Interoffice Memorandum

To: Ken Lay

From: Rob Bradley

Department: Policy Analysis

Subject: Wigley Letter

Date: September 14, 1999

Dr. Wigley's letter is way too one-sided—just like his science summaries that inspired our exchange.

In an early e:mail Tom did ask me to treat his e:mails in confidence. Being off the record concerned me since that is where Tom has a reputation for snowing non-specialists, so I kept things *on* the record. I explicitly told Tom that I *intended* to distribute our exchange since he was so critical of opposing viewpoints, other scientists, and me. He continued the exchange and never objected to my planned release. (I would have not done so if he objected.) After he was through responding, I released the exchanges with a disclaimer and a grading system to make it fun. I was surprised by his reaction and wondered why he never told me not to distribute it for "peer review" if he was really concerned about any of his answers or "reputation."

My distribution was to nine scientists who Tom and I know, not strangers. There is a clear disclaimer in bold at the front that stated, " The following exchange was compiled by Rob Bradley for constructive criticism and is in the interest of finding the middle ground in a very polarized debate. . . . My views are wholly my own and do not represent any organization or institutional position. I do wish to publicly thank over twenty scientists from differing viewpoints. . . . " I can assure you nobody felt this was a big Enron deal. The exchange deals with science issues, not economics or politics and was all in the name of being fair to important non-alarmist arguments (which Wigley refused to do).

Wigley stated in our exchange that I was like a little terrier snipping at his heels and that I utterly failed to see the big picture. I said that was harsh but I want other scientists to grade my report card too. Now Wigley says the release has hurt his reputation—a huge feat for a terrier dog.

Tom does have a peer problem, which might explain his sensitivity. More and more of his colleagues want little to do with him (see attachment). He was in the middle of the controversy several years back about doctoring Chapter 8 of the IPCC report that the *Wall Street Journal* covered on their op-ed page. Today, he is misleading non-specialists with a lawyerly one-sided summary of the science. My exchange documents this claim, and I have other evidence I could not share with him about how the IPCC working group on feedbacks is critical of the way models treat water vapor (which as a strong positive feedback is crucial to the alarmist case). Tom never investigated this as he was supposed to do in his IPCC scientific update.

Wigley is stretching to make this an Enron/Pew issue. Enron did not endorse his study, and we are in fact at odds with Pew over their pet issue, early crediting. My exchange with Wigley is a fairness issue on the science. There was no attempt to politicize the exchange like Tom is now trying to do.

I can show you the things Wigley sweeps under the rug to make his alarmist case. The key issues are worth understanding for some of your environmental and global warming discussions coming up. But for now, I would recommend a minimalist response from you and a letter from me where I made a few of the above points but sincerely apologize for the misunderstanding over the release. I can take the blame, but I hope that Tom will learn that being a scientist-lawyer and being mad at the world is not good science or politics.

Rob Bradley

Kenneth L. Lay
Chairman and
Chief Executive Officer

Enron Corp.
P. O. Box 1188
Houston, TX 77251-1188
(713) 853-6773
Fax (713) 853-5313
klay@enron.com

September 15, 1999

Dr. Tom M. L. Wigley, Director
National Center for Atmospheric Research
P. O. Box 3000
Boulder, Colorado 80307-3000

Dear Dr. Wigley:

I am responding to your letter of August 26, 1999 concerning various communications you had with Mr. Rob Bradley of Enron.

To begin with, I am sorry that you are unhappy about those communications and how Rob used them. He assures me that he did advise early in his discussions with you that he would intend to ultimately exchange information received in his inquiry with various experts on global warming. He assumed inasmuch as you continued to exchange information with him that that would not be a problem.

He also assures me that he was not in any way attempting to impugn your character or the quality of your research. He was simply trying to share a lot of information among peers on the subject of global warming in the hope that somewhat more light might be shed on this very controversial subject.

Rob does intend to communicate directly with you. I will leave it to the two of you to get into the specifics. Certainly I was not involved in any of the conversations between you so am not in a very good position to play arbiter.

I will say that I am sorry that your communications with Rob and his use of those communications was not satisfactory to you. But I do agree with Rob that there does need to be a lot of additional exchange of views among experts with different conclusions on the subject of global warming if we are to somehow close the very wide gap on this subject.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Lay