

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

Sections of the letter signed by Allan Behm on behalf of Minister Combet dated March 13th, 2013 are copied and pasted below. Each is indented and in red type.

My responses are provided immediately below each paragraph of your (Greg Combet's) letter. Where necessary, points within your paragraphs are numbered.

My report entitled '*CSIROH! Climate of Deception? Or First Step to Freedom?*' has been sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to all major agencies and prominent academics employed or funded by government on the topic of global warming (aka climate change). All have been invited to identify any material errors they claim to exist. Some have replied to acknowledge receipt of my report. All failed to provide any specific rebuttal of points raised in my report. The reasons for their failure to identify errors is that my report is based on empirical scientific evidence and on documentation of extensive corruption of climate science.

Your letter fails to provide any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning of causation of warming by human carbon dioxide (CO₂).

Instead, your letter relies on unscientific appeals to authority, unsubstantiated opinion and unvalidated computerised numerical models already proven hopelessly wrong.

Your letter vindicates my position and conclusion on the UN IPCC and specifically confirms that your position relies upon corruption of climate science. It seems highly likely that your department's position was entrenched during the time of your predecessor as Minister for Climate Change under Prime Minister Kevin Rudd.

In politics such political positions can become deeply entrenched and eventually taken for granted.

The core question is: Have you and your Chief of Staff been misled or are you and your department perpetuating the misrepresentation of climate? I urge you to do due diligence and protect yourself by meeting with me.

If I am in significant material error in my response below or in my *CSIROh!* report including appendices it encompasses, please identify, specify and justify with supporting empirical scientific evidence and facts by Friday, April 19th, 2013. Failure to do so will, as I see it in law, be deemed judgment by default in my favour.

Original personally signed

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.
Tuesday, April 2nd, 2013

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

Office of the Hon Greg Combet AM MP
Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency
Minister for Industry' and Innovation

Mr Malcolm Roberts
180 Haven Road
PULLENVALE QLD 4069

13 March 2013

C13/349

Dear Mr Roberts

1 Thank you for your letters to the Prime Minister, the Hon Julia Gillard MP, the Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, the Hon Greg Combet AM MP, the Parliamentary Secretary for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, the Hon Yvette D'Ath MP, and various other Ministers, concerning your review of a CSIRO climate report. Your letters have been forwarded to the Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency as he has portfolio responsibility for these matters. The Minister has asked me to respond on his behalf.

Thank you for recognising the existence and significance of my report entitled *CSIROh!* and appendices it encompasses.

I note with satisfaction that your letter fails to identify, specify and factually justify any error in my *CSIROh!* report.

2 (2.1) There is clear evidence that our climate is changing, largely due to anthropogenic greenhouse gases. (2.2) The *Fourth Assessment Report*, produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 2007, states global warming is 'unequivocal' and 'most of the observed increase in globally-averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in greenhouse gas concentrations'.

Failure to provide empirical scientific evidence

2.1, Yet Minister, you fail to provide any such empirical scientific evidence of human causation of global warming (aka climate change). Empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning reveal that there is no scientific evidence of causation by human carbon dioxide (CO₂). My *CRISOh!* report and appendices it encompasses document the complete lack of such evidence of proof of causation.

Documented is the fact that CSIRO has repeatedly failed to provide evidence of human causation. It's documented that the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) has repeatedly failed. It's documented that your department's Climate Commission has repeatedly failed. All nine (9) most prominent academic alarmists from whom I've requested such evidence have failed to provide such evidence. All federal politicians have failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence of causation. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendices 2, 6, 6a, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 documenting this fact.

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

Earth's history reveals that climate often changes. Empirical scientific evidence confirms that your claim that Earth's climate is currently changing globally due to so-called "*anthropogenic greenhouse gases*" is false. Your unfounded and false claim contradicts empirical scientific

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

evidence. That fact is explained in detail together with the logical framework needed to establish causation. That framework is provided in *CSIROh!* appendix 4 starting on page 2. Your assertion is not supported by science. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

2.2, The UN IPCC has no empirical scientific evidence nor any logical scientific reasoning necessary for proving causation. Appendix 2 documents the unscientific falsity in each of the UN IPCC's four reports to national governments and media: 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007. *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 1, page 2 and section 2, page 9.

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/2_AppendixIPCC.pdf

Please note that CSIRO, BOM, other agencies, academics and all federal politicians received a copy of my *CSIROh!* report and were invited to comment. Senior executives of both CSIRO and BOM responded individually on behalf of CSIRO and BOM respectively. Both failed to identify, specify and justify any material errors in my report and its appendices encompassed. In their responses both again failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for their unfounded, unscientific and false claim that human CO2 caused Earth's latest modest warming that ended in 1998.

Similarly no other person or agency has identified any material error in my *CSIROh!* report. In response to my requests during the last four years for empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused global warming (aka climate change) no person or agency has provided any empirical scientific evidence for the claim. I've had responses to my request for such evidence from prominent academics and agencies claiming the link to human CO2 yet in their responses all have failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence for their claim. As documented in *CSIROh!* appendices 6 and 7 CSIRO and BOM executives have repeatedly failed. Appendices 8, 9 10, 11 and 12 discuss failed responses by other individuals and organisations.

Contradicting empirical scientific evidence

I agree that the statement you quote is in the UN IPCC's latest report to national governments and media, the 2007 Fourth assessment Report (AR4). The UN IPCC's latest report contains one chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of CO2, chapter 9. That sole chapter contains no empirical scientific evidence of causation. It relies on unvalidated computerised numerical modeling already proven to be hopelessly wrong and contradicting empirical scientific evidence. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 4 starting on page 4. **If you or your Department of Climate Change disagree with my statement please identify specifically the evidence and logic of causation in Chapter 9.**

The UN IPCC relies on its unproven and unscientific supposition of radiative forcing of temperature. Of the 16 listed claimed temperature forcing factors, just one is claimed by the UN IPCC to be of a High level of understanding yet contradicts empirical scientific evidence. Two are claimed to be of a Medium level of understanding. The remaining 13 are admitted by the UN IPCC to be of Low, Low-medium or Very low levels of understanding. Please see Table 2-11 provided by the UN IPCC itself:

http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch2s2-9-1.html

Projections made by AR4 are already contradicted by satellite measurements of global atmospheric temperature. The reason is that the UN IPCC does not rely on empirical scientific evidence. It relies on projections made by unvalidated computerised numerical models based on over 80% of factors having Low, Low-medium or Very Low levels of understanding. Those models are a sham conjured to appear scientific yet are unscientific. Thus, your claims are unscientific. That is the reason your claims are contradicted by empirical scientific evidence.

The UN IPCC deceptively uses the term '*very likely*' to convey statistical significance. That is false. Throughout the UN IPCC's history, likelihood levels have been arbitrarily assigned in a political process. Please refer to many sections within *CSIROh!* appendix 2.

UN IPCC reporting processes and procedures condemned by world's peak academic scientific body: Inter Academy Council

The world's peak academic scientific body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) released its report into UN IPCC processes and procedures in August 2010. The body of that report condemns the UN IPCC's reporting processes and procedures. The UN IPCC is not scientific. It is a political body*. The IAC report reveals that the UN IPCC's poor treatment of uncertainty brings into question every one of the 800 likelihood and confidence statements in Working Group 1 of the UN IPCC's 2007 report (Assessment Report 4, AR4). This destroys the credibility of the UN IPCC's latest report to national governments and media. The UN IPCC's report is not scientific. Please see *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 1, page 1 onwards.

* Further, as an *intergovernmental* body it is political.

Your second paragraph contradicts empirical scientific evidence and documented facts.

3 (3.1) There are multiple lines of evidence in the report showing that the Earth's climate system is warming. **(3.2)** These include increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea level. **(3.3)** The report represents the international consensus on climate change science in literature that has been extensively peer-reviewed and published in scientific journals. The report can be found at: www.ipcc.ch.

UN's core claim not supported by empirical scientific evidence

3.1, Yet you fail to provide any empirical scientific evidence. When you, like me, read the UN IPCC 2007 report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ you will find that the chapter contains no empirical scientific evidence for the claim about human CO₂.

My conclusion is independently confirmed by UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray. He has over 60 years' real-world experience as a research scientist with more than 20 years in climate. He has reviewed all four UN IPCC reports: 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007. He says there is no evidence anywhere in any of the UN IPCC reports for the claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 2, page 5.

Empirical scientific evidence confirms that global atmospheric temperatures are not warming. This was confirmed yet again on February 21st, 2013 in a lecture given at Deakin University's Burwood campus, Melbourne by Rajendra Pachauri, UN IPCC Chairman.

Please see my responses below to your paragraph No.8 for empirical scientific evidence contradicting your false claim. Please see *CSIROh!* appendix 4, section 1, pages 3-16. The UN IPCC's core claim is that the greenhouse effect causes atmospheric warming. Yet since the start of atmospheric temperature measurements in 1958 there were 18 years of global cooling during the peak period of growth in western industrialisation and CO₂ output. That cooling was followed by very modest warming to 1998. That was followed by ongoing temperature stasis as China and India rapidly increased CO₂ output. Thus, Earth experienced 18 years of atmospheric cooling, 22 years of warming, and 15 years of stasis. Further, a significant portion of the modest increase in atmospheric

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

temperature occurred in one year during the Great Pacific Climate Shift. That further contradicts the UN IPCC's supposition of gradual atmospheric warming by mirroring human CO2 output.

Ocean temperatures flat and slightly falling

3.2, Since 2003 global ocean temperatures have been measured by the ARGO study. It is the world's most comprehensive study of ocean temperatures and measures temperature at various depths. It reveals ocean temperatures are at most flat and falling slightly.

Your predecessor as Minister for Climate Change, Senator Penny Wong, was advised of this fact by four independent scientists and Senator Stephen Fielding on June 15th, 2009.

<http://joannenova.com.au/?p=2292&preview=true>

Please note that Senator Wong's advice was presented by Will Steffen, a chemical engineer whose own public words reveal that he misled your Multi Party Climate Change Committee in 2010 and 2011. Or, if he did not mislead your MPCCC he lied publicly.

Please see Appendix 9, pages 15-25: http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/9_appendix.pdf

Your implied claim of unusual rises in sea level contradicts empirical scientific evidence. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4a, pages 1-4:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/4a_AppendixEmpiricalData.pdf. Your claim of implied unusual widespread melting of snow and ice contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Regardless, even if your false claim were true, you present no evidence of human causation.

Instead, your claim relies on unvalidated computerised numerical models contradicted by empirical scientific evidence. Please see *CSIROh!* appendix 4a.

If you disagree, please provide such empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning proving causation and refuting the empirical scientific evidence provided in *CSIROh!* appendix 4.

UN corrupted, by-passed & prevented scientific peer-review

3.3, Your claim of scientific peer-review is undermined by the documented facts proving the reality that peer-review has been corrupted, by-passed and prevented by the UN IPCC and some of its leading contributors. This is detailed in *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 10, pages 16-18 and many references within appendix 2.

Please note that UN IPCC reports themselves are not scientifically peer-reviewed. Please refer to references to John McLean's work analysing the UN IPCC's sole chapter in 2007 claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2. His analysis and reports cannot be sensibly refuted since he simply presents UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC. Please see *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 2, pages 9-11, 13-19 and 26-27.

The UN IPCC's so-called review processes are justifiably one of the serious concerns identified in the body of the Inter Academy Council's (IAC) report in August 2010.

Are you aware of the IAC's detailed and extensive report? Are you aware of methods used apparently to suppress and offset the report's findings and hide or downplay it in the media? Are you aware of the possible link to academics and publications funded by your department prior to your becoming Minister for Climate Change? Please refer to the involvement of Kurt Lambeck as noted on various pages in Appendix 8:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/8_appendix.pdf

Were misrepresentations entrenched when Senator Wong was Minister of Climate Change?

Senator Wong was misled or maybe she misled. She failed to clean house when massive errors were revealed by Steve Fielding and independent scientists. Were errors entrenched by your predecessor's staff? In Canberra's frenetic pace have they never since been objectively questioned?

That would be easy to understand since many people have relied upon claims by senior UN IPCC contributors claiming a supposed scientific *consensus*. Yet that term itself reveals the UN IPCC's approach to be unscientific and political since consensus is antithetical to science. It is from the realm of politics. Further it is an appeal to perceived authority, another anti-scientific approach.

UN IPCC proven to be driven by politics, not science

The domination of the UN IPCC by political considerations is reflected in UN IPCC guidelines for publishing reports. Those guidelines require the science to be modified to suit the politics. Please see *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 5, page 11.

Regardless, the scientific consensus you claim is a non-existent fabrication contradicting reality. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 5, section 2, pages 3-5 and pages 7-8:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/5_AppendixMassiveMisrepresentations.pdf

and please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 9, page 18:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/9_appendix.pdf. Chemical engineer Will Steffen's own words reveal that he misled the public by falsely implying that no expert scientists oppose his view. Did he similarly mislead your Multi Party Climate Change Committee and your department?

Please refer below to my response to your fifth paragraph for more on Professor Singer, another internationally eminent signatory to the petition Will Steffen falsely dismisses.

4 Contrary to your claims, the IPCC has not been discredited. Since the release of the 2007 *Fourth Assessment Report*, two errors on points of detail have been found in the Working Group II report (Impacts and Adaptation); one relating to the rate of loss of the Himalayan glaciers and another concerning the area of the Netherlands which is susceptible to inundation from sea level rise. No errors have been found in the Working Group I report which examines the physical scientific basis for climate change. The science of climate change remains robust - it shows that greenhouse gas emissions from human activity are changing the Earth's climate system.

UN IPCC's documented history of corrupting climate science

CSIROh! appendix 2 provides clear documented evidence that the UN IPCC has a history of corrupting climate science. That corruption was initiated by its predecessor fabricating climate alarm, the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP). Since the UN IPCC's inception it has extended and refined UNEP's corrupt methods. Please refer to references on pages 10-11 and elsewhere to the work of Australian climate data analyst John McLean.

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/2_AppendixIPCC.pdf

Contrary to your claims, the UN IPCC's Working Group 1 (on the supposed climate science) have been severely discredited. There have been many revelations of it being tainted by activists writing significant sections on the supposed climate science and by political interference in writing the Working Group 1 Summary for Policy Makers (SPM).

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

The UN IPCC's unscientific assessment process has no similarity to stringent scientific processes used to assess new drugs. The UN IPCC's version of '*assessment*' is simply writing a predefined story to a political agenda using references often from tainted unscientific peer-review processes. The UN IPCC and/or its contributors have by-passed, corrupted and even prevented scientific peer-review.

As discussed in my response to your paragraph 8 below, the UN IPCC's core claim of a supposed atmospheric warming effect relies on corrupted ground-based temperature measurements known to be sloppily, unprofessionally and unscientifically corrupted. The raw data is prevented from being peer-reviewed. On this basis alone it should be scientifically dismissed and disregarded. The database programmer admitted publicly that the database is in a quote: "*hopeless state*". Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4, section 1, pages 9-10:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/4_AppendixBasicQuestions.pdf

Why do you rely on the UN IPCC and its unscientific and political reports pushing a blatantly and demonstrably political agenda?

5 The IPCC is the leading body for the assessment of climate change and provides the world with a clear scientific view on the current state of knowledge on climate change and its potential environmental and socio-economic consequences. Each chapter of the IPCC Report includes an extensive list of peer-reviewed studies used in the preparation of that Report.

Eminent UN IPCC scientists reveal UN IPCC is corrupt

According to UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray, UN IPCC Lead Author Dr. John Christy and eminent UN IPCC contributing scientists who resigned from the UN IPCC in protest against its corruption of science (including Paul Reiter and Chris Landsea) the UN IPCC is hopelessly tainted by corruption of science. UN IPCC contributing scientists are leading spontaneous world-wide movements against the UN IPCC. Internationally eminent American climate scientist, ecologist, environmental scientist and physicist Professor S. Fred Singer has been diligent for two decades in exposing the UN IPCC's corruption. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 13b, pages 11-12:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13b_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingNotes.pdf

Irrepressible independent Australian scientist Warwick Hughes has been exposing UN IPCC corruption for two decades: <http://www.warwickhughes.com/climate/>

Please confirm whether you and your department are aware of the position of such eminent independent scientists. If you are, please explain why you do not make that publicly known and why you only accept the baseless opinions of some of the UN IPCC's contributors.

The UN IPCC was formed to establish that human CO2 is a problem. It was not formed to explore climate. Its purpose is political: To conjure human CO2 as a driver of catastrophic global warming at some future unspecified date. Please refer to:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf, specifically item 8 on page 8.

Yet despite spending tens of billions of dollars worldwide, no empirical scientific evidence as proof of human causation has ever been found.

Please refer to appendix 2 of my *CSIROh!* report. It lists and discusses 23 serious problems identified with the UN IPCC. None are trivial. Most are individually significant and cause open and objective reviewers of the UN IPCC to conclude that the UN IPCC is corrupt. The 23 sections

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

combine to reveal an organisation that is corrupt to the core. Have you read appendix 2?

It is well known that UN IPCC Lead Authors for various chapters had huge discretion to include only supportive papers cherry-picked to support the story of human CO2 as the cause of global warming. Papers not supporting the view were excluded.

Politics, not science, determines UN IPCC reports

It's well known that the UN IPCC's Summary for Policy Makers is published before reports of Working Group 1 on the supposed climate science. It's documented that UN IPCC reporting guidelines require the science report to be changed to suit the political report. The Working Group 1 report on the science cannot be scientific. It is demonstrably not scientific as comprehensively documented and proven in *CSIROh!* appendix 2.

It is well known that the UN IPCC's activities are so narrow as to exclude adequate scientific study of natural drivers of global temperature and climate. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 9, page 27.

Proven drivers of climate do not include carbon dioxide (CO2)

It's well documented that the UN IPCC omits or unscientifically and significantly downplays prominent natural factors known to drive global climate. These have been scientifically proven. A scientifically peer-reviewed paper by two Australian climate researchers including internationally eminent palaeoclimatologist Professor Bob Carter and New Zealand co-author Chris de Freitas confirms the link between global temperature and ocean-atmosphere decadal cycles such as El Nino Southern Oscillation Index. It's available here:

http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/McLean_deFreitas_Carter_JGR_2009.pdf

Eminent American meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo confirmed the relationship between North American temperatures and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation:

Quote: "*Clearly the US annual temperatures over the last century have correlated far better with cycles in the oceans and sun than carbon dioxide. The correlation with carbon dioxide seems to have vanished or even reversed in the last decade.*"

http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US_Temperatures_and_Climate_Factors_since_1895.pdf

Joe D'Aleo is a Fellow of the American Meteorological Society. He documents extensive periods in which CO2 levels are negatively correlated with temperatures. Thus CO2 cannot be a driver of global temperature.

Are you aware of the extensive work of the Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change, the NIPCC? Its scientists are independent and study science scientifically. Its work is here: <http://www.nipccreport.org/index.html>

Its 2008 report provides a succinct, scientific report that is easily read by laypeople. It's here: http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

Is your department aware of documented extensive corruption of climate science by the UN IPCC? Was your view based on your department's understanding developed during Senator Wong's period as its first Minister?

Proof that your predecessor, Senator Wong, misled your party

Your parliamentary colleagues were advised in writing of my conclusion that Senator Wong had

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

misled the party. They were presented in my letter dated Tuesday, November 10th, 2009 with documentation of the corruption of climate science by Senator Wong. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 12, pages 8-10:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/12_appendix.pdf

I concluded then that Senator Wong misrepresented climate science. That remains my conclusion.

Royal Commission into corruption of climate science

As Minister you are now aware in detail of the serious corruption upon which your department's conclusions are based. Will you guide your government to now commission an independent Royal Commission into apparent corruption of climate science and misappropriation of taxpayer funds by your predecessors as Minister and Chief of Staff?

6 (6.1) The findings of the IPCC have been strongly supported by recent publications that synthesise the peer reviewed literature including, the American National Academies (www.dels.nas.edu), the Royal Society in the United Kingdom (www.royalsociety.org) and the Australian Academy of Science (www.science.org.au). The online version of the Australian Academy of Science document contains a comprehensive list of references to relevant scientific literature. **(6.2)** Information on websites and blogs, such as *Watts Up With That* and *The Galileo Movement*, which are not based on peer-reviewed information, do not have comparable scientific credibility.

Australian Academy of Science has misled you by misrepresenting climate

6.1, Your claim about the Australian Academy of Science is one upon which I can shed the light of personal experience with the Academy. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 8, section 1, pages 2-8:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/8_appendix.pdf

Please note that I was advised by the Academy that references numbered 90 to 120 in the Academy's booklet entitled '*The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers*' provided empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. I checked all those references and more on the document's list of '*References*'. Contrary to your claim none contain any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning supporting the false claim that human CO2 caused global warming.

When challenged with this in writing (delivery confirmed) to the Academy and its President neither replied. I lodged a formal complaint with the Academy's President Dr. Suzanne Cory. She again failed to reply.

Dr. Cory is on the CSIRO board.

The Academy's booklet to which your letter's sixth paragraph refers is a glossy scientific sham. It implies human CO2 as driving climate yet fails to provide any such evidence. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

If you disagree, please identify specifically within the document and/or its specific references the location of the empirical scientific evidence that verifies proof of your implied claim that human CO2 drives global temperature.

Please note the refusal by atmospheric physicist Professor Garth Paltridge to have his name associated with the booklet.

Are you aware that the Academy's shameful propaganda was funded by your department under your predecessor as Minister for Climate Change?

Are you aware that its publication was around the time of release of the Inter Academy Council's damning review of UN IPCC processes and procedures? Are you aware that as a result, the IAC's scathing report received no or little media attention in Australia?

British Royal Society's about-face contradicts your claim

Britain's Royal Society initially took a position decided by its executive. That is believed to have been influenced by the executive's desire for funding. The Royal Society had no evidence for the claim that human CO2 caused global warming. The executive's decision followed no rigorous scientific process. Subsequently, 42 members of the Royal Society revolted and the Society's original position was overturned.

The membership of the American National Academy of Science (NAS) was changed to allow activists to become members. The NAS has failed to provide empirical scientific evidence for the claim that human CO2 caused global warming. It has no such evidence.

World's peak academic scientific body confirms UN IPCC as unscientific

As revealed in responding to your second paragraph, the world's peak academic scientific body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) released its report into UN IPCC processes and procedures in August 2010. The body of that report condemns the UN IPCC's reporting processes and procedures. The UN IPCC is not scientific.

Has Will Steffen misled your department?

Will Steffen has admitted that his public statement that all 12-13 national academies of science support the claim that human CO2 controlled climate was false. Yet after admitting such he subsequently repeated his false claim publicly elsewhere. Given his significant interaction with and funding by your department has he misled you and/or your department?

When investigating for my report on corruption of climate science I discovered that two names recur across many climate agencies and bodies funded by government. They are David Karoly and Will Steffen. Both have connections to your department. Are you aware of that?

CSIROh! report section 8, page 13 and *CSIROh!* appendix 9, sections 1 and 2, pages 6-25.

***WUWT* and *The Galileo Movement* provide empirical scientific evidence**

6.2, Your reference to *Watts Up With That* and *The Galileo Movement* web sites is intriguing. Both sites present empirical scientific evidence, the ultimate arbiter of science. Both sites present scientifically peer-reviewed literature.

Anthony Watts is a meteorologist who has teamed with reputable scientists/statisticians to write a paper currently undergoing peer-review.

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

The Galileo Movement goes further to document the extensive corruption of climate science. Given that you refer to that web site, am I to reasonably conclude that you're familiar with its extensive documentation of the corruption of climate science?

The Galileo Movement web site provides comprehensive empirical scientific evidence. It includes scientifically peer-reviewed papers. Additionally, the site comprehensively documents extensive government-funded corruption of climate '*science*'. It discusses the deceit, enormous injustice and cost of taxing human production of CO₂ and '*trading*' CO₂ '*credits*'. It discusses the unjustified cost and damage of arbitrarily cutting human CO₂ using the opposition's Direct Action plan.

As I am a volunteer with The Galileo Movement, could you please identify specifically any errors in The Galileo Movement's web site?

Please note that my letter to you dated February 4th, 2013 and this response to you are from me as an independent citizen and not as a volunteer within The Galileo Movement.

Are you aware that both web sites are independent? The Galileo Movement is funded entirely by donations and is a voluntarily non-profit independent non-aligned oarganisation.

Your failure to identify specific errors or faults in The Galileo Movement web site reinforces The Galileo Movement's credibility.

The IAC's report confirms the view of leading independent sceptic scientists: the UN IPCC and/or some of its prominent contributors by-pass, corrupt and at times prevent scientific peer-review.

UN IPCC reports are not scientifically peer-reviewed.

7 (71.) There is a lot of information on climate change science available in the media and on the internet. It is therefore important to ensure that what you are reading is accurate and not influenced by personal, social or political agendas. As with all scientific fields, climate change science relies on the continued questioning and challenging of ideas.

(7.2) The peer-review process provides a mechanism to quality control scientific discourse and therefore peer reviewed papers provide a reliable and quality assured source of information on climate change science.

I agree with most of this paragraph.

7.1, There is abundant extensive, comprehensive, detailed documentation of corruption of climate science by UNEP since 1972 and by the UN IPCC since its formation in 1988. That corruption has been and continues to be driven by political agenda. Will you fulfill your responsibility to the Commonwealth of Australia and to all Australians by questioning and challenging the UN IPCC and academics funded by government. They've placed you and your party in a very difficult position.

UN IPCC reports are not scientifically peer-reviewed

The Inter Academy Council, John McLean, UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray and eminent UN IPCC contributing scientists reveal that UN IPCC reports are not scientifically peer-reviewed. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 8, pages 14-15 and various other pages.

Prominent and influential UN IPCC contributor Phil Jones admitted by email that "*No reviewer has ever asked for my data.*" He is at the centre of the Climategate scandal plaguing the UN IPCC.

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

Climategate emails include the following comment: "*I will stop this paper being published if I have to redefine the whole peer-review process.*" Another explained that it would be impossible for a reviewer to spend more than a few hours reviewing a paper.

Academics being prominent UN IPCC contributors refused to comply with Freedom of Information requests and refused to respond to legitimate scientific requests.

The UN IPCC's 2001 report relied heavily on the unscientific 'hockey stick' temperature graph. It relied upon many unscientific tricks including inappropriate use of short-centred PCA statistical method, hiding the decline in temperatures, splicing proxy data and temperature data, and hiding data and code. Peer-review was actively prevented yet the UN IPCC made this work the centrepiece of its claims in its 2001 report that ignited headlines worldwide. Later, after it was scientifically discredited worldwide it was quietly withdrawn with no headlines.

The editorial boards of some supposedly scientific journals contain activists. Some journals are owned by organisations with strong beliefs (as distinct from evidence) that human CO2 caused global warming. Some UN IPCC contributors have colluded to have journal editors sacked for allowing sceptical papers to be published.

Recent peer-reviewed papers are now questionable. For example: Gergis et al (2012):

Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 9, page 8:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/9_appendix.pdf

And:

<http://retractionwatch.wordpress.com/2012/06/11/paper-claiming-hottest-60-year-span-in-1000-years-put-on-hold-after-being-published-online/>

Here is another recent paper claiming warming yet debunked as unscientific:

http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/03/another_hockey_stick.html

And:

<http://www.sepp.org/twtwfiles/2013/TWTW%203-16-13.pdf>

Are you aware of David Karoly's association as a co-author of Gergis et al, his involvement in or with almost all bodies corrupting science in Australia and his senior roles in the UN IPCC? Surely you are aware that he is on the Science Advisory Panel of the Climate Commission funded by your department. Are you aware that in his responses to my requests for empirical scientific evidence of causation of global warming by human CO2 he has repeatedly failed to provide such evidence? Do you wonder why? Has your department held him accountable for use of taxpayer funds?

There is no substitute for due diligence

7.2, Scientific peer-review can be a reliable source of information. It can never though provide assurance of quality. For that one needs to rely on open challenging, questioning and critical thinking combined with open discussion free of ad hominem attacks and smears of sceptics. That is the way science progresses. It is vital for our society that we return to real science.

My report entitled *CSIROh!* and appendices it encompasses together with my accompanying letter to you dated February 4th, 2013 challenge you. Yet your response depends on platitudes, appeals to authority and unsubstantiated opinions contradicting documented facts. Your response fails to provide empirical scientific evidence and the logical scientific reasoning necessary for your core claim that human CO2 caused global warming. Your response fails to provide factual rebuttal of my documentation of corruption that is the basis of the position Senator Wong established while working under Kevin Rudd.

8 (8.1) The assertion that global warming has stopped since 1998 is incorrect. **(8.2)** Typically, 30 years of atmospheric temperature data is needed to determine a valid trend and average out natural variability. **(8.3)** The approach of cherry-picking a starting year and month in the temperature record specifically because of the result it gives is a flawed approach. **(8.4)** Observations from around the world clearly show that globally temperatures have increased by around 0.74 degrees Celsius over the 20th century. **(8.5)** The World Meteorological Organization has found that the decade of 2001-10 was the world's warmest decade on record, warmer than the 1990s which in turn was warmer than the 1980s. **(8.6)** 2010 tied for warmest year on record in records dating back to 1880. In Australia, 2001-10 was the warmest decade on record and each decade since the 1940s has been warmer than the preceding decade.

Temperature stasis is now “*widely accepted*”

8.1, Temperature stasis is confirmed as widely known. The Weekend Australian's Environmental reporter, Graham Lloyd, reported on Saturday, March 30th, 2013: “*But the fact that global surface temperatures have not followed the expected global warming pattern is now widely accepted.*”

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/features/twenty-year-hiatus-in-rising-temperatures-has-climate-scientists-puzzled/story-e6frg6z6-1226609140980>

It's confirmed in The Economist magazine that had been a strong advocate of the claim that human CO2 caused global warming.

Satellite measurements of atmospheric temperatures reveal no warming of the atmosphere since 1998. That is confirmed by radiosonde (weather balloon) measurements. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4, section 1, pages 3-16.

According to Philip Jones, the UN IPCC's supposed expert on global temperatures, there has been no statistically significant global warming in ground-based temperature measurements for 17 years!

Are you aware that James Hansen, the serial misrepresenter and fabricator of climate alarm has admitted a substantial period with no warming?

8.2, Agreed. Yet where is the reference that supports the assertion that 30 years is somehow special? There are temperature variations occurring on all scales from 24 hrs to 250,000 years.

Nonetheless, it's pleasing that you implicitly admit global atmospheric temperature has plateaued.

There is no scientific basis for your core claim

From the start of atmospheric measurements by weather balloon radiosondes in 1958 temperature fell until 1976's sudden Great Pacific Climate Shift. It occurred in one year and clearly was not caused by human CO2. Atmospheric temperatures then rose modestly to 1998. Every year since then atmospheric temperature has been below that of 1998.

Thus since the start of atmospheric measurements in 1958 and by satellite since the 1970's we've had 18 years of cooling, 22 years of warming and now no warming for 15 years.

Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4, section 1, pages 3-16.

Consider ground-based measurements of temperature. Consider temperatures since the Little Ice Age ended in 1750/1800. There was an initial period of modest warming. Since the 1880's there has been no 30 year period of ground-based warming.

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

Rural temperatures in North America and in Australia since the 1890's reveal natural warming and cooling cycles with no net increase. *CSIROh!* appendix 4, section 1, page 3.

Urban temperatures reveal slight warming overall due largely to corruption of temperature measurements by heat sources and sinks within urban areas. The Urban Heat Island Effect is statistically significant. It accounts for half the claimed temperature increase in the last century.


CSIROh! appendix 4, section 1, pages 1-16 reveals the extensive corruption of temperature data fabricating claims of rising temperatures. It presents extensive empirical data revealing no unusual warming since the start of industrialisation. Temperatures in recent decades remain below the average temperature for Earth's last 3,000 years.

The Medieval Warming Period has repeatedly been scientifically proven to be warmer than recent decades. Yet the UN IPCC tried to disregard that established and proven science using an unscientifically fabricated graph in its 2001 report. That graph has since been quietly withdrawn after being scientifically discredited world-wide.

Since 1900, America's warmest decade is the 1930's. *CSIROh!* appendix 4.

australia-uah-summers.jpg 841x385 pixels

19/03/13 5:34 PM



Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combat

The preceding graph is taken from:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2013/03/hottest-summer-record-in-australia-not-even-close-says-uah-satellite-data/>

It reveals that empirical scientific evidence of Australian summertime atmospheric temperatures shows no warming since 1979 and the start of satellite measurements. That's 34 years.

Yet your department funds the Climate Commission that has been making wild, unscientific and false claims about Australia's recent summer:

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

Given your comments about the need for a 30 year period of sustained temperature change to justify climate change, how do you justify the warming you claim? By your own criteria you have no basis for claiming warming, much less unusual sustained, ongoing warming.

Further, the natural temperature cycles during the last 160 years have been independent of human CO2 production. That contradicts your claim of causation by human CO2.

8.3, Agreed. Yet cherry-picking is relied upon by the UN IPCC and Al Gore. Furthermore, they engage in unscientific data manipulation and fabrication. *CSIROh!* appendix 4.

Cherry picking is the approach used by BOM, CSIRO and the Climate Commission in their press releases. Yet none has any empirical scientific evidence of unusual warming. All have repeatedly failed both publicly and personally to me and others to provide empirical scientific evidence of their implied cause: human CO2.

One example of cherry-picking is the use of unscientifically manipulated and corrupted ground-based temperatures to claim a supposed atmospheric effect. Worse, oceans cover 71% of Earth's surface, land covers only 29%. Ground-based temperatures are measured from a tiny fraction of that 29%. Thus a tiny portion of Earth's surface is used to represent global atmospheric temperature. Additionally, some sites showing cooling are unscientifically removed.

This is not a scientific basis for policy. Yet it is your basis for policy projected to wreak massive damage on Australia's competitiveness and economic well-being and hurt people's security.

8.4, Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4 and to discussion above on rural temperatures and the statistically significant Urban Heat Island Effect.

Are you aware that human beings cannot detect a temperature change of one degree Celsius?

There is no unusual or catastrophic human-made problem with global climate

No problems have been caused by the modest temperature rise from 1976 to 1998. History and science reveal that Earth's past warmer periods provided enormous net benefits for humanity, individual people and the natural environment.

Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4 page 2 for a logical scientific framework necessary to honestly advocate cutting human CO2 output. Empirical scientific evidence answers all four basic questions negatively. There is no need to cut human CO2 output.

The problem is human-made corruption of climate science

8.5, The World Meteorological Organisation's claims are false. The WMO is known to be an agent working with UNEP and now UN IPCC to fabricate false claims of anthropogenic warming. Please see Appendix 7: http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/7_appendix.pdf Regardless, the WMO has no empirical scientific evidence for its claim that human CO2 caused warming. The WMO contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

There has been no atmospheric warming since 1998. There has been no warming in ground-based temperature measurements since 1997.

That has been admitted by UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri and by the UK Met Office. Both are known for their bias in favour of the claim of anthropogenic global warming.

Climate Commission's corruption of climate science is funded by your department

8.6, Empirical scientific evidence proves your claims are false. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4.

See above: there has been no atmospheric warming since 1998 and no warming in ground-based temperature measurements since 1997.

The Climate Commission is funded by your department. It is a body that apparently has its roots in Senator Wong's term as Minister for Climate Change. It fabricates unfounded and false claims of warming. Please refer to Appendix 10: http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/10_appendix.pdf It has been fabricating unfounded fears and alarm. It disseminates propaganda.

The Climate Commission's false fabrications and implied claims scaring people have no scientific foundation. They contradict empirical scientific evidence.
http://blogs.news.com.au/couriermail/andrewbolt/index.php/couriermail/comments/no_not_our_hot_test_summer/ Empirical scientific evidence of actual atmospheric temperature measurements reveals that the Climate Commission contradicts empirical scientific measurements—repeatedly.

There has been no unusual rise in temperatures. There is no ongoing rise in temperatures.

The above reveals serious corruption of temperatures as portrayed by the UN IPCC and your department's Climate Commission.

BOM's impartiality has been repeatedly questioned by independent scientists. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 7: http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/7_appendix.pdf And: <http://www.warwickhughes.com/agri/darwinfiddle25jun12.pdf>

CSIROh! appendix 4, section 2, pages 17-21 and section 3, pages 22-24 reveal corruption by the UN IPCC of the presentation of atmospheric CO2 levels.

Appendix 4, section 4, page 25 confirms what most people already know: warmer periods are highly beneficial and of net economic and physical benefit to the planet, the natural environment humanity, civilisation, and individual people. The scientific term for Earth's past far warmer periods is '*climate optimum*'.

Wouldn't you agree that comments and claims stated and/or implied by CSIRO, BOM, Climate

Commission and other government-funded agencies employed by the government are worthless when they contradict empirical scientific evidence?

9 It is also important to consider warming of the climate system as a whole, not just the atmosphere. Studies that consider changes in the total heat content of the Earth show continued warming. More than 90 per cent of human induced warming is occurring in the oceans. Measurements show that the oceans have continued to warm and that global sea levels have continued to rise. Both Greenland and Antarctica are losing ice, and in 2012 Arctic sea ice melted to its lowest level on record this year.

Please refer above to 3.2, Since 2003 global ocean temperatures have been measured by the ARGO study. It is the world's most comprehensive study of ocean temperatures and measures temperature at various depths. It reveals ocean temperatures are at most flat and falling slightly.

In 3.2 above I stated: Your implied claim of unusual rises in sea level are false. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4a, pages 1-4:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/4a_AppendixEmpiricalData.pdf.

Sea level had been rising since the end of the last ice age. Measurements in recent decades reveal a reduction in the rate of sea level rise. South Pacific Islands have been the focus of the world's most extensive study of sea levels. It reveals no sea level rise in 20 years. Australia's annual rate of sea level rise over the last 15 years indicates a rise over the next 100 years of around one inch.

Unfounded and unscientific claims of catastrophic sea level rise are based on CSIRO's unvalidated computerised numerical models that contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Sea ice is varying naturally as normal

The Arctic sea ice record you claim refers to the period of 33 years since the start of satellite measurement. Are you not aware that the low level was subsequently explained by NASA to be due to a large Arctic storm in June? It quickly recovered to be normal for seasonal ice extent. Arctic sea ice floats and is affected by wind and ocean currents.

The Arctic's Northwest Passage was open in the 1940's and in 1906. Current variation in Arctic ice reveals natural variation is occurring.

Empirical scientific measurements reveal Antarctica is gaining ice. Total global sea ice is stable and shows no rising or decreasing trend. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 4a.

Some glaciers are advancing (growing in size). Some are retreating (shrinking). Others are stationary. The largest glacier in North America, the Hubbard Glacier for example, is growing.

10 (10.1) Scientists have looked very closely at all of the natural factors, such as volcanic eruptions and changes in the sun that have affected climate over the 20th century. Through these studies they have been able to determine that none of these processes can explain the sustained rise in global temperature that has been observed. (10.2) In contrast, the ability of human produced carbon dioxide emissions to explain the observed warming is well understood.

UN IPCC downplays or omits natural climate factors

10.1, Your claim is false. The UN IPCC's charter precludes detailed study of natural climate factors. See my answer to your paragraph 5, above.

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

It is well known that UN IPCC activities are so narrow as to exclude adequate scientific study of natural drivers of global temperature and climate. Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 9, page 27.

These natural factors have low levels of understanding. Nonetheless, there is extensive empirical scientific evidence that these entirely explain climate variation over the last century.

The UN IPCC relies on its unproven supposition of radiative forcing of temperature. Of the 16 listed claimed forcings, one is claimed by the UN IPCC to be of a High level of understanding yet contradicts empirical scientific evidence. Two are claimed to be of a Medium level of understanding and the remaining 13 are admitted by the UN IPCC to be of a Low, Low-medium or Very Low level of understanding. Please see Table 2-11 provided by the UN IPCC itself:

http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch2s2-9-1.html

This confirms the UN IPCC's low levels of understanding of natural factors and their effect on climate.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray confirms that the UN IPCC excludes or downplays both most prominent natural climate factors: Solar and ocean-atmospheric decadal cycles such as El Nino Southern Oscillation. Please refer to his most comprehensive review of the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 in the UN IPCC's latest report (2007).

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/gray%20documents/Chapter%209%20UN%20IPCC%20WG1%20AR4%20Vincent%20Gray.pdf

His is the most comprehensive, detailed and thorough review of the 2007 report. His reviews of every UN IPCC chapter from the UN IPCC's Working Group 1 report on climate science are available here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/>

One of his explanations of the UN IPCC's fabrication of unfounded climate alarm is here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/gray%20documents/SpinningThe%20Climate.pdf

There is no empirical scientific evidence rebutting my claim

10.2, Your claim contradicts empirical scientific evidence. There is no empirical scientific evidence supporting your claim. CSIRO has none. BOM has none. The government has none.

If you had such evidence it would enable you to easily end my factual, documented and proven claim that your policy is based on government-funded corruption of climate science contradicting empirical scientific evidence. That you repeatedly fail to provide factual evidence and in particular fail to provide accurate empirical scientific evidence in your letter reveals you have no such evidence or study of such evidence.

That reason is that there is no such evidence, anywhere in the world.

UN IPCC relies on unvalidated computerised numerical models contradicting empirical scientific evidence

Although empirical scientific evidence is science's ultimate arbiter, another arbiter is the ability to predict future outcomes using a proposed scientific theory. Yet UN IPCC climate models based on the UN IPCC's theory that human CO2 drives global warming have repeatedly proven wrong. They

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combet

have proven to be wildly wrong. They predicted ongoing rapid rise in temperature yet since 1998 temperatures have been flat and since 2006 fallen slightly. The predictive ability of the UN IPCC's claimed theory is wrong.

Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 2, section 2, pages 5–12.

Scientist and engineer David Evans is recognised as one of the world's top computer modelers. He worked on the federal government's computerised carbon modeling. He originally assumed the UN IPCC was correct. When things didn't make sense he started asking questions and became a strong sceptic of anthropogenic global warming:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/03/david-evans-carbon-modeler-says-its-a-scam/>

The UN IPCC's theory is falsified by both its predictions and by empirical scientific evidence.

11 The consensus within the mainstream science community is that climate change is real, currently being observed and will have significant future impacts if no action is taken to reduce global carbon pollution.

As explained above, in response to your third paragraph, factual evidence contradicts the claim of a scientific consensus. The claim that there is a consensus is false. Secondly, your paragraph 11 is a logical fallacy and an appeal to unfounded authority. That too is unscientific.

Such claims are used when people lack empirical scientific evidence.

There is no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ is a factor in global climate.

12 Thank you for bringing your concerns to the Australian Government's attention.

Abuse and misappropriation of taxpayer funds

My *CSIROh!* report and the appendices it encompasses reveal abuse of taxpayer funds. In your role as a Minister I imagine that is of interest. Will you be investigating corruption?

Secondly, as the Minister aren't you presiding over the granting of millions of dollars of taxpayer funds to a wind-farm company whose business cannot be justified by empirical scientific evidence. Yet you were a Director of the union superannuation fund that previously directed that company until shortly before your election into parliament. Does this involve a significant conflict of interest?

Please refer to *CSIROh!* appendix 12, pages 11-16, especially page 13 and 14:

http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/12_appendix.pdf

Your letter dated March 13, 2013 fails to address the key point of my letter to which it responds. That is, the massive corruption of climate science by agencies funded by Australian taxpayers using funds misappropriated by the Australian government. It fails to address the fact that CSIRO and BOM have no empirical scientific evidence for their claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. Your letter fails to address the detailed and quantified analysis of corruption in the CSIRO document entitled '*The Science of Tackling Climate Change*'.

I again call on you to rescind all 19 pieces of the so-called Clean Energy legislation referred to as the '*Carbon Tax*'. I call on you to rescind the ALP's Renewable Energy Target (RET) policy. Furthermore, the Opposition needs to rescind its RET policy. There is no scientific basis for such legislation and policies of either party. Both policies contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Attachment to letter dated April 2nd, 2013 to Minister Combat

Both policies are highly regressive taxes on the poor and people of low income. Both policies are already destroying Australian industry and employment. In the hands of Greens senators holding the balance of power, these policies will destroy Australia's future.

Yours sincerely

Allan Behm
Chief of Staff

Original personally signed

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.
Tuesday, April 2nd, 2013

As stated in my original letter to you dated February 4th, 2013, quote:

"ABC-Radio journalist Steve Austin requested review of a prominent CSIRO climate report. My review is enclosed because investigation into the carbon dioxide science and tax reveals the science was manipulated by agencies employed by government. Cutting human carbon dioxide by taxes or Direct Action cannot impact climate. The pain for no gain is itemised for you.

Your behaviour and statements on climate policy have been prominent in misleading Australians. I previously advised you in writing of corruption of climate science yet you continued advocating cutting carbon dioxide and penalising Australians. You have never provided any empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human carbon dioxide warms our planet. You have repeatedly contradicted empirical scientific evidence.

Unless you provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning showing human carbon dioxide controls climate I ask you to resign from parliament immediately.

This letter and your response will be posted on the Internet. You have a golden opportunity to restore trust by advising actions you will take to rescind all legislation on the carbon dioxide tax and Renewable Energy Target. We need an open, impartial inquiry into corruption of climate science requiring evidence under oath.

The report provides all the evidence you need to repeal the tax, stop the Coalition's Direct Action and regain people's trust, respect and admiration. I'm available to discuss it with you. Which party will reveal and repeal first? Which MP will win people's hearts and votes by placing people first, party second. Will you demonstrate integrity to secure Australia's future?"