

Gentlemen:

I've read the response from Professor Boulton, and the affirmation of support from Sir Muir Russell. I fear that neither has done much to allay the concerns that have been raised about a possible apprehension of bias arising from Professor Boulton's participation in the inquiry. Indeed, Professor Boulton's own statements on the matter seem to have raised further issues (he states that he worked at UEA until 1980; other documentation suggests he was there until 1986, at least on a part time basis).

Other concerns which have been noted include the following:

1. His CV states that he has acted as a contributor to the "*G8 Preparatory Groups and Intergovernmental Panels on climate change*". This role should be clarified, and his contributions identified.
2. On the FAQ page, the initial answer to the question as to whether any of the review participants had a pre-determined view on climate change and climate science was an unqualified "No." This has since been amended by a further statement on 12 February by Sir Muir Russell, suggesting "it would be impossible to find somebody with the qualifications and experience we need who has not formed an opinion on climate change" (an amendment that appears to have been made at the behest of Professor Boulton). Even if the claim is true - and the statement itself is sweeping and rather ill-considered in its breadth - Professor Boulton's views on climate change go beyond merely having an opinion on the science: there is evidence from his public pronouncements and lectures that he has become an advocate, driven by that particular point of view. In particular:
 - a. His 29 January 2009 lecture to the Glasgow Centre for Population Health, where he uncritically repeated the now clearly fallacious view that the Himalayan glaciers will largely have melted by mid-century, and promulgated a questionable view as to their contribution to the total water flow of several main rivers in India;
 - b. His presentation at the opening of a Romanian factory/warehouse owned by Coca Cola, where he stated (among other things), that "...we're in the process of trashing the global atmosphere which is a vital part of our life support system", in relation, apparently, to the problems of CO₂ and greenhouse gases;
 - c. A presentation to the Royal Society of Edinburgh on 29 October 2009, which again promulgates an inaccurate and alarmist view

(indeed, from the available slides, it appears he tries to link the current alleged glacier melting with a decrease in the dry season flow of the Ganges, which would simply be wrong). While there is no copy of his talk available, the summary of the "present situation", attributed to him, is captured in the notes of the proceeding:

" We have the evidence, we have a consensus on scientific interpretation, we have the investment, we know (Stern) that mitigation now rather than later is cheaper. But, we have not sorted out the politics and started to adapt behaviour to minimize risks. We cannot do this without public support. If we fail, we will be risking the consequences of catastrophic climate changes."

3. Professor Boulton is a close colleague of Professors Hegerl and Crowley, both of whose emails are found in the released CRU materials.

As it was the advocacy aspect of the CRU team which has led to so many questionable behaviours, Professor Boulton's shared position on such issues is potentially problematic. His view that the risks of climate change are so great and so certain, on the face of it makes it unlikely that he will be inclined to find wrongdoing or inappropriate behaviour by others who share his view.

Since you have openly stated that the science of climate change is not a subject under discussion or consideration (so, you will not be looking at whether the issues relating to possible manipulation or loss of data, or with programming errors has had an effect on the scientific results that have been published and promoted), the need for a person with Professor Boulton's background and close links to "climate science" is unclear. Professor Boulton's statement to the press that: *"I may be rapped over the knuckles by Sir Muir for saying this, but I think that statement [i.e., **no connection with climate science**] needs to be clarified. I think the committee needs someone like me who is close to the field of climate change..."* is incorrect. Instead, you would have done far better to find a science ethicist, whose focus is on the correct and appropriate approach to scientific inquiry, and relations between science and general society - one with no open or specific connection to the field in question.

Given Professor Boulton's presence, a genuine apprehension of bias exists in relation to the panel, its operation (including the framing of its mandate) and any results. This will neither assist the CRU, the University of East Anglia nor the individuals whose actions are the subject of this inquiry.

Sincerely,

Ian MacDonald.