

## Essential Facts to Support Senator Wong in Correcting Her Public Misrepresentations as Minister for Climate Change

### Contrary to Senator Wong's Public Assertions in Hurried Defense of UN IPCC Errors on Himalayan Glaciers, such Errors are Not Exceptional, They are Demonstrably Typical

For eight months I've been asking Senator Wong questions and providing her with abundant scientific material and credible scientific references. These have ranged from detailed paper documents with scientific references to faxes, to paper letters sent by Registered Post to approximately 100 e-mails, many substantiated with scientific references.

These challenge Senator Wong's public position on global warming and specifically her claims that the modest natural, cyclic warming that ended around 1998 was caused by humans and specifically by human production of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). My intent has been to protect my children who are entitled to an opportunity to earn a secure future, protect my elderly parents who have worked hard all their lives and to protect the environment, science, integrity and basic human freedom. In so doing, my intent has been to protect Senator Wong.

On Monday, January 18th, 2010, the ABC reported on the then unfolding controversy over the UN IPCC's unfounded fabrications claiming catastrophic melting of Himalayan glaciers. In its web news article headed '*Wong defends UN over climate mistake*' the ABC said, quote: '*But Ms Wong says the main claims of climate change science remain unchallenged*'.

*"This is a report that has been peer reviewed extensively; very few errors have been found in it and none that challenge the central findings," she said.*

*"Climate change is real and human beings are contributing to it, and people like Senator Minchin, who have never believed in climate change, will jump on anything in order to justify their position."*

(<http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/01/18/2794830.htm>. *Wong defends UN over climate mistake*)

The material in this summary makes it abundantly clear that Senator Wong's trivialisation of the UN IPCC's Himalayan falsities contradicts the reality of the UN IPCC. That organisation's 'peer review' typically is not what is commonly understood as scientific peer review practices. In addition to avoiding accepted peer review practices, the UN IPCC even bypasses its own typically ineffective reviews.

The UN IPCC's many very serious breaches of scientific integrity, scientific peer review and honesty are at the heart of its core claims and many minor supporting claims.

As used in this document, fraud is defined as:

Fraud [frawd] –noun

1. deceit, trickery, sharp practice, or breach of confidence, perpetrated for profit or to gain some unfair or dishonest advantage.
2. a particular instance of such deceit or trickery: *mail fraud; election frauds*.
3. any deception, trickery, or humbug: *That diet book is a fraud and a waste of time*.
4. a person who makes deceitful pretences; sham; poseur.

Source: Dictionary.com Unabridged. Based on the Random House Dictionary, 2009.

## Understanding the UN IPCC's Himalayan Glacier Fraud

Senator Wong's unfounded defence of the UN IPCC's 2007 report contradicts the facts that have emerged as follows in the scandal now nicknamed Glacieregate:

Fact - a lone scientist, Syed Hasnain, who was credited with making the forecast included in the UN IPCC report has admitted he never made a specific forecast.  
(Jeremy Page, The Australian, Fr.22.01.10, Front page reprinted from The Times. 'UN says sorry for glacier error')

Fact - the scientist now works in Delhi for the Energy and Resources Institute headed by Rajendra Pachauri, the UN IPCC chairman.  
(Jeremy Page, The Australian, Fr.22.01.10.)

Fact - when finally admitting the UN IPCC's serious error, the UN IPCC chairman refused to answer any questions on the report.  
(Jeremy Page, The Australian, Fr.22.01.10.)

Fact - when the Indian government itself challenged the UN IPCC report's claim last year, chairman Pachauri responded by describing those who cast doubt on the UN IPCC's Himalayan glacier claims as practising and peddling quote, "voodoo science";  
(Peter Wilson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.23.01.10, page 10. 'Climate Chief on Thin Ice')  
(Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10. 'Climate Science on Thin Ice and associated side bar entitled Ice and snow not retreating any more')

Fact - the UN IPCC's completely unfounded claim that Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035 due to human production of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) had been "cut and pasted" from a WWF campaign document, that had in turn been based on a journalist's news item about an Indian glaciologist, Syed Hasnain. It was not supported by any scientific research; ie, a journalist interviewed an Indian scientist and on that basis wrote a news item. That was converted into a WWF campaign document and from that source became the UN IPCC's claim and forecast which was embellished with specific numbers also unfounded.  
(Peter Wilson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.23.01.10)  
(Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10)

That is the basis for the government's climate policies. Thus we have journalism (based on one source lacking data) being passed off as scientific research and later the single source denies providing any specific dates such as 2035.

Fact - the UN IPCC claims its report has a certainty of 90%;  
(Editorial, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10. *Not so fast: why glaciers offer a lesson in caution*)

Fact - such claims for levels of certainty have been justifiably exposed as laughable by noted scientists world-wide, including UN IPCC scientists. Please see below. There is no logical basis for such a statement and, clearly from the Himalayan Glacieregate mess, such claims are laughable.

Separately, Britain's Lord Monckton explains that the quantitative confidence level was manufactured by a group of non-scientists writing the UN IPCC's political report. The decision was made on a show of hands. That is not science.  
(Public presentation in Brisbane by Lord Christopher Monckton, Fr.29.01.10)

What does it say about the UN IPCC when, as reported by The Australian newspaper, Professor Murari Lal 'oversaw the chapter on Himalayan glaciers in the 2007 IPCC report' yet 'Lal admits he knows little about glaciers'.

Fact - like glaciers around the world, some Himalayan glaciers are retreating, some Himalayan glaciers are advancing and other Himalayan glaciers are stationary. Refer to side bar entitled 'Ice

*and snow not retreating any more*' accompanying the reference entitled 'Climate Science on Thin Ice'. Note the article indicates that while expert scientists disagree on what is happening overall to Himalayan glaciers it is clear that if the Himalayan glaciers are retreating they are not retreating at anything like the rate claimed by the UN IPCC. Experts say the UN IPCC's claims amount to "*a gross misrepresentation*"

(Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10)

Fact - Australian glacier expert Cliff Ollier from the University of Western Australia accuses the UN IPCC of being "deliberately alarmist" "*because he says the organisation has a vested interest in global warming*";

(Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10)

Fact - The UN IPCC had been warned well ahead of publication day by a leading glaciologist, Georg Kaser, that the prediction presupposed warming at two to three times the highest expected rate. As he said: "This number is not just a little bit wrong; it is as wrong as wrong can be"

(C Pearson, The Weekend Australian, (Inquirer page 7, 'The climate starts to suit Abbott') ;

Fact - the UN IPCC's claims about the melting of Himalayan glaciers appears to be flawed on many levels: (1) the UN IPCC did not acknowledge there had been only limited research on the remote Himalayan glaciers that are among the least studied in the world; (2) there is a lack of field data to corroborate the UN IPCC's forecast—the Himalayas have thousands of glaciers and only 30 have been studied for one fifth of the time needed to understand the glaciers. Yet UN IPCC reports imply an air of confidence and certainty; (3) failure to acknowledge that there is disagreement among the world's glacier scientists as to the cause of retreating glaciers, especially while some glaciers are advancing and others stationary; (4) the UN IPCC failed to acknowledge that the rate of retreat of glaciers has slowed yet it says the rate is accelerating.

(Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10)

Fact - the Indian government has had the courage to question the UN IPCC and even to "*accuse the IPCC of being alarmist*" to which UN IPCC chairman Pachauri responded by labelling the Indian government as arrogant and practising '*voodoo science*';

(Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10)

Fact - the UN IPCC report was the purported basis for December's Copenhagen summit. See below for the newspaper report by Britain's Times newspaper stating UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri was advised of the error before the Copenhagen conference.

Fact - the Himalayan '*prediction*' has been described as '*apocalyptic*' with consequences including "*deadly floods followed by severe long-term water shortages across the food bowl of Asia*". Based on such a scenario, truly scary reports said this would seriously and directly threaten 500 million people and as many as 2 billion people. Horrific. Fanning fear, the WWF said it would mean "*massive economic and environmental problems for people*".

(Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10)

Fact - journalists have used the UN IPCC's unfounded, alarmist and erroneous claim on Himalayan glaciers to spread climate alarm world-wide.

(Peter Wilson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.23.01.10 '*Glaciergate threatens a climate change*')

Fact - Professor Murari Lai, the Co-ordinating Lead Author of the UN IPCC report's chapter responsible for the Himalayan falsity, quote: "*it related to several countries in this region and their water sources. We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action. It had importance for the region, so we thought we should put it in.*" ie, it was politically motivated, not scientific.

(David Rose, Mail, '*Glacier Scientist: I knew data hadn't been verified*' <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1245636/Glacier-scientists-says-knew-data-verified.html>)

Fact - Benny Peiser of the Global Warming Policy Foundation says, quote “*The IPCC review process has been shown on numerous occasions to lack transparency and due diligence*”; (Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10)

Fact - contrary to the ABC’s depiction of Senator Wong making light of the issue, the UN IPCC eventually apologised for its serious breach of peer review.\* The UN IPCC seems to have realised that the public could see the seriousness of the issue. Yet Senator Wong seems unable to agree. Even in apologising, UN IPCC chairman Pachauri seems to want us to believe the UN IPCC was merely ‘slipping up on a number’ and that UN IPCC review processes are sound. The Australian newspaper editorial correctly pointed out the Himalayan glacier scandal is indicative of UN IPCC structural problems. The next page provides links to McLean’s excellent papers presenting UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes. McLean’s work highlights that UN IPCC processes are systemically flawed and politically driven. McLean’s papers cannot be sensibly refuted since they simply present data obtained from the UN IPCC itself. McLean’s 2009 article on the UN IPCC’s history shows the UN IPCC is not scientific and has been driven by political purposes to an agenda that predated its formation in 1988. He quotes revealing statements made by UN IPCC chairmen and senior members of the UN themselves. (\*Jeremy Page, The Australian, Fr.22.01.10, Front page reprinted from The Times. ‘*UN says sorry for glacier error*’) (Editorial in The Australian, Fr.22.01.10 entitled ‘*Heeding the political lessons of Glaciergate, subtitled Governments must constantly question scientific claims*’)

**The significance of the Himalayan error is that contrary to Senator Wong’s claim in the ABC News report, the error was not a simple error but a deliberate and conscious attempt to bypass peer review to fabricate unfounded alarm for political purposes.**

The UN IPCC’s reports are not extensively peer reviewed. The UN IPCC’s so-called peer review processes actually breach typical scientific peer review processes and are virtually useless in that they provide no reassurance of scientific rigour.

In accepted peer review processes, reviewers submit their comments anonymously and it is then up to the authors to defend their claims. In the UN IPCC’s process by contrast, comments are not anonymous. That is significant because reviewers can be afraid to lose funding or even membership of scientific bodies - as has happened. In the UN IPCC’s processes, there have been instances when authors evaluated comments and dismissed comments with no sound reason given. Please consider these five (5) references to McLean’s diligent work:

- [http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC\\_numbers.pdf](http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf)
  - [http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC\\_review\\_updated\\_analysis.pdf](http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf)
  - [http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\\_policybot/pdf/23573.pdf](http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/23573.pdf)
  - [http://folk.uio.no/tomvs/esef/McLean\\_ipcc\\_review.pdf](http://folk.uio.no/tomvs/esef/McLean_ipcc_review.pdf)
  - [http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband\\_the\\_ipcc.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf)
- history of UN IPCC:  
[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate\\_science\\_corrupted.html](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate_science_corrupted.html)

Quoting internationally eminent UN IPCC scientist Paul Reiter, in UN IPCC processes “*the deliberations of the authors are strictly confidential*”. Quoting Solomon from his interviews of many UN IPCC scientists and experts in their field: “*In effect the science is spun, disagreements purged, and results predetermined*”. Solomon, page 189. (Solomon, L., 2008. ‘*The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so*’. Richard Vigilante Books, USA.)

That Senator Wong seems not aware of this is an indictment of her Ministry of Climate Change or demonstrates her lack of integrity.

If Senator Wong had done her due diligence or even taken responsibility for ensuring her department fulfilled its responsibilities to the parliament and the nation she would have been aware of this. It seems surprising that Senator Wong could not be aware and that likely raises even more serious questions than incompetence and negligence.

Senator Wong's statement in the ABC report that few errors have been found in UN IPCC reports is blatantly false as the many points made later in this document amply and reliably demonstrate. The UN IPCC's central findings have been demonstrated clearly by eminent scientists to be false. Indeed, the strongest comments exposing the UN IPCC's reports as unfounded have come from UN IPCC scientists as I show below. Another powerful body has proven the UN IPCC's central (core) claim to be false - Nature herself.

There is no scientifically measured, real-world proof that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming. Not one piece. None.

Repeatedly, the UN IPCC has acted consistent with the preordained political agenda defined for it before its first report. Thus it has been consistently making a climate alarm mountain out of a data molehill. Actually, the UN IPCC has been making a mountain of alarm out of nothing.

Senator Wong though, while lacking any evidence to support her ABC statement, is making a molehill out of a mountain of evidence exposing UN IPCC misrepresentations, fabrications and fraud. Thus, she seems to have reinforced her position as an accomplice to the UN IPCC's fraud.

Her response to Senator Minchin's statement reminds of Pachauri's response to the Indian government's scientific facts challenging the UN IPCC report. ie, Pachauri stated the Indian government was arrogant and practising 'voodoo science'. Yet when the truth emerged it was Pachauri whose faulty science was exposed.

In the Himalayan scandal, an unfounded alarmist claim from a lone scientist has, via an activist organisation, been included in a UN IPCC report to governments world-wide. That report was falsely implied to be checked and supported by 4,000 scientists. Then, Mr Rudd became a carrier for the falsity by publicly spreading the falsity of vetting and support by 4,000 scientists. He has said publicly that is the basis for his climate policy and CPRS. This mocks science, climate and Nature - and the Australian government. In rushing to blindly defend the UN IPCC before even the UN IPCC had decided on its apology, Senator Wong mocks her position. The senator's credibility is destroyed by her own lack of due diligence.

Why did Senator Wong, without waiting for the facts to emerge, support the UN IPCC's report? Why did Senator Wong not investigate the UN IPCC, especially after numerous UN IPCC unscientific acts and falsities have been drawn to her attention - repeatedly? Why is the senator condoning the UN IPCC's repeated, flagrant breaches of scientific process? Why?

**An Early Summary of UN IPCC Fraud was Given to Senator Wong and all federal MP's on December 16th, 2009.  
It is provided again for Senator Wong**

In March, 2008 I attended the First International Conference on Climate Change in New York, addressed by some of the world's most eminent climate scientists and environmentalists. Thereafter I continued exploring by reading thousands of pages of scientific books, papers and articles. Included in my reading were publications that in turn reference thousands more scientific publications. The enclosed paper document, entitled '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*' was first sent to Senator Wong electronically on December 16th, 2010. It provides a summary of global warming and climate alarm.

It's been very well received since its release on December 16th and continues generating many appreciative comments. It's spreading quickly on the net and has already been posted on many web sites in Australia and overseas including:  
<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/nature-and-humanity.pdf> and  
[http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Thriving\\_with\\_nature\\_and\\_humanity.pdf](http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Thriving_with_nature_and_humanity.pdf).

Following on from the document's four brief introductory pages, the first section '*Earth Misrepresented*' (pages 9 through 14) provides a summary of the UN IPCC's fraudulent climate misrepresentations. These pages link to references provided on pages 53 through 55. In particular I refer Senator Wong to references listed under the Note preceding the first reference on page 53. The document includes a declaration of my personal interests on page 52.

In addition to providing a summary of the science, my document is designed to protect people against the human condition that can drive the human ego to control and damage people—especially in large institutions such as political parties. It provides an explanation of the development of unfounded climate alarm verging on panic.

On a personal note, my past experience in all industry sectors includes positions of responsibility for the lives of hundreds of people working with methane and carbon dioxide. I am familiar with these gases. My background includes experience in industry and in the bush living and working with Nature.

References to this document below are denoted as 'Thriving'.

As can be seen from the stunning expose of UN IPCC non-science that has occurred since my document's publication less than two months ago, my document's summary of UN IPCC fraud is already superseded. In light of the recent rapidly expanding expose of the UN IPCC, my document significantly understates the extent of UN IPCC fraud and corruption of science.

## **Blatant Exaggerations and Gross Errors Typify UN IPCC Reports**

Clearly, the Himalayan glacier scandal was not a simple mistake missed by thousands of scientists falsely implied to be writing and reviewing the UN IPCC's core claims. Contrary to UN IPCC comments, breaches of peer review are common in UN IPCC reporting processes, including those surrounding the most alarmist and publicised aspects of its claims. Some include those listed below.

The UN IPCC has a history of systemic and systematic bypassing and misrepresenting science. Its claims of scientific peer review are nonsensical.

Echoing the statement of Dr Murai Lai above, eminent climate scientist John Christy, (Alabama State Climatologist and University of Alabama in Huntsville) Lead Author of the UN IPCC's 2001 report claims, quote: *"I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol."*

(<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/5064/Manufactured-Science-Another-IPCC-Scientist-Reveals-How-UN-Scientists-talked-about-trying-to-make-IPCC-report-so-dramatic-that-US-would-just-have-to-sign-Kyoto-Protocol>)

**The UN IPCC's core claim of high temperatures is unfounded, was made by junior contributors and breached peer review. After it succeeded in driving unfounded world-wide climate alarm it was withdrawn**

The UN IPCC's core temperature claims of unusually high and rapidly rising temperatures were based on an unscientific graph fabricated by a junior scientist, Michael Mann working with colleagues Bradley and Hughes. The collaborators bypassed peer-review processes. In serious breach of accepted scientific peer review processes, other scientists were prevented from accessing the data.

Yet without any substantiating data, the graph - and the UN IPCC - dismissed 787 scientists (of 462 institutions in 42 nations)\* who have demonstrated Earth's global temperature was as much as 2 degrees C warmer just 800 years ago. Thus, by adopting a graph from a junior 'scientist' with no track record (Mann) and by avoiding peer review, the UN IPCC contradicted the scientifically accepted fact that global temperatures in the Medieval Warming Period were far higher than in Earth's latest modest natural warming. Despite the Medieval Warming period appearing in the UN IPCC's own 1995 report, and despite it being scientifically accepted world-wide, the UN IPCC dismissed it unilaterally with NO scientific proof.  
(\*Britain's Lord Monckton during radio interview, Th.28.01.10)

The UN IPCC graph purporting unusually high and rapidly rising temperatures has since been scientifically discredited world-wide. After the graph had successfully driven climate alarm world-wide, the UN IPCC quietly withdrew its discredited graph from prominence.

The fabrication was discovered after painstaking investigation by two statisticians, Canada's Ross McKittrick and America's Steve McIntyre. They found the graph by Mann et al was fabricated using demonstrably unscientific processes. In a similar fabrication by Briffa, these methods were apparently compounded by unjustifiable selective use of data. Mann and Briffa have both been implicated in the CRU 'Climategate' scandal. Mann is reportedly now under investigation in the USA.

Details and references are provided in '*Thriving With Nature & Humanity*', sent electronically to all members of federal parliament on December 16th, 2009. It is now available on many web sites including:

<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/nature-and-humanity.pdf> and  
[http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Thriving\\_with\\_nature\\_and\\_humanity.pdf](http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Thriving_with_nature_and_humanity.pdf).

**This graph was initially the UN IPCC's flagship for its claim that humans caused runaway global heating. In reality it became yet another example of the UN IPCC's reliance on non-experts, unscientific methods, unsubstantiated data and avoidance of peer review.**

Contrary to Senator Wong's statement to the ABC on Monday, January 18th, 2010, these tricks lie at the heart of the UN IPCC's core claim.

### **Both of Earth's Two Accurate Sets of Global Temperature Records Show No Net Warming since 1958**

It is well known that radiosonde (weather balloon) data shows no net warming since 1958. For the relevant recent portion of that period, this has been confirmed by satellite data.

Temperatures fell from 1958 to mid-1970's, then rose to 1998 and then have since fallen and returned to 1958 levels as shown by both weather balloons and satellites. Senator Wong has been repeatedly advised of this fact together with substantiating references. Professor Bob Carter provided material to Senator Wong's team when he was supporting Senator Fielding. Carter provided further material in his submission to the 2009 Australian Senate Enquiry into the Draft CPRS Bill. He provided evidence yet again when he addressed members of parliament last year in a forum that Senator Wong apparently declined to attend.

### **Contrary to UN IPCC Predictions, Satellites Measuring 24 Hour Every Day have Found No Tropospheric Warming**

Thus the UN IPCC's erroneous computer model projections are in error after just ten years. How can they be trusted to predict climate 100 years into the future? They cannot.

### **Corruption of Ground Temperature Records Used by the UN IPCC**

It has been exposed that temperature records from ground based weather stations have been corrupted by gross errors, by location of weather stations skewed through proximity to industrial heat sources artificially raising temperatures, by skewing of recordings due to the Urban Heat Island effect and by seemingly intentional corruption of data.

In their excellent report entitled 'Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception', meteorologists Joe D'Aleo and Anthony Watts provide a succinct summary of this tampering. Their summary of conclusions is, quote:

- 1. Instrumental temperature data for the pre-satellite era (1850-1980) have been so widely, systematically, and unidirectionally tampered with that **it cannot be credibly asserted there has been any significant 'global warming' in the 20th century.***
- 2. All terrestrial surface-temperature databases exhibit very serious problems that render them **useless for determining accurate long-term temperature trends.***
- 3. All of the problems have skewed the data so as greatly to **overstate observed warming** both regionally and globally.*
- 4. Global terrestrial temperature data are gravely compromised because more than three-quarters of the 6,000 stations that once existed are no longer reporting.*
- 5. **There has been a severe bias towards removing higher-altitude, higher-latitude, and rural stations, leading to a further serious overstatement of warming.***
- 6. Contamination by urbanization, changes in land use, improper siting, and inadequately-calibrated instrument upgrades **further overstates warming.***
- 7. Numerous peer-reviewed papers in recent years have shown the overstatement of observed longer term warming is 30-50% from heat-island contamination alone.*
- 8. Cherry-picking of observing sites combined with interpolation to vacant data grids may*



make heat-island bias greater than 50% of 20th-century warming.

9. In the oceans, data are missing and uncertainties are substantial. Comprehensive coverage has only been available since 2003, and **shows no warming**.

10. Satellite temperature monitoring has provided an alternative to terrestrial stations in compiling the global lower-troposphere temperature record. Their findings are increasingly diverging from the station-based constructions in a manner consistent with evidence of a warm bias in the surface temperature record.

11. NOAA and NASA, along with CRU, were the driving forces behind the systematic hyping of 20th-century “global warming”.

12. Changes have been made to alter the historical record to mask cyclical changes that could be readily explained by natural factors like multidecadal ocean and solar changes.

13. Global terrestrial data bases are seriously flawed and can no longer be trusted to assess climate trends or VALIDATE model forecasts.

14. An inclusive external assessment is essential of the surface temperature record of CRU, GISS and NCDC “chaired and paneled by mutually agreed to climate scientists who do not have a vested interest in the outcome of the evaluations.”

15. Reliance on the global data by both the UNIPCC and the US GCRP/CCSP also **requires a full investigation and audit.**”

(Reference: [http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface\\_temp.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf) [Accessed, January, 2010.]

Their authoritative report includes detailed case studies. One case study exposes the tampering of temperature data from Darwin’s weather station. Is Senator Wong aware of this? If not why not?

Quotes from their report include:

“These graphs all use the raw GHCN\* (temperature) data, and they show virtually no trend in temperatures in Northern Australia in 125 years”. This confirms the work of the late Professor Lance Endersbee.

\*GHCN - Global Historical Climate Network

**“Before the ‘adjustment’ by NOAA, temperatures in Darwin were falling at 0.7 Celsius per century, but after the honogenization they were rising at 1. Celsius per century. The gross upward adjustment was 2 Celsius (degrees) per century”.**

A simple graph by Canadian statistician, Ross McKittrick puts this in simple pictorial form. His graph shows that when stations were eliminated, reported global temperature climbed alarmingly - in the 1990’s and 2000’s. A rather remarkably questionable concurrence.

(Wishart, I, 2009. Air Con—The Seriously Inconvenient Truth About Global Warming. Howling At The Moon Publishing, New Zealand, page 110.)

(The graph is available on the internet at:

[http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\\_policybot/pdf/26664.pdf](http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/26664.pdf) page 4)

## **Climate Research Unit (CRU), Key Source of UN IPCC Temperature Data, is Corrupt**

The scandal that has come to be known as Climategate is serious. A summary is provided in ‘Thriving’ on pages 13 and 14. Investigations have commenced. The release of e-mails from the Hadley Climate Research Unit of the University of East Anglia show the corruption of academia and agencies that contribute to the UN IPCC. E-mails exposed UN IPCC scientists hiding Earth’s natural cooling and misrepresenting science through fraudulent collaborations, fabrications and intimidation. It seems the unscientific behaviour was driven partly by seeking government grants. Again, there are examples of the bypassing of peer review and the deliberate avoidance of peer review.

## **USA's NASA and NOAA Face Claims of Corruption. Both Provide Global Temperature Data to UN IPCC**

CRU Climategate has now broadened to include serious allegations of unscientific and dishonest tampering of data at the USA's NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) and NASA, organisations that provided temperature data for the UN IPCC's reports.

All three temperature data sets (CRU, NASA, NOAA) from ground based measuring stations have apparently been corrupted. This has apparently involved tampering to fabricate warming when in reality there was no warming. NASA scientist James Hansen has inexplicably preferred to use unreliable ground based temperature measurements over the highly accurate and verified satellite measurements from NASA's own satellites. These satellite records and weather balloon measurements show no net warming—only natural inherent variation that raised and lowered temperatures. Hansen is a close associate and 'scientific' adviser to Al Gore.

## **UN IPCC's Core Claim on Atmospheric CO2 Levels was Falsified**

The UN IPCC's core claim of rising Atmospheric CO2 levels was fabricated by omitting credible, accurate past measurements of atmospheric CO2 that contradicted another false UN IPCC core claim—steadily, rapidly and abnormal rising of atmospheric CO2 levels.

The UN IPCC deliberately excluded 90,000 reliable measurements of atmospheric CO2 levels by scientists, including some awarded Nobel Prizes for science.

Note that the Nobel Peace Prize as awarded to Al Gore and the UN IPCC is awarded on the basis of a political process within the Norwegian parliament. Reassuringly though, Nobel prizes for physics and chemistry, are awarded by a scientific panel.

By excluding the earlier, reliable readings, the UN IPCC falsely claimed atmospheric CO2 levels were above those of the recent past.

Details provided in 'Thriving', page 10

## **UN IPCC Political Summary Reports Presented to Media and National Governments Contradicted UN IPCC Scientists' Reports**

In 1991, UN IPCC scientists stated that warming cannot yet be attributed to any anthropogenic (human) causes.

In 1995, five (5) statements by UN IPCC scientists in their report stated that warming could not be attributed to human causes. Despite this, the UN IPCC's Report for Policymakers—widely circulated to the media and governments—falsely claimed warming was due to human activity.

According to Lord Monckton, a UN IPCC scientist was asked by bureaucrats to change the report. He complied. The document was not re-circulated to peer review, nor to other scientists before it was published and given to the media.

(Public presentation in Brisbane by Lord Christopher Monckton, Fr.29.01.10)

Details provided in 'Thriving'.

In its 2001 report the UN IPCC quantified the likelihood of its predictions of damaging warming caused by humans at 66%. There was no scientific derivation of this figure.

(Public presentation in Brisbane by Lord Christopher Monckton, Fr.29.01.10)

In its 2007 report the UN IPCC raised the likelihood to 90%. The decision was made by politicians and bureaucrats on a show of hands. That is not science.  
(Public presentation in Brisbane by Lord Christopher Monckton, Fr.29.01.10)

### **Amazongate Highlights UN IPCC's Unfounded Alarm over Natural Wonders and Ecosystems**

From The Australian' newspaper (Mo.01.02.10) comes a revelation that broke into the public domain last week. Quote: "*A startling report by the UN climate watchdog (UN IPCC) that global warming might wipe out 40 per cent of the Amazon rainforest was based on an unsubstantiated claim by green campaigners who had no scientific expertise.*"

*The source for its claim was a report from WWF, an environmental pressure group, which was written by two green activists. They had based their "research" on a study published in the science journal Nature, which did not assess rainfall but looked at the impact on the forest of human activity such as logging and burning. WWF said on Saturday it was launching an internal inquiry into the study.*

*This is the third time in as many weeks that serious doubts have been raised over the IPCC's conclusions on climate change. Two weeks ago, after reports in London's The Sunday Times and The Australian, the panel was forced to retract a warning that climate change was likely to melt the Himalayan glaciers by 2035. That warning was also based on claims in a WWF report.*

*The IPCC has been put on the defensive as well over its claims that climate change may be increasing the severity and frequency of natural disasters such as hurricanes and floods."*  
(Jonathan Leake, The Australian newspaper, Mo.01.02.10 'More Flaws Emerge in Climate Alarms')

Britain's Telegraph newspaper states, quote:

*"The claim in an IPCC report that 40 per cent of the Amazon rainforest could disappear through global warming turned out to be unfounded:*

*Dr North next uncovered "Amazongate". The IPCC made a prominent claim in its 2007 report, again citing the WWF as its authority, that climate change could endanger "up to 40 per cent" of the Amazon rainforest – as iconic to warmists as those Himalayan glaciers and polar bears. This WWF report, it turned out, was co-authored by Andy Rowell, an anti-smoking and food safety campaigner who has worked for WWF and Greenpeace, and contributed pieces to Britain's two most committed environmentalist newspapers. Rowell and his co-author claimed their findings were based on an article in Nature. But the focus of that piece, it emerges, was not global warming at all but the effects of logging."*

Amazongate: new evidence of the IPCC's failures

The IPCC is beginning to melt as global temps rise, says Christopher Booker.  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html> [Accessed, January 30, 2010]

### **Student and Hikers Wrote UN IPCC's Claims About Mountain Alarm**

A news report on the ABC News web site on Mo.01.02.10 was headlined '*UN climate claims based on student essay*'.  
(ABC News, 31.01.10, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/01/31/2805918.htm>)

Hot on the heels of the UN IPCC's apology over the Himalayan scandal and its reassurances that the remainder of its 2007 report was of a high standard and had been peer reviewed,

Britain's Sunday Telegraph has found alarming claims by the UN IPCC stretching over three continents yet not peer reviewed, quote:

*"In its most recent report, it stated that observed reductions in mountain ice in the Andes, Alps and Africa was being caused by global warming, citing two papers as the source of the information.*

*However, it can be revealed that one of the sources quoted was a feature article published in a popular magazine for climbers which was based on anecdotal evidence from mountaineers about the changes they were witnessing on the mountainsides around them.*

*The other was a dissertation written by a geography student, studying for the equivalent of a master's degree, at the University of Berne in Switzerland that quoted interviews with mountain guides in the Alps."*

And, this, similar to the week before after apologising for the previous embarrassment, quote:  
*"The IPCC failed to respond to questions about the inclusion of unreliable sources in its report but it has insisted over the past week that despite minor errors, the findings of the report are still robust and consistent with the underlying science."* Is it Groundhog Day every week?

(Richard Grey, Science Correspondent and Rebecca Lefort, 30.01.10. 'UN climate change panel based claims on student dissertation and magazine article', The Sunday Telegraph <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7111525/UN-climate-change-panel-based-claims-on-student-dissertation-and-magazine-article.html>)

### **UN IPCC Alarm over Storms has been Fabricated**

It's not just Britain, Europe and Australia that's being startled. American mainstream media is at last waking to the UN IPCC. From ABC News (America), quote: *"At the IPCC report, the damage associated with such events "are very likely to increase due to increased frequencies and intensities of some extreme weather events" (italics in original). The report cites as evidence a study that supposedly demonstrates precisely this trend.*

*The only problem is that the study in question had not been subjected to outside peer review before the IPCC report went to press. This has since been done, and the conclusions are surprising: "We find insufficient evidence to claim a statistical relationship between global temperature increase and normalized catastrophe losses," read the report published in the compendium "Climate Extremes and Society."*

*Roger Pielke, a leading expert in this field, wrote in his blog: "The claims were not just wrong. The claims were based on knowledge that just doesn't exist."*

(G Traufeiter, *Can Climate Forecasts Still Be Trusted? Confidence Melting Away: Doubts Grow in Climate Change Debate* <http://abcnews.go.com/print?id=9685251> [Accessed January 29, 2010])

### **Unfounded Alarm Contradicted by Eminent Scientists—Experts in their Field**

In his book entitled 'The Deniers', one of Canada's most respected environmentalists, Lawrence Solomon reveals that in topics including sea level, ice caps, glaciers, storms, diseases, atmospheric CO2 levels, temperature, sun, atmospheric CO2 levels and ice cores he interviewed at least one top scientist from each field, including UN IPCC scientists. They contradict UN IPCC claims.

Along the way Solomon found there is no scientific consensus supporting the UN IPCC. Scientists noted that more scientists disagreed with the UN IPCC's conclusions and claims than agreed. Scientists revealed shoddy UN IPCC processes including suppression of scientists who

disagreed with the UN IPCC's seemingly predetermined outcomes, biased processes and use of non-experts and non-scientists including activists passed off as experts.

It is clear that the UN IPCC is not scientific and has no grounds for alarm over Earth's modest natural global warming that ended around 1998. Solomon appears to have started his book with little expectation of finding much. That he uncovered a large number of top scientists contradicting UN IPCC reports and exposing the UN IPCC's shoddy science and unscientific work seems initially to have surprised him. Only now are we realising why so many UN IPCC claims were not written by scientists at all

New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart similarly exposes glaring UN IPCC falsities, unfounded claims for alarm and absurdities. These include the UN IPCC Chairman's major falsities, repeated in public after he had been advised his statements were false. (Wishart, I, 2009. Air Con - The Seriously Inconvenient Truth About Global Warming. Howling At The Moon Publishing, New Zealand.)

As an aside, Solomon's interviews of eminent scientists and economists reveals the Stern Review contains unfounded exaggerations that indicate the Stern Review, like UN IPCC reports, is unfounded and aimed at promoting unfounded alarm to achieve a political agenda.

Separately, an independent expert group of scientists, statisticians and economists (including former British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Lawson) completely and soundly discredited the Stern Report soon after its release. The critique showed basic assumptions and data used by Stern were unsupported and wildly exaggerated to create alarming unfounded outcomes. (<http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/World%20Economics%20-%20Stern%20Review,%20Part%201.pdf>  
<http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/WE%20Riposte%20to%20Critique.pdf>)

The Stern Review has recently returned to the headlines.

Richard Gray, The Sunday Telegraph reports, Su.31.01.10, quote:

"Information was quietly removed from an influential government report on the cost of climate change after its initial publication because supporting scientific evidence could not be found. The Stern Review on the economics of climate change, which was commissioned by the Treasury, was greeted with headlines worldwide when it was published in October 2006. It contained dire predictions about the impact of climate change in different parts of the world. But it can be revealed that when the report was printed by Cambridge University Press in January 2007, some of these predictions had been watered down because the scientific evidence on which they were based could not be verified.

Among the claims that were removed in the later version of the report, which is now also available in its altered form online, were claims that North West Australia has been hit by stronger tropical typhoons in the past 30 years.

Another claim that southern regions in Australia have lost rainfall due to rising ocean temperatures and air currents pushing rain further south was also removed.

Claims that eucalyptus and savannah habitats in Australia would also become more common were also deleted.

The claims were highlighted in several Australian newspapers when the report was initially published, but the changes were never publicly announced.

A figure on the cost of US Hurricanes was also changed after a typographical error was spotted in the original report. The original stated in a table the cost of hurricanes in the US would rise from 0.6% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) to 1.3%.

The later report corrected the error so the increase was from 0.06% to 0.13%. A statement about the correction appeared in a postscript of the report and on the Treasury website.

The Stern Review has been instrumental in helping the UK government draw up its climate change policies while it has also been cited by leading organisations such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in its assessment reports on climate change."

(<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7111618/Stern-report-was-changed-after-being-published.html>)

Jonathan Leake, The Sunday Times, Su.31.01.10, quote  
Lord Stern's report on climate change, which underpins government policy, has come under fire from a disaster analyst who says the research he contributed was misused.  
Robert Muir-Wood, head of research at Risk Management Solutions, a US-based consultancy, said the Stern report misquoted his work to suggest a firm link between global warming and the frequency and severity of disasters such as floods and hurricanes.  
The Stern report, citing Muir-Wood, said: "New analysis based on insurance industry data has shown that weather-related catastrophe losses have increased by 2% each year since the 1970s over and above changes in wealth, inflation and population growth/movement.  
"If this trend continued or intensified with rising global temperatures, losses from extreme weather could reach 0.5%-1% of world GDP by the middle of the century."  
Muir-Wood said his research showed no such thing and accused Stern of "going far beyond what was an acceptable extrapolation of the evidence".  
The criticism is among the strongest made of the Stern report, which, since its publication in 2006, has influenced policy, including green taxes.  
(<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7009710.ece>)

### **Unfounded Deliberate Hurricane Panic Contradicting Science**

Hurricane/cyclone expert Professor Chris Landsea, a Contributing Editor for the UN IPCC's second major report (1995) and its Third Assessment Report in 2001 was invited to participate in the UN IPCC's latest report (2007). Yet, according to Solomon, another UN IPCC scientist Kevin Trenberth, with the support of UN IPCC chairman Pachauri, made false public statements of increasing hurricane activity that knowingly contradicted the scientific evidence. The statements triggered unfounded alarm. Solomon, page 30.

It appears the wording of the public release could have been deliberately alarming yet cleverly unspecific. The effect though in the media was alarming.

Trenberth has been named in the Climategate scandal as lamenting the lack of warming and apparently wanting to hide it.

Landsea resigned from the UN IPCC because it was corrupting science. Landsea saw back in 2004 that the UN IPCC's science was problematic and had the courage to say so. Solomon, page 34.

After the unscientific and unfounded fearful hurricane media release had done its job in spreading alarm, the UN IPCC dropped its use. Solomon pages 35 and 36.

### **Unfounded Alarm over Disease Contradicts Science**

Paul Reiter, arguably the world's most eminent scientist on insect-borne diseases and a member of the UN IPCC has condemned the UN IPCC's practices as unscientific and dishonest. Solomon's interviews of Reiter (pages 183-190) expose disturbing behaviour by the UN IPCC. The UN IPCC's alarming claims about mosquito borne disease were unfounded.

Quote, Reiter: "*I know of no other scientist with any long record in this field who agrees with the pronouncements of the alarmists at the IPCC*";

Solomon: '*Reiter says that using climate models to predict the spread of mosquito-borne diseases. as the IPCC does, reflects a dangerous ignorance*;

Solomon: '*These (UN IPCC) claims, says Reiter, reflect an astounding ignorance of disease history*';

Reiter: "*The paucity of information in the IPCC reports was hardly surprising: not one of the lead authors had ever written a research paper on the subject. Moreover, two of the authors, both physicians, had spent their entire careers as environmental activists. one of these*

activists has published 'professional' articles as an 'expert' on 32 different subjects, ranging from mercury poisoning to land mines, globalisation, to allergies, and West Nile virus to AIDS".

Solomon: 'According to Reiter, the (UN IPCC) contributing authors included exactly one "professional entomologist, and a person who had written an obscure article on dengue and El Nino, but whose principal interest was the effectiveness of motorcycle crash helmets (plus one paper on health effects of cell phones)" (Reiter quoted).

### **Unfounded Alarm in UN IPCC Reports was Often Inserted by Activists, not Scientists**

As Professor Reiter says above, activists lacking qualifications wrote key statements in the UN IPCC reports. Yet the same statements passed 'peer review'

It has been reported that: '*There are Dozens' of instances where WWF reports have been cited as the sole authority for contentious claims. The World-wide Fund for Nature (WWF) is not a scientific body, but a lobby group so to have its information as the sole basis for the IPCC to decide on climate change is poor scrutiny of the information.*' See below.

### **Unfounded Alarm About the Barrier Reef**

Brave scientists and dive operators have, in recent months, been reported in The Australian newspaper as speaking out by saying the reef is in fine health. Now the scepticism is about unfounded gloomy alarm. Parts of the Great Barrier Reef have bleached in previous summers and in record **cold** temperatures during the winter of 2008. Reports and observations show that is entirely normal.

(Jamie Walker, We.03.02.10, '*Report undercuts Kevin Rudd's Great Barrier Reef wipeout*', The Australian newspaper.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/report-undercuts-kevin-rudds-great-barrier-reef-wipeout/story-e6frg6nf-1225826128644>)

Lord Monckton confirms this to be correct.

(Monckton - material used in American presentation, October, 2009)

On the subject of reefs, Britain's Sunday Telegraph newspaper reports, quote:

*"It can be revealed that the IPCC report made use of 16 non-peer reviewed WWF reports. One claim, which stated that coral reefs near mangrove forests contained up to 25 times more fish numbers than those without mangroves nearby, quoted a feature article on the WWF website."*

(Richard Grey, Science Correspondent and Rebecca Lefort, 30.01.10. '*UN climate change panel based claims on student dissertation and magazine article*', The Sunday Telegraph

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7111525/UN-climate-change-panel-based-claims-on-student-dissertation-and-magazine-article.html>)

### **Unfounded Alarm About Human Food Production**

Quoting from Dr RW Bradnock, former editor (1994-1995) of the Geographical Journal):

*"I know that many of the claims about the impact of 'global warming' in Bangladesh, for example, are completely unfounded. There is no evidence that flooding has increased at all in recent years. Drought and excessive rainfall are the nature of the monsoon system. Agricultural production, far from being decimated by worsening floods over the last twenty years, has nearly doubled. In the early 1990s, Houghton published a map of the purported effects of sea-level rise on Bangladesh. Coming from a Fellow of the Royal Society, former Head of the Met Office and Chair of the IPCC, this was widely accepted, and frequently reproduced. Yet, it shows no understanding of the complex processes that form the Bengal delta, and it is seriously misleading. Moreover, despite the repeated claims of the World Wide*

*Fund, Greenpeace, and, sadly, Christian Aid, the melting of the Himalayan glaciers is of completely marginal significance to the farmers of the plains in China, India, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. One could go on!"*

([http://web.mac.com/sinfonia1/Global\\_Warming\\_Politics/A\\_Hot\\_Topic\\_Blog/Entries/2008/6/9\\_Guest\\_Essay:\\_A\\_Christian\\_Critique.html](http://web.mac.com/sinfonia1/Global_Warming_Politics/A_Hot_Topic_Blog/Entries/2008/6/9_Guest_Essay:_A_Christian_Critique.html))

Note that Houghton to whom Bradnock refers above is a past chair of UN IPCC Working Group who has been quoted as justifying going beyond science to foment alarm and fear. See quote below.

### **Unfounded UN IPCC Alarm Propagates Other Unfounded Alarm**

This is clearly occurring. Last year I attended a lecture in Brisbane by a Nepalese palaeontologist promoting peril in Nepal from the claimed rapid retreat of Himalayan glaciers. He relied upon UN IPCC reports. He was inadvertently reinforcing the UN IPCC's myth and spreading unfounded alarm.

### **Zero Scientific Evidence for Catastrophes**

Lord Monckton references Schulte, 2008 in stating of the '539 global climate change papers', 'evidence for catastrophe was presented by 0'. None.  
(Monckton - material used in American presentation, October, 2009)

Senator Wong, referring again to the ABC report, clearly it is the UN IPCC who is jumping on anything in order to justify its position.

### **More than 20 Additional Cases of Unsubstantiated UN IPCC Alarm are Being Exposed**

From the same Telegraph article comes this, quote: "A Canadian analyst has identified more than 20 passages in the IPCC's report which cite similarly non-peer-reviewed WWF or Greenpeace reports as their authority, and other researchers have been uncovering a host of similarly dubious claims and attributions all through the report. These range from groundless allegations about the increased frequency of "extreme weather events" such as hurricanes, droughts and heatwaves, to a headline claim that global warming would put billions of people at the mercy of water shortages – when the study cited as its authority indicated exactly the opposite, that rising temperatures could increase the supply of water."

From The Sunday Telegraph newspaper, Britain, quote:

*"It can be revealed that the IPCC report made use of 16 non-peer reviewed WWF reports."*  
(Richard Grey, Science Correspondent and Rebecca Lefort, 30.01.10. 'UN climate change panel based claims on student dissertation and magazine article', The Sunday Telegraph <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7111525/UN-climate-change-panel-based-claims-on-student-dissertation-and-magazine-article.html>)

### **UN IPCC Does Not Work for National Governments - it Works for its UNEP Agenda**

From the same American mainstream media source as the previous item, quote: "*when the IPCC recently set up a special working group to address natural disasters, the US government nominated ecologist Pielke. The IPCC declined to appoint him.*"

Yet the UN IPCC claims to serve governments.

There is a significant number of credible scientists who have resigned from the UN IPCC in



disgust at the UN IPCC's politicisation of 'science' and/or who have spoken out publicly condemning the UN IPCC as unscientific it is clear the UN IPCC does not follow its own protocols for appointing scientists to its panel. Thriving, page 11.

Note the substantial and solid work of John McLean reveals much systemic corruption in the UN IPCC since its inception in 1988: McLean, J, 2009b. *Climate Science Corrupted: How the IPCC's sponsor, the UNEP, and key IPCC individuals have misled governments into supporting the notion of manmade warming*. Science & Public Policy Institute. [http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate\\_science\\_corrupted.html](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate_science_corrupted.html) [Accessed: December, 2009]

### **It is an Indictment of Senator Wong that When Senator Steve Fielding Asked Her Simple, Basic Questions on Climate, Senator Wong and Her Advisers Could Not Provide Scientific Proof - They have No Proof Humans Caused Global Warming**

One of Senator Wong's responses to Senator Fielding's questions apparently included the statement that ocean temperatures are rising. That is not correct. Scientists accompanying Senator Fielding pointed out that Argo measurements show oceans appear to be cooling.

### **Lead Author and Editing Reviewer of UN IPCC Chapter Claiming Human Causation of Warming has No Scientifically Measured Real-World Evidence Humans Caused Global Warming**

In recent months I have been corresponding via e-mail with Professor David Karoly, one of the close knit group of authors and reviewers of the UN IPCC's single chapter attributing global warming to human production of CO<sub>2</sub> in each of its 2001 and 2007 reports. David was a Lead Author of the 2001 report's chapter and a Review Editor of the 2007 report's chapter which built on the 2001 report's chapter.

Late last year, I asked David for scientifically measured real-world proof that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming. He has not provided any proof - because there is none.

Senate parliamentary records dated June 18, 2009 reveal David Karoly received \$1.9 million in grants from the federal government.

### **Data Obtained from the UN IPCC Itself Exposes UN IPCC Processes as Unscientific**

McLean's outstanding documents have been listed above 'Thriving', pages 13, 14.

The UN IPCC's charter limits UN IPCC investigations to seeking human causes of global warming. The original site providing the charter was suddenly withdrawn from use after this became a topic of discussion by climate realists. It can now be found in internet archives at: <http://web.archive.org/web/20071113023321/http://www.ipcc.ch/about/about.htm> [Accessed early January, 2010]

The charter is significant. It means the UN IPCC does not seek natural explanation of warming. A logical extension of the charter is that failure by UN IPCC bureaucrats to find evidence of human causation would mean the body has no future - and they would have no jobs.

**Although UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri Repeatedly Implied 4,000 Scientists Endorse the UN IPCC's Core Claim that Human CO<sub>2</sub> Warmed Earth, Only Five (5) Endorsed the Claim. And there's doubt they were even scientists. The Prime Minister has assisted the UN IPCC in spreading this falsity**  
(Thriving, page 11)

## **In Absence of Sound, Scientific Data, the UN IPCC Creatively Conjured Erroneous Models to Fabricate ‘Data’**

In absence of solid, scientifically measured real-world data, the UN IPCC bases its core claim on UN IPCC computer models.

These have not only failed as noted above, they are not based on sound understanding of science. Additionally, they omit known major natural drivers of climate - deliberately and inexplicably.  
(‘Thriving’, page 12.)

Table 2.11 of the UN IPCC’s own 2007 report admits low and very low levels of understanding of 13 of 16 listed climate drivers. Yet apart from being buried in the bowels of a thick report, this received scant attention.

Yet these models were the basis of unfounded alarm in media releases. The media often reported them as if they were reliable, bankable forecasts. The UN IPCC not only allowed this, it seems to have encouraged it, wilfully.

## **UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri’s Apparent Conflicts of Financial Interest are Public Knowledge - and Seemingly Hugely Significant**

Britain’s Lord Monckton advises UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri and former UN IPCC Working Group Chairman John Houghton are under criminal investigation in Britain for filing false accounts as trustees of an organisation associated with climate research. Lord Monckton claims “*very serious financial irregularities*” by profiteers running the UN IPCC.  
([http://www.2gb.com/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=6295&Itemid=134](http://www.2gb.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=6295&Itemid=134))

Credible commentators expressing concern about Chairman Pachauri’s conflicts of financial interest are numerous. They include:

- Booker & North - Pachauri’s apparent income from links with carbon trading companies:  
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/6847227/Questions-over-business-deals-of-UN-climate-change-guru-Dr-Rajendra-Pachauri.html>
- Monckton:  
[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri\\_letter.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri_letter.pdf)
- Delingpole - listing many Pachauri business links:  
<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100019821/climategate-with-business-interests-like-these-are-we-really-sure-dr-rajendra-pachauri-is-fit-to-head-the-ipcc/>
- Telegraph (Britain):  
<http://climaterealists.com/index.php?id=4908>

Pachauri was a lead author on the IPCC’s second report (1995) which paved the way to Kyoto – which in turn ushered in the world’s first carbon trading schemes.

Alarmist fabrications presented by Pachauri at Copenhagen can be found at:  
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/12/17/lord-monckton-reports-on-pachauris-eye-opening-copenhagen-presentation/>

Lord Monckton highlights major, glaring errors in Pachauri’s public presentations at:  
[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri\\_letter.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri_letter.pdf)

Outstanding books by Wishart (eg, pages 118, 119) and Solomon raise Pachauri’s falsities and unfounded alarmism. Refer to References listed in Thriving (page 53) and separately above. It is clear from Wishart’s account that Pachauri knowingly continues to speak falsities even after being made aware that his statements are false.

According to The Times (newspaper) on line, UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri was advised of the Himalayan glacier revelation before December's Copenhagen conference. Yet he apparently failed to disclose it.

The same source advises that the Chairman used the exaggerated and false Himalayan error to win grants worth hundreds of thousands of pounds.

(<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7009081.ece>)

UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri is a director of the TERI organisation. According to The Sunday Times newspaper in Britain, the TERI organisation obtained a 310,000 pound from New York's Carnegie Corporation and 'the lion's share of a 2.5 million pound grant funded by European taxpayers', quote:

*'The Carnegie money was specifically given to aid research into "the potential security and humanitarian impact on the region" as the glaciers began to disappear. Pachauri has since acknowledged that this threat, if it exists, will take centuries to have any serious effect.'*

*'An abstract of the grant application published on Carnegie's website said: "The Himalaya glaciers, vital to more than a dozen major rivers that sustain hundreds of millions of people in South Asia, are melting and receding at a dangerous rate.'*

*"One authoritative study reported that most of the glaciers in the region "will vanish within forty years as a result of global warming, resulting in widespread water shortages,"*

*The Carnegie money was specifically given to aid research into "the potential security and humanitarian impact on the region" as the glaciers began to disappear. Pachauri has since acknowledged that this threat, if it exists, will take centuries to have any serious effect.'*

(Jonathon Leake, The Sunday Times, Su.24.01.10, 'UN climate chief Rajendra Pachauri "got grants through bogus claim"')

(<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6999975.ece>)

The web site of Senator Wong's Department of Climate Change lists grants of taxpayer funds given by her department. They include a grant to TERI entitled 'Influencing International Climate Change' for the purpose of 'Sponsorship of the 2009 Delhi Sustainable Development Summit'. The grant was approved on December 11th, 2008.

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

### **The UN IPCC and its Executive have Thwarted and Discredited Real Scientific Research Stifling Real Science and Progress**

From his book interviewing the world's leading experts in each field of climate science, Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon provides examples of how UN IPCC actions and statements have held back the progress of real science. eg, page 145, 160.

This has severe impacts on science that has underpinned our society's material development and our knowledge about health, safety and security - and humanity's understanding of the natural world.

Disruption of real climate science may have serious immediate consequences. Eminent climate scientists—particularly Russians— are agreed in forecasting an imminent severe natural cooling on Earth that will likely hit food production. If accurate, this damage to food production will occur at the time agricultural land is being sacrificed to bio-fuels. Concurrently, use of low cost, reliable and environmentally compatible high energy density fuels such as oil, coal and natural gas is being discouraged through proposed additional artificial costs imposed by the government.

Russia continues to give priority to real scientific research into climate to understand the predicted severe cooling. Some developed nations following political agenda meanwhile waste resources on a non-problem fabricated by the UN IPCC with assistance from Al Gore. This waste driven by the UN IPCC is a moral issue and a safety and security concern.

## UN IPCC Senior Members Have Repeatedly Justified the Use of Unfounded Alarm

Former UN IPCC Working Group Chairman, John Houghton, quote: “*Unless we announce disasters, no one will listen.*”

Stephen Schneider, quote: “*We have to offer up scary scenarios.*”

And other advocates of alarm:

Stephen Guilbeault, Greenpeace, 2005, quote: “*Global warming can mean colder. ....That’s what we’re dealing with*”

In Australia, Professor David Karoly made a public statement on Monday, November 9th, 2009 claiming that each year there are no scientific papers published that ‘*seriously contradict the conclusions of the IPCC.*’ This is false. His statement seems to be aimed at reinforcing the myth that there is a consensus of scientists supporting the notion that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> was responsible for Earth’s latest modest global warming that ended around 1998.

In reality, there are hundreds of scientists including the world’s leading climate scientists producing many papers, including peer reviewed papers, completely discrediting the UN IPCC’s core claim. Much of the work contradicting the UN IPCC is by UN IPCC scientists.

David’s statement can be found in the program transcript at:  
<http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2009/s2737676.htm>

## Deviation of Funds to a Non-Problem (Natural Global Warming) Prevents Addressing Real Humanitarian and Environmental Challenges The Focus on Natural Global Warming is a Damaging Attack on the Environment

Biologist and respected founding environmentalist, David Bellamy, states money wasted on fighting Nature’s modest and now completed global warming cycle could be better spent on fighting world hunger and poverty, providing clean water, developing alternative energy sources, improving our environment, creating jobs. This is consistent with the World Health Organisation’s list of ten factors affecting human life expectancy. It is consistent with the late Professor Lance Endersbee’s thorough evaluation showing that the unfounded focus on natural global warming is detracting from addressing real pollution and looming humanitarian threats.

**Worse, Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon puts it into perspective on page 210 of his book entitled: "The Deniers" when he says, quote: "But Kyoto is not an insurance policy. Just the opposite, it is the single greatest threat today to the global environment, because it makes carbon into currency. Carbon is the element upon which all living things are built. With carbon a kind of currency—which is what all carbon taxes and carbon trading and similar schemes do—all ecosystems suddenly have a commercial value that makes them subject to manipulation for gain."**

Solomon then provides examples of manipulation due to carbon trading that are destroying the environment and hurting the world's vulnerable and poor. **In essence, the use of carbon trading schemes can involve paying people to offset carbon by destroying natural trees in natural forests, destroying communities and livelihoods - while simultaneously allowing continued production of carbon while banks and governments get rich.**

‘Carbon markets’ are not free and open like a true market. Carbon trading is a scheme of regulated and controlled activities highly vulnerable to manipulation and rorting. The scheme is camouflaged by the term “*market*”. Simply considering the product offered in the ‘market’ and the buyers’ needs reveals it is really not a real market.

Serious damage to the environment from adopting UN IPCC advice becomes obvious from reading *Thriving* ages 30 and 31 revealing very serious environmental and humanitarian challenges caused by smashing energy efficiency.

### **The Garnaut Review Relies Entirely and Only on UN IPCC Reports**

Refer to chapter 2 of the Garnaut Review report, another plank in the government's claim for its CPRS. The Garnaut Review relies entirely on 'science' provided by UN IPCC reports.

### **It seems that for the Government, it is the CPRS that Matters, not CO2**

This conclusion is based on the following, among other, observations:

- Senator Wong's lack of challenging the UN IPCC over its errors even when repeatedly raised to her attention;
- the government's fast-tacking of a large Queensland coal mining project. Thus it seems that while coal mined and burned in Australia is detrimental to our planet, that same coal mined in Australia and burned in China is enthusiastically supported by the government. This is despite Australian power stations having generally superior and more efficient combustion technology enabling greater efficiency (less CO2 per unit of energy generated) and less real pollutants (particulates and toxins);
- the government's taking of property rights as its way to easily ensure compliance with Kyoto without reducing production of CO2 - as illustrated by the spontaneous farmers' campaign supporting Peter Spencer;
- the government's desperate last minute acceptance of Malcolm Turnbull's CPRS amendments despite Senator Wong's initial severe public condemnation of same;
- the government flying 114 staff to Copenhagen.

The conclusion is clear: the government will go to extraordinary lengths to introduce a 'carbon-trading' scheme that is fully open to unlimited political fiddling enabling huge cost increases after introduction. Those changes will affect Australia, Australian employers and Aussies.

The observation that other nations' carbon trading schemes have failed and have no impact on CO2 is sobering. Additionally, that CO2 does not affect climate is the killer to every any Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS).

### **Senator Wong: Have you Caught the UN IPCC Disease of Creating Unfounded Alarm?**

Immediately prior to the Copenhagen fiasco, Senator Wong's department released a report that prompted alarming media headlines based on speculation about sea level associated with a report produced by her department. The report claims to assess risks based on current claimed sea level rises and projected sea level rises in reference to UN IPCC figures. Both these assumptions greatly exceed figures provided by science including actual measurements in recent years. The report assesses risks using computer models.

Reputable scientists, including UN IPCC scientists show there is no increase in rate of natural sea level rise due to human production of CO2. Indeed, scientific measurements show no rise in sea levels in recent years.

(*Thriving*, page 26. Note particularly references listed atop *Thriving* page 53, especially Solomon, Wishart and Singer NIPCC.)

The late climate expert Rhodes Fairbridge proved sea levels have changed several times within the last 1,000 years and by as much as 2 metres up and down. Among many factors, it appears sea level is, affected by:

- solar system and solar deviations that appear to be cyclic;
- quantity of water in the oceans (affected by snowfall and polar ice accumulation);

- temperature of water in oceans;
- land subsidence, particularly significant for islands.

The UN IPCC has made a habit of stirring unfounded scary headlines while hiding the details, disclaimers, uncertainty and sources - if these are mentioned at all.

The UN IPCC has been times its release of falsities to most effectively promote unfounded alarm through the media. Has Senator Wong's department been doing the same before events such as key senate votes, Copenhagen, elections? From her department's sea level report and other observations including government comments on the Great Barrier Reef and Kakadu, it seems so.

### **Senator Wong Misrepresenting Science and Climate to Her Own Party**

Senator Wong has, through her written response to her own party member—Senator Furner—misrepresented climate and science. If that letter is typical of Senator Wong's advice to her party, as seems to be the case, Labor Members of Parliament have been seriously misinformed.

Please refer to my detailed response to Senator Wong's response. My reply to Senator Furner highlighting Senator Wong's misrepresentations was electronically copied last November to all MP's including Senator Wong and in paper form to the Attorney General and to Senator Claire Moore.

### **The Vast Majority of People Inherently Care for the Environment, Yet Senator Wong Foments Unfounded Guilt and Fear**

People are entitled to live their life without government ministers fomenting unfounded alarm and guilt. From what I have seen, Senator Wong's use of fear and guilt is damaging to society, particularly to children.

The Senator's actions, in my view, promote the isolation and separation of humanity from Nature—our source, essential companion and spirit. For the protection of our natural environment, for the sake of our planet and for global peace, in a world in which many people live seemingly disconnected from Nature, we need to redevelop human connection with the sense of unity shared by all life.

What a challenging world it would be if weather was controlled by what we and our fellow animal species exhaled. In reality, Nature is so much grander, wondrous and magnificent.

We share the following with all living things:

- carbon occurring in every cell of our body and every cell of every flower, plant and animal;
- life force;
- a common source - whether one is a creationist or a believer in the big bang, we are all part of the miracle of life springing from the same universal source;
- we all depend on oxygen, water vapour and carbon dioxide.

## **The UN IPCC's Core Greenhouse Gas Effect 'theory' contradicts the Laws of Physics and Nature - it's not even a Theory, not even a Supposition. It's a Falsity**

Consider these established facts and laws:

1. The First Law of Thermodynamics says energy cannot be created or destroyed, merely converted in form;
2. The Second law of Thermodynamics says heat transfer occurs only from warmer to colder bodies, not from colder to warmer bodies. (Heat cannot of itself move from a colder to a warmer body);
3. There are three means by which heat is transferred: conduction, convection and radiation;
4. Gases do not trap heat in the open atmosphere. Remember, in confined spaces air acts as an excellent insulator. That's why it's used in double pane glass. Yet, when moving in the open atmosphere, gases provide excellent heat transfer through conduction from surfaces to air molecules. This enables operation of air-cooled motors and, through the wind chill factor, causes windy winter days to feel colder than still days of the same temperature. When the gas reaches the upper atmosphere the density becomes sufficiently low to allow the radiation to escape to space. (As an aside, if the concentration of gases in the atmosphere that more readily absorb heat increases, their absorption and re-radiation actually help cool the Earth by radiating heat more quickly away from Earth);
5. Lindzen and Choi, in their peer reviewed 2009 paper entitled "On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data" report real-world scientific measurements of radiative feedback (from air in the atmosphere). These scientifically measured real-world findings seriously contradict a core assumption of UN IPCC climate modellers. (Note: Lindzen and Choi do not discuss the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas *theory* and restrict their comments to the UN IPCC's computer models.) The findings would appear to support the classical physics I outline;
6. Heat transferred from Earth's surface to the atmosphere by conduction at their interface is transported primarily by convection to the upper atmosphere and then by radiation to space. That is common-sense confirmed by any glider pilot reliant on using thermals to climb in elevation;
7. In 1909, physicist RW Wood proved that reradiation of heat-rays by glass panels does not cause a greenhouse to become warmer as Al Gore and the UN IPCC claim. In 100 years of peer review since, his simple, replicable, scientific experiment has never been contradicted. It is common-sense. If glass is removed from ends of a greenhouse, the greenhouse loses its ability to stay warm. The warming in a greenhouse is not due to the roof glass, it is due to the prevention of cooler air from entering and the prevention of warmer air from leaving. The air within the greenhouse is warmed primarily by contact with the greenhouse floor heated by sunlight.

Like many people, including scientists, I was initially fooled by the UN IPCC's Greenhouse Gas Effect 'theory'. Examination of the supposed *theory* though using the laws and observations above shows it:

- contradicts the First Law of Thermodynamics. According to the UN IPCC, re-radiation of heat from the tropospheric CO<sub>2</sub> molecules produced by humans radiates increased heat to Earth which warms Earth's surface causing Earth to radiate more heat which further heats the troposphere causing more heat to radiate back to Earth and so on. This is an infinite heat generating phenomenon. Free radiation from the molecules cannot occur as claimed by the UN IPCC. Nature and physics say it cannot happen;
- contradicts the Second Law of Thermodynamics in that the troposphere at 10,000 feet elevation is 20 degrees C cooler than Earth's surface yet the UN IPCC claims it warms Earth's surface. Nature and physics say it cannot happen;
- relies on tropospheric CO<sub>2</sub> molecules to have intelligence in radiating heat only downward toward Earth. This is not possible and contradicts Nature because molecules radiate heat in all directions. Nature and physics say it cannot happen.
- contradicts the way an actual greenhouse works. Greenhouses depend not on re-radiation from glass panels, they depend on stopping cooling air from entering the closed glasshouse. They prevent convection;
- contradicts Nature because Earth's atmosphere does not operate as a greenhouse. Heat transfer occurs primarily through conduction at Earth's surface followed by convection toward space. The overwhelming heat transfer is by convection from Earth's surface to cooler space.

When remembering that oceans cover 71% of Earth's surface, realise that most of the heat is transferred to the air through evaporation of the warmed ocean surface water. I've read this is estimated to be 60% of the heat transferred from Earth. Of the remainder, a large percentage is estimated to escape through air's contact with Earth's solid surfaces—conduction.

By absorbing Earth's heat and reradiating it out to space, any gases with greater ability to absorb heat would cool the Earth. Increased quantities of tropospheric CO<sub>2</sub> would likely reduce Earth's temperature or at worst have no warming effect.

According to Britain's Lord Monckton, quote: "*IPCC climate sensitivity estimate rests on just 4 scientific papers*". That is a highly contentious field. The UN IPCC has shown repeatedly it cannot be trusted. I do trust Nature and the laws of physics.

In reality, as Lindzen & Choi show in their recent peer-reviewed paper, increased quantities of CO<sub>2</sub> will increase the rate of heat radiated from the upper troposphere-stratosphere into space. This is the opposite of that claimed by UN IPCC climate models relying on faulty logic and theory that contradicts Nature and laws of physics. Those models are the only remaining 'basis' of the UN IPCC's core claim that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> is catastrophically warming Earth. During the last ten years, these models' projections have been in gross error since global temperatures fell yet the models predicted the Earth would warm. Thus the '*models*' failed to even predict the direction of temperature change, much less the amount.

Lindzen, R S, Choi, Y-S, 2009. On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data, *Geophysical. Res. Lett.*, 36, L16705, doi:10.1029/2009GL039628. <http://www.drroyspencer.com/Lindzen-and-Choi-GRL-2009.pdf> [Accessed: January, 2009]

As a result of Lindzen and Choi's work, one suspects the uncertainty in modelling is even larger than the enormous uncertainty already (quietly) admitted in the UN IPCC's Table 2.11. The UN IPCC's greenhouse gas effect *theory* of warming is nonsense because the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas effect *theory* contradicts the laws of physics and Nature and now contradicts Lindzen's and Choi's real-world scientific measurements of Nature.

Norm Kalmanovitch's statement that, quote: "The forcing parameter of the climate models is just a contrived number that has no physical basis" supports the notion that there is no foundation for the computer models relied upon by the UN IPCC.

(Source: CCNet 8/2010 – 31 January 2010, daily news bulletin produced by Dr Benny Peiser, Faculty of Science, Liverpool John Moores Campus, <http://www.staff.livjm.ac.uk/spsbpeis/>)

Note that the UN IPCC's ignorance of greenhouse operation and of the true effects of glass in greenhouses is consistent with the many instances of the UN IPCC ignoring peer-reviewed science that does not conform to its preordained agenda.

Given the amount of inflamed hot air generated by the UN IPCC, it is ironic that the UN IPCC seems to not understand that weather and Earth's atmosphere are driven by heat differentials and that hot air rises.

## **The UN IPCC's '*theory*' is Impossible and Un-natural**

### **Regular Seasonal Variation of Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> Levels Shows that Nature Controls CO<sub>2</sub> Levels and that Human Production of CO<sub>2</sub> Cannot Cause Global Warming**

The Earth's soils, near-surface rocks, oceans and biomass contain 100,000 times the carbon contained in Earth's atmosphere. The Earth's oceans contain, as dissolved CO<sub>2</sub>, 50 times the CO<sub>2</sub> contained in earth's atmosphere. CO<sub>2</sub>'s solubility in water decreases as water temperature increases. 71% of the Earth's surface is ocean. Most of that ocean is in the southern hemisphere.



According to UN IPCC figures, annually humans produce around 23 billion tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub>. Annually Nature produces a whopping 770 billion tonnes. Thus humans produce just 3% of Earth's annual CO<sub>2</sub> production. Thus Nature overwhelmingly controls production of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels are seasonal, cyclical. During the southern hemisphere summer, ocean surface waters warm and release huge quantities of dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere to raise global atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels. During the southern hemisphere winter, ocean surface waters cool and absorb huge quantities of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere. Thus, even though humans continue producing CO<sub>2</sub>, Nature more than compensates and reduces atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels. Thus Nature entirely controls the reabsorption of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere that is in balance with the oceans and other CO<sub>2</sub> sinks through Henry's (gas) Law and through Nature maintaining natural equilibrium.

Why? Because Earth works to maintain equilibrium. Nature has not watched Al Gore's movie - she does not have '*tipping points*'. Instead, she has natural balancing mechanisms that return atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels to equilibrium. These equilibrium levels are themselves part of Nature's overall mechanisms for maintaining equilibrium through natural, inherent variation in thousands, perhaps millions, of natural factors.

Controlling almost all production of CO<sub>2</sub> and all reabsorption of CO<sub>2</sub>, Nature controls and determines atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels.

Scientific studies point to residence time for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> within the range 2-18 years, with many papers concluding 5-7 years. Some recent scientific studies show residence time is 12 months. That is, within 5-7 years or possibly within 12 months of CO<sub>2</sub> being produced (whether by Nature or by humans) it is removed from the atmosphere. That is part of the carbon cycle that is essential for all life on earth. Many natural factors affect atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels. When these factors change it can lead to new atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels. eg, ocean temperatures have a large controlling effect on atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels and the ongoing increase of temperature from the Little Ice Age has likely caused more ocean outgassing than can be absorbed by increased vegetation. The Little Ice Age's third minimum started to end around 1850. Earth's temperature currently remains below Earth's average for the last 3,000 years. (Thriving, page 19.)

Using the above figures, and thinking in layman's terms, in every 85,800 molecules of air, 33 are CO<sub>2</sub>. Of those just one is produced by humans. That the UN IPCC and Al Gore claim that one (1) molecule of CO<sub>2</sub> in 85,800 molecules of air catastrophically warms the planet is nonsense. That the UN IPCC and Al Gore claim that one (1) molecule of human CO<sub>2</sub> causes catastrophic warming while the remaining 32 molecules of Nature's identical CO<sub>2</sub> do not is insanity.

### **Copenhagen Contortions were Due Primarily to There Being No Scientifically Measured Real-World Data that Humans Caused Global Warming - None**

In absence of real data, individual leaders jockeyed by juggling their personal and national agenda to fulfil personal goals on a world stage in front of their nations' media feeding images back to their electorates. All the ingredients for a mess. Too many cooks (egos), each cooking a different dish to avoid negative electoral perceptions on television sets back home.

The fact there is no scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused Earth's modest global warming that ended around 1998 says it all. If there was any that showed Earth or humanity had a real problem there would have been concerted, unified action.

That there wasn't simply confirms no nation has evidence that human CO<sub>2</sub> warmed the planet.

## **If the UN IPCC was a Company, it Would be Up For Fraud**

In summary:

- UN IPCC reports are not scientifically prepared and do contradict science;
- The UN IPCC ignores natural causes of global warming;
- Very few scientists support the UN IPCC's core claim that human activity warmed the planet and a huge number world-wide oppose the UN IPCC's core claim;
- There is no scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming;
- Many UN IPCC claims are unscientific and provided by uninformed and unscientific activists pursuing their own agenda bypassing peer review;
- Many claims of the UN IPCC are false;
- The lack of any true and effective peer review process and the unjustified dismissal of well-founded dissenting comments demonstrates UN IPCC reports were written to a predetermined aim to ensure a predetermined outcome.

## **UN IPCC Reports are No Basis for Government's Global Warming Policy and CPRS**

As such the government has no basis for any CPRS. Nor any energy tax. Nor any rationing.

### **Dismiss the CPRS**

The UN IPCC shows it not only does not have science on its side, it contradicts the science. Instead, Nature and science show human production of CO<sub>2</sub> has no impact on global temperatures or climate. There is no scientific foundation for any emissions trading scheme (ETS).

Science, ecology and economics help us to understand our civilisation and humanity's recently discovered security, safety and ease of living. Ignorant, unfounded tampering to impose arbitrary artificial cost increases to energy will eradicate humanity's recent advances. To protect our environment, civilisation and freedom, leave intact the key to our civilisation and security, the key that has freed much of humanity from drudgery, misery and early death - energy, from fuels containing carbon.

Protect reliable, low cost, abundant, environmentally compatible energy. Drop the ETS and instead focus attention and resources on developing economically sound renewable energy and to assisting the world's poor to higher standards of health, wealth, security and ease. Our role is not to prevent them, it is to assist them. To the extent we do, the sooner the world will find peace.

### **Request for Inquiry to Overcome UN IPCC Fraud**

Initially, when hearing and reading Senator Wong's comments on climate over the last three years I felt annoyance, even anger because they undermined my need for honesty and integrity. As I see Senator Wong sinking under the weight of the UN IPCC's dishonesty and the position in which she has placed herself, I feel compassion. We cannot accurately know her needs that drove her misrepresentations. We can though know that if the government implements the CPRS through her misrepresentations she will hurt our nation and our planet.

The UN IPCC is disintegrating. The percentage of people of the opinion that humans caused the modest global warming that ended around 1998 is below 50% and falling. All MP's need unite to conduct a transparently independent and objective inquiry into the UN IPCC's fraud.

**"The only thing more dangerous than ignorance is arrogance." Albert Einstein**  
And fear?