

**Stephen McIntyre**  
**Climate Audit**

April 1, 2013

Brian Little  
Editor, *Frontiers in Psychology*  
Distinguished Scholar, Department of Social and Developmental *Psychology*  
Cambridge University.  
[bl321@cam.ac.uk](mailto:bl321@cam.ac.uk)

Frontiers Editorial Office  
Frontiers in Psychology  
EPFL Science Park, Building D  
CH – 1015 Lausanne  
Switzerland  
[editorial.office@frontiersin.org](mailto:editorial.office@frontiersin.org)

Dear Sirs,

You recently published an article by Lewandowsky et al, which, with malice, made a variety of defamatory and untrue allegations against me. These include false allegations that I have exhibited six different forms of supposed conspiratorial ideations: NI (nefarious intent), PV (persecution-victim complex), NS (nihilistic skepticism), NoA (nothing by accident), MbW (must be wrong) and UCT (unreflexive counterfactual thinking). Over and above these accusations and allegations being untrue, defamatory and malicious, the accusations are a falsification of my actual comments.

**Alleged Conspiracist “Hypotheses”**

You (referring here as below to the journal collectively with the authors) falsely alleged that I originated no fewer than four “conspiracist hypotheses”, which jointly or severally allegedly exhibited no fewer than six aspects of conspiracist ideation: Unreflexive Counterfactual Thinking, PV (Persecution-Victimization), Nefarious Intent, MbW(Must be Wrong), NoA (Nothing As it Seems), NS (Nihilistic Skepticism), as summarized in your Table 3 below:

Table 3

*Summary of recursive—and at least partially conspiracist—hypotheses advanced in response to LOG12 during August - October 2012*

---

ID	Date	Originator <sup>a</sup>	Summary of hypothesis	Criteria <sup>b</sup>
----	------	-------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

---

.....

-

5	5 Sep	SMcI	Different versions of the survey	<i>NI, MbW, UCT</i>
6	6 Sep	SMcI	Control data suppressed	<i>NI, NoA</i>
7	10 Sep	SMcI	Duplicate responses from same IP number retained	<i>NS, MbW</i>
8	14 Sep	SMcI	Blocking access to authors' websites	<i>NI, PV, NoA</i>

### **The September 5 Incident**

On September 5, 2012, I asked the following question at Lewandowsky's blog (<http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/ccc2.html#234>). This is the 38<sup>th</sup> item in the Fury SI:

Another couple of questions:

- 1) the link attached to the email to me HKMKNI\_9a13984 was not the same as the link as at the Deltoid survey HKMKNF\_991e2415
- 2) the number of questions noted up in comments at Deltoid was 40, while only 31 were reported in the article. In addition, the project description at UWA mentions questions concerning "life satisfaction" but these are not listed in the Appendix. What happened to them?

The methodological section of the article had not reported the existence of different versions of the survey or the purpose of those versions. Similarly, the methodological section of the article did not list all the questions that were in the survey nor explain why not all questions were reported. I note that the questions were well-founded as it is a simple matter of fact that there were different versions of the survey and that some of the survey questions were not reported in Hoax.

By simply asking these questions, I did not presume "Nefarious Intent" or "Must Be Wrong". These are simple questions about the methodology of the study that are relevant to replication. They are questions that might and, in my opinion, ought to have been asked by the peer reviewers. Nor, by merely asking these questions, did I make a "conspiracist hypothesis", as alleged. Nor did these questions did not remotely constitute "Unreflexive Counterfactual Thinking", which is defined in the article as follows:

that is, the hypothesis was built on a non-existent, counterfactual state of the world, even though knowledge about the true state of the world was demonstrably available at the time.... We argue later that this unreflexive counterfactual thinking is indicative either of the absence of a collective memory for earlier events, or of the lack of a cognitive control mechanism that requires an hypothesis to be compatible with all the available evidence

(which is a hallmark of scientific cognition but is known to be compromised in conspiracist ideation; Wood et al., 2012).

It is absurd to allege that the mere act of asking the above questions constitutes Unreflexive Counterfactual Thinking as you allege.

To date, the authors have given no response to the second question (non-reporting of items) and have thus far given an incomplete and inaccurate response to the first question.

In a contemporary (Sep 7) blog response, Lewandowsky published immature and juvenile taunting as below. <http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/lewandowskyVersionGate.html>. ( This blog post that, by the way, was not listed in their supposedly “exhaustive” summary of blog commentary).

If I am not mistaken, I can indeed confirm that there were 4—not 3—versions of the survey (unless that was the number of my birth certificates, I am never quite sure, so many numbers to keep track of... Mr. McIntyre’s dog misplaced an email under a pastrami sandwich a mere 8.925307759554336<sup>3</sup> days ago, and I have grown at least one tail and several new horns over the last few days, all of which are frightfully independent and hard to keep track of).

Versiongate!

Finally this new friend from Conspirania is getting some legs.

About time, too, I was getting lonely.

Astute readers will have noted that if the Survey ID’s from above are vertically concatenated and then viewed backwards at 33 rpm, they read “Mitt Romney was born in North Korea.”

To understand the relevance of Mr Romney’s place of birth requires a secret code word. This code word, provided below, ought to be committed to memory [before burning this post](#).

So here it is, the secret code. Read it backwards: gnicnalabretnuoc.

In Fury, the authors gave a more formal rendering of the above:

Because question order was counterbalanced between different versions of the LOG12 survey, links to the various versions were quasi-randomly assigned to participating blogs.

However, this is not true. The versions were not “counterbalanced” between activist and “skeptical” blogs, as skeptical blogs were given different versions of the survey than the activist blogs. Lewandowsky has asserted that no skeptical blogs posted a link, but this is untrue, as a link to the Lewandowsky survey was posted at junkscience.com.

I have requested information on version used and date of response from Lewandowsky but he has thus far failed to acknowledge my email and has untruthfully told editor Eich of Psychological Science that he has fully responded to my request for data.

Nor have the authors given any response whatever to their failure to report some survey items in the article, notably their omission of results for a question about Iraq and WMD that is relevant to conspiracist ideation under their definition.

### **The September 6 Incident**

On September 6, a Climate Audit reader who was on the faculty of the University of Western Australia reported that an email from Charles Hanich had been sent to UWA staff on October 21, 2010 seeking their participation in a survey, now known to be the Lewandowsky survey. No mention of this part of the survey was made in the methodological section of *Hoax*. On learning of this unreported dataset, I asked the following questions at Climate Audit: <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/12/lewandowskys-unreported-results/>

Obvious questions: What were the results of UWA staff who actually took the survey. Surely this would have made an interesting comparison group with the bloggers who are the target of the Moon-landing paper. It would have been a logical comparison. Was it done and discarded? If so, why? If it wasn't, why wasn't it done?

Again, these are simply questions. I did not propose a "hypothesis" that "Control data [was] suppressed". However, the question was well-founded in that it is a fact that Lewandowsky had collected control data and that this data was not reported.

In asking the question, I did not presume "Nefarious Intent", though I did presume that it was an intentional decision on the part of the authors not to report the data (as opposed to merely "random" reporting decisions by the authors. Indeed, my surmise that the non-reporting was intentional has proved correct. However, it is untrue that this constituted NoA since I did not "weave" this question "into a conspiracy narrative and reinterpret [it] as indisputable evidence for the theory" as the authors allege. I simply asked a reasonable question.

Lewandowsky et al did not answer the question at the time, waiting until Fury to respond. In Fury, they purported to justify non-reporting on the basis that the "invitation returned only a small number of respondents (N<80)":

Control data suppressed (6). Data collection for LOG12 also involved an attempt to recruit a "control" sample via an emailed invitation to participate in the survey among the first author's campus community. Because this invitation returned only a small number of respondents (N < 80), only the sample of blog denizens was reported in LOG12.

In a recent article by Lewandowsky and coauthors (The pivotal role of perceived scientific consensus in acceptance of science), Lewandowsky et al's Study 2 was a survey of 100

respondents of which the “control group” was 49. If a control group of 49 was adequate in the one case, it is unclear why a control group of ~80 was not worth reporting in the other case. Be that as it may, there is nothing in my raising the question that warrants aspersions of “conspiracist ideation”.

By the way, the issue of sample groups being large enough is an important question that was inadequately discussed in Hoax. The total number of respondents purporting to adhere to Lewandowsky’s signature Moon Landing conspiracy was only 10, of which the majority (6) were “warmists”. In my opinion, many, if not all, of these responses were fake. As a further aside, Harrison Schmidt, one of the last people to walk on the moon and said to be the photographer of the famous Blue Marble photograph, is a prominent “skeptic” and even a director of the Heartland Institute. There is not a whiff of Moon Landing skepticism in the major “skeptic” blogs, where astronauts tend to be lionized.

### **The September 10 Incident**

On September 9, having just learned from a Climate Audit about the role of “Charles Hanich”, Roger Pielke Jr sent me his 2010 correspondence with Hanich, including Pielke’s correspondence with Hanich about the handling of duplicate IP addresses. Hanich had stated:

When we published the surveys, we had two options:

- a) Use the provision offered by the hosting company to block repeated replies using IP addresses. This, however, will block legitimate use of the same computer, such as in our laboratory, where numerous participants use the same PCs.
- b) Not to block multiple replies and allow for the possibility of repeated replies when evaluating the data.

We chose option b), which was more practical in our situation.

Lewandowsky et al had stated the following in Hoax:

Following standard recommendations (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004), duplicate responses from any IP number were eliminated (N = 71).

Lewandowsky’s reference (Gosling et al 2004) suggested several different methods for detecting repeat responders and did not really clarify what was done. (See my discussion at Climate Audit <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/the-third-skeptic/>).

My interpretation (and it is only an interpretation, since the description is not conclusive) is that Lewandowsky accepted multiple responses from the same IP address as long as there was a slight variation in any answer. For example, the answers from the two scam responses who agreed with every conspiracy were nearly identical, but varied on a couple of questions. As I interpret the methodology, because the two answers were not item-for-item identical, they would be accepted even if they came from the **same** IP address. No

need for complicated hiding behind proxy servers as long as one or two answers were varied.

I re-iterate that this is an interpretation of the methodological description and it is possible that the algorithm operated differently. Lewandowsky could easily clarify this issue without providing the actual IP addresses. It is trivial to assign a unique ID number for each unique IP address so that this phenomenon could be analysed.

A couple of days later, I inquired directly at Lewandowsky's blog as follows (an inquiry that was not reported in the supposedly exhaustive survey, though it was an inquiry by a major figure at Lewandowsky's own blog):

<http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/lewandowskyScammers1.html#916>

stevemcintyre at 05:42 AM on 13 September, 2012

Can you clarify your handling of multiple responses from a single IP address, as neither your article nor the above response does so.

If you had multiple (but non-duplicate) responses from the same IP address, did you keep all of them? If not, how did you decide which one to keep?

If you had duplicate responses from the same IP address, did you eliminate ALL of the responses or did you keep one?

Again, these are simple enough questions, that could have been quickly answered. However, Lewandowsky again chose not to answer even the most straightforward questions about methodology.

You allege that the asking of these questions exhibits the following conspiracist ideation: "Nihilistic Skepticism" and "Must Be Wrong". I did nothing of the sort. I asked straightforward questions about methodology that could have and should have been answered in a straightforward way.

### **The September 14 Incident**

On September 14, while discussing Lewandowsky's false claim that there had been a link to the Lewandowsky survey at the SKS website, I mentioned in passing that I was unable to access either the Lewandowsky or SKS websites (both registered to John Cook) using my IP address, but was able to access them using a proxy server. In the past, I've been blocked from accessing data at ftp sites operated by Michael Mann's associates so this sort of conduct has precedent.

At the time, there was considerable controversy over the removal of comments by Lewandowsky and associates at his website, controversy that would soon lead to their deletion of all of Tom Fuller's comments <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/14/the-sks-link-to-the-lewandowsky-survey/#comment-352980>. I began my coverage of Lewandowsky's censorship a few days earlier (Sep 10) with a post at Climate Audit (see <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/>.) In comments to that post, Tom Fuller reported that Lewandowsky had deleted one of his comments

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350259> . barry woods then reported that his comment at Lewandowsky's blog that quoted Tom Curtis' criticism of scam responses had been deleted (<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350266>). Hector M reported that his comment at Lewandowsky's blog was disappeared (<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350313>). Then a comment by A Scott was deleted at Lewandowsky's blog (see <http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/10/lewandowsky-censors-discussion-of-fake-data/#comment-350318>).

Because I was unable to access either Lewandowsky's or Cook's site using my own IP address, but was able to access both sites using an anonymous proxy server, I speculated that I'd been once again blocked by someone that I was criticizing. Commenters at my blog, some of whom were not known parties in the debate, subsequently observed that they too were unable to access Lewandowsky's blog; that there had been routing outages on the internet; and that the proxy server might follow a different route to Australia than my normal IP routing. I immediately acknowledged that this might explain the phenomenon and withdrew my complaint. I note that one of Lewandowsky's criteria for "conspiracist ideation" was "Self Sealing" refusal to accept contrary evidence and that this criterion for "conspiracist ideation" did not apply here. When an alternative explanation was presented, it was immediately accepted and corrections made.

The allegation of Lewandowsky et al that I exhibited "Persecution-Victimization" in this incident is totally unsupported. They define PV as follows:

The theorist typically considers herself, at least tacitly, to be the brave antagonist of the nefarious intentions of the conspiracy; that is, the victim is also a potential hero. The theme of the victimization of conspiracy theorists or their allies features prominently in science denial, for example when isolated scientists who oppose the scientific consensus that HIV causes AIDS are Presented as persecuted heroes and are likened to Galileo (Kalichman, 2009; Wagner-Egger et al., 2011). We refer to this persecution-victimization criterion as PV for short.

While I concede that I had incorrectly surmised that I'd been blocked by Lewandowsky and Cook, I did not regard that as "persecution" or myself as being "victimized". Nor did I consider that there was any particular "heroism" on my side of the apparent blocking. On the contrary, I regarded their (apparent) conduct as merely juvenile and immature.

## **Public Statements**

In Fury, Lewandowsky et al enter into a lengthy discussion of supposed "public declarations" by myself and others that we had never been approached by "researchers". Lewandowsky's allegations are untrue and defamatory. First, I never made any "public declaration" on the matter. I did state in a private email to Jo Nova that I had "no record" of being contacted in 2010 by **Lewandowsky** – a true statement. Then unaware of her dispute with Lewandowsky, I suggested that she simply contact Lewandowsky and find out who he had contacted. Nor did Pielke Jr or

Marc Morano make any “public statement” on the matter. Like me, both responded in private emails to Jo Nova. Like me, they had no record of being contacted by (or about) **Lewandowsky** in their 2010 emails. And like me, both gave limited responses stating that they had no record of being contacted by **Lewandowsky** in 2010.

For obvious reasons, I could not categorically assert that I had not been contacted. At the time, I had not heard of Lewandowsky and could easily have discarded an email approach from someone that I’d never heard of. Or the email might have gone into Junk Mail and been discarded. I express myself carefully and avoid saying things beyond what I know. While Jo Nova over-egged the statement in my email in a report on her blog (also over-egging the similar responses by Pielke Jr and Morano), this does not give you licence to make untrue and damaging accusations against me.

On September 3 (about noon Eastern time), Lewandowsky <http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/cccl.html> wrote a blog commentary

If I release the names but it turns out to have been unethical, this cannot be undone. If I decline to release the names, as I have done to date, and it turns out that this was unnecessary, then no harm is done if release of the names is delayed by a few days.

I am therefore awaiting guidance on this issue.

In the meantime, I understand that there is a list on the internet of individuals who have declared that they were never contacted. As we are awaiting the decision about release of the names, just a matter of general principle, there can be no harm if those folks were to again check their inboxes (and outboxes) very carefully for correspondence from my assistant at UWA in August and September 2010. I know how difficult it is to locate individual emails among thousands received in a year, and a double check may therefore be quite prudent. (Who knows, it might even prevent some overly trigger-happy and creative people from floating a conspiracy theory about how I just made up the fact of having contacted those blogs, similar to the way NASA faked the moon landing.)

Contrary to Lewandowsky’s allegation, I never “aired the suspicion that “skeptic” bloggers had not been contacted”. This seemed to me an extremely unlikely thing for someone to lie about and I accordingly did not hold this particular “suspicion”, let alone “air” it. If Lewandowsky claimed to have contacted five blogs, I presumed that he done so. It was unclear to me why Lewandowsky was refusing to identify the blogs, but that was a different question.

Although Lewandowsky’s previous comments had implied that he had been in personal contact with the various bloggers, I noticed that Lewandowsky’s blogpost introduced the term **“assistant”**. I therefore re-examined my 2010 emails for the term “uwa.edu” and located an email from a Charles Hanich in September 2010 (which made no mention of conspiracy ideation). Within a few hours, I posted notices at several blogs where this was under discussion: (Lucia at 4:11 pm; Bishop Hill 5:12 pm).

Lewandowsky retorted with further taunting (see his blog post <http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/ccc2.html#225>):

It has come to my attention that one of the individuals who initially denied—yes, folks, that's the correct word, look it up in a dictionary—having received an invitation to post a link to my survey on the rejection of science on his blog, has now found that email.

Lewandowsky's allegation that I had made a "denial" in those terms was untrue and I responded accordingly the following morning at Lewandowsky's blog. <http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/ccc2.html#225>. (Although this comment was listed in the Fury SI (38), the above paragraphs were not included in the listing.)

In your post, you state:

"It has come to my attention that one of the individuals who initially denied—yes, folks, that's the correct word, look it up in a dictionary—having received an invitation to post a link to my survey on the rejection of science on his blog, has now found that email."

I presume that you are referring to me.

In a post at Lucia's blog, Lucia had said that she did not recollect receiving such an email from you, but did not preclude the possibility that one was in the tide of emails. Hence her permission to you to release her name if she was one of the addressees.

My situation was identical to hers. I did not recollect receiving such an email from you (and hadn't received such an email from "you"). However, I could not preclude receiving one in the tide of emails. Hence I added my name to the list of people who gave permission to you to release such a request. See my comment <http://rankexploits.com/musings/2012/tweet-your-permission-for-lewandowsky-to-out-you/#comment-102397> at Lucia's blog.

Since Tim Lambert's invitation to the survey at his blog referred to a survey being carried out by "Stephan Lewandowsky", I had presumed that your name would appear in or be connected to the invitation and I had therefore searched my 2010 emails for correspondence referring to "Lewandowsky" and did not locate any.

It did not occur to me that the invitation would not be from you, but would not include any reference to you as a participant. When you provided the additional information that it had been sent by a research associate, I carried out a search for "uwa.edu.au" and located an email from a Charles Harnich - an email which made no mention of "Lewandowsky".

Thus, if your post refers to me, it would be accurate to say that I did not recollect receiving the email, but it is not accurate to say that I "denied" receiving the invitation

email, since, like Lucia, I did not preclude the possibility of overlooking something in the tide of email.

On September 8, I published a blog post at Climate Audit about the Lewandowsky, referring to Charles Hanich. Pielke Jr noticed this post and re-examined his emails for “Hanich”, locating the 2010 email. On Sep 9, he notified me and Jo Nova that he had also received an email from Hanich.. Jo Nova immediately notified her correspondents to look for “Hanich”. By the morning (Eastern) of Sep 10, both Marc Morano and Roy Spencer had located emails from Hanich and by noon Eastern on Sep 10, the receipt by Pielke Jr, Morano and Spencer had been reported both at Climate Audit and at Jo Nova.

For the record, I also observe that our inability to locate the email by searching for “Lewandowsky” arose from a deception by Lewandowsky in the first place. In August 2010, Lewandowsky had requested (and received) permission from his Ethics Committee to conceal his involvement with the survey for fear that association with him would “contaminate” the responses. Nonetheless, Lewandowsky personally notified the various activist blogs of his association with the survey, concealing his participation only from the “skeptic” blogs.

When the question of the identity of the skeptic blogs arose in August 2012, Lewandowsky purported to be concerned that disclosure of their identities would violate ethics guidelines. If Lewandowsky seriously had such concerns, it seems to me that his appropriate course of action would have been to notify the various parties from whom his association had originally been concealed to tell them that Lewandowsky had been a party to the original invitation and requesting their permission to have their names disclosed. Instead, Lewandowsky’s objective was clearly to embarrass parties who were unaware of his association with the original Hanich invitation, an objective made very clear in UWA correspondence obtained under FOI.

The article also falsely alleged that I had “air[ed] the suspicion that “skeptic” bloggers had not been contacted”, even though I had been “contacted twice”. At no time did I “air the suspicion” that skeptic bloggers had not been contacted. This did not seem to me like the sort of thing that someone would lie about it. Indeed in the very comment that the Fury SI selectively quoted, I discouraged such suspicions.

As a final observation on this topic, the following claim by Lewandowsky that he outed me and the other bloggers on September 10 is untrue and defamatory:

The names of the “skeptic” bloggers became publicly available on 10 September 2012, on a blog post by the first author of LOG12;  
<http://www.shapingtomorrowworld.org/lewandowskyGof4.html>.

As noted above, I had reported my receipt of an invitation from Hanich a week earlier. In addition, following my Climate Audit post on September 8 mentioning Hanich’s name, Pielke Jr notified both myself and Jo Nova on September 9. Jo Nova sent Hanich’s name to others and in the morning (Eastern), both Roy Spencer and Marc Morano located Hanich emails. By noon (Eastern) September 10, all had been publicly identified both at Climate Audit and Jo Nova, prior to Lewandowsky’s supposed outing.

## **Malice**

The authors claim that the data collection was “unbiased” because Cook and Hubble-Marriott had not been “involved in analysis or report” of Hoax:

While the authors because data collection (via internet search) was conducted by two authors who were not involved in analysis or report of LOG12, the resulting “raw” data available in the online supplementary material cannot reflect a conflict of interest involving the LOG12 authors.

However, both Cook and Lewandowsky have extreme bias against skeptics, bias that can fairly be described as malice. Lewandowsky’s animosity is evident in the statements from his blog quoted. Cook’s website (Skeptical Science) operates a private forum where Cook, as proprietor, has sanctioned vile commentary against both me and Anthony Watts. For example, one participant in Cook’s forum wrote:

McIntyre need to go down, it is quite that simple.

Another wrote:

to be candid, McIntyre or Watts in handcuffs is probably the only thing that will slow things down.

Another stated:

my personal contribution will be to rip Anthony Watts’ throat out – metaphorically of course...

Sometimes you just want to let loose and scream about how you want to take those motherfucking arseholes, those closed-minded bigotted genocidal pieces of regurgitated dog shit and do unspeakable violence to their bodies and souls for what they are doing to the safety of what and who we all hold dear. (Ain’t a lack of a moderation policy a cleansing and liberating thing?)

Hubble-Marriott publicly stated his intent to eradicate skepticism. Further, during the period in which Hoax was under discussion, Hubble-Marriott made scurrilous and unfounded accusations of anti-Semitism against David Evans, the husband of one of the targets (Jo Nova) of Fury, which I quote here so that you can fully adjudicate Hubble-Marriott’s bias:<http://watchingthedeniars.wordpress.com/2012/08/06/the-protocols-of-the-elder-climate-scientists-and-banksters-is-the-media-is-twigging-to-just-how-extreme-some-sceptics-are/>. Evans, who writes about money and currencies in his professional life, had written a short account of the development of paper currencies including the following statement which Hubble-Marriott quoted as particularly “alarming”:

“...Over time the goldsmiths became bankers, governments introduced central banking, and finally, in 1971, the world financial system switched from using gold as its base money to using cash (paper money). The world financial system is now unpinning by cash, which governments can print at will. We have a fully paper system, with no hard constraints on how much money there is.”

Hubble-Marriott continued:

In Evans reasoning is that “goldsmiths” from the medieval period – let’s be frank he is clearly talking about Jews – founded a “paper aristocracy” that secretly rules the globe.

Gold.

Smith.

Got it?

Do I really need to spell it out?

It is hard to imagine less objective and more malicious attitudes.

## **Conclusion**

By identifying and discussing the above issues, I do not imply that there aren’t other issues that could be raised. This letter is already lengthy enough. You accused me exhibiting six different forms of conspiratorial ideations: NI (nefarious intent), PV (persecution-victim complex), NS (nihilistic skepticism), NoA (nothing by accident), MbW (must be wrong) and UCT (unreflexive counterfactual thinking). These allegations are untrue, defamatory and malicious. Over and above these accusations and allegations being untrue, defamatory and malicious, the accusations are a falsification of my actual comments. I formally request that you withdraw these allegations and retract the article.

I also strongly dispute the allegation that my work is, in any sense, anti-scientific. I have published technical criticisms of proxy reconstructions in academic literature (Geophysical Research Letters, PNAS, Journal of Climate, Annals of Applied Statistics, Atmospheric Research Letters and Energy & Environment) and at my blog, Climate Audit. In respect to Climate Audit, I note that I was especially mentioned in the June 2012 report by the Royal Society, Science as an Open Enterprise, chaired by Prof Geoffrey Boulton and with a distinguished panel, made the following comment about my work at Climate Audit:

At the other extreme, there is a small, but increasingly numerous body of engaged “citizen scientists” that wish to dig deeply into the scientific data relating to a particular issue. Some ask tough and illuminating questions, exposing important errors and elisions.[102 -McIntyre S (2012). Climate Audit. Available at: [www.climateaudit.org/](http://www.climateaudit.org/)]

Yours truly,

Stephen McIntyre  
Climate Audit