

From: tom crowley <tom@ocean.tamu.edu>  
To: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>  
Subject: Re: Wally  
Date: Mon, 26 Feb 2001 11:18:19 -0600  
Cc: mhughes@ltrr.arizona.edu, rbradley@geo.umass.edu, k.briffa@uea.ac.uk, p.jones@uea.ac.uk, t.osborn@uea.ac.uk

Mike,

you are really the most appropriate person to be the lead author on this - I was just volunteering myself as the unfortunate soul who has to bear the brunt of Wallys wrath

Tom

ps Peck would be fine of course but I don't know whether we want to get him tangled up in the acrimony - we could of course ask for his comments beforehand

>HI Tom,

>

>Thanks--I was thinking this too. Ray held out a real olive branch to Wally >by the extremely balanced piece he wrote in Science last year (some of us >thought he caved in a bit too much!). So there was absolutely no reason for >Wally to write this piece.

>

>If Julie Uppenbrink gives us the go-ahead, I say lets do as Tom suggests. I >think this has a lot more cachet if all on this list are willing to sign on >as co-authors.

>

>Regarding primary authorship: On the one hand, it would be appropriate for >me tsince it is primarily Mann et al that is explicitly under attack here, >though all of us are implicitly under attack. However, I think the piece >carries a lot more weight if it is authored by someone of Wally's stature, >and I think Tom far better fits the bill in this regard. So if Tom is >willing to bear the brunt of this, I would definitely endorse him being >primary author.

>

>I would argue to include Peck too, but I think this would be a conflict for >him, as he is pretty close to Wally. So best to leave it w/ the current >group in my opinion. Lets pursue this further once Phil hears back from J.U...

>

>mike

>

>At 09:16 AM 2/26/01 -0600, tom crowley wrote:

>>Hi all,

>>

>>I vote for a response - quick and to the point - itemized in fact.

>>

>>The only problem is somehow has to volunteer to be the sacrificial lamb as >>first author - that person will almost certainly be badgered by Wally and >>probably charged with some trumped up unethical piece - he will also >>probably try to subvert the review process by contacting the Editor of >>Science. This is not paranoia - Wally did exactly this when some people >>(some at Lamont!) questioned his conveyor explanation for the LIA that came >>out in Science a year or so ago. He was actually screaming at some of >>these people in the Lamont lunch room.

>>

>>That said, I say we must bite the bullet and do it - Wally doesn't like me >>anyway so it wouldnt make as much a difference to me if I volunteered to go >>to the slaughter but if there is anyone else who wants to take the lead, >>thats fine with me!!

>>

>>Tom

>>

>>ps as I indicated the other day I will be in only until this Friday after >>which I am out for a month - I could write enough to get us going and then

>>hand it over to someone else to deal with the submission business (MIke?)

>>

>>

>>>Thanks a bunch Phil,

>>>

>>>Will look forward to hearing back w/ more info. I talked to Dick Kerr last

>>>week about related stuff (an IPCC article he's writing) and he made no

>>>mention of this at all! I wonder who did commission this, and why?

>>>

>>>mike

>>>

>>>At 02:51 PM 2/26/01 +0000, Phil Jones wrote:

>>>>A

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Mike,

>>>> I've had a quick read and sent an email to Julia Uppenbrink to get her

>>>>views as

>>>> she commissioned our piece. Also asked about a response, particularly on

>>>>the

>>>> high and low frequency indicators. I was going to send Wally two papers

>>>> (Sarah Raper's on linking trees and glaciers in J. Glaciol. and Brian

>>>>Luckman's

>>>> in The Holocene, where the two are also linked but only in a qualitative

>>>>way).

>>>> From the weekend it was clear he had no ideas about these. His lack of

>>>>knowledge

>>>> of density data in trees come through in the article as well.

>>>> In Maine he also went on at length about the Stine work. and seems to

>>>>in this

>>>> piece as well. Malcolm should know all about this.

>>>> I'm going to go home soon as I'm getting knackered, but I'll email you

>>>>Julia's

>>>> response. I think she'll find out who asked Wally to do it, as he

>>>>implied to me it

>>>> was.

>>>>

>>>> Cheers

>>>> Phil

>>>>

>>>> PS Meant to say at the start that I see your points. Thanks for pasting

>>>>it to us.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>Prof. Phil Jones

>>>>Climatic Research Unit Telephone +44 (0) 1603 592090

>>>>School of Environmental Sciences Fax +44 (0) 1603 507784

>>>>University of East Anglia

>>>>Norwich

Email p.jones@uea.ac.uk

>>>>NR4 7TJ

>>>>UK

>>>>-----

>>>>-

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>> \_\_\_\_\_  
>>> Professor Michael E. Mann

>>> Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall

>>> University of Virginia

>>> Charlottesville, VA 22903

>>> \_\_\_\_\_

>>>e-mail: mann@virginia.edu Phone: (804) 924-7770 FAX: (804) 982-2137

>>> <http://www.evsc.virginia.edu/faculty/people/mann.html>

>>  
>>  
>>  
>>

>>Thomas J. Crowley  
>>Dept. of Oceanography  
>>Texas A&M University  
>>College Station, TX 77843-3146  
>>979-845-0795  
>>979-847-8879 (fax)  
>>979-845-6331 (alternate fax)

>>  
>>  
>>  
>>

>

---

> Professor Michael E. Mann  
> Department of Environmental Sciences, Clark Hall  
> University of Virginia  
> Charlottesville, VA 22903

>

---

>e-mail: [mann@virginia.edu](mailto:mann@virginia.edu) Phone: (804) 924-7770 FAX: (804) 982-2137  
> <http://www.evsc.virginia.edu/faculty/people/mann.html>

Thomas J. Crowley  
Dept. of Oceanography  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843-3146  
979-845-0795  
979-847-8879 (fax)  
979-845-6331 (alternate fax)