

Sir Muir,

As a member of the public who is deeply concerned about scientific standards, I find it extremely worrying that the panel seem to have made up their minds already. You say that "given the nature of the allegations it is right that someone who has no links to either the university or the climate science community looks at the evidence and makes recommendations based on what they find" (The Times, 3rd Dec). So why exactly, given Geoffrey Boulton's background in climate alarmism, did you think it appropriate to appoint him to the panel? And why is he still there? At least Philip Campbell had the decency to resign, even though he should have never been appointed either. Because of this, your (at first convincing) claim to be "independent" is risible.

A word of advice: the general public won't tolerate another whitewash. It is sensible, right and proper to release all raw data and all mathematical modelling techniques and software into the public domain so we can see what's really going on - which is why this sham of an inquiry won't ever do it.

Yours sincerely,
Robert Owen