

February 28, 2011

Summary findings: four (4) years' of research into global warming

This summary is based on reading thousands of pages of scientific books, papers and articles and on listening to the world's eminent climate scientists in Australia and overseas.

First, consider the United Nations Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC). It's the basis of government and Greens' climate policies.

(1) UN IPCC's systematic, serial misrepresentations

Dictionary definition of fraud: presenting something as it is not to secure unfair gain.

The UN IPCC's core claim is that human production of carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused Earth's latest modest, cyclic warming that ended around 1998.

Carbon dioxide is a natural colourless, odourless, tasteless, non-toxic trace gas produced overwhelmingly by Nature.

Each UN IPCC report to national governments has relied on a blatant falsity.

1990. The first UN IPCC report has been documented to be based on a 1985 report from its predecessor, the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP). That report **contradicted the scientific evidence** showing no human warming due to carbon fuels. Why?

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_science_corrupted.pdf

1995. The second UN IPCC report relied on politicians overturning UN IPCC scientists. Five times, UN IPCC scientists stated there was no evidence of global warming due to humans. Yet in their summary to national governments and media, UN politicians reported, quote: "*The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate*". Why?

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=5206383248165214524#>
http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

Please note: Links to my documents on www.conscious.com.au produce documents referenced to source material. Depending on the document, those references are either listed in a bibliography at end of document or as footnotes or within the text. These documents encapsulate four years' of research into aspects of global warming alarm. The exact links may change in future as the site is updated.

The UN IPCC contradicts science and feeds falsities to national governments and media. Why?

2001. The third UN IPCC report relied on the infamous '*hockey stick temperature graph*' fraudulently purporting global temperatures to be rising rapidly and attributing that to rising atmospheric CO₂ levels. Media and political campaigns were based on this fraud to drive alarm internationally. Yet the graph was thoroughly discredited by scientists world-wide. As

a result it was quietly withdrawn—after falsely spreading world-wide alarm. The graph tried to erase the Medieval Warming Period that is documented in history and accepted scientifically world-wide. The report **contradicted real-world science**. Why? 'Thriving with Nature and Humanity':

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

UN IPCC 'scientists' prevented access by others to their supposed 'data'. That breaches scientific process and immediately disqualifies their claim. Yet the UN IPCC used it as the basis for a world-wide media and political campaign by **corrupting real-world science**. Why?

2007. The fourth UN IPCC report is the latest. Its core, chapter 9 is the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of CO₂. I've read it twice. It contains no real-world scientific evidence. It relies on **unvalidated computer simulations whose forecasts have driven alarm yet quickly proved to be false and in great error**. Why?

Check for yourself. The UN IPCC's chapter 9 is available here: http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch9.html

The **UN IPCC's own Expert Science Reviewer**, Dr Vincent Gray (PhD, Cambridge) has around 60 years real-world experience as a scientist including 20 years in climate. He has reviewed all four UN IPCC reports. **He says there's no evidence anywhere**. Why? www.conscious.com.au provides Dr Gray's comprehensive and detailed reviews of UN IPCC draft reports.

Contrary to UN IPCC claims, its reports are not peer-reviewed and are not scientific. The UN IPCC Chairman, Dr Rajendra Pachauri publicly claims UN IPCC reports are based on 100% peer-reviewed literature. Yet an independent international audit in February, 2010 revealed the UN IPCC's latest report cites and relies upon 5,587 references not peer-reviewed—including newspaper stories, bushwalkers stories and political activists campaign material. **A blatant falsity from the top of the UN's climate body**. Why? <http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/findings-main-page.php>

UN IPCC data on its own reporting processes shows peer-review processes are corrupted and often completely bypassed. Links to McLean's work presenting UN IPCC figures are provided below. Dr Vincent Gray's personal experience shows UN IPCC reports are not scientifically peer-reviewed. Why? www.conscious.com.au provides access to their work.

In key components of UN IPCC reports, data has been deliberately with-held from scrutiny. Thus, those components and the **UN IPCC reports themselves cannot be peer-reviewed and have not been peer-reviewed**. In effect, UN IPCC reviews merely review grammar and spelling and sanitise reports politically.

The UN IPCC Chairman, Dr Rajendra Pachauri has repeatedly publicly stated that 4,000 UN IPCC scientists claim global warming caused by humans. Yet UN IPCC figures themselves reveal only five (5) UN IPCC reviewers endorsed the claim—and there's doubt they were even scientists. **Not 4,000 scientists, just five (5) reviewers of dubious background. Another blatant falsity from the top of the UN's climate body**. Why? www.conscious.com.au and refer to McLean's work using UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC itself.

There is no scientific consensus as claimed by academic advocates and politicians pushing carbon dioxide taxes.

<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/9035/SPECIAL-REPORT-More-Than-1000-International-Scientists-Dissent-Over-ManMade-Global-Warming-Claims--Challenge-UN-IPCC--Gore>

The 2007 report's only chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 was written by a tight-knit cabal of computer modelers with no real-world evidence. Many are compromised by financial conflicts of interest. One man, David Karoly was Lead Author of the equivalent chapter in the 2001 report. Then building on his own 2001 work, he was Review Editor of the 2007 report. His papers were cited by the chapter and he apparently had close connections with many of the authors. He drafted the Summary for Policy Makers that influenced national governments. Yet he has no real-world evidence that warming was caused by human CO2. Why?

David Karoly's involvement as both Lead Author and subsequent Review Editor raises concerns about the objectivity of the report. It leaves the UN IPCC vulnerable to doubts and questions as to whether or not peer review was objective. It certainly cannot be seen to be independent, can it?

David Karoly has received millions of dollars of taxpayer funding from the Australian government. Even after the 2007 UN IPCC report was closed to input, he received government funding to study the detection and attribution of climate change. Yet we had previously been advised the "*science was settled*". He continues making public statements broadcast by our ABC paid by taxpayers. Why?

As a Lead Author of the 2001 report's chapter 12, David Karoly was responsible under UN IPCC guidelines for ensuring wide involvement of scientists from around the world. Yet he apparently breached guidelines by relying on a tight-knit cabal of authors. Sixty percent of references cited by his chapter were written or co-written by chapter authors. Of the remaining 40% how many could not or would not provide source data? If source data was not available, how could any other scientist validate the data?

There are thousands of scientists, including internationally eminent experts in their field and UN IPCC Lead Authors who publicly expose the UN IPCC's misrepresentation, contradiction and corruption of science. Why?

<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/9035/SPECIAL-REPORT-More-Than-1000-International-Scientists-Dissent-Over-ManMade-Global-Warming-Claims--Challenge-UN-IPCC--Gore>

This list continues to grow based on a list started by USA Senator James Inhofe. Separately, the late Professor Frederick Seitz, Past President of the USA's National Academy of Sciences, led over 30,000 scientists to petition their opposition to the UN IPCC's core claim:

<http://www.petitionproject.org/>

Advocates of global warming commonly dismiss opponents lacking scientific qualifications even when such people are simply exposing unscientific practices. Yet the **UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri is not a scientist and reportedly has written parts of UN IPCC scientific reports.** Why?

Much is explained by understanding the structure of the UN IPCC, the United Nations Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change. It selects scientists, activists and associated Non-Governmental Organisations to read literature. Politicians and bureaucrats then

provide summary reports to national governments and media. These **summary reports by politicians have often over-ruled and contradicted reports by the UN IPCC's own scientists**. Why?

Refer to pages 9-14 of '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*' available at:

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

and "*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*", at http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/dead%20elephants.pdf

These documents summarise the relevant science. They provide associated references for readers to verify the science themselves.

The UN IPCC conducts no scientific research. It's not accountable to any national governments.

The UN IPCC was co-sponsored by the United Nations Environmental program, UNEP in 1988. UNEP had and has a history of falsely cloaking political issues in supposed science to achieve political objectives. Refer to McLean's '*Climate Science Corrupted: How the IPCC's sponsor, the UNEP and key individuals have misled Governments into supporting the notion of manmade warming*' available at:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate_science_corrupted.html

Quoting senior UNEP and UN IPCC officials, he documents a history of corruption within both climate bodies, initially UNEP and later the UN IPCC. The UN's political claim of warming is an unfounded falsity cloaking a political agenda. It is not scientific. **Some academics, politicians and journalists have seemingly fallen for it because they have failed to demand real-world scientific evidence**. Why?

'*The Eco Fraud: Part 1, A timeline of International Fraud*' provides a brief introduction to, and partial summary of the UN IPCC's shady practices. It's available at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

Are you aware that, through its politicised actions contradicting science the UNEP is responsible for the deaths of more than 30 million people? That puts its toll in the league of Earth's worst mass-murderers—Hitler, Mao and Stalin.

Please refer to '*The Eco Fraud: Part 3, Black Deaths in Green Custody*' available at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%203.pdf

It seems many politicians and academic administrators have been conned by the UN IPCC's strategies pushing a political agenda. It is supposedly based on science yet contradicts science. The UN IPCC presents politicians and journalists with overwhelmingly thick reports entangled in scientific jargon. Facing this daunting prospect **journalists and politicians have understandably relied on brief Summaries for Policy Makers written by UN IPCC politicians and on UN IPCC press releases, glossy literature and choreographed presentations**.

That con would have been avoided by one basic scientific request: "*show me your real-world scientific evidence*".

That some academics have apparently failed this basic test of a scientist reveals to me that their approach is not scientific. Thus I conclude such academics are not scientists.

Maybe some have sought the source data underpinning the UN IPCC's core claim. If so, those academics need to be asked to please provide it? If they have not received such data, they cannot claim to have peer-reviewed the data.

The following reports by McLean cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present UN IPCC data on its own reporting and reviewing processes. McLean obtained the data from the UN IPCC itself. They expose the unscientific practices fabricating UN IPCC reports and expose the tight-knit cabal of computer simulators relying overwhelmingly on their own work and driven it seems by their own financial interests.

- '*The IPCC can't count its "expert scientists": - Author and reviewer numbers are wrong*'
http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf
- '*An Analysis of the Review of the IPCC 4AR WG I Report*'
http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf
- '*Prejudiced Authors, Prejudiced Findings. Did the UN bias its attribution of 'global warming' to humankind?*'
http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/23573.pdf
- '*Peer review? What peer review? Failures of scrutiny in the UN's Fourth Assessment Report*'
http://folk.uio.no/tomvs/esef/McLean_ipcc_review.pdf

Other reports by McLean exposing quotes and data from senior officials of the UN IPCC:

- '*We have been conned: An independent review of the inter-governmental panel on climate change*'
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean_we_have_been_conned.pdf
- '*Why the IPCC should be disbanded*'
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer, Dr Vincent Gray provides an excellent paper succinctly exposing UN IPCC tricks. He is a scientist with around 60 years experience in real-world science including 20 years researching climate. He has reviewed all four (4) UN IPCC reports: 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007.

'*Spinning the Climate*' by Vincent Gray is available at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/gray%20documents/SpinningThe%20Climate.pdf

UN IPCC Lead Authors have personally exposed the UN IPCC's fraud and unscientific ways.

'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', pages 9-14.

'*The Deniers*' by Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon is a book providing ample evidence from scientists internationally eminent in their fields. These include UN IPCC scientists. They expose the UN IPCC's many contradictions and distortions of science.

'*Air Con*' by New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart similarly exposes UN IPCC fraud.

Academics need to learn from real-world scientists and their real-world data.

Climategate e-mails between UN IPCC collaborators show that climate scientist Chris de Freitas was targeted by UN IPCC collaborators. Some advocated that his work be knocked out. Based on the merits of de Freitas' work, UN IPCC collaborators justifiably feared his work would smash the UN IPCC's core claim.

After his paper co-written with Carter and McLean was peer-reviewed, accepted and published the publisher permitted an appeal. That appeal was conducted in a way that breached the scientific publishing body's own review guidelines. de Freitas' paper was knocked out contrary to the scientific guidelines. He was allowed no appeal.

'Censorship at AGU—Scientists denied the right of reply'

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/agu_censorship.pdf

This is only one of apparently many examples of **UN IPCC collaborators conspiring to prevent opponents' papers being published.**

Can academics imagine the fear this triggers in real scientists when scientific research cannot be published and work is unscientifically discarded? Perhaps not—especially those who benefit from such unscientific and unethical behaviour.

The fear deepens when research publications are associated with grants. Unscientific dismissal of valid scientific papers causes genuine scientists to lose income and career.

It's documented that some scientists are afraid to publish views contradicting UN IPCC views. This bolsters UN IPCC claims, corrupts science and hurts humanity.

McKittrick shares his experience trying to publish a paper correcting a serious error made by the UN IPCC.

'Circling the bandwagons: My adventures correcting the IPCC'

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/Circling_the_Bandwagons_Correcting_the_IPCC.pdf

Climategate. The British Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) ruling found a breach of the law by scientists in key UN IPCC roles. Yet the Climategate scandal has still not been independently investigated.

'The Eco Fraud: Part 1 A timeline of international fraud' and its associated references *'The Eco Fraud: Climategate 'inquiry' references'* provide additional material: http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf and <http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf>

The detailed work of McLean, Gray, McIntyre, McKittrick, Singer and many others world-wide is supported independently by quotes from eminent UN IPCC scientists (www.conscious.com.au). Combined, they prove that within the UN IPCC, peer-review has been corrupted and often completely bypassed.

At times, when scientists advised there was no evidence of global warming by humans, UN IPCC politicians overturned the science by falsely telling governments and the public there was evidence.

In such instances governments and media were handed politicised summaries that contradicted the science. Contradicting the science and misleading governments is fraud.

The efforts of the UN IPCC and some proponents of human global warming remind of tactics reportedly used by the tobacco industry in the latter half of the last century to quash medical and scientific findings against tobacco. Reportedly, that industry paid for research to provide the answers it sought; it paid scientists to produce custom results; it falsified reports and claims; it lobbied to prevent release of the truth; it spread propaganda to influence public opinion; it suppressed information; it allegedly paid journalists to write favourable articles; it ridiculed opponents; and, corporations manipulated political and legal processes and willfully distorted and suppressed scientific findings.

When the matter eventually went to court requiring evidence under oath the tobacco industry campaign in developed nations rapidly collapsed. Already global warming is in early stages of lengthy court action in the USA. Where will the advocate-professors and their universities be when evidence is called?

Surely, if proponents of human global warming had proof they would love to use it in court.

On February 19, 2011 the USA's House of Representatives voted to kill funding of the UN IPCC.

<http://joannenova.com.au/>

On February 04, 2010 India's Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh announced an Indian research institute to replace the UN IPCC. He added that its research would be more "robust and solid" than that of the IPCC. <http://news.outlookindia.com/item.aspx?674068>

The Indian Environment Minister foreshadowed in 2010 that India would cease to participate in UN climate processes such as the Copenhagen talkfest.

(2) Despite UN IPCC corruption, Australian advocate-professors closely linked to government funding endorse the UN IPCC

The UN body has been publicly endorsed by a vocal and prominent group of advocate-professors: David Karoly, Tim Flannery, Matthew England, Andy Pitman, Will Steffen, Kurt Lambeck and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg. Despite some of these academics not having qualifications or experience in climate, each of these advocates is promoted in the media as a climate expert. Each rests his core claim about human production of carbon dioxide (CO₂) on the UN IPCC's core claim.

All named have been asked to provide specific real-world scientific evidence of their claims. All have failed. (www.conscious.com.au)

All are heads of, or senior staff in, Australian university institutes receiving extensive government funding for research into supposed global warming.

Tim Flannery has been appointed by the government as Chief Commissioner of the government's Climate Commission. In making the appointment, the government cited his communication skills. Will Steffen has been appointed a fellow Commissioner. David Karoly, Matthew England and Andy Pitman have been appointed to the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel.

Yet the Commission's role is not to investigate the science. The Commission's role is to convince Australians we need a carbon dioxide tax.

Tim Flannery has been paid for serving the government in previous roles promoting climate alarm. Under questioning by journalist Andrew Bolt, Tim Flannery admitted he is an investor in an alternate energy company. Reportedly his company receives financial support from the government.

Most of the advocate-professors have been requested to provide their declaration of personal interests. None have. Mine has been given to them.

(http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf)

This group of advocate-professors has played and continues to play a significant role in shaping perceptions of climate in Australian media, citizens and politicians. It influences shaping of policy that, if implemented, will seriously hurt Australians for a long, long time at huge cost—for no effect on climate.

The basis of this group's advocacy is the UN IPCC's false and unfounded core claim.

Thanks in part, it seems, to advocate-professors' frequent efforts, UN IPCC reports are the unfounded basis of the government's and Greens' climate policies.

The government funded ABC broadcasting network has given an advantage to these advocates with prime time on the airwaves and generous endorsement. Why?

I conclude that the Australian government, politicians and citizens have been misled into thinking there is a scientific consensus when there is no consensus and no real-world scientific evidence behind the UN IPCC's core claim on human CO2?

The above exposes the immoral and unethical UN IPCC that these advocate-professors endorse. Now consider the position of others paid by the government ...

(3) CSIRO's Chief Executive and Group Executive-Environment failed to provide real-world evidence

In written responses to my requests for specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused global warming, neither CSIRO's Chief Executive nor its Group Executive-Environment provided any evidence. Why?

CSIRO's glossy public reports such as "*The Science of Tackling Climate Change*" and "*State of the Climate*" contain no proof of human causation of global warming. Glossy pictures and unfounded inferences without real-world evidence are not science.

(<http://www.csiro.au/files/files/psvk.pdf>)

CSIRO is funded by the government.

(4) Australia's Chief Scientist failed to provide real-world scientific evidence

Despite my repeated written requests by Registered Mail with Confirmation of Delivery, Australia's Chief Scientist Professor Penny Sackett failed to provide any scientific evidence of human warming. Why?

The Chief Scientist's web site implies global warming and attributes it to human production of CO2. For example: <http://www.chiefscientist.gov.au/2010/05/delayed-action-increases-risk-of-dangerous-climate-change/> and endorses the UN IPCC <http://www.chiefscientist.gov.au/2009/12/why-we-must-act-now-to-reduce-greenhouse-gas-emissions/>

Yet she fails to provide any real-world scientific evidence. Why?

Attractive web site diagrams by professional graphic designers are no substitute for real-world science.

The Chief Scientist is funded by the government.

On February 23rd, 2011, Australia's Chief Scientist revealed to a Senate Estimates Hearing that, quoting the ABC: "she has never been asked to brief Prime Minister Julia Gillard." Reportedly, over a period of two and a half years, the Chief Scientist had briefed the previous prime minister only once.

(<http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2011/02/23/3146756.htm>)

(<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/chief-scientist-feels-eft-out-in-the-cold/story-e6frg6nf-1226010981950>)

Yet, as deputy prime minister, our current prime minister publicly supported the previous prime minister's statement that human-induced global warming is "*the greatest moral, economic and environmental challenge of our generation*".

(<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/features/politics-trumps-a-moral-challenge/story-e6frg6z6-1225859592923>)

The Chief Scientist's resignation was reported on February 23, 2011.

In the discussion on supposed '*imminent, irreversible, catastrophic global warming*' real-world science seems irrelevant to our politicians, to advocate professors and to others dependent on government funding.

(<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/features/politics-trumps-a-moral-challenge/story-e6frg6z6-1225859592923>)

I conclude science has been politicised and hijacked by politicians in the UN and in Australia.

The above pages expose the immoral and unethical UN IPCC endorsed by people in positions funded by government. Now consider the science ...

Real-world Observations and Evidence show the belief that '*humans caused cyclic global warming*' misrepresents climate, Nature and science

Lets approach this scientifically. Science deals in using observations to prove or disprove theories proposed to explain Nature.

(5) Carbon Dioxide levels—a consequence of temperature not a cause

The UN IPCC omitted 90,000 reliable measurements of atmospheric CO₂ levels taken in the last 180 years. These show natural fluctuations in CO₂ levels up to 40% ABOVE current levels. Many of these measurements were taken before modern industrialisation in the last century.

The UN IPCC avoiding the evidence. Why?

'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', page 10 summarises comments from internationally eminent scientist Zbigniew Jaworowski in Solomon's book '*The Deniers*'. **The UN IPCC not only ignores measurements of CO₂ it then distorts those it selects.** Jaworowski explains how the UN IPCC moved a graph's data 83 years along the graph's axis to fraudulently imply their case. **The UN IPCC corrupts and misrepresents data.** Why?

Atmospheric CO₂ levels are not a driver of temperature, they are a consequence of temperature. i.e., they are driven and determined by temperature. This is well understood in science and completely contradicts the core claim of the advocate-professors' and the UN IPCC. Did advocate-professors not know this? Why?

This is explained in the book '*Climate: the Counter Consensus*' by internationally eminent palaeoclimatologist Bob Carter. And in '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*', pages 37 and 38. It is revealed even in Al Gore's science fiction movie '*An Inconvenient Truth*' in a graph used by Al Gore.

Pages 16 and 17 of '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*' summarises key CO₂ data and explains their significance. Oceans contain 50 times more CO₂ in dissolved form than in Earth's entire atmosphere. The solubility of CO₂ in water increases as water temperature decreases.

As solar activity varies seasonally the variation in heat energy varies ocean surface temperature. When massive southern hemisphere ocean surfaces rise in temperature during the southern summer, oceans liberate CO₂ into the atmosphere raising global atmospheric CO₂ levels. As surface water temperature decreases in southern winters,

CO2 is absorbed from the atmosphere into the ocean, reducing global atmospheric CO2 levels.

Temperature drives CO2. NOT the other way around, as advocate-professors claim. **The real-world reveals the reverse of what they claim.**

In the longer term, with a lag of 400-800 years, variation between solar maxima and minima change the temperature of the ocean body. As the massive ocean water body temperature slowly changes, it affects atmospheric CO2 levels.

Contrary to Al Gore's movie, finer resolution of ice core data shows temperature leads and thus drives atmospheric CO2 levels. This was published two years before Al Gore's movie was released yet his movie stated the opposite. Why?

Like much of his movie, it contradicted science. His emotive Hollywood production by Hollywood producers spread misinformation world-wide to misrepresent climate and science. Why?

This is explained succinctly on pages 41-43 of '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*'.

Annually, Nature produces 97% of Earth's CO2 production. That overwhelms humanity's 3% (data source, UN IPCC). More significant, Nature controls reabsorption of CO2 from the atmosphere back into the main carbon dioxide sinks: ocean (containing 50 times more CO2 in dissolved form than in Earth's entire atmosphere), near surface rocks, soils and bio mass (plants and animals). Nature alone determines atmospheric CO2 levels.

Neither the government nor the mainstream media seem to publish the tiny proportion of CO2 in our atmosphere. CO2 is accurately described scientifically as a naturally occurring **trace gas** with a **concentration below 0.04% (0.0385)%**. **That's less than a mere four 100ths of 1%. As a fraction: in every 2,600 molecules of air only one is CO2.** The significance of this is discussed below.

The Earth's current atmosphere is its third. Prior to the current atmosphere, Earth had far higher levels of CO2. Early in our current atmosphere, Earth had CO2 levels 1,800 times higher than currently.

In more recent periods of high atmospheric CO2 levels, plants thrived and thus animals thrived. Especially in the warmer periods when life thrives even more vigorously.

Some advocates of human warming name satellite interferometry as justification for their claim. Yet they fail to explain how it measures what they claim to be the warming due to CO2 produced by humans. How does it isolate the effect of CO2 on atmospheric temperature? Specifically, how does it isolate and measure the human component?

Advocate-professors have contradicted observational and physical data presented above. Instead, they base their core claim on UN IPCC fraud. Thus I have sought real-world scientific justification for their faith-based claim that human CO2 affects Earth's atmospheric temperature. **All have failed to provide evidence.**

The UN IPCC has not been able to provide evidence. Neither has any academic nor any government agency I've contacted including CSIRO.

(6) Temperature: Scientific evidence shows no unusual or sudden warming of Earth and no net warming since 1958

The only reliable and accurate measurements of global atmospheric temperature are by weather balloon and satellite. These show no net warming since 1958, just inherent variation in natural cooling, warming, cooling cycles.

Current temperatures are lower than the average for Earth's last 3,000 years.

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

Current temperatures are lower than temperatures in 8,000 of the last 10,000 years of Earth's history.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/index.html>

Even in recent times, North America was warmer in the 1930's than it has been in recent decades. Arctic temperatures were warmer in the 1940's than in recent decades.

Yet the UN IPCC tried to fraudulently rewrite Earth's history by removing the Medieval Warming Period that was much warmer than today. It tried to erase the even warmer Roman Warming Period.

Many kids know that during the Medieval Warming Period Vikings had a thriving colony in Greenland growing grapes. Yet some academics seem not aware Why?

Rural temperatures in Australia and the USA show no net warming since the 1890's. They show slight cooling.

Urban temperatures show a marked rise as expected in growing cities as asphalt, concrete, glass and steel replace plants.

Meteorologists (weathermen) Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts exposed the corruption of American ground-based temperature measurements. 90% breach measurement standards. Those of other nations are even less accurate and less reliable.

'*Surface Temperature Records—policy driven deception?*' by D'Aleo and Watts.

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf

The three ground based temperature records used by the UN IPCC to make its claim rely on similar data. That data has been corrupted. That is well known.

'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', pages 18-21: http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

Statisticians including Ross McKittrick expose the unscientific manipulation of temperature measurements used to derive the UN IPCC's misleading, unscientific temperatures used to fabricate its claim of warming.

<http://www.uoguelph.ca/%7Ermckitri/research/nvst.html>

<http://www.staff.ncl.ac.uk/david.harvey/AES829/McKittrick2007.pdf>

A group of scientists joined by writers and Senator Cory Bernardi has requested the Australian Auditor General to audit temperature records maintained by the

Australian Bureau of Meteorology. Lengthy, detailed material accompanying their request exposes apparently unscientific and unfounded inconsistent manipulation of Australian temperature records. The Bureau of Meteorology is funded by government.

'Announcing a formal request for the Auditor General to audit the Australian Bureau of Meteorology' available at: <http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/announcing-a-formal-request-for-the-auditor-general-to-audit-the-australian-bom/>

Especially: <http://jonova.s3.amazonaws.com/audit/anao-request-audit-bom.pdf>

Appendices 1, 3, 4, 5, and top of page 37, page 63 by 'computer geek'.

NASA-GISS uses ground based temperature measurements even though NASA satellite measurements of atmospheric temperature are far more reliable and measure actual atmospheric temperatures. Why?

Could it be because James Hansen from NASA-GISS is an adviser to Al Gore and devoted advocate of the UN IPCC's unfounded claims? NASA/James Hansen have apologised for large errors and refused to share data. Why?

Even Dr Phil Jones, made infamous by the Climategate scandal that engulfed him, reportedly stated there has been no statistically significant warming since 1995.

Despite the known inaccuracies, UN IPCC scientists refuse to allow scrutiny of their ground-based temperature 'data'. Why?

That breaches scientific process and peer-review. In real science, when claims cannot be tested, they are dismissed. They are not accepted as science. Yet the UN IPCC shields such hiding of data from scrutiny. Why?

Professors Karoly, England and Pitman joined forces to make many comments broadcast by ABC-TV's Lateline program, February 09, 2011. From the transcript, Professor England said of temperature, quote:

"MATTHEW ENGLAND: The bushfires in Victoria were another good example of where the temperatures weren't just broken by a little bit, but they were smashed. And when you see that, you've either got a freakish weather event well above the average or there's a climate change signal to that.

The alarm bells being rung at the moment aren't based on single events, it's based on all the statistical calculations that are done on many of these events."

<http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2011/s3134677.htm>

Professor England seems unaware that record temperatures on all continents were set many decades ago? On a majority of continents records were set in the late 1800's or early 1900's. Australia's occurred in 1889 (or arguably 1960).

<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/globalextremes.html>

For an accurate real-world analysis of temperatures and disaster trends by an international group of eminent real-world scientists see: http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

Contrary to Professor England's claim broadcast by ABC-TV, real-world evidence shows no increasing trend in temperatures or disasters. See 'The Deniers', by Solomon and 'Air Con' by Wishart.

In our winter of 2008 many parts of Australia witnessed record cold temperatures. Southern portions of the Great Barrier Reef bleached due to low temperatures.

In citing and supporting the UN IPCC, the advocate-professors make claims contrary to science. Why?

(7) Temperature drives CO2 levels—FACT

'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', pages 21 to 23 summarises another paper by meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo showing that CO2 and temperatures are not well correlated and often for long periods negatively correlated.

'*US Temperatures and Climate Factors since 1895*'

[http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US Temperatures and Climate Factors since 1895.pdf](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US_Temperatures_and_Climate_Factors_since_1895.pdf)

D'Aleo's work with data reaching back more than a century shows temperatures well correlated with solar activity and most highly correlated with multidecadal cycles—natural oscillation cycles between atmosphere and ocean similar to La Nina and El Nino experienced in Australia.

Carter, de Freitas and McLean scientifically prove that global atmospheric temperature is driven by El Nino cycles.

'*Influence of Southern Oscillation on tropospheric temperature*'. Journal of Geophysical Research 114, D14104, doi:10.1029/2008JD011637 available at http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_4.htm

Kiwi Brian Leyland used this proven causal relationship to accurately predict temperatures in the past decade.

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/the-soi-still-rules/>

Now we get to the causal relationships. There are two (2) of note:

- **El Nino cycles determine temperature; and**
- **Temperature drives atmospheric CO2 levels seasonally and on a 400-800 year lag. (Over intermediate periods of many decades other factors superimpose to affect CO2 levels. Climate is complex.)**

This confirms the cyclic nature of climate variation complicated by the superimposition of many, many cycles of varying duration. It is clear that galactic, solar and planetary cycles drive temperature.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer, Dr Vincent Gray has provided by far the most detailed and comprehensive review of UN IPCC draft reports. He is scathing in his 575 comments on chapter 9 alone. That's the sole chapter in the UNIPCC's 2007 report claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2. He repeatedly raised the UN IPCC's avoidance of attributing significance to solar activity and El Nino cycles. **The UN IPCC avoiding the data—again.** Why?

Professor Karoly was Review Editor of Chapter 9.

Timothy Ball, PhD professor of climatology and renowned environmentalist says, quote:

"The most fundamental assumption in the theory that human CO2 is causing global warming and climate change is that an increase in CO2 will cause an increase in temperature. The problem is that in every record of any duration for any period in the history of the Earth exactly the opposite relationship occurs: temperature increase precedes CO2 increase".

From '*Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the greenhouse gas theory*', 2011, Stairway Press page 1. www.slayingtheskydragon.com

Lately much has been speculated in the media about 2010 temperatures. This illustrates further falsities as easily seen from the following links:

- http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/2010_warmest_on_record.pdf
- <http://www.spaceandscience.net/>
- '*Why NOAA and NASA Proclamations should be ignored*':
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/noaa_2010_report.pdf
- <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/8290469/How-BBC-warmists-abuse-the-science.html>

This raises serious questions about another UN organisation, the World Meteorological Organisation, WMO. In 1988 it co-sponsored the UN IPCC with UNEP. Peas in a pod?

Australia's Bureau of Meteorology is under its own cloud for seemingly tampering with data, possibly to support government policy. Refer to the report accompanying the recent call for an audit of the Bureau, cited above. The Bureau is funded by the Australian government currently pushing both carbon dioxide taxes and carbon dioxide 'trading'.

Note that New Zealand's counterpart to our Bureau of Meteorology has been taken to court by climate realists in New Zealand. It is being exposed for apparently misrepresenting temperatures.

Whenever court action is involved and evidence is required under oath, why is it that proponents of global warming get hammered? It's because the evidence exposes them.

Summary: Temperatures are not high. Even if temperatures were high, advocates of human warming provide no causal link showing HUMAN CO2 determines temperature. The reason: there is no link. Quite the opposite—the real-world proves temperatures drive atmospheric CO2 levels.

Having twice read the UN IPCC's chapter 9 claiming global warming and attributing it to human production of CO2 I know there is no evidence in that chapter.

The UN IPCC's own Expert Science Reviewer, Dr Vincent Gray goes further. He says there is no evidence in any of the UN IPCC's four reports to national governments and media (1990, 1995, 2001, 2007).

The reality is that temperature, and many other factors determine atmospheric CO2 levels.

Advocate-professors seemingly support UN IPCC fraud and contradict real-world evidence. Why?

(8) There is no causality or correlation showing CO2 levels drive temperature

(8.1) Causality

Based on my personal communication with professors Flannery, Karoly, England and Pitman it seems they do not understand causality. It's defined in the dictionary as:

- 1. the relationship of cause and effect;*
- 2. causal agency or quality.*

There is no real-world causal relationship between CO2 and temperature showing that temperature is determined by atmospheric CO2 levels.

There is a real-world empirical (measured observation), theoretical, physical and logical basis showing that temperature drives atmospheric CO2 levels.

(8.2) Correlation is complicated by other factors yet still contradicts the advocate-professors' core claim

To understand this, one needs to understand correlation. Lets use the dictionary:

Statistics: the degree to which two or more attributes or measurements on the same group of elements show a tendency to vary together.

Causality requires correlation. Correlation by itself is not sufficient to prove causality. Correlation between two factors may be due to them both being dependent on other factors.

Because causality requires correlation though, a lack of correlation is sufficient to prove lack of causality.

We are currently in a period of negative correlation. From the 1940's through the 1970's Earth experienced another period of negative correlation for 30 years. Science shows Earth has had ice ages with periods of high atmospheric CO2. CO2 does not determine temperature.

Seasonally, there is strong and direct correlation showing temperature leading CO2 levels. Because changes in CO2 follow changes in temperature, it seems temperature determines CO2 levels.

In the longer term, finer resolution analysis of ice core data reveals changes in temperature lead changes in CO₂ levels by 400-800 years. Thus temperature determines CO₂ levels.

In the intermediate term over periods of decades there is a lack of correlation because of other powerful superimposing factors such as El Nino and solar variation. **Temperature is not independent. It is determined by many climate factors—especially solar—and cycles not yet fully understood.**

It is clear though that CO₂ levels depend on many factors, including temperature.

Palaeoclimatologist Professor Bob Carter disproves the hypothesis that CO₂ drives temperature. Refer to item number 67 and to two other demolitions of the advocate-professors' core claim at Professor Carter's web site (http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_1.htm).

Bob Carter is a distinguished scientist of the real-world. He has the integrity and discipline to be pedantic in insisting that a theory's proponents prove their claim. He has published more than 100 peer-reviewed publications. Many of those deal with reconstructing and researching environments and climate in the real world.
http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_4.htm

Any one of the many above points is sufficient to refute the advocate-professors' core claim. Nonetheless, lets continue.

(9) Physical Reality and Reasoning show the UN IPCC's core claim is unfounded, illogical, nonsensical

Consider the physical reality and apply logic. Lets have a bit of fun and play.

In every 2,600 molecules of air, only one (1) is CO₂. That's 0.04% (0.0385%), the current atmospheric CO₂ level.

Secondly, Nature annually produces 97% of the CO₂ produced annually on Earth. Thus for every molecule of CO₂ produced by human activity, there are 32 produced by Nature (humans produce just 3%). Lets put aside the fact that Nature alone determines and thus controls atmospheric CO₂ levels. Lets pretend, as the UN IPCC tries to pretend, that the atmosphere is separate and not affected by the rest of our planet that contains 100,000 times more carbon than is contained in the entire atmosphere.

Over the long term, in every 33 molecules of atmospheric CO₂ only one is produced by humans. This means that in every $2,600 \times 33 = 85,800$ molecules, only one is from human activity. That's only 1 in 85,800 molecules of air. As a percentage, that's 0.0012%.

Lets understand the consequences of the advocate-professors' claim.

In essence they're claiming that one molecule of CO₂ in every 85,800 molecules of air irreversibly and catastrophically warms the planet and generates storms, increases disease and raises sea levels. 1 in 85,800 molecules of air—that's quite an amazing molecule.

What's more insane, it seems, is that among those 85,800 molecules, one molecule of (human) CO₂ causes catastrophic warming yet (Nature's) 32 identical CO₂ molecules are blessings!

How can this be in periods of massive forest fires and above-average volcanic eruptions producing huge quantities of CO₂?

Advocate-professors Karoly, England and Pitman seem enmeshed in computer simulations. In the real world though Earth sees far more powerful generators of CO₂ than puny humanity. During Earth's past far warmer periods and during ice ages, atmospheric CO₂ levels were many times current levels. Even in relatively recent times CO₂ levels have been six times higher than current levels—during periods warmer than currently and during periods cooler than currently.

Lets play a little more. Australia's CO₂ production is estimated to be around 1% to 1.3% of all CO₂ generated annually by humans. Lets be kind to the UN IPCC and use a conservative figure, say 1.5%. That means Aussies are responsible for a mere 1 molecule of CO₂ in 5.7 million molecules of air!

Wait, it becomes funnier: if we cut our production of CO₂ by 5%, Australian CO₂ would be cut to one molecule in 6.0 million molecules of air. Wow.

Are the advocate-professors not aware that China, India, the USA, much of the EU and many other nations are increasing their output dramatically—some exponentially? Yet even their increasing output pales beside a volcano or two. Earth has thousands of active volcanoes with most under the oceans that cover 71% of Earth's surface.

These calculations depend on the assumptions used. No one could claim perfect accuracy in this. Yet the order of magnitude is beyond dispute.

Lets understand then that the advocate-professors seem to demand destroying Australia's economy and taxing Aussies and their families for this nonsense. Why?

All for no possible impact on climate because CO₂ does not, and cannot, raise global temperatures.

Their advocacy comes after America's President Obama said "No" to a carbon dioxide tax. The leaders of India, China, Brazil, Japan and other nations have all said "No" to a carbon dioxide tax.

The advocate-professors recommend increasing the prices of petrol, electricity, food, transport and every aspect of our cost of living. While they and/or their institutes receive funds paid by Aussie taxpayers.

Another approach is to suspend the science and assume a greenhouse gas effect. Then use the calculations provided and qualified in '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*', pages 27 and 28.

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

Because UN IPCC assumptions are so rubbery, only order of magnitude is important. Use conservative figures that favour the UN IPCC. Contradict science for a moment by assuming the greenhouse effect is valid. Then, it seems the effect of human CO₂ on temperature would be about 0.0007 degrees C.

The supposed greenhouse gas effect is entirely dominated by water vapour. CO₂'s effect would be trivial. http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/greenhouse_data.html Even Al Gore says that water vapour is responsible for 95% of his supposed greenhouse effect and CO₂ 3% or less.

Per unit, water vapour has a greater opacity to long-wave radiation than does CO₂. The atmospheric concentration of water vapor is on average 25 to 50 times the concentration of CO₂. We have no idea whether the concentration of water vapour is going up or down. That is controlled entirely by Nature who remains in control of the sun and oceans.

Whether the concentration of water vapour is increasing or decreasing slightly though is irrelevant. We do know that it is a far larger contributor than CO₂ so any variation in water vapour would have a far greater impact than any supposed impact from CO₂.

Some advocates of warming then claim supposedly positive feedbacks amplify CO₂'s effect. Yet this contradicts Nature and many real-world climate scientists.

That's a pity, because it would enable generating unlimited energy with no fuel cost.

Instead, Nature's natural feedback loops tend to offset changes. Many real-world scientists have stated this based on real-world measured evidence and on the water-cloud cycle.

Otherwise, Earth's first warming period would have led to our planet experiencing runaway global warming. Or Earth's first global cooling would have led to Earth becoming an ice ball. Last time I looked it's not freezing or burning outside.

Lets return to estimating the significance of CO₂'s supposed effect: cutting Australia's production of CO₂ by 5% would reduce global temperature one half of one millionth of a degree, 0.0000005 C.

Or using the Greens' (old?) target of a 40% cut, we could reduce Earth's global temperature by 0.000004 degrees C.

Remember, this is only indicative. Anyway, it requires suspending science because as we now know, **Temperature drives CO₂ levels**.

The above illustrates the advocate-professors' claim as nonsensical.

Reference to the trace amount of CO₂ in our atmosphere does not by itself mean CO₂ is not dangerous. After all, arsenic in small quantities is lethal. Please note though two contradictions to the claim that CO₂ is harmful:

- like oxygen, CO₂ is not toxic in anything other than very high concentrations far higher than anything ever projected to occur by even the most extreme radical advocate of

human warming. CO₂ is beneficial at concentrations many times greater than the wildest projections. CO₂ is essential for all complex life on Earth. It is a plant food and plants thrive on higher levels;

- humans produce 3% of Earth's annual production of CO₂ and advocates of human warming claim that is dangerous and damaging. Yet Nature produces 97% of Earth's annual CO₂ production and that's not even mentioned. Why?

Poisons such as arsenic in small quantities administered by one person are dangerous. Large quantities of arsenic administered by Nature are dangerous. **By the logic of advocates of human warming though CO₂ is different: small quantities produced by humans are dangerous while overwhelming quantities produced by Nature are not.** Why?

CO₂ is a naturally occurring trace gas essential for life on Earth. It is not a poison. It is not a pollutant.

Nor is Nature's CO₂ production stable. Variation in volcanic CO₂ production alone is estimated to greatly exceed the production of CO₂ from humanity. Yet even massive volcanoes have only a short term effect as CO₂ levels quickly return to their pre-eruption levels. Nature, not humans, determine atmospheric CO₂ levels.

The sun has a huge impact on atmospheric CO₂ levels. Variation in solar energy reaching the surface of Earth's oceans has enormous impact on atmospheric CO₂ levels.

Producing each molecule of CO₂ consumes one atom of carbon (C) and two of oxygen (O₂). Yet no one is claiming any shortage of oxygen.

There is no shortage of oxygen because CO₂ is a trace gas and because Nature's carbon cycle is controlled by Nature. That cycle replenishes oxygen through plant growth.

It is difficult to believe that even academics enmeshed in computer simulations using unvalidated computer models could be so lost on these basic elements of science and Nature.

That politicians and journalists fell for the scam is not surprising given that they were convinced by the self-proclaimed 'authority' of advocate 'scientists'. Politicians and journalists assumed they could trust the competence and integrity of advocates and the UN IPCC. They weren't to know advocates rely on UN IPCC computer models and fraud while avoiding real-world data.

Politicians and journalists can only fulfill their responsibilities by demanding and auditing specific real-world scientific evidence.

Until then, are we on the way to becoming a Nintendo and X-Box planet?

The advocate-professors' core claim has failed four tests: observational (empirical), physical, logical and—given UN IPCC fraud—ethical. There is another test we can apply—the theoretical.

(10) Consider the theory: the advocate-professors' core claim is unfounded—it contradicts the Laws of Nature

(10.1) Slaying the Sky Dragon

Are advocate-professors aware that an international team of physicists, chemists, meteorologists and writers last year released their book smashing the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas supposition?

'*Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the greenhouse gas theory*' is available at [Amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com/Slaying-Sky-Dragon-Greenhouse-ebook/dp/B004DNWJN6/ref=sr_1_3?ie=UTF8&s=digital-text&qid=1297683280&sr=8-3-catcorr)
http://www.amazon.com/Slaying-Sky-Dragon-Greenhouse-ebook/dp/B004DNWJN6/ref=sr_1_3?ie=UTF8&s=digital-text&qid=1297683280&sr=8-3-catcorr

(10.2) Believers in greenhouse 'theory' are flat-earththers

Have the advocate-professors read the 1909 real-world, replicable work of physicist RW Wood who completely demolished the so-called greenhouse gas effect supposition that emerged back in the mid 1800's?

After reading many scientists, I reasoned that the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas effect supposition is not even a 'theory'. It contradicts the laws of physics and the laws of Nature. To be a theory it must be consistent with proven theories. It is not. Thus it is not even a 'theory'. It is a supposition that contradicts the real-world.

My summary is on pages 35 to 37 of '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*'.
<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/dead%20elephants.pdf>

Based on my reading and on communication with many real-world scientists, lets explore the UN IPCC's supposed 'theory':

The supposed 'theory' is based on assumptions rooted in the 1800's. The assumptions contradict reality. These assumptions include: Earth is a flat disc; it does not spin on its axis and instead all parts continually receive sunlight (no night-day); the '*theoretical Earth*' is something that cannot be found in Nature—a reflecting blackbody, a contradiction in terms; sunlight has equal strength all over the planet; a planet's irradiance can be divided by four to determine the planet's average temperature while ignoring specific heat, conductive transfer, rotation period. This means the model is a constant temperature model.

The last time I checked: Earth is approximately spherical, not flat; Earth rotates; at any moment only half the Earth is in sunlight—we have sunshine during the day and no sunshine at night; Earth's temperature varies; amount of sunlight reaching Earth varies with latitude.

There are other differences between reality and the greenhouse gas model. These include the reality that radiance and temperature don't operate 1 to 1 together but on the basis of a 4th power law.

The greenhouse model contradicts Earth's reality. It can not accommodate the reality that atmospheric heat increases with pressure. This applies on all planets with or without CO2 in their atmosphere.

It causes actual atmospheric temperature to rise above the theoretical, predicted temperature as calculated by the '*theory*'. This reality of an actual temperature greater than that calculated using the assumptions applies to all planets.

The concocted 'greenhouse gas' is a fabrication attempting to explain the difference between Earth's theoretical, calculated temperature and its actual temperature. It supposedly becomes a '*theory*' when the huge and expected difference is claimed to be 'explained' by the presence of trace gases that are opaque to infra-red radiation.

This explanation begins by citing the infra-red opacity of glass even though spectral selectivity has been proven to have nothing to do with heat gain in a glass enclosure. (physicist, RW Wood, 1909, as above).

Theorists ignore conduction and convection in the swirling reality of Earth's atmosphere. Yet, unbelievably, they persist in claiming the swirling atmosphere will do what even a solid, glass filter (more opaque to infra-red) does NOT.

Then they use a '*thought experiment*' depicting a '*theoretical*' blackbody layer hovering over a heated surface while they simultaneously mimic and discredit a glass greenhouse. After being warmed by the warmer Earth's surface this layer supposedly radiates back to Earth the energy it acquired from Earth's surface. This fantasy supposedly doubles the amount of radiation involved and contradicts the laws of thermodynamics and real-world empirical testing. After further adjustments to this mental model, multiple layers back-radiate more than 100% of the surface energy.

Using this mental model, the multiplying of energy by the 'greenhouse gas' 'explains' Earth being warmer than theoretically calculated without the magical energy multiplication. Advocates then rest their case and advise taxing energy users to save the world. Not the blackbody disc used to calculate theoretical temperatures, the real world.

The calculations are based on nonsensical fantasy to justify taxing the real world.

At its core, the term 'greenhouse gas' is an attempt to explain the reality that actual temperatures are higher than those calculated using the 'theory' based on false assumptions that contradict Nature's reality.

Quoting from '*Slaying the Sky Dragon*' referring to the blackbody calculations used to estimate Earth's theoretical temperature: "A blackbody calculation is merely guesswork that an actual body is under no obligation to obey".

Again, Nature wins.

The '*theory*' that the advocate-professors promote is baseless—from its introductory assumptions to its desperately stupid proof.

The '*theory*' they promote fails to meet the test of being a theory. To be credible, a theory must be consistent with laws already proven. The UN IPCC's '*theory*' supported and promoted by the advocate-professors is not consistent. It contradicts proven laws.

There are many other invalid assumptions. The above though explain the reason why Earth's actual temperature is higher than as '*theoretically*' calculated. The difference is not due to 'greenhouse gases', the difference is due to flawed assumptions in the '*theoretical*' calculations.

This error underestimates Earth's temperature and blames the difference on '*greenhouse gases*' instead of on ridiculous assumptions.

The greenhouse gas effect is a nonsense that contradicts the Laws of Nature and real world observation. It is a fabrication based on theories from the mid-1800's using false assumptions.

If we were still in the mid-1800's the error would be understandable. Since then science has progressed. The assumptions were long ago disproven.

Yet on these old assumptions the UN IPCC bases its case.

The erroneous '*theory*' has been revived by the UN IPCC. It's now due to an unscientific fabrication labelled as a scientific '*theory*' to promote a flawed political ideology.

A pity it's merely fantasy. If this fantasy were real we could generate infinite energy to end all our energy needs forever, for free—theoretically.

Initially I believed in the greenhouse warming '*theory*'. When the evidence was put before me that I was wrong though, I had no option but to change my mind.

(10.3) An astronomer's view

Here's an evaluation of the greenhouse gas supposition by astronomer Gregg Thompson who investigated the supposition through wide reading and in discussions with scientists internationally. Using layman's words, he writes:

• CO₂ can absorb heat a little faster than nitrogen and oxygen but it becomes no hotter because it cannot absorb anymore heat than there is available from the Sun to the other gases. Gas molecules are constantly colliding with one another so CO₂ almost instantly shares any excess heat with nitrogen and oxygen. That's why the air is all one temperature in any limited open volume. The greenhouse effect violates the well proven laws of thermodynamics. Physics experiments long ago proved the greenhouse effect to be a myth. See http://wapedia.mobi/en/Joseph_Fourier:

•The following facts show that CO₂ produces no measurable heating of the atmosphere – even with extremely high concentrations.

1. The planets Venus and Mars have atmospheres that are almost entirely CO₂ (97%) yet they have no 'runaway' greenhouse heating effect. Their temperatures are stable. CO₂

*has no effect because Mars is bitterly cold. Venus' atmosphere is hotter than Earth's almost entirely because it is 92 times more dense, its sulphuric acid clouds are nearly totally black and absorb far more ultraviolet light from the sun. And it is 40 million kilometres closer to the Sun. (Venus' atmospheric temperature is due mainly to its density and opacity. Yet Venus' atmospheric temperature is as stable as Earth's. **Like Earth its atmospheric temperature changes very slightly with changes in the sun's activity from solar minimum to maximum. Similarly, the very much cooler Martian atmosphere varies according to solar activity.**) See <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/05/08/venus-envy/>*

2. Glasshouses with high levels of CO2 (to make plants grow faster) have levels 300% or more higher than the air does yet they heat up no more during the day than glasshouses with air. This is also true for bottles of pure CO2 compared to those containing air.

3. The geological record over hundreds of millions of years has shown that when CO2 levels were tens to hundreds of times higher, this has had no affect whatsoever on climate. At such times, when there were ice ages!

4. In recent times when Earth was considerably warmer during the Roman Warming and the Medieval Warming, these much higher temperatures were totally natural because there was no industrialisation back then. (End of quote)

If supposed CO2 'greenhouse warming' is taken to its ultimate extreme as on both Venus & Mars then we would see an extreme example of its perceived warming effect. Yet astronomers do not see that. So if it doesn't happen on these worlds, how could it possibly happen on Earth? That is a classic proof that it does not exist.

The behaviour of Venusian and Martian atmospheres confirms the sun as the primary driver of temperature.

(10.4) The UN IPCC admits low and very low levels of understanding of supposed warming factors

Are the advocate-professors aware that in Table 2.11 of its 2007 report, the UN IPCC lists 16 factors affecting radiative forcing (CO2 forcing)? These supposedly drive the UN IPCC's supposed greenhouse gas effect. Of these 16 factors incorporated into its models, do the advocate-professors not know that only one factor is claimed to have a high level of understanding? That single factor is the greenhouse gas effect demolished above.

Two factors are given moderate levels of understanding.

Do the advocate-professors know that the remaining 13 factors are admitted by the UN IPCC to have low or very low levels of understanding? Thus, UN IPCC models and claims are based on a fantasy and this low level of understanding.

This is the unfounded sole basis for its core claim.

<http://www.staff.ncl.ac.uk/david.harvey/AES829/McKitrick2007.pdf>

Is it any wonder these models remain unvalidated and erroneous?

The UN IPCC relies purely on falsities and erroneous unvalidated computer models using factors low in understanding and supposedly 'justified' by 1800's formulae using assumptions that contradict reality. Why?

(11) Responses to Professor Matthew England's e-mails

Professor England's e-mail (below) was in response to my request for specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence of his claim that human production of CO₂ caused global warming.

(See 'E-mail reply to Professor England' at www.conscious.com.au)

Professor England's e-mail does not provide any real-world evidence of human warming. It illustrates his complete failure to provide evidence of human causation. It illustrates what I conclude to be his lack of understanding of science and causality.

It raises serious questions of this advocate-professor. His appointment to the government's Climate Commission Science Advisory Panel, raises serious questions about the government.

Below, Professor England's e-mail text is underlined. His lines are interspersed by my responses to him in italics within his e-mail text. Combined, it formed my response to him:

On 10/02/2011, at 7:44 AM, Matthew England wrote:

Dear Malcolm,

Thanks for your interest in climate science. You asked for specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO₂ caused global warming.

The link between CO₂ concentrations and warming has been measured directly by something called a "satellite interferometer" – reported in a paper by Harries et al., Nature, "Increases in greenhouse forcing inferred from the outgoing long-wave radiation spectra of the Earth in 1970 and 1997", Nature 410:355, 2001.

I bought and read the paper by Harries et al you recommend.

Matthew, since human vs natural CO₂ emissions constitute 3% and 97% respectively, how much of the annual CO₂ increase do you attribute to humans alone?

The authors provide no real-world measured evidence of the impact of human CO₂. Yet you imply their paper provides real-world evidence that human production of CO₂ caused global warming. Why?

Matthew, would you please be so kind as to advise specifically where it is in the paper you referenced that the authors provide specific real-world evidence showing human CO₂ caused global warming?

The title says 'inferred', not definite real-world.

The paper's opening paragraph is false. Atmospheric temperatures contradict their claim. Evidence of corruption of ground-based temperatures presented previously renders their claim as unfounded.

The authors rely on satellites for measuring radiation spectra yet avoid reliable satellite temperature data in preference to corrupted ground-based data. Why?

The authors use two (2) data points to infer a trend over almost three decades in a highly complex and dynamic atmosphere. Their work seems to be based on questionable assumptions. They lightly dismiss significant real-world climate factors. Why?

The authors base their inference on comparison with output from models and simulations. Are these like the other models known to be based on low levels of understanding of climate drivers?

The authors invoke the greenhouse 'theory' that is nonsense.

You fell for this. Significantly, you are a Co-Director of the UNSW CCRC and present yourself publicly as a climate expert. Yet you put forward this paper as real-world evidence. Why and on what basis?

These direct satellite measurements have shown that human emissions of CO₂ have increased radiative forcing of the earth – via their well-known heat trapping capacity () - by 1.6 Watts per meter squared. (* I say well-known here as John Tyndall first worked on this in the UK in the 1850's.)*

Please provide specific real-world evidence that human production of CO₂ increased radiative forcing.

In the laboratory, CO₂ contained within a bottle seem to 'trap' heat. (Very loose use of the word 'trap'). As explained above, in the real-world's open atmosphere it cannot 'trap' heat.

Regarding your alleged 1.6 W/m² disparity: with constantly changing surface and cloud reflectance, atmospheric light scattering and absorption, measured over the whole planet in a one year period (and not to mention the anomalously quiet sun recently) — how is it that a mere 1.6 W/m² variance can be winnowed out of an approximate 342 W/m² total? $1.6 \div 342 = 0.004678$ or 0.47%. Do you actually claim, then, that we are now able to pin down the entire energy budget to ½%? Isn't it widely agreed that the Earth's average temperature requires about 390 W/m² of combined solar and supposed greenhouse forcing:

390.11 W/m² = 288.000 Kelvin

So add 1.6 W/m² to this:

391.71 = 288.295

That's a 0.295° difference. Are you claiming that our global network of thermometers is able to discern this fraction of a degree?

References above by Nova, D'Aleo, Watts and McKittrick and the summaries and further references provided in 'Thriving with Nature & Humanity' provide context.

Based on your e-mail responses, you will likely benefit from discussing your claim with Joseph D'Aleo or Ross McKittrick, experts in analysing the corrupted temperature databases used by the UN IPCC.

One Watt = one Joule per second. That is, $1.6 * 86400$ (seconds in a day) * 365 (days in a year) * 30 (years in a climatologically significant period) Joules per m² per 30 years. So that's $1.6 * 86400 * 365 * 30 = 1,513,728,000$ Joules of extra energy per meter squared - for every square meter on the Earth's land and ocean. (By the way, this is equivalent to every person on the planet holding 29 hairdryers running 24/7 and every year we are handing them an extra hairdryer).

Conservation of energy is a fundamental law of physics. It means that this extra energy trapped has got to translate into extra heat (warmth) in the system. E.g., via melted ice, warmer oceans, warmer air etc. If not we would have to ask the question, where did this extra 1,513,728,000 J per m² for each m² of the Earth go? It turns out that much of this trapped heat is in the oceans, a smaller amount in the atmosphere and melted ice. We are lucky to live on a planet that is dominantly ocean-covered, as it is far more energetic to heat a m³ of water than it is to heat a m³ of air.

Matthew, regarding your question—"If not we would have to ask the question, where did this extra 1,513,728,000 J per m² for each m² of the Earth go?"

Exactly! In the face of declining ocean temperatures, that's the very question Trenberth was asking in the Climategate emails: Where did the supposed heat go?

Could it be that Nature's real-world is exposing your assumptions and the UN IPCC's assumptions as not valid?

The answer is provided above and below and in reading 'Slaying the Sky Dragon': yes, definitely.

In summary, we know the 1.6 Watts per m² from direct satellite measurements. We know conservation of energy is right - a basic law of physics. We know the amount of energy trapped by GHG's to date, and we can account for this extra heat via temperature changes in the ocean, atmosphere, and melted ice. The amount of warming that has occurred – adding up the changes seen on land, ocean, air and ice - is completely consistent with the amount of energy calculated to have been produced by GHG's.

I hope this explanation helps. I am happy for you to forward my response to any individuals that you originally cc'ed in your communication to us.

This is being copied to the same address list as was my original e-mail, Matthew.

Sincerely, Matthew England

Professor Matthew England

Climate Change Research Centre (CCRC)
Faculty of Science
The University of New South Wales
UNSW SYDNEY NSW 2052
Australia

Telephone: +61-2-9385-7065
Facsimile: +61-2-9385-8969
E-mail: M.England@unsw.edu.au
Web: <http://web.science.unsw.edu.au/~matthew>
Copenhagen Diagnosis: www.copenhagendiagnosis.org
CCRC Web: www.ccrcc.unsw.edu.au

Secondly, On 10/02/2011, at 7:57 AM, Matthew England wrote:

Malcolm, the attached is also a worthwhile read. I hope this helps. Matthew

My reply to Matthew was as follows:

To which of my questions were you responding by attaching Pierrehumbert's article? You have again failed to provide any specific real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused Earth's latest period of modest, cyclic global warming.

Matthew, would you please be so kind as to advise specifically where in Pierrehumbert's article you think he provides the specific real-world evidence showing that human CO2 caused global warming? (*see below)

Pierrehumbert is from the University of Chicago. I'm a graduate of, and recipient of awards from, the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business. My respect for UChicago developed first hand.

Yet I trust first in Nature not in Pierrehumbert's theoretical discussion of a supposition heavily infected and driven by political agenda. Why do you trust a supposition born in the 1800's and since proven false?

Are you aware of Lindzen and Choi's 2009 analysis of satellite measurements of real-world radiative flux? They're the opposite to that assumed by the UN IPCC. Lindzen and Choi measured climate sensitivity directly using satellites to observe outgoing radiation. The models all react the wrong way.

'On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data' by Lindzen and Choi, 2009
<http://www.drroyspencer.com/Lindzen-and-Choi-GRL-2009.pdf>

Please refer to section 8 above and pages 5-83 of 'Slaying the Sky Dragon' by an international team of scientists.

The article you provided by Pierrehumbert ignores the most basic evidence that totally contradicts his assumptions. His closing paragraph sums up his apparent naivety.

He relies on laboratory measurements of CO2 contained in sealed containers. He extends that to the real-world's open atmosphere without mentioning heat energy affected by powerful dynamic factors and natural phenomena such as conduction and convection.

It's public knowledge that models fail to incorporate the enormous effect of clouds. Which everybody feels whenever a cloud passes overhead. That's what happens in the real-world.

Matthew, why do you think that a theoretical paper relying on assumptions contradicting Nature and the real-world is real-world evidence? Are you serious?

Pierrehumbert seems to use many UN IPCC tricks including: appealing to authority; translating models out of context; not specifying basic assumptions that violate Earth's real-world reality; and, contradicting Nature's real-world reality.

Along the way he contradicts the laws of physics and facts in astronomy.

He singly raises the relative power of the supposed greenhouse gas effect more than eleven fold compared with claims by others who believe in the greenhouse gas supposition.

The result is that his complexities and assumptions amount to laughter as he tries to prove that Nature's empirical, physical and logical reality are impossible. Yet we witness Nature daily. Nature wins by showing us what is really happening on this planet outside his models and 'theory'.

His 'theory' fails to explain Nature. It contradicts Nature. I conclude it is scientifically invalid.

You claim to be a scientist. Yet in answer to my request for real-world evidence you send me a paper that relies on a 'theory' based on assumptions that conflict with the real world and that contradicts scientific evidence.

Real science attempts to explain Nature for people's benefit. You contradict Nature to people's detriment. I conclude you are a pseudo-scientist.

Matthew, are you trying the UN IPCC trick of appealing to authority? Nature in the real-world is a far greater authority.

You present yourself as a climate expert when you are clearly not. Then attach silliness cloaked in scientific terms yet not scientific.

Overwhelmingly and with few exceptions, politicians and journalists lack the time, skills and knowledge to challenge such material. They defer to your supposed 'expert' status.

(One exception is federal MP Dennis Jensen, parliament's only physicist. His understanding of science combines with his integrity to courageously speak out against the myth of human global warming. He values scientific integrity.)

Your response is valuable in emphasising that many politicians, journalists and lay-people have been misled and seemingly exploited by people such as yourself. Yet you have no evidence for your bold, unfounded and frightening statements.

All the more reason for you, Matthew, to investigate the real-world science.

Professor England has acknowledged my response. He has since repeatedly failed to address my points, answer my questions or justify his claims.

Thrice since receiving his e-mail, I requested Professor England to identify the specific real-world evidence of human causation that he implies is in the articles he referenced/ provided. All three of his subsequent responses failed to even acknowledge my request. One is a theoretical article and the other cannot separate CO2 produced by humans. Why did Professor England imply the articles provided real-world evidence when both do not?

(12) Sea levels, Storms, Diseases—more dead ends for advocates of human causation

What about the claimed consequences of supposed global warming?

(13) Sea levels are stable

Professor Hoegh-Guldberg is a marine biologist. Yet he promotes himself in the media as an expert on climate and advises the Queensland parliament. His October 29, 2010 interview on ABC-TV's 'Lateline' program produced a transcript. My challenges to his comments are presented with the ABC-TV transcript at:

(*Professor Hoegh-Guldberg (transcript)* at www.conscious.com.au)

Queensland state government Maritime Safety Queensland (MSQ) data reveals that during the last 15 years Australian sea levels have risen by a "very low" 0.3 mm annually. This is less than one-fifth (20%) the supposed international average annual rate (1.6-1.8mm pa) stable over the last century.

Refer to "Sea Level Rise" at: http://www.icsm.gov.au/SP9/links/msq_tidalreferenceframe.html

Relative sea levels, as measured on land, depend on vertical land movements (rise/fall) as well as sea levels.

In contrast to unfounded alarm about Pacific Island sea levels as fomented by some media and academics, please note that science shows sea level is stable.

<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/southpacific.pdf>

<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/08/south-pacific-sea-levels-no-rise-since-1993/>

Using the MSQ's data, sea levels over 100 years will rise by 3.0 centimetres—a little over an inch.

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 average annual rate for the last century. Please refer to page 16-19 of '*Nature, not Human Activity Rules the Climate*',

a reader-friendly scientific document produced by internationally eminent climatologists, environmentalists, physicists and scientists across many scientific disciplines: http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

Yet the wild and unfounded claims commonly spread by government politicians and the media are based on unvalidated computer models contradicting reality.

People's lives depend on MSQ data. Tampering could lead to deaths and lawsuits. Media reports based on unvalidated models such as those spread by the government's Department of Climate Change though have no accountability. **Assumptions are usually not divulged and on examination found to be spurious. That explains huge divergences between unvalidated alarmist models and real world real science.**

Professor Karoly joined Professor Matthew England in an interview with ABC-TV's Margot O'Neill broadcast on February 9th, 2011. Professor England stated, quote: "MATTHEW ENGLAND: And if it wasn't happening, why are the glaciers melting as well? I mean, there's no glacier on the planet, I don't think, that hasn't melted significantly over the last century. Why would they be doing that if warming wasn't occurring?"
<http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2011/s3134677.htm>

During January 2010 the UN IPCC was exposed for its overtly politicised presentation of Himalayan glaciers and water. The UN IPCC Lead Author confessed to using a recycled report from WWF activists to politicise water issues.

Indian experts in Himalayan glaciers later stated some of those glaciers are advancing, some are retreating and some appear to be stationery? The same applies to other glaciers around the world.

Even India's glacier scientists don't know how many glaciers are in the Himalayas. They're honest enough to admit they don't know ...

'*The Deniers*' provides experts' explanations about sea level rises and falls during Earth's recent history. They explain glacier movement triggers.

For Himalayan glacier scandal, see '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*', pages 8 to 11. For explanation of glacier movement triggers and sea levels please refer to various pages within '*The Deniers*'—especially comments about Rhodes Fairbridge's determinants of sea level, pages 172 to 175.

During the interview, advocate-professors Karoly, England and Pitman make unfounded comments misrepresenting real-world science and climate.

Please refer to the Bureau of Meteorology report referenced above to see further apparent contradictions.

When some glaciers are retreating, others are stationery and others are advancing, how can movements be attributed to human CO2? They cannot.

After recognising Professor England's falsity in stating all glaciers are retreating, we return to cause-and-effect. Even if all glaciers were retreating, how can it be attributed to human CO2 when there are hundreds of interacting factors affecting climate and glaciers? Do

Professors Karoly and Pitman not understand cause-and-effect? If they do, why did neither challenge Professor England's unscientific comment?

I conclude that many statements in the broadcast were not those of true scientists—they're not scientific. The false statements are pseudo-science.

Why are these advocate-professors fomenting fear using falsities in an area in which they apparently lack expertise?

By the way, ex-Prime Minister Kevin Rudd who fabricated and rode climate alarm to election victory and Greg Combet, current Minister for Climate Change reportedly bought beach-front and ocean-front properties respectively. Despite their own dire warnings of sea level rises. The claim of global warming being caused by human production of CO2 is an entirely political issue with no foundation in science. Why are advocate-professors involved in such a blatantly political issue that misrepresents science, climate and Nature?

http://blogs.news.com.au/couriermail/andrewbolt/index.php/couriermail/comments/warmist_rudd_doesnt_fear_sea_level_rises_after_all/

(14) Disease incidence and severity are not rising

Contrary to those fomenting unfounded climate alarm, the incidence and severity of insect-borne diseases are not rising. The incidence and severity of other diseases blamed on 'global warming' are not rising.

Read the conclusions of internationally eminent Professor Paul Reiter, head of the Insects and Infectious Diseases Unit at the acclaimed Pasteur Institute on pages 183 to 190 of Solomon's book *'The Deniers'*. There is no rise in disease frequency or severity. Paul Reiter exposes alarming falsities and contraventions of science by the UN IPCC. He was a member of the UN IPCC until he resigned in disgust because of its unscientific practices. Refer to *'The Deniers'*, *'Air Con'*, *NIPCC (2008)*, *'Thriving with Nature & Humanity'* all listed previously.

(15) Natural weather events are not increasing in frequency or severity

The frequency and severity of natural weather events such as floods, cyclones/hurricanes, tornados, droughts, fires and storms are not increasing. This is well known. What has changed is that the media now describe such natural events as *'extreme weather events'* instead of by commonly accepted terms.

Refer to *'The Deniers'*, *'Air Con'*, *NIPCC (2008)*, *'Thriving with Nature & Humanity'* all listed previously.

Advocate-professor Karoly misrepresents weather data in an interview broadcast by ABC-TV on January 13th, 2011 during Queensland's tragic, natural floods.
(*'E-mail to Professor Karoly'* at www.comscious.com.au)

Real-world data exposes his explicit and implicit claims as false. He has been invited to provide real-world evidence proving his claim. He has failed to do so.

Lets analyse his chain of falsities starting with his 2003 claims and implied claims. eg, January 14th, 2003 statement about droughts, quote: "*This is the first drought in Australia where the impact of human-induced global warming can be clearly observed.*"
http://qualenergia.it/UserFiles/Files/CI_IC_EE_03_Global_Warming_2003.pdf
(From "*Global warming contributes to Australia's worst drought*", a document co-authored by Professor Karoly and published by the activist group WWF.)

In making his statement, **was he not aware that Australia has had drier periods in our nation's recent past?**

http://www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/climate/change/timeseries.cgi?graph=rain&area=aus&season=0112&ave_yr=0

Focussing on Eastern Australia:

http://www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/climate/change/timeseries.cgi?graph=rain&area=eaus&season=0112&ave_yr=0

He has been asked to please explain where the impact of human-induced global warming can be "clearly observed" in our recent drought? And to explain how it differs from previous droughts and especially from the 1901 Federation Drought that was far harsher? He has failed to explain either.

His WWF document provides no proof. From that document I conclude that he fails to understand scientific causality.

Is he not aware that some past droughts had relatively greater impact on our nation because Australia was then more reliant on the rural sector? Does his statement allow for inflation and for relative sizes of Australia's past and current economies? Did he knowingly make statements out of context?

Is he really implying that 50 years is a representative period? As a meteorologist he has easy access to 110 years of data since federation. Why did he choose a period of only 50 years?

Even for that short period of 50 years, by glancing at the Bureau of Meteorology's graph it seems his statement is false. Why did he state this falsity?

From his statements, I conclude that a journalist, Andrew Bolt, has sounder understanding of Australia's droughts and floods than does advocate-professor Karoly.

http://blogs.news.com.au/couriermail/andrewbolt/index.php/couriermail/comments/karolys_global_warming_wetter_drier_worse_better_whatever/

Of greater importance than one's profession are one's reliance—or otherwise—on facts and one's intent. Mr Bolt's intent is clearly focussed on understanding the truth by relying of facts. Professor Karoly's claims though contradict the facts—repeatedly.

Droughts are broken by ... rain. Australia's history shows repeatedly that it is common for droughts to be broken by floods.

In the past 170 years Brisbane has experienced six floods that reached levels higher than did our city's latest flood. During the same period the Bremer River flowing

beside Ipswich and into the Brisbane River has had many, many floods. Check for yourself: http://www.bom.gov.au/hydro/flood/qld/fld_history/brisbane_history.shtml

From the Bureau of Meteorology graph, please note the relatively higher frequency of floods in the Brisbane River during the period 1840 to 1900 and the relatively high frequency of Bremer River floods during the period 1945 to 1990. Both rivers experienced a relatively high frequency of major floods in the period 1885-1900.

Referring to his comments broadcast by ABC-TV, did he miss this data from the Bureau of Meteorology? Or did he ignore it?

I conclude from the data that his statements about floods cannot be trusted. It seems his statements tell us little about floods yet reveal much about him. ie, the data reveal he is publicly and expressly and/or implicitly spreading falsities.

From an Australian Bureau of Meteorology report into the 1974 Brisbane floods, quote: *"However, four floods well in excess of the 1974 levels have occurred in the past 133 years and, according to the Professor of Economic Geology at the University of Queensland (Professor Sergent), there is geological evidence of water levels 5.5 m higher than the 1974 flood in the Indooroopilly area of Brisbane. Meteorological studies suggest that rainfalls well in excess of those recorded in the floods of 1893 and 1974 are possible."*

(http://www.bom.gov.au/hydro/flood/qld/fld_reports/brisbane_jan1974.pdf)

At the top of page 15, the Bureau forecast future events similar to those of the past.

As an aside, does advocate-professor Karoly know what else occurred in the year when the Bureau made its forecast of future floods continuing as normal? 1974 is the year that the media and some academics now supporting the UN IPCC's claims of warming were inciting unfounded alarm about supposed forecast imminent, irreversible, catastrophic global freezing blamed on human use of coal and oil.

Nature brushes aside academics fomenting unfounded global catastrophe. Nature controls global climate and her ways are revealed by real-world data.

Sadly, when water at natural flood levels enters a natural flood plain, any dwellings built in the flood plain are ... flooded. Naturally.

Based on the real-world data, it's clear that Brisbane's recent floods were entirely normal and natural. He has been requested, if he disagrees, to please provide real-world evidence. He has failed to do so.

He seems to be in apparent ignorance of the fact that in the real-world, droughts are often broken by floods. He was reported by Associate Professor Stewart Franks thus: "Professor Karoly stressed individual events could not be attributed to climate change. But the wild extremes being experienced by the continent were in keeping with scientists' forecasts of more flooding associated with increased heavy rain and more droughts as a result of high temperatures and more evaporation."

Associate Professor Stewart Franks is a scientifically published expert on El Nino and La Nina. He says advocate-professor Karoly's statement and what it implies in the context in which Karoly made it about flooding being evidence of human induced global warming are

typical of, quote: "a common confusion made by those who have not studied the interaction of the land surface hydrology and atmosphere, as Prof. Karoly has not."

Given that an expert on the topic reveals Professor Karoly is not an expert, why did he make any statement at all? Given that he chose to speak, why did he broadcast a controversial and unfounded statement fomenting alarm? Why did he contradict the real-world data?

Professor England's comment about Victoria's recent tragic fires defies history and fact. More severe fires reportedly occurred in Victoria in the late nineteenth century (1800's) under weather conditions similar to those during Victoria's recent fires. Why?

(16) Where is the advocate-professors' real-world scientific evidence that warming is harmful?

No one has evidence showing warming is harmful. There is much contemporary scientific knowledge and history (human and geological) showing warming and higher CO2 levels are blessings.

Science and history show colder periods are dangerous. It's well known that humanity has reason to fear cold periods because disease increases and productivity decreases.

It's well known that Earth's past warm periods are highly beneficial to humanity, plants and animals.

Where is the advocate-professor's evidence that warming is harmful? Where is their evidence that warming is not beneficial?

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

(17) It's not CO2, so what does drive climate?

Contrary to the advocate-professors' oft-repeated claim, CO2 cannot possibly be driving Earth's global average temperature.

I previously showed that cyclic temperature variation has been grossly exaggerated and misrepresented. Nonetheless, what does cause Earth's temperature to vary?

Page 24 of '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*' summarises the main drivers of climate and global temperature. Science shows six likely dominate. Two have been proven strongest:

- El Nino, SOI (Southern Oscillation Index)
- solar.

'*Influence of the Southern Oscillation on tropospheric temperature*'

http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/McLean_deFreitas_Carter_JGR_2009.pdf

'*US Temperatures and Climate Factors since 1895*'

http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US_Temperatures_and_Climate_Factors_since_1895.pdf

'*The SOI still rules*'

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/the-soi-still-rules/>

The UN IPCC downplays proven effects of El Nino (SOI) and solar. Why?

Dr Vincent Gray explains the UN IPCC's unfounded and unscientific neglect of El Nino and solar factors. www.conscious.com.au

Are the advocate-professors aware that each hour our sun reportedly delivers more energy to Earth than does all human industrial, transport and other activity in one year. Have they any idea how significant heat differences and transfers are to Earth's weather and climate?

Ultimately, weather and climate are driven by temperature differences and heat energy. That is basic.

Atmospheric CO2 levels are driven by, among other factors, heat energy. Yet advocate-professors claim, without evidence, that human CO2 drives climate. That is impossible as real science shows. Aply supported by logic.

Advocate-professors seem to be stumbling around, lost in unvalidated computer models repeatedly proven wrong. They're clutching at a bastardised supposition masked wrongly as 'theory' and peddled by a fraudulent organisation running to its political agenda.

Although I have not met Professor Stewart Franks (University of Newcastle), I suggest the advocate-professors contact him. He is published in the scientific literature. He understands climate/weather cycles and reportedly publicly predicted floods when La Nina broke.

We have arrived at the conclusion. There is no scientific or moral justification in the advocate-professors' core claim. Science is confident it knows the major drivers of real-world climate and temperature. Science knows CO2 is not a driver of temperature.

(18) The advocate-professors' unscientific falsities are red-herrings risking people's lives and security

Professor Stewart Franks provided warnings of the natural, cyclic El Nino change that led to Queensland's recent floods. Yet, contradicting Nature and science, some advocate-professors in academia blame human CO2. They exploit the media fomenting unfounded fear and guilt while riding the government grants gravy train.

Have the advocate-professors considered that when scientists and politicians are lost chasing a harmless natural trace gas they are diverting science from real-world climate studies? In this way they're preventing improved understanding of natural weather events and climate. They're putting lives at needless, avoidable risk.

Professor Franks and other real-world experts warned about El Nino. Neglecting such warnings is dangerous, life-threatening and costly. I conclude that by contradicting such

experts, the advocate-professors misdirect our politicians onto Nature's harmless, essential trace gas (CO₂). I conclude their action is irresponsible—and damaging.

Professor Andy Pitman stated in his article in The Australian newspaper that, quote: “... we know with certainty that continued emissions of carbon dioxide will lead to warming, rising sea levels and ocean acidification at unprecedented rates, and that these changes will trigger expenses and outcomes that dwarf the costs of actually solving the problem.”

In response to my request for specific real-world scientific evidence for his huge claim, he failed to provide any evidence and fled from my question. Check for yourself his behaviour in his own words provided under ‘Professor Andy Pitman’ at www.conscious.com.au

Do his e-mail responses show responsible behaviour? Why is he publicly claiming “certainty” yet fleeing from accountability?

Why did the reputable newspaper ‘The Australian’ fail to check his claim? When arguably Australia’s best newspaper is hijacked in this way to spread propaganda contradicting science and Nature, it’s clear the media is now a conduit for climate propaganda and the fomenting of fear constantly bombarding our kids and communities.

I conclude that the advocate-professors’ unfounded claim about human CO₂ is at the core of climate alarm. It is a threat to science, lives and livelihoods—ours and our children's.

(19) Conclusion

The advocate-professors’ core claim is that human production of CO₂ determines temperature. Yet their claim has no empirical (observational), theoretical, physical or logical basis.

Based on systematic UN IPCC fraud and misrepresentation of science it has no ethical or moral basis.

What does it have? It is driven by a political agenda along an outdated and ill-conceived ideology that contradicts human nature and the real-world. An ideology rooted in grabbing control by eroding people's freedom through control of finances, energy, water, food and even the air we exhale.

Energy is fundamental to modern civilisation, our standard of living and minimising our cost of living. Those who control energy control society—and people.

Page 40 of ‘Thriving with Nature & Humanity’ lists unfounded **climate alarm's bandwagon of beneficiaries.**

Now we have arrived at the core. This is what drives the core claim supported by the advocate-professors. Can they specifically refute this with real-world data as evidence?

(20) The advocate-professors' unfounded claims and responses damage others and the environment

Are they not aware of the science and facts about Nature? If so, why?

Please refer to '*The Eco Fraud: Part 2, The Environmental Casualties*' available at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%202.pdf

and to page 31 of '*Thriving with Nature & Energy*'.

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

This explains why the advocate-professors' public recommendations to increase prices of fuels containing carbon are detrimental to the environment. Do they not understand these basics? Or do they not care?

Please refer to '*The Eco Fraud: Part 3, Black Deaths in Green Custody*' available at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%203.pdf

This explains why the advocate-professor's public recommendations supporting the UN IPCC hurts humanity. Do they care about people?

The advocate-professors seem oblivious to the crucial role of low cost energy in protecting the environment, reducing birth rates and improving human life. Yet without real-world evidence it seems they want to reverse the amazing environmental improvements of developed nations in the last 40 years and the improvements of Eastern European nations since 1989's fall of the Berlin Wall. Why?

Meanwhile, the real-world market is working. Overseas, subsidy-riddled alternative energy policies are being dumped. Pseudo-markets for CO2 trading imposed by governments are collapsing in Europe and America. The Chicago Climate Exchange, part-owned by one of Al Gore's companies, has ceased trading.

The Chinese use our coal to generate cheap energy to manufacture costly windmills. They sell these to us and other '*developed countries*' so we can generate unreliable, costly wind energy.

Distracting people from real science is detrimental to science, humanity, the environment and people's security?

(21) Why do the advocate-professors spread falsities?

It's sad, disappointing and of serious concern that they seem to not understand what's happening in the field they promote as their own—climate. It's of concern that they abandon the real world and empirical evidence to rely on unvalidated computer models producing erroneous simulations and projections while accepting UN fraud.

Yet they present themselves in the media and to the public as climate experts to advise citizens and politicians on life and death matters.

They have cultivated publicly prominent profiles spreading unfounded fear and guilt that mislead people and mis-direct resource allocation across society.

My education is as an engineer. That is the discipline of real-world implementation of scientific discoveries. I have been personally responsible in statutory, managerial and executive positions for people's health and safety. My practical, working knowledge of CO2 and other atmospheric gases was a vital part of fulfilling my responsibility for thousands of people's lives.

I earned a Masters degree from the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, one of the world's most rigorous business schools. I understand the importance of rigorous analysis. Advocate-professors need do some rigorous real-world analysis.

Despite my academic awards won during university studies, of greater value are my experience in many nations, on many continents. I cherish experience working in Nature with a huge diversity of people.

Driving every human's every behaviour are fundamental universal human needs. I wonder what needs are driving the advocate-professors' explicit and implied falsities and their apparent ignorance of real-world science?

Their personal interests in income from government grants reveal a potential conflict of interest. Do these cloud their objectivity and motives?

(22) Please provide real-world evidence

The advocate-professors have repeatedly failed to provide real-world scientific evidence of their core claim. Why?

I conclude that if the advocate-professors continue fomenting unfounded climate alarm they will be abetting UN fraud.

Malcolm Roberts
BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

www.conscious.com.au

180 Haven Road
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone:
Home 07 3374 3374
Mobile 04 1964 2379
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

Abound in the Oneness of Nature and Life

February 28, 2011