

This PDF is associated with [this post](#).

We asked Christopher Clack to respond to Mark Jacobson's statements one by one. First, from Jacobson:

*This case has always been about three false factual claims, including two of modeling "errors" or "bugs," claimed by Dr. Clack and published by NAS that damaged the reputations of myself and my coauthors.*

Clack:

*Strongly disagree, if you read his initial filing he complains about many "defamatory statements" in our PNAS paper. He has now decided to fight only on three of them, presumably admitting the rest as he has dropped them as an argument (see [Judge Wingo Order Page 23](#), footnote 10); BTW each of the other issues in the paper we pointed out also cast doubt on all the conclusions they made. Any claimed damage done to himself and his colleagues was not the fault of myself or my coauthors or PNAS, we simply pointed out the problems with his paper and published a paper through peer-review.*

Jacobson:

*What has come out is that the Clack attorney has now admitted in a Court document that Dr. Clack now makes no claim of a "bug in the source code" of our model, despite Dr. Clack's rampant claim throughout his paper that we made "modeling errors."*

Clack:

*We never claimed there was a bug in any source code. This is something fabricated by Jacobson in court documents. We claimed modeling errors and implausible assumptions (different in our opinion to claiming a "bug in the source code"). We (authors of our PNAS paper) still claim that there were modeling errors and implausible assumptions and stand by the paper. I am not going to rehash this all again, as it is all well documented. This claim of bug in source code is Jacobson's attempt to re-litigate the case after the Judge granted us our legal fees & costs.*

Jacobson:

*Dr. Clack has also admitted in writing that our paper includes Canadian hydropower, yet neither he nor NAS has corrected this admitted error in the Clack Paper.*

Clack:

*Again, this is not true, and again, he only points to this after he withdrew his case and then decided to try and re-litigate after the Judge awarded our fees and costs. The "admission" that Jacobson claims is from a slide show (presented to a Canadian audience, three months after our paper was published) and it clearly states that his (PNAS) paper DOES NOT state anywhere that it included Canadian hydropower, even though Jacobson claims that it does. It was simply stating one of his explanations for his error, and is consistent with our paper, and clearly states that it was not noted in his paper. Full quote from the slide: "Rely on Canadian hydroelectricity when necessary (in a paper that stated it was contiguous US only)".*

Jacobson:

*Third, all evidence points to the fact that Table 1 of our paper contains average, not maximum values, indicating that Dr. Clack's claim regarding modeling error on this issues is factually wrong as well.*

Clack:

*Once more this is simply wrong by Jacobson, all evidence in his paper DOES NOT point to what he claims. Note here he doesn't even claim that we agree with him or have stated this to be true. This is simply his opinion. This has been well documented in the court filings and we said nothing factually wrong.*

Jacobson:

*Thus, it is more clear than ever that the three false facts published by the Clack Authors were indeed false facts and not questions of scientific disagreement. I regret that it was impossible to have these errors corrected upon our first request rather than having to go through this drawn-out process to restore the reputations of myself and my coauthors.*

Clack:

*The PNAS paper we published was a scientific discussion of an important issue and we highlighted numerous errors and mistakes (and implausible assumptions) that rendered the conclusions unfounded. We have never said anything or done anything defamatory towards Jacobson or his coauthors; rather, there is quite a lot of evidence that we could claim that he has been defamatory to myself and my co-authors, as was duly noted by the Judge in our case (Judge Wingo Order Page 25, footnote 13). I personally believe that more reputational damage could have been done by the behavior of Jacobson since the publication of our paper, rather than our paper itself.*