

**Email of November 11, 2008 to Tom Karl and Other Co-Authors of Santer *et al.*
International Journal of Climatology Paper¹**

Date: Tue, 11 Nov 2008 19:57:22 -0800

From: Ben Santer <santer1@llnl.gov>

To: "Thomas.R.Karl" <Thomas.R.Karl@xxxx.xxx>

CC: (21 undisclosed recipients)²

Subject: Re: [Fwd: FOI Request]

Dear Tom,

Thanks for your email regarding Steven McIntyre's twin requests under the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act. Regarding McIntyre's request (1), no "*monthly time series of output from any of the 47 climate models*" was "*sent by Santer and/or other coauthors of Santer et al 2008 to NOAA employees between 2006 and October 2008*".

As I pointed out to Mr. McIntyre in the email I transmitted to him yesterday, all of the raw (gridded) model and observational data used in the 2008 Santer *et al.* *International Journal of Climatology (IJoC)* paper are freely available to Mr. McIntyre. If Mr. McIntyre wishes to audit us, and determine whether the conclusions reached in our paper are sound, he has all the information necessary to conduct such an audit. Providing Mr. McIntyre with the quantities that I derived from the raw model data (spatially-averaged time series of surface temperatures and synthetic Microwave Sounding Unit [MSU] temperatures) would defeat the very purpose of an audit.

I note that David Douglass and colleagues have already audited our calculation of synthetic MSU temperatures from climate model data. Douglass *et al.* obtained "model average" trends in synthetic MSU temperatures (published in their 2007 *IJoC* paper) that are virtually identical to our own.

McIntyre's request (2) demands "*any correspondence concerning these monthly time series between Santer and/or other coauthors of Santer et al 2008 and NOAA employees between 2006 and October 2008*". I do not know how you intend to respond this second request. You and three other NOAA co-authors on our paper (Susan Solomon, Melissa Free, and

¹ This email has been reformatted. No words have been changed.

² Note: The email of addresses of 21 persons on the CC list have been removed.

John Lanzante) probably received hundreds of emails that I sent to you in the course of our work on the *IJoC* paper. I note that this work began in December 2007, following online publication of Douglass *et al.* in the *IJoC*. I have no idea why McIntyre's request for email correspondence has a "start date" of 2006, and thus predates publication of Douglass *et al.*

My personal opinion is that both FOI requests (1) and (2) are intrusive and unreasonable. Steven McIntyre provides absolutely no scientific justification or explanation for such requests. I believe that McIntyre is pursuing a calculated strategy to divert my attention and focus away from research. As the recent experiences of Mike Mann and Phil Jones have shown, this request is the thin edge of wedge. It will be followed by further requests for computer programs, additional material and explanations, *etc., etc.*

Quite frankly, Tom, having spent nearly 10 months of my life addressing the serious scientific flaws in the Douglass *et al.* *IJoC* paper, I am unwilling to waste more of my time fulfilling the intrusive and frivolous requests of Steven McIntyre. The supreme irony is that Mr. McIntyre has focused his attention on our *IJoC* paper rather than the Douglass *et al.* *IJoC* paper which we criticized. As you know, Douglass *et al.* relied on a seriously flawed statistical test, and reached incorrect conclusions on the basis of that flawed test.

I believe that our community should no longer tolerate the behavior of Mr. McIntyre and his cronies. McIntyre has no interest in improving our scientific understanding of the nature and causes of climate change. He has no interest in rational scientific discourse. He deals in the currency of threats and intimidation. We should be able to conduct our scientific research without constant fear of an "audit" by Steven McIntyre; without having to weigh every word we write in every email we send to our scientific colleagues.

In my opinion, Steven McIntyre is the self-appointed Joe McCarthy of climate science. I am unwilling to submit to this McCarthy-style investigation of my scientific research. As you know, I have refused to send McIntyre the "derived" model data he requests, since all of the primary model data necessary to replicate our results are freely available to him. I will continue to refuse such data requests in the future. Nor will I provide McIntyre with computer programs, email correspondence, *etc.* I feel very strongly about these issues. We should not be coerced by the scientific equivalent of a playground bully.

I will be consulting LLNL's Legal Affairs Office in order to determine how the DOE and LLNL should respond to any FOI requests that we receive from McIntyre. I assume that such requests will be forthcoming.

I am copying this email to all co-authors of our 2008 *IJoC* paper, to my immediate superior at PCMDI (Dave Bader), to Anjuli Bamzai at DOE headquarters, and to Professor Glenn McGregor (the editor who was in charge of our paper at *IJoC*).

I'd be very happy to discuss these issues with you tomorrow. I'm sorry that the tone of this letter is so formal, Tom. Unfortunately, after today's events, I must assume that any email I write to you may be subject to FOI requests, and could ultimately appear on McIntyre's "ClimateAudit" website.

With best personal wishes,

Ben