3rd October 2011

Dear Professor Chubb

I have written to you on several occasions expressing my concerns about incorrect public statements you have made about climate change. I note that you provided testimony before the Joint Select Committee on Australia's Clean Energy Future Legislation, on the 26th September, 2011 in which you provided "information" about climate science to the committee. Climate science is an area in which I believe you, as a neuroscientist, have no expertise.

When Senator Milne asked you:

*"What can we learn from the record Arctic ice melt this year?"*

You replied:

*"The latest information I have seen shows that the CO2 levels are high and that the rate of accumulation is accelerating."*

and

*"The scientists who study this would argue that it is getting to the point where something has to be done quickly in order to cap them at least and start to have them decrease over a sensible period of time."*

In fact most *"scientists who study this"* reject your points completely.

Carbon dioxide levels are not high. The levels we have today (about 388 ppm) are amongst the lowest they have been in over 500 million years. You do not appear to understand that carbon dioxide is a trace, minor greenhouse gas in the atmosphere and has never driven global temperature in the past and there is no empirical evidence that it drives global temperature today.

Carbon dioxide makes up a trivial 0.03% of the Earth's atmosphere and human activity worldwide contributes a mere 3% of this. To believe that carbon dioxide emission reduction by Australia or indeed any countries will make any measurable difference to carbon dioxide levels or global temperature is the height of absurdity.

You said:

*“Again, the evidence I have seen suggests that you could not get that Arctic melt if you did not factor in the increased emissions that have been occurring through human activity.”*

This is a preposterous statement and I would certainly like to see some empirical data for unusual Arctic ice melt and any link with human activity.

For more than 80% of the last 500 million years the average global temperature has been significantly higher than it is today. The Joint Select Committee needs to understand that, if all the glaciers and ice sheets disappeared completely, that would be the Earth’s climate getting back to normal. In reality there is no “normal” temperature for the Earth.

There has been ongoing cooling since the Cretaceous Period, about 65 million years ago. The last 3 million years have seen dramatic swings in temperature as the Earth has shifted between glacial and interglacial periods.

It is not unusual for the Arctic sea ice to “disappear.” The retreat of ice from the Arctic has been recorded many times and there are numerous reports such as these:

In 1906, Norwegian explorer Ronald Amundsen and six crew members sailed the Northwest Passage from east to west, becoming the first to completely traverse the passage.

In 1922 the US Weather Bureau reported:

*“The Arctic Ocean is warming up. Icebergs are growing scarcer and in some places the seals are finding the water too hot. Reports all point to a radical change in climate conditions and hitherto unheard of temperatures in the Arctic zone. Expeditions report that scarcely any ice has been met with as far north as 81 degrees 29 minutes. Great masses of ice have been replaced by great masses of moraines of earth and stones, while at many points well known glaciers have entirely disappeared.”*

In 1937 Professor V Vize reported a $2^{o}$C rise in Arctic temperature and a notable recession of glaciers and sea ice.

In 1940, and again in 1944, a group of Canadians, led by Royal Canadian Mounted Police officer Henry Larsen, traversed the Northwest Passage.

In 1947 Dr Hans Ahlmann reported a "mysterious warming of the Arctic."

He said:

*"If the present melting rate continues, sea level will rise to catastrophic proportions. People living on lowlands and the coast will be inundated."*

In 1959 photographs were taken of the USS Skate, surfaced in clear water at the North Pole on the 17th March.

In 1987 photographs were taken of 3 submarines (HMS Superb; USS Billfish; USS Sea Devil) surfaced in clear water at the North Pole on the 18th May.

You made this comment to the Joint Select Committee:

*"The point about these things is we have human activity superimposed on natural processes but it is as low or equal lowest as it has ever been. If it is not the lowest then it is the second lowest and the lowest was three years ago."*

This is totally incorrect.

Had you bothered to check satellite data you would find that AQUA satellite data is in agreement with JAXA data. Both show that Arctic ice has been increasing. If the trend up continues (likely unless changing winds moves ice near the edge out to the Atlantic or compresses it), it will have fallen more than 6% short of the 2007 satellite record.

I don't want to overload you with examples of peer-reviewed published papers which contradict the IPCC on just about every topic where they have exaggerated and/or omitted papers which disagree with IPCC "findings" but please check out the following peer-reviewed, published papers on Arctic paleoclimate:

Jung-Hyun et al., North Pacific and North Atlantic sea surface temperature variability during the Holocene, Quaternary Science Reviews, 23, 2004

Kultti, et. al., Past changes in the Scots pine forest line and climate in Finnish Lapland: a study based on megafossils, lake sediments, and GIS-based vegetation and climate data," The Holocene, Vol 16 No3, 2004.

MacDonald,et. al., Radiocarbon dated Pinus sylvestris L. wood from beyond tree-line on the Kola Peninsula, Russia, The Holocene, Vol. 10, No.1, 2000.

Solovieva & Jones, A multiproxy record of Holocene environmental changes in the central Kola Peninsula, northwest Russia, Journal of Quaternary Science, 17(4), 2002.

Sarnthein, et. al., Centennial-to-millennial-scale periodicities of Holocene climate and sediment injections off the western Barents shelf, 75°N, Boreas, Vol. 32, 2003.

Kultti, et al., Holocene tree line, permafrost, and climate dynamics in the Nenets Region, East European Arctic, Canadian Journal of Earth Science, Vol 41, 2004.

Koshkarova and Koshkarov, Regional Signatures of Changing Landscape and Climate of Northern Central Siberia in the Holocene, Russian geology and geophysics, N 6, v. 45, 2004.

Robert A. Monserud, Nadja M. Tchebakova, and Olga V. Denissenko, Reconstuction of the mid- Holocene Palaeoclimate of Siberia using a bioclimatic vegetation model, Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 139, 1998.

Ilyashuk, et al. Chironomid-inferred Holocene mean July air temperatures for the Lena River Delta area, East Siberia, and the Kola Peninsula, northwestern Russia, ACSYS Final Science Conference,11-14 November 2003, Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute (AARI), St. Petersburg, Russia.

Matul, et. al., Recent and Late Holocene Environments on the Southeastern Shelf of the Laptev Sea As Inferred from Microfossil Data, Oceanology, Vol. 47, No. 1, 2007.

Lawson,et. al., 2007, Early to mid-Holocene glacier fluctuations in Glacier Bay, Alaska, in Piatt, J.F., and Gende, S.M., eds., Proceedings of the Fourth Glacier Bay Science Symposium, October 26–28, 2004:

U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2007-5047, p. 54-55.

Kaufman, et. al., Holocene thermal maximum in the western Arctic (0-180°W), Quaternary Science Reviews, 23, 2004.

Stewart & England, Holocene Sea-Ice Variations and Paleoenvironmental Change, Northernmost Ellesmere Island, NWT., Canada, Arctic and Alpine Research, Vol 15, No. 1, 1983.

Dahl-Jensen, et al. Past Temperatures Directly from the Greenland Ice Sheet, Science, 282, 1998.

All of these papers point to the Arctic having previously (and on a number of occasions) been significantly warmer than today. In fact, if you read the article by Polyakov et al. Variability and trends of air temperature and pressure in the maritime Arctic, Journal of Climate 16, 2067 - 2077 (2003) you will see there has been no nett warming in the Arctic since 1937.

Data from the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) in 2008 indicated a dramatic increase in sea ice extent in the Arctic regions. The growth in 2008 covered an area of 700,000 square kilometers.

Opel et al. looked at Arctic temperatures over the Past 115 Years. They published their results in: 115 year ice-core data from Akademii Nauk ice cap, Severnaya Zemlya: high-resolution record of Eurasian Arctic climate change. Journal of Glaciology **55**: 21-31 (2009) concluding that there has been no net warming of the Atlantic and Eurasian sub-Arctic over the last eighty years of the 20th century.

Rather than blindly accepting summary statements from the now discredited Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the government's compliant scientists, I would expect some independent analysis and due diligence from Australia's Chief Scientist before public statements are made about ice melt in the Arctic.

Senator Milne asked the question:

*"At the same time, Australia has signed up internationally to constrain global warming to less than two degrees. Is 550 parts per million on track to constrain global warming to less than two degrees? "*

Any suggestion that we can somehow control the temperature of a planet by manipulating the pitifully low levels of anthropogenic carbon dioxide is childish and fanciful.

You replied:

*“We are making decisions that are based on the best modelling available now based on the information we have now. If that changes then surely one has to change one's goals, targets and ambitions.”*

Had you sought independent advice about “the best modelling available” you would have found that even the IPCC acknowledges the limitations of their own modelling. Their computer models have not been able to predict future climate accurately, at either global or regional level. This is well understood by all climate modelling practitioners and their colleagues, starting with the IPCC authors who wrote in 3AR (Section 14.2.2.2, p. 774):

*“In climate research and modelling, we should recognize that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore that long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.”*

Furthermore, Dr Kevin Trenberth, IPCC senior scientist and lead author, has admitted to this problem:

*“There are no (climate) predictions by the IPCC at all and never have been.”*

Additionally,senior IPCC representative, Dr. Jim Renwick (2007), stated that:

*“Climate prediction is hard, half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don’t expect to do terrifically well.”*

and

Third Assessment Report (Chapter 14, 14.2.2.2, Working Group 1, The Scientific Basis) noted:

*“In climate research and modeling, we should recognize that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore that long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.”*

Dr James Koermer, Professor of Meteorology and Director of the Meteorological Institute at Plymouth State University summarises:

*"Global warming hysteria is based to a large extent on the unproven predictions of climate models. These numerical models are based on many simplified approximations of very complicated physical processes and phenomena. My biggest concern is their [computer models'] lack of ability to adequately handle water vapor and clouds, which are much more important as climate factors than anthropogenic [human] contributors. Until we can realistically simulate types of clouds, their optical thicknesses, and their altitudes, which we have a difficult time doing for short-term weather forecasts, I can't have much faith in climate models."*

So why didn't you tell the Select Committee that even the IPCC has admitted that the best modelling available is totally inadequate for predicting future climate?

You said:

*"What we are projecting seeing is hugely changing patterns of rainfall and weather and the intensity of certain weather events."*

Projections from unvalidated computer models is one thing. Reality is another.

Douglass et al. (2007) tested computer model predictions against real world observations. They said:

"*We have tested the proposition that greenhouse model simulations and trend observations can be reconciled. Our conclusion is that the present evidence, with the application of a robust statistical test, supports rejection of this proposition*."

Professor Demitris Koutsoyiannis reported that the IPPC's computer predictions about future climate from 1990 to 2008 had a success rate of about 12%.

In 2009 computer models predicted an 85% chance of normal or warmer than average winter conditions in the UK. Peter Stott, Climate Scientist at the Met Office, said:

*"The trend to milder and wetter winters is expected to continue, with snow and frost becoming less of a feature in the future."*

In 2010, the UK Met Office predicted one of the *"five warmest years ever"* and a *"barbecue summer.*" In fact heavy rainfall saw the wettest July for almost 100 years.

The Climatic Research Unit's alarmist Dr David Viner, in 2000, foolishly predicted that winter snowfalls in Britain would soon be a thing of the past. He said:

*"Children just aren't going to know what snow is."*

In fact, the 2009-10 winter was the coldest for more than 30 years. Below zero temperatures in December, January and February made it the deepest freeze since 1978-79. The Central England Temperature (CET) from the 1st to the 7th December last year averaged -1.9$^{O}$C, bringing the coldest week in December since 1879.

Professor Julia Slingo from the UK Met Office admitted that they use the same computer models for weather forecasting as they use to predict climate 100 years ahead. These are the models which, for the last 3 years have been so wrong. It is my understanding that the UK Met Office has now suspended its seasonal forecasts and I suggest they abandon any 100 year forecast they might contemplate.

Australian Bureau of Meteorology computer models proved no better, completely failing to provide a long-term prediction about the significant rainfall and flooding which impacted the eastern states. Any model which incorporates carbon dioxide as a significant warming agent into its algorithms will prove to be useless.

As Professor Stewart Franks from Newcastle University said:

*"Nor though should we pay much heed to those that may loosely call themselves climate change scientists and who make alarmist claims for the future climate. They should acknowledge that we never could predict the future climate of 10, 20, 50 or 100 years time, at least not with any credibility."*

So why didn't you provide the Joint Select Committee with this information?

You went on to say:

*“I think there does need to be a recognition that the evidence of science is suggesting that we will have changed weather patterns and extreme weather events with much greater frequency than we have at the moment. That is where the evidence sits right now. Of course, where they will occur and all the rest of it we do not know. But that is where the evidence is pointing and that seems to me to be the view of the majority of scientists who are studying that particular aspect of weather and climate.”*

If you think that is where the evidence sits right now, I suggest you are being told about so-called “evidence” from vested interest groups and not looking at the evidence made available by the broader scientific community.

As far back as 1996 the IPCC “Science of Climate Change” report stated that *“it is not possible to say whether the frequency, area of occurrence, time of occurrence, mean intensity or maximum intensity of tropical cyclones will change”* (Houghton et al. 1996, p. 334).

Since that time the IPCC, no doubt prompted by advocacy groups, has become more alarmist about its extreme weather predictions, albeit without any supportive evidence.

The IPCC has wrongly linked global warming to increasing frequency and severity of disasters such as hurricanes and floods. The claims were based on an unpublished report that had not been subjected to scientific scrutiny. The report's own authors later withdrew the claim because they felt the evidence was not strong enough.

The IPCC’s FAR (WG1 SPM) claimed an increase in intense tropical cyclone activity "*in some regions since 1970*" and "*in the North Atlantic since about 1970*.”

In fact there is no meaningful trend. For the North Atlantic, the SPM misleads its readers by pointing out the increase since 1970 but neglecting to mention the decrease prior to 1970.

In the IPCC’s FAR (SPM p15) we are told:

"*Based on a range of models, it is likely that future tropical cyclones (typhoons and hurricanes) will become more intense, with larger peak wind speeds and more heavy precipitation associated with ongoing increases of tropical sea surface temperatures*."

Terms such as “Based on models” and “likely” are hardly convincing.

Dr Chris Landsea has made clear that the IPCC has systematically ignored the science, presented by its own experts, on hurricane intensity. Rather, the IPCC have promoted dramatic scenarios which are not backed up by research findings.

Dr Kevin Trenberth, a lead author for the IPCC, announced at a press conference at Harvard University that there was a clear relationship between global warming and the increased intensity of hurricane activity. Incidentally, Trenberth has no expertise in this area.

Dr Chris Landsea, was so annoyed about this unsubstantiated claim that he withdrew from the IPCC. He asked:

*"Where is the science, the refereed publications, that substantiate these pronouncements? ...As far as I know, there are none."*

Landsea said:

*"I cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound."*

and

*“I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns.”*

Research by Wu, et al. (2006) found no increase in either intensity or number of hurricanes striking the USA and a significant downward trend for some areas of the Pacific.

Research by Pielke et al. Hurricanes and Global Warming. (*Bull. Amer. Meteor. Soc.*, 86, 1571–1575) concluded that "claims of linkages between global warming and hurricane impacts are premature.”

Data (2009) from the Center for Ocean-Atmospheric Prediction Studies in Florida, show that global tropical cyclone activity is currently at its lowest level in 30 years.

In 2011, Mau reported on recent historically low global tropical cyclone activity. ( Geophysical Research Letters 38: 10.)

The IPCC prediction on the severity of disasters was central to demands by African nations at the Copenhagen climate summit for compensation of $US100 billion from the rich nations. Interestingly, the IPCC knew in 2008 that the link could not be proved but did not alert the media or politicians, who have used weather extremes to bolster the case for action on climate change.

The Western North Pacific (typhoons) tropical activity was well below normal in 2007 and 2008 as it was in the Eastern North Pacific.

The Southern Hemisphere, which includes the southern Indian Ocean from the coast of Mozambique across Madagascar to the coast of Australia, into the South Pacific and Coral Sea, also saw below normal activity in 2008.

Using the Accumulated Cyclone Energy index (ACE), Bell and Chelliah (2006) reported that, despite IPCC computer models predicting overall cyclone activity increase, activity has continued to fall to levels not seen since the 1970s.

For the record,1935 saw the most powerful hurricane to ever hit the US, and the 1940's saw the most US hurricane strikes of any decade.

During the 2008-2009 TC season, the Southern Hemisphere ACE was about half of what would be expected in a normal year, with a multitude of very weak, short-lived hurricanes. In fact, just as there are active periods of hurricane activity around the globe, there are inactive periods, and we are currently experiencing one of the most pronounced inactive periods for almost 3 years.

Dr Roger Pielke, Professor of Environmental Studies at the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado, reminds us that:

*"Our understanding of the complicated role of hurricanes with and role in climate is nebulous to be charitable."*

You also mentioned an increase in the intensity of rain and flooding:

*"The argument at the moment is that there will be, for example, much more intense cyclones and whatever they are called in the Northern Hemisphere, and more intense rain and flooding. There will be a lot more intense and focused events of that type and that character as the climate changes. That is where the current view is."*

No it isn't!

Flooding in Queensland was hailed by the media as a "freak weather event" which it wasn't. In fact flooding has been a recorded fact of life in Queensland since the 19th Century. The latest flood was well below the 1974 level and more than 3 metres lower than the 1893 flood.

The dynamic nature of our climate results in 2 or 3 decades of regular flooding followed by similar periods of drought (e.g. 1910 to 1945). This shift from flood to drought is controlled by El Nino and La Nina episodes with El Nino conditions between 2001 and 2008. A recent swing to pronounced La Nina activity saw nearly 2 years of storms and resulting floods - not predicted by computer models.

Professor Neville Nicholls (Monash University) stated:

*"The Queensland floods are caused by what is one of the strongest La Niña events since our records began in the late 19th century."*

Queenslanders need realistic flood adaptation strategies rather than embracing futile and silly attempts at reducing carbon dioxide levels to control climate and flooding. It is the discredited IPCC and many environmentalists and politicians who have demonised this essential, life-giving gas for their own purposes.

There is no empirical evidence which links carbon dioxide levels, storms and floods.

Mr Cheeseman asked:

***"****Given that the science is telling us that we are going to see a drier climate and more intense droughts, particularly in the south-east corner of Australia, as a consequence one might assume that we will see more intense bushfires. Is that a reasonable observation of the science?"*

You replied:

*"There are those who say that, yes."*

Mr Cheeseman continued:

*"So we might start to see more circumstances like the events of a number of summers ago in Victoria where bushfires will become a real danger to the Australian community?"*

You replied:

*"You could reasonably speculate that, yes."*

Actually, we don't speculate in science. We look for empirical evidence.

Bushfires have always been part of the Australian landscape and much of our vegetation has evolved because of fire. It recovers quickly because of the evolution of a number of fire adaptations. Many gum trees have kino in their bark which helps them resist heat penetration; lignotubers are common in eucalypts, giving the plant an ability to survive drought and fire; some gums have epicormic buds under their bark and these are protected from fire, allowing dense leaf growth following a bushfire; a number of banksias and acacias need fire to split open their seeds which germinate when the fire has passed.

Sparg et al. (2005) have described how smoke from bushfires stimulates seed germination in a number of plant species. Global warming alarmists really should heed the words of National Association of Forest Industries (NAFI) chief executive Allan Hansard when he said:

*"Bushfire management policy must be based on the best scientific knowledge, not the whims of uninformed green ideologists."*

People living in Victoria, will long remember the bushfires of Black Saturday 2009 but many of them might have forgotten the Black Friday event of 1939.

Crompton et al. (2010) have evaluated the history of building damage and loss of life due to bushfire in Australia since 1925. They acknowledged a link between fire damage and the El Niño-Southern Oscillation and Indian Ocean Dipole phenomena, but found no

evidence of any influence from climate change due to greenhouse gas emissions. Their more significant findings were to do with issues of land-use planning.

Roger Underwood presented a case study on Australian Bushfire Management (2009) in which he made the comment:

*"They cannot say the impacts of intense bushfires on human communities were unimaginable. We have known for 200 years that European settlement represented the insertion of a fire-vulnerable society into a fire-prone environment."*

and

*"Research has confirmed that fire is not an alien visitor, but a natural part of Australian bushland ecosystems."*

and

*"There is no question that the influence of green activists at Federal, State and Local government levels has resulted in a steep decline in the standard of bushfire management in this country."*

*and*

*"The excuses put forward, especially that fires are unstoppable because of global warming, are simply that: excuses."*

Robert Darby and Nick Brown (The Australian, 1st January, 2010) pointed to:

*"Green environmental policies that have encouraged and even mandated the planting of eucalypts in rural and semi-rural areas."*

There is no empirical evidence which links carbon dioxide levels, and increased risk of bushfire.

You told the Joint Select Committee:

*"I have read the literature that says that a lot of work is being done in a lot of countries to try and get stabilisation, yes, and that there are a lot of countries now taking action, on the basis of the scientific evidence, to reduce their emissions."*

I would certainly like to see that scientific evidence.

Professor Richard Muller has said:

*"The developing world is 'not joining-in with CO2 emission reductions nor does it have any intention of doing so."*

In fact only a few developed countries have embraced the carbon dioxide - catastrophic global warming mantra of the IPCC. These include EU countries, New Zealand and Australia. Collectively this represents a mere 8% of global population and around 14% of global carbon dioxide emissions.

Europe's economy is far from robust and they may well regret their pointless and unachievable emission reduction and renewable energy targets.

Robert Stavins, Director of Harvard's Environmental Economics Program said:

*"It's unlikely that the U.S. is going to take serious action on climate change until there are observable, dramatic events, almost catastrophic in nature, that drive public opinion and drive the political process in that direction."*

The USA is far too worried about its current economic position to take any action on emissions reduction that might impact on its economy.

China has questioned the link between carbon dioxide and global climate and is the world's largest emitter, building the equivalent of one new coal-fired power station per week.

India has flatly rejected the IPCC alarmist claims and recommendations of the IPCC. India's emissions continue to grow.

Canada, Russia and Japan have all withdrawn their support of the Kyoto Accord.

Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia, South Korea, Mexico, Saudi Arabia and Iran will not reduce their carbon dioxide emissions. In fact, their emissions continue to increase.

The remaining countries support about 40% of the world's population and around 20% of the world's carbon dioxide emissions. They will certainly not reduce their emissions and restrict their improving standard of living.

To say that:

"*There are a lot of countries now taking action, on the basis of the scientific evidence, to reduce their emissions.*" does not reflect the true picture.

You said:

*"With respect to this cooling stuff, I have seen the claim, but the evidence that I have seen is that the last decade has been the warmest decade that we have ever had on this planet, so I do not know what this cooling stuff means. I know you get fluctuations in that; of course you do. There are natural events. Nobody has ever argued that there are not natural events in the climate."*

When you refer to *"this cooling stuff"* I assume you are referring to the fact that there has been no global warming since the 1970's with global cooling from around 2002.

Consider your view:

*" ... the evidence that I have seen is that the last decade has been the warmest decade that we have ever had on this planet."*

This is an absurd statement and reflects a total lack of knowledge about paleoclimate.

We are currently living in a mild (interglacial) part of an ice age. We emerged from a glacial maximum, about 15,000 years ago and we should not be surprised if the planet has warmed since that time and continued to warm. There have been 4 interglacials during the last 400, 000 years and they have all peaked at temperatures higher than the current interglacial.

Global temperatures have been significantly higher than today, for more than 80% of geologic time, Greenland ice core analysis clearly show:

(a) A Minoan warming about 3500 years ago;

(b) A Roman warming about 2000 years ago;

(c) A Medieval Warm Period;

(d) Twentieth-century warming, with each new warming being about 1 degree cooler than previous warm periods.

Please do your homework before making incorrect statements in front of a committee which, one hopes, is seeking factual information about the climate.

I'm left wondering (perhaps you don't know) why you didn't inform the committee that uncontaminated satellite data, showing cooling, has been ignored by the IPCC. Atmospheric physicist, Dr Fred Singer notes:

*"Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"*

During the eight years, from 2001 to 2009, the temperature trend (Hadley, UAH MSU) shows a decrease of 0.52 degrees Celsius per century, despite rising carbon dioxide levels. This tends to question the IPPC model projections of continued warming triggered by human activity and carbon dioxide emissions.

Physical chemist, Dr. Martin Hertzberg observes:

"*It is implausible to expect that small changes in the concentration of any minor atmospheric constituent such as carbon dioxide can significantly influence that radiative equilibrium*."

Dr Mojab Latif, climate modeller and IPCC author told more than 1,500 climate scientists at the UN's World Climate Conference in Geneva (New Scientist, 9th September, 2009) we could be entering one or even two decades of cooler temperatures.

Dr David Gee, chairman of the science committee of the 2008 International Geological Congress, asks the question:

*“For how many years must the planet cool before we begin to understand that the planet is not warming? For how many years must cooling go on?"*

Climate scientist, Dr John Christy points out that few scientists actually believe global warming is taking place so we now come across weasel terms such as *“climate change”* and “*climate disruption.”* Christy says:

*"Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."*

It’s worth repeating Christy’s statment:

*"Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring.”*

Contrary to some media and politicians claim, 4,000 scientists did not say that human activity is causing global warming. This claim was endorsed by only 5 IPCC reviewers.

Shouldn’t you be informing the Joint Select Committee about this?

Professor Phil Jones from the University of East Anglia Climatic Research Unit (CRU) admitted in a BBC interview that:

“*... for the two periods 1910-40 and 1975-1998 the warming rates are not statistically significantly different*.”

So we have the imprimatur of Phil Jones to the key fact that recent warming, towards the end of the last century, was not unusual.

Satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth's atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted. Climate warming is not continuing as predicted by the IPCC and CSIRO computer models.

Spencer & Braswell reported “On the Misdiagnosis of Surface Temperature Feedbacks from Variations in Earth’s Radiant Energy Balance.” in the journal Remote Sensing (2011) 3, 1603-1613.

Spencer is a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and responsible for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer on NASA's Aqua satellite. Real-world data from NASA's Terra satellite contradict the various assumptions that have been fed into alarmist computer models.

When uncontaminated satellite data show a large discrepancy between alarmist climate models and real-world facts, climate scientists, the media and politicians should pay attention.

Australia's Chief Scientist should be informing the Joint Select Committee accordingly.

The Royal Society has admitted that the recent spell of warming ended in 2000 and the UK Met Office (Hadley Centre) has confirmed that the HadCRUT3 temperature data show no temperature increase over the past ten years.

The Journal *Science* has said the pause in global temperatures is real, as do many refereed scientific papers in numerous journals. For instance, Kaufmann et al. (2011) stated:

*"Given the widely noted increase in the warming effects of rising greenhouse gas concentrations, it has been unclear why global surface temperatures did not rise between 1998 and 2008."*

Dr Khabibullo Abdusamatov, head of the Space Research Laboratory at the Pulkovo Observatory in St. Petersburg. said.

*"Many meteorologists predicted that higher levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere would make the year 2007 the hottest in the last decade, but, fortunately, these predictions did not become reality."*

You told the Joint Select Committee that you would get back to them with further information on a number of issues. I wonder if you are planning to get back to the committee with an update on the literature which shows several years of global cooling?

You said:

*"The question is: are you putting, on top of that, changes that are caused by human activity? The overwhelming majority of climate scientists would say yes."*

I have previously provided you with hard evidence showing this statement to be completely incorrect. You have either not seen the information I have provided or you have decided to ignore it. The overwelming majority of climate scientists say no such thing.

Let me remind you how quickly the consensus has shifted. In the space of 2 - 3 years, an increasing number of scientists have become aware of the highly questionable IPCC practices. Where is the current consensus? I have previously urged you to look up the following:

The Heidelberg Appeal; The Oregon Petition; The Manhattan Declaration; Open Letter to UN Secretary General; The Petition by German Scientists to the Chancellor; The Leipzig Declaration; Statement from Atmospheric Scientists; Letter to the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate; Memorandum submitted by the Institute of Physics; Statement from scientists to President Obama.

I also urged you to look up and bring to the Joint Select Committee's attention the following document:

*"More than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming."*

I previously asked you to verify how the IPCC has corrupted climate science by looking at testimony from some of the scientists and other experts who actually contributed to the IPCC process in good faith.

Please bring the following statements to the attention of the Joint Select Committee:

Dr Robert Balling: "The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected." (This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers).

Dr. Lucka Bogataj: "Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don't cause global temperatures to rise.... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed."

Dr John Christy: "Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or

politicized with each succeeding report."

Dr Rosa Compagnucci: “Humans have only contributed a few tenths of a degree to warming on Earth. Solar activity is a key driver of climate.”

Dr Richard Courtney: "The empirical evidence strongly indicates that the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis is wrong."

Dr Judith Curry: “I'm not going to just spout off and endorse the IPCC because I don't have confidence in the process.”

Dr Robert Davis: "Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers."

Dr Willem de Lange: "In 1996, the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3,000 “scientists” who agreed that there was a discernible human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."

Dr Chris de Freitas: “Government decision-makers should have heard by now that the basis for the longstanding claim that carbon dioxide is a major driver of global climate is being questioned; along with it the hitherto assumed need for costly measures to restrict carbon dioxide emissions. If they have not heard, it is because of the din of global warming hysteria that relies on the logical fallacy of 'argument from ignorance' and predictions of computer models.”

Dr Oliver Frauenfeld: “Much more progress is necessary regarding our current understanding of climate and our abilities to model it.”

Dr Peter Dietze: "Using a flawed eddy diffusion model, the IPCC has grossly underestimated the future oceanic carbon dioxide uptake."

Dr John Everett: “It is time for a reality check. The oceans and coastal zones have been far warmer and colder than is projected in the present scenarios of climate change. I have reviewed the IPCC and more recent scientific literature and believe that there is not a problem with increased acidification, even up to the unlikely levels in the most-used IPCC scenarios."

Dr Eigil Friis-Christensen: “The IPCC refused to consider the sun's effect on the Earth's climate as a topic worthy of investigation. The IPCC conceived its task only as investigating potential human causes of climate change.”

Dr Lee Gerhard: "I never fully accepted or denied the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) concept until the furore started after NASA's James Hansen's wild claims in the late 1980's. I went to the [scientific] literature to study the basis of the claim, starting at first principles. My studies then led me to believe that the claims were false.”

Dr Indur Goklany: “Climate change is unlikely to be the world's most important environmental problem of the 21st century. There is no signal in the mortality data to indicate increases in the overall frequencies or severities of extreme weather events, despite large increases in the population at risk.”

Dr Vincent Gray: "The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."

Dr Mike Hulme: "Claims such as '2,500 of the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that human activities are having a significant influence on the climate' are disingenuous ... The actual number of scientists who backed that claim was “only a few dozen.”

Dr Kiminori Itoh: "There are many factors which cause climate change. Considering only greenhouse gases is nonsense and harmful."

Dr Yuri Izrael: "There is no proven link between human activity and global warming. I think the panic over global warming is totally unjustified. There is no serious threat to the climate."

Dr Steven Japar: "Temperature measurements show that the climate model-predicted mid-troposphere hot zone is non-existent. This is more than sufficient to invalidate global climate models and projections made with them.”

Dr Georg Kaser: "This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing."

Dr Aynsley Kellow: “I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process

for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be.”

Dr Madhav Khandekar: "I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."

Dr Hans Labohm: "The alarmist passages in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."

Dr. Andrew Lacis: “There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department.”

Dr Chris Landsea: "I cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound."

Dr Richard Lindzen: "The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."

Dr Harry Lins: "Surface temperature changes over the past century have been episodic and modest and there has been no net global warming for over a decade now. The case for alarm regarding climate change is grossly overstated.”

Dr Philip Lloyd: “I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said.”

Dr Martin Manning: "Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."

Dr Stephen McIntyre: “The many references in the popular media to a “consensus of thousands of scientists” are both a great exaggeration and also misleading.”

Dr Patrick Michaels: "The rates of warming, on multiple time scales have now invalidated the suite of IPCC climate models. No, the science

is not settled."

Dr Nils-Axel Morner: "If you go around the globe, you find no sea level rise anywhere."

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: "The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."

Dr Roger Pielke: "All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."

Dr Paul Reiter: "As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."

Dr Murray Salby: "I have an involuntary gag reflex whenever someone says the science is settled. Anyone who thinks the science is settled on this topic is in fantasia."

Dr Tom Segalstad: "The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."

Dr Fred Singer: "Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"

Dr Hajo Smit: "There is clear cut solar-climate coupling and a very strong natural variability of climate on all historical time scales. Currently I hardly believe anymore that there is any relevant relationship between human CO2 emissions and climate change."

Dr Richard Tol: "The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices."

Dr Tom Tripp: “There is so much of a natural variability in weather it makes it difficult to come to a scientifically valid conclusion that global warming is man made.”

Dr Gerd-Rainer Weber: “Most of the extremist views about climate change have little or no scientific basis.”

Dr David Wojick: "The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates."

Dr Miklos Zagoni: “I am positively convinced that the anthropogenic global warming theory is wrong.”

Dr. Eduardo Zorita: “Editors, reviewers and authors of alternative studies, analysis, interpretations, even based on the same data we have at our disposal, have been bullied and subtly blackmailed.”

**Please remind the Joint Select Committee, these are quotes by experts who contributed in good faith to the IPCC process.** This is hardly a case of one or two scientists on the fringe of the scientific community being critical of the IPCC process.

Please point out to the Joint Select Committee that:

1. Many former IPCC contributors are now criticising the IPCC “science” and “process”

2. A distinct majority of scientists now reject the notion of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming.

Mr Cheeseman asked the question:

*“Over the last decade in southern Australia we have seen perhaps the worst drought ever recorded in Australia. What does the climate change science tell us about drought and the frequency and intensity of drought?”*

You answered:

*“What happens out there as the temperature warms—evaporation is greater, more clouds are formed et cetera—is not something that I am expert in and an expert could probably give you a better answer to that*

*part of it than I can. But there does not appear to be much doubt that there is a shift in our patterns."*

It would appear that neither you nor Mr Cheeseman are aware that the last decade did not see the "*worst drought ever recorded in Australia."* In fact the major drought periods of 1895-1905 (Federation Drought); 1958-68 and 1982-83 were more severe.

Northern Queensland experienced a 70 year drought between 1801-70 when I suspect there was little talk of global warming.

On January 12th, 1896, 47 people died in a heatwave in Bourke, New South Wales when temperatures averaged 47$^{o}$C for 13 days.

Of course we all know what the warming alarmists would be saying if those extreme drought conditions were experienced in more recent times.

Droughts will continue to be a prominent feature of the Australian scene and the causes of drought have their origins in the natural fluctuations of the climate system. There is no empirical evidence whatsoever to link human activity with droughts.

Soule and Zhi-Yong yin (Climate Research Vol 5: 149-157, 1995) found that, for the USA, 95 years of data showed a shift toward more normal or above normal moisture conditions.

Their work agreed with Karl & Heim's (1990) finding that the contiguous United States has not undergone a substantial trend toward drought conditions this century.

The positive 50 and 30 yr trends also support Idso & Balling's (1992) finding of a significant trend toward wetter conditions in the post-1954 period.

Dr. David Stockwell examined models used in a major drought study by the CSIRO and the Australian BoM. The Drought Exceptional Circumstances Report (DECR), was used to support the claim that major increases in drought frequency and severity in Australia would result from further increases in carbon dioxide emissions.

In fact, droughts decreased during the 20th century as rainfall increased. The climate models used in the DECR predicted the

opposite.

The IPCC and the Australian Academy of Science consider General Circulation Models (GCM's) to be of limited value when predicting regional rainfall change.

I wonder if you will inform the committee about the many cases of IPCC omissions, errors and malpractice which have been documented? Let me remind you with just a few examples.

**Example 1.**

The 1990 IPCC First Assessment Report (FAR) in WG1 stated:

*"A global warming of larger size has almost certainly occurred at least once since the end of the last glaciation without any appreciable increase in greenhouse gas.* ***Because we do not understand the reasons for these past warming events, it is not yet possible to attribute a specific proportion of the recent, smaller warming to an increase in greenhouse gases."*** (my emphasis)

The Summaries for Policymakers (SPM's), which go out to governments and the media, contained no such uncertainties.

**Example 2.**

The IPCC's 1995 Scientific Report draft included the following three statements:

1. *"None of the (scientific) studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed (climate) changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases."* (Source, IPCC, 1995.)

2. *"No study to date has positively attributed all or part (of observed climate change) to anthropogenic causes."* (Source, IPCC, 1995.)

3. *"Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced."* (Source, IPCC, 1995.)

Yet, in the IPCC's Chapter 8 draft, all three of the above statements by IPCC scientists were later replaced with:

*“The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate.”*

**Example 3.**

Dr Patrick Michaels was Research Professor at the University of Virginia for over 30 years and a reviewer for the IPCC. He recounts how, as a reviewer for the 2007 FAR, he looked over the draft which clearly documented how Siberia and East Russia had previously been between 2oC and 7oC warmer than any post-industrial period.

MacDonald et al. (2000) collated tree records from tundra areas, dating these by radiocarbon analysis. They reported:

*“Over most of Russia, forest advanced to or near the current Arctic coastline between 9,000 and 7,000 yrs BP and retreated to its present position between 4,000 and 3,000 yrs BP.”*

This information was removed from the second draft.

**Example 4.**

The SAR (1995; WG 1; Chapt. 8) report noted:

*“Many, but not all of these studies show that the observed changes in global-mean, annually-averaged temperature over the last century is unlikely to be due entirely to natural fluctuations of the climate system."*

This was changed to:

*“The majority of these studies show that the observed changes in global-mean, annually-averaged temperature over the last century is unlikely to be due entirely to natural fluctuations of the climate system."*

The following statement was deleted:

*"The evidence rests heavily on the reliability of the (still uncertain) estimates of natural variability noise levels."*

**Example 5.**

The SAR (WG 1; Chapt. 8) report noted (Section 8.3.3.3):

*"While such studies help to build confidence in the reliability of the model variability on interannual to decadal time scales, there are still serious concerns about the longer time scale variability, which is more difficult to validate (Barnett et al., 1995). Unless paleoclimatic data can help us to 'constrain' the century time scale natural variability estimates obtained from CGCMs, it will be difficult to make a convincing case for the detection and attribution of an anthropogenic climate change signal."*

This was later deleted.

**Example 6.**

The SAR (WG 1; Chapt. 8) report noted (Section 8.4.1.1):

*"While none of these studies has specifically considered the attribution issue, they often draw some attribution-related conclusions, for which there is little justification."*

This was deleted.

**Example 7.**

The SAR (WG 1; Chapt. 8) report noted (Section 8.4.2.1):

*“None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases."*

This was deleted and replaced with:

"*Implicit in these global mean results is a weak attribution statement--if the observed global mean changes over the last 20 to 50 years cannot be fully explained by natural climate variability, some (unknown) fraction of the changes must be due to human influences*.”

**Example 8.**

Dr Willem de Lange, an expert in Oceanography, coastal processes and climatic hazards, was listed by the IPCC as one of approximately 3,000 “scientists” who agreed that there was a discernible human influence on climate. In fact he did not agree. Nor did he agree with the IPCC projections of sea level rise and threats to Pacific Islands.

de Lange indicated how research clearly shows that coral atolls and associated islands are likely to increase in elevation as sea level rises. Hence, the assumptions were invalid, and he was convinced that the IPCC projections were unrealistic and that they severely exaggerated the problem.

The IPCC ignored his comments.

Professor Frederick Seitz considers the 1996 IPCC report as:

*"Not what it appears to be - it is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists listed on the title page."*

He went on to say:

*"In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report."*

and

*"Many of the contributing scientists object to what is left in the Summaries For Policymakers after the non-scientists have influenced it but their names remain as contributing scientists."*

Seitz asked for his name to be removed from the report but the IPCC refused saying that he had contributed to the report, so they had to give him credit. Seitz insisted they remove his name and he threatened legal action if they did not comply. Eventually, they did.

**Example 9.**

The IPCC's Summary for Policy Makers which is issued to politicians and the media was prepared and released **before** the science chapters were written.

IPCC guidelines specifically say that, where there is conflict between the science report and the summary for policy makers, the summary takes precedence and the science reports have to be modified to reflect the political summaries.

**Example 10.**

Research scientist at the Hurricane Research Division of Atlantic Oceanographic & Meteorological Laboratory at NOAA, Dr Chris Landsea has made clear that the IPCC has systematically ignored the science, presented by its own experts, on hurricane intensity. Rather, the IPCC have promoted dramatic scenarios which are not backed up by research findings. Dr Landsea asks the question:

*"Where is the science, the refereed publications, that substantiate these pronouncements? ...As far as I know, there are none."*

**Example 11.**

Dr Kevin Trenberth, a lead author for the IPCC, announced at a press conference at Harvard University that there was a clear relationship between global warming and the increased intensity of hurricane activity. Incidentally, Trenberth has no expertise in this area.

Dr Chris Landsea, was so annoyed about this unsubstantiated claim that he withdrew from the IPCC.
Landsea wrote:

*“I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns.”*

**Example 12.**

Atmospheric Physicist (MIT), Professor Richard Lindzen was Lead Author for the IPCC Third Assessment Report (TAR). He relates how, as an insider, he was able to observe how manipulation took place. He noted how the reports and summaries were subject to constant pressure to push findings in a definite direction:

*“Throughout the drafting sessions, IPCC “co-ordinators” would go around insisting that criticism of (computer) models be toned down and that “motherhood” statements be inserted to the effect that models might still be correct despite the cited faults. Refusals were occasionally met with ad hominem attacks. I personally witnessed co-authors forced to assert their “green” credentials in defence of their statements.”*

**Example 13.**

The IPCC "Summary for Policymakers" stated:

*"Climate change is likely to have wide-ranging and mostly adverse impacts on human health, with significant loss of life."*

Professor Paul Reiter heads the Insects and Infectious Disease Unit at the Pasteur Institute. Because of his history of excellence in research of diseases transmitted by mosquitoes and other insects, the U.S. State Department in 2001 nominated Professor Reiter to be a lead author of the IPCC's health chapter.

The IPCC was taking the line (with no supporting evidence) that global warming was increasing the habitats for mosquitoes, putting hundreds of millions of people in the tropics at risk of contracting malaria and dengue fever. They promoted the view that these diseases would spread around the world with CAGW.

Reiter was not surprised when the IPCC rejected him as a lead author since he had been a critic of the pseudo-science the IPCC had previously disseminated about this matter. Neither was he surprised when the IPCC failed to select any scientists with expertise in mosquito-borne diseases. Reiter reported that, in its Second Assessment Report chapter on human population health, the IPCC displayed' "glaring ignorance" about mosquitoes, their survival temperatures and the altitudes where mosquitoes can be found.
Reiter testified to a U.K. parliamentary committee in 2005. He said:

*"The paucity of information 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 career as environmental activists."*

In summary, the treatment of this issue by the IPCC was ill-informed, biased, and scientifically unacceptable. Reiter commented emphatically on pre-report meetings:

*"For the 2001 report, I was a contributory author. And we had these meetings that were absolute bullshit. I mean they had an agenda, and that was it."*

**Example 14.**

When the IPCC reported:

*"Renewable technologies could supply 80% of the world's energy needs by mid-century."*

It was not reported that this "80% by 2050 figure" was based on the contribution of a lead author, Sven Teske, who should have been identified as a climate and energy campaigner for Greenpeace International. Greenpeace was not only embedded in the IPCC itself, but Teske was allowed to review and promote his own campaigning work via the IPCC. But then, the IPCC is renowned for using "grey literature" in support of its claims.

**Example 15.**

Related to the above breach, in its 2007 FAR (Chapt. 10, WG 2) the IPCC stated there was a very high chance that Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035. Only one reference was used to substantiate this claim, in the form of a paper (not peer-reviewed) by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), an environmental activist group. The reference is:

*WWF (World Wildlife Fund), 2005: An overview of glaciers, glacier retreat, and subsequent impacts in Nepal, India and China. World Wildlife Fund, Nepal Programme.*

The IPCC conceded, 3 years later, that their prediction on vanishing Himalayan glaciers had no basis in fact.

**Example 16.**

Also related to advocacy groups, in its 2007 FAR (Chapt. 13, WG 2) the IPCC stated:

*"Up to 40% of the Amazonian forests could react drastically to even a slight reduction in precipitation; this means that the tropical vegetation, hydrology and climate system in South America could change very rapidly to another steady state, not necessarily producing gradual changes between the current and the future situation."* (Rowell and Moore, 2000)

Checking the reference, we find:

Rowell, A. and Moore, P.F., 2000: Global Review of Forest Fires. WWF/IUCN.Gland, Switzerland, 66pp.
http://www.iucn.org/themes/fcp/publications/files/global_review_forest_fires.pdf

This is another WWF report written in conjunction with the International Union For Conservation of Nature.

**Example 17.**

Dr Andrei Kapitsa described how:

*"A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace....As a result, the discussion was one-sided and heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact."*

Of course these documents could have been misplaced.

**Example 18.**

Dr Robert Balling observed:

*“The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected."*

This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers.

**Example 19.**

Dr Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen wrote, in a submission to the UK Parliament:

*"I inherited the editorship of Energy & Environment from a former senior scientist at the Department of the Environment (Dr. David Everest) because we shared doubts about the claims made by environmentalists and were worried about the readiness with which politicians accepted these claims, including 'global warming' which followed so seamlessly from the acid rain scare, my previous research area. As editor of a journal which remained open to scientists who challenged the orthodoxy, I became the target of a number of CRU*

*manoeuvres. The hacked emails revealed attempts to manipulate peer review to E&E's disadvantage, and showed that libel threats were considered against its editorial team. Dr Jones even tried to put pressure on my university department. The emailers expressed anger over my publication of several papers that questioned the 'hockey stick' graph and the reliability of CRU temperature data."*

Dr Tom Wigley complained that Professor Hans von Storch, from the Meteorological Institute of the University of Hamburg, was partly to blame for papers critical of CAGW being published at Climate Research. He suggested (in emails) they tell publishers that the journal was being used for misinformation. He also said that whether this was true or not didn't matter. Wigley suggested they got the editorial board to resign.

**Example 20.**

The IPCC's First Assessment Report (FAR,1990) and Second Assessment Report (SAR,1995) clearly showed a graph in which the Medieval Warm Period (MWP) and Little Ice Age (LIA) showing temperature shifts far in excess (in range and extent) of anything we saw in the 20th century. There is ample historic and paleoclimatic data to support this.

Dr David Deming, geologist at the University of Oklahoma said:

*"I received an astonishing email from an IPCC climate scientist who said: We have to get rid of the Medieval Warm Period."*

Deming continued:

*"The existence of the MWP had been recognized in the scientific literature for decades. But now it was a major embarrassment to those maintaining that the 20th Century warming was anomalous. It had to be gotten rid of."*

In 1999, Michael Mann and his colleagues produced a 1,000 year reconstruction of past temperature in which the MWP simply vanished. The infamous "hockey stick" became the centre piece for IPCC propaganda and it featured prominently in Al Gore's silly movie "An Inconvenient Truth."

Mann's "hockey stick" was based on a number of different temperature indicators, including ice cores and tree rings. It showed that the average Northern Hemisphere temperature remained relatively constant until the last part of the 20th century, when the temperature increased dramatically.

McShane and Wyner (2010) published a critical paper in which they concluded unequivocally that the evidence for a "long-handled" hockey stick (where the shaft of the hockey stick extends to the year 1000 AD) was lacking in data.

I would urge you to look into the whitewashing that masqueraded as an investigation into Michael Mann and Pennsyvania State University and compare the university's (internal) findings with those from the independent Wegman report (2008) which concluded:

*"Overall, our committee believes that Mann's assessments that the decade of the 1990s was the hottest decade of the millennium and that 1998 was the hottest year of the millennium cannot be supported by his analysis."*

Wegman went on to say:

*" ..at least 43 authors have direct ties to Dr. Mann by virtue of coauthored papers with him. Our findings from this analysis suggest that authors in the area of paleoclimate studies are closely connected and thus 'independent studies' may not be as independent as they might appear on the surface..."*

It is interesting to note that the IPCC quietly dropped Mann's hockey stick from subsequent reports.

The IPCC appears to have a political / ideological agenda and it has never undertaken an impartial meta-analysis of climate science research. In 2010 Dr Benny Peiser reported:

*"The IPCC review process has been shown on numerous occasions to lack transparency and due diligence. Its work is controlled by a tightly knit group of individuals who are completely convinced that they are right. As a result, conflicting data and evidence, even if published in peer reviewed journals, are regularly ignored, while exaggerated claims, even if contentious or not peer-reviewed, are often highlighted in IPCC reports. Not surprisingly, the IPCC has lost a lot of credibility in*

*recent years. It is also losing the trust of more and more governments who are no longer following their advice - as the Copenhagen summit showed."*

**Example 21.**

In its 2007 report (Chapt. 10, WG 2) the IPCC stated there was a very high chance that Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035. Only one reference was used to substantiate this claim, in the form of a paper (not peer-reviewed) by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), an environmental activist group. The reference is:

WWF (World Wildlife Fund), 2005: An overview of glaciers, glacier retreat, and subsequent impacts in Nepal, India and China. World Wildlife Fund, Nepal Programme.

The IPCC conceded, 3 years later, that their prediction on vanishing Himalayan glaciers had no basis in fact.

Let me know if you would like to see other examples of IPCC omissions, exaggerations and malpractice. I have many more.

You said:

"*My job is to make sure that scientists have a fair go at putting the evidence on the table, putting the uncertainties on the table, and having them debated in a rational and civilised way."*

Would that include that distinct majority of scientists who reject the notion of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming?

Would that include the large number of scientists who have contributed to the IPCC process and have publicly criticised the IPCC process and findings?

Would that include the large number of respected scientists who have publicly accused the IPCC of fraud? Let me remind you with a few examples:

Dr Vincent Gray, climate consultant, long-standing member of the New Zealand Royal Society and expert reviewer for all four IPCC Assessment Reports described the IPCC's climate change statements as:

*“An orchestrated litany of lies.”*

Former Professor of Climatology at the University of Winnipeg, Dr Tim Ball was equally explicit:

*“The argument that global warming is due to humans, known as the anthropogenic global warming theory (AGW) is a deliberate fraud.”*

Dr Ian Plimer, Professor of Mining Geology at The University of Adelaide and Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences at The University of Melbourne agrees:

*“Here we have the Australian government underpinning the biggest economic decision this country has ever made and it's all based on fraud.”*

Professor Tim Ball was also explicit about the leaked emails and documents:

*“The argument that global warming is due to humans, known as the anthropogenic global warming theory (AGW) is a deliberate fraud. I can now make that statement without fear of contradiction because of a remarkable hacking of files that provided not just a smoking gun, but an entire battery of machine guns.”*

and

*“Carbon dioxide was never a problem and all the machinations and deceptions exposed by these files prove that it is the greatest deception in history, but nobody is laughing. It is a very sad day for science.”*

Dr. Christopher Kobus says:

*“In essence, the jig is up. The whole thing is a fraud. And even the fraudsters that fudged data are admitting to temperature history that they used to say didn't happen...Perhaps what has doomed the Climategate fraudsters the most was their brazenness in fudging the data.”*

Dr Hilton Ratcliffe was equally clear:

*“The whole idea of anthropogenic global warming is completely unfounded. There appears to have been money gained by Michael Mann, Al Gore and UN IPCC's Rajendra Pachauri as a consequence of this deception, so it's fraud.”*

Russian Antarctic ice core researcher, Dr Andrei Kapitsa also considered the Kyoto Protocol as:

*“The biggest ever scientific fraud.”*

Dr Harold Lewis, Emeritus Professor of physics at the University of California, Santa Barbara, resigned from the American Physical Society (APS). He said:

*“Climategate was a fraud on a scale I have never seen.”*

and

*"… the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist.”*

Dr Ivar Giaever, the 1973 winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, also resigned from the APS over its position on global warming. He objected to their statement that: *“the evidence is incontrovertible.”*

Dr William Gray is Emeritus Professor and Head of the Tropical Meteorology Project, Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado University. He states:

*"I am of the opinion that (global warming) is one of the greatest hoaxes ever perpetrated on the American people."*

Professor Bob Carter, Research Fellow at James Cook University is a palaeontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist. Professor Carter describes the notion of anthropogenic global warming (AGW) as promoted by the IPCC as:

*“The greatest self-organised scientific and political conspiracy that the world has ever seen.”*

I suspect that the IPCC is the only organization which can be publicly accused of malpractice without fear of libel. I can readily imagine the long line of scientists waitng for an opportunity to testify against the IPCC.

Dr William Gilbert wants his feelings known:

*“I am ashamed of what climate science has become today. The science community is relying on an inadequate model to blame CO2 and innocent citizens for global warming in order to generate funding and to gain attention. If this is what 'science' has become today, I, as a scientist, am ashamed.”*

Swedish climatologist, Dr. Hans Jelbring is equally specific:

*“Science is too important for our society to be misused in the way it has been done within the Climate Science Community.”*

Perhaps I am being naive and optimistic but I always thought that a Chief Scientist would tell politicians that the science of climate change is far from settled and that the IPCC “science” and “process” are not to be trusted.

Science is about process, evidence, truth and integrity and Chief Scientists from all countries should be staunch defenders of those principles. Australia does not need a compliant Chief Scientist who will tell Government Ministers only what they want to hear.

Sincerely.

Dr John Happs

CC: Simon Birmingham; Doug Cameron; Mathias Cormann;
Christine Milne; Louise Pratt; Anne Urquhart; Bernie Rippoll;
Anna Burke; Darren Cheeseman; George Christensen; Joanna Gash;
Ed Husic; Tony Smith; Tony Windsor.