

Dear Sir Muir Russell

Can I respectfully point out that the panel, as currently constituted, has no possibility of persuading sceptics, and the general public, of its impartiality when it is still biased towards those who have clearly stated their support for the AGW hypothesis and for the scientists involved in the matter you are investigating.

By now you must have received numerous emails about the background of Prof Boulton-no doubt an eminent and learned man- but one who has enthusiastically supported the science and lectures widely on its accuracy.

Geoffrey Boulton signed the petition on 25th November which was specifically circulated in support of CRU. As you know it states:

"The evidence and the science are deep and extensive. They come from decades of painstaking and meticulous research, by many thousands of scientists across the world who adhere to the highest levels of professional integrity. That research has been subject to peer review and publication, providing traceability of the evidence and support for the scientific method."

The controversy will continue about the matters detailed in your terms of reference until it is seen that there has been a genuinely independent enquiry carried out by objective people. Regretfully I must say this does not appear to be happening at present. Can I suggest that rather than ask Prof Boulton to stand down-he does after all have considerable expertise in the area-that you instead appoint a well known and qualified sceptic to the vacant place?

There are far more of these than the scientific community likes to admit to.

Thank you for your time

Tony Brown (Devon)

Ps I write on the Historic variability of the climate on my web site here;
<http://climatereason.com/LittleIceAgeThermometers/>