



Lord Lawson of Blaby  
The House of Lords  
London SW1A 0PW

15<sup>th</sup> June 2010

*Dear Nigel*

I am conscious that I have been taking a rather long time to respond to your letter of 25<sup>th</sup> May. As I am sure you will appreciate, there is rather a lot on at the moment, particularly as we move towards the forthcoming budget. My intention is to respond relatively fully to your letter and my current plan, or perhaps I should say hope, is to get back to you early next week at the latest.

I was surprised to receive your letter of June 7<sup>th</sup> referring to the *Guardian* article. I think it was completely clear from the article itself that this was the sort of headline searching attempting to make a story out of something that did not in fact happen.

I made no mention of you or your organisation in the speech. What I did do was make a clear point that proper scientific scepticism is the way science grows and that there are perfectly reasonable discussions that can be had at a scholarly level about assessing climate science and the way it can be taken forward. What I was critical of was the anecdotal type of evidence and observation such as the fact that we had a cold winter is in some sense seen as refuting the body of scientific evidence on climate. When I made these remarks, I was unaware that Mr Peiser had actually made such statements. Nevertheless, my criticisms stand and accordingly I see no merit in writing to the editor of the *Guardian* as you request.

On another matter, I am as you predicted thoroughly enjoying working with David Willetts.

*Yours sincerely*  
*John*

**Sir John Beddington**