The Honorable Joe Barton  
Chairman  
Committee on Energy and Commerce  
2125 Rayburn House Office Building  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515  

Dear Mr. Chairman:

On June 23, 2005, you wrote to three of the world’s most respected experts on global warming to demand information about “all financial support” they ever received during their long and distinguished careers, “the source of funding” for every study they ever conducted, “all data archives” for every published study they ever wrote, and multiple other burdensome and intrusive subjects.

Your letters also raised issues about alleged “methodological flaws,” “data errors,” “problems with underlying data,” and lack of “transparency” in their highly regarded research.

Although you have failed to hold a single hearing on the subject of global warming in the eleven years that you have been chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and its Energy and Oversight Subcommittees — and have vociferously opposed all legislative efforts in the Committee to address global warming — your June 23 letters justify your extraordinary demands of these scientists on the grounds that “the Committee must have full and accurate information when considering matters relating to climate change policy.”

These letters do not appear to be a serious attempt to understand the science of global warming. Some might interpret them as a transparent effort to bully and harass climate change experts who have reached conclusions with which you disagree.

In addition, on the same date, you wrote to the highly regarded heads of two premier scientific organizations with intrusive demands for information about the funding and review of scientific studies of climate change and the role of individuals in those review processes. In these letters, you raise issues about the “quality and transparency of federally funded research,” question the independence of the review process, and allege that conclusions in certain acclaimed studies “cannot be supported.”
The scientists you have targeted in the letters are Dr. Michael Mann, who has been appointed the Director of the Earth System Science Center at Pennsylvania State University; Dr. Raymond S. Bradley, who is the Director of the Climate System Research Center at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst; Dr. Malcolm K. Hughes, who is the former Director of the Laboratory of Tree-Ring Research at the University of Arizona; Dr. Rajendra K. Pachauri, who is the Chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and Director General of the Energy and Resources Institute in New Delhi, India; and Dr. Arden L. Bement, Jr., who is the Director of the National Science Foundation.

These climate scientists have impeccable records. They are widely regarded as among the leading researchers in their respective fields. Collectively, they have published hundreds of articles and dozens of books in the field of earth and atmospheric sciences and received numerous distinctions.

If the Committee indeed has a genuine interest in the science of global warming, you should withdraw these letters and instead schedule a long-overdue Committee hearing on climate change. The five scientists you have written would all make excellent witnesses. Evaluating their testimony on the science — and the testimony of other experts — would be a far more effective way to educate members about global warming than launching this dubious investigation.

Sincerely,

Henry A. Waxman
Member of Congress

cc: The Honorable John D. Dingell
Ranking Minority Member