

Dr. James G. Brasseur
Chairman, Topical Group on the Physics of Climate
American Physical Society

Dear Jim,

It has become clear that I can no longer contribute effectively to the progress of the Topical Group on the Physics of Climate (GPC) as it was originally envisioned. Therefore, I am tendering my resignation from the Topical Group and the Executive Committee.

The GPC Executive Committee has been strongly influenced by pressure from within, and from others involved in the development of GPC activities, to exclude discussion of science that does not conform to the doctrine of strong anthropogenic global warming. This disregards the desires of a substantial fraction of the membership to discuss *all* the relevant science. Furthermore, before holding activities of its own, the fledgling GPC is moving to explore joint activities and interactions with other societies which are completely invested in climate alarm and which will not support the GPC science-only objective. These developments indicate that the GPC has set a course to become yet another outlet for promoting the doctrine.

As demonstrated in the development of the inaugural GPC speakers program (to be presented in March 2013), we have drawn a boundary around the science so as to substantially exclude peer-reviewed, published work that conflicts with the doctrine of strong anthropogenic global warming, regardless of a speaker's credentials and distinguished research record. For example, one accomplished physicist, an expert on the key issue of solar variability effects on terrestrial climate, was shunted off to "back up speaker" status due to the intervention of an IPCC lead author with a demonstrable vested interest in the IPCC's posture on the solar issue. Another proposed speaker's peer-reviewed, published work concerning the integrity of the land temperature data was completely discounted because he had endorsed a public expression of religious faith and its connection with science.

While skeptics' public statements were considered evidence of bias, there were no qualms about applying a double standard that excused doctrine supporters from such considerations. One enthusiastically approved invited speaker has ventured into public environmental advocacy for reduced meat-eating, vegetarianism, and for limiting natural offspring and airplane travel. Another invitee's public statement of opinion on a human contribution to a single hurricane (Katrina) was not judged grounds for questioning his objectivity. This double standard was no accident: one member of the committee charged with choosing speakers was quite explicit about skeptics' participation when he warned against an "argument that winds up giving more effective weight to the 'skeptics' over the consensus viewpoint."

None of the proposed speakers' public expressions of belief or opinion should bear on their qualifications to speak on their scientific work in climate. The science must be considered in isolation – as science and only science. To do otherwise is to act as thought police. The selective use of these public expressions as a basis for excluding one kind of science is wrong and biases GPC activities.

My participation in the GPC development process was the result of a grass roots petition signed by more than 200 APS members, most of whom eventually joined the GPC. I now feel compelled to inform these petitioners of the outcome so that they can make their own assessments regarding the legitimacy of the

GPC. Also, since I have supported the GPC in public and private statements, I will be updating these statements in the future.

As you know the GPC was intended to channel strong APS member disagreement over the Society's 2007 Statement on Climate Change into a productive scientific enterprise. But there was also a greater opportunity: to demonstrate that it is still possible to convene a forum that would present and discuss, as scientists, the broad body of climate science with all of its complexities, uncertainties, and interpretations. Alas, despite good faith efforts made by some, this opportunity appears to have been lost, and I fear that another may not come along soon.

Sincerely,

Roger W. Cohen
Fellow, APS
10-17-12