

Reply to Seitz letter in the August 13, 1996 issue of the Wall Street Journal¹

An Aug. 13 Letter to the Editor from Frederick Seitz (*"Global Warming Report: Basic Rules Disregarded"*) repeats Mr. Seitz's earlier claim that a key chapter in a recent report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was subject to *"unauthorized rewriting."* This allegation has been comprehensively refuted by myself, other IPCC scientists, and the chairmen of IPCC. Our previously published Letters to the Editor (June 25, *"No Deception in Global Warming Report"*; July 23, *"Global Warming Critics, Chill Out"*) state in clear language that the changes made to Chapter 8 of the IPCC report were authorized by the IPCC and in compliance with IPCC rules, and were made for scientific and not political purposes.

Mr. Seitz attempts to buttress his claims of unauthorized rewriting with *"additional evidence"* in the form of incomplete and selective quotes from secondary sources: an editorial in the June 13 issue of Nature and a *"News and Comment"* report in the June 21 issue of Science. Neither source can be considered authoritative on the subject of IPCC rules and procedures. In the Science report that he quotes, Mr. Seitz ignores the crucial statement made by Bert Bolin (chairman of the IPCC) that IPCC procedures were not violated by the changes made to Chapter 8.

Mr. Seitz's erroneous and repetitive claims of *"unauthorized rewriting"* and political tampering have generated valuable publicity for the 1995 IPCC Report, causing many more people to read it than would otherwise have done so. This can only improve popular understanding of the science of climate change.²

BENJAMIN D. SANTER, PH.D.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Livermore, Calif.

TOM M. L. WIGLEY, PH.D.

National Center for Atmospheric Research
Boulder, Colo.

¹ This reply was published in the Wall Street Journal on September 3, 1996, under the header *"Our Critics Provide Valuable Publicity"*.

² This is the version of the Santer/Wigley letter which was actually published in the Wall Street Journal on September 3, 1996. I do not have the version of the letter which was submitted to the Wall Street Journal, and I am therefore unable to identify any changes to the submitted letter which may have been made by Wall Street Journal editors.