

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Friends of Science directors

Date:Wed, 09 May 2007 11:49:25 -0700

From:<SourceWatch contributor name and email deleted>

To:<FOS email deleted>

Dear Friends of Science,

I would like to release the following list of current officers and directors of the Friends of Science online, and I presume you have no reasonable objections to the publication of this information. Please review the following list and advise me of any errors or omissions; thanks in advance. If I receive no reply, I will assume the list is correct and complete, and may be released as is.

Regards,

<SourceWatch contributor name deleted>

=====
Douglas Leahey - President
Eric Loughead - Vice-President
Giles Wilderman - Secretary
William Hommel - Treasurer

Other directors:

Lloyd Flood
Albert F. Jacobs
Leonard F. Maier
Arthur Patterson
Charles Simpson

Subject:Re: Friends of Science directors

Date:Wed, 9 May 2007 14:40:00 -0600

From:Friends of Science <email deleted>

To:<SourceWatch contributor name deleted>

Hello <SourceWatch contributor name deleted>,

You have an old list there, and - in fact - the current list will probably change again at our forthcoming AGM.

We are delighted that you are making the attempt to reflect the proper make-up of our Board and we expect that you will be equally eager to print the correct information about our volunteer society, which follows in synopsis. I would hope that the information it contains will clear up the false impression created by the current entries in the "blog world" and that unproved allegations and *ad hominem* attacks will become a thing of the past.

Regards,

Albert Jacobs

FoS Board as of May 1st 2007:

Douglas Leahey, Ph.D., President
Eric Loughead, P.Geol, Vice President
Giles Wilderman, Secretary
Lloyd Flood, P.Eng., Treasurer

Other Directors:

John Leeson, P.Geol.
Leonard Maier, P.Eng.
William Howell, Ph.D.
Norm Kalmanovitch, P.Geoph.
Charles Simpson, Past President.

The Friends of Science Society was formed in 2002 by a number of retired earth scientists and engineers and is registered as a not-for-profit society under the Alberta Societies Act. Its main goal is to bring the full weight of scientific evidence to the public, the media and politicians with respect to Climate Science as it relates to the IPCC's version of that science and its offspring, the Kyoto Protocol. A proper open scientific discussion about climate change has never taken place in Canada.

We pay our running expenses mostly out of the membership fees and donations of the several hundred individual members we have and in the few cases, when we are initiating larger projects (such as our video, our website and the like), we try to raise money from wealthy individuals and private foundations in this city and elsewhere. Such funds are often channelled through charitable organisations for education purposes, which is what they are indeed used for. We are not political lobbyists. In the case of the video, the funds were obtained through the University of Calgary through a Trust Fund established at U of C to encourage debate on basic Climate Science (something Environment Canada never got around to). While some of the smaller oil and gas companies have occasionally contributed because their leaders are often earth scientists who are sympathetic to our fight on scientific grounds, so-called "big oil" is generally absent in our list of donors. The large companies would not contribute if we asked them, because of their public image as marketers in a country where 70% of the population has been brainwashed in embracing "Kyoto".

Although we always insist that the message we are trying to get through to a brainwashed public is more important than how that message is paid for, the question of where our funding comes from is a legitimate one in this cynical world. But you should be aware that nobody ever seems to ask the question about where the Sierra Club, the Greenpeace, the Suzuki Foundation, the Pembina people etc get their money from. Some of these have in fact been denied charitable status because they are lobby groups. Some of them have been funded to lobby on Environment Canada's behalf during the Liberal Government's days. Then there is Environment Canada itself, which has used literally billions of dollars of tax money to promote their biased version of the debate, without having been instrumental in fulfilling their cherished objective: lowering CO2. Friends of Science advocate that the priority be shifted to fighting pollution of air, water and soil instead. Unlike these groups who have large promotion budgets and a large paid staff and require significant funding for their operations, all of our efforts are done by volunteers including our advisory board who do so for moral and scientific, not financial reasons. The equivalent cost of the untold thousands of hours put in by our members represents far more than any real or perceived funding that we get.

None of the funds we received from any source ever came with any strings attached. Most of us (including our Advisory Board) don't even know who the donors are. We are all registered professionals, bound by the ethics standards of our respective professional organisations and we don't sell our souls. Several muckraking bloggers have made false allegations and engaged in *ad hominem* attacks on some of our members and advisors. Unfortunately, politically inclined editors have seen fit to copy the lies as fact and publish them prominently.

If we had all the money we are alleged to have received from "big oil", we would sue them.

Subject:Re: Friends of Science directors

Date:Wed, 09 May 2007 14:27:28 -0700

From:<SourceWatch contributor name and email deleted>

To:Friends of Science <email deleted>

Albert,

Thanks for the update. I'll make sure to use the proper list.

I can't say I agree with everything you've written in your synopsis, but I do try to be factual in any information put forward. To that end, I note that in the past FoS has stated that donations to the U of C Trust Fund was used for the video and the anti-Kyoto radio ads. FoS website enhancement was also mentioned, as I recall. I assume that these are the only three FoS items that were paid for by the Trust Fund, and that everything else came from memberships or other donations.

For what it's worth, I can believe your doubts about the current IPCC consensus are sincere, even though I find the scientific evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the IPCC. Anyway, I don't believe in *ad hominem* attacks, preferring to stick to the facts.

Regards,

<SourceWatch contributor name deleted>

Subject:Re: Friends of Science directors
Date:Wed, 9 May 2007 17:15:26 -0600
From:Friends of Science <email deleted>
To:<SourceWatch contributor name and email deleted>

<SourceWatch contributor name deleted >,

As I said: "video, web site and the like". The radio ads (instead of TV which we can't afford) were also paid that way as an educational outreach. Their sole goal was to get people to look at our website. Since we have been accused by some that we were making political propaganda during an election campaign, I would like to point out, that the ads were contracted and started before any election call. They ran their course and were non-political to the extent that Kyoto is a scientific environmental matter. In any case, they were not partisan. That an election was called was not our doing. And see what the former opposition, now government, is doing with the issue! What the problem really is about is that politicians, 95% of which come out of the "humanities" have no knowledge and no appreciation of things scientific and the method by which scientific research works. As a result they use cherry-picking of science to bolster their arguments for political decisions already reached. That's really what we at FoS are fighting against.

I am not going to argue science with you, but do you realise that there is in fact NO peer-reviewed scientific paper in existence that proves that increasing CO2 causes catastrophic global warming? There are actually peer-reviewed papers that show evidence of the opposite.

Another thing that the research funds supported was an annotated bibliography of peer-reviewed papers that support the contentions of IPCC critics like ourselves, a job contracted out to Dr Madhav Khandekar, a retired Environment Canada research scientist. It's an 8 MB file so I am not taking the risk your provider will bounce it, but you should just take a peek at it. It can be found in the top of the "Scientific References" section of our website.

Next time you are in Calgary, give me a call (<phone number deleted>). We'll have a beer and chat about media misconceptions and the truth of C. P. Snow's concept of "Two Cultures".

Albert

Subject:Re: Friends of Science directors
Date:Thu, 10 May 2007 13:48:04 -0700
From:<SourceWatch contributor name and email deleted>
To:Friends of Science <fos@telus.net>

Hi Albert,

I hope you can see why some believe the radio ads were political rather than educational:

- With the impending release of the Gomery report, a federal election was widely expected in early 2006, although of course the exact timing could not be known.
- The content of the ads appeared to be political, as they attacked government policies and took a point of view that appeared to be consistent with the Conservative environmental policy at the time (the "made in Canada" plan that would opt out of Kyoto and emphasize regulation of toxic pollutants rather than greenhouse gases)
- The motivation also appeared to be political; according to an interview with FoS Vice-President Eric Loughead, the ad campaign targeted a small number of Ontario ridings where the Liberals held only a slight lead in the polls.

But, of course, you have every right to have your side of the story known, and I would be happy to post your statements on this, as well as your more general comments. By the way, I have also downloaded the annotated bibliography (both long and short versions).

I suppose we'll have to agree to disagree on many things. But it would be interesting to meet someday. By the way, I have two degrees, one in computer science/math and one in music, and have since pursued dual careers in both music and operations research. So I am well aware of the cultural divide between the arts and sciences, and try to bridge that gap in my own way.

Regards,
<SourceWatch contributor name deleted>