

Copenhagen April 25 2002

General observation in connection with complaint from Kåre Fog (KF)

In my last letter to DCSD (Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty) (March 22 2002) I answered a long series of allegations and documented that these in no way are even close to being able to document scientific dishonesty. In that connection I therefore found it necessary also to comment on the reasonableness of a continued case taking up a large part of my work. Together with an obvious political motivation I would like specifically to take up this problem with DCSD because I now see that my previous letter in conformity with customary procedures has been sent on to KF without any substantial discussion.

Fundamentally, I found it necessary to draw the committee's attention to KF's political motivation, long-term intentions, and a more general view on resources. KF writes in his letter March 4 2002 that 'I did not have any knowledge of the existence of DCSD until February 20, and since I judged it better for the cause if I lodged a complaint February 21 at the latest, at the same time as the last date for application for the position as director of the new Environmental Assessment Institute, my complaint was written hastily.' By using the wording 'better for the cause' (an understanding which is also to be seen in the original complaint under the headline 'the purpose of this complaint' with considerably more words, however) KF clearly shows that the primary goal of this complaint is political, i.e. avoiding me being employed as the director. (KF sent an additional copy of the complaint to the address given in the **job announcement** to the Environmental Assessment Institute, from where it was published in *Ingeniøren* ('The Engineer').)

At the same time KF writes that the new complaint could be but one of many: 'I would like to emphasise that provided that DCSD cannot draw a conclusion on the basis of the material I have sent it is better if you request further examples of dishonesty than coming up with an unclear conclusion. The amount of possible of possible examples is almost unlimited; what sets the limit is how many I have time and strength to explain.' This underlines that almost no matter how many examples I can reject, KF is ready to send in even more.

The problem here is that despite the obviously ungrounded character of the 9 charges that I have treated above, the defense takes up extraordinarily much time. The obvious political motivation along with promises/threats of a constant flow of new charges of an obviously ungrounded character raises the question of whether it is fair to continually take up my time and resources in order to refute what more and more seems to be politically inspired de facto harassment.

It is clear that there should be confidence that there has been put a serious and detailed effort into a complaint to DCSD which plainly and logically exposes the alleged dishonesty – especially out of respect for the essential work carried out by the committee. It appears to me that KF has broken this confidence which I have documented above in all of the nine charges. Perhaps it is best illustrated by KF's 'Breach no.5' where it is claimed that I am dishonest, but where KF does not even check my reference, (which – of course – is cited correctly and supports my claim.)

At the same time it should be clear that DCSD cannot have any interest in its method of work being abused by people with political motives and much time.

Therefore I would like to recommend to DCSD that they in this concrete case, in the light of objections given in the letter of March 22 2002 against KF's first nine counts, in the light of the obvious ungroundedness of the allegations, in the light of the obvious political motivation, and in the light of the threat of even more allegations, consider the reasonableness of me having to continue answering the many assertions.

Practically, I recommend to the committee that you, in a concrete weighing out of a free access to complain and a protection of the accused against arbitrary harassment, select a reasonable amount of counts so that I can debate their factual aspects in progressively more detailed levels while even more counts might be sorted out. In this connexion I would like to ask the committee to please point out the counts in KF's complaint or renewed commentary from April 9 2002, if there are more counts to which I ought to adopt an attitude.

Kind regards

Bjørn Lomborg