



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

[monckton@mail.com](mailto: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](mailto: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**