

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

Tuesday, November 10th, 2009

Senator Mark Furner
Senator for Queensland
PO Box 2246
Strathpine QLD 4500
And;
The Senate
Parliament House
Canberra ACT 2600

Dear Senator Furner:

Re: Your letter conveying response from Senator Wong

Thank you for your letter dated November 2nd, 2009 that arrived late last week. Please accept my regret for not replying earlier as my father was in hospital and I had to care for my mother who is 91 years of age. I have since returned home and am addressing mail.

I feel encouraged that my letter of July 30th, 2009 triggered you to ask questions of Senator Wong. You seem to be starting to do your due diligence and I'm encouraged you are meeting needs for fulfilling parliamentary responsibilities to the Australian people.

Concurrently though I feel deeply concerned with Senator Penny Wong's response to you. This is partly due to her response containing numerous direct and implied falsities and partly due to my wondering as to her circumstances and her motivation for spreading falsities.

Late last week on Thursday afternoon and evening, November 5th, you were sent electronic copies of my correspondence with Senator Wong and the Prime Minister. You will note from those copies that Senator Wong has received from me two (2) copies of each of four (4) outstanding and objective reports by John McLean. Those reports reveal falsities and misrepresentations contained in UN IPCC reports and spread implicitly and directly by the UN IPCC Chairman. Please note that McLean's reports cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present data on UN IPCC report writing processes and that the data was provided by the UN IPCC itself.

Referring to copies of my correspondence with Senator Wong, I am concerned that Senator Wong was not able initially to even collect her mail containing McLean's reports sent by Registered Mail. After the reports were provided by facsimile Senator Wong's office collected the reports. Yet I have still not received any reply from Senator Wong. Now it seems it needed seven (7) weeks for her response to reach your office. Your promptness in forwarding it the same day is appreciated.

I enclose a copy of your letter and of Senator Wong's response to you. On that copy, paragraphs have been numbered by hand. I will now respond to your letter and to her response to you by referring to the numbered paragraphs as items.

Item (1)

Thank you.

Item (2)

Thank you - your responsibility is appreciated and commended.

Item (3)

This response is being copied to both of Senator Claire Moore's offices.

Item (4)

Your representation and diligence is appreciated. I am wondering why Senator Wong failed to respond to any of my correspondence to her.

Item (5)

While there is clear evidence Earth's climate has continually changed for billions of years and continues to continually change, there is no evidence whatsoever that Earth's latest modest period of global warming from the mid-1970's through to around 1998 was caused by human activity. None. Senator Wong's statement that the climate is changing (quote) 'due in large measure to anthropogenic greenhouse gases' is false.

As becomes clear below, Senator Wong has no measured scientific data as evidence for her claim.

Further, there is abundant solid, scientific evidence confirming that Earth's modest warming was due to Nature. References are provided below for you. Further the fall in global temperatures since 1998 completely contradicts the UN IPCC's unfounded 'theory' on global warming. This completely contradicts Senator Wong's implied conclusion in the last sentence of the paragraph marked item (5).

Her implied conclusion is based on her reference to UN IPCC reports that, as explained below, contain unscientific falsities. My assertion is abundantly supported below.

Item (6)

Contrary to what Senator Wong implies, the UN IPCC's processes appear to be grossly prejudiced with many instances of peer review having been bypassed or ignored, thereby resulting in significant misrepresentations of science. These misrepresentations have been revealed by UN IPCC data provided on its own review and reporting processes. That data was provided by the UN IPCC itself. UN IPCC misrepresentations have been exposed by McLean's presentation of that UN IPCC data and separately by experts in their field such as the Wegman Panel in its report to the USA Senate.

Other references are provided below from UN IPCC scientists and from investigative journalist Ian Wishart's thorough documentation of UN IPCC activities. It is clear that UN IPCC reports are not rigorous, are not scientific and do misrepresent climate.

For your own integrity, due diligence and protection, I urge you to become thoroughly familiar with McLean's succinct reports. I commend to you Wishart's best-selling book.

Please note that while UN IPCC reports address many aspects of climate, much of the voluminous reports cover a scattering of climate topics. On the UN IPCC's core claim though that human activity caused global warming, the UN IPCC has no measured data from scientific observations. No data. None.

Chapter 9 of the UN IPCC's AR4 is the sole chapter attributing the cause of climate change to human activity. Note in particular, and contrary to UN IPCC protocol, that chapter 9 relies on the work of a close-knit group of people claiming human activity caused the modest global warming that ended around 1998. Significantly, their claim is based only on computer model projections.

Contrary to Senator Wong's advice to you, projections by these models have been proven to be in gross error. And that's over just the last ten years. Although every model projected continued increases in temperature from 1998 as atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) increased, the reality is that temperature has actually fallen.

Senator Furner, when UN IPCC computer models fail to predict climate just ten (10) years into the future, and fail even to get the direction of change correct much less the quantity, how can we rely at all on those same models for projections 50 and 100 years in advance? We cannot.

Why not? The reason is that UN IPCC models are based on **low understanding of climate factors**, the drivers of climate. The UN IPCC's own report includes table 2.11 listing 16 climate factors each with their individual level of understanding. Of the 16 factors listed by the UN IPCC, 13 are admitted by the UN IPCC itself to have low levels of understanding.

Worse, despite extensive information on the proven significance of ocean-atmosphere oscillations such as the El Nino Southern Oscillation, such factors are omitted entirely from UN IPCC models. Further, despite world-wide acknowledgement of the significance of natural variations in the sun's irradiance, particle emissions and magnetic field, these are not modeled.

The UN IPCC's computer models rely on only one climate factor being understood to a claimed high level, the impact of greenhouse gases. Yet this remains in deep dispute. Indeed, the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas *'theory'* contradicts the laws of physics and the laws of Nature and has failed to be validated by scientific measurement in Earth's atmosphere. The UN IPCC's *'theory'* contradicts behaviour of the atmosphere and even misrepresents greenhouses.

Factual data from real measurements made by satellite over 15 years, show the exact opposite result from those fabricated by UN IPCC projections made using computer models which do not produce real data. As the sun warms Earth's oceans, Earth releases more heat into space. Satellite results prove it. Refer to summary of Lindzen and Choi, 2009 accessible via page four (4) at http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/co2_report_july_09.pdf

Just last week the journal "Science" published a peer-reviewed paper that cast even more doubt on the assumptions climate modelers make in regard to greenhouse gases. This was the only forcing in IPCC table 2.11 for which the level of scientific understanding was rated by the UN IPCC as "high" but that rating seems highly dubious. Being blunt the rating is nonsensical. [reference: <http://theresilientearth.com/?q=content/global-warming-predictions-invalidated>]

Despite these facts, Senator Wong says each new UN IPCC report represents a (quote) 'progressive strengthening of our understanding of climate change'. The reality, admitted by the UN IPCC itself, is that its level of understanding of climate factors is poor. Worse, the UN IPCC omits factors known to be powerful natural drivers of climate.

Why does the UN IPCC, by its own admission, have low levels understanding of climate? The answer can likely be found in the charter of the UN IPCC. That charter limits the UN IPCC to investigating human impacts on climate.

History and personal experience shows us much about bureaucracies. The UN IPCC bureaucracy, when unable to fulfil its charter of finding human causes of warming is faced with a choice: admit the lack of data and have their employment and perks terminated, or spread falsities. It seems the UN IPCC has chosen the latter to perpetuate itself and to pursue a political agenda. That agenda is clearly revealed by Ian Wishart and by Britain's Lord Monckton.

Additionally, in making their claim that humans caused global warming, most authors of chapter 9 work in the infant field of computer modeling of climate and thus appear to have conflicts of financial interest. Please note that even chapter 9 does not provide any observed, measured scientific data linking human production of carbon dioxide (CO₂) to climate change. None.

Using UN IPCC data, the lengthier and more detailed of McLean's reports reveal the apparent conflicts of interest among some of the authors claiming human activity affects global climate.

As an aside I refer you to UN IPCC figures published in 2004 covering Earth's annual production of CO₂. Those figures claim that humans produce an estimated 23 billion tonnes of CO₂ while Nature produces a whopping 770 billion tonnes. That is, of Earth's annual CO₂ production, humans produce just 3%.

Note further that atmospheric CO₂ levels depend significantly on Nature's carbon cycle which dictates Nature's **absorption of CO₂ from the atmosphere**. Earth's oceans contain 50 times the carbon contained in the atmosphere. The carbon in Earth's soil, near-surface rocks, oceans, bio-mass (plants and animals) contain 100,000 times the carbon contained in Earth's atmosphere.

The residence time of CO₂ in Earth's atmosphere, whether produced by Nature or by humans, is estimated to be merely 5 to 7 years, with recent scientific studies stating it is less than one year. That is, CO₂ whether produced by Nature or by humans, is continually kept in balance by Nature. Thus, human production of CO₂ is miniscule and is demonstrably easily accounted for, and managed by, Nature as part of Earth's natural carbon cycle.

Note further that accepted science shows that in our planet's relatively recent past Earth has seen atmospheric carbon dioxide levels around six (6) times that of Earth's current atmosphere. Such levels occurred during Earth's past warm periods and during past ice ages. Earth's temperature is clearly independent of atmospheric CO₂ levels.

Contrary to Senator Wong's statement, the entire greenhouse gas effect '*theory*' of global warming contradicts the laws of physics and laws of Nature. Specifically, it contradicts the first and second laws of thermodynamics. Please refer to eight e-mails I sent you from July 13th, 2009 through July 22nd, 2009. I enclose a paper copy of a compilation of the text of those e-mails.

I will send you, by e-mail, the compiled text of my eight series of e-mails sent you from May 20th, 2009 through August 21st, 2009. These reveal the UN IPCC's fraud and its scientific misrepresentations.

Please note that there is no scientific observation linking human production of CO₂ with climate

change. None. There is considerable evidence, including evidence from UN IPCC scientists, showing that political and bureaucratic arms of the UN IPCC have spread falsities.

I am wondering why Senator Wong fails to advise you in her letter to you that there have been, and there continue to be, decreases in atmospheric and ocean temperatures, increases in polar ice and advancing of glaciers. I wonder why Senator Wong has not advised you that measurements of sea level repeatedly show sea levels are consistently rising at just 1.6 millimetres per year, the same rate apparently for many decades possibly centuries and due to natural factors other than melting ice.

Item (7)

Computer models used by the UN IPCC have been completely discredited by eminent climate scientists world-wide. And by Nature. I feel deeply troubled that Senator Wong continues to spread her claim that computer models can be relied upon. She seems either (1) falsely and negligently reliant on the UN IPCC when it has been proven to be spreading falsities, or, (2) given the data I have provided Senator Wong, she is knowingly spreading falsities. If the latter is true, that's fraud.

Claims made under this item in Senator Wong's response to you have been addressed in my response to the preceding item.

Senator Wong mentions the UN IPCC's climate projections for the 21st century. Don't confuse projections with predictions. The subtle difference is that scientific predictions can only be made from models that have been fully validated (i.e. tested and found to be accurate). None of the models used by the UN IPCC have been validated. The UN IPCC's projections contain the huge assumption that the models are correct and that the scenarios to which the models are applied will eventuate. These assumptions are false.

As discussed above, merely looking at the UN IPCC's own table 2.11 in the UN IPCC's report of 2007 reveals that there is no way the UN IPCC's computer models can be accurate. It is, impossible to construct quality models with such a knowledge shortfall. Clearly their projections cannot be relied upon. When their projections are the opposite of what has actually occurred over the last ten years, we know the computer models cannot be relied upon.

Making decisions on attempting to interfere with Nature's climate is not akin to dabbling on an X-Box or Playstation.

Being frank, the modus operandi of every UN IPCC report, including the latest, has been to note shortfalls in scientific knowledge and then brandish, as if it was gospel, the output of models constructed from that limited understanding. This would be laughable if the situation were not so serious.

Item (8)

Senator Wong cites the UN IPCC processes and implies they are a paragon of probity but that's a long way from the truth.

The UN IPCC Chairman has repeatedly implied 4,000 scientists endorsed the UN IPCC's core claim that human activity caused global warming. That is false. Only five (5) reviewers endorsed that claim in chapter 9. Five. And there's doubt they were even scientists. It's all there in the data provided by the UN IPCC. Five endorsements and those possibly not scientific.

UN IPCC processes are not those of a normal peer review process. In normal peer review

processes, authors are obligated to modify their text in line with the reviewers' statements but in the UN IPCC process the authors are obliged only to provide a written response away from the text of the UN IPCC report. Review editors do act as Senator Wong states but she omits the vital point that it is the lead authors (i.e. main authors) of each chapter that decide if and how the text will be modified.

John McLean's reports presenting UN IPCC data on UN IPCC processes contain very interesting observations on this entire UN IPCC process, especially the number of reviewers' comments that were rejected out of hand and of how little explicit support the reviewers showed for the UN IPCC's pivotal chapter.

Senator Wong says that UN IPCC review comments are retained in an open access archive. One wonders at her source of information for this statement because I am advised it is simply wrong. Prior to the latest UN IPCC report in 2007 no reviewers' comments were publicly available. It was only through diligent investigators resorting to various Freedom of Information Acts that the comments of this latest report have been made available.

Senator Wong's comment that organisations such as the Royal Society have "reached similar conclusions to the IPCC" is yet another distortion. The Royal Society has in fact just taken the IPCC report and basically said, "We agree". The Royal Society neither examined the data and came to the same conclusions nor did it survey its members prior to publishing a statement of support by the executive or a subcommittee.

Of that latter point the same is true of just about all organisations that have publicly endorsed the IPCC's claims.

Further please note that scientific truth is not determined by voting but by a hypothesis' ability to explain all observed phenomenon. Quoting consensus shows remarkable ignorance, or possibly misrepresentation, of science.

I provide a reference to a paper by Professor Fred Singer who exposes the distortions implied by the Royal Society. Note that the Royal Society relied on the UN IPCC's report which is shown by the UN IPCC's own data to be falsified. Note that Singer's report relies on material provided by the NIPCC which includes scientists from the UN IPCC scientific panel. NIPCC scientists were spurred into action by their realisation of UN IPCC misrepresentations of science in the final version of reports, as produced by the UN IPCC's political arm. http://www.cps.org.uk/cps_catalog/CPS_assets/679_ProductPreviewFile.pdf

Singer's comments are useful for their exposure of the Royal Society and for exposing UN IPCC misrepresentations. Note that Professor Singer is an internationally respected and eminent ecologist, environmentalist, physicist and climate scientist who has held significant responsibilities in senior positions in USA administrations, both Republican and Democrat. Professor Singer is a member of the UN IPCC scientific panel.

Sadly, Senator Furner, when governments control funding through bodies such as the Royal Society and Australia's own CSIRO, they steer science and can steer 'findings'. That is alarmingly clear from McLean's expose of the UN IPCC, from Singer's account and from numerous published reports by scientists around the world. Wishart independently confirms.

Item (9)

Unless Senator Wong can demonstrate that human production of carbon dioxide (CO₂) has a significant influence on climate, this item by Senator Wong is entirely devoid of merit. I doubt Senator Wong has any evidence given that the UN IPCC could produce no credible evidence,

given that there is no evidence anywhere in the world and given that Senator Wong has never before produced any evidence. In response to Senator Steve Fielding's simple questions seeking evidence, Senator Wong has failed to produce any.

Given Senator Wong's inability to provide evidence, are you going to rely on her 'advice'. Are you going to hand over your reputation, your name on the enduring parliamentary record and your constituency's future to someone with no evidence?

Closer to home I am aware that for well over 12 months a physicist has been requesting evidence from the CSIRO's Dr Penny Whetton. In response, the only scientific paper that was produced by that CSIRO scientist contained such fundamental errors as to render it useless.

Alarming, CSIRO cannot say human production of CO₂ caused global warming yet publicly endorses efforts to constrain human activity. All this from an organisation supposedly scientific. A government agency whose research activities and employees depend on government funding.

Unless Senator Wong can provide credible supporting evidence I will conclude that she has failed to do her due diligence and is therefore failing in her responsibility to the national interest. The government's actions on global warming (climate change) are irresponsible and, given the electoral benefits manufactured by the Prime Minister and Senator Wong, the government's actions seem fraudulent.

There is no need for any Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS), carbon tax or energy tax. The government has no evidence to substantiate naming its scheme a "carbon pollution reduction scheme". Neither carbon dioxide nor carbon are pollutants.

Carbon dioxide is an essential natural trace gas. In every 2,600 molecules of air, carbon dioxide is just one molecule. That trace level is maintained and controlled completely by Nature. Carbon dioxide is essential for life. It is not a pollutant. Again, senator Wong and the government seem to be either grossly irresponsible in their negligence or, in falsely inciting climate alarm, fraudulent.

Item (10)

Senator Wong's proposed ETS might guarantee that Australia reduces its production of CO₂. That assumes of course that there's not huge fraud in relation to a trace colourless, odourless gas that's difficult to measure. Remember, in the ETS it's in both parties' interests to overstate the reduction in emissions.

The question is not what the reduction is or isn't but whether this will make a whit of difference to average global temperatures. Science shows overwhelmingly that it will make no difference. The Kyoto treaty is recognised as failed.

Just where is Senator Wong's cost-benefit analysis for the proposed ETS? I conclude that she either doesn't have one because it can't be constructed with any credibility, or she has one that she thinks is credible but won't reveal it because it says that the proposed ETS will make negligible difference to average global temperatures. Either way she is again failing in her duty to the Australian public.

Item (11)

I commend you for your initiative in starting your due diligence. Given the pressure for MP's in all parties to conform to the highly emotive yet unfounded alarmist campaigns of highly funded activists, I appreciate your strength and courage in asking essential questions to protect the

people of Australia. I admire the integrity, strength and courage demonstrated by your fellow senators such as Steve Fielding, Barnaby Joyce, Julian McGauran and Cory Bernardi and by MP's such as Dr Dennis Jensen. Completing your due diligence will enable you to fulfil your responsibilities to Queensland and to Australia and prevent you from committing fraud.

It is hoped that other MP's from your party who are known to be sceptical of the notion that humans caused global warming will publicly speak out to protect their constituents and protect their reputations and integrity.

Senator Furner, in light of the above you may be asking: So, what does cause climate change? The answers are clear. On July 23rd, New Zealand scientist Chris de Freitas, Australian scientist Bob Carter and John McLean published a peer-reviewed paper showing close correlation between Earth's temperature and the El Nino Southern Oscillation. A copy accompanies.

American Joe D'Aleo has published an article on a northern hemisphere equivalent. D'Aleo's paper is entitled "USA Temperatures and Climate Factors Since 1895" and is available at: http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US_Temperatures_and_Climate_Factors_since_1895.pdf

It is becoming increasingly clear that the most significant drivers of global climate are all entirely natural. These include: Solar activity (irradiance, solar wind particles, magnetic field polarity and strength), ocean-atmospheric oscillations (such as El Nino and the North American Oscillation), cloud cover, atmospheric water content, ocean salinity, ocean currents and sea surface temperature. These are but a few of many, possibly hundreds of drivers of global climate ranging in scale from galactic to microscopic and organic.

New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart's best-selling new book "Air Con - The Seriously Inconvenient Truth About Global Warming" contains an up to date review of global warming. The closing date for submissions to the UN IPCC's AR4 was reportedly 2005. Wishart's book closed data in April this year, 2009. It is far more up to date than is the UN IPCC. Wishart's book references 432 scientific and other works. Importantly, it reveals many glaring falsities perpetrated by the UN IPCC, including blatant falsities by its current chairman, Dr Rajendra Pachauri. (see particularly pages 118 and 119, 176, 250, 251 and 253). These include the falsities on which Senator Wong appears to be relying.

Please note that the spontaneous, world-wide people's movement exposing UN IPCC falsities is led informally by UN IPCC scientists alarmed by the UN IPCC's distortions and misrepresentations of science. Here for your consideration are some of the many scientific references written by UN IPCC scientists:

- Michaels, P J, PhD, Editor, 2005. Shattered Consensus - The True State of Global Warming. (Rowman & Littlefield: Plymouth, UK). Containing chapters by internationally eminent climate scientists on specific topics in climate science. Includes three (3) UN IPCC scientists (one being a Lead Author) and a consultant to the UN IPCC. References 729 sources;
- Singer, S F and Avery, D T, 2007. Unstoppable Global Warming - Every 1,500 Years. (Rowman & Littlefield, Plymouth, UK). Comprehensive, reader friendly book on all aspects of climate alarm. S F Singer is an internationally renowned Professor emeritus of Ecology and Environment, respected climate scientist, physicist, first director of the USA's National Weather Satellite Service and former vice-chairman for five years of the US National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmospheres, member of UN IPCC panel of advisory scientists. References 534 sources;
- NIPCC, Singer, S F, (Ed) 2008. Report entitled "Nature, Not Human Activity Rules the Climate". http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf [Accessed: June, 2009] Produced by a group of internationally eminent scientists, including scientists on the UN IPCC panel. Prepared by the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate

- Change (NIPCC) 2008 as a Science and Environmental Policy Project and published by The Heartland Institute, page 24. Edited by Prof S F Singer. References to 168 sources;
- Michaels, PJ and Balling, R C, 2009. Climate of Extremes - Global Warming Science They Don't Want You to Know. (Cato institute, Washington, USA). Michaels is a member of the UN IPCC and Balling a consultant to the UN IPCC. References to 278 sources and reading;
 - NIPCC, Singer S F, PhD and Idso, C D, PhD, (Editors) 2009. Climate Change Reconsidered. <http://www.nipccreport.org/index.html> [Accessed: June, 2009] The Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) is an international panel of nongovernment scientists and scholars including UN IPCC scientists who came together to understand the causes and consequences of climate change. Unlike the UN IPCC, the NIPCC is not prevented from exploring natural causes of climate change. NIPCC scientists are able to look at evidence the UN IPCC ignores. Because the NIPCC does not work for any governments, NIPCC scientists are not biased toward the assumption that greater government activity is necessary. Had the UN IPCC been a scientific body, this is the report it would likely have produced.

I recommend the following reports by McLean. All are available on the internet at no cost. None can be sensibly refuted since they simply present data on UN IPCC processes for producing reports. The data is provided by the UN IPCC itself:

- 'The IPCC can't count its "expert scientists": Author and reviewer numbers are wrong'. **This was sent to you with my letter of July 30th, 2009.** More detailed reports are:
- 'An Analysis of the Review of the IPCC 4AR WGI Report'.
- 'Prejudiced authors, Prejudiced findings: *Did the UN bias its attribution of "global warming" to humankind?*'
- 'Why the IPCC Should be Disbanded'.
- 'Peer Review? What Peer Review? Failures of scrutiny in the UN's Fourth Assessment Report'.

Wishart's compelling expose of unfounded climate alarm and of the UN IPCC is available from Dymocks and from Angus & Robertson bookstores and from Amazon.com.

I attach my documented scrutiny of UN IPCC activities. Clearly the UN IPCC is not providing scientific advice. From its formation and in its early reports, the UN IPCC contradicted the science. It seems this has become a continuing UN IPCC tradition.

My understanding is that McLean is currently researching the source of the UN IPCC's fraud, falsities and misrepresentations. When his latest report becomes available I will send you a copy.

Senator Furner, the key issue in global warming and its associated climate alarmism is not climate, it is the UN IPCC's fabrications and misrepresentations. It is clear that the UN IPCC has misled governments and the media.

Thanks to your letter, I now understand your position and that of parliamentarians depending to date on Senator Wong's advice. Based as it is on UN IPCC falsities, her advice is wrong and misrepresents science. I empathise with MP's on their time pressures and workloads that limit their personal research. I hope this response and the independent references are of assistance to you.

Given that Senator Wong's response to you contains falsities and depends on UN IPCC misrepresentations, I urge you to read McLean's reports yourself. That will enable you to understand climate reality and avoid committing fraud. Then you will be able to make an informed decision to protect your integrity by voting down the CPRS.

If I can be of further assistance please feel welcome to contact me. Ultimately, we all leave behind only our names. I hope that after the CPRS vote you'll be comfortable with your name's position in the enduring parliamentary record.

Yours sincerely,



Malcolm Roberts

Enclosures:

- Copy of original letter from Senator Mark Furner with paragraphs as items numbered by hand.
- Paper by McLean, J D, de Freitas, C R and Carter, R M, entitled "Influence of the Southern Oscillation and tropospheric temperature". Published by the Journal of Geophysical Research on July 23rd, 2009 in Volume 114, D14104, doi:10.1029/2008JD011637, 2009.
- UN IPCC Science Scrutinised.
- Copy of the text of e-mails sent between July 13th and 22nd, 2009

cc:

Senator Claire Moore - Canberra
Senator Claire Moore - Fortitude Valley Electorate Office
Senator Wong
The Hon Robert McClelland, Attorney-General