

Malcolm Roberts
180 Haven Road
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone: 07 3374 3374
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011

Professor Ross Garnaut
Arndt-Corden Department of Economics,
Crawford School of Economics and Government
Coombs Building 9, Fellows Road
The Australian National University
ACT 0200
ross.garnaut@unimelb.edu.au

Dear Professor Garnaut:

RE: Legal notice hereby given by Registered Mail with Delivery Confirmation Receipt

(1)

Reading headlines generated by your recent sequence of staged publicity events I feel disappointed, annoyed and deeply concerned. Real-world evidence proves **your reported public claims on global warming contradict real-world science. Your claims are unfounded and inaccurate.** I conclude that **your claims, recently released Fifth Update and 2008 Garnaut Review misrepresent science, climate and Nature.** Real-world scientific evidence and your own words expose your approach as unscientific and your recommendations as unfounded. I conclude that **your claims misdirect national policy and threaten my children's future.**

(2)

I wonder whether you have been misled and used or are misleading and using journalists and politicians. Given your listed '*Additional Resources (Box 1)*' and based on my own experience with Professor Karoly whom you acknowledge as your adviser **I conclude you have been misled.** Given the nature of your comments and their startling contradictions, though, **I do not conclude your misleading of people is inadvertent.** Ultimately that is for parliament to decide and for you to consider.

(3)

Your Update's core climate claims rely on unvalidated computer models. Yet you seem to not realise the models are proven to be erroneous. Based on their flawed assumptions and unfounded structure it is impossible for their output to be valid. **You rely on and endorse UN IPCC reports yet seem ignorant that their core claim misrepresents climate and science. You seem oblivious to the UN IPCC's fraudulent corruption of science.**

(4)

Instead, understanding real-world science provides clarity, reassurance, support, security and ease. These are possible only by seeking truth. Freedom from unfounded fear and guilt restores appreciation for Nature's beauty and grandeur. This makes a confident foundation for contributing to our planet and humanity. **To be effective care needs to be informed.**

(5)

This letter analyses your March 17th speech, reported public claims, 2008 Review and Fifth Update. Based on your own words and on my four (4) years researching the science and politics of global warming. I present scientific facts and ask questions that challenge and develop understanding. Please refer to www.conscious.com.au and both documents enclosed. **Yours is not a review of science, it is a corruption of science. It spreads misrepresentations based on falsities. This letter explains why and makes three requests.**

Your claims are based on falsities

(6)

Are you aware that even according to UN IPCC figures, Earth's annual production of CO2 is 97% from Nature and 3% from all human activity? Are you aware that Nature completely controls atmospheric CO2 levels? Please refer to sections (7) and (9) of the enclosed Summary Findings.

(7)

According to the UN IPCC itself, Nature's annual production of CO2 is estimated to be 32 times that from all human activity. **Please explain why you consider human production of CO2 is dangerous yet Nature's is not.**

(8)

Are you aware that annual human production of CO2 is estimated to be less than the inherent variation in Nature's annual production? Yet Nature easily handles that variation.

(9)

On the first page of your Update (numbered page 6) you state, quote: "*As I noted in the Review, there is no genuinely scientific dissent from the main propositions of the physics of climate change—that increased concentrations of greenhouse gases raise the earth's temperature by calculable amounts.*" **That is false.**

(10)

There are many papers including those by physicists. The recently released book entitled '*Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the greenhouse gas theory*' is written by a group of scientists from many scientific disciplines. They **expose the nonsensical assumptions used by the UN IPCC as the basis for its greenhouse gas effect.** Please refer to the enclosed Summary Findings, sections (10) and (11) together with (9).

http://www.amazon.com/s/ref=nb_sb_noss?url=search-alias%3Dstripbooks&field-keywords=slaying+the+sky+dragon&x=0&y=0

(11)

In 1909, physicist RW Wood's repeatable, real-world experiment proved the greenhouse effect is not valid.

(12)

Enclosed for you is a copy of my Summary Findings based on four (4) years researching the science and politics of global warming. I now know why your Review and your Fifth update both present no real-world evidence of human causation: **There is no scientifically measured real-world evidence of human carbon dioxide causing global warming.**

(13)

There is much scientific evidence that human production of carbon dioxide (CO₂) did not, could not and cannot cause global warming.

A Personal Note

(14)

My personal experience includes personal and statutory responsibility for the lives of thousands of people based on my knowledge of atmospheric gases. Despite this I initially deferred to authority, the government. I asked myself, "*how could thousands of scientists and most of our political leaders be wrong?*" Yet my gut feeling kept nagging. My love of Nature spoke through my heart. **I decided to do my research and discovered that the UN IPCC's core claim relied not on the claim of 4,000 scientists, but on endorsement by only five (5) UN IPCC reviewers—and there's doubt they were even scientists. Talking with politicians I realised many were sceptical yet too afraid to say so publicly because the media had swallowed the line pushed relentlessly by the UN IPCC and extreme activists.**

(15)

Initially I decried politicians. Then after listening personally realised some face enormous workloads. Some skate over issues relying on supposed '*experts*' such as you. Yet you're not an expert. **Your work is abetting UN IPCC fraud.** I see your work as aiding political deception by apparently misleading journalists and politicians to in turn mislead citizens.

(Dictionary definition of fraud: Presenting something as it is not, to secure unfair gain.)

(16)

From the transcript of your speech on Thursday, March 10, 2011 launching your Fifth Update you said, quote: "*So the IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is a unique scientific body set up by the United Nations because this issue was such an important issue for the international community and it brings together scientists from all over the world. A couple of thousand in number who carefully go through the peer review literature and come up with an integrated assessment of the science as it stands at the time of each review.*"

<http://www.garnautreview.org.au/update-2011/events-speeches/science-climate-change-transcript.html>

(17)

Your statement contains two (2) huge inferences. **Firstly, that thousands of scientists endorse the UN IPCC's core claim that human production of carbon dioxide caused global warming. Secondly, that the UN IPCC's claim is based on peer-reviewed science. Both are false.**

Analysis of Your Claims with emphasis on your Fifth Update

(18)

Please refer to your Fifth Update's 'Summary of Key Points' at

<http://www.garnautreview.org.au/update-2011/update-papers/up5-key-points.html>

You fail to provide any evidence of your core claim that human production of carbon dioxide (CO2) causes global temperature increase. There is no real-world scientific evidence for your claim anywhere in your Update, nor in your 2008 Review. If I am wrong, please advise the location of specific, real-world scientific evidence of your claim.

(19)

In this letter I refer repeatedly to your Fifth Update available, at:

<http://www.garnautreview.org.au/update-2011/update-papers/up5-the-science-of-climate-change.pdf> and to your own (Garnaut) Review's Chapter 2, entitled 'Understanding Climate Science' at:

http://www.garnautreview.org.au/pdf/Garnaut_Chapter2.pdf.

(20)

I challenge specific points in your Update. Then prove your Key Points and some of your recent public comments are unscientific or unfounded. I await your response to my underlined requests.

Your approach contradicts science—it's political

(21)

In introducing your Fifth Update, you said, quote: *"In order to understand the mechanisms and implications of climate change, an interested non-scientist must draw on the publications of experts in the field. The review's acceptance in 2008 on the balance of probabilities of the overwhelming majority of opinion in the Australian and international science communities has not been challenged by developments in the genuine science over the past three years.*

The most - and I've shown you a few of them but we could go through more. The most important and straightforward of the quantifiably - quantitatively testable propositions from the mainstream science have been confirmed, was shown to be understated by the passing of time."

(22)

From what I've seen, your statement reveals remarkable ignorance of real-world science and scientists. Many eminent scientists are challenging UN IPCC falsities. These include UN IPCC scientists speaking out against the UN IPCC's corruption of science. Please refer to the enclosed Summary Findings and documents it references.

(23)

Please provide specific real-world scientific evidence of confirmation of testable propositions.

(24)

On the first page (number 6) of your Fifth Update you state, quote: *"Examination of the credentials and numbers of climate scientists who expressed both the mainstream and sceptical views led me to the premise upon which the Review was built, that the central conclusions of the mainstream science were right "on a balance of probabilities."* **That is a stunning admission of your lack of understanding of science. Your stated approach is the exact opposite of the scientific approach.**

(25)

Please refer to Professor Tim Ball's work entitled '*Analysis of Climate Alarmism*', chapter 11 of '*Slaying the Sky Dragon*'. Professor Ball is a retired climatology professor and renowned environmental consultant. His proven experience includes sustainable development and the impact of government policy on business and economics.

(26)

His chapter succinctly summarises UN IPCC corruption of science. **His chapter exposes how you, as an economist, have been misled and misdirected on the science.**

(27)

True scientists and those applying science in the real-world understand that, quote: "*Science works by creation of theories based on assumptions, in which scientists performing their proper role as sceptics, try to disprove the theory*". (Professor Tim Ball) Once a theory passes tests and criticism it is accepted. Your stated approach is the exact opposite.

(28)

Science is about drawing conclusions based on objective, proven data, not on consensus. By your own admission, your approach is political. It contradicts science.

(29)

The objective, structure and mandate of the IPCC directly contradict the scientific method. The claim of anthropogenic global warming was proposed as part of a political objective and assumed as fact. As philosopher Karl Popper explains, quote: "*It is easy to obtain verification for nearly every theory—if we look for confirmations*".

(30)

You seem to prefer fiction. Here's a quote from Sherlock Holmes (via Arthur Conan Doyle): "*It is a capital mistake to theorize before one has data. Insensibly one begins to twist facts to suit theories, instead of theories to suit facts.*" For me, that accurately summarises your Fifth Update.

(31)

Despite the UN IPCC's bias that contradicts science and despite massive political clout, media coverage and worldwide spending of an estimated 100 billion dollars on climate research, the UN IPCC has failed to find any confirmation of its unfounded assumption.

(32)

More importantly, **real-world scientific evidence proves the UN IPCC's claim is false. The UN IPCC, and your own work, is repeatedly repudiated by the real world.** You both contradict reality. You have both been tested and both failed.

(33)

You are an economist paid by government pushing its policy. In my view you had little credibility on science. Your statement though completely destroys the credibility of your 2008 Garnaut Review and your Update. Your own words are an indictment of your unscientific approach.

(34)

Your own words reveal that your 2008 Review's central premise is unfounded. Your premise is repeated at the start of your Update's first section on page 8.

(35)

Your Update confirms your 2008 Review was based on the apparently untested assumption that the 'science' was proven. Your work is based on and enabled by UN IPCC misrepresentations and fraud. Your work uses repetition of terms such as '*dangerous climate change*' to mislead and to imply unfounded conclusions. Your work is contradicted by real-world scientific evidence.

(36)

The phrase '*dangerous climate change*' (17 times) and similar phrases are used 22 times—in a report comprising just 50 pages of text. The phrase was used three times in one paragraph. **Because your Update's basic premise contradicts real-world science, I conclude your Update is propaganda.**

(37)

Please refer to the enclosed Summary Findings and especially section (1).

(38)

On page 10 of your Update you advise readers to access additional material as listed. Yet you simply list resources largely funded by the Australian government.

(39)

Your Update's second section relies on unvalidated computer modelling, not real-world science. The Update uses the letters '*m-o-d-e-l*' 115 times. Section 2. Entitled '*Climate change observations and projections*' uses the letters 73 times. That section unscientifically mixes computer simulations throughout and could easily give the false impression that your conclusions and '*the science*' are based on real-world evidence. Yet that is not the case.

(40)

Errors produced by computer modelling of global warming are numerous and extensively documented. Although you claim that can be offset by use of an ensemble of models, that is false—because the models share basic assumptions and inadequacies. That is well known and documented. Are you not aware of this? If not, why?

(41)

Many UN IPCC scientists themselves show use of models is not scientific.

(42)

Your Update mixes observation and modelling. When used by the UN IPCC that mixture appears to be what I refer to as a trick apparently to give models unfounded and misplaced credibility. The reality is the models' output is spurious and erroneous. **The reality is neither your Update nor the UN IPCC has any real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused global warming.**

Did you rely on Professor Karoly's falsities?

(43)

Professor Karoly is a proponent of models and apparently has a personal financial interest in their use. You acknowledged his assistance in producing the report. How much of the report was written or drafted by Professor Karoly?

(44)

Are you aware Professor Karoly was Lead Author of the UN IPCC 2001 report's sole chapter (chapter 12) on detection of supposed global warming and attribution to human production of CO2? Are you aware that UN data reveals that in leading the writing of that chapter, Professor Karoly apparently contravened UN IPCC guidelines for Lead Authors? Are you aware he was Review Editor of the subsequent 2007 UN IPCC report's equivalent chapter (chapter 9)? Are you aware Professor Karoly is a member of a small cabal of computer modellers who dominated and drove chapter 9? Are you aware that Professor Karoly drafted the UN IPCC's 2007 Summary for Policy Makers? **Are you aware that on January 13th, 2011 Professor Karoly made public statements that contradicted Australia's rainfall and flood records? Yet he is a meteorologist.**

(45)

Please refer to my e-mail dated January 25th, 2011 to Professor David Karoly available at http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January,%202011.pdf or go to www.conscious.com.au and search for 'Karoly'.

(46)

Did Professor Karoly help write your Update after receiving my e-mail advising him of his errors and contradictions of real-world weather data? Did he discuss this with you? If so, did you choose to ignore the data? If not, did Professor Karoly dump 'you in it' by misrepresenting science to you? Why did he not advise amending your Update?

(47)

On Monday night, November 9th, 2009, as part of its '4 Corners' program, the ABC broadcast the following statement by Professor David Karoly, quote: '*Typically there would be one to 2,000 scientific papers published every year in the fields of climate change science contributing to the understanding of climate change science and none of those seriously contradict the conclusions of the IPCC.*' Please refer to the program's transcript available at: <http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2009/s2737676.htm>. **Professor Karoly's statement is false.**

(48)

I then easily provided Professor Karoly with six references presenting views completely contradicting the UN IPCC's core claim that human production of carbon dioxide caused Earth's latest modest period of global warming that ended around 1998. There are many hundreds in the public domain, including peer-reviewed scientific papers.

(49)

As Lead Author and then Review Editor, Professor Karoly would supposedly have knowledge of the literature on this topic. That he says he was not aware is astounding and, in my view, leads to serious questions about his competence and/or integrity.

(50)

Last week I was forwarded a copy of an e-mail from Professor Karoly to a person challenging his public statements. In his e-mail he made false statements about my actions. His statements contradicted the truth.

(51)

It seems Professor Karoly falsely fomented misleading perceptions of climate by contradicting real-world science and weather data. It seems he tried falsely to establish a public perception of a supposed '*scientific consensus*' that is non-existent. **In my experience, he makes personal and public statements that are not accurate and that contradict reality. Given the scope and seriousness of his falsities and his personal interest in promoting climate alarm I question his suitability as an adviser to you on climate science.**

(52)

I wonder about your relationship with Professor Karoly: specifically I ask you to please question whether you have been led astray or have been complicit with him in contradicting real-world climate science?

(53)

Avoiding real-world data your Update relies on computer models, scenarios and projections that remain unvalidated and previously proven to be in error.

(54)

Although such projections produce attractive and apparently authoritative graphs for various scenarios, they have no scientific basis. They contradict the science.

(55)

In your speech releasing your Fifth Update, you said, quote: “*The actual evidence from the science is stronger*”. **Please provide specific real-world scientific evidence for your claim.**

Professor John Christy, a real scientist, proves no need for fear

(56)

For comment on your claimed increases in global temperatures please refer to the Summary Findings, sections (6) and then (7) and (5). Please note the recent call for an independent audit of the Bureau of Meteorology. The Bureau is funded by government and its records are clouded by what some see as the Bureau’s unscientific and unfounded inconsistent manipulation of Australian temperature records.

(57)

Contrary to your claims, the actual sea level ‘rise’ across Australia reported by the Queensland State government department, Maritime Safety Queensland averaged 0.3mm per year for the last 15 years. In 100 years that will raise sea level 3.0 centimetres—around an inch. (Summary Findings, page 30.)

(58)

Scientific studies of Pacific islands show no rises in sea levels.

(59)

In regard to your claims about sea level, please refer to the Summary Findings, section (13). **With each successive report, even the UN IPCC has lowered its forecast rate of sea level rise. Its lower limit for projections is now almost equal to the claimed average annual rate for the last century.** (Summary Findings, page 30). **Yet that lower level is not discussed in the media, nor your Update or 2008 Review. Why not?**

(60)

Exposing your claims as unfounded relieves people of needless fear. That fear was launched by scary, unscientific computer projections that you prefer instead of real-world science.

(61)

Your Figure 7 fails to include a graph similar in format produced by the Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change in its 2008 report entitled ‘*Nature, not human activity, rules the climate*’ available at: http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

An international panel of scientists eminent in their fields produced that independent, non-aligned report. They include UN IPCC scientists and reviewers.

(62)

Regarding ocean temperatures: It’s well known that ocean temperatures vary regionally around the planet. The ARGO data though show that globally temperatures are steady or likely falling. <http://joannenova.com.au/2009/07/ocean-temperatures-the-new-bluff-in-alarmism/>

(63)

Regarding rainfall and floods: please refer to my e-mail dated January 25th, 2011 to Professor David Karoly referenced above and refer to the enclosed Summary Findings.

(64)

Rainfall in late 2010 and 2011 has not been unusual. The higher rainfall was predicted based on the La Nina ocean-atmosphere cycle. This is well known and well

understood. Weather experts have shown that past rainfall extremes have been higher in terms of both rainfall rates and rainfall event totals. Refer to my e-mail to Professor Karoly.

(65)

On your ocean acidification claims: firstly, are you aware that as temperature rises the solubility of CO₂ in oceans decreases? Secondly, do you know that coral reefs were formed in Earth's past during periods far warmer than today while others were formed in periods cooler? Some reefs were formed in periods with far higher atmospheric CO₂ levels.

(66)

Your reliance on computer projections is alarming. Please refer to comments in my annotated transcript of an ABC-TV broadcast of Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg. It's available at:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/ABC%20transcripta.pdf>. Or visit www.conscious.com.au and search for Hoegh-Guldberg.

(67)

Your comments on 'severe weather events' are scientifically unfounded and contradict real-world scientific data. Please refer to Summary Findings, section (15) and to the recent written statement by eminent climate expert John Christy, Distinguished Professor and UN IPCC Lead Author. It's available at

<http://www.climatedepot.com/r/10055/Former-UN-IPCC-Lead-Author--Climatologist-Dr-John-Christy-Slaps-Down-Extreme-StormClimate-Claims--Read-his-21page-testimony>

(68)

Professor Christy uses real-world scientific data. That data shows that unvalidated computer models driving your 2008 review, recent Fifth Update and your reported public claims contradict science.

(69)

Professor Christy's scientific conclusion on page 3 of his **statement on recent Australian floods is, quote: "they show absolutely no trend since 1966"**. Refer to his conclusions on English floods, Pakistani floods, Russian heatwave and American snowfall.

(70)

Please refer to my e-mail to Professor David Karoly on January 25, 2011. Please refer to the Summary Findings for comments about fires, droughts and storms.

(71)

At your speech releasing your Fifth Update you stated, quote: "*The analysis of climate change impacts on Australia along the way demonstrated that Australia was more vulnerable to the costs of climate change than any other developed country.*" **Please provide specific real-world scientific evidence for your statement.**

Your approach—not climate—threatens people

(72)

Please refer to Professor Christy's broader comments on science and the scientific approach. **By contradicting the science, Professor Garnaut, you are diverting citizens' attention and policy makers' attention from real climate.** That is risky. My view is that diversion of policy makers' attention from climate reality has likely already cost lives.

(73)

Professor Christy comments on 'consensus science', which is what you use. He states, quote: "Consensus, however, is a political notion, not a scientific notion". His comment

is a damning indictment of your climate presumptions and claims. He has separately publicly blown the whistle on UN IPCC corruption and contradiction of science.

(74)

With respect, Professor Garnaut, I commend you learn from his advice on how to conduct and assess science. Lives are at stake and your methods could cost many lives, severely hurt the environment and catastrophically harm humanity by costing millions of lives. This is explained in two documents referenced in the Summary Findings on pages 4 and 38.

(75)

As a fellow human I urge you to please deeply consider Professor Christy's second last paragraph. I conclude that your unscientific claims and statements possibly threaten millions of lives.

You seem to ignore basic economics

(76)

I wonder what Australian taxpayers will think when they see the grants distributed by the federal Department of Climate Change. Many of the grants totalling hundreds of millions of dollars seem to be based on the unscientific presumption underlying your 2008 Review. And quite possibly fed by your Review's conclusions that contradicted real-world science.

<http://www.climatechange.gov.au/en/about/grants.aspx>

(77)

You are an economist. Does it concern you that taxpayers' funds have been diverted unscientifically—possibly partly based on your recommendations funded by taxpayers?

(78)

Please explain why you ignore the benefits of global warming. Humans, humanity and the natural environment have all benefitted from Earth's past warmer periods. These were far warmer than Earth's latest, modest cyclic warming that ended around 1998.

(79)

Please refer to pages 22 to 26 of '*Nature, not human activity, rules the climate*' at http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf for facts and data on the net economic blessings of global warming. I find it amazing that you assess costs yet fail to adequately consider economic benefits, especially when benefits are so much greater. Why?

(80)

Reputable studies show that after adjusting for rising coastal population density and growing development, and after adjusting for consumer price indices, the damage due to storms, floods and other natural events has not increased. Have you, as an economist, not adjusted for basic economic factors? If not why?

(81)

Your claims of future storm activity are based on computer models. In contrast, consider the approach of Dr Chris Landsea, an internationally eminent expert scientist on storms and lead scientist at the American National Hurricane Center. He uses real-world data. That contradicts and refutes your claims.

(82)

As a UN IPCC Lead Author he used real-world evidence to advise UN IPCC chairman Dr Rajendra Pachauri that storm activity is not increasing. Contrary to Dr Landsea's advice, the UN IPCC chairman staged a press conference that triggered fearful headlines worldwide. They falsely shouted rising storm activity. That is a blatant falsity from the very top of the UN IPCC and contradicts real-world science. The falsity drove unfounded fear.

(83)

Are you aware that Dr Landsea resigned from the UN IPCC because the UN IPCC is “*corrupting science*”? This corruption is well documented in the ‘*The Deniers*’, a book by Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon. He interviewed many scientists internationally eminent in their fields. Together with the book ‘*Air Con*’ by investigative journalist Ian Wishart, it exposes the UN IPCC’s serious corruption of science. Here is an easily accessible link to an article on Landsea’s work and erosion of UN IPCC credibility:

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7044158.ece>

(84)

Dr Pachauri is an engineer with economics qualifications. Yet he writes on science for UN IPCC reports.

(85)

Global warming brings increasing bio-diversity. In the past, life on Earth flourished in periods far warmer than today. Even children know that cold spells are far more harmful to humanity and eco-systems.

(86)

Contrary to your unsupported statements, it is well known that rates of warming during Earth’s most recent modestly warmer period were lower than past severe, natural changes in climate—both cooling and warming

(87)

The notion of tipping points completely contradicts what science knows of Earth’s climate and past climate. Had Earth been governed by climate tipping points, the first ice age would have resulted in run-away global freezing. Earth’s first warm period would have led to run-away and catastrophic heating.

(88)

Science well understands that Earth has a natural balancing mechanism dominated by negative feedbacks. That is commonsense. It is proven in the science. It is proven by observing Nature.

(89)

Another publicly prominent non-scientist, Al Gore, popularised the notion of tipping points. For a quantitative and qualitative analysis of his Hollywood production entitled ‘*An inconvenient truth*’, please refer to pages 41 to 43 of ‘*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*’.

UN IPCC admits models based on poor understanding

(90)

Your Update discusses what it terms ‘*fingerprints of forcing*’. Are you aware that Table 2-11 of the UN IPCC’s 2007 report lists sixteen ‘*forcing factors*’ driving UN IPCC modelling of climate? Of these sixteen, the UN IPCC itself assigns one a high level of scientific understanding. Two are assigned moderate levels of scientific understanding. The remaining 13 are admitted by the UN IPCC to have low or very low levels of scientific understanding. Thus, of the 16 factors, 13 can be taken with a grain of salt.

(91)

The sole factor assigned a high level of understanding is ‘*greenhouse gas*’. Real-world evidence shows that is nonsense. **That is why the models on which you depend remain unvalidated. ie, the sole factor supposedly understood is nonsensical while 87% of the other ‘*forcing factors*’ have low or very low levels of understanding.**

(92)

There is no scientific confidence level on the UN IPCC's core claim. How can there be: UN IPCC core claims contradict science?

(93)

The UN IPCC's claimed levels of confidence in its predictions were arbitrarily set initially to 66%. Reportedly politicians later arbitrarily raised it to 90%. Although the levels give an appearance of being statistical, they are not valid. **The UN IPCC scheme for assigning confidence levels is subjective and unscientific. Levels are arbitrary.**

(94)

They appear to be designed to give UN IPCC reports unfounded credibility. It seems they are misleading political constructs. I conclude they are propaganda.

(95)

(Please refer to the UNEP/WMO publication '*Guidance Notes for Lead Authors of the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report on Addressing Uncertainties*'.)

(96)

It seems that you, as a highly paid servant of the people of Australia, are spreading UN IPCC falsities and propaganda.

(97)

As the basis of your Review and Update are demonstrably unscientific, there is no point in commenting on section 3, mitigation. There is no real-world foundation for your claims. There is no need for mitigation,

Your section 4 confirms your lack of understanding of science

(98)

Your Update's section 4 contradicts your stated approach. Its purpose appears to be to wrap your work in a falsified appearance of science. If that is its purpose then your work seems either deluded by groupthink or deliberately deceptive.

(99)

Please refer to McLean's work and to many comments by UN IPCC scientists that prove beyond any doubt that the UN IPCC corrupts peer-review and at times completely bypasses peer-review. The Summary Findings provide references revealing that the peer-review falsity has been repeatedly spread publicly from the top of the UN IPCC itself.

(100)

Given the extent of the UN IPCC's deception I can understand you falling for it. Given your claims of investigating the science I cannot accept you falling for it. Given your list of '*Additional Resources (Box 1)*' skewed to those dependent on government funding, I wonder whether you have been misled to your erroneous conclusion or use it to justify your falsity?

(101)

Why are you apparently not aware that an independent international audit found that the UN IPCC's latest report in 2007 cited and relied upon 5,587 references not peer-reviewed? Almost six thousand references including mountain hikers' anecdotes, newspaper stories and political activists' campaign material. Summary Findings, page 2.

(102)

Please refer to your section 4.2, entitled 'Assessing the majority opinion' and specifically its first sentence, quote: "In this section we review how science has reached a majority opinion on climate change."

(103)

Science does not depend on majority opinion. It relies on objective observed data. Sadly your claims go beyond merely corrupting the scientific approach: you contradict real-world scientific data.

(104)

Your claims about, and support for, the UN IPCC's work are unfounded. This is obvious from the work of Professor Tim Ball and from my own wide reading of the UN IPCC's fraudulent misrepresentations of science. Please refer to the Summary Findings, section (1).

(105)

In your claimed research, did you not learn that the UN IPCC's reports are littered with examples of scientists' reports being overturned by politicians and bureaucrats?

(106)

The UN IPCC is not accountable to any national governments. The UN IPCC seems accountable only to a flawed and politically driven UN hierarchy dominated by the UN IPCC's major sponsor, UNEP, the United Nations Environmental Program. UNEP has a proven history of politicising and corrupting science to achieve political goals.

(107)

The UN IPCC does no scientific research. Some UN IPCC Lead Authors and many of its contributing scientists have publicly exposed its unscientific and dishonest approach.

(108)

The 2007 '*Summary for Policy Makers (SPM)*' was released three months before the related scientific report. **Are you aware that UN IPCC protocol explicitly stipulates that when there is a conflict between the SPM and its scientific report, the scientific report is required to be revised to suit the political SPM?**

(109)

In February 2007 the UN IPCC apparently inadvertently released a draft version of its SPM. Approximately three working days later it was quietly replaced by a revised version.

(110)

Professor Ball writes on page 124 of '*Slaying the Sky Dragon*', quote: "*The IPCC and those who were chosen to participate were locked in to a conclusion by the rules, regulations and procedures carefully crafted by Maurice Strong*", UNEP's first Secretary-General. Professor Ball's conclusions confirm my own research. His conclusions independently confirm the history of the UN Environmental Program as documented by John McLean. McLean cites many quotes from senior UNEP and UN IPCC officials.

(111)

It's reported that Maurice Strong made his personal fortune at an early age producing oil. He then crafted strong political networks before becoming UNEP's first Secretary-General. **Are you aware that UNEP has been blamed for the deaths from malaria of more than 30 million people?** It's claimed, those deaths would have been avoided but for UNEP's political decision to ban DDT despite the science conclusively proving it should **not** have been banned.

(112)

Professor Ball independently confirms what many other sources reveal: Summaries for Policy Makers (SPM) given to national governments and media contradict

scientists' reports. This is well known. Yet not apparently by you. Please refer to Professor Ball's chapter.

(113)

Many journalists and politicians are directed to the shorter SPM. Consequently, journalists publicly spread the SPM's politicised claims contradicting the science. Media headlines thrive on wild stories presenting politically driven claims that are out of context and/or contrary to science.

(114)

This seems to be one of the UN IPCC's deliberate strategies. It pressures politicians by driving fear within the public using unscientific and fearful falsities.

(115)

The public has become increasingly wary of the UN IPCC. It is aware of some UN IPCC contradictions of reality. Increasingly, the public does not trust government advisers. In their gut, many people disagree with what they are being fed. Until recently they lacked the confidence to speak up.

(116)

'*Scientific American*' magazine, conducted a poll in 2010. Many recognise the magazine as biased in reporting on global warming. Despite its persistent ongoing campaign to convince readers of human causation of global warming, poll respondents overwhelmingly see warming as natural.

(117)

84% believe, quote: **"The IPCC, or Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a corrupt organization, prone to groupthink, with a political agenda"**.

(118)

In response to the question, "*Which policy options do you support?*" **almost 70% chose, quote: "keeping science out of the political process"**.

(119)

The UN IPCC cannot be trusted. Documented political objectives and massive financial interests of many beneficiaries have developed the UN's initial climate lie into a political monster. The UN cannot be trusted on climate.

(120)

Sham reviews and '*investigations*' that are anything but independent cannot hide that fact.

(121)

The Royal Society made its commitment to the UN IPCC's claim apparently without approval from its members. Leadership was later pressured by members to recant its claim. The Royal Society cannot provide evidence for its earlier support for the UN IPCC. The test of science is not in the words of society leaders, it is in real-world data. In that the Royal Society fails.

(122)

In May 2010, Lord Martin Rees, president of the Royal Society, admitted that the case for anthropogenic (human) global warming has been *exaggerated*. He said *doubts* over global warming were *not* being communicated to the public.

(123)

Professor Kurt Lambeck, President of Australia's own Academy of Science has failed to provide me with any real-world scientific evidence that human production of CO2 caused global warming. Please refer to the academy's glossy report entitled '*The science of climate change—questions and answers.*' It is attractive and carries a carefully manufactured appearance of authority yet contains no real-world evidence. **Despite this its wording appears deliberately and falsely to imply human causation.**

(124)

Apparently, the academy receives extensive federal government funding. Despite my requests of its President, he has failed to disclose either his personal financial interests in global warming or the academy's financial interests in global warming.

(125)

The late Professor Frederick Seitz, former President of America's National Academy of Sciences publicly and in writing exposed the UN IPCC as, quote: "*The IPCC is pre-programmed to produce reports to support the hypotheses of anthropogenic warming and the control of greenhouse gases, as envisioned in the Global Climate Treaty. The 1990 IPCC Summary completely ignored satellite data, since they showed no warming. The 1995 IPCC report was notorious for the significant alterations made to the text after it was approved by the scientists – in order to convey the impression of a human influence. The 2001 IPCC report claimed the twentieth century showed 'unusual warming' based on the now-discredited hockey-stick graph. The latest IPCC report, published in 2007, completely devaluates the climate contributions from changes in solar activity, which are likely to dominate any human influence.*" And, quote: "*we do not currently have any convincing evidence or observations of significant climate change from other than natural causes.*"

(126)

Professor Seitz's comments have been reported in many publications including the prestigious Wall Street Journal and NIPCC at http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf.

(127)

In your speech introducing your Fifth Update and in reference to your address to Supreme and Federal Court judges, you said, quote: "Rarely in a case that comes before one of Australia's superior courts is the defence so weak that it can find no so-called expert to blow a fog through the proceedings." Were you implying to the judges that you could find no competent scientist opposing your view? Yet there are many climatology experts who disagree strongly with that—internationally and within Australia. Senator Fielding easily found four (4) in Australia. There are many, many more.

(128)

Your example highlights how public opinions can be cleverly and falsely shaped among Australia's senior judiciary and parliamentarians—despite the shapers having no evidence.

(129)

Tim Ball's excellent account of UN IPCC corruption of science is commended to you. It explains how and why politicians and journalists have been misled and confused by the UN IPCC. He clearly documents how the UN IPCC is unavoidably political. The UN IPCC's purpose assumes human causation and attempts to prove it. Yet despite this pre-ordained outcome fails to provide any evidence in its thousands of pages.

(130)

Professor Karoly was Lead Author (2001) and Review Editor (2007) of the 2001 and 2007 UN IPCC reports' sole chapter on detection of global warming and attribution to human production of carbon dioxide He was a writer of the 2007 UN IPCC draft Summary for Policy Makers. Yet in his responses to my requests to provide real-world evidence of the UN IPCC's core claim, he has repeatedly failed.

(131)

Professor Garnaut, my understanding is that the true working of the scientific process begins with a hypothesis. Attempts are then made to disprove it. Your approach, and that of

the UN IPCC is to assume something is valid and then seek information that appears to validate it. **Your approach leads to groupthink and is the very reverse of science.**

(132)

It explains why you (and the UN IPCC) have no real-world evidence of human causation of warming. Yet you make unsubstantiated claims contradicting science.

(133)

Based on Australian and overseas polls, I conclude that your comments on declining public support understate slumping public perceptions about human causation of global warming. That plummeting of opinion in many nations appears to be accelerating.

(134)

Your Update discusses scientific reticence. Are you aware that as UN IPCC projections for sea level rises reduced greatly with successive reports, its warning became more fearful? Therein lays a lesson exposing bias.

(135)

As you discuss, time can create lags between perception and reality. **Of greater concern are lags due to misrepresentations—inadvertent or deliberate—exacerbated by egos taking positions subsequently found to be false. From what I have seen, that is the most powerful driver of reticence. Significantly, it is often not conscious.**

(136)

Perhaps you could ask yourself two (2) questions. Firstly, why do you not include among your references the work of the Non-governmental Panel on Climate Change, the NIPCC? This body of internationally eminent scientists includes many scientists who contributed to the UN IPCC. NIPCC member scientists are not paid for their work. They have no financial interest. They are working to protect science from UN IPCC corruption.

(137)

Contrary to your approach, my Summary Findings include a reference to an organisation with whom I disagree. It refers to the UN IPCC's sole chapter on detection of supposed warming and attribution to human production of carbon dioxide. I am happy for people to discover for themselves the UN IPCC's lack of specific real-world evidence.

(138)

Secondly, **how many of your references rely on 'studies' produced by computer models?** A search of your Update for the letter '*m-o-d-e-l*' produces 115 matches. Is that simply a case of an economist being paid by the government using the tools with which he is familiar?

(139)

Understanding climate alarm cannot be found in unvalidated computer models and assumptions starkly contradicting the real world. Understanding climate emerges from real-world scientific evidence. It seems telling that you eschew real-world science and present views that contradict real-world science.

(140)

Understanding spreads not from making implied claims such as those in your 2008 Review and Fifth Update. Instead, accurate understanding by journalists, politicians and communities requires factual statements anchored in real-world scientific evidence.

(141)

In your speech introducing your Fifth Update you said, quote: "*My personal intellectual journey over these past four years has moved me from acceptance of the mainstream sciences' main propositions with the degree of certainty required by the civil law, a balance of probabilities, closer to the criminal law requirements of beyond reasonable doubt.*" **Your**

claim contradicts the real-world scientific findings. Please provide your specific real-world scientific findings.

(142)

When the UN IPCC misrepresents science, why do you raise reticence? Is that a diversion?

Basic questions not addressed by your Update

(143)

Noting your Update's section 4 discussing science's use of questions, please refer to the enclosed Basic Questions. These need to be answered before developing any policy on human production of carbon dioxide. They are available at:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/Basic%20Questions.pdf>

(144)

Answers to Basic Questions need to be truthful, accurate and substantiated by specific scientifically measured real-world evidence that shows a measured, consistent causal link.

Your 'Key Points' listed in your Fifth Update

(145)

Why does your recent Update's first Key Point apparently contradict the Key Points and opening paragraphs of your own (Garnaut) Review's Chapter 2?

http://www.garnautreview.org.au/pdf/Garnaut_Chapter2.pdf. Your 2008 comments make huge disclaimers on the supposed 'science' to which you lately refer publicly. Referring to your 2008 review, **please provide specific real-world scientific evidence for your public claims that human production of carbon dioxide needs to be reduced?**

(146)

Referring to your Update's first Key Point, **please provide one peer-reviewed scientific reference that provides specific scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused global warming.**

(147)

In my four (4) years' research into the science and politics of global warming, I have found no such evidence. Replies from CSIRO's Chief Executive and Group Executive—Environment to my request for specific real-world scientific evidence **have provided no such evidence**. The Chief Scientist appointed by Kevin Rudd's government has **failed to provide evidence**.

(148)

Similarly, responses to my request from the following publicly prominent advocates of human causation of global warming have **all failed to provide evidence**:

- Professor Tim Flannery, BA (English), MSc and PhD on evolution of macropods and Chairman of the government's Climate Commission;
- Professor David Karoly, the University of Melbourne, Lead Author (2001) and Review Editor (2007) of the 2001 and 2007 UN IPCC reports' sole chapter on detection of global warming and attribution to human production of carbon dioxide, and writer of the 2007 UN IPCC draft Summary for Policy Makers. Despite not having any evidence he assisted you in producing your Fifth Update;
- Professors Matthew England and Andy Pitman, Co-Directors of the University of NSW's Climate Change Research Centre;

- Professor Will Steffen, Executive Director and Professor Kurt Lambeck of the Australian National University's Climate Change Institute, the latter being President of the Australian Academy of Science;

- Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Director of the University of Queensland's Global Change Institute.

Five (5) of the seven listed above are either members of the government's Climate Commission or members of the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel. **Like you, they or their employers receive funding from the federal government. Like you, they all have no real-world evidence of human causation of global warming.**

(149)

In her sole response to my many letters, e-mails and facsimile letters, the previous Minister for Climate Change, **Senator Penny Wong failed to provide evidence.** Further, her letter implied that over a thousand scientists endorsed the claim that human production of carbon dioxide warmed the planet. **The reality: UN IPCC data provided by the UNIPCC itself shows only five (5) reviewers endorsed the claim, and there's doubt they were even scientists. Her error: 99.5%.**

(150)

She and her advisers failed to provide such evidence in her response to Senator Steve Fielding and his scientific advisers. Please refer to

<http://joannenova.com.au/?p=2292&preview=true> and

http://www.stevefielding.com.au/news/details/wongs_silent_treatment_clouds_emissions_credibility/

(151)

More information and further publications are available at my web site www.conscious.com.au. Please note publications by UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr Vincent Gray. His comprehensive and detailed work reveals that the UN IPCC repeatedly omitted adequate investigation of known key natural drivers of climate variability.

(152)

Please consider publications by John McLean. His work cannot be sensibly refuted since he merely presents UN IPCC data on the UN IPCC's own reporting processes. The data was obtained from the UN IPCC itself. These reveal that the UN IPCC's supposed peer-review processes have been corrupted and at times completely bypassed. Do you not know that UN IPCC scientists' reports have been reversed by UN IPCC politicians?

(153)

Please explain why your Fifth Update's second key point implies causality when your Update itself provides no evidence of causality.

(154)

In reference to your second Key Point please refer to my Summary Finding's sections (1), (5), (6), (7) and (13).

(155)

Material exposing your Update's third and fourth key points as unfounded has been provided herein and accompanies.

(156)

My comments above and the enclosed Summary Findings explain why your Update's fifth Key Point is correct: the public has awoken to the reality that the material you claim has been presented to them as 'science' actually misrepresents climate and science.

(157)

Your Update's sixth Key Point seems to be taking credit for diverting science and policy as a result of your 2008 Garnaut Review. **Please provide specific scientifically measured real-world evidence of what you refer to as the 'immediate implication'.**

Examining 'Key Points' in your 2008 Review

(158)

Examining your Review's second chapter, entitled 'Understanding Climate Science' raises serious questions. http://www.garnautreview.org.au/pdf/Garnaut_Chapter2.pdf

(159)

That chapter's first of three key points says, quote: "*The Review takes as its starting point, on the balance of probabilities and not as a matter of belief, the majority opinion of the Australian and international scientific communities that human activities resulted in substantial global warming from the mid-20th century, and that continued growth in greenhouse gas concentrations caused by human-induced emissions would generate high risks of dangerous climate change.*"

(160)

All publicly prominent figures in Australia who advocate that global warming was caused by human production of CO2 have failed to provide evidence for their claim.

(161)

Please explain why, in your view, science is apparently decided by your perception of the count of proponents rather than by scientifically measured observations subject to proper scientific peer-review?

(162)

Your Review's second Key Point includes this, quote:

"Stabilisation of carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere requires the rate of greenhouse gas emissions to fall to the rate of natural sequestration." Please provide your specific scientifically measured real-world data supporting your claim. **Please refer to paragraphs numbered 6, 7 and 8 above and explain your claim in light of Nature's control of atmospheric CO2 levels.**

(163)

Your Review's third key point states, quote: "*There are many uncertainties around the mean expectations from the science, with the possibility of outcomes that are either more benign—or catastrophic.*" **Please explain the apparent large inconsistency between this statement and your recent public statements of an apparently definitely worsening situation? Please provide real-world evidence supporting your recent claim.**

(164)

Your own Chapter Two's opening paragraphs introduce what they claim to be the considerable uncertainty in climate science. Your chapter's second paragraph states, quote: "*The Review is not in a position to independently evaluate the considerable body of scientific knowledge; it takes as a starting point the majority opinion of the Australian and international scientific communities that human-induced climate change is happening, will intensify if greenhouse gas emissions continue to increase, and could impose large costs on human civilisation.*"

(165)

Despite not being in a position to independently evaluate the science, you endorsed and reinforced the government's opinion with huge life-changing recommendations.

(166)

Yes, Professor Garnaut, there is considerable uncertainty. **There is sufficient certainty though that human production of carbon dioxide did not and cannot cause Earth's latest period of modest cyclic global warming that ended around 1998.** Please refer to my enclosed Summary Findings, sections (5), (7), (9), (10) and (11).

(167)

Why is it that in your claimed 'considerable uncertainty' you rely on what you perceive to be majority opinion as the basis for your belief that Australians need to be lumbered with a huge and costly artificial impost on fuels containing carbon? Please provide specific real-world evidence for your explanation.

(168)

Your second chapter's third paragraph states, quote: "*This chapter draws extensively on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and on detailed reports prepared by Australian scientists, research published since the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report and work commissioned specifically for the Review.*" **Are you not aware that the UN IPCC has been exposed as fraudulent in fabricating its reports? The UN IPCC and its predecessor UNEP have made many misrepresentations of science.** Please refer to section (1) of the Summary notes and to www.conscious.com.au. Note the work of John McLean and UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr Vincent Gray. McLean's core work cannot be sensibly refuted since it simply presents UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes. That data was obtained from the UN IPCC itself.

(169)

Your chapter's fourth and last introductory paragraph resorts to an unscientific appeal to unfounded authority. Sections (2), (3) and (4) of my Summary Findings raise serious issues contradicting your claim. **Please provide quantified real-world evidence of your claim that from my reading is wildly unsubstantiated.**

(170)

Nowhere in your report is there any specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence of your basic claim that human production of CO₂ caused global warming and needs to be reduced. **If I am wrong, please point to any such specific evidence.**

(171)

From your Review I conclude you admit there is no real-world scientific proof that human production of carbon dioxide caused warming. Yet you then imply there is a need to reduce human production of carbon dioxide, a natural trace gas essential to all complex life on Earth. In my view that contradiction exposes what could be viewed as your possible intent to deceive or mislead. Given that Nature controls atmospheric CO₂ levels, I conclude that as a minimum your statement exposes your gross misunderstanding of Nature, climate and science.

(172)

It seems Key Points listed at the start of your 2008 Review and Update are designed to imply claims to busy journalists and politicians. If so, I conclude that your Update's structure and content mislead people to make unscientific conclusions contrary to real-world science and evidence.

Examining your recent public claims

(173)

Following your recent unfounded public comments, the media is stuffed with misrepresentations driven apparently by your Fifth Update. Some examples:

- <http://au.news.yahoo.com/a/-/australian-news/8989679/garnaut-says-climate-science-is-stronger/> (entitled 'GARNAUT SAYS CLIMATE SCIENCE IS STRONGER', Yahoo 7 News, march 11, 2011)

- <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2011/02/03/3129424.htm>

(Entitled: 'Cyclones, floods to get worse as warming increases: Garnaut', ABC News, February 03, 2011)

- <http://www.couriermail.com.au/news/queensland/climate-risk-to-worsen-says-adviser/story-e6freof-1225999791393>

(Entitled: 'Climate risk to worsen, says adviser', The Courier-Mail, February 04, 2011)

- <http://www.abc.net.au/science/articles/2011/02/07/3132144.htm>

(174)

Some common quotes include:

'He also released specific data on temperature, sea level rises and extreme events from recent years.' **Please provide specific real-world scientifically measured evidence of your claim. Please show the physical data, the source of your data and the proof that any claimed changes in the physical measurements are due to human production of CO₂.**

If you fail in any of these or if your claimed evidence is in any way corrupted your statement will be misrepresenting the science, climate and Nature.

(175)

"On the measurable phenomena, it does seem that certainly there's been no evidence of overstatement," he said. **Please provide the specific physical real-world measurements and the measurements with which you compare as the basis for your claim.**

(176)

"And it does seem to be a number of points of understatement, and I call that an awful reality because it would be much better if [the] opposite were true." **Please provide the specific physical real-world measurements and the measurements with which you compare as the basis for your claim.**

(177)

Professor Garnaut says the world should have a target for cutting emissions. **Please advise the estimated cost of cutting human production of carbon dioxide and the resulting expected temperature.** Surely, as an economist and as a public figure you would have both these figures or ranges of figures available on which you base your statement—supported by real-world scientific evidence.

(178)

On Thursday night, March 17th, 2011 on ABC-TV's Lateline program you discussed econometricians' analysis of time series temperature data. That raises two (2) issues. Firstly, data used by the UN IPCC has been corrupted. **Before analyzing the time series, the corruption of data needs to be investigated.** Please refer to Summary Findings, section (6).

(179)

The UN IPCC uses corrupted ground-based temperature recordings as supposed proof of global atmospheric warming. The only reliable measurements of atmospheric temperature are by satellites and radiosondes (weather balloons). Yet the UN IPCC avoids this reliable

data. These correlate and show no ongoing warming. Real-world measurements of atmospheric temperature reveal stasis. Predictions are of cooling.

(180)

Secondly, although temperatures are not continuing to rise, even if temperatures were continuing to rise, that is not proof of a causal relationship between temperatures and atmospheric carbon dioxide levels. Please refer to Summary Findings, sections (7) and (5) to understand why carbon dioxide levels are a consequence of temperature—not a cause.

(181)

ABC-TV's Lateline program (17.03.11) broadcast you confirming that you can read English. That is not in question. Based on your 2008 Review, your Fifth Update and your reported public statements, I question your assumptions, supposed analysis, subjectivity, motives—indeed, your competence and perhaps honesty.

(182)

Your speech introducing your Fifth Update and your Lateline performance showed, in my view, masterly command and clever use of English. It seems you have the ability to use words that can cleverly, yet not directly imply an entirely different and/or secondary meaning.

(183)

If you cannot provide the clear and unambiguous data, I conclude you are behaving irresponsibly or possibly negligently or dishonestly. Given your apparent funding from the government pushing carbon dioxide taxes and '*trading*' one could conclude you are likely swayed by your own personal interests. **The lack of evidence for your claims raises serious concerns.**

(184)

Your Update reveals your premise is unscientific. Your claims are false. Your conclusions are taken directly from unvalidated computer models. Your recommendations contradict real-world science. I conclude your claims are fantasy. Your work is unfounded, irresponsible and possibly dishonest.

(185)

Some politicians claim carbon dioxide '*trading*' schemes are market mechanisms. Yet markets arise when people meet freely to exchange goods and services that meet specific real world needs. Carbon dioxide '*trading*' meets no real-world needs. It raises revenue and gives government power to control energy, the lifeblood of modern lifestyles and civilization. **A carbon '*price*' imposed by government is a regulation aimed at controlling energy AND raising revenue. It is an arbitrary, destructive and inefficient imposition. It is rationing. It is not a market.**

Are you a 'Climate Change Analyst' or 'Climate Crusader'?

(186)

Given my preceding comments and questions, I have deep concern about your analysis and possibly your motives. Please refer to the transcripts of ABC-TV's 7:30 Report programs broadcast on September 9th 2010 and September 15th, 2010 and your annotated transcript. In those transcripts I found no specific quantified evidence for your claims.

- <http://www.abc.net.au/7.30/content/2010/s3007654.htm>

- <http://www.abc.net.au/7.30/content/2010/s3012969.htm>

- <http://www.scribd.com/doc/37471900/Ross-Garnaut-Responds-to-the-7-30-Report>

- <http://www.abc.net.au/news/documents/scribd.htm?id=37906626&key=key-1m6gaz23hhvgu0ytm2fb>

(187)

Apart from your comment on copper levels being 30 times natural background you seem to be shy of supporting your claims with quantified real-world data. Surely, if it exists such data would easily refute 7:30 Report's core claims. When responding to the ABC's core issue, why do you not use specific evidence?

(188)

Your statements about Lihir not being contacted for comment are contradicted by ABC-TV. After reading your response, I wonder, can you please point to specific real-world scientific data that your claim repudiates the comments made by 7:30 Report?

(189)

I make no comments about your position versus that claimed by the 7:30 Report. I simply state my opinion that your response lacks adequate quantified real-world evidence. In my view, your response failed to address the 7:30 Report's key claim.

(190)

Reading ABC-TV's response to your continuing claims about its broadcast of the correct Lihir gold production I feel concerned about the accuracy and intent of your statements.

(191)

According to ABC-TV's response to your response you, quote: "Would have preferred to have been described as a '*climate change analyst*' rather than '*crusader*'. Yet based on your 2008 Review, your Fifth Update and your public comments you rely on unfounded statements that contradict science.

(192)

Being an economist you will be familiar with the University of Chicago where I graduated with a Masters degree and received American academic awards. You may not know that at the time staff from the University of Chicago had won more Nobel Prizes in economics and in finance than had staff from any other university. The university is rigorous in its approach and famous for its analysis.

(193)

From what I have seen, your work is not that of an analyst. It appears to be that of an advocate—a paid advocate. An advocate paid by the major proponent, a scared government.

Consequences of your climate crusading advocacy

(194)

Are you aware of the huge destructive impacts of carbon dioxide taxes and 'trading' on the environment? Please refer to www.conscious.com.au and specifically documents entitled:

- '*The Eco Fraud—Part 2, Environmental Casualties*' (3 pages)

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud%20Part%202.pdf>

- '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*', section 3, pages 30, 31 (one and a half page)

http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

Please refer to 'The Deniers' by Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon referenced in both the previously listed documents.

(195)

Please consider this: your implied conclusions and recommendations about Nature's harmless and essential trace gas (CO₂) will create what I see as humanitarian and environmental tragedies and legacies. I conclude that if adopted, your comments will drive misappropriation of funds to misallocate humanity's resources—with deadly consequences.

What are your personal financial interests in global warming?

(196)

My personal declaration of interests is provided at www.conscious.com.au. It can be found by clicking on the first item under 'Summaries': 'Aims, background and declaration ...'. All my work exposing global warming misrepresentations has been voluntary, independent and non-aligned.

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf>

(197)

Please disclose the source of your funding—both personal and the funding of any associations or institutes with which you are affiliated. I understand that you personally receive funds directly from the federal government that is pushing UN IPCC fraud as the basis for its carbon dioxide taxes and 'trading' schemes. **Please confirm whether or not the government is a source of your funding.**

(198)

I cannot know your needs for misrepresenting climate and science. I do though understand the damage your misrepresentations will drive if your recommendations are adopted.

Summarising my requests

(199)

Referring to the above underlined requests for responses, this inquiry may be summarised by four requests:

- **Please provide one piece of specific scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of carbon dioxide caused Earth's latest period of modest, cyclic global warming that ended around 1998;**

(200)

- **If the government enacts carbon dioxide taxes and 'trading' schemes, by what amount will temperatures fall and by what date will they fall? I understand you will need to provide a range of prices or alternatively a range of carbon dioxide cuts and corresponding temperature reductions;**

(201)

- **Please provide the range of forecast costs incurred to achieve this range of forecast temperature reductions;**

(202)

- **Please provide specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence showing that higher temperatures are detrimental to humanity, the environment and our planet.**

Science proves previous warm periods in Earth's human and geological history were highly beneficial to plants, animals, humans and our planet's ecosystem;

(203)

- You contradict real-world science by recommending economic impositions on carbon dioxide—a natural trace gas essential for all complex life on Earth. Lets consider another natural gas, oxygen that occurs in quantities almost 550 times greater than does CO2. Are you aware that humans can suffer oxygen poisoning? **Given that oxygen causes forest fires, house fires, rusting of cars and is essential for all combustion of fuels containing carbon, will you be recommending the taxing of oxygen? If not, why not?**

(204)

- **Have you been misled and used to spread UN IPCC and/or government misrepresentations? Or have you been assisting to mislead the Australian people?**

(205)

If you fail to provide real-world evidence to justify your claims, yet you continue publicly advocating action against human carbon dioxide you will be abetting UN IPCC fraud and lying. **My understanding is that you will be in contempt of parliament.** Will lying to the people and industry make you personally legally liable for losses incurred due to your falsities?

Conclusions

(206)

From your 2008 Garnaut Review and your recent Fifth Update I conclude that your work is based on falsely assuming an underlying premise to be true. In its wording your work assumes the UN IPCC's position to be accurate. It then seems to simply endorse it. Your approach contradicts science. Your claims contradict real-world scientific evidence. Your approach is one-sided and, despite you being an economist, it brushes aside economic benefits of warming. You fail to provide and adequately consider alternative views.

(207)

Please reflect on scholarly reticence, introduced on page 53 of your Update. **Aren't the most powerful antidotes of scholarly reticence real-world evidence and honest questioning of assumptions? Contrary to your false assertions, there is an enormous amount of real-world data on climate. That evidence proves your premise and assumptions are unfounded.**

(208)

It is difficult to conceive how you could accidentally make so many contradictions to real-world data with all contradictions tilting toward one conclusion. Statistics would show that is not random. I conclude it is deliberate and ask you why?

(209)

I conclude that your report is a corruption of science and that the corruption seems likely deliberate. If not deliberate then a statistically highly unlikely event reflecting gross incompetence and/or entanglement in groupthink.

(210)

I conclude that your 2008 Review, Fifth Update and recent public comments are misleading. The question is whether they are deliberately so? That is for you to consider and parliamentarians to decide.

(211)

Professor Garnaut, the broadcasting of your comments and Update stimulated my thinking and deepened my concern. From extensive reading, my grounds for the concerns presented above are sincere and clear in my mind. **Nonetheless, if I am in error in any way, I invite**

and welcome your corrections using real-world scientific evidence and facts.

(212)

Providing you supply specific real-world scientific evidence of your core claim and of any errors on my part, I will forward your response to all recipients of this letter.

Three requests

(213)

Please acknowledge this letter and answer the questions and requests underlined above.

(214)

Unless you can provide specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence for your claims, please retract your claims.

(215)

Please closely examine section (1) of the enclosed Summary Findings and supporting links and references. I will be pleased to discuss this letter and the Summary Findings with you and welcome an opportunity to do so.

Yours sincerely,

Original personally signed

Malcolm Roberts

BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)

Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Enclosure:

- Summary Findings
- Basic Questions

cc:

- Registered Post (with Delivery Confirmation) copies to:
- The Hon Greg Combet, MP, Minister for Climate Change
- The Hon Tony Abbott, MP, Leader of the Opposition
- The Hon Greg Hunt, MP, Opposition spokesman for Climate Action
- The Hon Kim Carr, MP, Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research
- The Hon Robert McClellan, MP, Attorney-General
- Mr Alex Chernov, University of Melbourne Chancellor
- Professor Glyn Davis, University of Melbourne Vice-Chancellor
- ABC Board
- Mr Maurice Newman, ABC Chairman

- Mr Mark Scott, ABC Managing Director
- Head of ABC Audience and Consumer Affairs

Electronically to:

- Federal Members of Parliament
- Professor David Karoly, University of Melbourne
- Interested scientists, select journalists and interested citizens