted and set in italics**

Tbl. 2 I don't understand it. **Table now removed: new Table 2 inserted, captioned, and explained**

Fig. 1 appears to contradict Fig. 2: in 1, T_S is going down; in 2 it is going up.

[Comment on this discrepancy, on the actual data of past years, not on the projections].

Explanation now provided that the NCDC dataset anomalously shows a rising trend

Fig. 2 can't read figures on left. **Figure now clarified**

Fig. 4, 5 can't read at all. Don't understand them, or where they came from. Some hints needed.

Figures now clarified, captioned, and explained fully in the text

Fig. 6 no ordinate labels. Don't understand it, or where it came from. Some hints needed.

Figure now labeled, clarified, captioned, and explained fully in text

Fig. 7 is clear. Make more of it: it contradicts the GW claims. **Discussion paragraph on this figure now added**

Fig. 8 has overprinting, making it very hard to read or understand. I don't understand it. **Figure clarified and explained**

Definitions

" T_S ": People mean different things about T_S ; clarify that further. **Now defined clearly at the beginning of the paper**

"Radiative forcing": Define it. **Now defined clearly early in the paper**

" $_F$ ": Define it. Is it directly measurable? If so, what data do we have? [you criticize IPCC for not providing a definition!]

Definition and discussion of this parameter now provided

"Other anthropogenic forcings": What is meant by this? Why are they net-negative? **New table and explanation added**

"Temperature feedback": Define it. Feedback of what to what? **Now defined clearly early in the paper**

"Unamplified temperature feedback": Define it. **Now defined and explained as not yet amplified by other feedbacks**

"Laboratory experiments": Describe them in outline. **Outline now provided in the text**

"Greenhouse-gas forcing": Define it. How is it distinct from other forcings (what are they)? **Distinctions now clarified**

"Aggregate forcing": Define it. **Term now defined at point of use**

"Linear/non-linear feedbacks": thought feedbacks made all systems non-linear.

Yes: but Bode's equation was designed only to address objects that were initially linear

"Forcing": I don't understand why forcing can't be measured. that shows that I don't understand the difference between solar flux incident on top of atmosphere and "forcing", which takes us back to the initial need for clear explanatory definition.

Now fully clarified in the text

"Feedback": I don't know the difference between "forcing" and "feedback". If "forcing" is not just external energy flux, than I would assume it includes "feedback". What do you mean? **Definitions now amplified and clarified in the text**

Equations

Eq. 1 Where does it come from? **All terms now defined at point of first use**

Eq. 2 Is this a definition or is it derived? If the latter, how? **Eq. 2 is the Bode feedback-amplification equation**

Eq. 3 Is this a definition or is it derived? If the latter, how? **The source for Eq. 3 is now cited at point of use**

Eq. 4, 5 Do they follow from Eq. 2 and 3? If so, say so; if not, hint where they come from.

Eq. 4's value is derived from IPCC central estimates as summarized in the new Table 1

Eq. 5 is the IPCC's definition (IPCC, 2001: ch. 6.1)

Eq. 6's derivation from Eq. 5 is now fully explained

Eq. 11 What does it mean? **This equation evaluates the CO₂ feedback: it is now fully explained at point of use**

Conclusion: Should be longer and stronger. **Discussion, conclusion, and acknowledgements now added**

References: Will be needed. **References now added**

Revised, accepted for publication, and published in *Physics & Society*, July 2008