

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2012
Latest update:

APPENDIX 10

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S CLIMATE COMMISSION

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with, all parts of and appendices to the document entitled *CSIROh!*

Minister Greg Combet introduced the Climate Commission in the opening sentence of his media release dated February 10th, 2011, quote: “*The Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, Greg Combet, today announced the establishment of an independent Climate Commission, appointing the leading science communicator, Professor Tim Flannery, as Chief Commissioner.*”

<http://www.climatechange.gov.au/minister/greg-combet/2011/media-releases/February/mr20110210.aspx>

With all supposed climate *scientists* on the panel reliant on government funding, the term *independent* contradicts reality. The Climate Commission’s main report writer, Will Steffen had held four government positions and is Director of the Australian National University’s (ANU) *Climate Change Institute* relying on government funding.

All three climate *scientists* as Commissioners—being Tim Flannery, Leslie Hughes and chemical engineer Will Steffen—contradict empirical scientific evidence. In that way they misrepresent climate science. They are paid by government in deep political strife on the carbon dioxide tax. The Commission is not audited by any body.

The Climate Commission’s *Science Advisory Panel* consists of Chairman Matthew England, Andy Pitman and David Karoly. All are funded by government.

Analysis of the Climate Commission’s role is revealing, quote:

“*Mr Combet said the Climate Commission would provide expert advice and information on climate change to the Australian community.*”

“*The Climate Commission has been established by the Gillard Government to provide an authoritative, independent source of information for all Australians,*” he said. “*It will provide expert advice on climate change science and impacts, and international action. It will help build the consensus required to move to a clean energy future.*”

The Climate Commission would have a public outreach role, he said, to help build greater understanding and consensus about reducing Australia’s carbon pollution.

“The Climate Commission will fulfil a key information and education role, enabling the Australian community to have a more informed conversation about climate change. I am delighted to lead this new Commission,” said Professor Tim Flannery.”

The Climate Commission’s ‘Tasks’ and ‘Duties’ as specified by the Minister conflict with empirical science. From my observation and experience with two Climate Commission meetings and my analysis of the Commission’s video recording of a third meeting, the Commission’s focus is on broadcasting messages advocating and supporting government policy. It is largely not engaged in two-way dialogue with Australians.

I have personal experience with the Climate Commission and investigated and analysed its behaviour. From that I conclude that Greg Combet’s statements above on the Climate Commission are not accurate. Some of his statements contradict the observed reality.

Three climate commissioners purported to be climate scientists and often taking the role of speaking for the Climate Commission on climate science are Tim Flannery, Will Steffen and Lesley Hughes. Appendix 9 reveals that their public statements and implied statements include many falsities together with many unscientific and unsupported claims. They have no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for their claim that human CO₂ caused, causes or will cause global warming (aka climate change). Their claims contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Analysis of the Climate Commission’s reports, public meetings and web site confirms contradiction of empirical scientific evidence and lack of any basis for their core implied/stated claim about HUMAN CO₂.

It’s not surprising therefore that Climate Commission meetings as revealed below are not conversations, they’re contrivances. Climate Commissioners retreat from discussing climate science. They appear reticent to discuss the massive corruption of climate science.

In addition to contradicting empirical scientific evidence some climate commissioners spread the three fundamental misrepresentations of climate science.

Climate Commission Reports

The Climate Commission’s reports contain no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for the Commission’s core claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. Real scientists have exposed the Climate Commission as unscientific and contradicting empirical scientific evidence:

Part 1:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/05/the-critical-decade-part-i>

Part 2:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/05/auditing-the-critical-decade-part-ii>

Unfounded alarm fomented by the report entitled *'The Critical Decade'* is, other than Will Steffen's name, not backed by names of authors, contributors or reviewers.

My analysis in Appendix 8 of the Australian Academy of Science's glossy booklet entitled *'The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers'* reveals it is unscientific, contains no evidence of human CO₂ causing global warming and contradicts empirical evidence. Yet according to Peter Bobroff's investigations, quote: "*The AAS Q&As were then used to support the Climate Commission's document: 'The Critical Decade' signed by Professor Steffen.*"

Available here:

<http://tome22.info/SteffenMtgCooma/IncompetentBriefing.html>

It seems that the Climate Commission's claims depend on CSIRO. Or does CSIRO depend on the Climate Commission? Both lack empirical scientific evidence supporting their core claim that HUMAN CO₂ controls climate.

http://climatecommission.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/NSW-report_final_web.pdf

Claims by the Climate Commission are so obviously unscientific that journalists themselves are now identifying unscientific claims and data taken out of context in fabricating the commission's claims.

<http://climatecommission.gov.au/topics/climate-impacts-and-opportunities-for-nsw/>

Mainstream media is awakening to the misrepresentation of climate science by alarmists. The extent of that misrepresentation is such that it raises questions as to whether it is coordinated between groups funded mostly by government.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/only-two-sets-of-data-does-not-a-hot-summer-make/story-e6frg6xf-1226355327332>

The Climate Commission misrepresents even hard data on renewable energy:

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/flannerys_commission_tells_another_outrageous_porky1/

The Climate Commission's report paints a rosy picture for renewable energy. Yet the reality is starkly opposite. Renewable energy in reality is confirmed as expensive.

Will Steffen's presentation to the Multi Party Climate Change Committee (MPCCC) is analysed scientifically by real scientists and revealed to be unscientific and contradicting empirical scientific evidence. His advice to national parliament and to the public fails to withstand scientific scrutiny:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/04/government-misadvised>

David Karoly is on the Climate Commissions' Science Advisory Panel. Within Australia he's connected with many organisations spreading unfounded and unscientific climate alarm. This triggers in people's minds the question: is the fomenting in Australia of unfounded alarm contradicting empirical scientific evidence in any way coordinated?

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/government-should-re-examine-the-climate-data/story-e6frgd0x-1226330722566>

Expert public comments on the Climate Commission

Climate researcher John McLean (see Appendices 2 and 4) likened the Climate Commissioners' public forum in Melbourne on Tuesday, July 24th, 2012 to an old southern USA revivalist meeting, complete with quote: “*glib patter worthy of an illusionist*”.

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/07/praise-be-the-climate-commission-in-melbourne>

Tom Quirk's view on the same meeting is more restrained yet he seems confounded by the lack of data supporting the Climate Commission's claims.

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/07/climate-commission-in-melbourne>

Climate Commission spreading misrepresentations of science

On October 17th, 2012 I received an email from the Climate Commission. In it was a link to the Climate Commission's article entitled *Global Warming in Record Arctic Sea Ice Loss*. It triggers many serious questions: Why does it not mention the powerful storm in June 2012 responsible for dispersing the Arctic's floating ice? Why does it not mention that with cooling as the northern hemisphere approaches winter, recent measurements reveal that Arctic ice is already back to where it was in the corresponding time of year in 2007? Why does the Climate Commission claim significance from natural variation in a period of only 30 years' of satellite measurements of Arctic ice? On what basis does it imply that something unusual is occurring in the Arctic when there is no empirical scientific evidence for that claim? Why does it not discuss the opening of the Arctic's Northwest Passage in 1906 when Amundsen sailed through? Why does it fail to discuss the Northwest Passage's openings in the 1940's? Why does it not discuss the surfacing of the USS Skate submarine at the North Pole at the end of winter in 1958? Why, contrary to the empirical scientific evidence, does the Climate Commission imply causation of inherent natural variation in Nature to HUMAN CO₂? Why does it claim inherent natural variation in Arctic ice mass as, quote: “*Time for rapid and decisive action on climate change*”? Why does the Climate Commission not discuss the current record Antarctic ice mass? Presumably the Climate Commission understands that Antarctica and the Arctic are on the same globe that the Commission (falsely) claims to be warming?

<http://climatecommission.gov.au/basics/arctic-ice-reaches-record-low/>

And:

<http://newsweekly.com.au/article.php?id=5369>

Is the Climate Commission returning to the tricks of Al Gore's unscientific movie *An Inconvenient Truth* in which normal, natural Spring melting of ice is implied to be proof of devastating climate change caused by human CO₂?

Is Australia's Climate Commission aligned with Al Gore's corrupt claims?

The same Climate Commission URL link offers a video of Al Gore saluting Australian government action. Why is the Climate Commission endorsing Al Gore's falsities claiming that weather events in recent years are due to human CO₂? Why is the Climate Commission supporting such contradictions of empirical scientific evidence? Al Gore's blatant falsities and misrepresentations appear to be in support of the Climate Commission's position. It raises the question: was the Climate Commission responsible for writing Al Gore's script or is the Climate Commission being used by Al Gore pushing his heavy emphasis on his **global** agenda?

Why did the Climate Commission not disclose Al Gore's many vested personal financial interests associated with pushing his false claim that HUMAN CO₂ drives global climate? These range into the tens of millions of dollars and reportedly raised Al Gore's worth by more than an estimated \$100 million.

Further fundamental misrepresentations by the Climate Commission

The Australian newspaper's Environmental Editor, Graham Lloyd reported on Saturday, November 3rd, 2012, quote: "Australia's Climate Commission has misrepresented data from the leading US meteorological bureau to highlight a link between climate change and the severity of Superstorm Sandy which this week crippled New York."

*In a statement on the disaster that hit North America on Monday, the federal government-sponsored Climate Commission said "all the evidence** suggests that climate change exacerbated the severity of Hurricane Sandy".*

Matthew England, chairman of the commission's Science Advisory Panel, said it was important to get the message out that storms today were "operating in a different environment than they were 100 years ago".

Later in the same article *Graham Lloyd states, quote: "However, senior NOAA climate scientist Martin Hoerling said the higher sea-surface temperatures quoted by the Climate Commission were not significant in relation to Sandy."*

The article added, quote: "Late yesterday, Professor England conceded the sea-surface temperature highlighted in the Climate Commission document was not significant."

Matthew England is quoted making further false claims contradicting empirical scientific evidence.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate-link-to-sandy-invalid/story-fn59niix-1226509504684>

** The phrase "all the evidence" seems popular with the Climate Commission. Yet its use by the Commission in the context of climate often contradicts empirical scientific

evidence and misrepresents climate, Nature and science.

Two scientists of the real world, Bob Carter and William Kinimonth expose the Climate Commission's false and absurd unscientific claim here:

<http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/society-and-culture/cometh-the-storm-cometh-the-climate-lies-20121107-28ytj.html#ixzz2BZlakdvK>

Quote: *"By circulating commentary that suggests hurricane Sandy was exacerbated by human-caused global warming, the Climate Commission is wilfully misleading the public. Let us be clear, Sandy was barely a category 1 hurricane as it crossed the densely populated north-east United States.*

The enormous damage resulted not from wind, but from flooding and inundation over low-lying areas where housing and commercial development was not designed to cope with such an extreme event. Compounding the issue, vital infrastructure such as levees, public transport systems and power stations were not adequately hardened.

The flooding resulted from heavy rain and a large coastal storm surge at a time of spring tides, all eventualities that could have been predicted."

Quote: *"In a broader context, the lack of recent global warming is also an impediment to those who argue that Sandy was influenced by industrial carbon dioxide. There has been no significant atmospheric warming since 1996 and no ocean warming since the Argo buoy network was deployed in 2003. In consequence, global atmospheric and oceanic temperatures are now close to their average over the past 30 years.*

Suggestions that higher concentrations of atmospheric carbon dioxide have somehow influenced the formation and development of Sandy are therefore simply untrue.

The Climate Commission appears to consider it opportune to use the harrowing Sandy event, with its loss of lives and immense destruction, to push its political agenda. But in favouring action to try to "prevent" global warming, the commission is propagating a wrong and costly message."

William Kinimonth is a meteorologist and former head of the National Climate Centre. Bob Carter is an internationally regarded palaeoclimatologist and a senior editor of the 2010 NIPCC report, *Climate Change Reconsidered*. Both rely on science's ultimate arbiter, empirical scientific evidence that contradicts the Climate Commission's false, unscientific and untrue claims.

Radio presenters Chris Smith and Rita Panahi list some of Matthew England's errors on hurricane Sandy here:

<http://www.2gb.com/article/climate-debate-hurricane-sandy>

When radio presenters are able to easily understand and chronicle reality and quote from real-world scientists why is Matthew England repeatedly contradicting empirical scientific evidence?

Empirical scientific evidence reveals that contrary to Matthew England's claims there is

no trend of intensifying storms. Nor is there a trend of more frequent storms. Matthew England's claims remind of Al Gore's blatant exaggerations and misrepresentations about hurricane Katrina. As some have said publicly, repeated misrepresentations and omissions are destroying scientific credibility. Offensive opportunism disrespects the lives of storm victims and detracts from valuable and costly lessons for preventing future loss of life and property. (Appendix 4a)

Journalist Andrew Bolt's many relevant points reveal the Climate Commission's contradiction of empirical scientific evidence, here:

http://blogs.news.com.au/dailytelegraph/andrewbolt/index.php/dailytelegraph/comments/column_a_storm_of_hypocrisy/

His summary of the Climate Commission's claims about hurricane Sandy is poignant, quote: "*instantly exploiting a natural disaster too eagerly than is decent.*"

One wonders whether Matthew England understands that while cutting human CO₂ production will not affect climate it will stifle humanity's future wealth, technology, material resources and ability to withstand Nature's variability and extremes.

Focussing on human CO₂ is already costing lives as science, attention and resources are diverted from real environmental and humanitarian challenges.

Reducing the ability of communities to respond to future storms will lead to thousands of otherwise avoidable future deaths.

As Robert Bryce stated in The Wall Street Journal article entitled *After Sandy, No One Lined Up for Wind Turbines*, quote: "*In the wake of Hurricane Sandy, all of the critical pieces of equipment were burning gasoline or diesel fuel: the pumps removing water from flooded basements and subway tunnels, the generators providing electricity to hospitals and businesses, and the cars, trucks and aircraft providing mobility.*"

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204349404578099360759535602.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

And:

<http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com.au/2012/11/after-sandy-no-one-lined-up-for-wind.html>

Does Matthew England not realise that since European settlement of America, there have been more severe storms that have tracked further north than New York city? Does he not realise that thanks to use of modern power, technology and science such storms now claim far fewer lives than would otherwise be the case? Does he not realise that distracting people from real causes of storms leaves people vulnerable to Nature through ignorance of reality? Does he not realise that destroying science's credibility leaves humans vulnerable to misinformation and inefficient waste of resources and needless loss of life? Does he not care about the environmental and human consequences of his misrepresentations?

Matthew England is a mathematician who now relies heavily on government funding. His reputation now seems entwined with the unfounded and unscientific claim that

human CO₂ causes global warming. Are his career and income dependent on the existence of the global warming political issue now renamed *climate change*? Is that colouring his judgment?

Award-winning American journalist Marc Morano compiled a collection of science around the false and unfounded alarm claiming HUMAN CO₂ caused or exacerbated hurricane Sandy. It's available here:

http://www.climatedepot.com/a/18238/Scientists-reject-SandyClimate-Link--Warmists-Go-Full-Tabloid-Climatology--Claim-Sandy-Speaks--Round-Up-of-Hurricane-Sandy-Reactions?utm_source=CFACT+Updates&utm_campaign=9607ac1942-Scientists_reject_SandyClimate_link_10_31_2012&utm_medium=email

Further data is presented in Appendix 4a.

Appendix 14 further discusses the antihuman and anti-environment position of advocates contradicting empirical science.

More blatant misrepresentation of science by the Climate Commission

Award-winning science writer Jo Nova exposes yet more falsities from the Climate Commission at this site:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/11/climate-commission-report-queensland-warmed-by-3-degrees-in-50-years-look-out/>

Quote: *“The latest Climate Commission report: “The Critical Decade: Queensland climate impact and opportunities” starts with blatantly incorrect figure. Since when do “averages” run outside the extreme highs and lows? Thanks to reader Ian E.*

Eyeballing this graph suggests Queensland’s average temperature has risen by 2.7 C since the 1950’s”.

Jo Nova asks who proof-read the Climate Commission’s *report*. Four commissioners signed their names to the report: Will Steffen, Lesley Hughes, Gerry Hueston and Veena Sahajwalla.

Jo Nova presents empirical temperature data and notes that it appears to be unscientifically manipulated. The variability in the graph is consistent with entirely natural inherent variation. This is particularly the case when taken in context with longer-term data as discussed in Appendix 4. There is nothing unusual or unnatural occurring in global climate.

As an aside note that Jo Nova operates her website and blog herself without government funding and relying on donations and savings. Like my wife and me it has cost Jo Nova and her family thousands of dollars and sacrifice to family plus hundreds of thousands of dollars of foregone income.

It's ironic that when government is deceitfully and fraudulently using taxpayers' money to justify stealing more money from taxpayers via CO2 taxing and *trading*, there are committed taxpayers/citizens like Ian E. and Jo Nova scouring government propaganda to restore scientific integrity. We work for free and at great cost because we believe in integrity while the government deceitfully steals our money.

Consider the waste as taxpayers and scientists are distracted from productive pursuits to improve Australia's efficiency and international competitiveness. Instead we work on restoring governance and integrity. This is a massive cost of modern western government as party politics and media capture and hold entire countries hostage to deceit.

One advantage is that it is building responsibility in the citizenry and voters.

Climate Commission's contrivances contradicting empirical science

From my observations and reading, the taxpayer-funded Climate Commission's public meetings on behalf of the government avoid conversations on specific details. They are not free exchanges of thoughts and information. Challenging and debating the basis of the Climate Commission's position is deterred and not possible for all but the hardest and most persistent.

Instead, the public meetings are seen by many in the audience to be contrivances.

Please refer to Appendix 9 for quotes from Tim Flannery, Will Steffen and Lesley Hughes in meetings in Ipswich and Canberra during 2011. Please refer to the Climate Commission's video of its Parramatta meeting on Tuesday, May 15th, 2012:

<http://climatecommission.gov.au/events/parramatta/>

The following notes derive from the Parramatta meeting:

- (7:55) After 7 minutes and 55 seconds elapsed video time, Will Steffen discusses temperature. For empirical scientific evidence in response to Will Steffen's claims on temperature, please refer to Appendix 4. It's interesting that Will Steffen now uses a graph entitled *The Atmosphere is Warming*. Is that in response to previous public meetings in which he was exposed for using ground-based temperature measurements and what appeared to be a combination of reconstructed and projected temperatures? Yet, the graph still uses ground-based measurement citing, quote *Source: NASA GISS Surface Temperature Analysis*. Is the word *analysis* used rather than the word *measurements* because temperatures have been adjusted? Why did he not state that the graph purports to show ground-based measurements and not, as implied, measurements of the troposphere (atmosphere)? Why did he not explain that the raw data is not available for scrutiny by peers and thus should be scientifically discarded? Why did he not state that the database programmer admits that the raw data is in a, quote: *"hopeless state"*? Why did he not draw attention to the fact that despite his graph's compressed horizontal scale close attention reveals temperatures have not

warmed for more than half a climate period? ie, for the last 16 years? Why did he not identify two cooling periods from the 1880's through to the 1920's and from 1940's through to 1976? Why did he not state that human CO₂ production increased throughout the last 130 years and especially in the last 16 years? Instead he drew attention to the modest overall rise that is consistent entirely with natural temperature rise and in comparison with Earth's past warmer periods is modest. Why did he not draw attention to NASA GISS's lack of credibility after NASA GISS's James Hansen has been publicly reported to have tampered with temperatures and reportedly fabricated temperatures where none existed, presumably to concoct global warming? Why did he say, quote: "*Over the last 50 or 60 years since the middle of the last century we've seen a very strong warming trend*"? The temperature rise during the **40 years** from 1958 through 1998 is a very modest rise. After removing the effects of corruption of temperature measurements and particularly the Urban Heat Island Effect the rise is seen as slight. Some scientists, including UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray question whether it qualifies as a warm period. Why did Will Steffen not disclose that his statement is hotly disputed by scientists worldwide including UN IPCC Lead Authors and contributing scientists? Will Steffen's direct and implied statements, are directly and by omission misleading. In parts his presentation is unscientific and false. Why?

- (8:23 elapsed time in minutes and seconds) Will Steffen's graph on ocean temperatures has been supplanted by the graph of ocean temperatures provided by the advanced ARGO system of measurements. (Appendices 4 and 4a.) These modern measurements reveal that ocean temperature since 2003 have been at most, flat and more likely slightly cooling. Why does he present outdated data? Why?
- (10:40) Will Steffen claims that CO₂ keeps heat "like a blanket". A blanket merely reduces heat shedding by reducing air movement. It reduces heat shedding by reducing conduction and convection of heat from the body to the atmosphere. Earth's open atmosphere cannot be a blanket. The open atmosphere is highly dynamic and moves heat using conduction, convection and latent heat. The open atmosphere acts in a way that is opposite from that of a blanket. The open atmosphere moves heat. It moves heat (absorbed by Earth's surface from sunlight) away from Earth's surface and toward space. Does Will Steffen not know this? Why?
- As an aside, in the open atmosphere, when a gas warms it rises, thus accelerating the removal of heat away from the Earth's surface. Could CO₂ in the bulk atmosphere be a coolant? Reputable scientists and engineers believe this to be the case. Regardless, at less than 0.04% of Earth's air, CO₂ is a trace gas. Human production of CO₂ is admitted by the UN IPCC to be an estimated 3% of Earth's annual CO₂ production. Nature produces 97%, 32 times more. Further, variation in measurements of atmospheric CO₂ levels as cited by the UN IPCC reveal that Nature alone completely controls and determines CO₂ levels in the air regardless of human production. This is explained in Appendix 4. Why is Will Steffen not disclosing this? Why?
- (12:24). Will Steffen implies an increase in proportion of warm days. Yet journalists report that analysis of the Climate Commission's claim reveals that it

relies on cherry-picking the data. See above comments under the sub-heading *Climate Commission Reports*. Note his use of a graph and a story about engineering on Melbourne's rail network apparently as evidence implying human causation of global warming. It's not evidence of HUMAN causation. Why does he imply otherwise by association? Why?

- (13:04) Will Steffen says, quote: "*By the way our human bodies aren't engineered for extremes like that either. We operate at 37 degrees Celsius.*" How did Will Steffen survive when studying in Florida with its far hotter and more humid days? How did he survive in Sweden? Does he leave Canberra in summer? Where does he have vacations? How does he think people living in central Australia survive with many days above 40 degrees? How does he think people survive in northern Australia when working outdoors in far hotter temperatures and under more humid conditions that inhibit heat shedding? Although it's true that a healthy human body's inner temperature is 37 degrees Celsius, we operate at far higher and far cooler temperatures unaided by clothing or mechanical cooling devices. Daily humans demonstrate that we are perfectly adapted to life across the planet with its huge diversity of natural temperature extremes. Why does Will Steffen contradict both history and science revealing that in Earth's recent far warmer periods humans, humanity, civilization and the natural environment thrived? Why does Will Steffen imply his fearful false claim? Why?
- (13:53) Lesley Hughes claimed that temperatures have gone up and implied that humans control it. Contrary to empirical scientific evidence she implied that Earth effectively has a thermostat controlled by humans. Why?
- Lesley Hughes goes on to discuss a BOM graph of rainfall from the 1970's through to 2011 and claims a change is underway. Yet BOM rainfall data for the last 100 years reveals no changes. Her false claim contradicts Will Steffen's opening remarks stating climate needs to be analysed over a far longer term greater than a few decades. The BOM has such data. Why did Lesley Hughes not present it? Why did her graph use a boldly misleading heading that screamed '*Changing Rainfall*'? Why?
- (15:30) Lesley Hughes claimed that changing temperatures will put intense pressure on our biodiversity. Why did Lesley Hughes state this when the natural temperature rise (excluding the proven urban heat island effect inflating urban weather station data and excluding unscientific data tampering) reveals a very modest rise? Why did she imply human CO₂ as the cause when she has no empirical scientific evidence for that as a cause? Why did she not discuss the fact that both history and palaeontologists' scientific evidence reveal that Earth and our plant and animal species thrived under past periods of warming far greater in amount and duration than our recent warming? Why?
- (17:30) Why does Lesley Hughes rely on unvalidated computerised numerical models that have already been proven erroneous? Why does she imply, contrary to empirical scientific evidence that humans can control Earth's temperature? Why does she unscientifically contradict empirical scientific evidence to drive unfounded fear that our grandchildren will face temperatures four degrees warmer than today? Is this an attempt to evoke emotions with no scientific basis? Why?

- (21:45) While mentioning one country recently deciding to tax CO₂, why did Tim Flannery not mention the American states withdrawing from CO₂ taxing/trading schemes, the banning of such measures in other states, the collapse in prices for CO₂ credits in the European Union, the closure of the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) and Al Gore's part ownership of the CCX? Why?
- During their answers both Tim Flannery and Gerry Hueston admitted that Australia already has a high cost base. Yet both support imposition of a tax on CO₂ that will further raise Australia's costs at a time when our competitors are not doing so? When Climate Commissioners have no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused/causes/will cause warming, why are they advocating imposing a new tax contrary to empirical scientific evidence? Why?
- (36:25) Will Steffen repeated his false claim made at other Climate Commission public meetings that the knowledge on warming attributed to human CO₂ production is, quote: "*unequivocal*". Why does he contradict empirical scientific evidence and fabricate a non-existent scientific consensus? Why?
- (36:45) Will Steffen falsely claims that technical papers on climate science are quote: "*quality controlled by a careful process*". Appendix 2 provides and cites evidence proving his claim to be false. Why did he make such a statement? Why?
- (37:17) Will Steffen said, quote: "*For us it's not belief ... science isn't built on belief systems. It's built on evidence. It's built on observations. It's built on understanding processes. And it's our ability to explain what's going on. So we test each other all the time in that very way*". The ultimate arbiter of science is empirical scientific evidence. He has no such evidence or logical scientific reasoning for his claim that human CO₂ caused global ATMOSPHERIC warming. A key characteristic of sound scientific understanding is that it enables accurate prediction of events. Yet climate projections have been wildly erroneous because they are not based on sound understanding. Yet it is this upon which the Climate Commission relies. It is this that Commissioners imply is unequivocally and universally accepted without dissent. Why?
- (37:50) Will Steffen, quote: "*I can guarantee you that there's no debate in the credible scientific community about whether the Earth's warming or not*". False. Is Will Steffen not aware of scientists listed with their quotes starting on page 28 here: <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/CSIRODecline-Print-2.pdf> Relying on empirical scientific evidence, these internationally eminent scientists of the real world include UN IPCC Lead Authors, Contributing Authors and Expert Science Reviewers. They and many of their peers question whether warming is continuing and certainly question the cause of warming that ended in 1998, some say 1997, some say 1995. Many are adamantly opposed to Will Steffen's claim. Unlike Will Steffen, their position is based on empirical scientific evidence. Unlike Will Steffen many do not receive government funding. Why is Will Steffen making his false claim? Why?
- (39:00) Lesley Hughes claims there exist some, quote "*pretty worrying projections*" based on computerised numerical modeling. Yet these models based on CO₂ levels are unvalidated. Why is she making such claims? Why?
- (46:20) Gerry Hueston discussed the political goal for 2020, quote: "*and that's reduce our emissions by 5% from business-as-usual which is no mean feat*"

because we're a growing country and that's probably going to mean something like a 25% reduction". He added, quote: "These things (extreme targets) come with a cost". In Ipswich on Tuesday, April 7th, 2011 Tim Flannery admitted it was a quote: "extremely ambitious target". Without any empirical scientific evidence to support their advocacy why are they endorsing such an extreme and unfounded target that will needlessly and severely hurt people Australia-wide? Why?

- (49:46) Tim Flannery falsely implies CO2 is a pollutant. Why?
- (51:45) A member of the audience identifying himself as Jim Simpson from the *Climate Realists of Five Dock*, Sydney asked a question about the body of the Inter Academy Council's (IAC) scathing report on UN IPCC processes and procedures. The IAC is the world's peak academic scientific body. In his question he referenced Donna Laframboise's expose of UN IPCC flaws and unscientific behaviour. See Appendix 2.
- (53:40) Tim Flannery illogically avoided Jim Simpson's question by steering people onto the politics that is based on the UN IPCC science discredited by the IAC report. Is he implying that politically driven policy determines what is science and overrides observation and fact? Why?
- (53:57-55:40) Will Steffen, quote: "First of all, I believe you vastly overstated the problems with the IAC". The questioner (Jim Simpson) merely accurately listed the problems identified in the body of the IAC's report. On what is Will Steffen's claimed belief based? Will Steffen continued: "There were some problems and the criticisms in that report have been taken on board and certainly I have some understanding about that because I contributed to two of the reports. And they have made changes. I agree with some aspects of that criticism. The IPCC is not beyond criticism. I will say however that what that triggered was an analysis of the primary data. The IPCC doesn't do research. It actually relies on that peer-reviewed literature and it accesses it. So academies of science around the world were concerned about the science just as you said. So they went around and did their own independent analysis of the peer-reviewed literature. The Royal Society of the UK, the American Association of Science, the Royal Swedish Academy, the Russian academy, the French Academy, the Chinese Academy. They all agree that the basic scientific conclusions of the IPCC are sound. They all agree that the basic scientific conclusions of the IPCC are sound. They agree that there needs to be improvement in the processes but I think it's important to note that there was a good response to these criticisms and the key points are: Should the IPCC processes be improved? And the answer is yes. And I believe you'll see in the AR5 (IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report) they have been substantially improved. Secondly, and more importantly, do the scientific conclusions of the assessment of the IPCC stand up to further scrutiny by the highest scientific bodies around the world? And the answer is yes they do". Yet in making his answer Will Steffen contradicted his own admission following his similar claims at Cooma in August 2011 that he subsequently admitted to Peter Bobroff AM were false. Will Steffen seems to ignore or not realize that the IAC's report highlights that the IPCC's poor treatment of uncertainty brings into question every one of the 800 likelihood and confidence statements in Working Group 1 of AR4. This refutes the credibility of AR4. Why did Will Steffen repeat

his claim about the national academies that he had previously admitted was false? Why?

- Conclusions from the body of the IAC report are presented here so you can decide for yourself: <http://Tome22.Info/IAC-Report/IAC-Report-Overview.html> for the summary of inferences from the body of the IAC report and <http://Tome22.info/IAC-Report/IAC-Report-Overview-Long.html> for the long overview.
- (59:18) Lesley Hughes revealed that she is on another board overseeing government distribution of about \$1 billion from the biodiversity fund for restoration projects. It's called the *Land Sector Carbon and Diversity Board*. It was established as part of the legislation widely known as the carbon tax. Is that a role paid by government? Why?
- (1:11:35 being 1 hour, 11 minutes and 35 seconds into the video) An apparently emotional woman claiming to be from Kiribas (presumably Kiribati Island in the Pacific) was upset while implying sea levels would be rising in her homeland. Appendix 4a presents empirical scientific data revealing that nothing unusual or unnatural is occurring in sea levels. There is no scientific basis for her fear fomented by wild and unscientific predictions/projections/forecasts/claims by people like Tim Flannery spreading unscientific, unfounded claims about future sea level. In response Will Steffen claimed that the rate of sea level rise has increased in the last few decades. **That is false.** He claimed the rate of sea level rise is now 3mm per year. **That is false. Both his claims contradict empirical scientific evidence.** He said his best estimate for sea level rise over the next century to the year 2100 is, quote: "*somewhere between 50cm and a metre*". There is no empirical scientific basis for his claim. He implied sadness that the woman's home island was simply going to fall prey to that rise. **Why are members of the Climate Commission contradicting empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning and in doing so fomenting unfounded fear, guilt and grief needlessly misleading and upsetting people? Why?**
- Will Steffen claimed 90% of the heat (implied or assumed to be from HUMAN CO₂ in the atmosphere) goes into the ocean. Yet the atmosphere is not warming and has not been warming for more than half a climate period. Why and on what basis is he making his claim that contradicts empirical scientific evidence? Why?
- In his introduction and repeatedly through the evening, compere Mike Munro reminded members of the audience that they were not allowed to make statements. Yet he and Tim Flannery invited a member of the Australian Youth Climate Coalition (AYCC) to make a lengthy statement. The Climate Commission went further by asking the representative to provide contact details to the meeting and video audiences. This was known to be the last question for the evening. Immediately after the activists' statement the evening was closed. By inviting the AYCC to make its statement the Climate Commission and its compere for the evening acted politically and used taxpayer funds to advocate for an activist body supporting government policy. One wonders whether members of the audience would have been aware that the head of AYCC, Anna Rose refused to engage in public discussion with Marc Morano, a prominent American climate realist known to have a powerfully accurate command of the science and politics of global warming? In encouraging a statement from an AYCC representative and

endorsing it and spreading its contact details Tim Flannery's Climate Commission is behaving as a taxpayer-funded advocacy body supporting political activism. Why?

- In its public meeting the meeting's chairman acting for the Climate Commission repeatedly and clearly discouraged and prevented statements from the audience. The Climate Commission avoided entering discussions after making their responses to audience questions. As with other Climate Commission meetings members of the audience had the microphone removed immediately after asking their question. There was no right of reply by audience members. Thus only members of the Climate Commission and members of the audience whom they selected could make statements. When Climate Commissioners responded with dubious or false statements they could not be challenged. They always had the last word. This appears to be a version of the Delphi Technique notoriously corrupted by the UN and its activist facilitators to control meetings and to drive public opinion. It is not a conversation. It is a contrivance camouflaged as a conversation. More can be learned about this here: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-tNqKh47bbk>

Is the Climate Commission aware that the rooster crowing at sunrise is not evidence the rooster caused the sun to rise?

(Adapted from a speech by Aung San Suu Kyi)

There is a glaring omission from the Climate Commission's presentation of the supposed science. In Will Steffen's explanation of the science he did not present any empirical scientific evidence for his implied claim that HUMAN CO₂ caused/causes/will cause catastrophic global warming. He did not discuss any logical scientific reasoning that HUMAN CO₂ caused global warming. It was falsely assumed and implied throughout. The Climate Commission's understanding of the supposed *science* failed to discuss CO₂'s relation to temperature and its supposed control by temperature. Why?

Tim Flannery runs from debate – yet again

After recently watching the Climate Commission's Parramatta video I tracked down Jim Simpson who asked a question recorded on the video. He advised that immediately after the Parramatta meeting he approached Mike Munro to host a genuine and fair debate between Tim Flannery and his team and a team of skeptics. Mike Munro agreed. Jim Simpson then handed a written note to Tim Flannery challenging him to debate a team of skeptics. According to Jim Simpson, Tim Flannery responded by stating that the Climate Commission doesn't normally engage in debates. The following day Jim Simpson sent a formal invitation to Tim Flannery in writing. In the five months since, no reply has been received. Actions speak more loudly than do words. Conversations with the Commission are seemingly not part of the Climate Commission's real brief.

Climate Commission spreading a core misrepresentation

In response to the Climate Commission's report entitled "*The Critical Decade: International Action on Climate Change by Tim Flannery, Roger Beale and Gerry Hueston*", independent researcher Graham Williamson published his analysis of the Climate Commission's report. His analysis is entitled "*THE CLIMATE COMMISSION ABANDONS SCIENCE AGAIN: A Response to The Critical Decade: International Action on Climate Change by Tim Flannery, Roger Beale and Gerry Hueston*" *Graham Williamson August 2012*". It has been widely distributed publicly. For readers' ease it is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/101_ClimateCommissionResponse.pdf

In it he evaluates the unscientific political construct of *per capita* production of CO₂. For example, quote: "*Although the Commonwealth government readily admits Australia only produces 1.5% of global emissions (6), according to Julia Gillard (7) "Australians are the biggest polluters per capita in the developed world, even more than the United States of America."* According to the government, the Climate Commission, and the CSIRO, selfish Australians are much to blame for any climate changes experienced in any other country because of the high per capita emissions they produce. And according to CSIRO, in their publication "**Climate Change: Science and Solutions for Australia**", Australia's emission reduction mitigation strategy or 'carbon price' is NOT based upon total emissions but in fact is based upon per capita emissions. Even the amount of so called climate debt resulting from per capita emissions has been calculated. According to Polya (8), **the "Net Per Capita Climate Debt (US\$ per person)" of Australia is "\$23,900 or \$24,265, if including the effect of its huge GHG Exports on its Climate Credits" while the "Net Climate Debt" for Australia is \$0.5 trillion.**

Repeatedly we are told climate change is a global problem that requires a global solution. In other words, we should tackle the main global sources of emissions, NOT the fictitious per capita emissions of Australians!

But where is the scientific evidence of the importance of fictitious per capita emissions? Good question. There is none, there is only a political consensus and an abandonment of science, an abandonment of truth, an abandonment of common sense, and an abandonment of Australians by their own government."

Australia's population is just 22.8 million people. That's one third of one percent of the world's population (0.34%). With as much legitimacy as *per capita* figures why not use figure for CO₂ production *per square kilometre* of each nation? We live in an area of 7,686,850 km² and are reportedly responsible for the *world's lowest CO₂ production per square kilometre*.

Why not use CO₂ production per area of land since there are valid measures of CO₂ absorption that depend on vegetation density? Or, perhaps we could use CO₂ production

per kilometre of coastline since oceans absorb CO₂ and determine atmospheric CO₂ levels?

Given that empirical data reveals Nature controls atmospheric CO₂ levels, there is no valid scientific reason for considering any such *per capita* or *per square kilometre* or *per kilometre* measure. Using such ratios is an unscientific political construct contradicting empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning.

Harry Truman said *The only thing new in the world is the history you haven't read*

I've read extensively of the financial, political and social campaigns waged by major European and American banks in the decades leading to the formation of America's privately owned Federal Reserve Bank in 1913. See Appendix 14. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century canny international bankers and allied politicians formed bodies giving the appearance of academic endorsement and legitimacy. These bodies included prominent academics, industrialists and communicators who endorsed formation of the privately owned US Federal Reserve Bank that has since been exposed for doing enormous damage world-wide.

The Gillard-Brown Climate Commission displays traits and behaviours similar to those used by American academic, government, political and industry bodies established a century ago to falsely give credibility to the international bankers' campaign. Regardless of whether those bodies' actions were deliberate or ignorant, they endorsed the dishonest and unconstitutional push by international bankers to eventually succeed in controlling money supply and interest rates as a way of controlling economies and nations globally. The same international bankers are now pushing taxing and *trading* of CO₂. See Appendix 14.

A century ago the mainstream media was manipulated into supporting the international bankers' campaign. Similarly in recent decades Australian journalists have been fooled by supposedly august academics into blindly spreading unfounded climate alarm. Fortunately Australian journalists are now awakening. Journalist Judith Sloan places the Climate Commission's use of catchy report titles in context, quote: "*Sadly, I do not have space to address the deficiencies of another recently released government report, the Climate Commission's The Critical Decade: International Action on Climate Change. (Note: the hyperbolic title.) This intellectually dishonest report paints a picture of international action on climate change that is at odds with reality*".

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/magpies-nest-of-manufactured-drivel/story-fnbkvnk7-1226464250748>

Journalist Andrew Bolt reveals, quote: "*This intellectually dishonest report paints a picture of international action on climate change that is at odds with reality*":

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/scrap_this_shameless_propaganda_outfit_now/

And here, quote: "*Not for the first time, the Climate Commission has released a disgracefully selective and misleading report to preach the warmist gospel*":

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/climate_commission_cherry_picks_again/

And here:

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/how_the_climate_commission_tried_to_trick_you/

Now that journalists can see the obvious, why is it that our government and its bureaucrats cannot? Why is it that our federal opposition cannot and instead continues to support unscientifically wasting billions of dollars on its *Direct Action* policy? Has either of the main parties any interest in ethically supporting real-world empirical science and taxpayers?

Double standards?

Why is it that taxpayer-funded climate commissioners are not held accountable for their many false statements that contradict empirical scientific evidence? Why is Alan Jones admonished for making an error that was clearly an innocent mistake as revealed by his emphasis on repeatedly using the correct figures. Please see Appendices 13d and 13e.

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/climate-of-dissent-being-punished/story-e6frfifx-1226500249819>

Conclusion

The Climate Commission's reports and individual Commissioners' statements and implied claims contradict climate, empirical scientific evidence and associated data such as that on energy generation. They provide no empirical scientific evidence and no logical scientific reasoning that human CO₂ caused global warming.

The government-funded Climate Commission's approach is not scientific. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence. Its approach is political. Its behaviour is that of an advocacy body spreading and supporting government policy. It displays traits of propaganda.

The Climate Commission embodies and reflects the sad reality that fundamental in modern Australian national governance is the belief that government knows best, government tells people what is needed and government then tries to convince people with spin and manipulation. This has usurped democratic government's fundamental role of protecting people's lives and property through engaging and connecting people to understanding the needs of the people they supposedly serve.

Instead, Australian governance is confirming the adage that government's make dangerous servants and terrible masters. Australian governance has forgotten how to serve and instead seeks to control. The jackboot and rifle have largely been replaced by spin and spending, yet their wasteful purpose remains to control.

Why is there no apology from the Climate Commission for its errors exposed? Why no apology from the government? Why isn't the opposition holding them accountable? Why isn't the mainstream media expressing outrage?

Government, like fire, is a dangerous servant and a terrible master
George Washington

But where is the scientific evidence of the importance of fictitious per capita emissions? Good question. There is none, there is only a political consensus and an abandonment of science, an abandonment of truth, an abandonment of common sense, and an abandonment of Australians by their own government."

Graham Williamson, 2012

The rooster crowing at sunrise is not evidence the rooster caused the sun to rise.
Adapted from a speech by Aung San Suu Kyi