

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2013
Latest update:

APPENDIX 9

Australian Academic Activists and Advocates Misrepresenting Empirical Science

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

History will judge us not only by what we stood for but also by what we fell for.

Preceding sections and appendices of this report introduce the government-pushed taxpayer-funded climate change '*industry*'. They reveal lack of accountability in an '*industry*' driving false climate claims misrepresenting science. They provide glimpses of the *industry's* global political drivers.

From appendices 2, 3, 4, 4a and 5 it's clear that climate '*scientists*' claiming catastrophic impacts from human CO₂ not only contradict science, they misrepresent science.

This appendix examines the behaviour of the climate industry's prominent Australian academic players as advocates projecting impending climate catastrophe while shaping public perceptions.

My leadership and managerial consulting clients include an internationally prominent Australian university. My work there involved reporting to that university's Vice-Chancellor. My conclusions and recommendations were frank and were adopted. My experience in various industries and nations reveals that it is most effective being open and truthful. That demonstrates care and integrity. It is in accord with my five aims for my voluntary work investigating climate alarm:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf>

In recent years communication of that openness has been refined to produce Broad General Comments at the end of this appendix.

Definitions

Please refer to Appendix 1d for definitions of words including *science*, *scientist*, *scientific*, *corruption* and *propaganda*.

Context

During the last three years I have written to all nine prominent Australian academic advocates mentioned in this appendix: David Karoly, Tim Flannery, Will Steffen, Ross Garnaut, Lesley Hughes, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Matthew England, Kurt Lambeck and Andy Pitman. I sought their real-world empirical scientific evidence of human CO₂ causing global warming and scientific reasoning justifying their public claims of climate alarm. My correspondence with them has been mostly by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation and/or email. In various forms, all but Lesley Hughes, Kurt Lambeck and Ross Garnaut replied. Ross Garnaut's office replied separately.

I sought answers from academics advocates funded by my taxes and my family's taxes. Their advocacy affects my family's future. Their advocacy affects the future of science that enables the safety and security of our modern civilisation and way of life.

Traits shared by academic advocates whose behaviour and statements are scrutinised in this appendix

The advocates share a number of traits including the following.

Apart from one professor of meteorology and likely another professor with qualifications in geology including claimed study of past climate none of the academics has formal educational qualifications in climate or weather science. To varying extents, the others have been publicly described by each other and/or the media and/or politicians as climate scientists or experts. The sole meteorologist has reportedly contradicted fundamental principles of meteorology.

In their defense, their public climate roles in various government-funded and controlled bodies may have enticed many of them to go well beyond their area of academic expertise.

All failed to provide empirical scientific evidence for their core claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. In responses to my requests for empirical scientific evidence never have any of the academics provided such evidence.

All failed to provide logical scientific reasoning that human CO₂ caused/causes/will cause global atmospheric warming or global climate change.

All have made public statements contradicting empirical science.

All, in some way, have misrepresented empirical climate science.

All promote the three fundamental climate misrepresentations. None has empirical scientific evidence for a plausible case that human CO₂ will cause future catastrophe.

Some have smeared those who disagree with their claims or view. Such smears have been direct and/or indirect.

All are funded by government.

Some are funded by political activists pushing a political agenda.

One is reportedly a member of the Trilateral Commission.

Some are associated with organisations pushing global governance and global control.

The UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies extensively on papers written or co-written by seven of these academic advocates.

Two thirds are connected with or depend on the government's Climate Commission for their careers and financial income.

Tome22 is a resource described below that, quote: "*is concerned only with the processes of scientific research and the **processes** that allow that research to impact on government policy.*" Tome22 reveals the academics are part of a cabal of prominent Australian academic alarmists funded by taxpayers in a close-knit web connecting government bodies, activist organisations, academic organisations and groups falsely spreading unfounded climate alarm. Many in the cabal are enmeshed in connections to global organisations and political activists pushing for undemocratic global governance.

My overall conclusions

These academics are not expert climate forecasters. They have not demonstrated independence and expertise as climate forecasters. In climate forecasting they have yet to demonstrate any capability.

All fail to provide empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused global atmospheric warming. All fail to provide logical scientific reasoning for the claim or implied claim that human CO₂ causes warming of the atmosphere with catastrophic future consequences. By contradicting empirical scientific evidence and/or selectively cherry-picking data all have misrepresented climate and science to the Australian public.

All fail to provide empirical evidence that warming is catastrophically or significantly detrimental to humans and/or the environment. They fail to provide empirical scientific evidence that any claimed future warming would produce disadvantages greater than warming's massive documented benefits.

All are funded by government. Many have working associations with CSIRO.

Sources of information:

Except where otherwise stated, any views and conclusions are my opinion based on my interpretation of facts discovered, on observations and on correspondence during five years of voluntary research.

My sources include personal correspondence with the academic advocates and personal discussions with two of them. Sources include publicly reported statements and public meetings addressed by the academics. Sources include works published by the academics.

Peter Bobroff AM has developed Tome22 website revealing connections between the academic players and organisations involved in the taxpayer-funded climate *industry*. It includes connections between individuals to various bodies including global organisations such as the World Bank and the UN.

Given the immense scope covered, Tome22 asks visitors to read the Limitations before making their conclusions. The site will always be Under Construction and some areas are as yet devoid of useful information.

Tome22 can be accessed through the following links:

<http://tome22.info/Top/Limitations.html>

To find a person:

<http://tome22.info/TypeViews/Persons-Index.html>

To find an organisation:

<http://tome22.info/TypeViews/Organisations-Index.html>

For wider access:

<http://tome22.info/Top/ResearchEntrance.html>

The approach of Tome22 is specified as, quote: “*Tome22 is concerned only with the processes of scientific research and the **processes** that allow that research to impact on government policy. Flawed processes will not yield credible science, documents or policy.*”

Due to the nature of material collected from various sites across the Internet some of the data provided is not complete. Nonetheless, Tome22 is an amazing resource for anyone passionate about science, integrity and freedom. It answers and raises many questions.

Tome22 reveals connections between named persons and Climategate email threads.

Since connections to a global cabal orchestrating climate alarm became apparent, Peter Bobroff's work is expanding to identify connections within broader UN activities pushing unelected global governance.

Further comments on many of the prominent academic alarmists are available at these pages:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/political_scam_exposed.php

And:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

And:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php

My personal website includes correspondence with academics and politicians:

www.conscious.com.au

Correspondence between Graham Williamson and some of these academics is available on this page:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/government_csiro.php

More correspondence is available on various pages at Tome22:

<http://tome22.info/Top/index.html>

Appendix 9a: Professor David Karoly	page 6
Appendix 9b: Professor Will Steffen	page 15
Appendix 9c: Professor Tim Flannery	page 26
Appendix 9d: Professor Ross Garnaut	page 42
Appendix 9e: Professor Lesley Hughes	page 48
Appendix 9f: Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg	page 54
Appendix 9g: Professor Kurt Lambeck	page 60
Appendix 9h: Professor Matthew England	page 63
Appendix 9i: Professor Andy Pitman	page 67
Appendix 9j: Brief comment on Prof Stefan Lewandowsky's recent claims	page 70
General Comments	page 76

Appendix 9a

Professor David Karoly

As noted in various other appendices, David Karoly is associated via his role in various alarmist organisations with Will Steffen, Tim Flannery, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Kurt Lambeck, Matthew England, Andy Pitman and Lesley Hughes.

UN IPCC's most senior '*scientist*'?

David Karoly is arguably the most senior UN IPCC '*scientist*'. For the UN IPCC's Third Assessment Report (AR3) in 2001, he was Lead Author of the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂: Chapter 12.

That chapter reportedly became the foundation for the equivalent sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ in the UN IPCC's subsequent Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) in 2007: Chapter 9.

Despite that foundation and association, David Karoly was a Review Editor of chapter 9.

He was a writer of the 2007 draft UN IPCC *Summary for Policy Makers*. The finished document was distributed to national governments and media worldwide.

Please refer to comments and data on these crucial chapters in Appendix 2 discussing the UN IPCC. The UN IPCC's data on its reporting processes raises many serious questions. When leading production of the UN IPCC 2001 report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of CO₂ (chapter 12) did David Karoly's selection of contributing authors breach UN IPCC guidelines and requirements? When leading production of the UN IPCC 2007 report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of CO₂ (chapter 9) did David Karoly as Review Editor breach accepted scientific practice and breach UN IPCC guidelines and requirements?

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

For information on review procedures please see pages 12 and 13 including Figure 2; For information on selection of authors see pages 3, 5, 6, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18. It's understood that these comments appear applicable to chapter 12 in 2001. If not, why not?

Note: John McLean's articles on UN IPCC reporting processes provide additional comment and data. They cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes. The data was obtained from the UN IPCC.

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf

And:

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf

As discussed in Appendix 2, John McLean's reports are vindicated by the Inter Academy Council's August, 2010 report.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray advises me that for the 2007 report's chapter 9, the Review Editors failed to acknowledge to Dr. Vincent Gray any of his 575 review comments and failed to incorporate or adequately incorporate some of Dr. Gray's crucial scientific comments including those on known natural drivers of climate. Yet David Karoly signed on November 20, 2006 a document confirming, quote: "*that all substantive expert and government review comments have been afforded appropriate consideration by the writing team in accordance with IPCC procedures*". For further data on the review process please refer to John McLean's comments on pages 6-9 available here:

http://folk.uio.no/tomvs/esef/McLean_ipcc_review.pdf

Neither 2001's chapter 12 nor 2007's chapter 9 nor 2007's Summary for Policy Makers claiming or implying alarming global warming and climate change due to human CO₂ contain any empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning for their false claim. They contradict empirical science.

David Karoly is a mathematician who relies on unvalidated computerised numerical modelling of climate. UN IPCC and CSIRO climate projections rely on unvalidated and erroneous numerical modelling that contradict empirical scientific evidence and misrepresent Nature. Please refer to Appendix 4 for many references. He is a professor of meteorology although that does not make him a climatologist.

<http://drtimball.com/2012/static-climate-models-in-a-virtually-unknown-dynamic-atmosphere/>

Failed to provide empirical evidence for core global warming claim

I have held David Karoly accountable for his public statements and implied statements broadcast widely through media, especially ABC Radio, TV and Internet. His responses failed to provide empirical scientific evidence for his core climate claim that human CO₂ is having or will have a detrimental effect on global climate or temperature.

Following on the heels of Climategate's tarnishing of both the UN IPCC and the UN IPCC's attribution of global warming to human causation, the UK Met Office produced a report entitled '*Detection and attribution of climate change: a regional perspective*'. The report was co-authored by Professor David Karoly.

It was obtained via this link:

<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/123310513/abstract> - and then clicking on a 'PDF' link.

From reading the report, I drew these initial conclusions:

- The Met Office's claims are based on unvalidated computerized numerical modeling of climate/weather and tenuous, broad inferences from inherent

natural climate variation. UN IPCC climate projections from unvalidated computerised numerical modeling relying on faulty assumptions have already been proven erroneous. Even the UN IPCC admits its computerized numerical modeling of climate is based on a limited range of 16 radiative forcing climate factors with 13 of the 'factors' having 'low' or 'very low' levels of understanding. (Table 2.11, UN IPCC 2007 report.) Thus, because the assumptions on which they are based are not valid, numerical climate modeling can never represent Nature accurately. Their unvalidated projections cannot be reliable The Met Office report reveals much uncertainty and appears to rely on speculation;

- Contrary to the report's title, regional effects seem sketchy and tenuous. The report seems to lay the foundation for justifying additional grants for further computerised numerical climate modeling.

Flawed methodology in co-authored paper retracted after statistical scrutiny?

Investigations by Canadian statistician Steve McIntyre recently made disturbing findings concerning apparent flawed methodology in a paper co-written by David Karoly. Steve McIntyre's comments are available here:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/10/more-on-screening-in-gergis-et-al-2012/>

And:

<http://www.theage.com.au/environment/climate-change/climate-warming-study-put-on-hold-20120611-2065y.html>

Disturbing questions are raised about the authors' reported unscientific refusal to release their data, links to environmental advocacy and suggestions of a false statement being provided by one of the authors. Please see here:

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2012/6/7/another-hockey-stick-broken.html>

And:

<http://notrickszone.com/2012/06/10/german-scientists-joelle-gergis-has-lost-all-critical-distance-to-her-research-results/>

And:

<http://www.webcitation.org/67j0qvxbP>

Gergis et al released media statements about their paper before it was published and possibly before it was reviewed. Real science isn't done by media release.

Reportedly, David Karoly's co-author Joelle Gergis has said that the authors had wanted to, quote: "*provoke a strong emotional response*". Is this science meets Hollywood?

Yet even though the paper was retracted by its authors it seems David Karoly was describing it as other than retracted:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/07/24/was-gergis-et-al-withdrawn/>

Can David Karoly's statement be trusted?

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

David Karoly's statement about the proportion of atmospheric CO2 attributable to human production is false and contradicts empirical scientific evidence. It's one of his many false statements reported by Andrew Bolt. Additionally, see Appendices 4, 13d and 13e.

Earlier Summary of Observations and Conclusions of David Karoly's falsities and/or major errors

My earlier *Summary of observations and conclusions of David Karoly's falsities and/or major errors* is available here:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/KarolyFalsities.pdf>

One of my email communications with David Karoly raises many significant issues. It's available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January,%202011.pdf>

ABC broadcasts spread David Karoly's falsities

My analysis of ABC-TV's *Media Watch* program broadcast on Monday, May 30th, 2011 contains my analysis of David Karoly's public comments and behaviour. It's available as Appendix 13e.

Combined with David Karoly's public statements and implied statements I conclude that these raise serious questions about David Karoly's work, behaviour and funding.

Formal complaint to The University of Melbourne

Following communication with David Karoly, I formally complained to the University of Melbourne Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor in my letter dated Tuesday, November 17th, 2009. It is available here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/91_09.11.16%20UMelbournecopy.pdf

My letter was copied to members of federal parliament and to the Producer of ABC-TV's '4 Corners' program that broadcast David Karoly's false statement.

Mr. Chernov's reply dated November 23, 2009 was brief and gives little encouragement that the University of Melbourne is open or objective on investigating misrepresentations of climate science. It is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/92_Chernovreplycopy.pdf

Following David Karoly's false and unfounded public comments on Brisbane's January 2011 floods, I wrote to the University of Melbourne Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor. My letter dated Sunday, February 27th, 2011 advised them of David Karoly's false statements and misrepresentations of climate science and asked fundamental questions on the university's acceptance of public false statements from a university representative. My letter is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/93_ChernovFebruary,2011copy.pdf

My email dated January 25th, 2011 to which my letter refers is available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January,%202011.pdf>

My records show no response was received from the University of Melbourne.

My subsequent formal complaint dated March 28th, 2011 to the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/94_Complaint,March,2011copy.pdf

My records show no response was received from the University of Melbourne.

Soon thereafter on April 8th, 2011 Mr. Chernov was appointed as Victoria's Governor.

Tome 22 reveals David Karoly's activist and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about David Karoly at this site:

<http://tome22.info/Persons/Karoly-David.html#id1-1>

From Tome 22, David Karoly:

- Has eight (8) UN IPCC roles;
- Is author or co-author of 26 papers cited in the UN IPCC's 2007 report;
- Is affiliated with 14 organisations listed on Tome 22 including 11 academic organisations, 2 world organisations, 3 university organisations, 3 Nongovernment Organisations, 4 transient organisations, 9 alarmist organisations and 2 consensus-list organisations.

David Karoly shares participation in some organisations with many of the other alarmist academic advocates discussed in this appendix. They seem to form a tight-knit group.

<http://tome22.info/Persons/Karoly-David.html>

The shared groups include many key UN IPCC roles:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/IPCC-Intergovernmental-Panel-on-Climate-Change.html>

WWF:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/WWFSAP-World-Wildlife-Fund-Science-Advisory-Panel.html>

Bureau of Meteorology, BOM: see Appendix 7.

Australian Academy of Science:

http://tome22.info/Organisations/AAS_QNA_2010.html

Climate Commission Science Advisory Panel:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/Aus-CCC-SAP-Climate-Commission-Science-Advisory-Panel.html>

World Climate Research Programme:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/WCRP-World-Climate-Research-Programme.html>

Climate Scientists Australia:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/CSA-Climate-Scientists-Australia.html>

Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/WGCS-Wentworth-Group-of-Concerned-Scientists.html>

University of Melbourne:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/MONASH-Monash-University-.html>

Monash University:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/MONASH-Monash-University-.html>

Rainfall Final:

http://tome22.info/Organisations/CC_RainfallFinal.html

Wall Street Journal signatories:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/WSJ38-Wall-Street-Journal-Signatories-of-Feb-2012.html>

Guardian signatory:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/Guardian201202-Guardian-Letter-2012-02-18.html>

Association in Climategate emails:

<http://pjmedia.com/blog/climategate-obamas-science-adviser-confirms-the-scandal---unintentionally/?singlepage=true>

From the preceding link one discovers that David Karoly is an author of the Copenhagen Diagnosis:

<http://www.copenhagendiagnosis.com/authors.html>

The Copenhagen Diagnosis contradicts empirical scientific evidence. It is unscientifically and unfoundedly alarmist. Its publisher is the University of NSW. Its publication date is the month before 2009's critical Copenhagen conference.

http://www.ccrc.unsw.edu.au/Copenhagen/Copenhagen_Diagnosis_LOW.pdf

Fortunately, despite the Diagnosis' fearful claims, the Conference failed.

Reportedly, scientists involved in Climategate, the UN IPCC and the Copenhagen Diagnosis groups overlap:

<http://pjmedia.com/blog/climategate-obamas-science-adviser-confirms-the-scandal---unintentionally/>

David Karoly is a member of the activist WWF Science Advisory Panel. It is prominent in unscientifically pushing the UN's climate alarm agenda and its global agenda. See Appendix 15.

According to data assembled by Tome 22, chapters in the 2007 UN IPCC report in which David Karoly had a role rely on 10 of his own papers, quote: "**3-1-3 Observation:** In

AR4 chapters in which David Karoly had a role, there were 10 references to papers of which he/she was an author.”

According to data assembled by Tome 22, David Karoly’s papers include those co-authored with members on journal editorial boards in 2011, quote: “**3-3-2 Observation:** Gabriele Hegerl, Nathan Gillett, Francis Zwiers were authors of papers published in a journal that they were on the editorial board in 2011.”

Resorting to unfounded criticism of those whose views differ?

In one of his email responses to me David Karoly used false implied assertions to question the credentials and intent of Professor (Siegfried) Fred Singer. Yet Fred Singer has a distinguished career as a physicist, administrator, climate scientist and guardian of scientific integrity. It seems David Karoly was not able to refute Fred Singer’s work exposing the UN IPCC and resorted instead to personal smears.

Contrary to David Karoly’s implied assertion that Fred Singer was not involved in producing UN IPCC reports, Fred Singer promptly replied to my inquiry stating, quote: “*I was reviewer for the FOD (First order Draft) of AR-5 and have similar letters of appointment for prior IPCC reports*”. Checking IPCC documents a colleague found S Singer was listed for example as a reviewer of the Working Group I contribution to the UN IPCC’s Third Assessment Report, 2001.

Recently David Karoly criticized Steve McIntyre after earlier publicly appearing to thank Steve McIntyre for exposing a significant error forcing David Karoly to retract the Gergis et al paper of which David Karoly was co-author:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/11/david-karoly-leader-of-the-climate-underground/#more-67245>

Steve McIntyre is one of two statisticians who exposed Michael Mann’s paper that was previously the centrepiece of the UN IPCC’s 2001 report. As a result of their work and that of other scientists and statisticians Mann’s paper has since been discredited worldwide.

Does the following indicate people are awakening to David Karoly’s stances?

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/11/abr-pulls-karolys-review-of-michael-manns-book/>

This raises questions about David Karoly’s approach:

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

And from Steve McIntyre himself:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/07/14/another-untrue-allegation-by-karoly/#more-16434>

Why does David Karoly resort to falsely smearing or implicitly smearing others whose views differ or who hold him accountable? Is it because he lacks evidence to counter their evidence?

David Karoly's links and interactions are many and varied

During investigations of climate advocacy within government-funded organisations a small group of Australian academics identified itself through recurrence of their names within and across organisations. Some names recurred more often and/or more significantly than did others. Two were most prominent: David Karoly and Will Steffen. Both staunchly publicly advocate government policy cutting human CO₂ production.

David Karoly's publicly reported interactions and links are extensive. Reportedly, he:

- is linked with many CSIRO staff as a co-author of papers cited by the UN IPCC and as a UN IPCC contributor;
- holds a significant position with the BOM;
- admits receiving payments from the government's Department of Climate Change;
- is a member of the Science Advisory Panel of WWF, a politicised activist organisation corrupting climate science and pushing global governance;
- is a member of the working group that produced the Australian Academy of Science's unscientific booklet funded by the Department of Climate Change;
- is a member of the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel funded by the Department of Climate Change;
- is arguably the most senior UN IPCC contributor to its core claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. He is a Lead Author and Review Editor of the sole chapter making that claim in the 2001 and 2007 reports respectively and draft writer of the 2007 Summary for Policymakers given to media and politicians worldwide;
- features prominently in ABC broadcasts misrepresenting climate science;
- is employed as a professor at a prominent Australian university receiving government grants for studying climate;
- receives government grants including a federal government grant in 2006 of \$1.9 million to study, quote "*detection and attribution of climate change*". That was given after closure of the UN IPCC report that supposedly presented what politicians and academics misrepresented as the '*settled science*';
- makes unfounded claims following natural weather events. Such claims are presented as expert comment yet contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- reinforces publicly all three major climate misrepresentations;
- is connected with several self-interested global organisations including some pushing global governance and control;
- is connected directly or indirectly with most academics listed in section 13 of my report entitled *CSIROh!* and in this Appendix 9.

My Conclusions on David Karoly's behaviour, statements and implied statements

David Karoly's false claims have arguably influenced public opinion and policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentation of climate. These range from indirect impacts on government policy such as Wivenhoe Dam management to impact on householders, families, farmers, small businesses and universities making decisions on the future of community constituents. By falsely claiming or implying floods, droughts, fires and other natural events are caused or exacerbated by human CO₂ his statements have likely influenced planning by many people, organisations and communities—to their detriment.

For example, consider enormously expensive desalination plants paid for by taxpayers and already mothballed. Some have never been used. They were reportedly built by governments fearing that the recent drought would continue due to unfounded and false claims it would be more severe due to effects of human CO₂ than were past droughts.

David Karoly is highly intelligent, capable and well-educated. He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

David Karoly has perpetrated all three massive misrepresentations identified in Appendix 5.

Appendix 9b

Will Steffen

Will Steffen is a chemical engineer employed as Director of the Australian National University's (ANU) Climate Change Institute, (CCI).

He is a contributing author to the UN IPCC's 2007 Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) Working Group 1, Chapter 7 with a paper entitled "*Coupling Between Changes in the Carbon System and Biochemistry*".

David Karoly is associated with Climate Commissioner Will Steffen through various organizations including David Karoly's role on the Commission's Science Advisory Panel.

On February 10th, 2011 Greg Combet introduced Will Steffen as one of four '*Expert Advisers*' to the Gillard-Brown Multi Party Climate Change Committee, MPCCC. He is the MPCCC's sole such adviser on climate '*science*' he described Will Steffen as, quote: "*independent*". Yet Will Steffen had had at least four government-funded positions in addition to his ANU department being funded by government. See this site:

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

From his own words it seems Will Steffen misled parliament's Multi Party Climate Change Committee

Colleagues of mine in Canberra have a recording of Professor Will Steffen publicly erroneously stating in Cooma last year, quote: "*the IAC came out and said the (IPCC) science is sound*". As he subsequently admitted after being shown a copy of the Inter Academy Council (IAC) report, Professor Steffen's statement is false.

After pointing out Professor Steffen's falsehood, colleagues received statements from Professor Steffen that the IPCC was endorsed in formal reviews by all national academies worldwide, ie, he said specifically 12 or 13 academies. After my colleagues failed to find any such reports they requested Professor Steffen to provide links to such reviews. Professor Steffen failed. He then admitted he relied on the Australian Academy of Science's glossy booklet entitled *The Science of Climate Change: Question & Answers*. It was commissioned and funded by the Department of Climate Change. It is analysed in Appendix 8.

Professor Steffen's claimed support for the UN IPCC from formal reviews by 12 or 13 national academies is false.

He should know that only two national academies of science surveyed their members, Russia and China, and they did not endorse the UN IPCC's view. The statements from

the other academies were written by Executive bodies or by subcommittees and are being challenged by academy members.

His reliance on the Australian Academy's unscientific booklet contradicts the scientific method, scientific process and empirical science. Please see below and accompanying transcript and refer to Appendix 8.

On Thursday, October 20, 2012 radio interviewer Alan Jones presented facts to Professor Steffen about the body of the IAC's report discrediting the UN IPCC's 2007 report. After what seemed to be Professor Steffen's avoidance of directly answering Alan Jones' questions, Professor Steffen seemed to dismiss the UN IPCC's report and cast serious doubt on his advice to the Multi Party Climate Change Committee, MPCCC.

The MPCCC relied on Will Steffen's advice as its sole Expert Adviser on climate science when recommending to Australia's parliament to tax CO₂.

The interview is available at the following link.

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20111020-aj2-willsteffen.mp3>

Although the whole interview is revealing, the relevant portion is from eight minutes and 30 seconds onwards. To assist understanding and to save readers time that portion's annotated transcript is available here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/Steffen_transcript_highlighted.pdf

Please refer to these links:

<http://tome22.info/>

<http://tome22.info/Top/Articles.html>

<http://Tome22.info/SteffenMtgCooma/IncompetentBriefing.html>

The latter accesses correspondence by Peter Bobroff AM, to many individuals including Professor Steffen, Rob Oakeshott, Tony Windsor and Australia's Chief Scientist.

Among other conclusions, I draw two primary conclusions from Professor Steffen's comments.

Firstly, it's seems that Professor Steffen implies that he gets around the IAC's severe condemnation of the UN IPCC by basing his advice to the MPCCC on his own reading of the 'scientific' literature.

Having seen his public presentations and having two reliable scientific critiques of his presentations, I conclude that he misled the MPCCC. One of those critiques is of the slides Will Steffen used with the MPCCC.

Professor Will Steffen's presentation to the government's Multi-Party Climate Change Committee has been analysed by four scientists and one economist at:

<https://www.quadrant.org.au/Steffen-2%20-%20Climate%20Change%20-%20latest%20science%20-%20March%202011-%20QO%20commentary%20-%205z.pdf>

And:

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

And:

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

Secondly, given Will Steffen's public contradiction in Cooma of the IAC report's damning contents and given his behaviour and comments during the interview with Alan Jones, it seems that Will Steffen could not have advised the MPCCC of the IAC's scathing report. Thus, it seems that by omission, whether inadvertent or not, he misled the Multi Party Climate Change Committee. In doing so he arguably misled Australia's parliament in its deliberations on taxing human CO₂.

Analysing the transcript of Alan Jones' discussion with Will Steffen is revealing. Six times Will Steffen falsely states or implies that support for his position and the UN IPCC's core claim is unequivocal. That was despite Alan Jones providing evidence proving Will Steffen is wrong. Six times he repeats or implies his falsehood that scientific academies in other nations have conducted formal inquiries of their own and endorsed the UN IPCC's core claim. That contradicts his earlier correspondence admitting to Peter Bobroff AM that the academies did not.

Will Steffen's contradiction of the facts maintains two of three core misrepresentations in the UN IPCC's campaign fomenting unfounded climate alarm: (1) the science is verified, (2) there is no or little opposition and the claim is undisputed and universally accepted.

Publicly repeats false claim after admitting it to be false

Stating a falsity once bothers most people. Yet after admitting to my colleagues in Cooma in July 2011 that he made an error in implying that the IAC endorsed UN IPCC 'science' and subsequently admitting that there was no formal scientific review and endorsement of the UN IPCC by any national academy of science here is what another colleague reports by email of Will Steffen's comments at the Climate Commission's Parramatta meeting on Tuesday, May 15th, 2012, quote:

"Will Steffan didnt enjoy the question about the Inter Academy Councils (worlds highest academic body) report on the workings of the IPCC & its AR4 report on which the government bases its Climate policy. Its not widely known but the IAC severely and formally criticised the IPCC AR4 on points of: Conflict of Interest; Political Interference; Bias; Bad Treatment of Uncertainty and Management Shortcomings. Whilst Steffan acknowledged the criticisms he played them down but this of course doesnt take anything away from the IAC reports actual criticising contents. Steffan is an AR4 report contributor - Working Grp 1 Chptr 7 - is his 'playing down' a Conflict of Interest?"

Will Steffan went on to say that despite the criticisms other science academies also reviewed the IPCC AR4 report, he named many, France & Russia and others. This prompted a retort from myself seeking to know where these reports were because

many people are seeking them & they thus far cannot be found. At this point the MC Mike Munroe chose to gag the 'Conversation' and switched to another question from the audience. Mike Munroe, like the government, doesn't want the debate either even though the people of Australia do."

(My colleague attended the Climate Commission meeting and tried to hold Will Steffen accountable for his false statement.)

Summary notes and key points are available here:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/SteffenMPCCC&IPCC.pdf>

Correspondence between Peter Bobroff AM and Will Steffen is available here:

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

Will Steffen made unfounded false and seemingly heartless public statements about Queensland's 2011 floods:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/academic%20experts/Steffen2011January25.pdf

My email was copied to him by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. No response was received although Will Steffen responded to my similar question put to the Climate Commission in Ipswich on April 7th, 2011. In that answer he failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning that human CO₂ caused global warming.

Contradicting empirical science—again

During his presentation to the Climate Commission's Ipswich audience on April 7th, 2011 Will Steffen used a graph purporting to show rapidly rising global temperatures. That graph appeared to include the scientifically discredited infamous Mann, Bradley, Hughes 'hockey stick' temperature fabrication.

When asked by me in the audience whether the temperatures were ground-based, Will Steffen confirmed they were ground-based temperatures measurements.

Yet he and Tim Flannery were discussing a supposed claimed atmospheric warming effect from human CO₂. They failed to mention that satellite and weather balloon temperature measurements had shown global atmospheric temperatures every year since 1998 were below 1998's peak.

Later he claimed satellites confirmed ground-based temperature measurements. That is contradicted by Dr. John Christy who is responsible for satellite measurements. Will Steffen's claim is false and contradicts empirical science. Yet he held the microphone and was able to continue misleading the audience.

He and Tim Flannery failed to advise the audience of the known corruption of ground-based temperature measurements. That's discussed in *Appendix 4 Basic Questions*.

When I raised the ocean's primary role in determining global atmospheric CO2 levels the ABC compere for the evening, Lisa Backhouse, immediately shut down my questions to Will Steffen.

At that Ipswich meeting, another audience member asked Will Steffen this question, quote: *"Now over 31,000 scientists in America have signed a partition against the carbon tax in the United States. It's easy to access on what's called the [petition project.org](#)".*

Serial errors stated publicly and subtle big power of the little word 'if'

Will Steffen's response was, quote: *"I know a little bit about this petition. It's been going around for quite awhile. We need to differentiate types of scientists. For example, I'm not competent to comment on neuroscience or, you know, organic chemistry or something like that. I'm not an expert in the field. So if you go through that list of 31,000 scientists, I couldn't recognise any that are recognised as publishing in the range of literature that covers climate science. So the issue there is that list really doesn't carry any weight at all in the credible scientific community. They don't publish, they don't go to the conferences we do. They're not expert –"*

The reality is that Will Steffen is wildly wrong. The leader of the Oregon Petition was the late Professor Frederick Seitz, past President of the USA's National Academy of Science. Other signatories include Professor Fred Singer an accomplished atmospheric physicist, environmental scientist and science administrator for both Republican and Democratic administrations, internationally eminent meteorologist Professor Richard Lindzen, Professor Paul Reiter and many other eminent scientists.

www.oism.org/pproject/s33p357.htm

And:

www.petitionproject.org

Has Will Steffen not heard of a separate list of over 1,000 scientists who initially assumed climate claims were plausible until they decided to check for themselves and realised the claim about human CO2 driving global climate is unfounded? The list is available here:

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

Is Will Steffen not aware of severe criticism of the UN IPCC by UN IPCC contributing authors and Lead Authors? If not, why not? Their criticism is widely known publicly.

One wonders about conferences that chemical engineer Will Steffen attends.

Other quotes by Will Steffen in Ipswich, include:

Will Steffen, quote: *"The second issue is what's causing that warming and we know that, to a very, very high level of confidence, that since the middle of the last century at*

least the majority – main point of that warming is due to the extra greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that (indistinct) by human activities". His statement is false. In making this statement he is falsely fabricating a non-existent scientific consensus and contradicting empirical science. Please refer to Appendix 2.

Will Steffen, quote: "*But if you put the satellite measurements of the lower atmosphere which come in in the last 30 years or so, you get exactly the same trend.*" (ie, same as the ground-based trend). His statement is false.

Will Steffen, quote: "*These are some observations of the loss of Arctic sea ice, that's the ice over the Arctic Ocean. And if you look at that red line, observations from 1950 to 2008/9 and you see that it's clearly dropping, we're losing ice*". Will Steffen fails to mention that the long-term total polar ice mass trend is fairly flat and stable and that Antarctic ice mass is increasing. He fails to mention that the Arctic's floating ice mass is subject to winds, storms and ocean currents. This year, for instance, one (1) million square kilometres was lost in 10 days in early June. That storm alone is reportedly responsible for 40% of the deficit from the 1979-2008 average. Data reveal the trend is natural and cyclic. There is no data showing occurrence of anything unusual. Please refer to Appendix 4a.

Will Steffen, quote: "*If we look at CO₂ - that's the CO₂ record for (indistinct) when we first started measuring it very accurately from 1958 on to the present - and you see it's been going steadily upwards. We know exactly where that's coming from. About 80 per cent of it's coming from the burning of fossil fuels, about 20 per cent is coming from deforestation.*" His statement is false on two counts. Firstly, credible scientists admit that Earth's CO₂ cycle is not well known. Secondly, variation in atmospheric CO₂ levels and past trends reveal that CO₂ levels lag temperature and that temperature determines CO₂ levels. That is true seasonally and in the overall trend in which CO₂ lags temperature by around 1,000 years. Thirdly, is he not aware that the carbon isotope in CO₂ from combustion of fuels containing carbon is the same as the carbon isotope in CO₂ from volcanoes?

Will Steffen, quote: "*In the reputable scientific community, those that are climate scientists who publish in the peer reviewed literature in the climate sciences – and it is very likely - and that very likely means I can say that with more than 90 per cent confidence that that range of evidence, that body of evidence says that human emissions of greenhouse gases, the main one of those is carbon dioxide, have caused most of this warming*". His statement is misleading and false. The Inter Academy Council's August, 2010 report and many scientists advise that the UN IPCC's likelihood levels are not statistically or scientifically calculated, they're arbitrarily assigned. Sometimes the assignment is by political meetings. Secondly, the ATMOSPHERIC temperature trend from January 1997 through to July 2012 is flat. There's been no warming for 15 years despite higher levels of CO₂. Thirdly, there is no scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended around 1998 (some say 2002, others say 1997 or 1995).

Will Steffen, quote: “**Now if that’s right** we can calculate by how much we should see the climate warm today because we’re part way to that doubling. And when you do the sums – I didn’t have time to do it – you pretty much get the answer that we observe. So that gives us some confidence that not only do we have the physics right, we have the quantification right of how much we should see.” There is no confident scientific calculation on the impact of CO₂ on global temperature. The action of CO₂ in the real world, compared to the virtual world of unvalidated computerised numerical modelling is hotly debated. Reputable scientists disagree on whether or not extra CO₂ will produce warming and if so whether any warming will be significant, medium or negligible. Regardless, empirical science contradicts the claim that human CO₂ controls global climate/temperature. Note that Will Steffen relies on a vague **if** statement. Further, he falsely implies that human production of CO₂ determines CO₂ levels in air yet data cited and relied upon by the UN IPCC reveals that Nature alone determines CO₂ levels. Appendix 4.

Will Steffen, quote: “And when we go through that temperature rise, in a century or a century and a half, this puts enormous evolutionary pressure on organisms which took several thousand years to go through the same change. So you’re quite right in terms of the – the (indistinct) of change was quite great between an ice age and now but the time frames are completely different. And that’s the thing that worries ecologists and biologists and I’ll let Lesley add the defining words to that.” His statement is false. Entirely natural changes in temperature far greater in magnitude and far more rapid in rate have occurred in Earth’s recent history. Nature has always adapted. Scientific evidence and historical evidence combine to reveal warmer periods are highly beneficial to people and to the natural environment including animal and plant species. Additionally, as temperature increases, species diversity increases.

Will Steffen claims, quote: “Nobody doubts that CO₂ warms the planet, no one whatsoever”. That statement is false. Reputable scientists proclaim the cooling effects of increasing CO₂ levels in Earth’s open, dynamic bulk atmosphere. That is noted under the third point listed here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/science_futility.php#K

Dissenters include scientists among the authors of the book entitled *Slaying the Sky Dragon* reviewed here:

<http://www.slayingtheskydragon.com/en/view-sample-chapters/read-the-reviews>

There are significant scientists who contradict Will Steffen. Their claim relies on theory consistent with the laws of science and on empirical scientific evidence. This topic contains many divergent views producing lively scientific debate.

During the question and answer session, Will Steffen contradicted himself in stating human CO₂ drives climate yet admitting that temperature drives atmospheric CO₂ levels.

Compelled by overwhelming evidence even Will Steffen publicly admitted on April 7th, 2011 that temperature drives CO₂. Yet he then absurdly said that once his imaginary threshold CO₂ level is reached, CO₂ drives temperature. Yet empirical science in Milankovitch cycles reveals severe temperature decrease follows temperature rise. That

temperature fall is driven by factors other than CO2 levels. Additionally, it is followed by decreases on CO2 levels. Does he not know this? Or did he mislead people by omission?

Another of his assertions claims that human warming is supported by peer-reviewed literature, implied to be scientifically peer-reviewed. Yet we know that in climate, scientific peer-review has been corrupted. We know that UN IPCC peer-review is not scientific peer-review and that the UN IPCC and/or its contributors distort, avoid and even prevent scientific peer-review.

Will Steffen appears to be invoking an appeal to authority. Too often that's the response of people lacking empirical facts or evidence.

His performance as a Climate Commissioner in the Commission's presentation in federal parliament house on Tuesday, May 24th, 2011 was similarly loaded with unscientific misrepresentations and unfounded alarm.

Will Steffen, quote: *"Yeah. Just one thing very briefly to follow on from what Tony McMichael has said, If we go to say a four degree world later this century, we have to remember that our bodies operate at 37 degrees Celsius. We're going to see temperatures in many of Australia's cities in the 40s and maybe even the 50s and a four degree temperature rise to (indistinct). It's going to be almost impossible for our bodies to give off the heat that we normally do to the atmosphere around us. So I think that the health challenges of a four degree world would be enormous and there's simply (indistinct) that we are not simply built to operate in a four degree world warmer than today."*

Note Will Steffen's use of the word **'if'**?

Emcee, quote: *"You said if we go to a 40 degree world, I mean –"*

Will Steffen, quote: *"A four degree world."*

Emcee, quote: *"A four degree world. What's the probability? That's what a lot of people are finding difficult to come to terms with."*

Will Steffen, quote: *"If we really fail as a global community at getting emissions down to the levels that we described in the report, you can look at the temperature projections and in this regard the climate models are very good. We have a reasonable probability of hitting four degrees and more by 2080 or 2090. This isn't far fetched if we don't get emissions down."*

Firstly, empirical scientific evidence reveals that independent of human CO2 production, Nature alone determines atmospheric CO2 levels. Secondly, one wonders where Will Steffen lives in Canberra's summer. As he has qualifications from a Florida university one wonders how Will Steffen coped with Florida's warmer and far more humid summers. How did his body shed heat?

Will Steffen's comments at the meeting reinforced the three fundamental misrepresentations of climate.

Does chemical engineer Will Steffen understand that UN IPCC and CSIRO climate projections rely on misrepresentations and on unvalidated and erroneous projections from computerised numerical climate modelling that misrepresents Nature and the beauty of our planet's climate and weather systems?

<http://drtimball.com/2012/static-climate-models-in-a-virtually-unknown-dynamic-atmosphere/>

Will Steffen is the author of the Climate Commission's report entitled '*The Critical Decade*'. It contains no empirical evidence or any logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 caused warming. It promotes all three fundamental climate misconceptions. A critique is available. Part 1 is here:

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

And, Part 2 here:

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

More of Will Steffen's unfounded unscientific implied claims are presented below in quoting from his tag-team effort with fellow Climate Commissioners Tim Flannery and Lesley Hughes in front of federal parliamentarians and busloads of impressionable school children. See quotes in Appendix 9 under Lesley Hughes.

Produces Climate Commission's reports contradicting empirical science

For more on Will Steffen apparently misleading the public please refer to the Climate Commission's latest report and his article in *The Australian* newspaper

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/clean-up-energy-for-the-sake-of-our-grandchildren/story-e6frgd0x-1226432219509>

Please note his selective use of data and omissions identified here?

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

Andy Semple claims that Will Steffen misleads by omission:

http://www.andysrant.com/2012/07/will-steffen-and-the-sum-of-all-imaginary-fears.html?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AndyRant+%28Andy%27s+RANT%21%29

Tome 22 reveals Will Steffen's activist, global governance and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about Will Steffen at this site:

<http://tome22.info/Persons/Steffen-Will.html>

From Tome 22, Will Steffen:

- Has at least one role in the UN IPCC that being contributing author;
- Has 10 of his papers referenced in the UN IPCC's 2007 report (Fourth Assessment Report, AR4);
- Is affiliated with 14 organisations listed on Tome 22: 10 academic organisations, 3 world organisations, 3 government organisations, 3 transient organisations, 9 alarmist organisations. He has been Executive Director of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme, one of the four international global change research programmes. He is a member of the Earth System Governance Project.

According to data assembled by Tome 22, in AR4 chapters in which Will Steffen had a role there was a reference to a paper of which he was an author, quote: "**3-1-3 Observation:** In AR4 chapters in which Will Steffen had a role, there were 1 references to papers of which he/she was an author."

Will Steffen shares participation in some organisations with many of the other alarmist academic advocates discussed in this appendix. They form a tight-knit group.

<http://tome22.info/Persons/Steffen-Will.html>

Including UN IPCC participation:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/IPCC-Intergovernmental-Panel-on-Climate-Change.html>

Earth System Governance Project:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/ESGP-Earth-System-Governance-Project.html>

Australian Climate Commission:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/AusCC-Australian-Climate-Commission.html>

Australian Government Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/DCCEE-Aust-Dept-of-Climate-Change-and-Energy-Efficiency.html>

Kungl Vetenskaps Akademien, Sweden (Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences):

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/KVA.html>

The organisation Assessments of Impacts and Adaptations to Climate Change in Multiple Regions and Sectors:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/AIACC-Assessments-of-Impacts-and-Adaptations-to-Climate-Change-in-Multiple-Regions-and-Sectors.html>

ANU Climate Change Institute:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/ANU-ICC-ANU-Institute-of-Climate-Change.html>

Climate Scientists Australia:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/CSA-Climate-Scientists-Australia.html>

Planet Under Pressure:

http://tome22.info/Organisations/PlanetUnderPressure_2012.html

Bali Declaration:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/BaliDec-2007-Bali-Declaration-by-Climate-Scientists.html>

International Geosphere-Biosphere Program:

<http://tome22.info/Organisations/IGBP-International-Geosphere-Biosphere-Programm.html>

Rainfall Final:

http://tome22.info/Organisations/CC_RainfallFinal.html

Separately, Will Steffen is co-author with Schellnhuber of this publication: Steffen, W., Sanderson, A., Tyson, P.D., Jäger, J., Matson, P., Moore III, B., Oldfield, F., Richardson, K., Schellnhuber, H.J., Turner II, B.L. and Wasson, R.J. (2004). *Global Change and the Earth System: A Planet Under Pressure*. The IGBP Book Series, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 336 pp.

H J Schellnhuber is a German with a master plan for transformation of global society. http://www.wbgu.de/fileadmin/templates/dateien/veroeffentlichungen/ha uptgutachten/jg2011/wbgu_jg2011_kurz_en.pdf
Reportedly his plan advocates more power to '*the community of scientific experts*'.

My Conclusions on Will Steffen's behaviour, statements and implied statements

Will Steffen is enmeshed in government bodies and finances. He contradicts empirical scientific evidence. His unscientific statements advocate a position contrary to empirical science and in support of a political agenda.

He is highly intelligent and capable. He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

From his own words quoted and discussed above together with reference links, it seems that Will Steffen misled parliament's Multi Party Climate Change Committee that subsequently recommended parliament adopt the carbon dioxide, CO₂ tax.

Will Steffen's false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentation of climate.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Will Steffen has perpetrated all three massive misrepresentations identified in Appendix 5.

Appendix 9c

Tim Flannery

Tim Flannery is joined on Julia Gillard's Climate Commission by Will Steffen. Their Commission's Science Advisory Panel includes David Karoly.

Professor Tim Flannery shot to prominence after publication of his book *'The Weather Makers'* in 2001 and especially after being announced *'Australian of the Year'* in 2007.

His many contradictions and the complete failure of many of his unscientific and unfounded alarmist forecasts have opened him to extensive public ridicule and derision.



In Tim Flannery's defense, his role as Chief Climate Commissioner and in endorsing government policy has enticed him to go well beyond his area of academic expertise.

Arguably, together with Julia Gillard's massive lie on the carbon dioxide tax Tim Flannery's unfounded and unscientific forecasts opened people to consider sceptic views. People have thereby learned of extensive empirical evidence refuting alarmist claims.

I personally challenged Tim Flannery in front of a large public audience. He failed to support his core claim that human CO₂ caused warming. One of his answers contradicted his subsequent public statements broadcast on ABC-TV.

Tim Flannery has a BA (English) an MSc and a PhD in mammal palaeontology. When asked for his qualifications on climate he has admitted he has no qualifications in climate. Member of the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel, Andy Pitman reportedly said, quote: "*Flannery is not a climate expert.*"

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science>

Yet possibly due to government endorsement the media falsely portrays Tim Flannery as a climate expert.

Review and Spreadsheet on Tim Flannery's book '*The Weather Makers*'

Dr. Wes Allen wrote what is the first known detailed review of Tim Flannery's book '*The Weather Makers*'. Dr. Allen's review reveals that 307 statements in Tim Flannery's book created 577 problems with some of Tim Flannery's statements creating multiple problems. Wes Allen has classified these as:

- Baseless extreme (comments) – 14
- Baseless dogmatic – 103
- Suspect source – 51
- Half-truth – 85
- No uncertainty – 48
- Misrepresentations – 7
- Misinterpretation – 26
- Exaggeration – 78
- Factual error – 70
- Confusing/Silly – 43
- Contradictory – 31
- Failed predictions – 11
- Mistakes – 10

Grand total of problems: 577.

To see Dr. Allen's complete analysis download his spreadsheet analysing '*The Weather Makers*' at this link:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/TWM_Spreadsheet-11.pdf

Yet on the basis of *'The Weather Makers'*, Professor Flannery scared many young adults into climate alarm, garnered his 2007 award *'Australian of the Year'*, rocketed to fame, launched a publishing career, became a darling of the media and especially the government's ABC network and helped scuttle the government on climate in the 2007 election year.

With few exceptions his falsities have never been publicly scrutinised by major politicians or journalists.

Tim Flannery's *The Weather Makers* contradicts empirical evidence and makes many unscientific and false claims that contradict empirical data. It fabricates a non-existent problem and falsely pins the blame on human activity. It foments unfounded fear and guilt.

Please refer to:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php#G

The *Tweed Valley Weekly* newspaper sought Tim Flannery's comment on Wes Allen's book. The newspaper on May 6th, 2012 provided the reply from Tim Flannery's office, quote: *"A spokeswoman for Professor Flannery said she was unable to speak with the professor about the Weekly's request for comment because he was currently overseas.*

"However, I do know that he received a copy of The Weather Makers Re-Examined and the professor was heartened to find that The Weather Makers stands up so well to detailed review," she said.

"The Weather Makers was reviewed in manuscript by over a dozen leading researchers in climate-related fields prior to publication, and it is due to their care that so few errors made it into the published work," End of quote from The Tweed Valley Weekly on page 7, here:

http://issuu.com/tweedvalleyweekly/docs/tvwmay6_2012

The statement from Tim Flannery's office raises many serious issues. Is Tim Flannery under the delusion that Dr. Allen's book did not reveal so many glaring errors and unscientific bias in Tim Flannery's book? Who are the dozen leading researchers supposedly supporting Tim Flannery's claims? What are their fields of research? How could anyone conclude that Dr. Allen's book finds so few errors when in reality it finds Tim Flannery's book is riddled with errors? ...

The newspaper article states, quote: *"Dr Allen said Prof Flannery was the first person to receive a copy of his book and to date the local GP hadn't got a reply"*.

And quote: *"Dr Allen said when he re-read Dr Flannery's book he was amazed to find a multitude of the references didn't say what the professor was saying they said in his book."*

Tim Flannery's memory doesn't match his recorded words

Journalist Andrew Bolt reveals Tim Flannery contradicting and denying his own previous alarming claims and projections:

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

And:

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/warmist-cant-take-the-heat/story-e6frfhqf-1225878118730>

Aren't the following personal conflicts of financial interest?

Tim Flannery has been heavily publicly advocating for renewable energy while personally investing financially in a failed energy project that received \$90 million in financial aid from the Rudd-Gillard government. Is Andrew Bolt declaring Tim Flannery to be a lobbyist?

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

Naivete? Innocence? What about the questionable associations?

Is there a darker side to Tim Flannery's outlandish and unfounded forecasts contradicting empirical science? His position and statements raise questions about conflicts of interest including his association with Siemens.

During the recent drought he spread unfounded alarm with outrageous false statements reportedly claiming never-ending drought that he attributed to human CO₂ and that would cause dams to never again fill. Seemingly panicked by his unfounded scares contradicting science, state governments rushed to build desalination plants at enormous expense. Most are now mothballed. Some have never been used.

Tim Flannery is a member of Siemens Advisory Board. The large German corporation Siemens was involved in and benefitted commercially from these wasteful projects. Quoting international law firm Morgan Lewis: "*On December 15, Siemens AG and three of its subsidiaries pleaded guilty to criminal violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) for paying more than \$1 billion in bribes to foreign government officials worldwide. As part of their plea agreement, the companies have agreed to pay at least \$800 million in fines and disgorgement to settle FCPA charges brought by the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC).*" Available here:

http://www.morganlewis.com/pubs/LIT_SiemensFCPACase_LF_18dec08.pdf

And, quote: "*Also, in a related settlement, Siemens AG agreed to a disposition with the Munich Public Prosecutor's Office involving most of Siemens AG's operating groups (other than the Telecommunications group) relating to the parent's alleged failure at*

*the corporate level to supervise its officers and employees. In connection with those charges, Siemens AG agreed to pay an additional \$569 million in fines and disgorgement of profits to the German authorities. These collective settlements with the U.S. and German authorities alone will result in Siemens paying approximately **\$1.6 billion dollars** in fines, penalties, and disgorgement of profits.”*

And, quote: “*The company faces related corruption investigations by authorities in Switzerland, Norway, Italy, Greece, Argentina, Venezuela, Hungary, China, Indonesia, and Russia, and probably other countries. It also may face an avalanche of follow-on civil litigation. Siemens estimates that it will have to pay fines and likely disgorgement nearing \$2 billion.*”

http://www.morganlewis.com/pubs/LIT_SiemensFCPACase_LF_18dec08.pdf

And:

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/business/0,1518,516127,00.html>

Tim Flannery has no empirical scientific evidence for his core claim and contradicts empirical science

Not only do Tim Flannery’s statements contradict science, he has no evidence for his core claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. A transcript of three questions asked of Tim Flannery at yet another of his book launches on Tuesday, October 12th, 2010 is revealing. It’s available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/95_TranscriptFlannery.pdf

He provides no empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning for his claim that human CO₂ caused warming. He relies on the discredited UN IPCC. He relies on John Tyndall’s early work in the mid nineteenth century, quote: “*His 1859 paper published the same year that Darwin published the Origin of Species quantifying the warming potential of CO₂. Er that’s the basis.*”

In 150 years since 1859 science has improved dramatically. Scientist Tim Casey scrutinises John Tyndall’s actual paper and work here:

<http://tyndall1861.geologist-1011.mobi/>

And:

<http://geologist-1011.mobi/>

And:

<http://greenhouse.geologist-1011.net/>

Tim Flannery relies on the known and undisputed ability of CO₂ in a sealed laboratory canister to claim human CO₂ raises atmospheric temperatures to the point that the atmosphere will catastrophically warm Earth’s surface at some future unspecified date. He falsely portrays the widely-accepted behaviour of CO₂ in a sealed glass container is evidence of a supposed theoretical effect in the open, bulk, dynamic atmosphere governed by massive natural forces and laws of physics. His claim contradicts empirical evidence on Earth’s atmosphere.

Ironically, while invoking Tyndall as an expert Tim Flannery confidently and authoritatively spelled Tyndall's name incorrectly.

Tim Flannery has a master's degree in science and a PhD in mammal palaeontology. Yet observation leads to questioning whether he relies more on his bachelor's degree in arts (English). He's a master in skilfully convincing audience's with subtly emotive words wrapped in catchy yet meaningless phrases, interesting yet irrelevant stories and sympathetic tones.

Notice his use of the technique of invoking Charles Darwin's respected work when discussing climate. Is this an appeal to authority for legitimacy? If so, why does he rely on appeals to authority?

Elsewhere he astutely uses stories from Nature and anthropology to weave unscientific and often unrelated, unfounded messages with jargon implying science and evoking care for the environment. Instead, isn't real care demonstrated by telling the truth and being accurate?

Tim Flannery's English degree is of considerable assistance to him. He is seen in public as charming, caring and promoting considered, scientific opinions. Yet his positions are often unscientific.

Does this explain how he has become the darling of the media, government and environmentalists despite his abysmal misrepresentations of science, climate and Nature and despite his erroneous failed forecasts?

The transcript reveals another contradiction. Tim Flannery publicly endorsed my statement that atmospheric "*temperatures come down in the last 10 years*"

Yet six days later on ABC-TV's *QandA* program on Monday, October 18th, 2010 he gestured ridiculing scientist Jennifer Marohasy's identical claim.

Tim Flannery failed to provide any empirical evidence or logical scientific rationale as evidence for his core claim about human CO₂. It seems that he fails to understand causation. Further, he demonstrated his ability to convincingly yet falsely portray an unscientific approach as science.

I have twice publicly challenged Professor Flannery to provide evidence of human causation of global warming. Twice he failed. Yet in both failures he cleverly wove a seemingly scientific appearance to the audience.

On Tuesday, October 12th, 2010 I personally challenged Tim Flannery to a debate. His response was an awkward freeze and silence. His accompanying publishers moved him on.

Tim Flannery's unscientific contradictions can be breathtakingly revealing

Tim Flannery can be breathtakingly revealing. For example, on November 23rd, 2009 he said, quote:

"We're dealing with an incomplete understanding of the way the earth system works... When we come to the last few years when we haven't seen a continuation of that (warming) trend we don't understand all of the factors that create earth's climate... We just don't understand the way the whole system works... See, these people work with models, computer modeling. So when the computer modeling and the real world data disagree you've got a very interesting problem... Sure for the last 10 years we've gone through a slight cooling trend."

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

ABC-TV's *Lateline*, 23.11.2009, quote: *"we deal with an incomplete understanding of the way the earth's system works ... In the last few years, were there hasn't been a continuation of that warming trend, we don't understand all of the factors that create earth's climate, ... we don't understand the way the whole system works, and we have to find out ... sure for the last few years we have gone through a slight cooling"* trend (now 14 years without warming)

On March 25th, 2011, he said, quote: *"If the world as a whole cut all (CO2) emissions tomorrow, the average temperature of the planet's not going to drop for several hundred years, perhaps over 1000 years," he said."*

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/no-fast-result-in-cuts-flannery/story-e6frg6xf-1226028366173>

It seems that despite his implied claims of imminent irreversible catastrophic warming we cannot stop the catastrophe by globally cutting CO2 production. Yet his statement remains false since there is no scientific evidence that human CO2 causes catastrophic global climate change. There is much empirical evidence proving human CO2 has no effect on climate. Indeed, human CO2 does not determine global atmospheric CO2 levels.

Tim Flannery's illogical contradictions can be unfathomable

Over a period of 19 months, Tim Flannery's public descriptions of coal changed from quote *'antique' 'carbon catastrophe'* as *"dangerous as asbestos and nuclear power"* and *"as expensive as solar panels"* yet a *"cost-effective and a solution that cannot be questioned"*. September 22, 2008, ABC-TV, quote: *"The world is going to need coal - particularly China and India"* two significant markets for Australian coal. Is this scientific logic? Are these contradictions rational? Which of his statements does he believe?

Later Tim Flannery returned to [advocating the banning](#) of coal fired power stations. He did this while rambling on many topics and outing the prominent government minister

widely mentioned as being a sceptic on human causation of global warming, Martin Ferguson.

http://fora.tv/2010/05/12/Tim_Flannery_Now_or_Never

And transcript of relevant portion:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/TimFlanneryTranscriptNowOrNever.pdf>

The relevant section of interest starts around the 31 minutes and 30 seconds mark, quote:

"I would love to see some political leader commit to a ban on the building of any new conventional coal-fired power plants or any enhancement of existing conventional coal-fired power plants in Australia.

That wouldn't be such a radical move. The reason being that we have a 20% renewable energy target which under current settings is unlikely to be met but anyway it's in there as policy which goes a lot of the way towards that end in any case.

(Is he saying we should rely on renewables even though we cannot rely on renewables?)

The government of Queensland has already introduced legislation that goes a long way to banning conventional coal-fired power plant construction in future.

For the federal government to do that is not such a great leap and it would show their bonafides on this issue. I very much fear that the Labor party won't do that because the sort of policy settings we're seeing actually implemented in the climate change area now are not those of the climate minister, they're not Penny Wong's way forward, they're Martin Ferguson's vision of the future of Australia, Martin Ferguson has been a climate sceptic for a long time. He may still be a climate sceptic. He believes very sincerely that coal is the future. That's what the future of the world is going to be.

And if you believe coal's the future you spend a lot of money on carbon capture and storage but nothing on other options, or very little. As little as you can do politically on other options."

More of Tim Flannery's wild claims:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/96_FlanneryonamalgamfillingsinDT29May12.pdf

Russell Wade shared *The Daily Telegraph's* article published on May 29th, 2012. His email included section 88 *Dignity of deceased person to be respected*, from the NSW Coroners Act 2009 No 41. Russell Wade's email stated, quote: "As a child of the 1950s, with a mouthful of stable mercury amalgam fillings and a former Clinical Waste Controller in the ACT Government and Waste Management expert, I have some expertise to refute Professor Flannery's claim." Russell Wade's email endorsed comments from the Australian Dental Association and Australian Funeral Directors Association reported in *The Daily Telegraph*.

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/national/professor-tim-flannerys-climate-fix-is-now-like-pulling-teeth/story-e6freuzr-1226370604306>

Or:

<http://www.news.com.au/national-old/professor-tim-flannerys-climate-fix-is-now-like-pulling-teeth/story-e6frfkvr-1226370604306>

Russell Wade continues, quote: *“if fillings are removed from a body, they are clinical waste and have to be disposed of in an authorised manner, normally by high temperature incineration, above 1100 degrees Centigrade. ... The fillings are inert in their amalgam state, but if placed in landfill, the acetogenic nature of landfill leachate may react with the amalgam to mobilise the mercury, which despite landfill lining and environmental controls, could find its way into the environmental waters.*

The only safe place to keep mercury compounds is in either an aboveground storage facility built to the Dangerous Goods storage standard or in a covered secure landfill.

Notwithstanding, I am sure that the funeral industry and surviving next of kin would be outraged to know that our ... Climate Change Commissioner was going around to funeral parlours ripping out fillings in an act of barbaric behaviour, using \$2 pliers!

It is about time Professor Flannery and his cohort were pulled into line for espousing fear on matters that have nothing to do with climate change and are outside their area of professional expertise. After the Sydney western suburbs episode, you can see the pattern of behaviour is to continue to instil fear into the population to justify anything to do with climate change.”*

*Russell Wade is referring to his opinion by email on Thursday, May 31, 2012, quote: *“... Climate Change Commissioners scaremongering over the propensity for violence in Sydney’s western suburbs, due to the projected impacts of climate change. The issue was that Climate Change Commissioners are liable for the accuracy of their statements, especially if outside their professional expertise and it causes economic loss.”*

Tim Flannery jolted by a *shock jock* keeping records

Simply by keeping detailed records did popular radio host Ray Hadley reveal Tim Flannery making a clown of himself through his own contradictions? You decide here: http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=10889

Tim Flannery endorsing James Hansen’s outrageous unscientific claims

Reported by John Izzard, quote: *“The third problem identified by the professor was the decline in trust the public has in the climate-change science and presumably in the scientists themselves. Well yes there is a slight perception of a credibility problem. Take rising sea-levels. In his book Now or Never, Professor Tim quotes James Hansen “who is the world’s leading thinker in this area” saying that “we are on the brink of triggering a 25 metre sea-level rise”. Tim goes onto say “So anyone with a coastal view from their bedroom or kitchen window is likely to lose their house as a result of that change”. The Australian of 5th March 2010 quotes a Tim Flannery estimate of a 60 metre sea-level rise.”*

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2010/03/flannery-nags-launceston>

Appendix 8 raises serious questions about activist James Hansen's false claims and reported tampering with temperature data. Why is Tim Flannery endorsing James Hansen?

Is Tim Flannery all at sea on sea levels?

In addition to seemingly endorsing James Hansen's unscientific claim, Tim Flannery has reportedly earned a reputation for varying sea level projections.

The Australian newspaper on March 5th, 2010 quotes his estimate for a future 60 m sea level rise:

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/flannery_flops/asc/P20

Reportedly, in his Launceston lecture on Friday evening, March 12th, 2010 he repeatedly claimed we are now experiencing an annual 3mm rise in the sea level along Australia's coastline.

Appendix 4a presents data from Queensland state government department Maritime Safety Queensland (MSQ). It reveals that over the last 15 years sea level rise in mainland Australian has been 0.3 mm per year. Tim Flannery's claim is ten times that rate.

At MSQ's actual rate in 100 years the sea level will rise 3cm—just over an inch. People's lives depend on these tide records. They're actual measurements, not projections from unvalidated computerised numerical modeling.

Empirical science reveals that sea levels have been rising—and occasionally suddenly falling—naturally for the last 16,000 years since the end of the last ice age. 11,000 years ago it was possible for humans to walk from Victoria to Tasmania.

The Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change projects sea level is to continue rising at the rate of 1.8mm pa for 100 years, totalling 18cm over the next century.

Even unscientific UN IPCC projections decreased in every succeeding report after grabbing headlines in its 1990 report with a projected rise of 367cm (3.67 m). The UN IPCC projected sea level rise over 100 years from 2000 to 2100 is between 14-43cm (2007 science draft rpt) and 18-59cm (2007 political rpt).

As discussed in Appendix 4a there has been no net change in South Pacific Islands' sea levels for the past two decades. Refer to the **Sea Level Fine Resolution Acoustic Measuring Equipment Seaframe Study** shows no upward trend. Alberto Boretti's peer-reviewed paper presents Australian tidal gauge measurements over recent decades and

for two locations over the last century. It reveals minimal sea level rise, stable rate of rise and projected 50 mm rise over the coming century. That's around two inches.

What is the basis of Tim Flannery's projections? Why do they vary so wildly? Why is he fomenting unfounded alarm? Is it associated with his connections to global organizations fomenting unfounded climate alarm?

Tim Flannery cultivating a wildlife image contradicting his climate claims?

Tim Flannery has made and implied many statements about Australia's recent drought. He implied it was unusually severe and linked that to human CO₂. Reportedly he implied the drought may never end. With that in mind, consider recent statements in his article entitled *Seeing Red* published in Australian Geographic, Issue 109, July-August, 2012:

Page 56: *"Sand dune and gibber plain. The Sturt Stony Desert stretches from horizon to horizon in Australia's heartland, its varnished, stony surface reflecting the heat, making this a land of bizarre mirages. It is one of the most unforgiving corners of our harsh land. Averages out here mean nothing. For decades the country can lie baking under the pitiless sun. But sudden changes, originating far away in the Indian and Pacific oceans, can trigger widespread rain, turning it into a Garden of Eden. And when that happens—as it has in the last few years—every living thing changes gear. Seeds that have lain dormant spring to life. Aestivating frogs shrug off their torpor and struggle to the surface, while small mammals breed as if there's no tomorrow. Soon the desert is carpeted in grasses and herbs, and throbbing with life."* He's aware of massive, sudden, natural changes in central Australia due to effects of changes in far away Indian and Pacific oceans. He's aware of natural cycles. He's aware that Nature copes, indeed thrives.

He's known this for years, page 56: *"In 1974 I was lucky enough to see the phenomenon for myself. I was in the Lake Frome Basin as a volunteer on a fossil dig, excavating the 30-million-year-old bones of creatures that once lived in rainforests, when great thunderstorms rolled in. Soon our excavations were waterlogged and tracks impassable, so we sat in camp and watched the spectacle. Over the course of a single night frogs emerged by the tens of thousands, overrunning our campsite. Their croaking was so loud we couldn't sleep. Within weeks a carpet of green had spread under the gaunt mulgas, and flowers were blooming everywhere—white daisies on the dunes and purple parakeelya in the swales. The daisies were heliotropic; I awoke one night to find entire fields of them pointing towards the full moon."*

It seems he has been aware for decades of massive climate shifts so great that rainforests became desert long before use of coal-fired power plants and oil-burning cars were invented. He's been aware of Nature's wonderful cycles and the way the desert and its animals and plants have adapted successfully.

Being a supposed macropod palaeontologist he's known for some time it seems that animals adapt to weather and climate: *"The largest native mammal of Sturt Stony Desert, seen in these pictures captured by Theo Allofs, is the red kangaroo. It is also the world's largest living marsupial, and its response to the rains is wondrous. In dry times the females may wait five years before becoming sexually mature, but when it's wet they'll begin reproducing at 18 months. And from then on they are a reproductive production line. Permanently pregnant, they're perpetually poised to take advantage of the rains. In a good season they carry three young, all at different stages of development. The furthest along are the young at foot. They're still drinking milk from an elongated teat, but no longer climb into the pouch, which is occupied by a smaller young attached to its own teat. Remarkably, the composition of the milk produced by the two teats differs—it is tailored to suit the needs of the different-sized joeys. The third young is not yet born: it enters a state of suspended animation when consisting of just a few hundred cells, and will recommence development soon after the oldest joey stops suckling. Then mum will mate and become pregnant again. Their overlapping generations maximise what may be a brief reproductive opportunity, which is just as well, for it might be decades before the big wet returns."*

Page 61, he says, quote: *"In the mid-19th century fears were held for the survival of the red kangaroo. John Gould placed it with the thylacine as a species likely to become extinct. But the rapid expansion of grazing pasture and the suppression of the dingo favoured it, and today it's readily seen over much of the inland."* He seems to be saying humans helped a species survive.

On page 61 his own words reveal that he has known for some time that conditions were much drier 20,000 years ago ... Let's read his own words, quote: *"There is still much we don't know about red kangaroos, including their evolutionary origins. They're members of the wallaroo group, close to the antilopine wallaroo of northern Australia. But because their fossils are incredibly rare, when they arose as a distinct species is unclear. Some of the fossils that have been found have turned up in strange places, like the outskirts of Melbourne, where no reds exist today. These date back 20,000 years and tell of a time when conditions were much drier, the arid inland extending all the way south to Port Philip Bay. You may have to travel far inland to see red kangaroos today, but it's well worth the effort, especially in a wet year such as this."*

A picture caption on page 60, quote: *"1. Ebb and flow. By breeding and flourishing when there is sufficient nourishment, kangaroos compensate for the deadly impact of drought. During hard times numbers reduce to form a balance with the available food supply."*

Australia has wet years and dry years. Australia is now not as dry as it was 20,000 years ago. Arid land has been pushed back since then. Remarkable.

Australia's landforms and adaptations by its plant and animal wildlife confirm that cyclical weather and climate patterns over the last century are entirely natural. It seems that for possibly almost four decades Tim Flannery has known that Australia is a land of cyclic drought and floods and that its wildlife is remarkably adapted to those severe

natural cycles. He knew of far drier times in the past. Why then did he falsely dramatise our latest drought to imply it was caused or worsened by human activity? In doing so why did he contradict empirical scientific evidence? Why did he foment unfounded alarm?

Why did he imply to governments and citizens that the recent drought was unusual and threatening due to human CO₂ while understanding past droughts had been far more severe? Why did he falsely imply the drought as evidence of human CO₂ causing global warming while knowing of Australia's far more severe and entirely natural past climate changes and dry periods?

Is Tim Flannery's talent in colourful, evocative, persuasive language?

Tim Flannery has a remarkable ability to connect with audiences through people's inherent connection with, interest in, and care, for animals and the environment. He romanticises and evokes emotions from discussing everyday events. He reveals a flourish of colourful language simultaneously portraying himself as scientific. He seems to have the knack of using catchy, memorable phrases spoken in a soothing tone. Is he trying to create an image as a lovable and admirable scientist with heart and passion, a man with whom people can connect and believe? Do these colourful skills mask his many misleading statements, unscientific claims, unfounded scary exaggerations, erroneous forecasts and self-contradictions?

Before a live audience his skills and language can be mesmerising. Audience's can forsake logic and become enthralled in his emotive anecdotes and pseudo-science.

Some though can be annoyed. My experience in leadership and management reveals a propensity for people to overuse their strengths thereby creating weaknesses. That's likely the reason people seem to be increasingly recognising that Tim Flannery's scares and claims are overdone to the point of absurdity. His remarkable personal contradictions and reversals combine with his personal conflicts of interest to open him to extensive public ridicule.

Yet he remains Chairman of the government's Climate Commission. This reflects poorly on the government and on academics. It emphasises Greg Combet's media release dated February 10th, 2011 announcing the Climate Commission's appointment and specifically Tim Flannery as Chief Climate Commissioner when Greg Combet said, quote: "*today announced the establishment of an independent Climate Commission, appointing the leading science communicator, Professor Tim Flannery, as Chief Commissioner.*"

After his many unscientific claims contradicting empirical science can Tim Flannery be accurately described as a *leading science communicator*? Given its composition of many scientists relying on taxpayer funding, is the government-funded Climate Commission independent? Why did Greg Combet's release fail to reveal Tim Flannery's government salary of reportedly \$180,000 per year for eight month's work three days a week?

Tim Flannery's unfounded scary predictions are now widely ridiculed, even by fellow alarmist academics. Retired journalist Tony Thomas reveals that when The Australian Academy of Science elected Tim Flannery as a Fellow it was despite objection from Academy Fellows. Other objectors included fellow government-funded advocate Will Steffen who later became one of Tim Flannery's climate commissioners and who is not a Fellow of the Academy. The objections are not surprising given Tim Flannery's unscientific claims:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science>

Andy Pitman is on the Science Advisory Panel to Tim Flannery's Climate Commission. In his article in The Australian newspaper on January 07th, 2011 entitled '*No need to go gaga over Gaia*' Andy Pitman says of Tim Flannery's statements, quote: "*he also said: "I think that within this century the concept of strong Gaia will actually become physically manifest." This is about as silly, in my view, as Flannery's statement on the ABC's Late line program in November 2009 that global warming had not occurred over the past 10 years, that "there hasn't been a continuation of that warming trend". This statement was incorrect and highlights the dangers of a scientist commenting outside their area of expertise.*"

[.http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/no-need-to-go-gaga-over-gaia/story-e6frg6zo-1225983237159](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/no-need-to-go-gaga-over-gaia/story-e6frg6zo-1225983237159)

Note: Ironically, Tim Flannery was indeed correct about global warming not occurring over the preceding 10 years.

Public comments about Tim Flannery's positions, statements and reported conflicts of interest are available in website links posted at this site:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php#G

Tim Flannery's ridiculous forecasts, warnings and contradictions and those of his academic peers seem to have been a significant factor in undermining public belief in supposed catastrophic global warming. Spurred by Nature revealing the reality of natural cyclic weather events the deepening public ridicule reflected by Larry Pickering's cartoon above raises a question: Would it be accurate to conclude that in the public's eyes the Climate Commission has been transformed into the Climate Circus with Tim Flannery its Chief Clown?

Tome 22 reveals Tim Flannery's activist and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about Tim Flannery at this site:

<http://tome22.info/Persons/Flannery-Tim.html>

From Tome 22, Tim Flannery is affiliated with 3 NonGovernment Organisations and 4 alarmist organisations.

Tome22 enables exploration of his connections through the following organisations:

- World Future Council;

- Copenhagen Climate Council;
- Sustainable Population Australia;
- Australian Climate Commission;
- Planet Under Pressure;
- Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists.

Tim Flannery is chairman of the Copenhagen Climate Council. It includes Crispen Tickell who is associated with Agenda 21 organisations including The Club of Rome, United Nations Environmental Program and Chicago Climate Exchange together with Thomas Lovejoy who is associated with Agenda 21 organisation WWF.

Tim Flannery sees Gaia as Earth's life-force yet humans as bits of dirt

In The Weekend Australian on Saturday, August 18th, 2012 Tim Flannery was quoted as saying on May 6th in his ABC-TV series *The Green Divide*: “*All we (humans) are is just animated bits of Earth's crust. Everything in our chemistry tells us that we originated in Earth's crust and that is who we are.*” What does Tim Flannery make of the human spirit? Soul? Love? Universal energy and life-force? What does he make of Gaia of whom he speaks? His statement about human beings reminds me of a theme to which this report will return in Appendix 14, *Motives*.

One wonders what happened to Tim Flannery's earlier statement, quoted by Tony Thomas: “... (Flannery) speculated that during this century *“the planet will have acquired a brain and a nervous system that will make it act as a living animal, as a living organism”*”

My Conclusions on Tim Flannery's behaviour, statements and implied statements

Tim Flannery has no evidence for his core climate claim that human CO₂ caused, causes or will cause future catastrophic global warming. His wildly inconsistent and sometimes contradictory statements lack sound empirical, physical, logical or theoretical basis.

I conclude that he misrepresents science, climate and Nature. Yet he cultivates an unfounded aura of scientific respectability. He benefits enormously from his unscientific statements and claims, from his unfounded forecasts and from his unscientific contradictions. Financial benefits include his reported sponsorships, book publishing and his reported government salary of \$180,000 for three days per week for eight months.

Yet his misleading and false portrayal of climate is one the government relies upon and quotes.

Tim Flannery is enmeshed in government bodies. His position is clouded by his financial and other benefits from the government, various sponsors and financially beneficial

ventures. He contradicts empirical science. He contradicts himself. His unscientific statements advocate a position contrary to the science and in support of a political agenda.

Tim Flannery is highly skilful. His false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentations of climate science. He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Tim Flannery has perpetrated all three massive misrepresentations identified in Appendix 5.

Appendix 9d

Ross Garnaut

Economics professor Ross Garnaut rose to prominence in climate '*science*' through releasing his *Garnaut Review* in 2008. His review's second chapter portrays the '*science*' and reveals that he relies on the UN IPCC and Australian science seemingly being CSIRO, Bureau of Meteorology and the Australian Academy of Science.

Appendix 2 reveals that the Garnaut Review is undermined by its self-admitted reliance on the discredited UN IPCC. Appendices 6, 7, 8 and 9 reveal that the Garnaut Review is undermined to the extent by its self-admitted reliance on Australian (climate) science depending as it does on CSIRO, BOM, the Australian Academy of Science and prominent Australian academics funded by government.

My letter dated Tuesday, March 22nd, 2011 was sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to Ross Garnaut. It is available here:
<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/GarnautMarch2011.pdf>

It followed the release of his *Fifth Update* in March 2011. My letter presented empirical evidence refuting his implied core claim that human CO₂ production needs to be cut in order to avoid claimed supposed catastrophic future damage.

Both his 2008 Review and his 2011 *Fifth Update* received massive widespread media coverage and carried enormous political clout.

His work and statements contain no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for his core claim.

His position relies on discredited, flawed UN IPCC reports and unvalidated computerised numerical climate modelling.

His work and public statements spread all three fundamental misrepresentations of climate science.

His work reveals misunderstanding, contradiction and reversal of the scientific approach.

My letter itemises many empirical scientific points contradicting his false claims. It presents access to information revealing the UN IPCC as corrupt. It analyses specific points in his *Fifth Update*. It reveals to Ross Garnaut the falsities spread by individuals prominent in the UN IPCC.

My letter revealed that Ross Garnaut's position ignores and contradicts basic economics by ignoring massive documented benefits of global warming.

From the transcript of his speech on Thursday, March 10, 2011 launching his Fifth Update Ross Garnaut said, quote: *“So the IPCC, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is a unique scientific body set up by the United Nations because this issue was such an important issue for the international community and it brings together scientists from all over the world. A couple of thousand in number who carefully go through the peer review literature and come up with an integrated assessment of the science as it stands at the time of each review.”*

<http://www.garnautreview.org.au/update-2011/events-speeches/science-climate-change-transcript.html>

In his speech introducing his Fifth Update and in reference to his address to Supreme and Federal Court judges, he said, quote: *“Rarely in a case that comes before one of Australia's superior courts is the defence so weak that it can find no so-called expert to blow a fog through the proceedings.”* Was he implying to the judges that he could find no competent scientist opposing his view? Yet there are many climatology experts who disagree strongly with his claim—internationally and within Australia. Senator Fielding easily found four (4) in Australia. There are many, many more. Worldwide, there are thousands more. Professor Garnaut's statement reverses reality.

Ross Garnaut provides no empirical evidence or any scientific reasoning proving human CO₂ as the cause of global warming. One wonders about Ross Garnaut's understanding of cases before *'Australia's superior courts'*.

In his speech introducing his Fifth Update he said, quote: *“My personal intellectual journey over these past four years has moved me from acceptance of the mainstream sciences' main propositions with the degree of certainty required by the civil law, a balance of probabilities, closer to the criminal law requirements of beyond reasonable doubt.”* His claim contradicts real-world scientific findings. I requested him to provide specific real-world empirical scientific evidence for his statement. He failed to do so.

ABC-TV questions Ross Garnaut's environmental record

My letter to Ross Garnaut raised ABC-TV's scrutiny of his reportedly questionable environmental record as Chairman of Lihir Gold. The program's transcript and transcripts of ABC-TV's subsequent exchanges with Ross Garnaut reveal that he seems to rely on implied claims without supporting such claims with quantified real-world data.

My letter said, quote: *“I make no comments about your position versus that claimed by the 7:30 Report. I simply state my opinion that your response lacks adequate quantified real-world evidence. In my view, your response failed to address the 7:30 Report's key claim.”*

From my letter to Ross Garnaut asking him to address my concerns about his position

My letter summarises, quote:

Summarising my requests

(199)

Referring to the above underlined requests for responses, this inquiry may be summarised by four requests:

- Please provide one piece of specific scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of carbon dioxide caused Earth's latest period of modest, cyclic global warming that ended around 1998;

(200)

- If the government enacts carbon dioxide taxes and 'trading' schemes, by what amount will temperatures fall and by what date will they fall? I understand you will need to provide a range of prices or alternatively a range of carbon dioxide cuts and corresponding temperature reductions;

(201)

- Please provide the range of forecast costs incurred to achieve this range of forecast temperature reductions;

(202)

- Please provide specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence showing that higher temperatures are detrimental to humanity, the environment and our planet. Science proves previous warm periods in Earth's human and geological history were highly beneficial to plants, animals, humans and our planet's ecosystem;

(203)

- You contradict real-world science by recommending economic impositions on carbon dioxide—a natural trace gas essential for all complex life on Earth. Lets consider another natural gas, oxygen that occurs in quantities almost 550 times greater than does CO₂. Are you aware that humans can suffer oxygen poisoning? Given that oxygen causes forest fires, house fires, rusting of cars and is essential for all combustion of fuels containing carbon, will you be recommending the taxing of oxygen? If not, why not?

(204)

- Have you been misled and used to spread UN IPCC and/or government misrepresentations? Or have you been assisting to mislead the Australian people?

(205)

If you fail to provide real-world evidence to justify your claims, yet you continue publicly advocating action against human carbon dioxide you will be abetting UN IPCC fraud and lying. My understanding is that you will be in contempt of parliament. Will lying to the people and industry make you personally legally liable for losses incurred due to your falsities?

Conclusions

(206)

From your 2008 Garnaut Review and your recent Fifth Update I conclude that your work is based on falsely assuming an underlying premise to be true. In its wording your work assumes the UN IPCC's position to be accurate. It then seems to simply

endorse it. Your approach contradicts science. Your claims contradict real-world scientific evidence. Your approach is one-sided and, despite you being an economist, it brushes aside economic benefits of warming. You fail to provide and adequately consider alternative views.

(207)

Please reflect on scholarly reticence, introduced on page 53 of your Update. Aren't the most powerful antidotes of scholarly reticence real-world evidence and honest questioning of assumptions? Contrary to your false assertions, there is an enormous amount of real-world data on climate. That evidence proves your premise and assumptions are unfounded.

(208)

It is difficult to conceive how you could accidentally make so many contradictions to real-world data with all contradictions tilting toward one conclusion. Statistics would show that is not random. I conclude it is deliberate and ask you why?

(209)

I conclude that your report is a corruption of science and that the corruption seems likely deliberate. If not deliberate then a statistically highly unlikely event reflecting gross incompetence and/or entanglement in groupthink.

(210)

I conclude that your 2008 Review, Fifth Update and recent public comments are misleading. The question is whether they are deliberately so? That is for you to consider and parliamentarians to decide.

(211)

Professor Garnaut, the broadcasting of your comments and Update stimulated my thinking and deepened my concern. From extensive reading, my grounds for the concerns presented above are sincere and clear in my mind. Nonetheless, if I am in error in any way, I invite and welcome your corrections using real-world scientific evidence and facts.

(212)

Providing you supply specific real-world scientific evidence of your core claim and of any errors on my part, I will forward your response to all recipients of this letter.

Three requests

(213)

Please acknowledge this letter and answer the questions and requests underlined above.

(214)

Unless you can provide specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence for your claims, please retract your claims.

(215)

Please closely examine section (1) of the enclosed Summary Findings and supporting links and references. I will be pleased to discuss this letter and the Summary Findings with you and welcome an opportunity to do so.

End of quote.

No response has been received from Ross Garnaut.

Yet in response to a friend forwarding a copy of my letter to Ross Garnaut's office within the Department of Climate Change, his office responded that, quote: "*Professor Garnaut recognises that everyone has their own opinion on the subjects discussed in his Update Papers.*" Does this reflect his office's misunderstanding of science? I concluded that it does and that it confirms that Ross Garnaut's approach is political and based on opinion not objective empirical science.

Canadian climate professor Tim Ball explains that true scientists and those applying science in the real-world understand that, quote: "*Science works by creation of theories based on assumptions, in which scientists performing their proper role as sceptics, try to disprove the theory*". Once a theory passes tests and criticism it is accepted.

Yet prominent Expert Adviser to the government and Multi Party Climate Change Committee, economics Professor Ross Garnaut's stated approach is the opposite.

Ross Garnaut playing questionable politics on climate and on economics?

Respected economist Henry Ergas questions Ross Garnaut's economics advice here: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/alan-jones-fosters-robust-debate-while-ross-garnaut-hides-his-models/story-fn7078da-1226488506326>

Quote: "*It's hard to disagree with Ross Garnaut that China's slowing growth will place new pressures on our economy. But the implications he derives from that are wrong-headed. And that is unsurprising, as they are driven more by the politics of protecting the carbon tax than by sensible economic analysis.*"

Quote: "*As commodity markets enter a new phase, avoiding such mistakes, and reversing them when they are made, is more important than ever. With Australia's future at stake, ordinary Australians have every right to be involved, even if Garnaut believes the resulting debate looks foolish compared with that in Europe. Well, if that is foolishness, long may it continue. For only it stands between us and the errors the Garnauts of this world would inflict.*"

Why is Ross Garnaut reportedly decrying debate? Quote: "*Well, if that is foolishness, long may it continue. For only it (debate) stands between us and the errors the Garnauts of this world would inflict.*"

Henry Ergas asks: "*has led Garnaut into contortions worthy of Circus Oz*". Does the circus extend beyond Tim Flannery's Climate Circus? In both his supposed field of expertise and his new field of climate change, reputable commentators see Ross Garnaut's advocacy as contrary to Australia's interests. Why?

Ross Garnaut is listed as a member of the Trilateral Commission pushing global governance. Why are its deliberations secretive?

My Conclusions on Ross Garnaut's behaviour, statements and implied statements

Ross Garnaut is highly intelligent and skilful. His false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentations of climate science. He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Ross Garnaut has perpetrated all three misrepresentations identified in Appendix 5.

Appendix 9e

Lesley Hughes

Lesley Hughes is an ecologist at Macquarie University.

David Karoly and Matthew England join Lesley Hughes as members of WWF's Science Advisory Panel. Together with Will Steffen she is a member of Tim Flannery's Climate Commission.

Prior to making her false statements and false implied claims at the Climate Commission's presentation in federal parliament house on Tuesday, May 24th, 2011 Lesley Hughes was introduced by Chief Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery as, quote: "*Professor Lesley Hughes of Macquarie University, another eminent climate scientist ...*"

The audience included busloads of impressionable high school students, Labour and Greens federal MP's, independent Tony Windsor, Liberals Malcolm Turnbull and Greg Hunt, ...

Thus, thanks to Tim Flannery's false statement to the audience she was likely perceived as a climate expert. This is simply one illustration of how the unscientific appeal to authority so often used by government and alarmist advocates rests on ... nothing.

Wild and false temperature claim

During her presentation, Lesley Hughes stated, quote: "*The climate is changing far faster than it ever has in the past, probably several orders of magnitude faster and for most species, it is simply too fast to keep up in an evolutionary sense.*"

My letter to her by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation dated Thursday, September 29th, 2011 is available here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/LesleyHughes_September2011.pdf

Note that the email address given in the letter should be malcolmr@conscious.com.au

I stated, quote: "*Based on my reading on climate, your statement is false. Geologists and palaeontologists have scientific evidence of many periods when climate change was far greater in extent and in rate than Earth's latest modest cyclic atmospheric warming that ended around 1998. This applies to both rates of cooling and of warming.*"

Please refer to Figure 1 in the accompanying paper by American geologist Don Easterbrook. It's available at: <http://www.klimarealistene.com/looming-threat-of-global-cooling.pdf>

What is the basis of your claim made in front of impressionable school students and federal parliamentarians? Why did you make your claim? I wonder whether or not you have misled parliament and if so, whether or not you are in contempt of parliament.

Are you aware that Earth's latest, modest period of cyclic global atmospheric warming ended around 1998? Are you aware there is no scientifically measured real world evidence that human production of carbon dioxide caused that warming?"
End of quote.

No reply has been received from Lesley Hughes.

Additionally, other geologists and palaeontologists have widely identified and discussed both cooling and warming periods on Earth that have been far greater in extent than Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming that ended around 1998. These include international award winning geologist Professor Ian Plimer and internationally eminent palaeoclimatologist Professor Bob Carter.

Lesley Hughes' wild, unfounded claim contradicts reality and empirical science.

Actual temperature records reveal that North America was warmer in the 1930's than today. The Arctic was reportedly warmer in the 1940's than in recent decades. The Medieval Warming Period 1,000 years ago is widely accepted worldwide by scientists as warmer than today by at least one degree and possibly two degrees. Scientists have determined the Early Roman Period was yet warmer. Scientists have identified the Egyptian Warming period was even warmer. Reputable climate scientists report Earth's current temperature is below Earth's average temperature for the last 3,000 years.

References are available in this document:

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

And:

Page 4 here: http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

And in books by Plimer and Carter and hundreds of scientifically peer-reviewed papers.

This site reveals recent cool periods and subsequent warming after each:

<http://iceagenow.info/2012/06/astrophysicist-forecasts-19th-ice-age-7500-years/>

Nothing unusual is currently occurring.

Geologists have evidence of past warming rates and cooling rates far greater than the modest, gradual supposed warming since the Little Ice Age ended around 1800. Empirical science reveals that since 1890 temperatures have naturally decreased and increased cyclically with no net change in rural temperatures. Please refer to Appendix 4.

During the Climate Commission's meeting Prime Minister Julia Gillard waded into her Climate Commission's theatrics with, quote: "*The stuff about the Great Barrier Reef I think particularly struck my eye as well and people will want to look at that, it's so much a part of what we think about ourselves as a nation.*"

Tiny words fomenting fear for 80% of Aussies and emotive Aussie icons

Lesley Hughes later supported the PM by scaring the audience about ‘*Australian icons*’ such as the Great Barrier Reef and Kakadu. For added measure she presented scientifically unfounded claims about future quadrupling of the modest temperature increase over the last century.

In doing so she contradicted empirical scientific evidence from climate data analyst and PhD candidate John McLean, quote: “*This proxy data from temperature monitoring on Willis Island suggests that sea surface temperatures on the Great Barrier Reef have varied very little over the last seventy-one years and show no sustained periods of significant warming.*”

http://mclean.ch/climate/GBR_sea_temperature.htm

And:

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/GBR_SST_and_ENSO.pdf

Nonetheless, the emcee for the parliament house stunt asked Lesley Hughes, quote: “*What might the future look like in Australia without action? Is it possible to answer that question given that we don’t really know the extent to which the world is likely to go on warming? Can you give us a snapshot? Can you give us a picture, Lesley?*”

Lesley Hughes’ answer, quote: “*Well, it depends on what sector you’re looking at but for example one of the major impacts of climate change is sea level rise and most of the Australian population, about 80 per cent, lives extremely close to the coast. We have massive investment in coastal infrastructure and we are already seeing really significant (indistinct) to a lot of coastal Councils including some of the ones that we’ve visited. So one snapshot will be that our cities will have to simply move back from the coast. We will have to retreat. The alternative being to build sort of hard engineering solutions, so-called, which are not really solutions because they have impacts on either side.*”

So one snapshot will be our coastal way of life in the future will be very different with, say, a metre of sea level rise.

Did you notice the word ‘**say**’ casually slipped into her story?

Can you see the implied scare without telling a direct lie? Of course there would be consequences if sea level rose one (1) metre. Yet empirical evidence overwhelmingly reveals that is not occurring. Nor is it likely to occur. Empirical evidence reveals that we have no cause for any concern from human activity as claimed by alarmists.

Tim Flannery chimed in, quote: “*I’ll just add a brief note to that. It’s often said in the science that the sea level will rise by, say, a metre or half a metre by 2100. It’s really important to understand that the sea won’t stop rising at that point. Once we’ve started this process, it is an ongoing thing. There’s no line of retreat we can draw*”

around the coastline to say, “That’s definitively where it’s going to stop.” So it is a process which makes it more difficult to manage and obviously the sooner we get on top of our emissions, the sooner we can limit the melt and the expansion of the oceans, the better off we’ll be. We do need to understand that it is an ongoing process.”

Ramping it higher while staying with the implied *scientific* assumption based on the word **‘say’** the emcee encouragingly invited, quote: “Okay. Will, did you want to add to that?”

Will Steffen, quote: “Yeah. Just one thing very briefly to follow on from what Tony McMichael has said, **If we go to say a four degree world later this century**, we have to remember that our bodies operate at 37 degrees Celsius. We’re going to see temperatures in many of Australia’s cities in the 40s and maybe even the 50s and a four degree temperature rise to (indistinct). It’s going to be almost impossible for our bodies to give off the heat that we normally do to the atmosphere around us. So I think that the health challenges of a four degree world would be enormous and there’s simply (indistinct) that we are not simply built to operate in a four degree world warmer than today.”

Note Will Steffen’s use of the word **‘if’**?

Emcee, quote: “You said if we go to a 40 degree world, I mean –“

Will Steffen, quote: “A four degree world.”

Emcee, quote: “A four degree world. What’s the probability? That’s what a lot of people are finding difficult to come to terms with.”

Will Steffen, quote: “If we really fail as a global community at getting emissions down to the levels that we described in the report, you can look at the temperature projections and in this regard the climate models are very good. We have a reasonable probability of hitting four degrees and more by 2080 or 2090. This isn’t far fetched if we don’t get emissions down.”

Is this the Climate Commission transformed into World Championship Wrestling? Or is it perhaps the Climate Circus?

Who needs Hollywood fiction when supposed *‘scientists’* can scare people simply by implying falsities that misrepresent climate science and contradict empirical science?

One wonders whether Lesley Hughes and Will Steffen realise that all Earth’s large animal species including polar bears and humans trace their origins to a period between three and six million years ago when Earth’s temperature was at least three degrees warmer than current.

Source: Palaeoclimatologist Professor Bob Carter in his book entitled *‘Climate: The Counter Consensus’*, page 40.

Graham Williamson asked reasonable questions of Lesley Hughes concerning her report entitled '*The Critical Decade; Climate Change and Health*'. She failed to reply to any of Graham Williamson's seven emails. Paul Ryan, Director of Climate Commission Secretariat replied twice yet failed to provide any evidence sought by Graham. The summary of correspondence is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/96.1_LesleyHughes.pdf

Note that the Climate Commission's report to which Paul Ryan refers contains no empirical scientific evidence of Lesley Hughes' claim discussed above.

Tome 22 reveals Lesley Hughes' activist and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about Lesley Hughes at this site:

<http://tome22.info/Persons/Hughes-Lesley.html>

From Tome 22, Lesley Hughes a Lead Author of the UN IPCC's 2007 Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) and is continuing in that role for the UN IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report.

Lesley Hughes:

- Has at least two (2) UN IPCC roles;
- Is author or co-author of 16 papers cited in the UN IPCC's 2007 report;
- Is affiliated with 6 academic organisations, 3 NonGovernment organisations and 6 alarmist organisations.

Tome22 enables exploration of her connections through the following organisations:

- UN IPCC;
- Climate Commission;
- WWF Science Advisory Panel;
- Bali Declaration;
- Climate Scientists Australia;
- Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists;
- Macquarie University.

My Conclusions on Lesley Hughes' behaviour, statements and implied statements

Lesley Hughes receives funds from government bodies. She contradicts empirical science. Her unscientific statements advocate a position contrary to empirical science and in support of a political agenda.

She has been given information and empirical scientific data contradicting her core claim and identifying her errors. The nature and context of her claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

Lesley Hughes' false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by her misrepresentation of climate.

I cannot know what is in her mind. Nor can I know her personal needs. I do not know her motives or her intent. I simply know that she has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting her core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements she contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given her financial interests, her statements and her behaviour I conclude that she has placed herself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust her statements or her intent. Her public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Appendix 9f

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg

Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is a marine biologist and Director of the University of Queensland's Global Change Institute relying on government funding.

David Karoly is a colleague of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg on WWF's Science Advisory Panel.

After his unscientific and unfounded statements broadcast Friday, October 29th, 2010 on ABC-TV's *Stateline* program I asked him by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation for evidence of his claims, including his core claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. He failed to respond.

My annotated transcript of his comments is available here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/academic%20experts/ABC%20transcripta.pdf

It reveals that he peddles falsities and the three fundamental misrepresentations commonly spread by advocates claiming human CO₂ caused global warming. It reveals further that he contradicted science in his own field of marine biology and seemingly his own earlier endorsement of findings about coral reefs.

It's difficult to accept that a marine biologist implied by the ABC to be an expert on climate is not aware of the ocean's role in determining and controlling global atmospheric CO₂ levels. It's even more difficult to accept that to be the case for someone claiming to rely on UN IPCC reports that admit such fundamental data on oceans and CO₂.

In his email responses to my earlier requests for evidence he failed to provide evidence for the core claim that human CO₂ caused or will cause warming. His responses confirmed that he relied on UN IPCC reports and that he mistakenly believed there is empirical evidence for the claim in those reports. When asked specifically to identify any such evidence he failed to do so.

He provided me with a copy of the UN IPCC's 2007 Summary for Policy Makers and falsely purported that it contains evidence that human CO₂ causes warming. By his doing so I concluded that he seemingly fails to understand scientific reasoning and the concept of causation.

Lacking evidence Ove Hoegh-Guldberg turns to discrediting others

On ABC-TV's *Stateline* program (Fr.29.10.10) Professor Hoegh-Guldberg condemned geologists and mining engineers. Yet geologists and engineers are trained in objective analysis and use of facts—because they're often directly responsible for people's lives.

Perhaps Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is basing his opinion of engineers on mining engineer Greg Combet, Minister for Climate Change or railroad engineer Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the UN IPCC. Both have misrepresented climate. See Appendix 12.

In March 2010 Ove Hoegh-Guldberg made unfounded inferences and false statements about me. They were made behind my back. In response I corrected Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's statement, provided my declaration of personal interests and asked him for his declaration of interests. In his subsequent response he failed to provide his declaration of interests. It's since been revealed that he is funded by political activists.

If requested I will be pleased to make these emails available.

Separately Ove Hoegh-Guldberg spuriously publicly raised the fact that I had been invited to address a multi-industry group on leadership. His intent in so doing seemed to be to cast aspersions. Sadly, this seems to be a common tactic in that some advocates claiming global warming from human CO2 lack scientific evidence and instead attempt to imply unfounded and unwarranted inferences about those whose conclusions differ with their view.

As another correspondent of his summarised of Ove in an email sent to me and openly copied to Ove on Friday, March 19th, 2010, quote: "*As I have previously stated he apparently has no qualms about making public pronouncements but declines to answer legitimate, relevant and pertinent queries concerning those pronouncements*".

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg revealed to be funded by political activists

Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise discovered that Ove Hoegh-Guldberg had received money from political activists Greenpeace and WWF. Available here:

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

And:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/ipcc-warming-assessments-attract-the-activists-and-snob-the-sceptics/story-e6frg6zo-1226180881974>

Donna Laframboise says, quote: "*After serving as a **contributing author** to the 2007 climate bible, Hoegh-Guldberg received a big promotion. In the upcoming edition, currently underway and expected to be completed in 2013, he is now a coordinating lead author – the most senior of the IPCC's three author designations (click the image for the source document, see page 19).*

*In 2007, Hoegh-Guldberg testified as an expert witness before an Australian tribunal. His written submission ran to **57 pages** – the last 15 of which are comprised of his CV. Pages 53 and 54 are of particular interest since they list his 10 major research reports. Four of these were published by Greenpeace and a fifth was published by the World Wildlife Fund. (Four others were written for the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park*

Authority.)

This means that Hoegh-Guldberg has been cashing paycheques from activist organizations for the past 17 years.”

Tony Thomas reveals, quote: *“Australia’s marine biologist Ove Hoegh-Guldberg gets credits in nine chapters of the IPCC 2007 report. He was a contributing author and will be a ‘coordinating lead author’ for the 2014 Report. Laframboise says that he wrote four reports on coral reefs for Greenpeace between 1994 and 2000, and later, two for the World Wildlife Fund. He will lead a chapter for the 2014 IPCC report.”*

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/10/delinquent-science>

Climate data analyst and PhD candidate John McLean reveals, quote: *“This proxy data from temperature monitoring on Willis Island suggests that sea surface temperatures on the Great Barrier Reef have varied very little over the last seventy-one years and show no sustained periods of significant warming.”*

http://mclean.ch/climate/GBR_sea_temperature.htm

And:

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/GBR_SST_and_ENSO.pdf

Despite contradicting empirical science it seems Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is being promoted by the UN IPCC for its next report to national governments and media in 2014.

Analysis of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg’s public statements reveals that he invokes unfounded alarm involving Aussie icons such as the Great Barrier Reef and Daintree rainforests yet contradicts empirical scientific evidence. He reinforces unscientific and false claims about human CO2 driving climate. He reinforces the false notion that the science is settled. He quotes and endorses the discredited and flawed UN IPCC that unscientifically misrepresents climate. Quote: *“Well if you look at the IPCC which is the most reliable consensus on this issue they’ll put it as a very likely scenario that we will achieve those conditions over the coming decades and century. Now very likely in their parlance is over 90% so it’s highly likely and very probable.”*

Appendix 2 reveals that the UN IPCC is scientifically discredited. The 90% confidence levels were admitted to be assigned arbitrarily. They’re not statistical. They’re not valid.

He invokes doom for the Great Barrier Reef yet credible marine biologists and other scientists in North Queensland say the Great Barrier Reef today is thriving. Please refer to Appendix 4a.

Respected geologists and palaeoclimatologists worldwide know that 8,000 years ago Barrier Reef sea level was 120 metres below where it is today. Worldwide many museums display the evidence publicly.

My formal complaint to the University of Queensland

The annotated transcript of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's interview accompanied my formal complaint dated Wednesday, November 10th, 2010. They were sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation individually to all Appointed members of the University of Queensland Senate and to all Official members of the senate.

My letter is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/97_10.11.02UQformalcomplaint.pdf

Note: I declare that my Bachelor of Engineering degree (Honours, 1976) is from UQ.

My letter produced a reply dated November 29th, 2010 from then Vice-Chancellor Professor Paul Greenfield AO here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/98_Greenfieldreply.pdf

It reveals that the Vice-Chancellor of a university dependent on federal government funding saw the issue of my presentation of hard factual evidence disproving unscientific falsities as a matter of differing opinions decided not by independent experts but by a panel of the university's senior executives.

Subsequently I extended my complaint to include the Vice-Chancellor's behaviour. My extended complaint was dated Friday, December 17th, 2010 and submitted by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation individually to all Appointed and all Official members of the UQ senate. It is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/99_10.12.13Greenfield.pdf

In response UQ acknowledged receipt dated December 22nd, 2010 of my formal complaint:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/99.1_ActingV-C.pdf

A welcome and reassuring reply dated December 23rd, 2011 was received from the Hon Justice Martin Daubney an Appointed member of the UQ senate. His response acknowledged receipt of my complaint and voluntarily undertook to take advice on my complaint and then reply further.

I have since received nothing addressing my specific concerns on this matter from the university and sadly not from Hon Justice Martin Daubney.

In 2011 Vice-Chancellor Paul Greenfield and his Deputy Vice-Chancellor Michael Keniger were stood down reportedly as a result of breaches of university enrolment procedures. Their employment was subsequently terminated.

<http://www.couriermail.com.au/news/queensland/favouritism-probe-at-uq/story-e6freoof-1226186284276>

And:

<http://www.icacnews.com/category/australia/west-australia/corruption-and-crime-commission-wa/>

And:

http://australian-politics.blogspot.com.au/2011_11_01_archive.html

A letter containing comments about ethical standards at the University of Queensland was published by The Australian Financial Review and re-published here:
<http://jennifermarohasy.com/2011/11/university-entitlement-must-change/>

My initial complaint about Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's behaviour was accompanied by the annotated transcript of his ABC-TV interview. One would think that an honourable institution would have been concerned with many specific matters raised by my complaint and transcript relying as they do on empirical data. The annotated transcript raises serious issues about the UN IPCC and Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's dependence upon, involvement in, citing of and promotion of the discredited and flawed UN IPCC.

Tome 22 reveals Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's activist and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about Ove Hoegh-Guldberg here:
<http://tome22.info/Persons/Hoegh-Guldberg-Ove.html>

From Tome 22, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg:

- Has three (3) UN IPCC roles;
- Is author or co-author of 21 papers cited in the UN IPCC's 2007 report;
- Is affiliated with 7 organisations listed on Tome 22: 5 academic organisations, 2 advocate organisations, 3 NonGovernment Organisations, 2 transient organisations, 5 alarmist organisations;
- He publishes his papers in a journal that he edits;
- On the UN IPCC he referenced or reviewed papers he wrote.

Tome22 enables exploration of his connections through the following organisations:

- UN IPCC;
- WWF Science Advisory Panel;
- Greenpeace International Research Staff;
- Doctors Against Heartland;
- Climate Scientists Australia;
- Ocean Acidification due to increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide.

In addition to being a colleague of David Karoly on WWF's Science Advisory Panel Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is on Greenpeace's Research Staff.

He joined a statement to cut the already low funding of climate sceptics. That is an unscientific action since scepticism is among the first duties of all scientists when presented with a new supposition, theory or claim.

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg conjures unscientific and false claims while continuing to contradict empirical science on both atmospheric temperatures and ocean alkalinity. In his correspondence with me he repeatedly failed to provide empirical evidence that human CO2 caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global ATMOSPHERIC warming that ended in 1998. He cited the UN IPCC 2007 Summary for Policy Makers yet in response

to my subsequent request he failed to advise where in that document there is empirical evidence of causality:

<http://www.news.com.au/national/scientists-want-more-protection-for-oceans/story-fndo4eg9-1226453766559>

Could it have anything to do with his funding by extreme activists Greenpeace and WWF? See appendix 15.

My Conclusions on Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's behaviour, statements and implied statements

From statements by ABC-TV's Jessica van Vonderen copied to Ove Hoegh-Guldberg and not refuted by him I conclude it likely that he misled the Queensland state parliament.

His false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentation of climate. His addresses to schools on the same topic would similarly mislead school students.

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is enmeshed in funding from government and prominent global political activist organisations. He contradicts empirical science. His unscientific statements advocate a position contrary to empirical science and in support of a political agenda.

He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg has perpetrated all three massive misrepresentations identified in Appendix 5.

Appendix 9g

Kurt Lambeck

Professor Kurt Lambeck is a professor at the Australian National University's Climate Change Institute, where Will Steffen is Director.

David Karoly is associated with Kurt Lambeck in their work on The Australian Academy of Science's glossy unscientific booklet entitled '*The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers*'. Kurt Lambeck's Director at the Australian National University's Climate Change Institute is Will Steffen.

He was a Lead Author of the UN IPCC's 2001 report and a contributing author of its 2007 report.

He has served as President of the Australian Academy of Science and was one of two monitors responsible for overseeing the Inter Academy Council (IAC) report's Executive Summary in August 2010. As detailed in discussion of the Australian Academy of Science in Appendix 8, the IAC Executive Summary conflicts in both material content and tone with the body of the IAC report. It seems that the IAC's own guidelines for producing the Executive Summary were contravened under Kurt Lambeck's watch.

Appendix 8 contains more details on Kurt Lambeck's role in fomenting unfounded climate alarm by misrepresenting science during his term as President of The Australian Academy of Science.

As revealed by retired journalist Tony Thomas, Kurt Lambeck's contradictions and questionable unscientific statements as President of the Australian Academy of Science and as a scientist raise many serious questions:

http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science#_ednref29

As President Kurt Lambeck wrote the Foreword of the Australian Academy of Science's booklet entitled '*The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers*'. Allied with glossy pictures and artwork the Foreword and carefully scripted booklet imply scientific support where no empirical scientific support exists. The Foreword seems perfectly written for subtly managing questions casting doubt on the UN IPCC's false portrayal of scientific certainty without mentioning the scathing IAC report. Both reports were released around the same time. The Foreword contradicts empirical science.

Kurt Lambeck has made offensive comments. For example his July 12, 2007, statement as President, "*Those who deny human-induced global warming are in the same camp as those that deny smoking causes lung cancer and that CFCs deplete the ozone layer.*"

<http://www.science.org.au/news/media/12july07.html>

That is not the comment of a true scientist relying on empirical scientific evidence.

Retired journalist Tony Thomas reveals that Kurt Lambeck wildly misled the National Press Club about the UN IPCC, quote: “*Lambeck claimed to the National Press Club in 2006 that in compiling IPCC assessment reports, “An independent judiciary is set up to ensure that all criticisms are properly answered.” [59] This was wildly incorrect, as shown in the IAC audit of 2010, and Donna Laframboise’s 2011 documentation of IPCC realities.*”

Quote: “*The Academy originally recruited its sceptic Fellow Garth Paltridge for anonymous discussions on the draft booklet. But Paltridge took his name off the booklet lest he be thought to endorse it. Lambeck was asked at the 2010 launch about any Academy dissenters, and replied only: “There is controversy in any debate. No controversy, no debate.”*”

Garth Paltridge has personally confirmed to me his position. Tony Thomas is correct.

Tome 22 reveals Kurt Lambeck’s activist and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about Kurt Lambeck at this site:
<http://tome22.info/Persons/Lambeck-Kurt.html>

From Tome 22, Kurt Lambeck:

- Has four (4) UN IPCC roles;
- Is author or co-author of 8 papers cited in the UN IPCC’s 2007 report;
- Is affiliated with 7 organisations listed on Tome 22: 6 academic organisations, 3 transient organisations, and 3 alarmist organisations.

Tome22 enables exploration of his connections through the following organisations:

- UN IPCC;
- Australian Academy of Science and key participant in its glossy Q&A booklet;
- Inter Academy Council Report monitor;
- ANU Institute of Climate Change;
- ANU;
- National Academy of Sciences 255 Members Letter.

On December 19th, 2011 Kurt Lambeck refused to accept my letter sent to him by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. Yet my letters have never been abusive. They were accepted by other recipients.

My Conclusions on Kurt Lambeck’s behaviour, statements and implied statements

My conclusion is that Kurt Lambeck contradicts empirical climate science, has reportedly made other contradictions and unscientifically maligns without foundation real climate scientists whose views differ from his own. In doing this Professor Lambeck

has in my view forsaken science and chosen instead to act as an advocate for a political agenda.

In his former role as President of The Australian Academy of Science and in his role at the Australian National University his false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentation of climate.

He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Kurt Lambeck has perpetrated all three massive misrepresentations identified in Appendix 5.

Appendix 9h

Matthew England

Matthew England is a mathematician whose expertise is reportedly in computerised numerical modelling. He is co-Director of the University of New South Wales' Climate Change Research Centre (CCRC) relying on government funds from taxpayers.

David Karoly and Andy Pitman join Matthew England on the Science Advisory Panel of Tim Flannery's Climate Commission containing Commissioners Will Steffen and Lesley Hughes.

He's a member of The Australian Academy of Science's Working Group that produced the unscientific glossy brochure entitled '*The Science of Climate Change Questions and Answers*'.

In response to my request for empirical evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming (aka climate change) Matthew England provided a theoretical paper by Pierrehumbert. In my email response to Matthew England dated February 21, 2011 I said, quote: "*Yet I trust first in Nature not in Pierrehumbert's theoretical discussion of a supposition heavily infected and driven by political agenda. Why do you trust a supposition born in the 1800's and since proven false?*"

In that February 2011 response I noted many points including my comments that:

- A paper discussing theory is not empirical evidence of human CO₂ causing warming;
- His public claim fails four fundamental tests: (1) observational (empirical), (2) physical, (3) logical. Given UN IPCC corruption it (4) lacks scientific integrity;
- It fails the fifth test: (5) theoretical;
- The UN IPCC on which he relies contradicts science and is discredited, flawed and corrupted;
- Empirical relationships in climate science between temperature and atmospheric CO₂ levels reveal CO₂ levels being determined by temperature.

These were accompanied by many associated details.

I asked Matthew England, quote: "*why do you think that a theoretical paper relying on assumptions contradicting Nature and the real-world is real-world evidence?*"

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/E-mail%20reply.pdf>

Despite my request for him to identify in the paper he cited the specific location of empirical evidence, in his responses he failed to do so.

He has failed to respond to my request to advise whether or not his UNSW CCRC has performed due diligence on the UN IPCC's core claim. Given Matthew England's

position in the UN IPCC and on the Australian government's taxpayer-funded gravy train it's doubtful he could risk such a scientific exercise.

He too contradicts real-world science yet promotes himself as a climate expert. He contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

How does an academic claiming to be modelling oceans not know that oceans control global atmospheric CO2 levels yet in contradiction of empirical science claim humans do?

Yet the ABC funded by taxpayers falsely spreads and implies Matthew England's statements as scientific.

Professor Matthew England's responses to my requests for real-world evidence of human causation of warming have failed to provide scientific evidence. His responses reveal ignorance of what constitutes empirical evidence and of cause-and-effect. He contradicts real-world science and empirical data.

During and since our two-way written correspondence Matthew England failed to provide any empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning for his unfounded claims. He has continued to publicly make further claims contradicting science.

On ABC-TV's '*QandA Climate Debate*' Matthew England stated that Nick Minchin's summary of temperature was not true. Matthew England's statement is false. Further, the UN IPCC's temperature projections forecast temperature rise following CO2 levels yet for almost half a thirty year climate period we have atmospheric temperatures flat and possibly falling yet CO2 continued rising**. Worse, he claimed, quote '*certainty about some of these issues*'

** [Explained in Appendix 4.](#)

Note that even flattening corrupted ground-based temperatures relied upon by the UN IPCC are deviating below and away from UN IPCC predictions and from UN IPCC projections of CO2:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/soil-moisture-illustrates-why-ipcc-computer-models-fail/>

On the same program Matthew England, a UN IPCC contributor and advocate said he was not aware of the source of the 3% figure attributed to human CO2 as a percentage of Earth's annual CO2 production. It is a UN IPCC figure confirmed by prominent UN IPCC scientists including David Karoly.

Instead, he misrepresented the science by taking data out of context to imply human CO2 production determines atmospheric CO2 levels. Yet even CO2 measurements cited by the UN IPCC reveal Nature alone determines CO2 levels. That is confirmed by independent scientists including contributors to UN IPCC reports.

In an area in which details are known to be broad estimates he categorically implies certainty as to the end locations of human CO₂ production. Yet Nature herself contradicts Matthew England's unscientific claim.

During ABC-TV's '*QandA*' program he repeated his false claim and asserted human CO₂ determines atmospheric CO₂ levels. That contradicts Nature and empirical science.

Tome 22 reveals Matthew England's activist and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about Matthew England at this site: <http://tome22.info/Persons/England-Matthew.html>

From Tome 22, Matthew England:

- Has two (2) UN IPCC roles;
- Is author or co-author of 3 papers cited in the UN IPCC's 2007 report;
- Is affiliated with 13 organisations listed on Tome 22: 12 academic organisations, 2 government organisations, 4 transient organisations, 9 alarmist organisations, 2 consensus-list organisations.

He was a Contributing Author and Reviewer for the UN IPCC Second and Third Assessment Reports respectively.

Tome22 enables exploration of his connections through the following organisations:

- UN IPCC;
- CSIRO;
- Climate Commission Science Advisory Panel;
- UNSW Climate Change Research Centre;
- Australian Academy of Science participant in its glossy Q&A booklet;
- Royal Society;
- Bali Declaration;
- Wall Street Journal Signatories of February, 2012;
- Climate Scientists Australia;
- Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society;
- UNSW;
- Rainfall Final.

My Conclusions on Matthew England's behaviour, statements and implied statements

Matthew England is enmeshed in government bodies and finances. He contradicts empirical science. His unscientific statements advocate a position contrary to the science and in support of a political agenda.

He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

Matthew England's false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentation of climate.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Matthew England has perpetrated all three massive misrepresentations identified in Appendix 5.

Appendix 9i

Andy Pitman

The University of New South Wales advises that Professor Andy Pitman is a modeller relying on unvalidated computerised numerical models. Together with Matthew England he is co-Director of the UNSW's Climate Change Research Centre.

Further details were not available at time of writing this document since pages linked by UNSW on Andy Pitman are not available.

David Karoly and Matthew England join Andy Pitman on the Science Advisory Panel of Tim Flannery's Climate Commission containing Commissioners Will Steffen and Lesley Hughes.

Andy Pitman stated, quote: "*There is scientific doubt about global warming, too, but we know with certainty that continued emissions of carbon dioxide will lead to warming, rising sea levels and ocean acidification at unprecedented rates, and that these changes will trigger expenses and outcomes that dwarf the costs of actually solving the problem.*" This quote starts by defying logic yet despite that continues with false, unscientific and unfounded claims of alarm.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/no-need-to-go-gaga-over-gaia/story-e6frg6zo-1225983237159>

The Australian, January 07th, 2011, '*No need to go gaga over Gaia*'.

In his response to my written request for empirical evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming he failed to provide any evidence. In my simple request for him to define scientific peer-review he failed to define it. Would that be because doing so would confirm that UN IPCC reports are not scientifically peer-reviewed? Nor are thousands references cited and relied upon by the UN IPCC and falsely touted by UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri and others as 100% peer-reviewed.

During our correspondence he failed to answer key questions on climate science. During his retreat he made false accusations including false allegations that I was a member of a political party. He fails to provide evidence for his claims. His emails contain false statements. Four (4) of our email threads are available at these sites:

(Note: Queensland summer time is one hour behind Andy Pitman's state of NSW (daylight saving).

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Thread%20No1.pdf>

And:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Thread%20No2.pdf>

And:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Thread%20No3.pdf>

And:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Thread%20No4.pdf>

Unsurprisingly, making false allegations seems to be a common tactic among advocates of global warming. Is that because they lack empirical scientific evidence for their core claim?

Tome 22 reveals Andy Pitman's activist and other connections

Tome22 provides publicly available data gathered about Andy Pitman at this site:
<http://tome22.info/Persons/Pitman-Andy.html>

From Tome 22, Andy Pitman:

- Has at least four (4) UN IPCC roles;
- Is author or co-author of 5 papers cited in the UN IPCC's 2007 report;
- Is affiliated with 9 organisations listed on Tome 22: 7 academic organisations, 2 world organisations, 3 university organisations, 6 alarmist organisations.

Tome22 enables exploration of his connections through the following organisations:

- UN IPCC;
- Climate Commission Science Advisory Panel;
- Bali Declaration;
- World Climate Research Program;
- Climate Scientists Australia;
- UNSW Climate Change Research Centre;
- UNSW;
- MQ (Macquarie University).

He was a Lead Author on the IPCC Third (2001) and Fourth (2007) Assessment Reports.

He is a member of the Australian Academy of Science's National Committee for Earth System Science.

He is also a member of the New South Wales Ministerial Council on Climate Change.

My Conclusions on Andy Pitman's behaviour, statements and implied statements

Andy Pitman receives funds from government. He contradicts empirical science. His unscientific statements advocate a position contrary to the science and in support of a political agenda.

He has been given much information and empirical scientific data contradicting his core claim and identifying his errors. The nature and context of his claims and their one-sidedness raise many questions.

Andy Pitman's false claims have arguably influenced public policy to the detriment of many people affected by his misrepresentation of climate.

I cannot know what is in his mind. Nor can I know his personal needs. I do not know his motives or his intent. I simply know that he has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting his core claim that human CO₂ is seriously and detrimentally affecting global climate and needs to be cut. I know that in making crucial public statements he contradicts empirical science and climate data.

Given his financial interests, his statements and his behaviour I conclude that he has placed himself in the position of being perceived as compromised. I cannot trust his statements or his intent. His public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy.

Appendix 9j

Brief Comment on Prof Stefan Lewandowsky's recent claims

Professor Stefan Lewandowsky published his paper entitled *NASA faked the moon landing—Therefore (Climate) Science is a Hoax: An Anatomy of the Motivated Rejection of Science* available here:

<http://websites.psychology.uwa.edu.au/labs/cogscience/documents/LskyetalPsychScienceinPressClimateConspiracy.pdf>

Instead of relying on empirical evidence, science's ultimate arbiter, it seems he prefers to classify those who disagree with his view by (falsely) implying their association with supposed conspiracy theories. Why?

His claim and methodology is being dismantled openly in public view. This summary is by the Science and Environmental Public Policy Institute's Ken Haapala available at:

<http://www.sepp.org/twtwfiles/2012/TWTW%20-%209-22-12.pdf>

Quote:

“Global Warming Skepticism – a Medical Condition? The controversy continues regarding a paper in press in Psychological Science by Stephan Lewandowsky et al. of the University of Western Australia. The title is ‘NASA faked the moon landing, Therefore (Climate) Science is a Hoax: An Anatomy of the Motivated Rejection of Science.’

<http://websites.psychology.uwa.edu.au/labs/cogscience/documents/LskyetalPsychScienceinPressClimateConspiracy.pdf>

There are many comments in the blogs on how deficient the paper is including those by Thomas Fuller and Steven McIntyre. McIntyre hones in on the statistical deficiencies in the paper and the inability to replicate the findings.*

Fuller's approach is broader. He brings out that for decades it has been common practice by some to demonize opponents including claiming the opponents have a medical condition. For example, in 1851 (Fuller dates it as 1861) Dr Samuel Cartwright invented the term drapetomania to describe what he claimed to be a mental deficiency in slaves who wished to flee captivity.

Apparently in Lewandowsky's view, those who demand observational data supporting claims that human emissions of greenhouse gases, particularly carbon dioxide (CO₂), are causing unprecedented and dangerous global warming / climate change must be suffering from a mental deficiency. They simply cannot accept the recognized authority of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

One wonders how Lewandowsky et al. would treat the Right Climate Stuff Team – retired members of the Apollo team who are demanding observational data from those who are spreading global warming / climate change fears. Are they living a special form of dementia? Please see links under Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.”

In publishing his wild claims Stefan Lewandowsky exposed himself to peer-review that exposed glaring deficiencies in his data, methodology and apparent lack of objectivity. Statistician Steve McIntyre revealed Stefan Lewandowsky's *methodology* as highly questionable and seemingly dubious. A sample of Steve McIntyre's responses follow links to his analysis and comments:

<http://climateaudit.org/?s=lewandowsky>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/23/more-deception-in-the-lewandowsky-data/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/20/conspiracy-theorist-lewandowsky-tries-to-manufacture-doubt/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/18/lewandowskys-fake-correlation/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/16/trying-unsuccessfully-to-replicate-lewandowsky/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/15/lewandowskys-cleansing-program/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/14/the-lewandowsky-census/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/14/the-sks-link-to-the-lewandowsky-survey/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/13/lewandowskys-fake-results/>

And:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/09/12/lewandowsky-study-useless-unless-authors-demonstrate-data-integrity/>

* And by science writer Jo Nova

A brief list of points revealed by Steve McIntyre within Stefan Lewandowsky's paper and his explanations and responses to Steve McIntyre includes, quote:

- *"the Lewandowsky survey was conducted at stridently anti-skeptic blogs";*
- *"numerous responses purporting to be from "skeptics" were actually from anti-skeptics fraudulently pretending to be skeptics";*
- *"another style of (almost certain) deception in which Lewandowsky respondents gave fake/deceptive responses to the Free Market questions";*
- *"Unfortunately for Lewandowsky, his failure to ensure data integrity renders him unable to give any assurance on the matter";*
- *"In Lewandowsky's criticism of the Bray-von Storch survey, Lewandowsky told his fellow SkS** insiders that its results were worthless because Bray and von Storch had been unable to ensure data integrity. A criticism that applies even more forcefully to the Lewandowsky survey, which is clearly contaminated with fake/fraudulent responses for the free market questions as well as the conspiracy questions"; ** See below, Skeptical Science,*
- *"As I've said before, I do not believe that Lewandowsky was personally complicit in the initial submission of fake/fraudulent responses, though his decision to survey skeptics at anti-skeptic blogs was unwise, if not reckless. however, in my*

opinion, once the problem with fake/fraudulent responses was forcefully drawn to Lewandowsky's attention (by Tom Curtis as well as me), Lewandowsky himself should have notified the journal and asked that the article be re-reviewed with particular emphasis on whether he had adequately ensured data integrity. Had he done so, Lewandowsky would have an answer to criticism that he had failed to act properly once he was aware of potential problems. I think that Lewandowsky's decision to sneer at criticism will prove unwise";

- *"In addition, it turns out that Lewandowsky misrepresented explained variances from principal components as explained variances from factor analysis, a very minor peccadillo in comparison. In a recent post, I observed inconsistencies resulting from this misdescription, but was then unable to diagnose precisely what Lewandowsky had done. In today's post, I'll establish this point. Rather than conceding the problems of his reliance on fake/fraudulent data and thanking his critics for enabling him to withdraw the paper, Lewandowsky has instead doubled down by not merely pressing forward with publication of results relying on fake data, but attempting to "manufacture doubt" about the validity of criticisms, including his most recent diatribe – to which I respond today";*
- *"But instead of conceding these results, Lewandowsky fabricated an issue regarding the number of retained eigenvectors in this analysis, a point that I had not taken issue and which did not affect the criticism, as I'll detail";*
- *"As noted above, the reason why I was unable to replicate Lewandowsky's explained variance claims was because they were incorrect – they came from the eigenvectors (from principal components) and not the factors (from factor analysis). The person who appears to be in need of Multivariate 101 is Lewandowsky himself";*
- *"Lewandowsky's attempt to divert attention to the number of retained factors was a fabricated diversion on several counts";*
- *"Lewandowsky's results are bogus because of his reliance on fake and fraudulent data, not because of replication issues in his factor analysis. Nor do I believe that there should be any "doubt" on this point. In my opinion, the evidence is clearcut: Lewandowsky used fake responses from respondents at stridently anti-skeptic blogs who fraudulently passed themselves off as skeptics the seemingly credulous Lewandowsky";*
- *"That Lewandowsky additionally misrepresented explained variances from principal components as explained variances from factor analysis seems a very minor peccadillo in comparison (as I noted at the time.) On this last point, to borrow Lewandowsky's words, there seem to be two alternatives. Either Lewandowsky "made a beginner's mistake, in which case he should stop posing as an expert in statistics and take a refresher of Multivariate Analysis 101". Or else Lewandowsky, cognizant of how thoroughly compromised his results are by fake/fraudulent data, rather than thanking his critics for spotting defects and withdrawing his study, has decided to double down by trying to manufacture doubt about criticism of the degree to which his data and results have been thoroughly compromised in the "hope that no one would see through his manufacture of doubt."";*

- “These paragraphs (by Lewandowsky) are about as wrongheaded as anything you’ll ever read”;
- “However, Lewandowsky is absolutely off-base in his assertion that the examination of outliers is inappropriate statistical analysis. In fact, exactly the opposite is the case: proper statistical analysis *REQUIRES* the examination of outliers”;
- “Far from the examination of contingency tables being irrelevant to the analysis, they are essential to it”;
- “The “signal” from Lewandowsky’s analysis is also “unambiguous”: that, using his own words, “number-crunching ability that’s unaccompanied by informed judgment can often do more harm than good”. A thesis that his own work amply illustrates”;
- “Tom Fuller, who does online commercial surveys for a living, has sharply criticized the Lewandowsky’s tainted methodology – a methodology that relied on fake data to yield fake results”; *** see below
- “Today, Lewandowsky (who is being assisted by an SkS squadron) liquidated every single comment by Fuller on the entire blog, leaving rebuttals to Fuller in place without the protagonist. This is different from not approving the blog comments: it’s an after-the-fact cleansing of Fuller from the blog.” Why does he suppress dissenting views?
- “The University of Western Australia should hang its head in shame at Lewandowsky’s Gleickian antics.”
- “**Steve: According to a comment at Lewandowsky’s blog operated by the University of Western Australia, Lewandowsky’s moderation is being done by (presumably) members of the SkS squadron, who were merely trying to silence Fuller as a commenter on the blog, stating that their liquidation of the history of Fuller’s comments was an accidental by-product of silencing Fuller**”;
- “however, one point is obvious: Lewandowsky’s defence is framed in terms of “outliers” as opposed to “data integrity”. It seems evident that, using Lewandowsky’s own words (about the Bray-con Storch study): “this study should not have been published without the authors demonstrating the integrity of their data—I doubt that they could””;

** SkS denotes the alarmist blog *Skeptical Science* that stridently implies human CO2 caused global warming yet fails to provide empirical scientific evidence and contradicts empirical science. In responses to requests from The Galileo Movement to Skeptical Science’s John Cook, his responses reveal he fails to understand causation and empirical evidence.

*** Tom Fuller’s public comments are available here:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/09/15/toodle-lew/>

Quote: “The (Lewandowsky) paper is badly flawed, primarily because the internet survey is junk science. I am a market researcher who has extensive experience with online surveys. I’ve done them for government, non-governmental organizations, companies and volunteer groups. I’ve done a lot of them. Over 1,000, most of them in

the UK when we were cranking them out like sausages to the tune of 25 a week for two years.

Stephan Lewandowski has not described the details of the fielding of his survey, which is probably wise on his part. The few details that emerge by chance in his paper are enough to invalidate his conclusions.”

And, quote: *“He has written on the same subject before without any data and came to the same conclusion. In this case, he just manufactured data to support the same conclusion.”*

And, quote: *“I will just note that the numbers of skeptics believing in multiple conspiracies does not seem to be sufficient to produce statistically significant results and that in more than one case, both the number and percentage of warmists who believed in a conspiracy theory was greater than that of skeptics.”*

Australian science writer, Jo Nova:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/08/lewandowsky-shows-skeptics-are-nutters-by-asking-alarmists-to-fill-out-survey/>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/09/lewandowsky-hopes-we-meant-conspiracy-but-we-mean-incompetnce/>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/09/10-conspiracy-theorists-makes-a-moon-landing-paper-for-stefan-lewandowsky-part-ii-and-all-40-questions/>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/09/steve-mcintyre-finds-lewandowskys-paper-is-a-landmark-of-junk-science/>

Reportedly, quote: *“Lewandowsky gets \$1.7m of taxpayer funds to denigrate people who disagree with him”*. Here’s a succinct list of *some flaws in Lewandowsky et al 2012*:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/09/lewandowsky-gets-1-7m-of-taxpayer-funds-to-demonize-people-who-disagree-with-him/>

Is the University of Western Australia is aware of claims made by Stefan Lewandowsky or of events on its blog site.

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/10/lewandowsky-part-viii-formal-moves-for-a-governance-review-of-the-stw-blog/>

And:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/09/lewandowsky-gets-1-7m-of-taxpayer-funds-to-demonize-people-who-disagree-with-him/>

Stefan Lewandowsky’s paper seems to advocate acceptance of views touted (falsely) as majority views or perceived authority views in preference to thinking critically for oneself. Why? Does this reflect his university?

Does such blind acceptance explain the root cause of initial widespread acceptance of the UN's corruption of climate science? That occurred prior to independent freethinking academics, UN IPCC scientists and laypeople questioning UN climate claims and exposing them as unfounded.

Given his interest in conspiracy theories, perhaps Stefan Lewandowsky could be challenged to identify errors in Appendices 14 and 15 of this report. Both appendices provide information widely available publicly. Such information is not secretive, a trait associated with conspiracies. Yet issues raised in Appendices 13, 14 and 15 are often falsely claimed to be conspiracies as a means apparently of demonising and deterring discussion of such documented issues.

Stefan Lewandowsky's approach is a threat to science and free expression.

Stefan Lewandowsky's paper reminds of demonization by Al Gore, activists, politicians and some alarmist academics who falsely stated or implied that sceptics are anti-environment or tainted by using old science or supposedly dubious funding. Such demonization initially suppressed scientific dissent. That created a false public perception of unanimous agreement with corrupt misrepresentations peddled by the UN and its accomplice Al Gore and by extreme political activists such as WWF and Greenpeace.

In his paper Stefan Lewandowsky states, quote: "*Acceptance of science, by contrast, was strongly associated with the perception of a consensus among scientists.*" In context, by this statement is he implying we should trust perceptions of consensus rather than demanding empirical evidence and thinking for ourselves? Is he aware of the massive documented and pervasive corruption of climate science?

Contrary to Stefan Lewandowsky's implied advice there is an easy way to resolve scientific disagreement. That way is to cite and rely on objective, validated empirical scientific evidence. Until that is done claims remain purely conjecture.

Empirical scientific evidence reveals that the claim that human CO₂ determines climate is not true. The claim is false, unscientific and unfounded. It is the reversal of Nature's reality.

As the internationally acclaimed statistician W. Edwards Deming was fond of saying: "*In God we trust, all others bring data*".

Where would western democracies be but for thousands of scientists, citizens and analysts voluntarily doing the climate work for which they paid taxes initially relying on scientific and political accomplices misrepresenting climate science? Where would we be if free speech had been muzzled as was attempted directly and indirectly by proponents of the myth that human CO₂ caused (catastrophic) global warming? Where would our society be if climate alarmists had been able to *medicalise* science in ways akin to those used by Adolf Hitler and Stefan Lewandowsky?

General Comments

Asking questions, observing behaviour, researching and analysing information reveal multiple funding and activist webs closely connecting a tight cabal of prominent Australian academic alarmists funded by taxpayers. These webs work closely with controlling government bodies, activist groups, academic organisations and other organisations falsely spreading unfounded climate alarm.

These academics receive funds from the same taxpayer-funded trough. They collaborate closely to apparently support and even dictate political agenda by shaping media opinion driving public perception. Many collaborate to produce glossy booklets appearing to laypeople, journalists and politicians as scientific yet in reality contradicting empirical science.

Investigations reveal that all prominent academics advocating climate alarm lack empirical evidence for their core claim about human CO₂. They all contradict empirical science. The issue raises serious concerns about corruption and control of science by government funding.

Recent unsubstantiated and unscientific claims such as those by Stefan Lewandowsky and Tim Flannery ridicule climate science and tarnish those claiming human CO₂ determines global climate. Wild, unscientific and unfounded statements by academic advocates contradicting each other and contradicting natural weather events destroy academic credibility.

Tome 22 and many books, papers and articles by reputable authors including UN IPCC Lead Authors document the close-knit web of alarmist academic advocates. Their dependence on government positions and taxpayer funding leaves them open to public doubt about their integrity.

Alarmist academic advocates are increasingly exposed and tainted by empirical science. This further awakens people's intuition. People who initially accepted the supposed *authority* view yet remained curious of many decades of prior real world experience observing normal cyclic weather patterns are now wary of claims of climate alarm.

Is politicised funding of science driving misrepresentation of climate science? Is advocacy cloaked as science replacing objective science? Why do academic advocates funded by government lack evidence for their core claim about human CO₂? Why do they contradict empirical scientific evidence?

Is their action allied to a concerted global fabrication of climate alarm?

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/global-campaign-for-climate-action-pushing-spin/story-fn59niix-1226314986334>

Global Campaign for Climate Action pushing 'spin' by Graham Lloyd, Environmental Editor. From: *The Australian* newspaper March 31, 2012 12:00AM

Alarmist academics funded by taxpayers seem to sing in chorus. Is it coincidence that their tune seemingly heightens and is punctuated with greater fear and alarm around events needing diversion or focussing of public attention? These include: (1) damning news such as the release of the Inter Academy Council's report on UN IPCC processes and procedures; (2) scandals such as ClimateGate, HimalayaGate, ...; (3) major government announcements on climate *policy*; (4) release of alarmist '*climate*' reports; and (5) natural weather events such as storms and floods.

Instead, real scientists support their claims with empirical evidence from independent sources and freely share data.

Alarmist academic advocates could each erase growing doubts about their claims. They need simply provide scientifically measured empirical evidence with logical scientific reasoning proving causation, openly volunteer their sources of funding and proactively disclose their personal financial and career interests.

Without empirical scientific evidence they exact a heavy price on society. They divert attention and spending from real environmental and humanitarian challenges. Some misdirect science, management of water resources and government spending as occurred in years leading to Queensland's 2011 floods and in false claims attributing floods to coal miners and power station workers providing electricity to Queenslanders and earning vital export income for Australia. Those spreading unfounded alarm and contradicting empirical science discredit science and smash community trust.

Is repeatedly misrepresenting climate science an attempt to control the debate?

Repeatedly contradicting empirical science, stating or implying falsities, misrepresenting climate, smearing those whose views differ and publishing glossy booklets falsely purporting to be scientific can be seen as attempts to control what has become a political debate. In my experience, beneath control there is fear.

We do not know what is in people's minds. We do not know their needs. I do not know the reason for repeated misrepresentations by some academics. They could be misguided or possibly even sub-consciously well intentioned. Rather than make value judgments of academics misrepresenting climate science it is of more value to forgive them in the true sense of *forgiveness*: absence of value judgments that alienate, separate and divert. By truly forgiving we keep our minds clear and open to identify real needs and solutions.

Minds free from value judgments enable restoring scientific integrity and demanding honest policy based on empirical science.

For our own emotional benefit and the benefit of all, we need to have compassion for alarmist academics feeling the growing probes of an awakening public. This is a topic continued in Appendix 18 discussing solutions.

Paraphrasing statistician W. Edwards Deming:

In the universe and Nature we trust, all others bring data