

Subject: Complaint of serious corruption of science by UQ's John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

From: Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
To: Høj Professor Peter <vc@uq.edu.au>
Cc: Cook John <j.cook3@uq.edu.au>, Hoegh-Guldberg Ove <oveh@uq.edu.au>, FORBES VIV <redacted>, Carter Bob <redacted>, Plimer Ian <redacted>, Jennifer Marohasy <redacted>

Date: 24 April 2015 12:06 pm AEST

Dear Professor Høj:

As an honours engineering graduate from the University of Queensland I am inquiring of you as to **the reasons our university supports the work of John Cook who serially misrepresents climate and science?** Specifically, why is our university wasting valuable funds to mislead the public through a free course and by producing associated international video material?

<http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/queensland/uq-offers-free-course-to-combat-climate-change-deniers-20150422-1mqtic.html>

Please refer to the lower half of page 4 of Appendix 5, here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

It details **John Cook's fabrication of an unscientific 'consensus'. Science is not decided by claims of consensus. Resorting to claims of consensus is unscientific and contradicts the scientific process.**

Fabricating false claims of scientific consensus is not honest.

Science is decided by empirical scientific evidence. John Cook has repeatedly failed to provide any such evidence that use of hydrocarbon fuels is causing the entirely natural climate variability we experience.

A succinct summary of John Cook's fabrication of a consensus, and of the corruption of science upon which his claims rely and that is furthered by his claims, and of the empirical scientific evidence he blatantly contradicts, are discussed in pages 6-18 of my report to federal MPs Senator Simon Birmingham and Bob Baldwin. It is available at this link: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/SBbboh.html>

My seven years of independent investigation have proven that there is no such empirical scientific evidence anywhere in the world. Climate alarm is unfounded and is a purely political construct pushing a political agenda. Please refer to Appendices 2, 6, 6a, 7 and 8 at this link: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

John Cook's core public climate claims are false and blatantly contradict empirical scientific evidence. Please refer to appendix 4 at the same link.

Further, John Cook and / or his employer are receiving funds in return for his deceiving the public, politicians and journalists and I'm wondering if that would make his work a serious offence.

As you likely know, John Cook works closely with the university's Ove Hoegh-Guldberg who reportedly has many serious conflicts of financial interest surrounding his false climate claims. These are discussed on pages 54-59 of Appendix 9 at this link: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> and briefly on pages 16 and 17 of my report to Senator Birmingham and Bob Baldwin MP.

I draw your attention to my formal complain dated Wednesday 10 November 2010 to

the university senate about the work of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg misrepresenting climate and science. **That was not independently investigated by then Vice Chancellor Paul Greenberg who was subsequently dismissed over another event, reportedly for a breach of ethics.** My formal complaint is discussed on pages 57 and 58 of Appendix 9 at this link: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's responses to my request for empirical scientific evidence of human causation of climate variability have repeatedly and always failed to provide such evidence.

This email is openly copied to both Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook and to reputable Australian scientists and academics expert on climate and to Viv Forbes an honours graduate in geology from our university. Viv Forbes understands the key facts on climate and on the corruption of climate science by beneficiaries of unfounded climate alarm perpetrated falsely by Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook.

Please stop John Cook's misrepresentations and restore scientific integrity to our university. I please request a meeting with you to discuss our university's role in deceiving the public and to discuss restoring scientific integrity. I would be pleased for that meeting to be in the company of John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg if that suits you.

Pages 19-26 of my report to Senator Birmingham and Bob Baldwin discuss the serious damage to our nation and to humanity and our natural environment worldwide as a result of unfounded climate alarm spread by our university's staff. I hope that you will fulfil your responsibility for investigating and ending such corruption. To neglect to do so will mean that you condone such damage and dishonesty. I seek confidence that you will restore the university's scientific integrity and look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Roberts

BE (Hons) UQ, MBA U Chicago, Member Beta Gamma Sigma Honours Society
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

180 Haven Road, Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone: 61 7 3374 3374
Mobile/Cell: 61 4 1964 2379

Subject: 2: Complaint of serious corruption of science by UQ's John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

From: Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>
To: Høj Professor Peter <vc@uq.edu.au>
Cc: Cook John <j.cook3@uq.edu.au>, Hoegh-Guldberg Ove <oveh@uq.edu.au>, FORBES VIV <redacted>, Carter Bob <redacted>, Plimer Ian <redacted>, Jennifer Marohasy <redacted>

Date: 25 April 2015 12:08 pm AEST

Dear Professor Høj:

Further to my complaint sent to you yesterday and provided below, please note that John Cook's paper on his fabricated consensus has been disproven by a peer-reviewed paper revealing major arithmetic errors in John Cook's work fabricating consensus. The peer-reviewed paper is discussed here: <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/03/cooks-97-consensus-disproven-by-a-new-paper-showing-major-math-errors/> and was written by internationally recognised climate scientists and by researchers into the UN IPCC's fraud that is at the core of John Cook's false climate claims.

The peer-reviewed work is the source of the data cited yesterday as being on the lower half of page 4 of Appendix 5,
here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

As stated yesterday, I seek confidence that you will restore the university's scientific integrity and look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Roberts
BE (Hons) UQ, MBA U Chicago, Member Beta Gamma Sigma Honours Society
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

180 Haven Road, Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone: 61 7 3374 3374
Mobile/Cell: 61 4 1964 2379

Subject: D15/7927: Complaint of serious corruption of science by UQ's John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

From: UQ VC OFFICE uqvc@uq.edu.au

To: Roberts Malcolm

Cc: Cook John, Hoegh-Guldberg, Ove FORBES VIV, Carter Bob, Plimer Ian Prof, Jennifer Marohasy, John Zornig (UQ)

Date: 11 May 2015 3:56 pm

Dear Mr Roberts,

Thank you for your correspondence on 24th April, 2015 in relation to the UQx course, Denial101x.

The University of Queensland has thoroughly reviewed all components of the research undertaken by John Cook and research subsequently presented in the peer-reviewed publication 'Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature' (Cook et al 2013 Environmental Research Letters 8 024024). The University is satisfied that the research is sound and may be relied upon for the purposes of proper academic discourse. The University has been in communication with the Publisher and Editor of Environmental Research Letters who have stated that they are completely satisfied with the University's review of the study and will not consider retracting the paper.

UQ has also thoroughly investigated your claims of misconduct, lack of integrity, conflicts of interest and other matters in relation to Mr Cook and Professor Hoegh-Guldberg, and have found them to be baseless.

Further, as with all UQx courses, Denial101x was subject to a rigorous review process. The Denial101x review panel comprised professorial staff with a range of relevant disciplinary expertise from within and beyond UQ.

The University is confident that the course and its authors represent a high standard of scientific integrity.

We appreciate your interest in this matter.

Regards

Max

Professor G. Q. Max Lu

Acting Vice-Chancellor and President

The University of Queensland

Brisbane Qld 4072

T: +61 7 33651300 | F: +61 7 33651266

E: vc@uq.edu.au | www.uq.edu.au

Discover UQ's Research Strengths – www.uq.edu.au/research/research-strengths

Subject: D15/7927: Complaint of serious corruption of science by UQ's John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

From: Roberts Malcolm

To: UQ VC OFFICE uqvc@uq.edu.au Høj Professor Peter vc@uq.edu.au

Cc: Cook John, Hoegh-Guldberg Ove, FORBES VIV, Carter Bob, Plimer Ian, Prof Jennifer Marohasy, John Zornig (UQ), Starck Walter, Ridd Peter, Ball Tim, Laframboise Donna

Date: 21 May 2015 1:11 pm

Dear Max and Professor Høj:

Thank you Max for your reply dated 11 May 2015 on behalf of our university's Vice Chancellor, Professor Høj.

You stated that your reply responds to my email dated 24th April (subject: *Complaint of serious corruption of science by UQ's John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg*).

Max, **you have not replied to my email of 25th April** (subject: '2: *Complaint of serious corruption of science by UQ's John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg*') addressed to Professor Høj.

That email provided a URL link to a peer-reviewed paper identifying serious errors in the Cook et al paper falsely fabricating a purported 97% consensus. The text of my 25th April email—obviously embracing my email of 24th April—is as follows:

Dear Professor Høj:

Further to my complaint sent to you yesterday and provided below, please note that John Cook's paper on his fabricated consensus has been disproven by a peer-reviewed paper revealing major arithmetic errors in John Cook's work fabricating consensus. The peer-reviewed paper is discussed here: <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/03/cooks-97-consensus-disproven-by-a-new-paper-showing-major-math-errors/> and was written by internationally recognised climate scientists and by researchers into the UN IPCC's fraud that is at the core of John Cook's false climate claims.

The peer-reviewed work is the source of the data cited yesterday as being on the lower half of page 4 of Appendix 5, here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

As stated yesterday, I seek confidence that you will restore the university's scientific integrity and look forward to your reply.

1. Professor Høj, why did you not acknowledge and reply to my email dated 25th April?

Max, your reply on Professor Høj's behalf used emphatic language to deny my initial complaint (24th April) yet your reply did not provide any evidence or data. Yours is an unsubstantiated opinion based partly on communication with the publishers of the paper by Cook et al. Given the justified ridicule publicly directed at the paper it is highly likely that its publishers could be embarrassed by the paper and would be unlikely to change their public stance.

Examples of ridicule based on credible and quantified foundations include the short Summary of comments on claims by Cook et al on page 3 of the following comprehensive article: <http://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2014/09/Warming-consensus-and-it-critics1.pdf>

Please note further the number and background's of people commenting negatively on the work by Cook et al. They include prominent people of the same opinion on human causation of climate variability as held by John Cook yet nonetheless critical of his paper.

2. Professor Høj, does this cause you concern and if not, specifically why not?

3. Professor Høj, please address the specific issues raised in the paper by Legates et al and please explain the basis for denying my complaint given that it is supported with specific quantified facts from a peer-reviewed published paper.

4. Professor Høj, are you aware that the opening sentence of the paper by Cook et al states, quote: “An accurate perception of the degree of scientific consensus is an essential element to public support for climate policy”? Are you further aware that science is not determined by consensus and that instead science is decided by empirical scientific evidence?

Consensus is the hallmark of politics. Fabricating an unfounded consensus to manage public perceptions is propaganda. Why are you condoning our university's use of propaganda in an unscientific and false consensus? Our university's support for relying on a consensus marks our university's climate position as unscientific.

5. Professor Høj, why are you supporting an error-riddled fabrication that is not honest?

All correspondence from UQ responding to my claims as to the behaviour and work of John Cook and of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg have not addressed the specific issues detailed in my complaints. Replies from UQ have been broad and unsubstantiated opinions.

6. Professor Høj, please specify the positions of UQ staff who have investigated my specific complaints. Given our university's dependence over many years on significant government funding attracted by Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's politicised climate advocacy, please explain why my complaints, given their seriousness, have not been independently investigated.

Our university's responses do not meet needs for transparency, specificity, openness and integrity.

Are you aware of the following information about the behaviour and work of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and his close colleague and subordinate John Cook? Specifically:

7. Professor Høj, are you aware that Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook individually and together have never presented any empirical scientific evidence for their often-stated unfounded and false public claims that carbon dioxide (CO₂) from human use of hydrocarbons causes climate variability?

8. Professor Høj, are you aware that in making their false climate claims, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook individually and together contradict empirical scientific evidence?

9. Professor Høj, are you aware that Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise has found that **Ove Hoegh-Guldberg received money from Greenpeace over a period of more than 20 years?**

<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2011/04/22/ka-ching-more-greenpeace-money/>

10. Professor Høj, are you aware that Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise has found that **Ove Hoegh-Guldberg has been funded by WWF for more than a decade?** Please refer to the previous link. Donna Laframboise is copied hereon.

11. Professor Høj, are you aware that **Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is a member of Greenpeace staff and is on WWF's Science Advisory Panel?** Please see pages 54-59 of Appendix 9 here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

12. Professor Høj, are you aware that both **Greenpeace and WWF are active in spreading false claims about climate and have corrupted reports by the UN IPCC** (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change)? Please refer to appendix 2 pages 26-28 & 47 and to Appendix 15, here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

13. Professor Høj, are you aware that an article in The Australian newspaper on 7 April 2015 reported that **Ove Hoegh-Guldberg made statements in the Queensland Land Court and that his statements as reported are unscientific, unfounded, misleading and contradict empirical scientific evidence?** My understanding is that statements in the Land Court are made under oath or, for those not wishing to swear on a bible, are made under affirmation.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/mining-energy/adani-carmichael-mine-coal-a-threat-to-great-barrier-reef/story-e6frg9df-1227294272873>

The newspaper report is pasted into this email below.

14. Professor Høj, are you aware that **Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's organisation—Greenpeace—is implementing its strategy for destroying the Australian coal industry?** The Greenpeace strategy document is available here:

http://www.abc.net.au/mediawatch/transcripts/1206_greenpeace.pdf

and here:

https://www.qrc.org.au/dbase_upl/stoppingtheaustraliancoalexportboom.pdf

Are you aware that the coal industry is our state's largest earner of export income? Are you aware that coal enables cheap energy and steel that are vital in developing nations for liberating billions of people from poverty?

Respected marine biologist Walter Starck and marine geophysicist Peter Ridd publicly present conclusions about the condition of the Great Barrier Reef that contradict Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's activism. Both live adjacent to the reef and work on the reef. Both are copied hereon.

15. Professor Høj, are you aware that my complaint to our university on 10 November 2010 included the **complaint that Ove Hoegh-Guldberg misrepresented climate and science to our state's parliament?** Please refer to Appendix 9, pages 57 & 58, here:<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

16. Professor Høj, are you aware that misrepresentations of climate by Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook have misled journalists and as a result misled the public and members of state and federal parliaments? In doing so they have contradicted empirical scientific evidence and have never presented any empirical scientific evidence proving that human activity causes climate variability.

17. Professor Høj, are you aware that **Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is a Lead Author with the UN IPCC and are you aware that the UN IPCC has never provided any empirical scientific evidence that CO2 from human activity causes climate**

variability?

18. Professor Høj, are you aware that the **UN IPCC is thoroughly discredited scientifically** and is documented to be a scientifically dishonest political organisation pushing a political agenda?

Please see Appendix 2, here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> and the book entitled *The Deliberate Corruption of Climate Science* by internationally renowned Canadian climatologist Professor Tim Ball who is copied hereon. Feel welcome to contact him directly as he is knowledgeable, open, specific and clear.

19. **Professor Høj, are you aware that the UN IPCC is directed by the UN FCCC whose head is Christiana Figueres and are you aware that she has admitted that the UN's climate topic is a means of ending national sovereignty and instituting unelected global socialist governance? She says it in her own words** here:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=W8TtafXtiwc

She follows the path started by Maurice Strong, the first Secretary-General of the corrupt UN Environmental Program and father of the UN's false and unfounded climate claims and campaign. Please refer to pages 19-23 here:

<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/docs/BaldwinBirminghamReport.pdf>

20. Professor Høj, are you aware that **respected Australian businessman Maurice Newman has concluded and publicly stated that the UN treats climate as a tool for unelected centralisation of global power?** I commend to you his article of 8th May 2015 entitled *The UN is using climate change as a tool not an issue* <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/the-un-is-using-climate-change-as-a-tool-not-an-issue/story-e6frg6zo-1227343839905?memtype=anonymous>

The newspaper article is pasted into this email below.

21. Professor Høj, are you aware that I have **documented the UN's global governance campaign in Australia in five succinct pages** (19-23) here:

<http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/docs/BaldwinBirminghamReport.pdf> and in greater detail in Appendix 14,

here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

22. Professor Høj, are you aware that Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's work contradicting empirical scientific evidence amounts to advocacy not science and that his advocacy is destroying Australian industry and threatening our national sovereignty and governance?

Are you aware that the burden of such damage falls most harshly on the poor since energy is essential in modern society and since artificially raising energy prices as a result of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's activism is a highly regressive impost on the poor?

23. Professor Høj, are you aware that if Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's false claims in Queensland's Land Court are heeded it will impoverish hundreds of millions of people in India? Do you condone that activism and outcome?

24. Professor Høj, will you continue to endorse Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's destruction of scientific integrity?

25. **Professor Høj, will you continue to enable the destruction of industry in Australia and overseas and will you continue to facilitate the destruction of our national sovereignty and governance?**

26. Professor Høj, why is our university not being transparent in discussing the work and behaviour of John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg? Is their reliance on unsubstantiated opinion mimicking the behaviour of our university's senior executives?

27. **Professor Høj, please provide the specific location (report title and page numbers; book and chapter title and page numbers; website page URL; scientific paper title with author name(s) and page numbers) of specific empirical scientific evidence proving human causation of global climate variability. To do so will end my complaint. To not do so or to incorrectly do so will make your support of John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg untenable and confirm their claims as unscientific.**

28. Professor Høj, will you initiate, enable and support an **independent, transparent and open investigation of the behaviour, work, advocacy and propaganda of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook?**

Ironically, given the name of John Cook's new course provided by our university, the contradiction of empirical scientific evidence by Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook is denial of scientific evidence. Comments from John Cook's students including retired journalist Tony Thomas are already appearing in public. His last paragraph here is particularly disturbing for our university:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2015/05/uqs-denial-101x-putting-the-stink-in-distinction/>

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook have serially misrepresented climate, science and human activity. They continue to do so.

29. Professor Høj, have Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook misled you and our university or are you and our university's executive leadership and senate accomplices in their misrepresentation?

Professor Høj, these questions raise serious concerns in the minds of reasonable and independent people. Although I am not in a position to conclude definitively on the motives of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook for their serial misrepresentations and contradiction of science, I conclude that their work is corrupting science and affecting our university's reputation. I do not know with certainty whether Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook separately or together have deliberately and fraudulently made their repeated false claims or are incompetent or careless or negligent or reckless or naive. My aim is not to judge or label them. I do though conclude honestly that their behaviour does not warrant being condoned, enabled or supported in any way by you or by our university. My need is to restore scientific integrity and to protect my children's freedom, prosperity and national sovereignty.

Professor Høj, as a result of the response from Max and past correspondence with our university, this matter concerning the behaviour and work of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook now becomes one involving your integrity and the integrity and reputation of our university.

The misrepresentation of science, climate and hydrocarbons by Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and John Cook is occurring during your tenure as Vice Chancellor and will affect your legacy. I urge you to initiate, enable and support a full and transparent independent investigation of their work and claims in relation to climate.

Please stop misrepresentation by John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and restore scientific integrity to our university. I please request a meeting with you to discuss our university's role in deceiving the public and to discuss restoring scientific integrity. I would be pleased for that meeting to be in the company of John Cook and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg if so desired by you.

Professor Høj, my personal declaration of interests is here:

http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf I receive no funding for my seven years of independently investigating climate claims.

Professor Høj, through the questions above, you are now aware of some of the serious ethical issues facing our university. I hope that you will demonstrate that you and our university value honesty by addressing the issues raised in the 29 questions above and in this final question:

30. Professor Høj, do you intend to continue supporting the destruction of our university's scientific reputation and continue supporting unscientific destruction of our state's industry and our country's sovereignty or will you restore scientific integrity and support our state, nation and humanity?

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm Roberts

BE (Hons) UQ, MBA U Chicago, Member Beta Gamma Sigma Honours Society
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

180 Haven Road, Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone: 61 7 3374 3374
Mobile/Cell: 61 4 1964 2379

Conscious Pty Ltd

Brisbane, Australia

Phone: 61 7 3374 3374

Mobile/Cell: 61 4 1964 2379

<http://www.conscious.com.au>

www.linkedin.com/in/malcolmieuanroberts

For question 12, above:

Adani Carmichael mine: coal a threat to Great Barrier Reef

- AAP
- APRIL 07, 2015 1:10PM

The extraction of coal from Australia's biggest mine would not directly affect the Great Barrier Reef, but burning it would help push the climate to a dangerous state, a Queensland court has heard.

Conservation group Coast and Country is objecting to Adani's plans to build the \$16.5 billion Carmichael Mine in the Galilee Basin.

The Indian mining giant intends to export at least 50 million tonnes of coal a year from the Abbot Point terminal, north of Bowen.

Coast and Country claims the project would contribute to climate change when the coal is burnt overseas, and carbon emissions would damage the Great Barrier Reef through ocean acidification.

The Queensland Land Court heard on Tuesday a United Nations agreement across 200 countries dictates global warming should be kept under 2C.

That threshold would be reached after the emission of roughly 850 gigatonnes of CO₂, University of Queensland's Ove Hoegh Guldberg told the court.

The marine sciences professor said the Carmichael project could contribute 4.5 gigatonnes of emissions.

"We're talking about 0.5 per cent of the total emissions left ... before we push the climate into a very dangerous state," he said.

"That's an enormous amount of CO₂ over the life of the mine." Adani argues the need

for coal is driven by demand, not supply, and even if the project does not go ahead, coal-fired power stations would simply find other sources.

Lawyer Peter Ambrose, for Adani, said the situation was similar to when a motorist drove a car — emitting CO₂ — but the car manufacturer was not directly responsible for the subsequent damage.

“It’s not possible that the mere extraction could damage the Great Barrier Reef,” he put to Prof Guldberg.

“The mere extraction, digging up the coal and putting it into a boat, doesn’t have an impact,” Prof Guldberg conceded.

The case, before Land Court President Carmel MacDonald, is expected to run until the end of April.

AAP

For question 19, above:

The UN is using climate change as a tool not an issue

- MAURICE NEWMAN
- THE AUSTRALIAN
- MAY 08, 2015 12:00AM

It’s a well-kept secret, but 95 per cent of the climate models we are told prove the link between human CO₂ emissions and catastrophic global warming have been found, after nearly two decades of temperature stasis, to be in error. It’s not surprising.

We have been subjected to extravagance from climate catastrophists for close to 50 years.

In January 1970, *Life* magazine, based on “solid scientific evidence”, claimed that by 1985 air pollution would reduce the sunlight reaching the Earth by half. In fact, across that period sunlight fell by between 3 per cent and 5 per cent. In a 1971 speech, Paul Ehrlich said: “If I were a gambler I would take even money that -England will not exist in the year 2000.”

Fast forward to March 2000 and David Viner, senior research scientist at the Climatic Research Unit, University of East Anglia, told *The Independent*, “Snowfalls are now a thing of the past.” In December 2010, the Mail Online reported, “Coldest December since records began as temperatures plummet to minus 10C bringing travel chaos across Britain”.

We’ve had our own busted predictions. Perhaps the most preposterous was climate alarmist Tim Flannery’s 2005 observation: “If the computer records are right, these drought conditions will become permanent in eastern Australia.” Subsequent rainfall and severe flooding have shown the records or his analysis are wrong. We’ve swallowed dud prediction after dud prediction. What’s more, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which we were instructed was the gold standard on global warming, has been exposed repeatedly for -mis-rep-resentation and shoddy methods. Weather bureaus appear to have “homogenised” data to suit narratives. NASA’s claim that 2014 was the warmest year on record was revised, after challenge, to only 38 per cent probability. Extreme weather events, once blamed on global warming, no longer are, as their frequency and intensity decline.

Why then, with such little evidence, does the UN insist the world spend hundreds of billions of dollars a year on futile climate change policies? **Perhaps Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of the UN’s Framework on Climate Change has the answer?**

In Brussels last February she said, “This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years since the Industrial Revolution.”

In other words, the real agenda is concentrated political authority. Global warming is the hook.

Figueres is on record saying democracy is a poor political system for fighting global warming. Communist China, she says, is the best model. This is not about facts or logic. It's about a new world order under the control of the UN. It is opposed to capitalism and freedom and has made environmental catastrophism a household topic to achieve its objective.

Figueres says that, unlike the Industrial Revolution, "This is a centralised transformation that is taking place." She sees the US partisan divide on global warming as "very detrimental". Of course. In her authoritarian world there will be no room for debate or -disagreement.

Make no mistake, climate change is a must-win battlefield for authoritarians and fellow travellers. As Timothy Wirth, president of the UN Foundation, says: "Even if the -(climate change) theory is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic and environmental policy."

Having gained so much ground, eco-catastrophists won't let up. After all, they have captured the UN and are extremely well funded. They have a hugely powerful ally in the White House. They have successfully enlisted compliant academics and an obedient and gullible mainstream media (the ABC and Fairfax in Australia) to push the scriptures regardless of evidence.

They will continue to present the climate change movement as an independent, spontaneous consensus of concerned scientists, politicians and citizens who believe human activity is "extremely likely" to be the dominant cause of global warming. ("Extremely likely" is a scientific term?)

And they will keep mobilising public opinion using fear and appeals to morality. UN support will be assured through promised wealth redistribution from the West, even though its anti-growth policy prescriptions will needlessly prolong poverty, hunger, sickness and illiteracy for the world's poorest.

Figueres said at a climate -summit in Melbourne recently that she was "truly counting on Australia's leadership" to ensure most coal stayed in the ground.

Hopefully, like India's Prime Minister Narendra Modi, Tony Abbott isn't listening. India knows the importance of cheap energy and is set to overtake China as the world's leading importer of coal. Even Germany is about to commission the most coal-fired power stations in 20 years.

There is a real chance Figueres and those who share her centralised power ambitions will succeed. As the UN's December climate change conference in Paris approaches, Australia will be pressed to sign even more futile job-destroying climate change treaties.

Resisting will be politically difficult. But resist we should. We are already paying an unnecessary social and economic price for empty gestures. Enough is enough.

Maurice Newman is chairman of the Prime Minister's Business Advisory Council. The views expressed here are his own.
