


TWO DEAD ELEPHANTS IN PARLIAMENT


by Malcolm Roberts

Replacing fear, guilt and fraud
with facts, forgiveness and freedom.



two dead elephants

IN PARLIAMENT



Referenced briefing paper on UN IPCC claims
prepared for members of parliament

By Malcolm Roberts

two dead elephants

IN PARLIAMENT



replacing fear, guilt and fraud
with facts, forgiveness and freedom

REFERENCED BRIEFING PAPER ON UN IPCC CLAIMS
PREPARED FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

BY MALCOLM ROBERTS

*Relax—you can stop holding your breath!
Exhaling CO₂ is not polluting our world!*

CONTENTS

Clarity and integrity—choices build legacies 1

Summary 3

Essential Facts 8

Protecting truth 41

Acknowledgments 42

Declaration of Personal Interests 43

CLARITY AND INTEGRITY—CHOICES BUILD LEGACIES

After listening to politicians and media, you may think the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) is scientific. You may even think that recent revelations about UN IPCC falsities were minor blemishes and lapses. Examining the almost daily exposing of new unscientific UN IPCC falsities shows otherwise.

Draft notes on UN IPCC falsities and fraud hurriedly sent last week to all members of parliament are already out of date. The emergence of errors by the UN IPCC is accelerating. We can be free of confusion and uncertainty by questioning and examining what we've been told. Use this catalogue of facts to assess political panic and alarm. Decide for yourself.

The Indian government has already decided. Quoting the Indian Environment Minister, Dr Ramesh, the Indian government has established its own body to monitor the effects of global warming because it "cannot rely" on the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change chaired by Rajendra Pachauri.

The UN IPCC's disintegration is accelerating.

Australians as Stunned Observers of an hilarious, tragic Parliamentary Farce

The UN IPCC's global warming alarm is dead. Killed by the stampeding revelations of the UN IPCC fraud and falsities.

Yet, there are two dead elephants in federal parliament—one each in the Senate and the House of Representatives. In each chamber, politicians are tiptoeing around the UN IPCC corpse. They're pretending climate alarm is still alive—no one wants to be the first to break the news.

Kevin Rudd's mob, cowed in silence imposed by party control and paralysed by fear of voter backlash, pretend the rotting corpses are not there. They aim to suffocate Australia through an Emissions Trading Scheme imposing a huge tax payable by every consumer.

Tony Abbott's mob is paralysed by fear of sensational headlines labelling them anti-green. They too tiptoe warily around the putrid corpses. They think that to be seen as environmentally caring they need a plan for tackling global warming alarm. They're trying to prove their plan is better. So they push a far less costly, far less risky and far less damaging alternative to suffocating Australia—they want to choke Australia through yet more unneeded regulation.

The growing majority of Aussies watch and laugh. Woken to reality, they look on and shake their heads with derision and disbelief. While politicians tiptoe around dead elephants, Aussies have figured out what really matters—global warming alarm has been fabricated.

Most Australians genuinely care for the environment. They've concluded climate alarm is a wasteful, costly derailment—a derailment that prevents addressing real environmental challenges.

Yet Senator Wong rushed into defending the UN IPCC. With the UN IPCC's subsequent apology for its breaches of science, Senator Wong's panic became embarrassing. The material in this summary makes it abundantly clear that Senator Wong's trivialisation of the UN IPCC's Himalayan falsities, as reported by the ABC, contradicts the UN IPCC's. Her trivialisation of reality shows politicians need scrutiny.

As an advisory body on climate, the UN IPCC is dead. This catalogue of facts shows why.

Before presenting conclusions, lets acknowledge Senator Steve Fielding's integrity. He did his due diligence, developing conclusions based on climate fact. He repeatedly demonstrates the courage to speak out in protection of his constituents. Lets acknowledge the strength and courage of Nationals MP's in alerting Australians to the government's climate fraud. We hope they've not been mesmerised by their coalition partners. We hope they continue to expose the elephant corpses by speaking with integrity.

Clarity of fact and integrity will determine every MP's enduring legacy

Truth and parliamentary credibility are threatened with extinction by the UN IPCC's global warming alarm. Australians will regain hope when MP's speak with integrity and truth. That will rebuild parliamentary relevance. It will build for those MP's a lasting, honorable legacy.

SUMMARY

Conclusions to Date from the UN IPCC's Patterns of Unscientific Behaviour

The following conclusions are obtained from examining this catalogue's list of UN IPCC misrepresentations of science. We are now seeing publicly what eminent UN IPCC scientists have been saying since the UN IPCC's second report in 1995—the UN IPCC peddles bogus science for political objectives. This bogus 'science' includes:

- Science being bent, distorted, fabricated, tampered with, destroyed, hidden, misrepresented;
- Frequent falsities deliberately fabricated yet claimed to be scientific;
- UN IPCC 'peer review' typically contradicts what is commonly accepted as scientific peer review practices;
- The UN IPCC even bypasses its own typically ineffective peer reviews;
- Activists, non-experts and non-scientists bypass or distort peer review rendering it useless and rendering science broken;
- Expert reviewers being prevented from checking the UN IPCC's claimed results;
- The UN IPCC's fraudulent attempts to reassure people that its fabrications are the product of scientific procedures;
- Dishonesty prevailing—systemically embedded with political objectives;
- False, unscientific claims appear clearly aimed at spurring public alarm to motivate government action in support of UN IPCC objectives. This has been achieved by politically altering scientific reports and feeding these to the media to produce frightening headlines.

In developing its core claims and alarming projections, the UN IPCC does not use solid data, sound analysis, objective assessment and considered judgement. In fabricating its core claims solid data, sound analysis, objective assessment and honest considered judgement are systemically and consistently avoided. This applies to many of its supporting emotive claims driving public alarm aimed at motivating governments and voters to comply with its agenda.

The UN IPCC's many very serious breaches of scientific integrity and scientific peer review and its dishonesty are at the heart of its core climate claims and many supporting alarming projections. Specifically, as detailed in later sections of this report, fraud underpins the UN IPCC's claims. Examples include:

- Its core temperature claim was fabricated by a junior scientist while bypassing and initially preventing peer review by scientists until exposed by scientific detective work. Yet Earth's two accurate global temperature records (weather balloons, later supplemented by satellites) show no net warming since 1958. Satellite measurements show that UN IPCC predictions of tropospheric warming are wrong;
- Tampering of Earth's three ground based temperature records to falsely show warming when there has been no warming. Specifically, the Climate Research Unit (CRU), a key source of UN IPCC ground based temperature data is corrupt. USA's NASA and NOAA now face claims of tampering and corrupting their records of ground based temperature data. The original ground based measurements reveal no net warming since 1890;
- Its core claim on atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) levels was falsified and unscientifically fabricated. It omitted reliable records showing higher levels of CO₂ during the last 180 years;

- Political summary reports presented to the media and national governments contradict UN IPCC scientists' reports. This is combined with political reports being written and presented to the media and governments before the scientific reports were written. Scientific reports have been altered and key graphs and supporting data changed without advising the scientists and without peer review;
- Falsely inferring scientists supported conclusions stated in UN IPCC political reports;
- Using apparently deliberate errors in data and calculations;
- Perpetrating misleading, incomplete, incorrect wrong or inadequate statements;
- Claims of alarm were fabricated without scientific data and based on anecdotes, comments by non-experts including activists and breaches of scientific peer review. The UN IPCC's unfounded claims of alarm have been contradicted by eminent scientists - experts in their fields. Unfounded claims of alarm include:
 - Himalayan glacier scandal - glaciers are not melting alarmingly. Contrary to the UN IPCC report, some Himalayan glaciers are advancing;
 - Amazon rainforest is not being adversely affected by climate and the UN IPCC's claim 40% will be seriously affected is unfounded;
 - Fabrications falsely promoting alarm about hurricanes, storms, droughts, floods and other normal weather events contradict expert science and data;
 - Unfounded claims of increased insect-borne disease contradict science and data;
 - Unfounded claims of animal and plant extinction;
 - Unfounded alarm about human food production;
 - Unfounded claims of devastation of African agriculture;
 - Unfounded claims of mud flows and avalanches in coastal Latin America due to glaciers;
 - Unfounded exaggeration of risks to Australian climate driven by an apparent concern that UN IPCC's reports may not be sufficiently scary;
 - There is no scientific evidence for catastrophes;
 - Scary newspaper story of cold showers, rotting food, etc used as a reference in UN IPCC report;
 - Unfounded alarm about sea levels;
- More than 20 additional cases of unsubstantiated UN IPCC alarm based on apparently unsupported claims by activists have been revealed and are being pursued;
- Lack of any scientifically measured real-world evidence or data that humans caused global warming. The UN IPCC has no such scientific evidence;
- Its implied claim that 4,000 scientists support its core claim that humans warmed Earth, yet only five (5) scientists endorsed the claim and there's doubt they were even scientists. There is no consensus of scientists in support of the UN IPCC's core claim. Many eminent scientists world-wide disagree with and criticise the UN IPCC. These include eminent UN IPCC scientists;
- Relies only on creatively conjured and erroneous computer models that fabricated outputs purported to be 'data'. These are fed to, and used by the media instead of scientifically measured real-world data;
- Chairman Rajendra Pachauri has apparent serious conflicts of financial interest and behaviours contradicting the UN IPCC's advice to governments;
- Senior members have repeatedly justified use of unfounded alarm;

- Ignoring, and even omitting, accepted significant natural causes of warming; and,
- Ignoring significant benefits of natural global warming.

According to McLean¹, the UN IPCC's 2001 report stated, quote: 'chapter 1 admitted that the changes in temperature did not necessarily mean that a human influence on climate had been identified and that the changes may be natural'. That truth was immediately buried by a 'theory' that contradicts the laws of physics and Nature.

The UN IPCC's core greenhouse gas effect 'theory' contradicts the Laws of Physics and Nature. It's not even a theory, not even a supposition. The UN IPCC's 'theory' is impossible and unnatural. Nature controls atmospheric CO2 levels. The UN IPCC's greenhouse claim is not scientific. It's a falsity.

Data obtained from the UN IPCC itself on its own processes for producing its reports reveals that UN IPCC processes are unscientific and not able to support the UN IPCC's core claims.

The UN IPCC's distortion of the scientific method, it's blind unfounded criticism of justified scientific challenge (legitimate scepticism), its politicised policies and its political propaganda could well damage science in the public's eye for decades.

Fraud is rife in the UN IPCC. It has been driven from the highest levels of the UN IPCC and its sponsoring organisation, UNEP (UN Environmental program) since its inception. The UN IPCC does not work for national governments, it works for the UNEP agenda.

The UN IPCC's global warming fabrication is dishonest - and, in places, apparently possibly criminal.

The UN IPCC and its executives have thwarted and discredited real scientific research stifling real science and hindering knowledge of climate. The UN IPCC has stifled humanity's progress.

UN IPCC reports were claimed to be the basis for the UN FCCC's Copenhagen conference that was a complete failure. That failure was unavoidable because without any scientific real-world measured evidence of human effect on global climate, delegates pursued personal and national political agenda.

The current Australian government is complicit in promoting UN IPCC falsities and neglecting reality. eg:

- The Prime Minister assisted by spreading the falsity that the UN IPCC's core claims are supported by 4,000 scientists. They are not;
- In answer to Senator Steve Fielding's three simple questions, Senator Wong and her advisers have not been able to provide any scientific proof that humans caused global warming;
- Senator Wong's department appears to be spreading unfounded alarm using tactics similar to the UN IPCC's tactics;
- Senator Wong has misrepresented science and climate to her own party;
- Alarm propagated by the government about the Great Barrier Reef is contradicted by science

¹ McLean, J, 2007. 'Why the IPCC should be Disbanded'. Science & Public Policy Institute. http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf [Accessed: December, 2009]

- Prime Minister Rudd supported Copenhagen calls for ‘reparations’ to Africa for extreme weather events falsely purported to be caused by developed nations’ production of CO2. Yet that claim is just another unfounded UN IPCC claim driving alarm. That the government did not check the source before committing to billions of dollars in ‘reparations’ shows gross negligence toward taxpayers’ money.

Global warming is not a problem. There is a problem with the United Nations – a very serious problem. There is a serious problem with the Australian government’s department of Climate Change and Water and the behaviour of its minister, Senator Wong.

Adopting the government’s climate policy will seriously damage the environment.

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

Secondly, the UN IPCC’s push to artificially increase energy prices is a serious threat to the environment, especially in poor nations. Thirdly, focussing on a non-problem—the UN IPCC’s fabrication of global warming—diverts attention and scarce resources from addressing real environmental and humanitarian challenges.

For the government it seems CO2 does not really matter. All that matters is initiating some form of Emissions Trading Scheme.

Senator Wong’s actions have seriously and for no sound reason damaged:

- science and particularly climate science, the scientific process and peer review;
- the environment—and worsened the greatest global environmental threat (carbon trading);
- the economy—and worsened humanitarian threats, particularly to the poor and vulnerable.

Senator Wong’s actions, through unfounded coercion and misrepresentations aimed at encouraging Australia’s adoption of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change’s Copenhagen agreement threaten to:

- destroy personal freedom of Australians;
- destroy Australia’s sovereignty and democracy through ceding governance to the UN;
- erode morality, misrepresent humanity and derail people’s inherent environmental care;
- end energy independence, the key to our civilisation’s productivity, material security, well-being and ease.

Senator Wong’s immediate and unsound defence of the UN IPCC over the unfolding Himalayan glaciers scandal demonstrated Senator Wong seems to be either:

- ill-advised; and/or;
- blind to UN IPCC flaws despite these being made clear to her in writing on numerous occasions; and/or
- involved in corruptly, fraudulently using the UN IPCC reports for personal/political gain.

The institutions of government and major political parties have failed Australia and the environment. We need less government, not bigger remote UN governance. As Opposition Leader, the current Prime Minister's 2007 election campaign on climate had no credible foundation and misled the people.

Combining the above with an understanding of Nature's powerful drivers of global climate, the only plausible policy is continuing to adapt to ongoing natural cyclic climate variability as humans have done for thousands of years. To deviate valuable resources to a failed theory peddled by bogus and fraudulent science leaves the nation and the planet vulnerable.

To destroy Australia's economy for a non-problem is irresponsible and heartless. With the evidence now clear, any politician assisting that deviation of resources will be doing so with no scientific foundation and likely for purely political reasons. Such politicians will be responsible for the deaths, in undeveloped nations, of millions of people, or at best, the tragic consequences of consigning millions to live in greater misery.

If the UN IPCC was a company it would be up for fraud. UN IPCC reports are no basis for the government's global warming policy and Carbon Pollution Reduction Scheme, CPRS.

Please ... Senator Wong:

- ▶ **launch an immediate, independent inquiry into the UN IPCC and its reports;**
- ▶ cease the destruction of science;
- ▶ cease the use of fear and guilt based on a combination of erroneous computer models projecting unfounded and unlikely future scenario with anecdotes that bypassed peer review;
- ▶ cease labelling and promoting CO₂ as a pollutant;
- ▶ dismiss the CPRS; and
- ▶ until you have scientifically measured real-world proof that human production of CO₂ caused global warming, cease your unfounded and false claims of climate alarm.

“If the IPCC wasn't there, why would anyone be worried about climate change²?”

Rajendra Pachauri, *UN IPCC Chairman*

Members of Parliament, please, do your due diligence using real science. Speak out. Vote against the CPRS. Stop toying with climate fraud. Instead, debate real environmental and humanitarian challenge.

2 Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Science, February 5, 2010.

ESSENTIAL FACTS

The following information provides essential facts to support Senator Wong in correcting her public misrepresentations as minister for climate change.

Contrary to Senator Wong's rushed premature defense of UN IPCC errors on Himalayan glaciers, such errors are not exceptional, they are demonstrably typical

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

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

"Climate change is real and human beings are contributing to it, and people like Senator Minchin, who have never believed in climate change, will jump on anything in order to justify their position."³

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

These challenge Senator Wong's public position on global warming and specifically her claims that the modest natural, cyclic warming that ended around 1998 was caused by humans and specifically by human production of carbon dioxide (CO₂). My intent has been to protect my children who are entitled to an opportunity to earn a secure future, protect my elderly parents who have worked hard all their lives and to protect the environment, science, integrity and basic human freedom. In so doing, my intent has been to protect Senator Wong.

As used in this document, fraud is defined as:

Fraud [frawd] –noun⁴

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

³ <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/01/18/2794830.htm>. Wong defends UN over climate mistake

⁴ Dictionary.com Unabridged. Based on the Random House Dictionary, 2009

Lets consider reports exposing continuing UN IPCC falsities.

Understanding the UN IPCC's Himalayan Glacier Fraud

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

Fact Jeremy Page⁵ reports that a lone scientist, Syed Hasnain, who was credited with making the forecast included in the UN IPCC report has admitted he never made a specific forecast.

Fact the scientist now works in Delhi for The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) directed by Rajendra Pachauri, the UN IPCC chairman.⁵

Fact when finally admitting the UN IPCC's serious error, the UN IPCC chairman refused to answer any questions on the report.⁵

Fact when the Indian government itself challenged the UN IPCC report's claim last year, chairman Pachauri responded by describing those who cast doubt on the UN IPCC's Himalayan glacier claims as practising and peddling quote, "voodoo science";^{6 7}

Fact the UN IPCC's completely unfounded claim that Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035 due to human production of carbon dioxide (CO2) had been "cut and pasted" from a WWF campaign document, that had in turn been based on a journalist's news item about an Indian glaciologist, Syed Hasnain. It was not supported by any scientific research; ie, a journalist interviewed an Indian scientist and on that basis wrote a news item. That was converted into a WWF campaign document and from that source became the UN IPCC's claim and forecast which was embellished with specific numbers also unfounded.^{6 & 7}

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

Fact the UN IPCC claims its report has a certainty of 90%;⁸

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

Separately, Britain's Lord Monckton⁹ explains that the quantitative confidence level was manufactured by a group of non-scientists writing the UN IPCC's political report. The decision was made on a show of hands. That is not science.

5 Jeremy Page, The Australian, Fr.22.01.10, Front page reprinted from The Times. 'UN says sorry for glacier error'

6 Peter Wilson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.23.01.10, page 10. 'Climate Chief on Thin Ice'

7 Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10. 'Climate Science on Thin Ice and associated side bar entitled Ice and snow not retreating any more'

8 Editorial, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10. Not so fast: why glaciers offer a lesson in caution

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

What does it say about the UN IPCC when, The Times newspaper reports¹⁰ that Professor Murari Lal ‘oversaw the chapter on Himalayan glaciers in the 2007 IPCC report’ yet ‘Lal admits he knows little about glaciers’.

Fact Christopher Pearson¹¹ reports in The Weekend Australian that , quote: ‘he (Lal) was “well aware” the panel’s findings didn’t rely on peer-reviewed science but on speculation in the form of reported remarks in an eco-journal by an obscure glaciologist, Syed Hasnain, recycled in a report by the World Wildlife Fund’. When the UN IPCC’s Co-ordinating Lead Author behaves in this way, it shows such behaviour is accepted within the UN IPCC.

Fact Like glaciers around the world, some Himalayan glaciers are retreating, some Himalayan glaciers are advancing and other Himalayan glaciers are stationary. Refer to side bar entitled ‘Ice and snow not retreating any more’ accompanying the reference entitled ‘Climate Science on Thin Ice’. Note the article indicates that while expert scientists disagree on what is happening overall to Himalayan glaciers it is clear that if the Himalayan glaciers are retreating they are not retreating at anything like the rate claimed by the UN IPCC. Experts say the UN IPCC’s claims amount to “a gross misrepresentation”¹²

Fact Australian glacier expert Cliff Ollier from the University of Western Australia accuses the UN IPCC of being “deliberately alarmist” “because he says the organisation has a vested interest in global warming”;¹¹

Fact The UN IPCC had been warned well ahead of publication day by a leading glaciologist, Georg Kaser, that the prediction presupposed warming at two to three times the highest expected rate. As he said: “This number is not just a little bit wrong; it is as wrong as wrong can be”¹³

Fact The UN IPCC’s claims about the melting of Himalayan glaciers appears to be flawed on many levels: (1) the UN IPCC did not acknowledge there had been only limited research on the remote Himalayan glaciers that are among the least studied in the world; (2) there is a lack of field data to corroborate the UN IPCC’s forecast—the Himalayas have thousands of glaciers and only 30 have been studied for one fifth of the time needed to understand the glaciers. Yet UN IPCC reports imply an air of confidence and certainty; (3) failure to acknowledge that there is disagreement among the world’s glacier scientists as to the cause of retreating glaciers, especially while some glaciers are advancing and others stationary; (4) the UN IPCC failed to acknowledge that the rate of retreat of glaciers has slowed yet it says the rate is accelerating.¹¹

Fact The Indian government has had the courage to question the UN IPCC and even to “accuse the IPCC of being alarmist” to which UN IPCC chairman Pachauri responded by labelling the Indian government as arrogant and practising ‘voodoo science’;¹¹

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

10 Jonathan Leake and Chris Hastings, January 20, 2010, The Times, UN Climate Chief Admits Mistakes on Himalayan Glaciers Warning <http://www.globalpolicy.org/home/212-environment/48650-un-climate-chief-admits-mistake-on-himalayan-glaciers-warning.html>

11 Christopher Pearson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.30.01.10, ‘Don’t trust the weatherman’s forecasts’ <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/dont-trust-the-weathermans-forecasts/story-e6frg6zo-1225824634542>

12 Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10. ‘Climate Science on Thin Ice and associated side bar entitled Ice and snow not retreating any more’

13 C Pearson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.23.01.10 (Inquirer page 7, ‘The climate starts to suit Abbott’

Fact The Himalayan 'prediction' has been described as 'apocalyptic' with consequences including "deadly floods followed by severe long-term water shortages across the food bowl of Asia". Based on such a scenario, truly scary reports said this would seriously and directly threaten 500 million people and as many as 2 billion people. Horrific. Fanning fear, the WWF said it would mean "massive economic and environmental problems for people"¹¹

Fact Journalists have used the UN IPCC's unfounded, alarmist and erroneous claim on Himalayan glaciers to spread climate alarm world-wide.¹⁴

Fact Professor Murari Lal, the Co-ordinating Lead Author of the UN IPCC report's chapter responsible for the Himalayan falsity, quote: "it related to several countries in this region and their water sources. We thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action. It had importance for the region, so we thought we should put it in." ie, it was politically motivated, not scientific.¹⁵

Fact Benny Peiser of the Global Warming Policy Foundation says, quote "The IPCC review process has been shown on numerous occasions to lack transparency and due diligence"¹⁶;

Fact Contrary to the ABC's depiction of Senator Wong making light of the issue, the UN IPCC eventually apologised for its serious breach of peer review. The UN IPCC seems to have realised that the public could see the seriousness of the issue. Yet Senator Wong seems unable to agree. Even in apologising, UN IPCC chairman Pachauri seems to want us to believe the UN IPCC was merely 'slipping up on a number' and that UN IPCC review processes are sound. The Australian newspaper editorial correctly pointed out the Himalayan glacier scandal is indicative of UN IPCC structural problems. The next page provides links to McLean's excellent papers presenting UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes. McLean's work highlights that UN IPCC processes are systemically flawed and politically driven. McLean's papers cannot be sensibly refuted since they simply present data obtained from the UN IPCC itself. McLean's 2009 article on the UN IPCC's history shows the UN IPCC is not scientific and has been driven by political purposes to an agenda that predated its formation in 1988. He quotes revealing statements made by UN IPCC chairmen and senior members of the UN themselves.^{17, 18}

For the UN IPCC's admission of failure to use science on Himalayan Glaciers, refer to:
<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2010/1/20/ipcc-and-wwf-statements-on-glaciers.html>

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

14 Peter Wilson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.23.01.10 'Glaciergate threatens a climate change

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

16 Cameron Stewart, The Australian, Tu.19.01.10. 'Climate Science on Thin Ice and associated side bar entitled Ice and snow not retreating any more'

17 Jeremy Page, The Australian, Fr.22.01.10, Front page reprinted from The Times. 'UN says sorry for glacier error

18 Editorial in The Australian, Fr.22.01.10 entitled 'Heeding the political lessons of Glaciergate, subtitled Governments must constantly question scientific claims

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

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

- http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf
- http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf
- http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/23573.pdf
- http://folk.uio.no/tomvs/esef/McLean_ipcc_review.pdf
- http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

A sixth paper detailing the history of the UN IPCC is available from: http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate_science_corrupted.html

Quoting internationally eminent UN IPCC scientist Paul Reiter, in UN IPCC processes "the deliberations of the authors are strictly confidential". Quoting Solomon from his interviews of many UN IPCC scientists and experts in their field: "In effect the science is spun, disagreements purged, and results predetermined". Solomon, page 189.¹⁹

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

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

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

There is no scientifically measured, real-world proof that human production of CO₂ caused global warming. Not one piece. None.

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

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

¹⁹ Solomon, L, 2008. 'The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so'. Richard Vigilante Books, USA.

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

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

An early summary of UN IPCC fraud was given to Senator Wong and all Federal MP's on 16.12.09. It was provided again in paper for Senator Wong 02.02.10.

In March, 2008 I attended the First International Conference on Climate Change in New York, addressed by some of the world's most eminent climate scientists and environmentalists. Thereafter I continued exploring by reading thousands of pages of scientific books, papers and articles. Included in my reading were publications that in turn reference thousands more scientific publications. The paper document, entitled 'Thriving with Nature & Humanity' was first sent to Senator Wong electronically on December 16th, 2009. It provides a summary of global warming and climate alarm.

It's been very well received since its release on December 16th and continues generating many appreciative comments. It's spreading quickly on the net and has already been posted on many web sites in Australia and overseas including:

- <http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/nature-and-humanity.pdf> and
- http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/pdf/Thriving_with_nature_and_humanity.pdf.

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

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

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

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

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

Blatant exaggerations, gross errors and political interference typify UN IPCC reports

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

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

Echoing the statement of Dr Murari Lal above, eminent climate scientist John Christy²⁰, Lead Author of the UN IPCC's 2001 report claims, quote: "I was at the table with three Europeans, and we were having lunch. And they were talking about their role as lead authors. And they were talking about how they were trying to make the report so dramatic that the United States would just have to sign that Kyoto Protocol."

As discussed in 'Thriving', pages 10 and 11, politicisation of UN IPCC scientific reports has been blatant and frequent. Refer to evidence given to the UK Parliament Select Committee on Economic Affairs by Professor Reiter²¹ alleging politicisation of the UN IPCC process by activists who have no credible credentials.

Further evidence that the UN IPCC ignored critical comments from reviewers and that the review process is not open and transparent can be found at: <http://ross.mckitrick.googlepages.com/McKitrick.final.pdf>. This Canadian statistician highlights bias in the UN IPCC process, errors in the temperature record and low levels of UN IPCC understanding of computer model climate drivers. He summarises, quote: 'I could go on with other examples, but I hope by now to have justified my belief that the core writing team of the IPCC Report shares a single point of view, that its members are alert and pre-disposed towards evidence that confirms it, and they are unreceptive or openly hostile to evidence that contradicts it.'

This reference: http://www.climateaudit.info/pdf/McIntyre_Submission_to_EPA.pdf from pp 10 onwards, identifies common breaches by the UN IPCC of recognised specific peer review processes and guidelines.

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

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

The Medieval Warming Period appeared in the UN IPCC's own 1995 report and is scientifically accepted world-wide. 787 scientists (of 462 institutions in 42 nations)²² have written about Earth's global temperature being far higher (as much as 2 degrees C warmer) just

20 Alabama State Climatologist and University of Alabama in Huntsville
<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/5064/Manufactured-Science-Another-IPCC-Scientist-Reveals-How-UN-Scientists-talked-about-trying-to-make-IPCC-report-so-dramatic-that-US-would-just-have-to-sign-Kyoto-Protocol>

21 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/ldselect/ldeconaf/12/12we21.htm>

22 Britain's Lord Monckton during radio interview, Th.28.01.10

800 years ago. Yet without any substantiating data, the alarming temperature graph produced by Mann, Bradley and Hughes—on behalf of the UN IPCC—dismissed this scientific record. Thus, by adopting a graph from a junior ‘scientist’ having a minimal track record (Mann) and by avoiding peer review, the UN IPCC contradicted the scientifically accepted fact that global temperatures in the Medieval Warming Period were far higher than in Earth’s latest modest natural warming. Through frequent use of its fraudulent temperature graph in its 2001 report, the UN IPCC dismissed the Medieval Warming Period unilaterally with NO scientific proof.

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

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

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

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

Details and references are provided in ‘Thriving With Nature & Humanity’, page 9.

Both of Earth’s two accurate sets of global temperature records show no net warming since 1958

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

As shown by weather balloon measurements and later verified by satellite measurements, temperatures fell from 1958 to mid-1970’s, then rose to 1998 and then fell, returning to 1958 levels. Senator Wong has been repeatedly advised of this fact together with substantiating references. Professor Bob Carter provided material to Senator Wong’s team when he was supporting Senator Fielding. Carter provided further material in his submission to the 2009 Australian Senate Enquiry into the Draft CPRS Bill. He provided evidence yet again when he addressed members of parliament last year in a forum for MP’s that Senator Wong apparently declined to attend.

Contrary to UN IPCC predictions, satellites measuring 24 hours every day have found no tropospheric warming

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

Corruption of ground-based temperature records used by the UN IPCC

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

In their excellent report entitled 'Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception'²³, meteorologists Joe D'Aleo and Anthony Watts provide a succinct summary of this tampering. Their summary of conclusions is, quote:

1. Instrumental temperature data for the pre-satellite era (1850-1980) have been so widely, systematically, and unidirectionally tampered with that it cannot be credibly asserted there has been any significant 'global warming' in the 20th century.
2. All terrestrial surface-temperature databases exhibit very serious problems that render them useless for determining accurate long-term temperature trends.
3. All of the problems have skewed the data so as **greatly to overstate observed warming** both regionally and globally.
4. Global terrestrial temperature data are gravely compromised because more than three-quarters of the 6,000 stations that once existed are no longer reporting.
5. **There has been a severe bias towards removing higher-altitude, higher-latitude, and rural stations, leading to a further serious overstatement of warming.**
6. Contamination by urbanization, changes in land use, improper siting, and inadequately-calibrated instrument upgrades **further overstates warming.**
7. Numerous peer-reviewed papers in recent years have shown the **overstatement of observed longer term warming is 30-50%** from heat-island contamination alone.
8. Cherry-picking of observing sites combined with interpolation to vacant data grids may make **heat-island bias greater than 50% of 20th-century warming.**
9. In the oceans, data are missing and uncertainties are substantial. **Comprehensive coverage has only been available since 2003, and shows no warming.**
10. Satellite temperature monitoring has provided an alternative to terrestrial stations in compiling the global lower-troposphere temperature record. Their findings are increasingly diverging from the station-based constructions in a manner consistent with evidence of a warm bias in the surface temperature record.
11. **NOAA and NASA, along with CRU, were the driving forces behind the systematic hyping of 20th-century "global warming".**
12. **Changes have been made to alter the historical record to mask cyclical changes that could be readily explained by natural factors like multidecadal ocean and solar changes.**
13. **Global terrestrial data bases are seriously flawed and can no longer be trusted to assess climate trends or VALIDATE model forecasts.**
14. An inclusive external assessment is essential of the surface temperature record of CRU, GISS and NCDC "chaired and panelled by mutually agreed to climate scientists who do not have a vested interest in the outcome of the evaluations."
15. **Reliance on the global data by both the UN IPCC and the US GCRP/CCSP also requires a full investigation and audit.**

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

23 Reference: http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf [Accessed, January, 2010.]

Quotes from their report include:

“These graphs all use the raw GHCN*²⁴ (temperature) data, and they show virtually no trend in temperatures in Northern Australia in 125 years”. This confirms the work of the late Professor Lance Endersbee.

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

A simple graph²⁵ by Canadian statistician, Ross McKittrick puts this in picture form. His graph shows that when many stations were selectively and suddenly eliminated from world temperature records, reported global temperature immediately and instantly appeared to step up alarmingly to higher levels—in the 1990’s and 2000’s. A remarkably questionable concurrence.

Climate Research Unit (CRU), key source of UN IPCC temperature data, is corrupt

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

Christopher Pearson²⁶ details the initial refusal of people associated with the CRU’s temperature data to release data. Then after being pressed they released incomplete data such that their conclusions could not be checked. Then when pressed further, they claimed they could not find the data sought. Yet that data had been the very core of their key conclusions concerning the validity of the temperature data.

24 GHCN - Global Historical Climate Network

25 Wishart, I, 2009. Air Con—The Seriously Inconvenient Truth About Global Warming. Howling At The Moon Publishing, New Zealand, page 110. The graph is available on the internet at: http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/26664.pdf page 4

26 Christopher Pearson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.06.02.10, ‘Media cools on global warming’:
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/media-cools-on-global-warming/story-e6frg6zo-1225827002660>

USA's NASA and NOAA face claims of corruption. Both provide global temperature data to UN IPCC

CRU Climategate has now broadened to include serious allegations of unscientific and dishonest tampering of data at the USA's NOAA²⁷ and NASA, organisations that provided temperature data for the UN IPCC's reports.

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

UN IPCC's core claim on atmospheric CO2 levels was falsified

The UN IPCC's core claim of rising atmospheric CO2 levels was fabricated by omitting credible, accurate past measurements of atmospheric CO2. Those recordings contradict another false UN IPCC core claim—rapidly and abnormally rising atmospheric CO2 levels.

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

Note that the Nobel *Peace* Prize as awarded to Al Gore and the UN IPCC is awarded on the basis of a political process within the Norwegian parliament. Reassuringly though, Nobel prizes for physics and chemistry, are awarded by a scientific panel. Tellingly, the UN IPCC did not receive a Nobel Prize for science.

By excluding the earlier, reliable CO2 readings, the UN IPCC falsely claimed atmospheric CO2 levels were above those in the recent past. ie, current CO2 levels are below natural peak fluctuations during the last 180 years.

Details provided in 'Thriving', page 10

UN IPCC political summary reports presented to media and national governments contradicted UN IPCC scientists' reports

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

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

According to Lord Monckton²⁸, a UN IPCC scientist was asked by bureaucrats to change the report. He complied. The document was not re-circulated to peer review, nor to other scientists before it was published and given to the media. 'Thriving', page 10.

27 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

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

In its 2001 report the UN IPCC quantified the likelihood of its predictions of damaging warming caused by humans at 66%. There was no scientific derivation of this figure.²⁹

In its 2007 report the UN IPCC raised the likelihood to 90%. That decision was made by politicians and bureaucrats on a show of hands. That is not science.²⁸

Amazongate highlights UN IPCC's unfounded alarm over natural wonders and ecosystems

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

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

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

The IPCC has been put on the defensive as well over its claims that climate change may be increasing the severity and frequency of natural disasters such as hurricanes and floods.³⁰

Britain's Telegraph newspaper states, quote: "The claim in an IPCC report that 40 per cent of the Amazon rainforest could disappear through global warming turned out to be unfounded.

Dr North next uncovered 'Amazongate'. The IPCC made a prominent claim in its 2007 report, again citing the WWF as its authority, that climate change could endanger "up to 40 per cent" of the Amazon rainforest – as iconic to warmists as those Himalayan glaciers and polar bears. This WWF report, it turned out, was co-authored by Andy Rowell, an anti-smoking and food safety campaigner who has worked for WWF and Greenpeace, and contributed pieces to Britain's two most committed environmentalist newspapers. Rowell and his co-author claimed their findings were based on an article in Nature. But the focus of that piece, it emerges, was not global warming at all but the effects of logging.³¹

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

30 Jonathan Leake, The Australian newspaper, Mo.01.02.10 'More Flaws Emerge in Climate Alarms'

31 Amazongate: new evidence of the IPCC's failures—The IPCC is beginning to melt as global tempers rise, says Christopher Booker. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html> [Accessed, January 30, 2010]
Refer further to: <http://eureferendum.blogspot.com/2010/01/and-now-for-amazongate.html>

Student and hikers as source of UN IPCC's claims about mountain ice alarm

A news report on the ABC News web site³² on Mo.01.02.10 was headlined 'UN climate claims 'based on student essay'.

Hot on the heels of the UN IPCC's apology over the Himalayan scandal and its reassurances that the remainder of its 2007 report was of a high standard and had been peer reviewed, Britain's Sunday Telegraph³³ has exposed more unfounded claims of alarm by the UN IPCC covering three continents. Yet, this was not peer reviewed, quote: "In its most recent report, it stated that observed reductions in mountain ice in the Andes, Alps and Africa was being caused by global warming, citing two papers as the source of the information.

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

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

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

UN IPCC alarm over storms has been fabricated

It's not just Britain, Europe and Australia that's being startled. American mainstream media is at last waking to the UN IPCC. From ABC News³⁴ (America), quote: "At the IPCC report, the damage associated with such events "are very likely to increase due to increased frequencies and intensities of some extreme weather events" (italics in original). The report cites as evidence a study that supposedly demonstrates precisely this trend.

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

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

32 ABC News, 31.01.10, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/01/31/2805918.htm>

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

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

Unfounded claims of rapidly rising costs due to extreme weather

Christopher Pearson³⁵ reports that the UN IPCC had in its report said the world had, quote, ‘suffered rapidly rising costs due to extreme weather-related events since the 1970’s’, It ignored warnings from other scientists in the field, basing the findings on an unpublished paper that had not been subjected to routine scientific scrutiny. According to Pearson, when published, the paper cautioned, quote: “We find insufficient evidence to claim a statistical relationship between global temperature increase and catastrophic losses.”

The IPCC concocted false evidence on the increased likelihood of bad weather events as the planet has warmed. <http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2010/01/castles-built-on-sand.html> and <http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2010/01/what-tangled-web-we-weave.html>.

Unfounded predictions of devastating African agriculture

Christopher Pearson reports, quote: ‘The IPCC report also warned that global warming could devastate African agriculture. This was on the strength of non-peer-reviewed, non-scientific research from a sustainability lobby group. Combined with the claims on extreme weather events, it underpinned the claims for \$100 billion for African nations from First World countries at Copenhagen’³⁴

Unfounded claims on coastal activity in South America

Christopher Pearson reports, quote: ‘The IPCC report also cited what’s politely termed advocacy research from the WWF as sole authority for findings on coastal developments in Latin America. A WWF report and a conference paper delivered in 2002 but still not published as the only citations for findings on mud flows and avalanches linked to melting glaciers’³⁴

Unfounded exaggeration of risks to Australian climate

Christopher Pearson discusses scientists in England being contacted by a representative of WWF with the aim of exaggerating the risks to Australian climate³⁴. Please refer to the next point that includes the Stern Review’s falsities about Australian risks, since quietly withdrawn.

Unfounded alarm contradicted by eminent scientists—experts in their field

In his book entitled ‘The Deniers’³⁶, one of Canada’s most respected environmentalists, Lawrence Solomon reveals that in topics including sea level, polar ice caps, glaciers, storms, diseases, atmospheric CO2 levels, temperature, sun, atmospheric CO2 levels and ice cores he interviewed at least one top scientist, and usually more from each field. These included UN IPCC scientists. They consistently contradict UN IPCC claims.

Along the way Solomon found there is no scientific consensus supporting the UN IPCC. Scientists noted that more scientists disagreed with the UN IPCC’s conclusions and claims than agreed. Scientists revealed shoddy UN IPCC processes including suppression of scientists who disagreed with the UN IPCC’s seemingly predetermined outcomes, biased processes and use of non-experts and non-scientists including activists passed off as experts.

35 Christopher Pearson, The Weekend Australian, Sa.30, 2010, ‘Don’t trust the weatherman’s forecasts’. As above <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/dont-trust-the-weathermans-forecasts/story-e6frg6zo-1225824634542>

36 Solomon, L, 2008. ‘The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so’. Richard Vigilante Books, USA

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

New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart³⁷ similarly exposes glaring UN IPCC falsities, unfounded claims for alarm and absurdities. These include the UN IPCC Chairman's major falsities, repeated in public after he had been advised his statements were false.

As an aside, Solomon's interviews of eminent scientists and economists reveals the British government's Stern Review contains unfounded exaggerations. These indicate the Stern Review, like UN IPCC reports, is unfounded and aimed at promoting unfounded alarm to achieve a political agenda. The Stern Review Report released on October 30th, 2006 was used to propel climate alarm in Australia.

Separately, an independent expert group of scientists, statisticians and economists (including former British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Lawson) completely and soundly discredited the Stern Review³⁸ soon after its release. The critique showed basic assumptions and data used by Stern were unsupported and wildly exaggerated to create alarming unfounded outcomes.

The Stern Review has recently returned to the headlines. Richard Gray, in *The Sunday Telegraph*³⁹ reports, Su.31.01.10, quote: "Information was quietly removed from an influential government report on the cost of climate change after its initial publication because supporting scientific evidence could not be found.

The Stern Review on the economics of climate change, which was commissioned by the Treasury, was greeted with headlines world-wide when it was published in October 2006.

It contained dire predictions about climate change impacts in different parts of the world.

But it can be revealed that when the report was printed by Cambridge University Press in January 2007, some of these predictions had been watered down because the scientific evidence on which they were based could not be verified.

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

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

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

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

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

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

37 Wishart, I, 2009. *Air Con - The Seriously Inconvenient Truth About Global Warming*. Howling At The Moon Publishing, New Zealand.

38 <http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/World%20Economics%20-%20Stern%20Review,%20Part%201.pdf> and, <http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/WE%20Riposte%20to%20Critique.pdf>

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

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

Jonathan Leake, *The Sunday Times*⁴⁰, Su.31.01.10, quote: “Lord Stern’s report on climate change, which underpins government policy, has come under fire from a disaster analyst who says the research he contributed was misused.

Robert Muir-Wood, head of research at Risk Management Solutions, a US-based consultancy, said the Stern report misquoted his work to suggest a firm link between global warming and the frequency and severity of disasters such as floods and hurricanes.

The Stern report, citing Muir-Wood, said: “New analysis based on insurance industry data has shown that weather-related catastrophe losses have increased by 2% each year since the 1970s over and above changes in wealth, inflation and population growth/movement.

“If this trend continued or intensified with rising global temperatures, losses from extreme weather could reach 0.5%-1% of world GDP by the middle of the century.”

Muir-Wood said his research showed no such thing and accused Stern of “going far beyond what was an acceptable extrapolation of the evidence”.

The criticism is among the strongest made of the Stern report, which, since its publication in 2006, has influenced policy, including green taxes.”

Unfounded deliberate hurricane panic contradicting science

Hurricane/cyclone expert Professor Chris Landsea, a Contributing Editor for the UN IPCC’s second major report (1995) and its Third Assessment Report in 2001 was invited to participate in the UN IPCC’s latest report (2007). Yet, according to Solomon⁴¹, another UN IPCC scientist Kevin Trenberth, with the support of UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri, made false public statements of increasing hurricane activity that knowingly contradicted the scientific evidence. The statements triggered unfounded alarm. Solomon, page 30.

It appears the wording of the public release could have been deliberately alarming yet cleverly not specific. The effect though in the media was alarming.

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

Landsea resigned from the UN IPCC because it was corrupting science. Landsea saw back in 2004 that the UN IPCC’s science was problematic and had the courage to say so. Solomon, page 34.⁴²

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

Unfounded alarm over disease contradicts science

Paul Reiter, arguably the world’s most eminent scientist on insect-borne diseases and a member of the UN IPCC has condemned the UN IPCC’s practices as unscientific and dishonest. Solomon’s interviews of Reiter (pages 183-190)⁴⁰ expose disturbing behaviour by the UN IPCC. The UN IPCC’s alarming claims about mosquito borne disease were unfounded.

40 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7009710.ece>

41 Solomon, L, 2008. ‘The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so’. Richard Vigilante Books, USA

42 Letter of resignation by Dr Chris Landsea alleging politicisation of the IPCC process by activist scientists <http://www.climatechangeffects.info/ClimateChangeDocuments/LandseaResignationLetterFromIPCC.htm>

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

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

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

Reiter: “The paucity of information” in the IPCC reports “was hardly surprising: not one of the lead authors had ever written a research paper on the subject. Moreover, two of the authors, both physicians, had spent their entire careers as environmental activists. One of these activists has published ‘professional’ articles as an ‘expert’ on 32 different subjects, ranging from mercury poisoning to land mines, globalisation, to allergies, and West Nile virus to AIDS”.

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

Unfounded alarm in UN IPCC reports was often inserted by activists, not scientists

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

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

Unfounded alarm about the Barrier Reef

Brave scientists and dive operators have, in recent months, been reported in The Australian newspaper as speaking out by saying the reef is in fine health.⁴³

Now there is growing scepticism about unfounded gloomy alarm. Parts of the Great Barrier Reef have bleached in previous summers and in record cold temperatures during the winter of 2008. Scientific reports and observations show that bleaching is an entirely normal adjustment by the coral to natural weather variations.

Lord Monckton confirms this to be correct.⁴⁴

On the subject of reefs, Britain’s Sunday Telegraph⁴⁵ newspaper reports, quote: “It can be revealed that the IPCC report made use of 16 non-peer reviewed WWF reports.

One claim, which stated that coral reefs near mangrove forests contained up to 25 times more fish numbers than those without mangroves nearby, quoted a feature article on the WWF website.”

43 Jamie Walker, We.03.02.10, ‘Report undercuts Kevin Rudd’s Great Barrier Reef wipeout’, The Australian newspaper. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/report-undercuts-kevin-rudds-great-barrier-reef-wipeout/story-e6frg6nf-1225826128644>

44 Monckton - material used in American presentation, October, 2009

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

Unfounded alarm about human food production

Quoting from Dr RW Bradnock⁴⁶, former editor (1994-1995) of the Geographical Journal):

“I know that many of the claims about the impact of ‘global warming’ in Bangladesh, for example, are completely unfounded. There is no evidence that flooding has increased at all in recent years. Drought and excessive rainfall are the nature of the monsoon system. Agricultural production, far from being decimated by worsening floods over the last twenty years, has nearly doubled. In the early 1990s, Houghton published a map of the purported effects of sea-level rise on Bangladesh. Coming from a Fellow of the Royal Society, former Head of the Met Office and Chair of the IPCC, this was widely accepted, and frequently reproduced. Yet, it shows no understanding of the complex processes that form the Bengal delta, and it is seriously misleading. Moreover, despite the repeated claims of the World Wide Fund, Greenpeace, and, sadly, Christian Aid, the melting of the Himalayan glaciers is of completely marginal significance to the farmers of the plains in China, India, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. One could go on!”

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

UN IPCC cites press article on rotting food and cold showers, etc after heatwave

Refer to <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/02/02/gate-du-jour-ipcc-ar4-references-nyt-story/> showing the UN IPCC report cited a newspaper article, apparently not peer reviewed. The article is: <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/07/08/nyregion/aftermath-heat-wave-neighborhoods-cold-showers-rotting-food-then-lights-then.html?pagewanted=1>

Unfounded alarm about sea levels

Canadian environmentalist, Lawrence Solomon⁴⁷, ‘IPCC Beyond the Himalayas’, writes, quote: “Sea-levels: This week, the Dutch Environmental Assessment Agency revealed that the IPCC blundered in its 2007 report in claiming that 55% of the Netherlands lay below sea-level. IPCC scientists who were evidently out of their depth had added the area of the Netherlands below sea-level to the area susceptible to flooding, not realising that these areas overlap. To the embarrassment of the Dutch Environment Minister, her department then based Dutch environmental policy on the IPCC’s mangled stats of her country. The correct stat: 20% of The Netherlands is susceptible to flooding should global warming cause sea levels to rise.”

For generations, the Dutch have managed their low-lying land. That fact seems to be seen by the UN IPCC as a source of alarm. Yet in reality it confirms human ability to successfully adapt to an ever-changing Earth. It provides hope in managing natural climate change.

That the UN IPCC can even fabricate alarm out of alarm’s antidote—hope—displays the UN IPCC’s skills in fabricating unfounded alarm.

Refer to ‘Thriving’, page 26, and to comments attributed to Rhodes Fairbridge⁴⁸, below.

46 http://web.mac.com/sinfonia1/Global_Warming_Politics/A_Hot_Topic_Blog/Entries/2008/6/9_Guest_Essay:_A_Christian_Critique.html

47 Lawrence Solomon,
<http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2010/02/06/lawrence-solomon-ipcc-beyond-the-himalayas.aspx>

48 Solomon, L, 2008. ‘The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so’. Richard Vigilante Books, USA

Unfounded UN IPCC alarm propagates other unfounded alarm

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

Zero scientific evidence for catastrophes

Lord Monckton references Schulte, 2008 in stating of the “539 global climate change papers”, “evidence for catastrophe was presented by 0”. None.⁴⁹

Senator Wong, referring again to your quote in the ABC News report, clearly it is the UN IPCC that will, and does, jump on anything in order to justify their position.

More than 20 cases of unsubstantiated UN IPCC alarm in the UN IPCC's report were based on activists' claims unsubstantiated by peer review—with more dubious claims and attributions throughout the report

From the Telegraph⁵⁰ comes this, quote: “A Canadian analyst has identified more than 20 passages in the IPCC's report which cite similarly non-peer-reviewed WWF or Greenpeace reports as their authority, and other researchers have been uncovering a host of similarly dubious claims and attributions all through the report. These range from groundless allegations about the increased frequency of “extreme weather events” such as hurricanes, droughts and heatwaves, to a headline claim that global warming would put billions of people at the mercy of water shortages – when the study cited as its authority indicated exactly the opposite, that rising temperatures could increase the supply of water.”

From The Sunday Telegraph⁵¹ newspaper, Britain, quote: “It can be revealed that the IPCC report made use of 16 non-peer reviewed WWF reports.”

UN IPCC does not work for national governments - it works for its UNEP agenda

From the same American mainstream media source cited previously, ABC Network⁵² quote: “when the IPCC recently set up a special working group to address natural disasters, the US government nominated ecologist Pielke. The IPCC declined to appoint him.”

Yet the UN IPCC claims to serve governments.

There is a significant number of credible scientists who have resigned from the UN IPCC in disgust at the UN IPCC's politicisation of 'science' and/or who have spoken out publicly condemning the UN IPCC as unscientific. It is clear the UN IPCC does not follow its own protocols for appointing scientists to its panel. 'Thriving', page 11.

49 Monckton - material used in American presentation, October, 2009

50 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html> [Accessed, January 30, 2010]

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

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

Note the substantial and solid work of John McLean⁵³ reveals much systemic corruption in the UN IPCC since its inception in 1988:

It is an indictment of Senator Wong that when Senator Steve Fielding asked her simple, basic questions on climate, Senator Wong and her advisers could not provide scientific proof - they have no proof humans caused global warming

One of Senator Wong's responses to Senator Fielding's questions apparently included the statement that ocean temperatures are rising. That is not correct. Scientists⁵⁴ accompanying Senator Fielding pointed out that Argo measurements show oceans appear to be cooling.

Lead Author and Editing Reviewer of UN IPCC Chapter claiming human causation of warming has no scientifically measured real-world evidence humans caused global warming

In recent months I have been corresponding via e-mail with Professor David Karoly. David is one of the close knit group of authors and reviewers of the UN IPCC's single chapter attributing global warming to human production of CO₂ in each of its 2001 and 2007 reports. David was a Lead Author of the 2001 report's chapter and a Review Editor of the 2007 report's chapter which built on the 2001 report's chapter.

Late last year, I asked David for scientifically measured real-world proof that human production of CO₂ caused global warming. He has not provided any proof - because there is none.

Senate parliamentary records dated June 18, 2009 reveal David Karoly received \$1.9 million in grants from the federal government to research climate change. The Project Title of his grant is, 'Improving understanding of climate change and its impacts in Australia through detection and attribution of climate change.' Despite the UN IPCC's inferences of thorough, proper scientific research by 4,000 scientists and despite billions spent by governments worldwide there is no proof. Despite millions spent by Senator Wong's government, the UN IPCC Lead Author and Review Editor of the chapter attributing global warming to human causes has no proof.

The total of grants awarded by the government to the University of Melbourne is many millions of dollars. An exact figure is difficult to determine because such grants can be found under various grants from various government departments. Totalling those listed in the Senate on June 18th, 2009 produces \$7,140, 360.

Other institutions have been formed specifically by universities to secure grants for climate change 'research.' At the time of its formation, for example, the University of NSW's then Vice-Chancellor said the UNSW's Climate Change Research Centre was established specifically to target funding in this flourishing industry reliant on government grants.

-
- 53 McLean, J, 2009b. Climate Science Corrupted: How the IPCC's sponsor, the UNEP, and key IPCC individuals have misled governments into supporting the notion of manmade warming. Science & Public Policy Institute. http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate_science_corrupted.html [Accessed: December, 2009]
- 54 Bob Carter, David Evans, Stewart Franks, William Kininmonth, August 11, 2009. Minister Wong's Reply to Senator Fielding's Three Questions on Climate Change - Due Diligence <http://joannenova.com.au/globalwarming/wong-fielding/7-carter-evans-franks-kininmonth-due-diligence-on-wong.pdf> and David Evans, June 17, 2009. The Wong-Fielding Meeting on Global Warming <http://joannenova.com.au/?p=2292&preview=true> and David Evans, July 24, 2009. Ocean Warming: The new Bluff in Climate Alarmism <http://sciencespeak.com/NoOceanWarming.pdf>

Yet no one has found any scientifically measured, real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused global warming. That's because Nature has clearly demonstrated that increasing atmospheric CO2 levels do not warm the planet. Remember, after one removes tampering of ground-based temperature records used by the UN IPCC, there has been no net global warming in the records covering the period from 1890 to the present.

Data obtained from the UN IPCC itself exposes UN IPCC processes as unscientific

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

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

The charter is significant. It means the UN IPCC is not seeking to fully understand natural causes of warming. A logical extension of the charter is that failure by UN IPCC bureaucrats to find evidence of human causation would mean the body has no future - and thus bureaucrats would be out of a job. Thus the UN IPCC has to either find proof (none exists) or go out of business. Another alternative to preserve employment of bureaucrats, politicians and scientists, of course, is to consciously or unconsciously fabricate perceptions of human causation, magnified by fear and guilt to drive alarm and provide political pressure.

Although UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri repeatedly implied 4,000 scientists endorse the UN IPCC's core claim that human CO2 warmed Earth, only five (5) endorsed the claim. There's doubt they were even scientists. The Prime Minister has assisted the UN IPCC in spreading this falsity

See 'Thriving', page 11 and McLean's five references previously cited. In correspondence with Mr Rudd (Th.18.09.08, We.10.12.08, Tu.26.05.09 and many subsequent related emails and paper letters) including the provision of McLean's papers, Mr Rudd was advised of his error. To my knowledge, he has made no retraction.

In absence of sound, scientific data, the UN IPCC creatively conjured erroneous models to fabricate 'data'

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

As noted above, these have not only failed, they are not based on sound understanding of science. Additionally, they omit known major natural drivers of climate - deliberately and inexplicably. See 'Thriving', page 12.

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

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

UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri's apparent conflicts of financial interest are public knowledge - and seemingly hugely significant

Britain's Lord Monckton⁵⁵ advises that UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri and former UN IPCC Working Group Chairman John Houghton are under criminal investigation in Britain for filing false accounts as trustees of an organisation associated with climate research. Lord Monckton claims "very serious financial irregularities" by profiteers running the UN IPCC.

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

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

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

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

Lord Monckton highlights major, glaring errors in Pachauri's public presentations at: http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri_letter.pdf

Outstanding books by Wishart⁵⁶ (eg, pages 118, 119) and Solomon⁵⁷ raise Pachauri's falsities and unfounded alarmism. Refer to References listed in 'Thriving' (page 53) and separately above. It is clear from Wishart's account that Pachauri knowingly continues to speak falsities even after being made aware that his statements are false.

According to The Times⁵⁸ (newspaper) on line, UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri was advised of the Himalayan glacier revelation before December's Copenhagen conference. Yet he apparently failed to disclose it.

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

UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri is a director of the TERI organisation. Britain's Sunday Times⁵⁹ says TERI obtained a 310,000 pound grant from New York's Carnegie Corporation and 'the lion's share of a 2.5 million pound grant funded by European taxpayers', quote:

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

55 http://www.2gb.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=6295&Itemid=134

56 Wishart, I, 2009. Air Con—The Seriously Inconvenient Truth About Global Warming. Howling At The Moon Publishing, New Zealand, page 110. The graph is available on the internet at: http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/26664.pdf page 4

57 Solomon, L, 2008. 'The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so'. Richard Vigilante Books, USA

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

59 Jonathon Leake, The Sunday Times, Su.24.01.10, 'UN climate chief Rajendra Pachauri "got grants through bogus claim"' <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6999975.ece>

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

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

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

Pachauri’s directorships⁶⁰ are reportedly many and diverse. They include, for example, India’s Oil and Natural Gas Corporation, The Energy and Resources Institute (TERI) formerly the Tata Energy Research Institute, Toyota and many others including, quote: ‘a long list of fossil fuel, alternative energy, and research organisations as well as venture capital companies involved in carbon trading’. Quote: ‘Pachauri is a co-founder of the Texas-based GloriOil, which specialises in technology allowing the last remaining reserves to be extracted from oilfields.’

Reports of Pachauri’s conflicts of interest stem from financial interests and the association of awards and consulting contracts to or between various agencies/companies and TERI. Reports include comments about his and TERI’s associations with oil and gas companies.

According to Amanda Hodge, in The Weekend Australian, Sa.06.02.10, quote: ‘Indian civil liberties lawyer Prashant Bhushan says he is concerned TERI has “various kinds of conflicts of interest and therefore the head of TERI would not be the right person to head the IPCC”’

Although there have recently been many calls for Pachauri’s resignation it is doubtful his resignation would cause a change since the UN IPCC’s unscientific ways and reliance on falsities preceded his appointment. Recent revelations appear typical of UN IPCC fabrications of alarm and bogus science that predate its formation. They seem typical of UNEP, one of two organisations that founded the UN IPCC. Indeed, according to McLean’s history⁶¹ of the UN IPCC, the UN IPCC merely adopted and extended methods in use by the UNEP.

The web site⁶² of Senator Wong’s Department of Climate Change lists grants of taxpayer funds given by her department. They include a grant to TERI entitled ‘Influencing International Climate Change’ for the purpose of ‘Sponsorship of the 2009 Delhi Sustainable Development Summit’. The grant was approved on December 11th, 2008.

The Prime Minister awarded a grant⁶³ of one million dollars to TERI. The grant was for ‘Technical Cooperation in Renewable Energy’.

Concurrently TERI’s director, Rajendra Pachauri simultaneously exploits oil and natural gas, carbon trading and alternative energy while being on the boards of many companies and institutes and leading and protecting the UN IPCC’s bogus climate alarm claims.

“If the IPCC wasn’t there, why would anyone be worried about climate change?” Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the UN IPCC, Science, February 5, 2010.⁶⁴

60 Amanda Hodge, The Weekend Australian, Sa.06.02.10, ‘Green warrior battles conflict-of-interest charge’

61 McLean, J, 2009. Climate Science Corrupted: How the IPCC’s Sponsor, the UNEP, and key individuals have misled governments into supporting the notion of manmade global warming. Science & Public Policy Institute.
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate_science_corrupted.html

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

63 http://globalsolartechology.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=4495&Itemid=9

64 The Week That Was, February 05, 2010 via <http://www.sepp.org>

The UN IPCC and its executive have thwarted and discredited real scientific research stifling real science and progress

From his book interviewing the world's leading experts in each field of climate science, Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon⁶⁵ provides examples of how UN IPCC actions and statements have held back the progress of real science. eg, page 145, 160.

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

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

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

UN IPCC senior members have repeatedly justified the use of unfounded alarm

- Former UN IPCC Working Group Chairman, John Houghton, quote: “Unless we announce disasters, no one will listen.”
 - Stephen Schneider, quote: “We have to offer up scary scenarios.”
- And other advocates of alarm including:
- Stephen Guilbeault, Greenpeace, 2005, quote: “Global warming can mean colder. That's what we're dealing with”

In Australia, Professor David Karoly made a public statement broadcast on Monday, November 9th, 2009 claiming that each year there are no scientific papers published that 'seriously contradict the conclusions of the IPCC.' This is false. His statement seems to be aimed at reinforcing the myth that there is a consensus of scientists supporting the notion that human production of CO₂ was responsible for Earth's latest modest global warming that ended around 1998.

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

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

⁶⁵ Solomon, L, 2008. 'The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so'. Richard Vigilante Books, USA

Deviation of funds to a non-problem (natural global warming) prevents addressing real humanitarian and environmental challenges. The focus on natural global warming is a damaging attack on the environment

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

Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon puts it into perspective on page 210 of his book entitled: "The Deniers"⁶⁶ when he says, quote: "But Kyoto is not an insurance policy. Just the opposite, it is the single greatest threat today to the global environment, because it makes carbon into currency. Carbon is the element upon which all living things are built. With carbon a kind of currency—which is what all carbon taxes and carbon trading and similar schemes do—all ecosystems suddenly have a commercial value that makes them subject to manipulation for gain."

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

'Carbon markets' are not free and open. They are not true markets. Carbon trading is a scheme of regulated and controlled activities highly vulnerable to manipulation and rorting. The scheme is camouflaged by the term "market". Simply considering the product offered in the 'market' and the buyers' needs reveals it is really not a market.

Secondly, serious damage to the environment from adopting UN IPCC advice becomes obvious from reading 'Thriving' ages 30 and 31. This explains how smashing energy efficiency has severe environmental and humanitarian consequences.

Thirdly, the UN IPCC's unfounded and demonstrably fraudulent 'global warming' scare diverts valuable attention and resources away from real environmental and humanitarian challenges.

For example, federal MP's waste time and energy toying with an emissions trading scheme (ETS) and regulation of CO₂ while neither can have any impact on climate and both do serious damage. Significantly such diversions erode public faith in parliament and render politicians' claims to be protecting the environment as nonsense. 'Thriving', pages 48 to 50

66 Solomon, L, 2008. 'The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so'. Richard Vigilante Books, USA

The Garnaut Review is based on UN IPCC reports

Refer to chapter 2⁶⁷ of the Garnaut Review report, a key plank in the government's claim for its CPRS. The Garnaut Review we find relies on 'science' provided by UN IPCC reports. As stated at the start of its chapter 2 'Understanding Climate Science', quote: "This chapter draws extensively on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change". This is the report that is now exposed as unscientific and highly dubious.

It seems that for the government, it is the CPRS that matters, not CO2

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

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

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

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

67 http://www.garnautreview.org.au/pdf/Garnaut_Chapter2.pdf

Senator Wong: have you caught the UN IPCC disease of creating unfounded alarm?

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

Reputable scientists, including UN IPCC scientists show there is no increase in rate of natural sea level rise due to human production of CO₂. Indeed, scientific measurements show no rise in sea levels in recent years. Sea levels have been and remain stable⁶⁸. ('Thriving', page 26. Note particularly references listed atop 'Thriving' page 53, especially Solomon, Wishart and Singer NIPCC.)

The late climate expert Rhodes Fairbridge⁶⁹ proved sea levels have changed several times within the last 1,000 years and by as much as 2 metres up and down. Among many factors, it appears sea level is, affected by:

- solar system and solar deviations that appear to be cyclic;
- quantity of water in the oceans (affected by snowfall and polar ice accumulation);
- temperature of water in oceans;
- land subsidence, particularly significant for islands.

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

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

Senator Wong misrepresenting science and climate to her own party

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

Please refer to my detailed response to Senator Wong's response. My reply to Senator Furner highlighting Senator Wong's misrepresentations was electronically mailed on November 13th to all MP's including Senator Wong. It was posted in paper form to the Attorney General and to Queensland Senator Claire Moore.

The vast majority of people inherently care for the environment, yet Senator Wong sees the need to foment unfounded guilt and fear

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

68 Ollier, Cliff, 2009. 'Sea Level in the Southwest Pacific is Stable'. New Concepts in Global Tectonics Newsletter, No. 51, June, 2009.

69 Solomon, L, 2008. 'The Deniers: The World-renowned scientists who stood up against global warming hysteria, political persecution and fraud And those who are fearful to do so'. Richard Vigilante Books, USA.

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

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

We share the following with all living things:

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

The UN IPCC's core greenhouse gas effect 'theory' contradicts the laws of physics and nature - it's not even a theory, not even a supposition. It's a falsity

Consider these established facts and laws:

1. The First Law of Thermodynamics says energy cannot be created or destroyed, merely converted in form;
2. The Second law of Thermodynamics says heat transfer occurs only from warmer to colder bodies, not from colder to warmer bodies. (Heat cannot of itself move from a colder to a warmer body);
3. There are three means by which heat is transferred: conduction, convection and radiation;
4. Gases do not trap heat in the open atmosphere. Remember, in confined spaces air acts as an excellent insulator. That's why it's used in double pane glass. Yet, when moving in the open atmosphere, gases provide excellent heat transfer through conduction from surfaces to air molecules. This enables operation of air-cooled motors and, through the wind chill factor, causes windy winter days to feel colder than still days of the same temperature. When air is warmed it rises. When it reaches the upper atmosphere its density becomes sufficiently low to allow the radiation to escape to space. (As an aside, if the concentration of gases in the atmosphere that more readily absorb radiative heat increases, their absorption and re-radiation of heat actually help cool the Earth by radiating heat more quickly away from Earth);
5. Lindzen and Choi⁷⁰, in their peer reviewed 2009 paper entitled "On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data" report real-world scientific measurements of radiative feedback (from air in the atmosphere). These scientifically measured real-world findings seriously contradict a core assumption of UN IPCC climate modelers. (Note: Lindzen and Choi do not discuss the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas theory and restrict their comments to the UN IPCC's computer models.) The findings would appear to support the classical physics I outline;
6. Heat transferred from Earth's surface to the atmosphere by conduction at their interface is transported primarily by convection to the upper atmosphere and then by radiation to space. That is common-sense confirmed by any glider pilot reliant on using thermals to climb in elevation;

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

7. In 1909, physicist RW Wood proved that reradiation of heat-rays by glass panels does not cause a greenhouse to become warmer as Al Gore and the UN IPCC falsely claim. In 100 years of peer review since, his simple, replicable, scientific experiment has never been contradicted. It is common-sense. If glass is removed from the ends of a greenhouse, the greenhouse loses its ability to stay warm. The warming in a greenhouse is not due to the roof glass, it is due to the prevention of cooler air from entering and the prevention of warmer air from leaving. The air within the greenhouse is warmed primarily by contact with the greenhouse floor heated by sunlight.

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

- contradicts the First Law of Thermodynamics. According to the UN IPCC, re-radiation of heat from the tropospheric CO₂ molecules produced by humans radiates increased heat to Earth which warms Earth's surface causing Earth to radiate more heat which further heats the troposphere causing more heat to radiate back to Earth and so on. This is an infinite heat generating phenomenon. This is impossible yet is purported by the UN IPCC. Nature and physics say it cannot happen. Nature and physics show it does not happen;
- contradicts the Second Law of Thermodynamics in that the troposphere at 10,000 feet elevation is 20 degrees C cooler than Earth's surface yet the UN IPCC claims it warms Earth's surface. Nature and physics say it cannot happen. Nature and physics show it does not happen;
- relies on tropospheric CO₂ molecules to have intelligence in radiating heat only downward toward Earth. This is not possible and contradicts Nature because molecules radiate heat in all directions. Nature and physics say it cannot happen. Nature and physics show it does not happen.
- contradicts the way an actual greenhouse works. Greenhouses depend not on re-radiation from glass panels, they depend on stopping cooling air from entering the closed glasshouse. They prevent convection;
- contradicts Nature because Earth's atmosphere does not operate as a greenhouse. Heat transfer occurs primarily through conduction at Earth's surface, then convection toward space. The overwhelming heat transfer is by convection from Earth's surface to cooler space.

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

By absorbing Earth's heat and reradiating it out to space, any gases with greater ability to absorb heat would cool the Earth. Increased quantities of tropospheric CO₂ would likely reduce Earth's temperature or at worst have no warming effect.

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

In reality, as Lindzen & Choi⁷¹ show in their recent peer-reviewed paper, increased quantities of CO₂ will increase the rate of heat radiated from the upper troposphere-stratosphere into space. This is the opposite of that claimed by UN IPCC climate models relying on faulty logic

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

and theory that contradicts Nature and laws of physics. Those models are the only remaining 'basis' of the UN IPCC's core claim that human production of CO₂ is catastrophically warming Earth. During the last ten years, these models' projections have been in gross error since global temperatures fell yet the models predicted Earth's temperatures would rise. Thus the 'models' failed to even predict the direction of temperature change, much less the amount.

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

Norm Kalmanovitch's statement⁷² that, quote: "The forcing parameter of the climate models is just a contrived number that has no physical basis" supports the notion that there is no foundation for the computer models relied upon by the UN IPCC.

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

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

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

Regular seasonal variation of atmospheric CO₂ levels shows that nature controls CO₂ levels and that human production of CO₂ cannot cause global warming

The Earth's soils, near-surface rocks, oceans and biomass contain 100,000 times the carbon contained in Earth's atmosphere. The Earth's oceans contain, as dissolved CO₂, 50 times the CO₂ contained in earth's atmosphere. CO₂'s solubility in water decreases as water temperature increases. 71% of the Earth's surface is ocean. Most of that ocean is in the southern hemisphere.

According to UN IPCC figures, annually humans produce around 23 billion tonnes of CO₂. Annually Nature produces a whopping 770 billion tonnes. Thus humans produce just 3% of Earth's annual CO₂ production. Thus Nature overwhelmingly controls production of CO₂.

Atmospheric CO₂ levels are seasonal, cyclical. During the southern hemisphere summer, ocean surface waters warm and release huge quantities of dissolved CO₂ into the atmosphere to raise global atmospheric CO₂ levels. During the southern hemisphere winter, ocean surface waters cool and absorb huge quantities of CO₂ from the atmosphere. Thus, even though humans continue producing CO₂, Nature more than compensates and reduces atmospheric CO₂ levels. Thus Nature entirely controls the reabsorption of CO₂ from the atmosphere. The atmosphere is in robust, dynamic balance with the oceans and other CO₂ sinks through Henry's (gas) Law and through Nature maintaining natural equilibrium.

Why? Because Nature naturally seeks to maintain Earth in equilibrium. Nature has not watched Al Gore's movie - she does not have 'tipping points'. Instead, she has natural balancing mechanisms that return atmospheric CO₂ levels to equilibrium. These equilibrium levels are

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

themselves part of Nature's overall mechanisms for maintaining equilibrium through natural, inherent variation in thousands, perhaps millions, of natural factors.

Controlling almost all production of CO2 and all reabsorption of CO2, Nature controls and determines atmospheric CO2 levels.

Scientific studies point to residence time for atmospheric CO2 within the range 2-18 years, with many papers concluding 5-7 years. Some recent scientific studies show residence time is 12 months. That is, within 5-7 years or possibly within 12 months of CO2 being produced (whether by Nature or by humans) it is removed from the atmosphere. That is part of the carbon cycle that is essential for all life on earth. Many natural factors affect atmospheric CO2 levels. When these factors change it can lead to new atmospheric CO2 levels. eg, ocean temperatures have a large controlling effect on atmospheric CO2 levels and the ongoing increase of temperature from the Little Ice Age has likely caused more ocean outgassing than can be absorbed by increased vegetation. The Little Ice Age's third minimum started to end around 1850. Earth's temperature currently remains below Earth's average for the last 3,000 years. 'Thriving', page 19.

Using the above figures, and thinking in layman's terms, in every 85,800 molecules of air, 33 are CO2. Of those just one is produced by humans. That the UN IPCC and Al Gore claim that one (1) molecule of CO2 in 85,800 molecules of air catastrophically warms the planet is nonsense. That the UN IPCC and Al Gore claim that one (1) molecule of human CO2 causes catastrophic warming while the remaining 32 molecules of Nature's identical CO2 do not is insanity.

Copenhagen contortions were due primarily to there being no scientifically measured real-world data that humans caused global warming—none

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

The fact there is no scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused Earth's modest global warming that ended around 1998 says it all. If there was any such evidence that showed Earth or humanity had a real problem that evidence would have been prominently displayed. Evidence would have driven concerted, unified action world-wide. That there wasn't any concerted, united action simply confirms no nation has evidence that human CO2 warmed our planet.

If the UN IPCC was a company, it would be charged with fraud

In summary:

- UN IPCC reports are not scientifically prepared and do contradict science;
- Many claims of the UN IPCC are false and based on fabrications;
- UN IPCC summary reports are designed to influence policy and are fed to national governments and the media. In writing these influential reports, politicians and bureaucrats contradicted and overruled scientific advice and duped the people;
- The lack of any true and effective peer review process and the unjustified dismissal of well-founded dissenting comments demonstrate UN IPCC reports were written to a predetermined aim to ensure a predetermined political outcome;
- There is no scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO₂ caused global warming;
- Very few scientists support the UN IPCC's core claim that human activity warmed the planet and a huge number world-wide oppose the UN IPCC's core claim;
- Many UN IPCC claims are unscientific and generated by uninformed and unscientific activists pursuing their own agenda bypassing peer review;
- The UN IPCC ignores natural causes of global warming;

The Indian Government has had enough—it will not rely on the UN IPCC and has formed it's own scientific body to assess climate

Quote: “The Indian government⁷³ has established its own body to monitor the effects of global warming because it “cannot rely” on the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the group headed by its own leading scientist Dr R.K Pachauri.”

Quote: “He (Dr Ramesh, the Indian Environment Minister) announced the Indian government will establish a separate National Institute of Himalayan Glaciology to monitor the effects of climate change on the world’s ‘third ice cap’, and an ‘Indian IPCC’ to use ‘climate science’ to assess the impact of global warming throughout the country.”

Quoting Mr Ramesh, the article states: “There is a fine line between climate science and climate evangelism. I am for climate science. I think people misused [the] IPCC report, [the] IPCC doesn’t do the original research which is one of the weaknesses... they just take published literature and then they derive assessments, so we had goof-ups on Amazon forest, glaciers, snow peaks.”

Mr Ramesh said, quote: “India is a very large country and cannot depend on [the] IPCC and so we have launched the Indian Network on Comprehensive Climate Change Assessment (INCCA).”

Mr Ramesh is quoted as having said The UN panel’s claims of glacial meltdown by 2035 (quote) “was clearly out of place and didn’t have any scientific basis.”

Mr Ramesh appears to be doing his due diligence to protect his nation. Unlike Senator Wong who simply blindly rushes to protect the UN IPCC’s false claims.

73 Dean Nelson in New Delhi, Telegraph, U.K., Feb 4, 2010.
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7157590/India-forms-new-climate-change-body.html>
(http://www.climatechange-fraud.com/climate-reports/6293-india-forms-new-climate-change-body?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+climatechange-fraud%2F+nkcO+%28Climate+Change+Fraud+news%29)

UN IPCC reports are no basis for government's global warming policy and CPRS

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

Dismiss the CPRS

The UN IPCC shows it not only does not have science on its side, it contradicts the science. Instead, Nature and science show human production of CO2 has no impact on global temperatures or climate. There is no scientific foundation for any emissions trading scheme (ETS).

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

Protect reliable, low cost, abundant, environmentally compatible energy. Dismiss the CPRS. Instead focus attention and resources on assisting the world's poor to higher standards of health, wealth, security and ease. This is best done with fuels containing carbon while developing economically sound renewable energy for the long term future. Our role is not to stifle the poor, it is to assist. To the extent we do, the sooner the world will find peace.

Request for inquiry to overcome UN IPCC fraud

Initially, when hearing and reading Senator Wong's comments on climate over the last three years I felt annoyance, even anger because her claims undermine my need for honesty and integrity. Now, as I witness Senator Wong sinking under the weight of the UN IPCC's dishonesty in the position she has placed herself, I feel compassion for her.

We cannot accurately know the needs that drove her misrepresentations. We can though know that if the government implements the CPRS through her misrepresentations she will hurt our nation and our planet. It is our responsibility as citizens to prevent that.

We cannot be sure of the needs and motives of those fomenting guilt and alarm. Whatever their reasons, they acted in the way they perceived as best for them. We need to truly forgive Senator Wong and all fomenters of unfounded guilt and alarm.

Instead of unconsciously reacting with anger, in the clarity, integrity, freedom and ease of true forgiveness and love we can choose our response. In Nature's freedom we can reconnect with Nature and with each other to truly care for our beautiful planet and its peoples.

This is a time for true forgiveness. A time to appreciate Nature. An opportunity to rebuild parliamentary relevance by returning to truth.

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

Replace fear, guilt and fraud with facts, forgiveness and freedom.

"The only thing more dangerous than ignorance is arrogance." Albert Einstein

PROTECTING TRUTH

Political will is built through integrity and courage to care enough to protect truth

According to Senator Wong's fraudulently named Carbon *Pollution* Reduction Scheme, every exhaled breath by a mother looking down on her feeding baby is pollution. Like all people, mothers inhale air containing an average of 0.0385% CO₂. By breathing they, and we, exhale air containing 4-5% CO₂. By living, we each increase the CO₂ concentration 130 times.

Why does Senator Wong not tell us that trees and plants absorb our exhaled CO₂ as part of Earth's essential cycle of life? When she's discussing the quantities of CO₂ produced by human industry, why doesn't she tell us it's tiny beside Nature's immense natural CO₂ production? Why doesn't she tell us scientific studies show CO₂'s residence time in the atmosphere is estimated to be 5-7 years, with some recent studies revealing it is as little as 12 months?

According to Senator Wong, every exhaling person and animal is a polluter. Yet, according to Nature, we are all part of Nature's cycle. Who will you believe? Senator Wong, a supporter and defender of the fraudulent UN IPCC, or Nature?

Even with all the facts catalogued in this document, is there one Liberal MP who can, or who will be allowed to, make a case for humanity and the environment? Is there one who will speak out honestly based on scientific fact to expose the UN IPCC? Is there one Liberal who will use this catalog of UN IPCC fraud to expose the government's CPRS as unfounded and unnecessary? Is there one Liberal willing to make a case for Australia?

Is there one ALP member, among known climate realists within ALP ranks, who has the integrity and courage to speak out honestly? Just one in integrity and with courage? All it needs for a lie to prevail is for good men and women to look the other way.

How many MP's will stop being cowed by the politicians' fear of media headlines? Who will join Senator Fielding and Senator Joyce in standing up for the workers? For science? For the economy? For the environment? For Nature?

The Prime Minister is repeatedly photographed emerging from church. Tony Abbott proclaims strong religious faith as his moral guide. Why do they abandon the truth on climate?

Forget budgie smugglers. In today's destruction of parliamentary relevance, many members of parliament are wearing the Emperor's new clothes.

On the topic of budgies, John Cleese's 'Dead Parrot' sketch is hilarious. Parliament's 'Dead Elephants' sketch is hilarious—and tragic.

Thanks to the integrity and courage of indigenous leaders Noel Pearson⁷⁴ and Galarrwuy Yunupingu⁷⁵ (a former long-serving chairman of the Northern Land Council) the reality of government involvement in crippling the indigenous is being unmasked. Need we wait 38 years for the damage of a huge ETS tax to emerge?

74 Noel Pearson, *The Weekend Australian*, 26.12.09, Pearson slams black housing
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/noel-pearson-slams-black-housing/story-e6frg6nf-1225813680340>
Noel Pearson, *The Weekend Australian*, Sa.23.01.10, *The Weekend Australian*, Fattest hand is first in the till,
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/fattest-hand-is-first-in-the-till/story-e6frg6zo-1225822681572>
Noel Pearson, *The Weekend Australian*, Sa.30.01.10When welfarism takes over, disaster will follow,
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/when-welfarism-takes-over-disaster-will-follow/story-e6frg6zo-1225824862838>

75 Galarrwuy Yunupingu, *The Weekend Australian*, Sa.30.01.10, We have the right to draw incomes from our land.
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/we-have-the-right-to-draw-incomes-from-our-land/story-e6frg6zo-1225824635615>

In reality, the Rudd mob and Abbott mob are having an auction for votes with our money. We're laughing at ourselves. We're the monkeys. We need to stop this parliamentary pantomime.

Please, do your due diligence using real science. Speak out. Vote against the CPRS. Stop toying with climate fraud. Instead, debate real environmental and humanitarian challenges.

And forgive.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

- Val Majkus, lawyer, for providing web links for additional references;
- Hans Schreuder (analytical chemist), Alan Siddons (radio/analytical chemist), John Nicol (physicist), Bruce Powell (electrical engineer) for contributions in exposing the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas effect theory as unfounded and contradicting the Laws of Physics and Nature;
- The many people world-wide who are part of the spontaneous and growing people's movement exposing UN IPCC fraud. They have written papers, articles, blogs and books detailing UN IPCC fraud and falsities. I note particularly the many courageous UN IPCC scientists and their peers who have been outspoken in exposing UN IPCC fraud despite the threat to their incomes and research.

Thank you

DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTERESTS

My family and I use electricity for food gathering, storage and preparation and for communication, entertainment, warmth and lighting. That electricity is generated from combustion of coal and supplemented by hydro-power from dams.

We rely on products produced with consumption of carbon-based energy—food, cement, steel, exotic metals, plastics, fertilisers, clothes, mineral processing, houses, transport, electricity and tourism.

We own two cars for transport and mobility, with one being a fuel-efficient four cylinder car and the other an efficient turbo-diesel six cylinder.

We dedicated part of our home land to our city council's 'Land For Wildlife' program as a refuge for wildlife.

We are concerned for our future in a world currently driven by consensual, dishonest political agenda displacing fact and integrity.

Neither I nor my family receive payment of any kind for my entirely voluntary work investigating and exposing unfounded climate alarm, nor for writing this paper. We tithe our income annually in support of charities and people in greater need.

I have worked in all industry sectors including agriculture and mining. For work performed in the mining industry I received money from mining companies and governments—just as all three tiers of government in Australia receive money from mining.

My family and I are supportive of the environmental and humanitarian benefits of low cost, reliable, clean, environmentally responsible energy.

To minimise costs and eliminate waste of resources, we actively recycle products and minimise use of electricity.

My wife and I, through a government mandated superannuation investment fund, own shares in diversified companies including two mining companies (one obtained by inheritance) and small holdings in Australian and overseas energy producers and an agricultural company.

We live and participate in modern society hugely dependent as it is for safety, health, comfort, ease and security on the Earth industries - mining and agriculture - which form the basis of all manufacturing. Apart from the air, every item in modern homes, commercial buildings and transport depends on mining. Food clearly depends on mining and agriculture.

Malcolm Roberts

BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA),
MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Brisbane, Australia.

Email: catalyst@eis.net.au



Science & Public Policy Institute

"Science-based policy for a better world."

Robert Ferguson

SPPI President

bferguson@sppinstitute.org

202-288-5699

P.O. Box 209

5501 Merchants View Square

Haymarket, VA 20169

www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org

