

Reactions to the release of the InterAcademy Council (IAC) Report on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) August 2010

- the *New Scientist* magazine considered this report so devastating, it called for the resignation of the IPCC's chairman in an article titled [Time for Rajendra Pachauri to go](#).
- The *Financial Times* also ran an [editorial](#) that urged Mr. Pachauri "to move on."
- Geoffrey Lean, "Britain's [longest-serving](#) environmental correspondent," [said](#) the report reveals the IPCC to be an "amateurish, ramshackle operation."
- Louise Gray, another environment correspondent, began her [account](#) with these words: "In a damning report out earlier this week..."
- The subtitle on a [news story](#) in the *Daily Express* similarly described this as a "damning report."
- Over at the *Daily Mail*, writer Fiona Macrae [called](#) it a "scathing report."
- Environmental studies professor Roger Pielke Jr. [thought](#) the report "remarkably hard hitting" - and was [quoted](#) by the Associated Press saying the IPCC might be redeemed via this sort of "tough love."
- A headline in the *London Times* declared: [This discredited science body must be purged](#).
- Two others - in [India](#) and [America](#) - used the word "slams" to characterize what the IAC said about the IPCC.
- Statistician William Briggs [said](#) the IPCC had received a dressing down in this "brutal report." In his view, some of the most interesting material is contained in the Appendix: "this appendix is hot stuff. Rarely have I seen so strong a rebuke."

Reasonable people can read the same 100-page document and arrive at different conclusions. Bob Ward could have marshalled evidence demonstrating that not everyone thinks the IAC report is damning, scathing, and brutal.

Instead, he wrongly accused me of misrepresenting the facts