


CSIROh!

CLIMATE OF DECEPTION? ... OR FIRST STEP TO FREEDOM?



Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts. | Brisbane | Australia | February 2013

© **Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.**

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

Brisbane, Australia

04 1964 2379

malcolmr@conscious.com.au

First published: February 4th, 2013

Latest update: March 18th, 2014

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with, all parts of and appendices to the document entitled CSIROh! Appendices are available at URL links provided electronically within the report.

This document and its appendices are provided in good faith and without malice or ill will. They are part of an open and continuing public and political debate about a challenging topic of public and political interest and controversy and with serious and important adverse consequences affecting all Australians. It's of declared interest to Steve Austin and to federal politicians. It analyses public claims made primarily by advocates in public functions funded by government using the public purse.

I've written to many of the people whose behaviours, opinions and/or claims are discussed in this report and whose core claim is that human carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming—that ended in 1998. Most have responded. All have failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning for the basis of their core claim. All seemed reluctant to address my questions adequately. They failed to meet my reasonable need for integrity, reassurance and understanding.

To the best of my knowledge, my work is substantially true, correct and fair. My report is based on five years' voluntary research and investigation to protect my family and taxpayers affected by serious issues raised in this report and appendices as a result of activities and claims of people funded by taxpayers. It's based on facts and is contextually true.

As noted in my declaration of personal interests (Appendix 1c) my personal aims include restoring scientific integrity. It has slipped as the reputations of many involved in public climate discussions were eroded by their contradiction of Nature and/or of their previous statements. Some academics funded by government have placed themselves in a position of public ridicule.

Copies of this report are being sent to Australians whose actions and claims are discussed herein with opportunity for them to identify, specify and justify any claimed material errors and to provide supporting evidence for claimed errors. I express my regret for any substantial material errors within this report that aims to be comprehensive and accurate in the interests of all Australians.

Contents

PART 1	
Review of CSIRO report in context	iv
1. Introduction	1
2. The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is corrupt	3
3. Al Gore's alarmism is based on corrupt UN IPCC	4
4. Empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning on climate and human CO2	5
5. Three frequent major misrepresentations of climate	7
6. CSIRO and review of CSIRO's report	8
7. Why? Motives driving corruption of climate science	11
8. Consequences of climate corruption	13
9. Our two core challenges	15
10. Solutions	15
PART 2	
Summary review of observations of organisations and individuals funded by government	17
11. Bureau of Meteorology (BOM)	18
12. Government-funded organisations, agencies and departments	19
13. Australian academic activists and advocates	20
14. The government's discredited Climate Commission	21
15. Prominent universities funded by government	22
16. Prominent national politicians	22
17. Government-funded ABC radio and TV and The Sydney Morning Herald	23
18. Nongovernment organisations, NGO's	25

This report including appendices is available at www.conscious.com.au or directly at www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html

"The time is always right to do what is right" Martin Luther King, Jr



PART 1

Review of CSIRO report in context

1. Introduction

Background

This report was prepared at the invitation of Steve Austin, host on ABC-Radio 612 Brisbane. The invitation and my acceptance are available in Appendix 1a, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1a_EmailReplySteveAustin.pdf

Steve Austin invited a management consultant's review of CSIRO's document entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change*. He specifies that the report is, quote "*The official CSIRO document provided by the head of CSIRO, Dr Megan Clarke. As you know CSIRO¹ had a great number of scientist [sic] contributed to the IPCC report, as Dr Clarke told the National Press Club in Canberra late 2009. I interviewed the Chief Executive of the CSIRO Dr Clarke recently and she made it quite clear that they stood by their research and the data they have provided that supports the general concerns about sea levels rises, shifting climate and water data.*"

My brief from Steve Austin is to, quote: "*Please read through the Australian scientific paper and identify where you believe the CSIRO data has been falsified or is wrong.*"

Work started immediately on reviewing CSIRO's report. My review progressively uncovered ever more disturbing insights into CSIRO and the global warming industry. Investigation eventually led to the inescapable conclusion that Australia's national governance is threatened.

Consequently this report was prepared for all members of Australia's national parliament. It's being posted to each MP via Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation.

This report is being distributed initially to people listed in Appendix 1b, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1b_appendix.pdf

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with, all parts of and appendices to the document entitled CSIROh! To minimise paper and resource usage and to enable readers to easily verify facts, detailed appendices are available electronically since they comprise over 700 pages. Internet links are provided.

My background and declaration of personal interests are available in Appendix 1c here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1c_appendix.pdf

My tertiary education qualifications are similar to those of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) Chairman, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri. My rigorous statutory qualifications and past statutory responsibilities for the lives of hundreds of people are based on my knowledge of atmospheric gases including carbon dioxide (CO₂).

Various definitions and comments on the scientific process, science's purpose, and Nature are available in Appendix 1d, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1d_appendix.pdf

Dedication and acknowledgments are listed in Appendix 1e, here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1e_appendix.pdf

CSIRO's misrepresentations are so alarming that before presenting my analysis it's necessary to provide context. The pain of discovering the truth about an Aussie science icon is deeply disturbing. CSIRO developed a justifiably proud reputation over many decades and contains many fine, dedicated scientists and people across disciplines. Why though does CSIRO corrupt science? Why does CSIRO's executive management contradict empirical scientific evidence? What does it reveal about Australian national governance?

Methodically using solid data, sound analysis and considered judgment to analyse CSIRO identifies core issues. Understanding gives birth to solutions that provide hope and reassurance. We can convert despair to celebration of the human spirit and use this huge opportunity to secure a far wealthier and fairer future in Australia.

Executive Summary

CSIRO executives provided written responses to my requests for empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest global atmospheric warming period². In their responses CSIRO's Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark and CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment Dr. Andrew Johnson both failed to provide any such evidence. Their responses and CSIRO's report entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* (released in October, 2009) repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence³. Responses from CSIRO executives and CSIRO's report to media and the public do not contain the necessary logical scientific reasoning for the claim that human carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused global warming (aka climate change). (Appendices 6 and 6a)

CSIRO's report grossly misrepresents science, climate and Nature. Its structure and bias mislead the public to support the government's tax on carbon dioxide (CO₂). Yet CSIRO Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark provided the report to Steve Austin as reportedly the official CSIRO document that she stood by. (Refer Appendix 1a.)

Analysis of CSIRO comments, behaviour and publications reveal that on the topic of climate, CSIRO is unscientific and blatantly political. In advocating government policy it contradicts empirical scientific evidence. CSIRO has no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused warming (aka climate change).

CSIRO has many fine people and a proud heritage. In areas outside climate it appears to have capability and credibility. That is threatened by CSIRO's politicisation.

Speaking at United Nations (UN) conferences, CSIRO scientists use taxpayer funds to advocate for global governance. This is consistent with CSIRO's actions supporting implementation of UN Agenda 21, the UN's campaign pushing global governance. It bypassed Australia's parliament and people and threatens Australia's sovereignty and our personal freedoms.

² That period ended in 1998.

³ Similar requests were made to agencies funded by taxpayers and to the nine most prominent Australian academics advocating that unusual global warming occurred and was due to human CO₂. Most responded. All failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning. All are funded by government. (Part 2, Appendix 9)

Research raises questions about conflicts of interest among CSIRO's executives.

In good faith the people of Australia are funding CSIRO to provide science. The CSIRO though is using that money to misrepresent science. That misrepresentation assisted passage through parliament of the government's deceitful tax on carbon dioxide (CO₂) based on a lie. Taxpayer funds are being misappropriated to plunder more tax from Australians via an open-ended upward-ratcheting tax designed to be repeatedly and sharply raised. Extensive research reveals that Australia's national governance has been undermined and taxation is used as plunder to control people.

People now serve governments when governments should be serving people.

Solutions for restoring governance are offered.

2. The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is corrupt

CSIRO scientists are deeply enmeshed in producing corrupt UN IPCC reports. They act as contributing scientists of various rank, have papers referenced and presumably act as reviewers. CSIRO endorses UN IPCC reports despite those reports being demonstrably corrupt and pushing a political agenda.

All five UN IPCC reports to national governments and media—1990, 1995, 2001, 2007 and 2013—contradict empirical scientific evidence and provide no logical scientific reasoning for their core claim that human CO₂ caused, causes or will cause global warming.

The corruption is pervasive, systemic and driven by a political agenda to achieve a political outcome.

Specific details are in Appendix 2, available here:

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

Key conclusions include:

- **The body of the August 2010 report by the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) comprehensively condemned UN IPCC processes and procedures. It exposed many concerns including conflicts of interest;**
- The UN IPCC has no empirical scientific evidence for its core claim of warming by human CO₂ (see Appendix 2);
- Each of the UN IPCC's four reports to national governments and media is based on an unscientific falsity. The UN IPCC uses propaganda techniques;

- Prominent independent scientists including UN IPCC contributing scientists and at least one Lead Author condemn the UN IPCC as unscientific and /or dishonest;
- There is no scientific consensus claiming warming by human CO₂;
- **UN IPCC contributors and officials have corrupted, bypassed and at times prevented scientific peer-review. As a method of quality assurance, the process of peer-review is now worthless;**
- UN IPCC guidelines require the science to be modified to suit the politics;
- UN IPCC data on its reporting processes reveals that the UN IPCC is unscientific;
- The UN IPCC's rot starts at the top with conflicts of financial and other interests;
- Significant chapters and parts of UN IPCC reports are written by junior scientists and by political activists, ideologues and extremists funded by foundations with close connections to international bankers pushing global governance;
- The UN IPCC originated in the corrupt United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) having a record of contradicting empirical scientific evidence and hurting humanity. UNEP policies have led to the deaths of more than 40 million people. The UN IPCC extended and deepened UNEP's methods of corrupting science;
- So-called *climate science* was settled politically before the science even started;
- UN IPCC reporting strategy deceptively misled key people;
- UN IPCC uses and relies on big tobacco's tactics and methods to confuse.

The UN IPCC's unfounded core claim about human CO₂ is part of UN Agenda 21 campaign for global governance.

UN IPCC reports are admitted by senior ALP and Greens leaders to be the basis of those parties' climate policies.

3. Al Gore's alarmism is based on corrupt UN IPCC

Specific supporting points are documented in Appendix 3, available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/3_AppendixAlGore.pdf

The British High Court ruled in 2007 that Al Gore's movie entitled *An Inconvenient Truth* is a political work containing many factual inaccuracies. Independent quantitative analyses of the movie and book of the same name reveal they contain: 19 Wrong statements or false statements; 17 Misleading statements; 10 Exaggerated statements; 25 One sided statements; 28 Speculative statements; 234 images of natural and everyday events falsely depicted as unnatural and implied to be caused by global warming; 71 images and instances of unscientific, unfounded mixing of projections with actual data to falsely fabricate future climate; 59 instances of comments / images out of context or misrepresenting reality; 74 instances of using the crowd effect; 35 major errors on climate alone; and, ZERO empirical scientific data supporting the movie's core claim that human production of CO₂ drives global temperature and climate. The movie fabricated the unfounded concept of a *Tipping Point* in climate yet never specified any basis for determining the point.

Al Gore's Hollywood produced movie contradicts empirical scientific evidence. It's packed with falsities and misrepresents climate and science. It's ideologically driven political propaganda. It uses Hollywood propaganda techniques to carefully, subtly, calculatedly and emotionally demonise opponents.

It silenced dissent by making it shameful to disagree with its falsely fabricated and unscientific claim and its conjured non-existent scientific consensus.

It emotionally entrenched unfounded climate alarm. It was silent on Al Gore's extensive conflicts of financial interest that included the Chicago Climate Exchange in which his company Generation Investment Management was the fifth largest shareholder. The movie laid the foundation for cap-and-trade that falsely purports to be market driven. It's a ration-and-tax scheme centrally controlled by global organisations. Al Gore is a beneficiary. Doesn't that make his actions fraudulent?

Al Gore has publicly pushed for global governance to tackle his unfounded crisis.

4. Empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning on climate and human CO2

Specific supporting points are documented in Appendix 4, available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/4_AppendixBasicQuestions.pdf

To honestly advocate cutting human production of CO2 based on global warming (aka climate change), ALL four basic questions need to be answered yes:

1. Is global ATMOSPHERIC⁴ temperature warming unusually in either amount or rate and is it continuing to rise?
2. Does the level of carbon dioxide (CO2) in air control or determine Earth's temperature?
3. Does human CO2 production determine the level of CO2 in air?
4. Is warming catastrophic or even damaging?

A foundation of science is logical scientific reasoning proving or disproving causal relationships. The core and ultimate arbiter of science is scientifically measured repeatable empirical evidence. It provides answers to all four questions. Logically, only one negative answer ends claims to cut CO2 to avert catastrophe. Empirical scientific evidence answers all four negatively:

1. Global atmospheric temperatures peaked in 1998. Temperatures have since been flat with every year since colder than in 1998. Since the start of atmospheric temperature measurement in 1958 temperatures cooled slightly from 1958 to 1976. A sudden small

4

The UN IPCC claims its greenhouse gas supposition is an atmospheric effect.

step change known as the Great Pacific Climate Shift occurred in one year, 1976. Temperatures very slightly increased to 1998. Temperatures have since been flat with the possible start of a cooling trend in 2006. CSIRO and the UN IPCC use ground-based temperature measurements that are corrupted and unscientifically manipulated. Rural ground-based temperatures uncorrupted by urban heat sources reveal no net change since 1890 with modest cyclic cooling, warming, cooling, warming, stasis;

2. **Carbon dioxide (CO2) levels in air are a consequence of temperature, not a cause.** This is the reverse of UN IPCC, CSIRO and government claims. It applies throughout Earth's history and over every duration. It's true seasonally and long-term;
3. Nature alone determines levels of CO2 in air. This is the reverse of UN IPCC, CSIRO and government claims. It means that cutting or increasing human CO2 production cannot affect CO2 levels in air. It's useless to cut human CO2 production;
4. Warmer periods in Earth's history are highly beneficial to people, humanity, civilisation and the natural environment. This is the opposite of UN IPCC, CSIRO and government claims. Warmer periods are scientifically classified as *optimums*.

All four core claims or implied claims by the government, UN IPCC and CSIRO are false and contradict empirical scientific evidence. Logical scientific reasoning and empirical scientific evidence proves human CO2 cannot affect global warming.

Empirical scientific evidence and discussion in Appendix 4 reveals corruption of ground-based temperature data and of CO2 data used by the UN IPCC and CSIRO.

The atmosphere is not warming, much less unusually. Fluctuations since 1958 reveal modest natural cyclic temperature variation. Ground-based rural measurements reveal the same since 1890. Appendix 4 discusses the strongest natural factors proven by empirical scientific evidence to control global climate. They are El Nino, La Nina and other regional ocean-atmosphere decadal cycles. Scientists have identified many factors driving climate. These include galactic, solar system, solar, planetary and lunar cycles ranging from 150 million years to 11 years. Strong drivers include:

- Solar: (1) variations in sun's solar output; (2) Output of solar particles; (3) Sun's magnetic field polarity and strength;
- Water vapour: (1) atmospheric water content; (2) Cloud cover;
- Cyclic regional decadal circulation patterns such as North American Oscillation and the southern Pacific ocean's El Nino together with their variation over time;
- Ocean: (1) temperature; (2) salinity; (3) currents; (4) sea surface temperatures;
- Volcanic activity.

These are either omitted from, or downplayed in erroneous unvalidated computerised numerical models used by the UN IPCC and CSIRO. Model projections contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Empirical data reveal no changes in trends of weather events, sea levels, ocean alkalinity, diseases, species survival and no threat to Aussie icons

Please refer to empirical scientific evidence presented in Appendix 4a revealing no changes in frequency or severity of weather events.

CSIRO and the closely connected UN IPCC contradict empirical scientific evidence to falsely misrepresent science, climate and Nature by projecting unfounded future catastrophic changes.

Empirical scientific evidence and discussion in Appendix 4a is available here:

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

Is the rooster crowing at sunrise evidence that the rooster causes the sun to rise⁵? No.

5. Three frequent major misrepresentations of climate

Understanding empirical scientific evidence combined with observations documented in Appendix 5 enables easy identification of three frequent, major misrepresentations of climate, science and Nature. These are:

1. Human CO₂ controls and determines global temperature and climate. False;
2. There is an overwhelming consensus of scientists supporting that claim. False;
3. Catastrophic consequences will result at some unspecified future date from human disruption of global climate: sea level rise, extreme weather, floods, drought, snowfall, fires, ocean pH (alkalinity), disease, species extinction, ... All false.

CSIRO publications and claims have included all three misrepresentations.

Specific supporting points are documented in Appendix 5, available here:

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

Appendix 19 currently simply provides a summary of views on the supposed greenhouse effect of back-radiation central to UN IPCC and CSIRO claims that human CO₂ warms the planet. Appendix 19 is available here.

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/19_Appendix.pdf

6. CSIRO and review of CSIRO's report

My conclusions on CSIRO are based on: (1) correspondence with CSIRO's Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark and CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment Dr. Andrew Johnson; (2) extensive analysis and research of CSIRO reports by me and by Graham Williamson; (3) reading of publicly available material; and (4) publications by and communication with former CSIRO scientists including former chief research scientist with the CSIRO division of atmospheric research, Professor Garth Paltridge.

They're documented in Appendix 6, available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/6_AppendixCSIRO.pdf

My conclusions on CSIRO are that:

- Written responses from CSIRO Chief Executive and CSIRO Group Executive—Environment reveal that neither have empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ affects global climate. On all four basic climate questions (Section 4, above), CSIRO and its executives contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- CSIRO relies on projections from unvalidated computerised numerical models already proven wrong by contradicting empirical scientific evidence;
- In his replies, CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment has twice failed to refute my specific conclusion that CSIRO documents and references he provided contain no supporting empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning;
- CSIRO, its executives and reports falsely claim human CO₂ drives global climate;
- CSIRO and its executives propagate all three major misrepresentations of climate;
- **Chief Executive is a former director of international banking firm Rothschilds Australia and is currently on the Advisory Board of major international banking firm Bank of America Merrill Lynch. (Appendix 6). International banking firms will profit enormously from trading in CO₂ credits. This relationship raises perceptions and questions about the opportunity for conflicts of interest;**
- CSIRO scientists are enmeshed in discredited UN IPCC reports and procedures;
- CSIRO endorses and supports the corrupt UN IPCC. Thus CSIRO endorses corruption of science;
- CSIRO has thereby ceded sovereignty over Australian science to an unscientific and corrupt foreign political organisation pushing a global political agenda;
- CSIRO is thus abetting systemic and pervasive documented corruption of science;
- **Scientists paid by taxpayers advocate global governance at overseas conferences;**
- CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment is aware of the Inter Academy Council's (IAC) August 2010 review of the UN IPCC. Yet CSIRO has not withdrawn support for the UN IPCC despite the body of the IAC report revealing crippling deficiencies in UN IPCC processes and procedures;
- **CSIRO is supporting implementation of UN Agenda 21, the greatest threat to Australian sovereignty;**
- CSIRO is heavily dependent on government funding and is a politicised advocate for government policy;
- On climate, CSIRO is political, not scientific. It's destroying science;

- CSIRO scientists are driven into political advocacy;
- Within Australia, CSIRO scientists act as political advocates;
- CSIRO's glossy print and website brochures are not objective and not scientific. They merely advocate the 'alarmist' or 'political' view on climate;
- Activists are involved in CSIRO climate publications contradicting reality;
- CSIRO climate reports reveal traits of carefully constructed propaganda;
- CSIRO's culture has led to formal complaints of bullying;
- CSIRO is now not focused on science. This is hurting its effectiveness in industry;
- The international and Australian scientific community is in revolt at CSIRO's destruction of climate science;
- CSIRO's dominant position enables its views to control and manipulate other Australian scientific institutions including universities;
- Undermining science by short-term political agenda will hurt politicians;
- CSIRO's false claims have influenced public opinion and policy to the detriment of many people, communities, research institutes, state governments, local councils and other groups affected by CSIRO misrepresentation of climate.

I conclude that CSIRO has misled the media. Through the National Press Club and media, CSIRO misled the people and parliament of Australia. CSIRO has been actively engaged in UN IPCC corruption of climate and science.

Management consultant's analysis of *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* as requested

Your request, Steve, for a report on CSIRO's "*climate change scientific theory*" is in respect to climate science. Thus my review of CSIRO's glossy booklet entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* is restricted to comments on its pages 2-11. I do not comment on CSIRO's work on alternative energy and other topics discussed in the booklet's subsequent pages.


Analysis of CSIRO'S document reveals it contains no empirical scientific evidence or any logical scientific reasoning for the claim that human CO2 caused global warming. The document repeatedly contradicts empirical scientific evidence and misrepresents science, climate and Nature.

Statements in *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* were analysed and classified into one of six categories. Although many statements could have been categorised into multiple categories each CSIRO statement was assigned only one category. eg, a statement could be false, unfounded, contradict empirical scientific evidence and falsely blame human CO2 yet was assigned to only one category.

Appendix 6a presents detailed analysis of the CSIRO document. It includes justification for each statement's categorisation. Please check and assess for yourself, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/6a_AppendixTheScienceOfTacklingClimateChange.pdf

My experience is in providing a specialised management and leadership service internationally to people of varied education and backgrounds. Experience reveals that data is often most effectively presented graphically for easy and rapid analysis, interpretation and summary.

This is the summary of CSIRO statements on pages 2-11 of its booklet entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change*.



CSIRO contradicts empirical scientific evidence and relies instead on unvalidated computerised numerical models contradicting empirical scientific evidence and proven to be wrong.

The Foreword by Dr. Andrew Johnson and the succeeding ten pages (numbered 2-11) contain many misrepresentations of science and climate.

Significantly, in the page discussing climate alarm's biggest unfounded scare—projected future sea levels—CSIRO makes 12 statements contradicting empirical scientific evidence. That was followed by the page discussing temperature and climate projections with ten contradictions of empirical scientific evidence.

CSIRO knows how to scare people. The CSIRO report's relatively short script is crammed with misrepresentations. Yet it has no empirical scientific evidence of human causation and often contradicts empirical scientific evidence. Why?

A sixteen year-old student's science report similar in quality to CSIRO's glossy booklet would fail for absence of scientific reasoning of causation and for contradicting empirical scientific evidence. A financial prospectus of the standard set by CSIRO's brochure would lead to investigation by authorities. I conclude that CSIRO's report is unscientific, misleading and deceptive. It's corruption of science.

CSIRO's glossy booklet is a cocktail of falsities, contradictions of empirical scientific evidence and unsubstantiated implied conclusions based on low levels of understanding. Section 3 of Appendix 6 quotes from, references and discusses correspondence from CSIRO senior executives. Contrary to claims by CSIRO's

Group Executive—Environment, the list of references he separately provided for the CSIRO document contains no empirical scientific evidence for his false core claim that human CO2 caused/causes/will cause global warming.

Why then did so many people initially fall for and then help spread the unfounded claim that human CO2 would catastrophically warm our planet? To understand corruption of climate science needs more than empirical scientific evidence. It requires understanding motives pushing corruption of climate science.

7. Why? Motives driving corruption of climate science

The forty-year campaign inventing and fabricating unfounded global warming (aka climate change) shares strategies, tactics, methods and goals with another prominent international scam: the forty year campaign by international bankers to create and own the American Federal Reserve Bank. The Fed controls America. It's not an American government department. It's privately owned by an alliance of European and American banks. The Bank of England is privately owned.

This conclusion is based on many independent reference books documenting events and facts associated with a concerted push for unelected global governance. They're cited in Appendix 14 available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/14_Appendix.pdf

Ellen Hodgson Brown's book *The Web of Debt* is highly recommended. Books referenced by Matt Ridley and Robert Zubrin are also highly recommended. See <http://booko.com.au/>

Appendix 14 reveals that the main pushers of unfounded climate alarm and corruption of science are international bankers seeking to make money for nothing by trading CO2 credits. They seek to magnify that using derivatives.

Understandably many informed people consider the climate scam to be history's worst. It's not. It's merely the third worst deceit of modern times.

It joins the second worst deceit: international bankers' money fraud creating currency as debt out of nothing. Our fiat money is not backed by anything. If citizens behaved as do international bankers we would be gaoled for counterfeiting and fraud.

Appendix 14 documents UN corruption of climate science as one part of its deceitful UN Agenda 21 campaign. It aims to remove people's private property rights and to control land, water, air, space, resource allocation, finance and energy. It's part of a deceitful push for global governance and control. This is clear and widely documented. It's based on antihuman ideology.

The late Henry Lamb provides an outstanding summary of international bankers pushing global control via UN agencies.

<http://shelf3d.com/Search/The%2BRise%2Bof%2BGlobal%2BGovernance%2BPlaylistIDPLKjJE86mQRtsd2abcjQkgq4uw-H5MLvMa>

Antihuman ideology is the worst deceit of modern times. During the last century it caused hundreds of millions of deaths. It's driven by international bankers pushing global governance using antihuman fabrications contradicting empirical scientific evidence. (Appendix 14)

Appendix 14 reveals the core problem: government control over people. It pushes tax plunder costing every Australian family thousands of dollars each year. Australian Taxation Office Deputy Commissioner Jim Killaly revealed in 1996, quote: "Since 1953 Multinationals have paid little or no tax." He reinforced it in 2010.

Each week the typical Australian works from Monday to smoko on Thursday (3.4 days) to pay government taxes, fees, rates, levees ...

Foreign companies use infrastructure funded by Australian families and small businesses yet they pay less than 10% of Australia's tax. That's not a fair go. We now face another tax. It's an open-ended upward-ratcheting tax on CO2. The government admits it's designed to be dramatically raised in future to cause pain to change people's behaviour. Growing central control within Australia and globally is hurting Aussie families. It's threatening our nation's existence, people's security and our children's future.

In good faith the people of Australia are funding CSIRO to provide science. The CSIRO though is using that money to misrepresent science. That misrepresentation and others by taxpayer-funded advocates and the Prime Minister's broken pre-election promise assisted the government's deceitful tax on carbon dioxide (CO2) to pass through parliament. (Appendices 9 and 12). Taxpayer funds are being misappropriated to plunder more tax from Australians.

Exposing the international bankers' scams raises enormous opportunities for Australians to increase national and personal wealth and to restore freedom.

This report could trigger typical responses from those pushing, supporting, hiding or benefitting from corrupting climate science. Some are listed in Appendix 14, Section 20.

8. Consequences of climate corruption

Appendix 16 documents enormous direct and indirect costs of unfounded climate alarm. It reveals that international bankers are the greatest global environmental and humanitarian threat. Other threats include enormous economic and social costs to Australian families as listed. Corruption driving unfounded climate alarm is significant and extends across society at huge cost to Australians.

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is not a pollutant. Focusing on a non-problem diverts valuable time, attention, money, research, energy and resources away from cutting toxins and stopping real pollution. Appendices reveal that climate alarm is one of the greatest threats to the global environment. We need to drop unfounded climate alarm and return to cutting real land, air and water pollution.

Consider the advocates' financial and personal interests. Consider the behaviour of CSIRO, academics and politicians contradicting empirical scientific evidence in falsely advocating that human CO₂ drives global climate. Their public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy. CSIRO's climate advocacy is destroying its scientific reputation. They've placed themselves in a position of being perceived as compromised. I do not trust their claims, statements or intent.

Appendix 16 is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/16_appendix.pdf

Part 2 discusses other groups funded by government and pushing unfounded climate alarm and advocating taxing and/or trading CO₂. During investigations of climate advocacy within government-funded organisations a small group of Australian academics identified itself through recurrence of their names within and across organisations. Some names recurred more often and/or more significantly than did others. Two were most prominent: David Karoly and Will Steffen. Both staunchly publicly advocate government policy cutting human CO₂ production.

To illustrate this linkage across government-funded organisations, consider David Karoly's publicly reported interactions and links. Reportedly, he:

- is linked with many CSIRO staff as a co-author of papers cited by the UN IPCC and as a UN IPCC contributor;
- holds a significant position with the BOM;
- admits receiving payments from the government's Department of Climate Change;
- is a member of the Science Advisory Panel of WWF, a politicised activist organisation corrupting climate science and pushing global governance;
- is a member of the working group that produced the Australian Academy of Science's unscientific booklet funded by the Department of Climate Change;
- is a member of the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel funded by the Department of Climate Change;
- is arguably the most senior UN IPCC contributor to its core claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. He is a Lead Author and Review Editor of the sole chapter making that claim in the 2001 and 2007 reports respectively and draft writer of the 2007 Summary for Policymakers given to media and politicians worldwide;

- features prominently in ABC broadcasts misrepresenting climate science;
- is employed as a professor at a prominent Australian university receiving government grants for studying climate;
- receives government grants including a federal government grant in 2006 of \$1.9 million to study, quote “detection and attribution of climate change”. That was given after closure of the UN IPCC report that supposedly presented what politicians and academics misrepresented as the ‘settled science’;
- makes unfounded claims following natural weather events. Such claims are presented as expert comment yet contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- reinforces publicly all three major climate misrepresentations;
- is connected with several self-interested global organisations including some pushing global governance and control;
- is connected directly or indirectly with most academics listed in section 13 and Appendix 9.

Why are prominent professors sceptical of the claim that human CO₂ caused warming excluded from government-funded positions and broadcasts? Why are the opinions of eminent scientists such as Ian Plimer, Bob Carter, Garth Paltridge, Stewart Franks and Bill Kininmonth excluded? Is it because they’re scientists of the real world and rely on empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning? Why are they excluded in favour of scientists relying on unvalidated erroneous computerised numerical models and contradicting empirical scientific evidence?

The government’s obvious bias raises broader issues. Through awarding grants reportedly heavily biased in favour of climate alarm is government pushing scientists to restrict research of sceptic views or to be advocates? How can individual scientists independently explore Nature when one of the consequences seems to be loss of scientific independence and objectivity?

Why does government make appointments to its bodies from a tight-knit, small clique of people. Why exclude those who factually challenge the unfounded claim that human CO₂ caused Earth’s latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming period that ended in 1998? Can objectivity come from a small group funded by any self-interested government and contradicting empirical scientific evidence?

It triggers the question: is there a tight-knit cabal spreading alarm within the global warming *industry*?

Appendix 20 is set aside for the future.

9. Our two core challenges

Appendix 17 reveals the two greatest problems we face: (1) the stifling control of socialist over-government and, (2) its driver, the Human Condition or ego. The ego is underlain by fear that triggers guilt and greed. It manifests as a grab for power by manipulating to control.

The push for global governance is Australia's most severe threat. Taxation has become plunder. Private land and property rights and freedom are being stolen. Government funding enables destructive, costly direct and indirect control of people. Our inherent care and trust are manipulated and used against us.

Details are provided in Appendix 17 available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/17_appendix.pdf

When people seek to control, it's revealing because always beneath control is fear. Control often masks weakness.

10. Solutions

Appendix 18 acknowledges that government's fundamental duty is to protect life and protect property.

Democratic governments are formed BY the people to serve the people. Today though, government plunders and controls the people to serve government.

How can excess government control by egotistical manipulators be minimised?

Appendix 18 provides information on systemic and personal changes to restore freedom and efficiency. It enables greater environmental and humanitarian care:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/18_appendix.pdf

Useful reports do more than list serious problems. They offer constructive solutions for consideration. This report offers the following:

- Follow due process restoring governance consistent with our country's constitution;
- Instil means for voters to directly hold politicians accountable for corruption. Methods used by the Swiss have produced high accountability;
- Exit the corrupt UN immediately;
- Introduce a simple transaction tax whose rate is determined and modified by voters in referenda. It would replace all other taxes and be levied by states with some revenue apportioned to a national government with vastly reduced responsibilities. Restore Australia's federation;

- Cap government expenditure using caps set by the people using direct democracy;
- Restore freedom of speech;
- Eliminate regulations across the board to enable citizens to live freely and to stimulate creativity needed to improve environmental protection and efficiency;
- Restore honest currency to replace fiat money currently issued as debt with no tangible backing and of no inherent value;
- Unshackle education from government control to enable creativity and responsibility to flourish and to improve teacher satisfaction and salaries;
- Remove science from government control after an impartial investigation of CSRIO and BOM and of grants awarded to institutions claiming unfounded climate alarm. Require funds to be repaid to taxpayers;
- Recharge Australian industry by providing fairness through fair trade;
- Allow ideas and people to emerge in response to our country's needs. Twenty two million Aussies will detail solutions to the mess made by international bankers;
- Give compassion to those trying to control. Giving compassion benefits givers too;
- Celebrate and appreciate the wonderful reality of humanity and Nature.

First step to freedom

The depth of corruption shocked me. People use many methods to control others. These include: overthrowing nations, fraudulently creating money as debt out of nothing, using camouflage such as *sustainability* and *biodiversity* for stealing land, smearing, corruptly fomenting unfounded alarm, lying, manipulating, making unlawful regulations and stealing money under false pretences. Those seeking to control others are desperate. They're in pain and in fear. People corrupting science and people using antihuman ideology to push global governance are misguided or misinformed.

We cannot condone their damaging control. Yet blaming them will not assist. To prevent recurrence we need to understand. That requires avoiding value judgments that cloud our minds and hearts and drive us to control. (Appendix 18) Forsaking ego-driven value judgments enables true forgiveness that clears our minds and hearts. It brings us peace and real freedom regardless of events.

We're all doing the best we can. By not making value judgments about others we can truly forgive. With real freedom's inner clarity we are conscious of core issues as a basis for taking effective action to free people.

International bankers' antihuman strategies have been choking nations worldwide—from Africa to Australia—for centuries. Despite an estimated \$100 billion spent on climate science, media and propaganda, people worldwide are seeing through the scam. We've earned our freedom from international bankers' greed.

Australians can restore integrity and return to having the world's highest per capita income, securing our nation and securing a future for our children.

STOP INSANITY | RESTORE HUMANITY

A green tree frog with yellow underparts is perched on a patch of green grass. The frog is facing right, and its body is covered in small, bumpy green skin. The background is a soft, out-of-focus green, suggesting a natural habitat. A semi-transparent green rectangle is overlaid on the right side of the image, containing the title and subtitle.

PART 2

Summary review of observations
of organisations and individuals
funded by government

11. Bureau of Meteorology (BOM)

Correspondence with BOM executives and comments about BOM's claims are documented in Appendix 7, available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/7_appendix.pdf

My conclusions on BOM are that:

- In his response to my requests for empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 caused warming, the BOM's head failed to provide evidence. He merely claimed such evidence exists. His statement is false;
- BOM cites and relies upon a nonexistent scientific consensus, an unscientific term;
- The head of BOM cites a joint BOM-CSIRO report implying evidence. Yet that report contains no empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused warming. It relies on prior false assumptions, presumably in UN IPCC reports that falsely claim human CO2 caused warming;
- BOM makes false claims about human CO2 causing climate change;
- BOM cites, relies upon and endorses UN IPCC corruption;
- BOM has failed to do its due diligence on UN IPCC climate claims and thereby ceded Australian sovereignty on climate science;
- BOM's climate reports misrepresent climate, science and Nature;
- BOM is funded by government;
- BOM's climate advocacy appears to allow public misrepresentations to go unchecked;
- BOM contributes to World Meteorological Organisation reports contradicting empirical scientific evidence and falsely claiming human CO2 changes climate;
- BOM's reputation on climate is tarnished by inaccurate work revealed by Australian and international scientists.

12. Government-funded organisations, agencies and departments

Correspondence with Australian Academy of Science executives and details about interactions with the Academy are documented in Appendix 8. These are combined with experience and/or investigations of other agencies, available here:

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

My conclusions are:

- In his response to my request for empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO₂ caused warming the Academy's Science Policy Manager failed to provide such evidence. He falsely claimed such evidence exists and provided 30 references that he said contain the evidence sought. Checking every reference revealed no empirical evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming. All were references cited in the Academy's glossy flagship climate booklet falsely implying global warming due to human CO₂. My detailed formal complaint to The Academy's President, Professor Suzanne Cory, a CSIRO board member, produced no response. Was it coincidence that the Academy's booklet emerged around the time that the Inter Academy Council's report damned UN IPCC processes and procedures? (Appendix 8 provides details)
- Government funds the Academy. Its glossy flagship climate booklet was commissioned and funded by the Department of Climate Change. The Academy and its booklet repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence and falsely imply human CO₂ caused global warming. It's not scientific, it's propaganda;
- The Academy has close ties with the UN IPCC and CSIRO;
- Another organisation funded by government is the office of Australia's Chief Scientist. My request to the Chief Scientist for empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming failed to provide any evidence. The Chief Scientist falsely publicly advocates that human CO₂ needs to be cut;
- The Chief Scientist's office makes fundamental errors in misrepresenting climate science, contradicting empirical scientific evidence and failing to do its due diligence;
- The Chief Scientist is funded by government;
- Another organisation with no evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming (aka climate change) is the government's Department of Climate Change. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence and misrepresents climate;
- National academies around the world have no evidence that human CO₂ caused warming. The body of the August 2010 report from the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) comprehensively condemned UN IPCC processes and procedures. It exposed many serious issues including conflicts of interest. Despite having no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming and without members' consent, the executives of some academies endorsed their government's policy. Members of some academies have censured executives for that position and forced a more honest appraisal of science effectively admitting the lack of evidence;

- There are no organisations overseas with evidence that human CO2 caused warming. NASA affiliates condemn NASA's rogue Goddard Institute of Space Studies (GISS) for its climate advocacy and corruption. James Hansen leads GISS's position. Both he and GISS have repeatedly contradicted empirical scientific evidence. Both lack evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Government funds NASA-GISS's corruption of climate science;
- The American government's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) provides no empirical scientific evidence for the claim that human CO2 caused warming. It's implied statements contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- America's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is similar. Beyond climate, its corrupt antihuman policies contradicting empirical scientific evidence have helped to cause millions of third-world deaths. (Appendices 8 and 14);
- Britain's infamous Stern Review has no evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Yet it recommended a policy of severely cutting human CO2. Its methods have been debunked scientifically, economically and statistically. It contradicts known principles in all three disciplines and contradicts empirical scientific evidence. The Stern Review has been comprehensively exposed for its disgraceful unscientific advocacy on behalf of Tony Blair's government;
- These agencies make all three misrepresentations of climate.

13. Australian academic activists and advocates

During recent years I contacted all nine most prominent Australian academics who claim that human CO2 causes global warming (aka climate change). I asked them to provide empirical scientific evidence for their claim. Most responded. All failed to provide evidence. Analysis of their statements and behaviour is in Appendix 9 available here:

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

The nine are professors: David Karoly, Tim Flannery, Will Steffen, Ross Garnaut, Lesley Hughes, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Kurt Lambeck, Matthew England and Andy Pitman. They share the following traits:

- All failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 causes global warming. All contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- All are funded by government;
- Additionally, almost all have prominent government-paid positions;
- Some receive additional payments from political activists pushing global governance;
- Many have working associations with CSIRO;
- The UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies extensively on papers written or co-written by seven of these academic advocates;

- The majority contribute to UN IPCC reports;
- All failed to disclose their personal financial interests associated with their claims;
- All misrepresent climate science;
- Some have falsely smeared those who disagree with their claims or view;
- Some are associated with organisations pushing global control;
- Ross Garnaut is reportedly a member of the Trilateral Commission. Appendix 14;
- Two thirds are connected with or depend on the government's discredited Climate Commission for their careers and financial income.

A tenth academic who I've not contacted and whose work is discussed briefly in Appendix 9 is Stefan Lewandowsky. Reportedly, quote: *"Lewandowsky gets \$1.7m of taxpayer funds to denigrate people who disagree with him"*. I conclude that if true such a taxpayer-funded approach is a threat to science and to free expression.

The academics' behaviour produces many serious questions and consequences discussed in Appendix 9.

14. The government's discredited Climate Commission

Analysis of the Climate Commission is in Appendix 10 available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/10_appendix.pdf

Climate Commission members and reports contradict empirical scientific evidence and provide no logical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Members and reports fabricate, exaggerate and project unfounded catastrophe and spread all three major misrepresentations of climate science discussed in Part 1, Section 5 and in Appendix 5. The Climate Commission has become the subject of ridicule after wild exaggerations, alarmist statements and contradictions by members, particularly the Chief Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery. The Climate Commission is not scientific, it's political. It displays traits of propaganda. It corrupts science.

Given politicians' (false) statements that thousands of scientists support the government's claim about CO2, why are so many positions handed to the same small cabal of academics? There seems to be a wider cabal of academics supporting government policy who move among boards of government-funded agencies, universities, NGO's and like-minded organisations capturing taxpayer funds.

15. Prominent universities funded by government

Analysis of prominent Australian universities is in Appendix 11 available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/11_appendix.pdf

As a result of their government dependency and high public profile some universities appear locked into operating in a way that supports government's agenda. That support appears to be in the form of comments supporting the political agenda and discrediting those with opposing views. The University of New South Wales, University of Melbourne, University of Queensland and the Australian National University all vigorously promote the claim that human CO2 caused global warming. All universities claiming human CO2 causes global warming lack any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for their claim. All contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Prominent universities in Britain and America known to be closely associated with the global warming *industry* have failed to transparently and independently investigate complaints of serious corruption, including complaints referred by British parliament. My complaints to the Universities of Queensland and Melbourne about behaviour and/or ethics were lightly dismissed.

Section Appendix 9 reveals that a university academic reportedly received '\$1.7m of taxpayer funds to denigrate people who disagree with him'.

What is happening at universities with taxpayer funds?

16. Prominent national politicians

Appendix 12 contains detailed analysis of correspondence with prominent Australian politicians. It provides analysis of their statements and behaviour and is available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/12_appendix.pdf

Prominent politicians advocating cutting human CO2 have no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 caused global warming. They contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Prominent Members of Parliament have been provided with empirical scientific evidence and extensive detailed documentation of corruption of climate science. That material has been sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. Despite this, MPs fail to fulfil their responsibilities.

ALP, Greens and Liberal climate claims are purely political and are corrupt. Of most concern are statements and/or actions of Kevin Rudd, Senator Penny Wong, Greg Combet, Robert McClelland, Julia Gillard, Craig Emerson, Senator Christine

Milne, Bob Brown (retired), Greg Hunt, Malcolm Turnbull, Rob Oakeshott and Tony Windsor. Reasons are provided in Appendix 12. The behaviour and /or comments of some politicians raise serious questions. Are some politicians behaving deceitfully?

Many MPs are reluctant to discuss corruption. The rapidity and ease with which some deflect accountability is of grave concern. Groupthink seems rife. Known sceptics within the federal parliamentary ALP have failed to publicly speak their truth.

MPs were advised that the Gillard-Brown Multi Party Climate Change Committee (MPCCC) recommending that parliament pass the tax on CO2 seems to have been misled by its government-appointed Expert Adviser. MPs seem unconcerned.

Generally, federal politicians have failed to do their due diligence and /or speak their truth effectively. Some politicians have demonstrated integrity yet parliamentary and party systems act to suppress them.

Collusion between Liberals and Labor destroyed farmers' private property rights. Largely through ignorance MPs are ceding Australian sovereignty and destroying Australian industries. This has been occurring for decades. Appendices 12 and 14 discuss the UN's current Agenda 21 campaign stealing private property rights.

Politicians have smashed national governance, undermined Australia's federation and bypassed our constitution.

Some politicians around the world and in Australia reveal strength, due diligence and integrity. In 2012 American state Alabama banned UN Agenda 21 to protect private property rights and the Alabama State constitution.

17. Government-funded ABC radio and TV and The Sydney Morning Herald

Detailed methodical analyses of six Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) programs is in Appendices 13 and 13a-13g accessible here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13_appendix.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13a_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingWorkingTranscript.pdf

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

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13c_AppendixQandAClimateDebateWorking.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13d_AppendixMediaWatchTranscriptMarch2011.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13e_AppendixMediaWatchTranscriptMay30-2011.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13f_AppendixCatalystTranscriptWorking.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13g_Appendix4CornersTranscriptWorking.pdf

The analyses demonstrate extreme bias in the ABC. On climate, the ABC is demonstrably an advocate for government policy. Some examples include:

- *Media Watch* (TV) purports to hold commercial media accountable. It fails to lead by example with serious misrepresentations implied by smear and innuendo. Its methods are deceitful and damage innocent taxpayers. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence;
- *Catalyst* (TV) program;
- *QandA* (TV) program;
- *Four Corners* (TV) program;
- *Background Briefing* (radio): people interviewed by former Four Corners reporter Wendy Carlisle saw her attempt as a concerted hatchet job on the volunteer⁶ Galileo Movement. Her extreme attempts failed. That confirmed The Galileo Movement as clean and credible. The same cannot be said for her methods. Her ignorance of science is astounding;

The ABC responded to my complaint about *Stateline* (TV). The ABC denies any responsibility for checking the accuracy of people it interviews as supposed climate experts. Yet it repeatedly broadcasts comments from a narrow group of academic advocates funded by government and misrepresenting climate science.

ABC science programs hosted by showmen Robyn Williams and Dr. Karl Kruszelnicki misrepresent climate science and corrupt public understanding of science.

ABC programs repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence. None have provided empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning for the ABC's repeated claim that human CO2 caused global warming. The ABC repeatedly broadcasts all three major misrepresentations of climate. Has the ABC failed to do its due diligence or is its swarm of investigative reporters incompetent and/or extremely biased? That so many failed to unearth and expose massive corruption of climate science raises serious questions.

ABC climate bias is extreme and conducted through omission and complicity. In some programs the bias is structural and is advocacy. It's not clear whether the bias across the ABC is cultural or systematic as revealed in the ABC's British sister, the BBC. Taxpayers fund ABC broadcasts of government's misrepresentations. These broadcasts are used to steal more money from taxpayers via the Deceit Tax on CO2.

The ABC is joined in its biased advocacy for government policy by Fairfax newspapers. In August 2012 Sydney Morning Herald (SMH) reporter Mike Carlton falsely smeared two prominent Aussie journalists (Andrew Bolt and Alan Jones), myself as a volunteer and the voluntary Galileo Movement. He falsely implied it's anti-Semitic.

It's not. Both co-founders of The Galileo Movement are intimately connected with Jewish people. Why did Mike Carlton contradict facts to drag into climate reporting a religion and race that has been murderously persecuted for centuries? Why did he need to falsely smear people? Why did he raise conspiracy? Why does he resort to changing the topic? Why does he avoid accountability? Earlier, why did he run from my email of March 8th, 2010 asking him for evidence and reasoning?

Appendix 14 explains standard responses of climate alarmists lacking evidence and reasoning. It reveals methods typically used to discredit people whose views differ. Appendix 13 explores Mike Carlton's outburst to reveal and illustrate significant lessons. It reveals methods some journalists use without any evidence and contrary to facts to trigger panic and shut debate. They can do so because science has been muddled by corruption and politicisation. It's not *'settled science'*.

Appendix 13 reveals that SMH environmental reporter Ben Cubby fails to report on corruption of climate science. His actions demonstrate his ignorance of science. His stories endorse claims that contradict empirical scientific evidence. They reveal an apparent lack of honest inquiry and desire to hold people accountable for corruption of climate science. This is not accurate news journalism.

The ABC and SMH spread corruption of climate science. They have prevented an Australian public debate on climate science.

Around the same time, a reputable and formerly strong journalist Andrew Bolt admitted his behaviour has been influenced by fear. This demonstrates the power wielded by media and government. It supports growing calls to protect free speech and freedom.

18. Nongovernment organisations, NGO's

Appendix 15 documents deceitful roles played by some nongovernment organisations. It's available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/15_appendix.pdf

NGO's such as WWF and Greenpeace are responsible for corrupting UN IPCC reports. They falsely use and then spread political campaign material as science. Their frequent public claims contradict empirical scientific evidence. WWF is a UN agent pushing global governance and funded by major foundations connected with international bankers. Its antihuman agenda does not protect the environment, it severely damages the environment.

Activists write significant chapters and parts of UN IPCC reports. Their connection with CSIRO and the UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri is documented in Appendix 6.

This report including appendices is available at www.conscious.com.au or directly at www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html

"The time is always right to do what is right" Martin Luther King, Jr

From: Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Subject: Reply to Steve Austin - Steve Austin Re: Climate change / CSIRO Report
Date: 15 February 2010 10:39:44 AM AEST
To: Stephen Austin <Austin.Stephen@abc.net.au>
Cc: Tony Delroy <delroy.tony@abc.net.au>, Kelly Higgins-Devine <higginsdevine.kelly@abc.net.au>, Michael Spencer <michaelspencer2@bigpond.com>, Vanessa Wiltshire <wiltshire.vanessa@abc.net.au>, Geraldine Doogue <geraldine.doogue@abc.net.au>, Tony Jones <tony.jones@abc.net.au>, Fran Kelly <fran.kelly@abc.net.au>, Kerry O'Brien <kerry.o'brien@abc.net.au>, Margot O'Neill <margot.o'Neill@abc.net.au>
▶ 2 Attachments, 121 KB

Steve:

Thank you for your e-mail and challenge.

I gladly accept your challenge subject to one simple condition below to ensure your commitment and accountability.

Before that though I want to address your apparent annoyance and concern that I may be just a 'keyboard crank'. I want to address your possible needs for reassurance and understanding - and maybe your need for responsibility on my part.

I want to provide you with some clarity and reassurance on my purpose and intent.

Please understand that while some recipients of my e-mails have forwarded them to friends/colleagues around the world resulting in requests for more people's addresses to be added to my lists, some other recipients have requested that their address be removed. I have always cheerfully complied with both types of request by adding or removing e-mail addresses immediately.

If you or any other recipient wants to be removed from my e-mail list, please say so and it will be done immediately I receive your e-mail. If you or any other recipient wants to add a friend's/colleague's name to my list, please advise and I will do so immediately upon receipt of your e-mail.

Steve, if I were simply a keyboard crank, to use your term, that would be disrespectful of my own time and others' time. That would be disrespectful of you and of me.

It is a wonderful surprise to receive your e-mail. I welcome the connection and recall your inquiry last year about the possibility of participating on your radio program which at the time I welcomed and still do - albeit initially nervously since that would be a new challenge.

As an aside, in an amazing coincidence, your e-mail arrived on the day I wrote letters to both the Chief Scientist, Professor Penny Sackett and to the CSIRO Chief Executive, Megan Clark. Copies attached.

Secondly, this fraud on the part of the UN IPCC and seemingly on the part of the government and the weakness of the opposition has so greatly concerned me and a number of friends that I have been selling assets to enable me to provide for my family while I read/research the topic. I am taking it very seriously.

My family and I are making a personal commitment to protecting freedom and the natural environment.

Thirdly, Steve, some background for you. During my career I've held positions directly responsible for the lives and welfare of hundreds of people. Fulfilling those responsibilities for people's lives depended on a knowledge of carbon dioxide and other gases. I have known from the start of this global warming myth that carbon dioxide cannot do what is claimed of it.

Nonetheless, I was initially overawed by the might of the army of scientists *purportedly* arrayed in support of the notion that human carbon dioxide production was threatening our planet with catastrophic damage. How can '*little 'ol me be right against this army of scientists and celebrities and politicians*'? Surely, '*I must be wrong*'?

Yet I trusted my instinct. Rather than just argue irresponsibly though, I devoted a considerable portion of the last two years researching for myself. That included attending The First International Conference on Climate Change in New York in March, 2008 addressed by the world's eminent climate scientists. I felt their passion and that surprised me. I discovered that many of the scientists denouncing the UN IPCC (the government's basis for its climate policies) were UN IPCC

scientists.

I felt reassured, invigorated, determined.

Yet did not reach for my keyboard. I needed much more. I read thousands of pages of scientific books, journals/papers and articles. Those scientific publications in turn reference thousands more scientific publications.

Steve, the science reassured me I was on solid ground. Nonetheless, I still doubted myself. After all, I wondered, who am I against the might of politicians and the *supposed* army of scientists claimed to be supporting the government? I decided to understand the origins of climate alarm and the motives driving climate alarm.

Once the Bandwagon of Beneficiaries of climate alarm was identified, I realised what is happening. John McLean's outstanding articles on UN IPCC reporting processes stunned me. His articles cannot be sensibly refuted since he merely presents data obtained from the UN IPCC itself. That data reveals that the army of scientists supposedly supporting the notion that humans caused global warming is a mirage.

McLean's articles simply confirmed the claims of many UN IPCC scientists who had been shouting about the mirage yet politicians and the mainstream media remained deaf. That's when I was galvanised. That's when I turned to the keyboard - for the first time in my life.

My initial aim was a short series of e-mail letters to the Editor and federal MP's. Two things happened. I received many responses urging me to continue. More significantly, I realised many of our politicians are clueless and/or afraid of facing reality. The low levels of many politicians' awareness and responsibility and their apparent lack of integrity amazed me. And shocked me.

I hope you're finding reassurance by understanding my purpose and intent. I trust you can see that prior to hunting and pecking buttons on my keyboard, I developed a firm foundation.

I'm wondering if you have any feel, Steve, for the amount of work that went into researching - and especially shortening - my document sent last December 16th, *'Thriving with Nature & Humanity'*?

This is typical of the passionate, informed and solid responses and challenges being spontaneously and independently generated on thousands of other keyboards around the world - without financial support and grants. Climate realists are challenging the UN IPCC's fraud and the bandwagon of beneficiaries because we are incensed with the UN IPCC's deceit, politicians' irresponsibility and every Emissions Trading Scheme's huge unjustified threat to devastating our economy and our children's futures.

People are stunned and angry about the false and non-existent environmental threat and the derailment of real environmental issues. We see this as a serious moral issue.

I have been pleasingly stunned by the uncoordinated yet willing sharing of data across the net world-wide.

Steve, I'm accepting your challenge. Given current priorities, please accept that I may not be able to respond immediately. My wife has recently been in hospital for a major operation and will soon be visiting her mother in the USA after I return from interstate next week. Thereafter I will be house husband for a couple of weeks and that involves caring for our two children.

I have downloaded the CSIRO report entitled: "The Science of Tackling Climate Change.

I am ready to start reading it in preparation for responding to your challenge.

My condition in accepting your challenge is that I will provide my response on the CSIRO report to you after you advise that you have read my latest document e-mailed last Thursday: *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'*. To make it easy for readers, that document has been laid out with a five page summary. That's followed by supporting details presented in a way that readers can easily skim the document by reading sub-headings and diving into detail and references as they wish.

Please forgive my lack of journalism training.

My condition seems fair and balanced. I'll do some work for you and the ABC for free and all that's expected in return is that you read a document. Is that a deal, Steve?

Please advise and if you agree I'll start work. CSIRO's document is already downloaded. I'm ready.

Malcolm Roberts
Brisbane, Australia

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

Friday, February 12th, 2010

Professor Penny Sackett
Chief Scientist
GPO Box 9839
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Dr Sackett:

Re: Corruption of Climate Science - Catalogue of apparent Climate Fraud

For two years I have been alarmed by UN IPCC claims on climate. The enclosed document, *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'* catalogues my concerns of the UN IPCC.

Given this catalogue of UN IPCC fraud and disturbing recent burgeoning revelations about UN IPCC advice to our government, I feel alarmed about the government's climate policy. Could you please meet my needs for reassurance, security and ease by addressing the following requests?

Firstly, please advise whether or not you will be recommending an independent inquiry into UN IPCC climate advice to the government. If you will not be recommending an independent inquiry, please advise justification for your decision. If you will be recommending an inquiry, please advise how you will ensure it is independent and advise its likely date of commencement.

Secondly, as you are the Chief Scientist, and given the accompanying catalogue, could you please provide me with one piece of concrete, scientifically measured, real-world evidence that human production of carbon dioxide caused Earth's latest modest cyclic warming that ended around 1998. Please also provide scientifically measured real-world data showing Nature was not responsible.

I look forward to you meeting needs for reassurance and for our nation's protection.

Yours sincerely,



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

Enclosures: *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'*

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

Friday, February 12th, 2010

Dr Megan Clark
Chief Executive
Office of the the Chief Executive
PO Box 225
DICKSON ACT 2602

Dear Dr Clark:

Re: Corruption of Climate Science - Catalogue of apparent Climate Fraud

For two years I have been alarmed by UN IPCC claims on climate. The enclosed document, *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'* catalogues my concerns of the UN IPCC.

Given this catalogue of UN IPCC fraud and disturbing recent burgeoning revelations about UN IPCC advice to our government, I feel alarmed about the government's climate policy. Could you please meet my needs for reassurance, security and ease by addressing the following requests?

Firstly, please advise whether or not you will be recommending an independent inquiry into UN IPCC climate advice to the government. If you will not be recommending an independent inquiry, please advise justification for your decision. If you will be recommending an inquiry, please advise how you will ensure it is independent and advise its likely date of commencement.

Secondly, you are the Executive of an organisation implying global warming was due to human production of carbon dioxide. Given this, and given the accompanying catalogue, please provide me with one piece of concrete, scientifically measured, real-world evidence that human production of carbon dioxide caused Earth's latest modest cyclic warming that ended around 1998. Please also provide scientifically measured real-world data showing Nature was not responsible.

I look forward to you meeting needs for reassurance and for our nation's protection.

Yours sincerely,



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

Enclosures: *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'*

On 12/02/2010, at 2:56 PM, Stephen Austin wrote:

From: Stephen Austin
Sent: Thursday, 11 February 2010 5:41 PM
To: ['catalyst@eis.net.au'](mailto:catalyst@eis.net.au)

Cc: Margot O'Neill; Kerry O'Brien; Fran Kelly; Tony Jones; Geraldine Doogue; Spencer Howson; Tony Delroy; Kelly Higgins-Devine
Subject: Climate change / CSIRO Report

Attention: Mr Malcolm Roberts

Dear Mr Roberts, for some time now I have been receiving a barrage of your unsolicited emails about climate change and your analysis of the IPCC flaws.

Leaving aside that it is normally regarded as rude to bombard a person with unsolicited emails I ask that you consider to try a more courteous, if not useful approach.

I have decided that given you seem to have so much time on your hands as a 'management consultant', I would like to put you to work.

Attached to this email is a copy of the CSIRO's report on "**The Science of tackling climate change**". It is the official CSIRO document provided by the head of CSIRO, Dr Megan Clarke.

As you know CSIRO had a great number of scientist contributed to the IPCC report, as Dr Clarke told the National Press Club in Canberra late 2009.

I interviewed the Chief Executive of the CSIRO Dr Clarke recently and she made it quite clear that they stood by their research and the data they have provided that supports the general concerns about sea levels rises, shifting climate and water data.

So if you really are a truly independent researcher please read through the Australian scientific paper and identify where you believe the CSIRO data has been falsified or is wrong.

If you do this I will present your data to the CSIRO for rebuttal or correction.

This will help satisfy me as a journalist that you are not just a 'keyboard crank', but a credible critic of climate change scientific theory.

(Please note that I have c.c.'d the other ABC people you have been emailing.)

Yours sincerely

<image001.png>**Steve Austin**

Presenter, Statewide Evenings QLD

Phone +61 7 3377 5160

Email austin.stephen@abc.net.au

Work www.blogs.abc.net.au/queensland/612_evenings

Address GPO Box 9994, Brisbane 4001

" 7-10pm every weeknight on 612 ABC Brisbane, ABC Local Radio QLD, ABC Digital and the World Wide Web."

From: Malcolm Roberts [<mailto:catalyst@eis.net.au>]

Sent: Thursday, 11 February 2010 3:49 PM

To: Stephen Austin; Tony Delroy; Kelly Higgins-Devine; Spencer Howson; Vanessa Wiltshire; Geraldine Doogue; Tony Jones; Fran

Kelly; Kerry O'Brien; Margot O'Neill

Subject: Fwd: Two Dead Elephants in Parliament - No.1 in a Series Exposing Climate Fraud Details Personally to all Senators

Begin forwarded message:

Subject: Two Dead Elephants in Parliament - No.1 in a Series Exposing Climate Fraud Details Personally to all Senators

To federal MP's and letters to the Editor

97 words

Two Dead Elephants in Parliament - No.1 in a Series Exposing Climate Fraud Details Personally to all Senators

Two Dead Elephants in Parliament (attached) summarises UN IPCC climate fraud followed by a detailed cataloguing of the fraud.

Accompanied by personal letters, it was posted to all senators including Senator Wong by Registered Post. Copies are on their way by Registered Post to Tony Abbott and Kevin Rudd.

It seems clear that Senator Wong and possibly the PM, have been playing Aussies for mugs. As demonstrated by correspondence from Senator Wong to Senator Furner, she's seemingly playing the Australian parliament, particularly ALP members, for mugs.

The attached catalogue's number and seriousness of facts is startling, alarming.

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

180 Haven Road
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone:
Home 07 3374 3374
Mobile 04 1964 2379
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

The information contained in this email and any attachment is confidential and may contain legally privileged or copyright material. It is intended only for the use of the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are not permitted to disseminate, distribute or copy this email or any attachments. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete this email from your system. The ABC does not represent or warrant that this transmission is secure or virus free. Before opening any attachment you should check for viruses. The ABC's liability is limited to resupplying any email and attachments. <MEGAN'S HANDOUT NPC ADDRESSpdf.pdf>

Date published: Monday, February 6th, 2013

Latest update:

APPENDIX 1b

DISTRIBUTION LIST

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

Copies sent to

Following release of my *CSIROh!* report every Australian and Australian agency featured prominently is being sent a copy of this document by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. Others will be sent copies electronically.

Copies are being or will be sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation to:

- All members of federal parliament individually and severally
- State Premiers
- Prominent journalists

Copies are being sent electronically to all ABC staff who were copied on your original email to me.

Copies may be sent to others.

Accuracy is important. I have endeavoured honestly to ensure all statements are accurate. Recipients of copies of my *CSIROh!* report are invited to identify and advise me in their own words specifically of any claimed material errors or errors of fact. Any such claim needs to demonstrate the sender's understanding. This is necessary due to extensive unfounded reliance by politicians, journalists and others on vague '*science*' that is in reality not scientifically supported. For reasons obvious in various appendices and in my main *CSIROh!* report, I will not accept a claim that defers to or is based on corrupted reports such as those by the UN IPCC or by CSIRO on climate. In response to any claims accurately supported with succinct empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning I may attempt to convene a panel of independent eminent experts to assess each claim. That panel will consist of experts in the topic of the error claimed.

Those claiming to identify material errors will be asked to declare their financial and other personal interests, if any, in the climate discussion.

Copies of letters accompanying distribution of my report will be available on my web site after recipients have been allowed sufficient time to receive and read their letter. Go to www.conscious.com.au and follow the links to *CSIROh!* report and letters.

A Freedom Of Information request is being sent to CSIRO and BOM seeking their empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning proving human CO₂ is causing ongoing and supposedly harmful global atmospheric warming.

Similar requests are planned for other organisations involved in fabricating unfounded climate alarm.

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2013

Latest update:

APPENDIX 1c

AUTHOR'S PERSONAL BACKGROUND

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

I have an honours engineering degree from the University of Queensland, Australia. My rigorous statutory qualifications led to statutory positions responsible for the lives and livelihood of hundreds of people. My Masters degree in Business Administration from the Graduate School of Business (now the Booth School) at the University of Chicago trained me in statistically sound objective analysis of data. I continue to personally explore the human condition and human behaviour extensively using western and eastern philosophies and methods.

My educational qualifications are similar to those of the UN IPCC Chairman, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri, the so-called "*world's top climate scientist*". He wrote part of the '*science*' in UN IPCC reports.

I'm a professional speaker and provide a specialised hands-on management and leadership service to leaders in business around the world.

For five years I've voluntarily investigated climate *science* and corruption of climate science. Apart from a very small portion of expenses reimbursed by people's donations to the voluntary Galileo Movement* my work has been funded entirely by me and by my family.

* I was appointed as the Project Leader of The Galileo Movement. Voluntary position.

My work on climate has cost my family and me well over a million dollars in foregone income and in travel and other expenses. I have no conflicts of personal or financial interest and pursue no vested financial interest in revealing climate reality.

I am not affiliated with any political party. I receive no funding or material support from any industry, individual or organisation. I am blessed though with much encouragement from people who cherish truth and desire a future for our country and for our planet.

My personal declaration of interests has been maintained publicly since publishing my first document on global warming (now aka climate change) in 2009. It's available at:

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

It presents my qualifications and broad work experience.

I've read thousands of pages of climate science. They in turn reference many thousands more pages. I've discussed climate change with prominent scientists and politicians on both sides of the global warming issue in Australia and internationally. I've written to all nine prominent government-funded Australian academics advocating action against human carbon dioxide (CO₂), agencies employed by government and prominent federal politicians from all parties holding them accountable. Their responses are intriguing and disturbing. See appendices.

My adult work started as a vineyard worker before three years as a coalface miner, mostly underground. I then worked in technical positions before entering management and leadership positions. I've been Chairman of the Board of a small closely held public company.

My travels have been extensive and include all fifty American states, all Australian states and all but one Canadian province and territory. I've lived in varied climate regions. My work has taken me to China, Japan, Korea, Singapore, New Zealand, eight American states, Canada, Britain and most Australian states. I've travelled to Europe. My country of birth and my residence for my childhood years was India where my parents were stationed.

Professional work

My professional work is across all industry sectors in Australia and overseas. My work experience includes Fortune 500 companies internationally.

I provide a specialised management and leadership service and write, speak and consult on human freedom.

I provide leaders with knowledge and methods that free and connect people to be both more productive and at ease. Personal and organisational clients have included company directors and Chief Executives. I've served people at all management levels.

What I've seen is that people in business, politics and relationships are often plagued by sub-conscious fears and guilt that can be released and removed and people freed by understanding the Human Condition and the laws of Nature.

Specifically I assist leaders to understand how to improve organisational and personal performance. That involves assisting leaders to understand what really makes their people tick. Then we build conscious systems with care to free and connect their people. Organisations become more productive and people become happier, more peaceful and at ease—with themselves, with life, free.

My analysis and methods are based on understanding universal human needs and drivers of human consciousness and behaviour. These guide and support clients. Using my methods some clients have doubled productivity without capital expenditure.

Methods are based on each client organisation's core processes and on developing leadership. Australian and overseas clients include commercial and non-profit

organisations and government departments. When needed, I provide personal coaching for executives, directors and business owners.

Voluntary work on climate, the environment and freedom

My voluntary work during the last five years provides people with knowledge and understanding of climate science and corruption to meet people's needs for reassurance and ease. My work includes assisting people to understand what really makes people tick*, and then to understand how systems are being manipulated to drive corrupt behaviours. By assisting people to understand variation in Nature, they develop reassurance and ease—understanding, clarity, security, comfort, peace and freedom.

*My voluntary work is based on conveying understanding of laws of Nature and the Human Condition.

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

APPENDIX 1d

DEFINITIONS

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

Corruption of science is so pervasive it's necessary to define basic words and terms. These include science, scientist, scientific, scientific method, Precautionary Principle, corruption, lie, fraud, propaganda and crook.

What is science? What is a scientist?

Science is the honest, objective, systematic observation and understanding of Nature and the world in which we live. It uses objective observation and measurements combined with logical reasoning to provide accurate knowledge and understanding of our universe.

Science is defined in the dictionary as, quote: "*sci-ence: noun*

1. *A branch of knowledge or study dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged and showing the operation of general laws: the mathematical sciences.*
2. *Systematic knowledge of the physical or material world gained through observation and experimentation.*
3. *Any of the branches of natural or physical science.*
4. *Systematized knowledge in general.*
5. *Knowledge, as of facts or principles; knowledge gained by systematic study."*

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/science?s=t>

Encyclopedia Britannica says of science that it is: "*Any system of knowledge that is concerned with the physical world and its phenomena and that entails unbiased observations and systematic experimentation. In general, a science involves a pursuit of knowledge covering general truths or the operations of fundamental laws.*"

Scientist is defined as, quote: "*sci-en-tist: noun*

An expert in science, especially one of the physical or natural sciences."

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/scientist?s=t>

Scientific is defined as, quote: “*sci-en-tif-ic: adjective*

1. *Of or pertaining to science or the sciences: scientific studies.*

2. *Occupied or concerned with science: scientific experts.*

3. *Regulated by or conforming to the principles of exact science: scientific procedures.*

4. *Systematic or accurate in the manner of an exact science.”*

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/scientific?s=t>

Scientific Method. The scientific method is defined in Black’s Law Dictionary as, quote: “*An analytical technique by which a hypothesis is formulated and then systematically tested through observation and experimentation*”.

People with science degrees and those with appointments as scientists may through their approach and behaviour not be scientific. They are not scientists.

People without formal science qualifications who use the scientific method honestly can be scientists. History provides many examples of famous scientists lacking formal academic science qualifications. True scientists systematically and objectively seek truth through objective knowledge made possible through observation using the scientific method.

The ultimate arbiter of science is empirical scientific evidence. It’s used within structured logical scientific reasoning to identify cause-and-effect.

A second way of assessing the validity of a hypothesis or supposition is to assess its effectiveness in predicting future outcomes. If predictions using the theory are accurate the theory may explain Nature. There may though be other confounding factors needing to be explored. If predictions are not accurate though, the theory is wrong. Wrong.

Nobel Science Prize-winning scientist Richard Feynman says it effectively in one minute:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b240PGCMwVO>

Quote: “*If it disagrees with experiment (Nature, observations) it’s wrong. In that simple statement is the key to science. It doesn’t make any difference how beautiful your guess is, it doesn’t make any difference how smart you are, who made the guess or what his name is if it disagrees with experiment it’s wrong. That’s all there is to it (science)*”.

A hypothesis is often based on assumptions. If the assumptions are not valid, the hypothesis is not valid. For a hypothesis to be valid, its underlying assumptions must be valid.

Documented facts though show that parts of the supposition that human CO₂ drives climate meet the definition of fraud.

To be called a theory, a supposition needs to be consistent with accepted laws and theories. Strong scientific arguments are emerging that reveal that the supposition that human CO₂ controls global climate contradicts laws of Nature and laws of science. That means the supposition does not meet requirements to be called a *theory*.

The supposition that global warming (aka climate change) is driven by human carbon dioxide (CO₂) is proven wrong principally by:

- Its contradiction of empirical scientific evidence;
- Its lack of logical scientific reasoning demonstrating causation;
- Its underlying assumptions are not valid;
- The fact that projections based on the supposition are wrong.

In layman's terms, the process for establishing true science involves stating a hypothesis and then measuring to test the hypothesis. Re-testing objectively and logically continues until the supposition/theory is validated or disproven. As Canadian climate professor Tim Ball explains, true scientists and those applying science in the real-world understand that, quote: "*Science works by creation of theories based on assumptions, in which scientists performing their proper role as sceptics, try to disprove the theory*". Once a theory passes tests and criticism it is accepted. Scientific scepticism is a vital part of science.

Informally, science begins with curiosity expressed in a specific question or as a quest for deeper understanding. That inherent human curiosity and/or aspiration to improve people's lives can be stimulated by observation of opportunities or on needs for improved understanding or on seeking material benefits. eg, reduced risk or greater security, ease, comfort, safety, productivity/efficiency, cost-effectiveness, environmental care, These spark knowledge and understanding.

The broad steps are:

1. An explanation is hypothesised to explain Nature and/or realise a benefit from greater understanding of Nature.
2. Observations are made of Nature and/or experiments conducted. These prove or disprove (confirm or reject) the hypothesis or refine the observation/testing. Observations continue until repeatable validated measurements confirm or reject the hypothesis.

Rejection is not failure. It's beneficial in growing knowledge.

Nothing is ever settled. Science is always open to question and challenge.

It is the hypothesiser's responsibility to prove the hypothesis.

The theory is then used to predict the future. If it fails to accurately predict future results, it's not science.

The supposition that human CO₂ drives global climate has failed every scientific test. It is not scientific.

The null hypothesis and its significance

The hypothesis that human CO2 drives global warming may be stated as: If CO2 levels increase due to increased human CO2 production, then global temperature will increase.

The null hypothesis is that an increase in human CO2 production does not drive higher temperature. Empirical scientific evidence proves that the null hypothesis is correct and the original hypothesis is wrong.

The null hypothesis' significance is that proving it correct disproves the hypothesis

UN IPCC forecasts of climate were repeatedly proven wrong. The UN IPCC then started doing scenarios. That's not science. It's conjecture.

Yet scenarios are broadcast widely across the media and subtly implied to be projections. Appendices 9 and 10 reveal subtle use of the words "if" and "may" by academics and supposed 'experts'. They're stated in such a way that audiences assume or interpret the statements as factual evidence. They're not lies. They are conjecture. They're misleading.

Appendix 14 reveals ways that false statements can be used to subtly imply science. It reveals other tricks such as *appeals to authority* and smearing those whose view disagrees. Abuse and labelling is no substitute for empirical scientific evidence.

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/12/18/labeling-people-climate-change-deniers-merely-reveals-the-attackers-ignorance/>

To the contrary, such tactics reveal a lack of science because if the science were available it would be presented. Yet it isn't.

A summary

Science by consensus is politics.

Science by belief is religion.

Science by programmers' code is computer gaming.

Science by story telling is science fiction.

Science by logic, transparent evidence and empirical proof IS science.

Private citizen Lionel Griffin posts on his blog, quote: "*Truth demonstrates and enables. Faith can only assert, force compliance, and disable. It is the difference between an engineer who makes things that work and a priesthood aligned with thugs enforcing their will with lies, distortions, clubs, swords, guns, bombs, etc....*"

<http://lkgnet.com/blog/12.30.12.htm>

He advises that, quote: "*Academically, he has a BS in Education, an MS degree in Pharmacology and many semester hours beyond. In the process he has acquired*

the equivalent of a major in Chemistry with strong minors in Physics, Mathematics, and Physiology plus a good bit of many other ologies.

Professionally, he has been a teacher of Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics in High School, a Biomedical Engineer, but mostly a Software Engineer for over 45 years both as an employee and as a contract consultant.” He understands and relies for a living on science and logical reasoning.

The Precautionary Principle

Another telltale sign that the UN IPCC and its supporters lack the science is their fallback position: the Precautionary Principle.

Although Wikipedia is not reliable on political matters, it provides a succinct and reasonable definition as, quote: “*The **precautionary principle** or precautionary approach states if an action or policy has a suspected risk of causing harm to the public or to the environment, in the absence of scientific consensus that the action or policy is harmful, the burden of proof that it is not harmful falls on those taking an act.*

This principle allows policy makers to make discretionary decisions in situations where there is the possibility of harm from taking a particular course or making a certain decision when extensive scientific knowledge on the matter is lacking. The principle implies that there is a social responsibility to protect the public from exposure to harm, when scientific investigation has found a plausible risk. These protections can be relaxed only if further scientific findings emerge that provide sound evidence that no harm will result.”

This ignores and dismisses the opportunity cost. There may be huge and overwhelming benefits of trying something unknown yet when the precautionary principle is invoked it stops progress. The precautionary principle can be used to stop development. In that way it is antihuman and anti-improvement. It’s a recipe for entrenching poverty, misery and disease.

Yet it’s a fundamental and core part of the UN Agenda 21 campaign pushing global governance.

The EU is the UN’s model for global governance. In the EU, the precautionary principle is entrenched. Consider Wikipedia, quote: “*In some legal systems, as in the law of the European Union, the application of the precautionary principle has been made a statutory requirement.*”

Robert Zubrin (see appendices 8 and 14) says, quote: “*According to this concept, no innovation can be permitted which cannot be proven in advance to be completely harmless. If accepted, this idea would make all technological progress impossible. Indeed, it is difficult to think of any form of human freedom or creative activity, ranging from entrepreneurship to childbirth, which would not require severe restriction under the Precautionary Principle”.*

Its purpose is to impose limits, to control. It contradicts reality. It's a fallback position when advocates lack data to support their ideology.

Marine biologist, Walter Starck, quote: *"To make matters even worse for producers there has also been a widespread adoption by government of a strict interpretation of the precautionary principle. This pernicious bit of intellectual swill mandates that any hypothetical risk to the environment must be addressed by full preventative measures as if it were certain. As a final touch, the burden of proof for no harm then rests on anyone who does not agree. The fact that proof of a negative is logically impossible conveniently eliminates any effective dissent. It doesn't require much ability to come up with some possibility of detriment which cannot be absolutely disproven. Much of our environmental regulation now deals with what amounts to hypothetical solutions to imaginary problems."*

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/12/government-by-ngo>

See Appendix 15.

Invoking the precautionary principle does not manage risk. It increases risk.

Invoking the precautionary principle either directly or camouflaged within attractive words is a telltale significant sign. It reveals that the proposers lack the evidence and logic to sustain their argument or claim. It is not a reason for heeding their advice. It is a reason for ignoring their advice. It is reason to be suspicious of motives.

The larger significance of science

The scientific method has been enormously beneficial for improving the material welfare of humanity. In just a few hundred years the scientific method has produced vastly greater comfort, longevity, ease, security, cleanliness, nutrition, variety, health, entertainment, mobility, knowledge, ... (Appendix 14)

There is another vital benefit of science: the Age of Enlightenment made possible by the use of logical reasoning undermined the law of the bully. Science relies on reasoning. In making decisions reasoning replaced the rule of might that prevailed during the Dark Ages. Instead of submitting to physical intimidation, violence, the loudest voice, the wealthiest person or group, political power, bluff and tricks, humanity can now rely on objective reasoning.

Apart from the UN's use of antihuman methods as discussed in Appendix 14, one of the greatest threats from the unfounded and unscientific claim that human CO₂ caused warming is a return to the Dark Ages and the rule of might. (Appendix 14)

Science is important for human freedom because it replaces brute force, cunning or deceit as determinants of policy with objectivity and fact. This is essential for fairness, efficiency, reducing waste and protecting the environment. Science is a cornerstone of truly caring for the environment. Science is a cornerstone of care for humanity. Appendix 14 reveals that restoring scientific integrity and the scientific process is essential for the environment and humanity.

That's the reason that people who care use science. It's the reason they care about science.

Corruption is a broad concept defined as: the removal of integrity thereby undermining trust, confidence and/or morality. Corruption can result from deliberate criminal and/or mischievous misrepresentations or from inadvertent errors of data analysis and/or judgment. It can result from inexplicable corruption of files by computers for no known reason.

Black's Law Dictionary defines corruption as, quote: "*The word 'corruption' indicates impurity or debasement*".

Lie is defined in dictionaries as: a false statement made with deliberate intent to deceive such as an intentional untruth; or intended or serving to convey a false impression; or an inaccurate or false statement, reckless or otherwise.

Black's Law Dictionary defines lie as, quote: "*to tell an untruth, to speak or write falsely*".

Fraud is defined as: the presentation of something as it is not, for personal gain.

Fraud is, according to Black's Law Dictionary, quote: "*a false representation of a matter of fact, whether by words or by conduct, by false or misleading allegations, or by concealment of that which should have been disclosed, which deceives and is intended to deceive another so that he shall act upon it to his legal injury*".

Propaganda is defined as information, ideas, or rumors deliberately spread widely to help or harm a person, group, movement, institution, nation, etc.

Black's Law Dictionary defines propaganda as, quote: "*The systematic dissemination of doctrine, rumor, or selected information to promote or injure a particular doctrine, view, or cause. (and) The ideas or information so disseminated.*"

Crook is defined as: a dishonest person, especially a sharper, swindler, or thief.
In Aussie vernacular a crook is someone dishonestly pursuing a dishonest objective for personal benefit.

Date published: Monday, February 6th, 2013
Latest update:

APPENDIX 1e

DEDICATION AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

Dedication

This report is dedicated to the many people around the world who have risen spontaneously to challenge the politically motivated and fraudulent campaign falsely claiming human activity controls Earth's temperature and climate.

I am proud to stand beside you. Whether retired CSIRO scientist. Or builder working night shift in a care facility, day shift on the job and evenings and weekends organising protest activities. Or concerned small business owner. Or retired grandmother concerned about the UN's AGENDA 21. Or disgusted and disgruntled voter who simply yearns for restoration of national sovereignty, national governance and integrity in politics. Or ... any of thousands of citizens who have never before imagined they would march on the streets, speak in public, challenge politicians and hold them accountable or argue with teachers pushing the party line, or challenge activists spreading doom contrary to scientific empirical facts or ...

Whether your actions have been painstakingly persistent in scouring the detail of glossy CSIRO brochures falsely purporting to be scientific or boldly challenging politicians or confronting and holding alarmist academics accountable for their falsities, I am proud to be among you.

I dedicate this report to you and hope it meets your expectations and aids in our vital joint work restoring and protecting freedom.

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge the many people restoring and protecting freedom.

Firstly, thank you to Steve Austin for inviting this report and for restoring my faith in journalism.

I acknowledge scientists, activists, writers, broadcasters and politicians on both sides of the climate debate. Many prominent sceptics freely share information, advice and

support. By their actions and their numbers they reassure faith in human nature and care for truth and the environment.

I have learned much about science from many people internationally. You have encouraged, supported and advised. These include, in no particular order: • Warwick Hughes • Viv Forbes • Tim Ball • S. Fred Singer • Marc Morano • James Inhofe • Graham Williamson • David Williamson • Lenore-Maree • Helen Dyer • Jacques Laxale and people organising and attending CATA rallies • Peter Bobroff AM • Richard Hopkins • Bruce Powell • Val Majkus • Ken Stewart • Gregg Thompson • Jim Simpson • Mike Elliott • Jim Sternhell • Ian Plimer • John McLean • Bob Carter • William-Vaughan: Izard. • Romley-Stewart: Stover. • Peter-Wayne: Fisher. • Gregory-John: Tudehope • Richard Saul • John Cribbes • Paul Evans • John O'Sullivan • Hans Schreuder • Alan Siddons • John Christie • John Smeed • Case Smit • Richard Pearson • Howard Martin • Julie Head • Bob Spanswick * Jeanette Jones • Phil Tsavellas • John MacRae • Leon Pittard • Hereward Fenton • Leon Ashby • Sue Maynes • John McMahon • Gordon Alderson • Geoff Brown • Peggy Balfour • Amy McGrath • Vivienne Skeen • Amy and Frank McGrath • Jo Nova • David Evans • Christopher Monckton • Nick Minchin and other federal parliamentarians who supported me yet cannot be named • Nigel Lawson • Ron Paul • Judy Ryan • Helen Dyer • Benny Peiser • Tony Gomme • Tony Mack • Helen Dyer • Michael Spencer • Maria Montessori • Carlos Tabernaberry • John Chatterton • Vicky Wilson and her family • Elka Palant • Cate Crombie • Ieuan Roberts • Susie King • Marshall Rosenberg • Bob Hoffman • Volker Krohn • Craig Turrell • Doc Childre • John Taylor Gatto • Michael Strong • Tim Seldin • Margot Garfield-Anderson • David Kahn • Don Casey • Ken Freeman • members of Darling Downs Soaring Club • Isabel Parlett • SN Goenka • Richard Court • and so many more, particularly all those who encouraged me either directly or through their inspiring actions to communicate with and hold politicians, academics, government agencies and NGO's accountable. You define the reality of being human through your love, care, respect for humanity and freedom.

Your teaching, suggestion, sharing and support have been encouraging and reassuring. Thanks to Alan Jones, Grant Goldman, Chris Smith and their commercial radio peers for giving science a public voice against the corruption and for focussing on the UN. Your courage and tenacity are inspiring.

I particularly acknowledge and appreciate the support of my wife Christine. Having foregone over a million dollars in income during the past five years and while living off sale of assets we had set aside for retirement and for our children's future her support is deeply gratifying. It's difficult for mothers focussed on security. Ultimately though her strengths include her deeply ingrained honesty, her care for our children's future and her strength in doing what is right. I recognise that it's been difficult for Christine and I appreciate her support and her challenging.

That Christine enabled me to continue on my heart's calling despite her long hours in isolation and external pressure is acknowledged and appreciated. My thanks to our children who challenged and supported.

Thank you to my mother and father who always extolled the virtues of truth and demonstrated by example. Thank you to my brother and sister who worked on an important family project in recent months and did my share so that I could complete this report.

I thank people associated with Vipassana meditation as taught by SN Goenka, The Hoffman Process, The HeartMath Institute, The Center for NonViolent Communication, The Foundation for Inner Peace for publishing *A Course In Miracles*, and so many other groups that have helped me on my continuing journey. I thank the people who've entered our family's lives through my daughter's horse riding. I've sensed that horses can indeed be callers of the spirit.

I have learned much through observing the behaviour of the following • Al Gore • Rajendra Pachauri • Phil Jones • David Karoly • Ove Hoegh-Guldberg • Mike Carlton • Andrew Bolt • Will Steffen • Tim Flannery • Wendy Carlisle • Ben Cubby • Lesley Hughes • Suzanne Cory • Kurt Lambeck • Andy Pitman • Matthew England • Ross Garnaut • Tim Flannery • and many more including Internet trolls. You have challenged me to think and to take action. I have learned much about human behaviour and about myself. I am blessed to count you among my teachers as my learning continues. Thank you.

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2013
Latest update: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014

APPENDIX 2

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, UN IPCC

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

*"When the climate models do not agree with the reality,
then reality is not what's false!" Fritz Vahrenholt*

Contents:

Section	Page
1. UN IPCC damned by the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council, IAC that exposes the issue of conflicts of interest	4
2. UN IPCC has no evidence for its core claim of warming by human CO ₂ . UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer reveals no evidence exists. UN IPCC Lead Author claiming human CO ₂ caused warming has no evidence. UN IPCC data itself contradicts UN IPCC's core claim.	7
3. Former President of America's National Academy of Sciences condemns UN IPCC	12
4. There is no scientific consensus claiming warming by human CO ₂	13
5. UN IPCC Guidelines require science to be modified to suit the politics	13
6. Fundamental Breaches of UN IPCC Guidelines	15
7. UN IPCC data on its reporting processes reveals UN IPCC is unscientific	17
8. Climategate scandal reveals prominent UN IPCC <i>scientists</i> hiding data, excluding empirical data from UN IPCC reports, preventing access to data, misrepresenting data, interfering with and destroying scientific peer-review	17

9. History reveals UN IPCC born in corruption and rife with corruption	18
10. UN IPCC ' <i>peer-review</i> ' corrupted, often bypassed, sometimes prevented	19
11. The UN IPCC's rot starts at the top with conflicts of financial and other interests	21
12. UN IPCC Lead Authors & contributing scientists reveal corrupt UN IPCC	21
13. Canadian investigative journalist reveals UN IPCC as unscientific, tainted, unworthy and deceptive	23
14. UN IPCC relies on and endorses reports by ideologues, extremists, and political activists	28
15. Notes on AR5, 2013 report by UN IPCC	28
16. India dumped the UN IPCC	41
17. UN IPCC researchers seeking immunity from prosecution	41
18. UN IPCC Lead Author misled USA Congress	41
Additional points revealing UN IPCC corruption:	
19. Each of the four UN IPCC reports to national governments and media is based on an unscientific falsity	42
20. The UN IPCC's corruption of climate science originated in the United Nations Environmental Program, UNEP led specifically by Maurice Strong, UNEP's first Secretary-General.	43
21. The so-called ' <i>climate science</i> ' was settled politically before the <i>science</i> even started.	46
22. UN IPCC reporting strategy deceptively misled key people	47
23. Many real scientists were initially fooled by UN IPCC corruption. Unlike many journalists they awoke to the scam.	48
24. Big government using big tobacco's tactics and methods?	49
Conclusions:	50

David Karoly's connection	51
Will Steffen's connection	52

In addition to specific references cited within the text below, the four following links provide information on the UN IPCC. They each contain many further references:

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

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

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

www.conscious.com.au

The UN IPCC is intimately associated with CSIRO. It relies on CSIRO for extensive input into UN IPCC reports to national governments and media worldwide. Its reports are publicly endorsed by CSIRO.

The UN IPCC is the basis of climate policies of both parties in the current Labor-Greens coalition minority government.

It has a self-developed and styled reputation as the world's top climate science body. Its reports are the basis of many national governments' climate policies and taxes.

The UN IPCC has existed for almost a quarter of a century. Since 2009 it has received wider and deeper scrutiny. Is it worthy of guiding our inherent human care for our planet? Can it be relied upon? Is CSIRO acting responsibly in ceding national sovereignty over climate science to the UN IPCC?

Definitions

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

1. UN IPCC damned by the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council, IAC that exposes the issue of conflicts of interest

The Climategate scandal tarnished the UN IPCC globally. It essentially forced the UN IPCC to be scrutinised. As a result, the UN IPCC requested the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) to review processes and procedures used in the UN IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), 2007.

The IAC released its report in August 2010 report. The report's Executive Summary deceptively failed to convey the report's essence. Yet no window dressing can hide the clear comments and devastating message in the body of the report.

After extensive detailed analysis of the IAC report, Peter Bobroff AM says, quote: *"The body of the IAC Report contained many serious and substantial criticisms concerning: conflict of interest, political interference, bias, poor treatment of uncertainty, vague statements not supported by evidence, failure to respond to critical review comments, and various management problems. These matters are not merely academic quibbles but impact directly on the integrity of the science assessment. The statements on bias indicate that AR4 was written by people with conflicts of interest and obvious bias who examined only the papers that suited them and who rejected or ignored any critical review comments and published evidence in conflict with the IPCC's view. The poor treatment of uncertainty brings into question every one of the 800 likelihood and confidence statements in Working Group 1 of AR4. This refutes the credibility of AR4".*

Item 2 here: <http://tome22.info/Top/AnnotatedDocuments.html#id2>

Concise Overview: <http://tome22.info//Docs-Ann/IACReport-Overview.html>

The body of the IAC's report has been swept aside by the Australian Academy of Science and the Department of Climate Change, or at best it seems they seemingly deliberately or negligently ignored the report. Yet the Department of Climate Change agreed in principle to all the IAC report's recommendations. Do the Department and Academy know yet not disclose?

Respected retired journalist Tony Thomas provides a succinct analysis here:

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

He includes significant comments on the role of the Australian Academy of Science.

The Academy's President when the IAC report was released was Professor Kurt Lambeck. He was reportedly responsible for monitoring the IAC's Executive Summary. He failed in his responsibility under IAC guidelines to ensure that the report's Executive Summary reflected the body of the report. Wouldn't a financial adviser be jailed for such non-disclosure and/or misrepresentation?

The IAC's report's key findings are listed on pages 8 and 9 here:

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

In summary, they are:

- Bias: precautions necessary to produce a credible unbiased scientific assessment or systematic review are well known by reputable scientists yet repeatedly ignored;
- Uncertainty downplayed and even removed: Many AR4 conclusions were based on little or no evidence, and were not traceable to underlying science, if it existed at all;
- Conflict of interest: The UN IPCC lacked provisions covering conflict of interest;
- Management: UN IPCC management did not conduct an unbiased scientific assessment as indicated by significant shortcomings uncovered by the IAC.

Tony Thomas' summary is, quote: *"The inquiry was into the IPCC's impartiality, accuracy and balance, not into the science. The report found "significant shortcomings in each major step of IPCC's assessment process".* [32] (Try substituting the word every for each.) *The report concluded, "Some fundamental changes to the process and the management structure are essential."* [33] Specifically,

Review editors were not ensuring that authors heeded reviewers' comments. They should "ensure that genuine controversies are adequately reflected in the [IPCC] report". [34]

In the "impacts" section of the 2007 report, "authors reported high confidence in some statements for which there is little evidence" and had made some statements deliberately vague so they could claim "high confidence" for them: "Such statements have little value." [35] *The Summary for Policy Makers "contains many such statements that are not supported sufficiently in the literature, not put into perspective, or not expressed clearly."* [36]

The IPCC responses to proven errors were "slow and inadequate" and IPCC leaders [IPCC head Rajendra Pachauri, obviously] were hurting the IPCC's credibility by straying into political advocacy. [37]

The IPCC's processes for selecting key authors and science papers were poorly understood and not transparent. [38] *[This would enable reports to be "stacked" to deliver a particular agenda]*

IPCC authors were not ensuring that unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature were critically evaluated. [39] *[In fact, such grey literature comprised 30% of all the 2007 report's citations].* [40]

There had been "opportunities for political interference with the scientific results" during final negotiations on the reports' key summaries. [41]

So how did the Australian Academy, led by Cory, react to the announcement of this important report, on which it was strongly represented? The Academy said nothing. Then, seven months later, on page 40 of the Academy's annual report, signed by Cory, we read: "The report released on 30 August 2010 concluded that the process employed by the IPCC had been successful overall but recommended a range of reforms particularly in relation to management structures to strengthen procedures." Move along, nothing to see here.

The IPCC itself then began watering down and rejecting key elements of the IAC's "fundamental" and "essential" recommendations. The Australian Academy did not react. It's called Totschweigetaktik, or "death by silence". In a frank e-mail, a Fellow

and Academy office-bearer explained:

Needless to say, any adverse findings do great damage to the credibility of climate scientists as a whole, especially in the current climate of almost religious opposition to the acceptance of climate change science as a whole. Regretfully the climate change nay-sayers apply different ethical standards when it comes to their own unsubstantiated proclamations! They remind me of Tea Party activists. [42]

Cory says the IAC report was outside her professional area. The Academy is necessarily selective on what third-party material it endorses or publicises, she says. An example was the Academy's comments on the 2012 Gonski education report, where the Academy had a direct interest. She believes Lambeck and Zillman worked on the IAC review as scientists, not Academy representatives."

Thus the UN IPCC was biased, was managed in a way as to be unscientific, was open to conflicts of interest at many levels and attributed high confidence on little evidence and to vague statements."

Please refer to associated comments in the radio interview of Professor Will Steffen available at:

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

Although the whole interview is revealing, the relevant portion is from eight minutes and 30 seconds onwards. To save you time and to assist your understanding the annotated transcript for that portion is available at:

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

For the UN IPCC's latest reports (2001, 2007) Working Group 2 (WG2) writing on supposed consequences of global warming was doing so as its sister Working Group 1 (WG1) was supposedly identifying whether or not global warming was even occurring and whether or not it was attributable to human CO₂. Simultaneously Working Group 3 was working on supposed measures to address warming and its cause. This was before any cause was known. The only way this could be done is by presuming the cause before work started.

2. UN IPCC has no evidence for its core claim of warming by human CO2.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer reveals no evidence exists.

UN IPCC Lead Author claiming human CO2 caused warming has no evidence.

UN IPCC data itself contradicts UN IPCC's core claim.

The UN IPCC's latest report to national governments and media is The Fourth Assessment Report, AR4, published in 2007. It includes just one chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2. That sole chapter, chapter 9 of Working Group 1, WG1, provides no empirical scientific evidence or any logical scientific rationale for its false core claim about human CO2.

That chapter's equivalent sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 in the preceding 2001 UN IPCC report, the Third Assessment Report (TAR) contains no empirical scientific evidence or scientific rationale showing causation.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray has over 60 years real-world experience as a research scientist across varied industries and scientific fields, including 22 years in climate. He reviewed all four UN IPCC reports to national governments and media: 1990, 1995, 2001 and 2007.

Dr. Gray provided by far the most comprehensive, detailed and thorough review of the UN IPCC's 2007 report. He made one sixth of all review comments. His review on chapter 9 alone totalled 575 comments. His comments range from identifying important grammatical changes ensuring scientific accuracy to highlighting the UN IPCC's lack of evidence for its core claim to the UN IPCC's glaring omission of known major natural drivers of climate that explain natural climate variation.

His review comments can be accessed here: www.conscious.com.au

His review comments specifically on chapter 9 are available here:

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

Dr. Gray confirms that the UN IPCC's core chapter avoids serious consideration of known major drivers of global climate: solar activity and ocean-atmosphere decadal cycles such as El Nino and La Nina.

Dr. Gray says there is no evidence of human causation of global warming or climate change. He says there is doubt that any significant warming occurred. I conclude that at most it was modest cyclic global atmospheric warming that ended in 1998 (some say 2002, others say 1997, others 1995).

Dr. Gray confirms that unlike true scientific peer-review, his comments have never been acknowledged.

I've read the 2007 report's chapter 9 twice. There is no evidence anywhere of human CO2 causing warming. Independently I came to the same conclusion as Dr. Gray.

Dr. Gray subsequently advised me that he has never received acknowledgment of his review comments even though he provided an estimated one sixth of all review comments on the 2007 report. That is a clear breach of scientific processes. It confirms the Inter Academy Council's scathing condemnation of UN IPCC processes and procedures.

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110608-aj2-vincentgray.mp3>

Data and statements in various UN IPCC reports reveal many errors, contradictions and omissions enabling the UN IPCC's false core claim about human CO2. Please refer to examples 1-21 here:

http://www.scienceheresy.com/2011_09/HappsVsChubb.pdf

Combining unvalidated computer models and deceptive language

Chapter 9 is buried deep within the massive 2007 report. It's written in a way such that readers could easily misconstrue output from unvalidated and erroneous computer model projections as real-world measurements. Thus, although the chapter implies it relies on scientific evidence it has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning showing cause-and-effect.

Chapter Nine's usage of specific words was analysed. It's revealing:

Phrase	Occurrences
model	406
model in references	101
simul as in simulation/ed	264
certain	176
uncertain	16
analys	89
likely	83
not likely	0
may	60
expected	35
fingerprint	26

assum as in assume/ption	26
difficult	23
error	13
very likely	13
appear	12
assign	3
limitation	1
compensating	1

The UN IPCC's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 employs many words such as *may*, *likely* and *expected* in ways conjuring or implying discovery of relationships. Arbitrarily and contrary to empirical scientific evidence it implies or states relationships and events as scientifically '*likely*'. Through an overwhelmingly voluminous, tortuous and confusing maze of jargon, chapters and Summaries, the UN IPCC massages a lack of evidence into its core claim.

The UN IPCC uses the word *attribution* instead of correlation to infer correlation. It uses the word *projections* not prediction because projections are based on the presumption that we agree on the assumptions. Supposedly quantitative statements of implied statistical probability are assigned purely as a guess and an opinion from people paid to do it. The word *evaluation* is used instead of validated—and often evaluation is self-evaluation by the modelers themselves.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray describes UN IPCC methods in his article entitled *Spinning the Climate* available here:

http://www.klimanotizen.de/2008.07.12_Gray_Spinning_the_Climate.pdf

He further explains the UN IPCC's vocabulary in his article entitled *The Triumph of Doublespeak*. He shows that the UN IPCC is the triumph of doublespeak over science:

http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=483&Itemid=32

Canadian climatologist Tim Ball explains why models misrepresent Nature and the beauty of our planet's climate and weather systems:

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

And:

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

And:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/what-causes-el-nino-la-nina-ipcc-doesnt-know-but-builds-models-and-makes-projections-anyway/>

As does Sydney professor, Murry Salby who reveals (Appendix 4) that the relationship between temperature and CO2 assumed by UN IPCC computer models is the reverse of that actually revealed by Nature in the real world:

<http://www.thesydneyinstitute.com.au/podcast/global-emission-of-carbon-dioxide-the-contribution-from-natural-sources/>

And video with slides:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YrIO3ts--9I&feature=youtu.be>

Viscount Monckton identifies flaws and errors in the substitution of unvalidated computer models instead of real-world empirical data:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/earths-climate-crisis-aint-necessarily-so/story-e6frg6xf-1225992476627>

These include:

- Much of the radiation that models say should be warming Earth's surface is escaping to space as before;
- The upper air in the tropics that the models predict should warm at thrice the surface rate is warming only at the same rate; model-predicted surface evaporation in response to warming is a third of the observed rate;
- The missing heat energy imagined by the models but not present as warming in the past decade is not lurking in the oceans; and the entire warming of the late 20th century can easily be explained without blaming man.

Each of these discrepancies alone dismisses climate catastrophism. Combined with the models' contradiction of empirical data, they raise serious questions about the methods, competence and motives of the UN IPCC.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Gray says, quote: "*The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies.*"

Dr. Gray's unsolicited summary on the UN IPCC is available here:

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

Professor David Karoly now works at the University of Melbourne and is on the Gillard-Brown Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel and many other organisations involved in *climate science* and in advocacy of climate alarm. He is a Lead Author of the 2001 UN IPCC's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 (chapter 12). Although that chapter reportedly formed the basis of the equivalent sole chapter in the 2007 UN IPCC report, David Karoly was the Review Editor of that chapter too. He was a writer of the UN IPCC's 2007 Summary for Policy Makers distributed to governments and media worldwide and falsely purporting human CO2 as the cause of warming. By his own work David Karoly has made himself arguably the most senior UN IPCC climate person.

If anyone in the world should have such evidence of human causation of global warming it is David Karoly. Yet in his responses to my requests David Karoly has repeatedly failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence for his claim.

Despite this he repeatedly makes false alarming media announcements of catastrophes supposedly caused by human CO2. He falsely makes projections claiming future catastrophe. All are unfounded.

David has been making many misrepresentations of climate and science. My email to him dated January 25th, 2012 summarises some of these. It's available here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January,%202011.pdf>

Consider some details. Under David Karoly's watch as Lead Author in 2001, 60% of references cited by authors of chapter 12 were by those authors and co-authors. One wonders how many of those papers couldn't provide source data. If source data was not available, how could another scientist validate the data?

Climate data analyst and PhD candidate John McLean's paper entitled "*Prejudiced authors, prejudiced findings*" reveals many details of chapter 9 from the UN IPCC's 2007 report, including the following:

1. It shows, on the first page, that David Karoly co-authored papers with 10 authors of IPCC WGI chapter 9, i.e. the chapter for which he was one of three Review Editors.

2. 37 of the chapter authors (plus David Karoly) had co-authored papers with other authors of the chapter. These were not just any papers but were papers cited by the chapter (and amounted to 40% of papers). All but about 4 of these 37 people were in a network of people who had worked together. To them should be added co-workers (e.g. 10 people were from the Hadley Centre, of whom some but not all were in the 37). To that should be added academic associates (possibly students and their supervisor, such as Kenyon and Lavine neither of whom were authors of a cited paper but came from the same establishment as Gabriele Hegerl, one of two Coordinating Lead Authors for the chapter).

(2007 report chapter 9 had 53 authors in total, including 10 people from Hadley Centre, 4 from Oxford University, 4 from University of Michigan, 3 Environment Canada, 3 Duke University, 3 NCAR)

3. Looking back to the authors of chapter 8 in the IPCC's 2nd Assessment report (1995) reveals that of the 36 chapter authors back then 10 didn't write any papers cited in 2007 but 26 did. Of those 26, 9 were also authors of the 2007 chapter and 1 (David Karoly) was a review editor. It's not immediately clear how many new papers - i.e. how much that 39.9% will grow by - because many of these papers were written with a 2007 chapter 9 author.

5. As a review editor David Karoly was required to make a written report to the Working Group (see the IPCC's procedures document) but his entire report was a one-sentence letter. That is presented in *Prejudices authors, prejudiced findings*.

Another important point about chapter 9's key claims is that the "*extremely unlikely*", "*very likely*" likelihood statements, etc are merely opinions of the author of the relevant section of the chapter. Contrary to appearances, these opinions are not statistically valid. They are in essence unsupported guesses/opinions being expressed according to IPCC directive. They are without scientific foundation yet become the baseline. Any reviewer who disagreed would need to convince the IPCC author that he or she was wrong and that some other expression applied. To convince an author would take very good evidence but compiling evidence to support an opinion is highly subjective. Even with the best evidence in the world the author was free to ignore it (except for making a written response within the system of recording the review comments and responses).

Further observations and comments about David Karoly's involvement are provided in Appendix 9.

The fundamental claim often repeated by politicians is that we need to avoid a two-degree warming. The reality is that the original two-degree warming was plucked out of the air. It's not scientific: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/climate-catastrophe-a-superstorm-for-global-warming-research-a-686697-8.html>

3. Former President of America's National Academy of Sciences condemns UN IPCC

The late Professor Frederick Seitz, former President of America's National Academy of Sciences publicly and in writing exposed the UN IPCC as, quote: "*The IPCC is pre-programmed to produce reports to support the hypotheses of anthropogenic warming and the control of greenhouse gases, as envisioned in the Global Climate Treaty. The 1990 IPCC Summary completely ignored satellite data, since they showed no warming. The 1995 IPCC report was notorious for the significant alterations made to the text after it was approved by the scientists – in order to convey the impression of a human influence. The 2001 IPCC report claimed the twentieth century showed 'unusual warming' based on the now-discredited hockey-stick graph. The latest IPCC report, published in 2007, completely devaluates the climate contributions from changes in solar activity, which are likely to dominate any human influence.*" And, quote: "*we do not currently have any convincing evidence or observations of significant climate change from other than natural causes.*"

(126)

Professor Seitz's comments have been reported in many publications including the prestigious Wall Street Journal and NIPCC at:

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf.

4. There is no scientific consensus claiming warming by human CO2

For its 2007 report, only five (5) UN IPCC Reviewers endorsed the UN IPCC's core claim of global warming due to human CO2.

Although Kevin Rudd as Prime Minister spread the false claim that 4,000 scientists endorse the UN IPCC's core claim, data from the UN IPCC itself reveals that only five reviewers of chapter 9 endorsed that claim. Not 4,000, just five.

UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC itself reveals that chapter 9 was the product of a close-knit cabal of '*scientists*'. Many of the 53 authors were computer modellers, including many with financial interests in the chapter's outcome.

John McLean presents the UN IPCC data. His work cannot be sensibly refuted since he merely presents data obtained from the UN IPCC. Is CSIRO not aware or is it ignoring?

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

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

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

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

Kevin Rudd was not alone in falsely fabricating a non-existent consensus of scientists. The UN IPCC's Chairman Rajendra Pachauri did the same internationally.

5. UN IPCC Guidelines require science to be modified to suit the politics

See page 5 and 6 of: http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

This continues with the UN IPCC's latest report, AR5 in 2013:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/10/12/tail-wagging-the-dog-ipcc-to-rework-ar5-to-be-consistent-with-the-spm/>

As UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray states, quote: "*All the reports have to have a "Summary for Policymakers", which is **really a Summary BY Policymakers** because it is agreed to line-by-line by the anonymous international government representatives who control the IPCC. The results are then dictated to politically-selected "Drafting Authors". In the end, they can only hope that their Summary will agree with the main body of the report.*"

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/10/13/ipcc-in-a-stew-how-they-cooked-their-latest-climate-books/>

The UN IPCC is not a scientific body. It is a purely political body that fabricates supposed science to suit its political agenda.

There is an irreconcilable break between UN IPCC science report and the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) fed to politicians and media worldwide. For example, the original

1995 science report said, quote: *"While some of the pattern-base discussed here have claimed detection of a significant climate change, no study to date has positively attributed all or part of climate change observed to man-made causes."*

Yet without consulting the other authors, one of the chapter's Lead Authors, Ben Santer, reportedly falsified comments in chapter 8 by submitting this comment, quote: *"The body of statistical evidence in chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points to a discernible human influence on the global climate."*

Headlines in western nations screamed the phrase *"discernible human influence"*.

Reportedly, five times in the 1995 science report there were specific declarations of a lack of scientific evidence showing human causation of the possible modest temperature rise.

Moving to the 2007 report's chapter on computer modeling (now Chapter 8) identifies problems with the models. Some problems are listed in the following article:
<http://drtimball.com/2012/climate-change-of-the-ipcc-is-daylight-robberyclimate-change-of-the-ipcc-is-daylight-robbery/>

It's a much longer list than presented by the UN IPCC, but almost any single item reveals the results as not viable. Yet the IPCC's SPM published the unfounded and false claim that, quote *"Another unusual aspect of recent climate change is its cause: past climate changes were natural in origin (see FAQ 6.1), whereas most of the warming of the past 50 years is attributable to human activities"*. This was done without raising red flags. It is unscientific, false and contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Reliance on computer model projections uses circular reasoning. The models assume that higher CO2 levels will cause warming and then projections are used to imply CO2 will warm the atmosphere. That is not science.

I'm reliably advised that using UN IPCC definitions attributes 90 percent of the warming of the last 50 years to human production of CO2. There is no scientific basis for that claim. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

As stated by climate scientist, Tim Ball, quote: *"How can they make such a claim when natural albedo change alone exceeds the entire change due to CO2."*
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2007/10/17/earths-albedo-tells-a-interesting-story/>

In its 2007 science report the UN IPCC itself published Table 2-11 showing purported levels of understanding for sixteen factors claimed to affect radiative forcing assumed in computerised numerical climate models. Of the sixteen factors two have a claimed medium level of understanding. One has a claimed high level of understanding despite empirical scientific evidence to the contrary. The remaining 13 have low or very low levels of understanding.

Thus over 80% of the factors that are the basis of the UN IPCC's unvalidated computerised numerical models have low or very low levels of understanding.

Yet the *unvalidated* models are the basis of the UN IPCC's 2007 claim that warming was caused by human CO₂. They are the UN IPCC's so-called *scientific* evidence.

That's the supposed '*basis*' for UN IPCC computer model projections of future warming. There is no scientific basis. That's why the models are already proven wrong. UN IPCC reports are unscientific and misleading. They contradict empirical scientific evidence.

6. Fundamental Breaches of UN IPCC Guidelines

Page 4 of: http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

The Review Editor of the 2007 report's chapter 9 is David Karoly. For the previous 2001 report he was Lead Author of the equivalent sole chapter claiming human warming in that report, chapter 12.

Although chapter 12 in 2001 reportedly became the foundation for chapter 9 in 2007, David Karoly was appointed Review Editor of chapter 9 in 2007.

He was a writer of the 2007 UN IPCC draft Summary for Policy Makers distributed to national governments and media worldwide. It implied evidence for warming despite the UN IPCC having no such empirical scientific evidence of human causation and despite scientific doubt that any significant warming occurred at all.

Since 2007 that doubt has increased to confirm no global atmospheric temperature increase since 1998 and an apparent likely cooling trend since 2006.

UN IPCC reporting processes and procedures are so poor that despite being a Lead Author in 2001 and a Review Editor in 2007, David Karoly was a significant contributor to both chapters through his own papers.

As Lead Author of chapter 12 in 2001 David Karoly reportedly breached the UN IPCC's own guidelines for appointing that chapter's contributing editors.

Instead of appointing authors from a wide variety of institutes worldwide, he selected authors from a narrow group of institutes dominated by the Hadley Centre. That agency is now infamous for the Climategate scandal.

Almost three quarters of authors were selected from two nations: America and Britain.

60% of papers cited by chapter 12's authors were their own papers.

Chapter 12 in 2001 and chapter 9 in 2007 were not scientifically peer-reviewed.

The sole chapter in each report (2001 and 2007) that claimed warming and attributed it to human CO₂ was written in contradiction of scientific principles.

This is confirmed by McLean's analysis of UN IPCC data on UN IPCC processes. He obtained that data from the UN IPCC.

In his responses to my requests for evidence of human causation of global warming, David Karoly has repeatedly failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and/or scientific logic proving causation.

Combined with the Inter Academy Council's report highlighting the opportunity for serious conflicts of interest with the biased subjective stacking of authors by colleagues and the apparent associations with the Climategate Scandal, chapter 9 is open to many questions. That it lacks any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for its unfounded claim is damning.

Another criticism of the UN IPCC is that it fails to include adequate representation of geologists, palaeontologists, palaeoclimatologists, geophysicists and astrophysicists among its contributors. Instead it seems to concentrate on meteorologists and environmentalists. Is that due to influence by the UN's World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) that co-sponsored the UN IPCC and reportedly has influence over national weather bureau and weather bureau funding?

Or is it because geologists and palaeontologists understand empirically that Earth's past reveals variations in CO₂ have not driven climate. Or is it because empirically they can prove that Earth's recent cooling-warming-cooling cycle is modest and entirely normal?

Or is it because a growing number of astrophysicists, physicists, chemists, radiation specialists and engineers who understand thermodynamics question the basic supposition of enhanced radiative warming built on poor understanding of gases and atmospheric processes 150 years ago.

Respected retired journalist Tony Thomas writes, quote: "*Lambeck claimed to the National Press Club in 2006 that in compiling IPCC assessment reports, 'An independent judiciary is set up to ensure that all criticisms are properly answered.'*"^[59] *This was wildly incorrect, as shown in the IAC audit of 2010, and Donna Laframboise's 2011 documentation of IPCC realities.*"

That illustrates how the media has been misled on both the UN IPCC and global warming.

7. UN IPCC data on its reporting processes reveals UN IPCC is unscientific

Please refer to page 2 here:

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

This provides links to four documents by John McLean presenting UN IPCC data on its own reporting processes.

John McLean's work cannot be sensibly refuted. That data was obtained from the UN IPCC. It reveals that the UN IPCC 2007 report's sole chapter claiming human warming is unfounded. It contains no evidence of warming by human production of CO₂.

The UN IPCC's own data reveals peer-review has been corrupted, bypassed and at times prevented.

When peers seek data supposedly underpinning major UN IPCC papers, loss of data seems more common than one would expect in documents underpinning global policy:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/25/nic-lewis-on-forest-et-al-2006/>

8. Climategate scandal reveals prominent UN IPCC *scientists* hiding data, excluding empirical data from UN IPCC reports, preventing access to data, misrepresenting data, interfering with and destroying scientific peer-review

The Climategate scandal rocked the UN IPCC. Viscount Monckton's analysis of emails to and from the heart of the UN IPCC's fabrication of temperature data revealed scientists engaging in the following unscientific practices:

- Colluding to fabricate warming;
- Conspiring to prevent journal editors publishing real scientists' papers contrary to UN IPCC claims;
- Colluding to prevent real science from entering UN IPCC's 2007 report (AR4);
- Colluding to use a '*trick*' to hide the decline in global temperatures;
- Colluding to prevent access to the raw data;
- Colluding to maintain their cash flow;
- Colluding to bypass scientific peer-review by using pal-review;
- Tampering with their own data to conceal inconsistencies and errors;
- Secretly expressing their dismay that contrary to all their predictions global temperatures had not risen for 15 years and had been falling for nine years;
- Blaming Nature's defiance of their predictions as a '*travesty*';
- Concealing internal doubt that contradicted their public claims that the present decade was the warmest ever and global warming science is settled;
- Conspiring to remove a learned journal's editor solely because he did not share their desire to corrupt science as part of a political agenda;
- Venomously campaigning by spreading misinformation to denigrate scientific opponents using a website they had expensively created;
- Criminally conspiring to conceal and then destroy computer codes and data after a person had sound reason to question whether their '*research*' was incompetent

and/or dishonest.

<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/Monckton-Caught%20Green-Handed%20Climategate%20Scandal.pdf>

Internationally eminent physicist, climate scientist and environment professor Fred Singer summarises the significance of Climategate and the inability to penetrate the wall built by universities receiving government funding to contradict empirical scientific evidence in support of the UN IPCC's false core claim:

<http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=3285>

Tellingly, initial investigations were really whitewashes giving the deceptive pretense that Climategate had been investigated and found clear. Climategate has never been investigated.

<http://thegwpf.org/images/stories/gwpf-reports/Climategate-Inquiries.pdf>

And page 4 here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

And:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf

I conclude that the University of East Anglia contravened its assurances to the United Kingdom parliament. Although some in parliament were upset, little, if anything seems to have been done about the apparent deceit.

9. History reveals UN IPCC born in corruption and rife with corruption

The meticulous work of John McLean reveals a history of corrupted climate science from the inception of the United Nations Environmental Program, UNEP in 1972. That corruption was widened and deepened with the UN IPCC sponsored by UNEP and the UN's World Meteorological Organisation, WMO in 1988. The UN IPCC's corruption is pervasive, systemic and systematic.

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

And:

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

And:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

My documents and links on *Eco-Fraud* present a timeline of UN IPCC corruption and its effects:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

And: www.conscious.com.au

The lack of independent investigations coupled with whitewashes falsely presented to

media and governments as objective and independent widens the corruption. Additional references on the whitewashes are available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf>

And:

<http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=3285>

A short history of UN corruption of science and fabrication of unfounded global warming blamed on human CO2 is available here:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/5/the-serpent-s-egg>

Leon Pittard's personal research reveals sources and aims of the UN's climate corruption:

http://fardinkumradio.com/?q=climate_podcasts

Click on the blue text: '[Where did the climate change propaganda start?](#)'

10. UN IPCC '*peer-review*' corrupted, often bypassed, sometimes prevented

Some journalists and politicians and many academic advocates and extremist groups claim their belief in global warming caused by human CO2 is based on scientifically peer-reviewed papers. That claim is false. It relies on an appeal to authority. Outsourcing critical thinking and judgment is dangerous.

Fundamental to the UN IPCC's supposed authority and the government's supposed validity of cutting human CO2 is the claim that such authority is based on scientifically peer-reviewed literature. Peer-review is pushed publicly as validation of UN IPCC and CSIRO '*science*' and government policy.

Yet UN IPCC data itself reveals that peer-review processes are corrupted, often bypassed and sometimes **prevented**. As revealed below, the UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies on 5,587 references not peer reviewed—including bushwalkers' stories, newspaper articles and political activists' campaign material. Yet IPCC Chairman Pachauri falsely claims 100% use of scientifically peer-reviewed science. That's yet another blatant falsity from the top of the UN climate body, spread by the top of the Rudd-Gillard-Brown government.

<http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/press-release.php>

Temperature data relied on by the UN IPCC as the basis for its core claim is prevented from being peer-reviewed. It should be automatically scientifically disregarded.

Separately, the fabricated basis for the UN IPCC's 2001 claim of human warming was closed to scientific peer-review. Thanks to diligence from Canadian statisticians Steve McIntyre and Ross McKittrick and other independent assessments including Wegman for the USA Congress, the Mann Bradley Hughes '*hockey stick*' temperature fabrication has since been scientifically discredited worldwide. Commentators in the field have described it as fraudulent. Yet the Mann Bradley Hughes graph was the core of the UN

IPCC's global media campaign and the core of Al Gore's movie '*An Inconvenient Truth*'.

Climategate emails reveal apparent collusion by conspirators to prevent publication of papers by skeptics whose research findings contradict those of climate alarmists. Despite that collusion to prevent sceptic scientists from publishing scientific papers, there are thousands of scientific papers, articles, books and web publications opposing and contradicting the UN IPCC's core claim.

A lawyer's study of supposed peer-review:

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1612851

Quote: *"A review of the peer-edited literature reveals a systematic tendency of the climate establishment to engage in a variety of stylized rhetorical techniques that seem to oversell what is actually known about climate change while concealing fundamental uncertainties and open questions regarding many of the key processes involved in climate change."*

Bob Carter has published many scientifically peer-reviewed papers and provides his informed opinion of the peer-review process here:

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2012/06/14/money-corrupts-peer-review-process/>

John McLean has published scientifically peer-reviewed papers and has analysed UN IPCC processes. At my invitation he provided his views here:

[21_JohnMcLeanAboutPeerReview.pdf](#) And:

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

Science reporter Jo Nova analyses of corruption of scientific papers in an article entitled *Scientists behaving badly - more retractions are cheats not mistakes*. It's available here:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2013/01/scientists-behaving-badly-more-retractions-are-cheats-not-mistakes/>

Quote: *"A detailed review of all 2,047 biomedical and life-science research articles indexed by PubMed as retracted on May 3, 2012 revealed that only 21.3% of retractions were attributable to error. In contrast, 67.4% of retractions were attributable to misconduct, including fraud or suspected fraud (43.4%), duplicate publication (14.2%), and plagiarism (9.8%). Incomplete, uninformative or misleading retraction announcements have led to a previous underestimation of the role of fraud in the ongoing retraction epidemic. The percentage of scientific articles retracted because of fraud has increased ~10-fold since 1975. Retractions exhibit distinctive temporal and geographic patterns that may reveal underlying causes."*

Jo Nova comments that studies indicate her quoted could be the tip of the iceberg. It raises the question that although papers have been retracted after effective peer review, how many other papers in an obviously subjective and variable process got past the reviewers? How many are now being cited by the UN IPCC as peer-reviewed?

The UN IPCC claims it relies on scientific peer-review. It does not. It prevents scientific peer-review. Its contributors have corrupted scientific peer-review.

11. The UN IPCC's rot starts at the top with conflicts of financial and other interests

The current UN IPCC Chairman, railway engineer Dr. Rajendra Pachauri reportedly has many conflicts of financial interest. These are in addition to his many false statements on climate. These are increasingly widely documented:

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

More articles are linked on pages 29 and 30 of 'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament', available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/dead%20elephants.pdf>

And page 9, here:

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

The serious absence of any UN IPCC policy on conflicts of interest is a major issue raised by the Inter Academy Council's report in August 2010. The IAC raises fundamental concerns such as the selection of authors by a hidden process producing serious conflicts of interest.

The UN IPCC has a history of senior officeholders contradicting the science and/or pushing a political agenda contrary to empirical scientific evidence. Please refer to four links at the start of this appendix and to John McLean's detailed work.

Dennis Ambler's investigation of Dr. Pachauri's behaviour, statements and many serious conflicts of interest concludes with, quote: *"If there were any doubts that the IPCC is anything but a political advocacy arm of the UN, then travelling salesman Rajendra K Pachauri should surely have dispelled them."*

Breathtakingly, Dr. Pachauri now advocates that India needs to use coal:

<http://sppiblog.org/news/ipcc-chairman-says-india-doesnt-have-any-choice-but-to-use-coal>

12. UN IPCC Lead Authors & contributing scientists reveal corrupt UN IPCC

UN IPCC Lead Authors are among the many scientists informally leading the spontaneous worldwide people's movement revealing UN IPCC misrepresentations and corruption. These include John Christy who has documented examples of corruption and breaches of science observed first-hand during his work for the UN IPCC. Some more UN IPCC contributors' comments about the UN IPCC are quoted on pages 25-29 of 'Loss of Independence and Integrity', available here:

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

Forty six statements by UN IPCC experts including Lead Authors and being statements against the UN IPCC are presented here:

<http://grumpydenier.wordpress.com/2013/10/08/46-statements-by-ipcc-experts-against-the-ipcc/>

The eminent scientists who voluntarily formed the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, the NIPCC include UN IPCC scientists. Its initial summary report is available here:

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

It's more detailed report is available here:

<http://www.nipccreport.org/>

Unlike UN IPCC reports, the NIPCC provides the ultimate arbiter of science: empirical scientific data. Unlike the UN IPCC, the NIPCC scientifically explores Nature, the true purpose of science.

Consider this sample of radio interviews of prominent scientists and informed citizens:

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110527-aj2-timothyball.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120426-aj-timball.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120530-aj-morano.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=12506

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110725-aj2-vaclavclaus.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110620-aj2-johnmclean.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=10678

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110517-aj2-richardlinzen.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=10871

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110704-aj2-stewartfranks.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=9774

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110518-aj2-malcolmroberts.mp3>

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

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110712-aj2-lordmonckton.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110707-aj1-lordmonckton.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110802-aj2-nigellawson.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110729-aj2-bjornlomborg.mp3>

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

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=1748

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120518-aj-weather.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120503-dellingpole.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120430-aj-roberts.mp3>

A partial list of many UN IPCC contributing scientists critical of unscientific UN IPCC processes is available here:

http://www.scienceheresy.com/2011_09/HappsVsChubb.pdf

Internationally eminent meteorologist and UN IPCC contributing scientist Richard Lindzen says of the UN IPCC's 2001 Third Assessment Report, quote: *"This (IPCC) is an unusual review because fundamentally you are your own editor. You decide, together with a Review Coordinator whether you pay attention to the reviews or not. Generally you ignore them."*

13. Canadian investigative journalist reveals UN IPCC as unscientific, tainted, unworthy and deceptive

Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise's book entitled *'The Delinquent Teenager who was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert'* reveals that the UN IPCC cannot be relied upon in any way.

<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2011/10/13/a-book-is-born/>

The UN IPCC's own self-publicity has been carefully and cleverly orchestrated. Its reporting strategy has successfully hidden reality from journalists. Donna's book is reportedly the first serious and deep journalistic scrutiny of the UN IPCC.

Donna Laframboise said, quote: *"Every time you take a close look at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC you find out that almost nothing you've been told is true."*

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=10678

Consider the so-called reliance on the world's top scientists, using this excerpt, quote: *"One group consists of graduate students. Typically these are individuals in their twenties. Their experience of the world is neither broad nor deep. If they were merely performing administrative tasks that would be one thing. But the IPCC has long relied on their expert judgment."*

Richard Klein, now a Dutch geography professor, is a classic example. In 1992 Klein turned 23, completed a Masters degree, and worked as a Greenpeace campaigner. Two years later, at the tender age of 25, he found himself serving as an IPCC lead author.

(The IPCC has three classes of writers. Coordinating lead authors are in charge of an entire chapter and are therefore the most senior in rank. Each chapter usually has two. Lead authors are expected to write a significant amount of text. Their numbers vary from a handful to several dozen. Contributing authors provide supplemental knowledge. They typically don't participate in the meetings attended by the other two kinds of authors, but are asked to write briefly about a narrow, specific topic. A chapter may have no contributing authors or as many as 20 of them.)

Klein's online biography tells us that, since 1994, he has been a lead author for six IPCC reports. On three of those occasions, beginning in 1997, he served as a coordinating lead author. This means that Klein was promoted to the IPCC's most senior author role at age 28 - six years prior to the 2003 completion of his PhD. Neither his youth nor his thin academic credentials prevented the IPCC from regarding him as one of the world's top experts. [FOOTNOTE 4-1]

Nor is he an isolated case. Laurens Bouwer is currently employed by an environmental studies institute at the VU University Amsterdam. In 1999-2000, he served as an IPCC lead author before earning his Masters in 2001.

How can a young man without even a Masters degree become an IPCC lead author? Good question. *Nor is it the only one. Bouwer's expertise is in climate change and water resources. Yet the chapter for which he first served as a lead author was titled Insurance and Other Financial Services.*

It turns out that, during part of 2000, Bouwer was a trainee at Munich Reinsurance Company. This means the IPCC chose as a lead author someone who a) was a trainee, b) lacked a Masters degree, and c) was still a full decade away from receiving his 2010 PhD.

Who else falls into this category? Step forward Lisa Alexander. As recently as 2008, this woman was a research assistant at Australia's Monash University. After earning her PhD in 2009, she was hired by another Aussie university - which noted in its announcement that she had already "played a key role" in both the 2001 and 2007 editions of the Climate Bible. (She was a contributing author the first time, and a lead author the second.)

The IPCC selected its 2001 authors during 1999. This means its leadership decided that Alexander was a world-class expert 10 years before she, too, had earned her doctorate.

*Sari Kovats, currently a lecturer at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, is an even more egregious example. She didn't earn her PhD until 2010. **Yet back in 1994 - 16 years prior to that event and three years before her first academic paper was published - Kovats was one of only 21 people in the entire world selected to work on the first IPCC chapter that examined how climate change might affect human health.*** In total, Kovats has been an IPCC lead author twice and a contributing author once - all long before she'd completed her PhD.

One of Kovats' health chapter colleagues was an American named Jonathan Patz. He earned a Masters degree in Public Health in 1992 and had his first academic paper published in late 1995. Yet in 1994 the IPCC judged his credentials so impressive he was appointed one of its lead authors.

Given the involvement of both Kovats and Patz, Paul Reiter's description of the IPCC's 1995 health chapter as amateurish starts to make sense. Rather than recruiting real

experts like Reiter the IPCC enlisted young, inexperienced, non-experts instead.

It has been doing so since the mid-1990s. Yet in 2011 newspapers still report that the IPCC is a collection of "the world's leading scientists."

It's feasible that some young and inexperienced people may be tapped within the UN IPCC. If they were to leave, newcomers may reveal the *quality* of their work.

Yet some of the world's experts in their fields are outside the UN IPCC. These include for example Dr. William Gray on tropical storms, Dr. Paul Reiter on insect-borne diseases, Nils-Axel Morner on sea levels, Professor Chris Landsea on storms, ... Some resigned in disgust at corruption within the UN IPCC. Chris Landsea said, quote: "*I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by preconceived agendas and scientifically unsound.*"

Quoting from a review summarizing the book: "*It is impossible not to feel angry when reading this book. It is not just the sheer scale of bad practice, the bad faith and the outright lies. It's the painful lack of objectivity from the world's media. The IPCC is, as the title of the book makes plain 'a delinquent teenager' who has never been subjected to serious criticism. It has gotten away with things because the media have looked the other way again and again. No matter how egregious the errors, no matter how appalling the behaviour, the IPCC is still treated as though it is the impartial scientific body it pretends to be. In the same way, the scientific journals and academies are also guilty.*"

<http://www.londonbookreview.com/lbr0061.html>

In my experience reading the UN IPCC's 2007 report, it seems that UN IPCC reports deliberately use structures, jargon and language that make it difficult for outsiders to read and make sense of reports. This presumably deters journalists and politicians from reading the report and misleads journalists who persevere. Instead, journalists seemingly are steered to the political Summary For Policy Makers that misrepresents reality and misleads readers such as politicians and journalists. In turn they then mislead voters. I conclude this is deliberate and a careful part of the UN's strategy to develop and spread unfounded climate alarm within the UN's broader political agenda.

The UN IPCC has been carefully yet deceptively and dishonestly presented as a legitimate, prestigious and powerful scientific organisation. In reality it is unscientific and contradicts and misrepresents science, climate and Nature.

Yet the carefully manipulated image developed over four (4) decades has successfully fooled journalists and politicians worldwide. Sadly, as Tolstoi's quote advises in the main report, people tend to believe what they hear first. As politicians and media then lock in initial perceptions it becomes almost impossible for eminent scientists presenting hard data to overturn people's initial perceptions and emotional images carefully manipulated and cultivated by the UN.

This approach by the UN IPCC seems to be combined with subtly and carefully orchestrated tainting of opponents by slick and emotive media productions like Hollywood's *'An Inconvenient Truth'*. Even reputable scientists then resile from publicly exposing or even opposing the UN IPCC. Legitimate scientists remain quiet fearing loss of government-funded research grants, threats from universities and/or being prevented from being published in scientific journals.

That is why the defence of science was initially by retired scientists with nothing to lose and driven simply by their deep desire to restore scientific integrity.

Accurate reviews describe Laframboise's book as presenting data revealing the UN IPCC to be, quote "*a hotbed of cronyism, shoddy science in the service of political activism, and politically-correct hand wringing*". The UN IPCC structurally escapes accountability. It is effectively a law unto itself.

The UN IPCC was falsely sold to Australians as a scientific body. The reality though is that it is political. Worse, it is corrupted by the "*sheer number of Greenpeace, WWF and other activists that parade through its pages as IPCC authors and high officials*".

During her lecture in Brisbane, Australia on July 12, 2012 Donna Laframboise advised that, "*Greenpeace is at the centre of the IPCC*".

Donna Laframboise's book confirms that the UN IPCC is dysfunctional partly because it is "*composed of climate activists from Nongovernment Organisations like Greenpeace, the WWF and EDF. Its about how the IPCC ignores its own rules, especially on grey literature*".

In her book she says, quote: "After a few days of searching, cross-checking, and tabulating here are my findings with respect to the IPCC's 2007 report:

- 28 out of 44 chapters (two-thirds) included at least one individual affiliated with the WWF
- 100% of the chapters in Working Group 2 – all 20 of them - included at least 1 WWF-affiliated
- Scientist
- 15 out of 44 chapters (one-third) were led by WWF-affiliated scientists – their coordinating lead
- Authors belong to the panel
- In three instances, chapters were led by two WWF-affiliated coordinating lead authors

Ladies and gentlemen, the IPCC has been infiltrated. It has been wholly and entirely compromised.

[FOOTNOTE 31-5]"

Quote: "*Pachauri, who authors forewords for Greenpeace publications, is still in charge (of the UN IPCC). This fact, in itself, delivers a fatal blow to *AR5's credibility.*

* *The Fifth Assessment Report*

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg - whose ties to Greenpeace extend back 17 years - is now leading a chapter. So is Michael Oppenheimer, who worked for the Environmental Defense Fund for more than two decades.

Greenpeace 'legend' Bill Hare is serving as a lead author. Richard Moss, the former World Wildlife Fund vice-president, and Jennifer Morgan, the former WWF chief spokesperson, are both involved.

** Reportedly lobby groups pay these activists.*

Andreas Fischlin and Guy Midgley, the two WWF-linked individuals who led the species extinction chapter are participating. So are Rik Leemans and Lesley Hughes, two more WWF-linked individuals from that chapter.

Sari Kovats, who only earned her PhD last year, is leading a chapter. As is Jens Hesselbjerg Christensen - who cited 10 research papers that hadn't even been accepted by a journal when he led an IPCC chapter the last time.

Gabriele Hegerl, who refused outright to allow Steve McIntyre to check her data, is involved. So is Kevin Trenberth - whose hurricane pronouncements sparked Chris Landsea's resignation. Alistair Woodward is now in charge of the health chapter, despite the overtly political treatises he has authored.*

** Statistician*

And let us not forget Thomas Stocker, the climate modeler who heads AR5's 'hard science' working group. Since he thinks gasoline prices should triple and that everyone should participate in the grand goal of de-carbonizing society it's clear his mind is already made up. Do we really suppose that a working group led by him is going to acquit the accused? [FOOTNOTE 36-1]"

WWF funding sponsored a UN IPCC conference:

<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2013/02/04/pachauri-takes-wwf-money/>

Independent investigator Graham Williamson confirms UN IPCC reports are propaganda disguised as 'science':

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/gw/IPCCDiscreditedAgain_GrahamWilliamson.pdf

WWF's connections and background are revealed in Appendices 14 and 15. Extensive documentation proves that WWF was established to push an agenda for global control and that it hides behind a pseudo-environmentalism camouflage.

Some of these nongovernment organisations (NGO's) were reportedly cultivated and strengthened by Maurice Strong as an aid in ramming the UN's 'Agenda 21 Sustainability' campaign through the UN's 1992 Rio Conference in Brazil. The measures were then hastily signed by world leaders despite bypassing parliamentary or congressional scrutiny in elected houses representing the people.

The measures have since been implemented by local governments under UN programs funded by taxpayers lacking awareness of the programs' broader purpose and agenda. Government agencies have abetted the undemocratic push to destroy private property rights. Taxpayers have funded government organizations such as CSIRO to speak at conferences advocating global governance.

These programs are funded by people's taxes. Yet their purpose and implementation strategy are hidden from the people. Why do the programs need to be implemented under cover?

14. UN IPCC relies on and endorses reports by ideologues, extremists, and political activists

The previous section discussed the UN IPCC's dependence on Greenpeace and WWF. This occurs in many facets of UN IPCC reports on climate and energy. Further examples illustrate its role as a political vehicle.

<http://climateaudit.org/2011/06/14/ipcc-wg3-and-the-greenpeace-karaoke/>

Quote: *"It is totally unacceptable that IPCC should have had a Greenpeace employee as a Lead Author of the critical Chapter 10, that the Greenpeace employee, as an IPCC Lead Author, should (like Michael Mann and Keith Briffa in comparable situations) have been responsible for assessing his own work and that, with such inadequate and non-independent 'due diligence', IPCC should have featured the Greenpeace scenario in its press release on renewables.*

Everyone in IPCC WG3 should be terminated and, if the institution is to continue, it should be re-structured from scratch."

<http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2011/6/16/ideological-money-laundering.html>

And:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/16/a-blunder-of-staggering-proportions-by-the-ipcc/>

15. UN IPCC's 2013 report, Assessment Report 5 (AR5)

The UN IPCC's most recent report is its Fifth Assessment Report, AR5. It contains no **empirical scientific evidence** that CO₂ from human activity causes global warming (aka climate change).

Secondly, since the start of global **atmospheric** temperature measurements in 1958 **atmospheric** temperature cooled from 1958 to 1976, rose in 1976 as a result of the entirely natural Great Pacific Climate Shift and thereafter rose modestly until 1995 / 1998. Since 1998 every year has been cooler than in 1998. The UN IPCC's claimed greenhouse mechanism is a supposedly **atmospheric** effect purported to be warming Earth's surface. Yet in the 57 years of **atmospheric** temperature measurements, temperatures have shown no warming or been cooling for 34 years. That's 60% with no

warming. The current trend is 16 years of ongoing lack of warming yet human CO2 output continues growing thanks largely to China and India. There is no warming occurring.

Thirdly, in its latest report confidence in UN IPCC projections was raised to 95%. That implied statistical validity yet the 95% is not statistically derived. It's politically fabricated.

To paraphrase and build on Canadian statistician Ross McKittrick: in previous years the UN IPCC was wrong about the Arctic, wrong about the Antarctic, wrong about the tropical troposphere, wrong about atmospheric temperatures, wrong about the ground-based surface temperature, wrong about ocean temperatures, wrong about hurricanes, wrong about sea levels, wrong about the Himalayas, wrong about sensitivity, clueless on clouds and useless on regional trends ... And on that basis it's raised to 95% its confidence that it's right.

Ross McKittrick and another Canadian statistician Steve McIntyre famously exposed the fraudulent Hockey Stick fabrication that falsely purported unprecedented warming. It was the basis of the UN IPCC's 2001 report. Al Gore infamously spread it in his movie and book '*An Inconvenient Truth*' that grabbed headlines globally to trigger unfounded alarm and drive political action. See Appendix 3: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>. Other statisticians confirmed that the UN IPCC's fabrication is fraud. As a result the UN quietly stopped using the fabrication.

Fourthly, Steve McIntyre's early investigation of the UN's latest climate report (AR5) reveals that the UN has cooked the figures to falsely show that although there has been a lack of warming for 16/17 years, current temperatures fall within the range of its earlier projections. They do not.

Steve McIntyre says, quote: "*earlier projections have been shifted downwards relative to observations, so that the observations are now within the earlier projection.*" As shown in notes below, AR5 tried to misleadingly hide the fact that contrary to UN projections, ground-based temperatures have not risen since its second report in 1995.

<http://climateaudit.org/2013/09/30/ipcc-disappears-the-discrepancy/>

If the UN IPCC were a corporation, an accountant or financial prospectus, it would be gaoled.

Steve McIntyre, again: "*None of this portion of the IPCC assessment is drawn from peer-reviewed material. Nor is it consistent with the documents sent to external reviewers.*"

Within 24 hours of releasing its Summary for Policy Makers, the UN's corruption was exposed.

The following detailed comments relate to the AR5 report's Chapter 10, the sole chapter claiming global warming and attributing it to human production of CO2:

- In its context, the chapter's opening sentence misrepresents reality by implying warming from 1951 to 2010. Similarly on page 878. Both are false. From 1958 to 1975 global atmospheric temperatures cooled. 1976 saw a sudden small rise due to the entirely natural Great Pacific Climate Shift over one year followed through to 1995 / 1998 by a very modest warming trend. From 1995 / 1998 temperature has been flat with every year since 1998 being cooler than in 1998. In 57 years of atmospheric temperature measurements, temperatures have shown no warming or been cooling for 34 years. That's 60% with no warming. The current trend is 16 years of **ongoing** lack of warming despite ever-rising human CO2 output due largely to China and India. Yet **there is no warming**;
- The same misleading claim is used at the head of the chapter's prominent summary table, 10.1;
- The opening section on page 869 headed '*Executive Summary – Atmospheric Temperatures*' yet starts by discussing ground-based temperatures. Secondly, these are known to be corrupted;
- Identifies no plausible logical scientific reasoning for attributing modest cyclic warming to CO2 from human activity. That contradicts empirical scientific evidence and factors needed to claim causal relationships as discussed in Appendix 4;
- It contains no empirical scientific evidence and no logical scientific reasoning for claiming human CO2 caused warming;
- Fails to identify any difference between current temperature variability and past temperature variability. Comparisons reveal both previous cycles are similar in modest extent **and** rate of warming and cyclical stasis after each warming. Both previous cycles moved into cooling just as the current cycle shows signs of cooling. Indeed, many Australian temperature stations' data reveal cooling that has been '*adjusted*' by the Bureau of Meteorology to fabricate warming. Similar fabrications have converted cooling to warming in other nations. See Appendix 7;
- Contradicts empirical scientific evidence on atmospheric temperatures;
- Admits (accurately) that Arctic warming of 1920s and 1930s was natural yet fails to mention that temperatures in those decades were warmer than in the current cycle;
- Falsely claims past UN IPCC reports were vindicated yet no past report contains any empirical scientific evidence showing human CO2 caused warming cycles;
- Instead it relies on unvalidated computerised numerical models whose core assumptions contradict empirical scientific evidence, natural phenomenon and laws of science and Nature. Attribution of causality is based on unvalidated computerised numerical models;
- Falsely implies certainty about key factors driving models contradicting Table 2-11 of AR4 (2007). That admits levels of understanding for sixteen factors claimed to affect radiative forcing assumed in computerised numerical climate models. Of the sixteen factors two have a claimed medium level of understanding. One is assigned a claimed high level of understanding despite contradicting empirical scientific evidence to the contrary. The remaining 13 have low or very low levels of

understanding. Thus over 80% of the factors that are the basis of the UN IPCC's unvalidated computerised numerical models have low or very low levels of understanding. Appendix 19 discusses this further:

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

- Past projections produced by the UN IPCC's computerised numerical models have been contradicted by Nature. Models projected rapid rise in temperatures. Reality is that since 1995 global atmospheric temperatures have shown no warming as confirmed by Dr. Phil Jones head of the unit overseeing and producing temperature records used by the UN IPCC;
- Hides in section 10.9 'Synthesis' the reality that past UN IPCC global temperature projections failed;
- Corruption of global ground-based temperature record has been explained in Appendices 4 and 7, here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>. Ground-based temperatures are from the Hadley Centre tainted by the Climategate scandal that revealed prominent contributors to UN IPCC reports trying to hide the decline in global temperatures;
- Yet the real drivers of climate variability are known and are either not discussed or downgraded. See Appendix 4: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>;
- Admits natural driver of CO2 level in atmosphere;
- Word counts in the chapter's 85 pages are as follows:
 - 'model' appears 677 times;
 - 'simul' as part of simulation/simulated and similar - 379;
 - 'certain' – 232
 - 'likely' - 172 times
 - 'analysis' – 169;
 - 'confidence' – 127;
 - 'hegerl' being the name of a key author - 94. Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise reports, quote: "*Gabriele Hegerl, who refused outright to allow (statistician) Steve McIntyre* to check her data*". Is this the 2013 UN IPCC report's repeat of the Mann, Bradley, Hughes fiasco and embarrassment? Hegerl presents no empirical scientific evidence that CO2 from human activity causes warming;
 - 'may' – 79 times;
 - 'expect' as expect or part of another word such as 'expected' - 63;
 - 'project' as part of projection or other - 60;
 - 'karoly' being the name of the Lead Author of the equivalent chapter in 2001 report (chapter 12) and Review Editor of the equivalent chapter in 2007 (chapter 9) and whose work claiming causation was discredited scientifically by Canadian statistician Steve McIntyre before his paper was withdrawn – 16 times;
- The use of key words here is akin to propaganda to conjure unfounded feelings of confidence and likelihood. Yet the key is the complete lack of empirical scientific evidence of causation by human CO2;
- Claims Arctic variation is significant when history shows it is not. It's normal and natural. It attributes claimed reduction in Arctic ice sheet to human CO2 yet doesn't know why Antarctic ice sheet is increasing in size;

- Claims increases in extreme weather yet elsewhere in AR5 admits no change and no trend in significant extreme weather events;
- Misrepresents ocean alkalinity by claiming observed variation is significant when empirical scientific evidence shows it's much less than inherent natural variation;
- Misrepresents sea levels. Empirical scientific evidence in Appendix 4a contradicts this false claim: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>;

The following comments relate to the AR5 report's Summary for Policy Makers (SPM):

- Contains no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning of causation by CO2 from human activity yet clearly implies causation;
- Although previously the claim has been repeatedly made that the science is settled, the SPM's footnote number 16 states, quote: "¹⁶ *No best estimate for equilibrium climate sensitivity can now be given because of a lack of agreement on values across assessed lines of evidence and studies.*";
- Word counts in the chapter's 27 pages are as follows:
 - 'likely' - 165;
 - 'model' appears 113 times;
 - 'confidence' – 127;
 - 'project' as part of projection or other – 57
 - 'certain' - 48;
- Again, the use of key words here is akin to propaganda to conjure unfounded feelings of confidence and likelihood. Yet the key is the complete lack of empirical scientific evidence of causation by human CO2 combined with the blatant contradiction of empirical scientific evidence;
- Assessing every main claim, and specifically the brown text in light brown text box is revealing:
 - A. - Section A (*Introduction*) begins with, quote "(AR5) considers new evidence of climate change" then fails to discuss the lack of warming since 1995 / 1998 and fails to mention global atmospheric temperatures cooling from 1958 to 1976, rising in one year due to the Great Pacific Climate Shift in 1976 and then rising very modestly to 1995 / 1998 and then no warming since and to the present. Please see Appendices 4 and 7 here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>. Appendices cited in support of notes on each SPM claim below are all available at this link;
 - B. - Section B (*Observed Changes in the Climate System*). Blatantly false. See Appendices 4 and 7: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>
 - B.1 - (*Atmosphere*) starts by discussing Earth's surface temperatures. Blatantly false. See Appendices 4, 4a and 7. Many errors and false claims in this section. Figure SPM.1 presents surface temperatures in a section on the atmosphere. Its fine print comments reveal that the UN IPCC has no clue as to the effect of CO2 relative to inherent natural climate variability;
 - B.2 - (*Ocean*). False. Contradicts empirical scientific evidence revealed by ARGO bouys. See Appendix 4a and below by science writer Jo Nova;

- B.3 – (*Cryosphere*). Many errors. Many glaciers growing. Antarctica ice sheet is growing. See Appendices 4a and 2;
- B.4 – (*Sea Level*). Blatantly false. See Appendix 4a;
- B.5 – (*Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles*). Appendix 4 and note the work of Ernst Georg Beck. UN IPCC's claim contradicts Henry's Law. See notes on ocean alkalinity above in comments on AR5 chapter 10;
- C. - (*Drivers of Climate Change*). Contradicts empirical scientific evidence on atmospheric temperatures. See Appendices 4, 7 and 19;
- D. - (*Understanding the Climate System and its Recent Changes*). False. Appendices 4 and 7. Contradicts empirical scientific evidence on atmospheric temperatures;
- D.1 – (*Evaluation of Climate Models*). Blatantly false. Models' underlying core assumptions contradict Nature and empirical scientific evidence. See Appendices 2 and 19. Models hopelessly failed to predict 17 years of temperature stasis and lack of warming trend for almost two decades. In the fine print's first point the UN IPCC admits divergence between models and actual temperatures. Further in the second point its comments reveal it has no clue as to the impact if any of CO₂;
- D.2 (*Quantification of Climate System Responses*). Blatantly false. Contradicted by empirical scientific evidence of ocean and atmospheric temperatures. Appendices 4, 4a and 7;
- D.3 (*Detection and Attribution of Climate Change*). Blatantly false. Contradicted by empirical scientific evidence. Natural variability is explained by natural factors and proven as such in peer-reviewed papers consistent with empirical scientific evidence. Appendix 4. This section is misleading and deceptive with large areas false. The atmosphere has not warmed and is not warming;
- E. - (*Future Global and Regional Climate Change*). Past UN IPCC projections failed dismally. Atmosphere is currently not warming. Appendices 2, 4, 7 and 19;
- E.1 – (*Atmosphere: Temperature*). It starts by discussing global surface temperature and fails to discuss atmospheric temperature. It makes projections based on unvalidated computerised numerical models proven to be wrong. It's sprayed liberally with the word '*likely*'. Appendix 2;
- E.2 (*Atmosphere: Water Cycle*). Projections based on unvalidated computerised numerical models proven to be wrong. Appendices 2 and 4a. In recent years the UN has been increasing emphasis on water resources and its perceived need to control water resources in accordance with UN Agenda 21 discussed in Appendix 14;
- Pleasingly, the UN IPCC admits briefly, quote: "*There is high confidence that the El Nin*

to rise. Appendix 4;

- E.5 – (*Cryosphere*). As for E.4;
- E.6 – (*Sea Level*). Empirical scientific evidence contradicts UN IPCC's claim. Past projections were downgraded in each successive UN IPCC report. All based on unvalidated computerised numerical models repeatedly proven wrong. Some glaciers and Antarctic ice sheet growing. Appendix 4a;
- E.7 – (*Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles*). Natural climate change does affect carbon cycle processes. Oceans are alkali. Natural variation in alkalinity is far greater than the variation cited by UN IPCC. Life in oceans thrived when atmospheric CO₂ levels were far higher than today. Henry's Law reveals interdependency of ocean and atmosphere with oceans containing, in dissolved form, more than 50 times the CO₂ contained in Earth's entire atmosphere. Appendix 4;
- E.8 – (*Climate Stabilization, Climate Change Commitment and Irreversibility*). Contradictions of empirical scientific evidence. Human CO₂ production cannot affect atmospheric CO₂ levels, as the level is temperature-dependent. Appendix 4;
- Figure SPM.10 provides an interesting and useful opportunity to summarise as the UN IPCC's major contributors live in the shaded region of the graph, well outside the real world that is a horizontal temperature line parallel to the X-axis since Nature alone controls temperature that in turn over the long term (and seasonally) drives and determines CO₂ levels. In reality, CO₂ is the dependent variable, not the independent variable. This UN IPCC graph reverses reality and falsely purports that human CO₂ determines CO₂ levels. Appendix 4;
- Box SPM.1 – (*Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs)*). The basis for this latest three-letter UN IPCC acronym that sounds technical reverses reality. Human CO₂ production does not determine atmospheric CO₂ levels. Appendix 4.

The UN IPCC Summary for Policy Makers repeatedly contradicts empirical scientific evidence, states blatant falsities and repeatedly reverses reality while cloaked in terminology that may cause lay-people to think it's scientific. It's not. It's propaganda.

As UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray states, quote: "*All the reports have to have a "Summary for Policymakers", which is **really a Summary BY Policymakers** because it is agreed to line-by-line by the anonymous international government representatives who control the IPCC. The results are then dictated to politically-selected "Drafting Authors". In the end, they can only hope that their Summary will agree with the main body of the report.*"

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/10/13/ipcc-in-a-stew-how-they-cooked-their-latest-climate-books/>

As discussed above in sections 5 and 6, the UN IPCC breaches its own guidelines. UN IPCC reporting processes are governed by politics and not science. This is confirmed by its practices as revealed by Canadian investigative reporter Donna Laframboise:

<http://sppiblog.org/news/10024>

A critique of AR5 by internationally acclaimed independent climate scientists is here: <http://wattsupwiththat.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/critique-of-ipcc-spm-ar5-1.pdf>. It's summarised here: <http://www.sepp.org/twtwfiles/2013/TWTW%2010-26-13.pdf>. The authors are with the independent, non-profit and non-aligned Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change.

The summary is that the scientists find that the IPCC:

- *Has retreated on at least 11 alarmist claims in prior reports*
- *The new SPM has at least 13 misleading or false statements, and that another 11 statements are phrased to mislead the readers or misrepresent important aspects of the science.*

Among the retreats was that IPCC recognizes:

- *Surface warming essentially stopped about 1998 even though there has been 7% increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) since then;*
- *Continents experienced a Medieval Warm Period and a Little Ice Age, which, of course, contradicts Mr. Mann's notorious hockey-stick that was the centerpiece of the UN IPCC's 2001 report;*
- *Antarctic sea ice expanded between 1979 and 2012, which is inconsistent (contradicts) with the claimed global warming;*
- *The models failed to forecast the observed failure of the globe to warm;*
- *The latest estimated range for a warming from a doubling of CO₂ is 1.5°C to 4.5°C (about 3 to 7°F), which is the same as the estimate made by the National Academy of Sciences 34 years ago. The last retreat is particularly significant. According to government reports, since 1993 the US spent at least \$150 Billion on climate change activities, at least \$35 Billion on what was categorized as climate science; yet, there has been no improvement in the scientific knowledge of the influence of atmospheric CO₂ on temperatures. This failure to advance scientific knowledge supports atmospheric scientist and UN IPCC contributor Richard Lindzen's contention that the entire program is not designed to answer critical questions;*

Among the 13 misleading or untrue statements uncovered by the NIPCC team are:

- *Probabilistic estimates of quantified measures of uncertainty in a finding are based on statistical analysis of observations or model results, or both, and expert judgment. "(!!!)*
- *"Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and since the 1950s many of the observed changes are unprecedented;"*
- *"The reduced trend in radiative forcing (1998-2012) is primarily due to volcanic eruptions." The NIPCC team asserts there were no globally significant volcanic eruptions during the period;*
- *"The net radiative feedback due to all cloud types combined is likely positive. Uncertainty in the sign and magnitude of the cloud feedback is due primarily to continuing uncertainty in the impact of warming on low clouds." The statement is*

inconsistent on its face. It concerns a significant climate factor that the UN IPCC has not been able to model—clouds.

- *"The underlying assumption is that the models contain a perfect representation of the physics of the climate system and so can account accurately for all different forcings." This is a false assumption because our knowledge is much less than complete;*

The 11 instances of deceptive language include:

- *"Each of the last three decades has been successively warmer at the Earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850."*
- *"In the Northern Hemisphere, 1983-2012 was likely the warmest 30-year period of the last 1400 years."*
- *"The ocean has absorbed about 30% of the emitted anthropogenic carbon dioxide, causing ocean acidification."*

Another summary by internationally acclaimed and respected climate scientist, Professor Fred Singer is here:

http://www.americanthinker.com/2013/11/nongovernmental_climate_scientists_slam_the_uns_ipcc.html

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray has more than 60 years experience as a research scientist and more than 20 years studying climate. He has reviewed all five UN IPCC reports: 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007, and 2013. He provided by far the most comprehensive, detailed and thorough review of the 2007 report. He makes comments on the 2013 process:

<http://theclimatescepticsparty.blogspot.com.au/search?q=fifth+report>

And:

<http://theclimatescepticsparty.blogspot.com.au/2013/10/controlling-scientists.html>

And:

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/larrybell/2013/10/13/ipcc-in-a-stew-how-they-cooked-their-latest-climate-books/>

And:

<http://www.sepp.org/science-editorials.cfm?whichcat=Report&whichsubcat=IPCC%20Assessment%20Report>

Significantly, the UN IPCC's 2013 report (AR5) was forced to come clean and admit no increase in storm activity—contradicting the UN IPCC Chairman's earlier media release and media conference that blatantly and wilfully contradicted empirical scientific evidence presented to him by the UN IPCC's most eminent scientist on storm activity, Dr. Chris Landsea. Important parts of its 2013 report have downgraded earlier UN IPCC warnings with some downgradings eliminating previous threats completely.

Here are some key points in the IPCC AR5 report summarised clearly in everyday language by journalist Andrew Bolt:

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

- *Statistically significant decrease in Eastern Australia land-falling tropical cyclones*
- *Evidence suggests slight decreases in the frequency of tropical cyclones making landfall in the North Atlantic and the South Pacific*
- *Little evidence exists of any longer-term trend in other ocean basins*
- *Low confidence in large scale changes in the intensity of extreme extratropical cyclones since 1900*
- *Low confidence that any reported long-term (centennial) increases in tropical cyclone activity are robust*
- *Low confidence for a clear trend in storminess*
- *Low confidence in observed trends in small-scale severe weather phenomena such as hail and thunderstorms*
- *Continuing lack of evidence and thus low confidence regarding the sign of trend in the magnitude and/or frequency of floods*
- *Not enough evidence at present to suggest more than low confidence in a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness*
- *Based on updated studies, AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated*
- *There is medium confidence that globally the length and frequency of warm spells, including heat waves, has increased*
- *Low confidence in trends in extreme winds*

American climatologist Dr. Judith Curry is Professor and Chair of the Georgia Institute of Technology's School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. Reportedly she's a scientist who initially believed that humans causing global warming. She now publicly questions that. She changed her mind after she saw alarmist scientists not behaving as scientists.

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/28/ipcc-diagnosis-permanent-paradigm-paralysis/>

Quote: *"Diagnosis (of IPCC): paradigm paralysis, caused by motivated reasoning, oversimplification, and consensus seeking; worsened and made permanent by a vicious positive feedback effect at the climate science-policy interface."*

Her conclusion, quote: *"The IPCC needs to get out of the way so that scientists and policy makers can better do their jobs."*

Quote: *"increasing levels of shrillness on both sides of the political debate, with the 'warm side' steeped in moral panic and hyperbole."*

Quote: *"after several decades and expenditures in the bazillions, the IPCC still has not provided a convincing argument for how much warming in the 20th century has been caused by humans."*

Quote: *"The hope, and the potential, of climate models for providing credible regional climate change scenarios have not been realized."*

And

“An unintended consequence of this strategy is that there has been very little left over for true climate modeling innovations and fundamental research into climate dynamics and theory”

Quote: **“Conclusion**

The diagnosis of paradigm paralysis seems fatal in the case of the IPCC, given the widespread nature of the infection and intrinsic motivated reasoning. We need to put down the IPCC as soon as possible – not to protect the patient who seems to be thriving in its own little cocoon, but for the sake of the rest of us whom it is trying to infect with its disease. Fortunately much of the population seems to be immune, but some governments seem highly susceptible to the disease. However, the precautionary principle demands that we not take any risks here, and hence the IPCC should be put down.”

Judith Curry alluding to unscientific groupthink in UN IPCC ‘deliberations’:

<http://judithcurry.com/2013/10/01/negotiating-the-ipcc-spm/>.

The UN IPCC’s ground-based temperature data is not allowed to be peer-reviewed. That means it should be scientifically discarded. Independent investigators in several nations report unscientific tampering of data to fabricate warming trends where none existed. See Appendix 7.

It’s sole chapter claiming warming attributed to human production of CO₂ is Chapter 10. It contains no empirical scientific evidence warming caused by human CO₂.

That’s the same as for the sole equivalent chapter in the preceding 2007 report (chapter 9) and the sole equivalent chapter in the 2001 report (chapter 12). None contain empirical scientific evidence of warming caused by human CO₂.

The latest UN IPCC report’s Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) contains no empirical scientific evidence of warming caused by human CO₂. Similarly the SPM’s for 2001 and 2007 contain no empirical scientific evidence.

The UN IPCC contradicts empirical scientific evidence because it relies on projections from computerised numerical models whose core assumptions contradict Nature. Those spurious assumptions are listed and discussed further in Appendix 19, here: <http://www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

As stated by climate scientist Dr. Judith Curry in her statement to the USA Senate’s Committee on Environment and Public Works, quote: *“The discrepancy between observational and climate model-based estimates of climate sensitivity is substantial and of significant importance to policymakers.”*

Science writer and scientist Jo Nova on the UN’s claim of rising ocean temperatures, quote: *“In answer to the excuse du jour: “The Ocean ate my Global Warming”.”*

Now that the plateau in air temperatures has lasted for 15 years, everyone, even IPCC lead authors, can see the “90% certain” models were 98% wrong. So the IPCC now claims the heat went into the deep abyss, which they didn’t predict, can’t measure accurately, and, even by the best estimates we have, has not been anywhere near large enough to explain the missing energy.

There are 1.4 billion cubic kilometers of ocean out there — it’s so big it hid a 650 km volcano until two weeks ago. Only two people have been to the bottom ever (correction, three men), and they stayed just 20 minutes (and all they saw was silt). Despite this the IPCC wants us to believe we can measure the entire Earth’s ocean temperature in one hundredth’s of a degree, not just now, but allegedly also 50 or 60 years ago. There is no 95% certainty about ocean measurements in 1962 or even in 2002.

Strangely, the best models in the world did not predict this in 2007. The IPCC are handwaving at the ocean heat so they can still say “the world is warming” but in reality the numbers are devastating, and the data (as scratchy as it is) supports the skeptics. If the standstill in temperatures is bad news for the IPCC, so are the ocean heat figures.

The excuse that the missing heat went into the ocean is a deceptive reframing — where a failure in ocean measurements is used to save them from their failure to predict what happened above the water.”

Ocean Heat Content does not help the IPCC

- 1. If the oceans affected global temperatures after 1998, what were they doing before that?*
- 2. The oceans are supposedly 0.06 C warmer than 50 years ago (but we can’t really measure the global ocean temperature to a hundredth of a degree).*
- 3. The utterly banal again: All forms of warming cause ocean heat to rise.*
- 4. The missing energy is just not enough. The numbers Jim, look at the numbers!”*
End quote

<http://joannenova.com.au/2013/09/ipcc-in-denial-just-so-excuses-use-mystery-ocean-heat-to-hide-their-failure/>

The mainstream media and politicians are vehicles for the UN to spread unscientific propaganda. For example, The Globe and Mail presented UN IPCC AR5’s key findings:

- Global warming is (now) “unequivocal,” and since the 1950’s it’s “extremely likely” that human activities have been the dominant cause of the temperature rise. (Note: this contradicts empirical scientific evidence)*
- Concentrations of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere have increased to levels that are unprecedented in at least 800,000 years. The burning of fossil fuels is the main reason behind a 40 per cent increase in carbon-dioxide concentrations since the industrial revolution. (False)*

- *Global temperatures are likely to rise by 0.3 to 4.8 degrees C, or 0.5-8.6 F, by the end of the century, depending on how much governments control carbon emissions.* (Unscientific projections based on unvalidated computerised numerical models repeatedly proven grossly wrong. Additionally, carbon is a solid and is **not** gaseous carbon dioxide)
- *Most aspects of climate change will continue for many centuries even if carbon-dioxide emissions are stopped.* (Contradicts empirical scientific evidence)
- *Sea levels are expected to rise a further 26-82 centimetres by the end of the century.* (Based on unvalidated computerised numerical proven grossly wrong)
- *The Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets have been losing mass over the past two decades. Glaciers have continued to melt almost all over the world. Arctic sea ice has shrunk and spring snow cover has continued to decrease, and it is “very likely” that this will continue.* (False. see above for comments on SPM)
- *It’s “virtually certain” that the upper ocean has warmed from 1971 to 2010. The ocean will continue to warm this century, with heat penetrating from the surface to the deep ocean.* (False, unfounded and contradicts empirical scientific evidence. See above)

The UN IPCC’s language is vague and unscientific. It’s certainly not conclusive yet implies certainty. Some statements contradict empirical scientific evidence. Some are highly suspicious by omission. eg, glaciers advancing.

Yet some media like the ABC convert these into implied certainties.

Here are further links providing comments on AR5:

- Canadian investigative reporter Donna Laframboise: <http://nofrakkingconsensus.com/2013/10/28/the-ipcc-looking-95-foolish/>
- More from Donna: <http://nofrakkingconsensus.com/2013/10/02/10-pages-of-ipcc-science-mistakes/>
- More: <http://nofrakkingconsensus.com/2012/12/15/ipcc-declares-its-intent-to-circumvent-expert-reviewers/>
- Independent climate researcher and data analyst John McLean reveals two key passages from the AR5 SPM prove that the UN IPCC has no clue how much warming (if any) CO2 causes: <http://www.theage.com.au/comment/hot-air-no-surprise-to-warming-sceptics-20131114-2xhxq.html> and [http://www.academia.edu/4210419/Can climate models explain the recent stagnation in global warming](http://www.academia.edu/4210419/Can_climate_models_explain_the_recent_stagnation_in_global_warming)
- Scientist Don Easterbrook: <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/10/03/the-2013-ipcc-ar5-report-facts-vs-fictions/>
- Independent climate investigator Steve Goddard reveals the outcome was decided years before the report was released:

<http://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2013/10/01/ipcc-conclusions-were-drawn-up-three-years-ago-before-any-of-the-science-was-done/>

- Independent comment on UN reporting processes by Kesten Green, quote: “*The global warming movement also relies on experts’ judgments, but this time the experts were asked to describe what causes temperatures to change. In their article examining the IPCC’s procedures, Fildes and Kourentzes (2011) observe: “a major part of the model building is judgmental” (p. 970). They report that judgment is heavily relied upon for constructing a global temperature series from selected local readings, including and excluding variables, representing climate processes, estimating parameters, selecting initial conditions, and selecting and interpreting model outputs*”. It’s a subjective process open to abuse and politicisation because it was designed to be so. It’s not scientific. It’s unscientific.
<http://www.kestengreen.com/gas-improvements.pdf>
- In absence of empirical scientific evidence the UN IPCC relies on unfounded fears:
http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/how_dare_the_ipcc_peddle_this_monstrous_scare/
- From Andrew Montford: <http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2013/10/1/the-fifths-first-fiddle.html>
- <http://www.redorbit.com/news/general/1112752620/leaked-draft-of-un-climate-report-admits-then-evades-role/>

16. India dumped the UN IPCC

Tiring of UN IPCC corruption and misrepresentations, quote: “*The Indian government has moved to establish its own body to address and monitor science surrounding climate change, saying it "cannot rely" on the official United Nation panel.*”

<http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/20100205/india-ipcc-un-climate-change-global-warming.htm>

http://www.nal-jsc.org/Climate_Change_Symposium_Leighton_Steward_Presentation.pdf

http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2010-01-19/india/28133382_1_ipcc-r-k-pachauri-glaciers

17. UN IPCC researchers seeking immunity from prosecution

It’s easy to understand why UN IPCC contributors are reportedly seeking immunity from prosecution.

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/06/14/un-climate-scientists-plead-for-immunity-from-criminal-prosecution/>

18. UN IPCC Lead Author misled USA Congress

Roger Pielke is professor of environmental studies at the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado at Boulder. He recently stated, quote: *“The politicization of climate science is so complete that the lead author of the IPCC's Working Group II on climate impacts feels comfortable presenting testimony to the US Congress that fundamentally misrepresents what the IPCC has concluded. I am referring to testimony given today by Christopher Field, a professor at Stanford, to the US Senate.*

This is not a particularly nuanced or complex issue. What Field says the IPCC says is blatantly wrong, often 180 degrees wrong. It is one thing to disagree about scientific questions, but it is altogether different to fundamentally misrepresent an IPCC report to the US Congress. Below are five instances in which Field's testimony today completely and unambiguously misrepresented IPCC findings to the Senate. Field's testimony is here in PDF.”

<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com.au/2012/08/ipcc-lead-author-misleads-us-congress.html>

This illustrates how the media and governments were captured by misrepresentations of climate impacts by people supposedly with scientific authority. It's difficult for harried, rushed politicians to cope with and respond to the media reaction stirred by alarmist misrepresentations. It forces them to take action—without sound scientific backing.

Additional points revealing UN IPCC corruption:

Please refer to documentation of UN IPCC corruption in my document entitled *‘Freedom's Foundation. Reclaiming our country and our planet using Truth: Exposing Corruption of Climate Science—Misrepresentations, Distortions, Omissions, Evasions, Myths and Lies’* available here:

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

Please note the following items from that document:

19. Each of the five UN IPCC reports to national governments and media is based on an unscientific falsity. ie, 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007 and 2013.
(See Sections 5 and 15, above)

The UN IPCC's core claim now rests on unvalidated computer models. These models used to predict temperature increases have been wide of the mark, revealing serious defects in the UN IPCC's supposed *‘theory’*. To become a theory, a supposition must be consistent with known laws and proven theories. Thus the UN IPCC's core supposition fails to qualify as a theory. It is a political fabrication, a supposition driven by a political agenda.

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/07/17/official-probe-shows-climategate-whitewash-link-to-sandusky-child-sex-case/>

20. The UN IPCC's corruption of climate science originated in the United Nations Environmental Program, UNEP led specifically by Maurice Strong, UNEP's first Secretary-General.

(See Section 7, above.)

This is extensively documented in published papers, books and Internet articles. Note the work of John McLean:

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

And:

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

And:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

Along the way Maurice Strong became a co-director of the Chicago Climate Exchange together with Al Gore. Dennis Ambler says, quote: "*Maurice Strong, architect of the UNEP and hence the IPCC, is a Director of the Chicago Climate Exchange. Al Gore's Generation Investment Management Company (GIM) owns 10% of CCX. Tata Power Company Limited, Tata Motors Limited and Tata Steel Limited, are all members of the CCX.*"

Current UN IPCC Chairman Dr. Rajendra Pachauri is closely involved with Tata.

How did it get to this?

Through its charter, the UN IPCC was specifically restricted to investigate only human-induced climate change. That excluded natural drivers of climate. Its reason for existence was to find human causation of climate change. In absence of data, human causation was fabricated.

Elaine Dewar's book *Cloak of Green* and James Delingpole's book entitled *Killing the Earth to Save it* discuss the UN IPCC's background and Maurice Strong's influence.

His own words reveal Maurice Strong's two key aims being de-industrialisation of western democracies and global socialist government through the UN. An introduction is available here:

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

And:

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

Note the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate change and its report entitled *Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action Under the Convention* at the Seventh session Bangkok, 28 September to 9 October 2009, and Barcelona, 2–6 November 2009:

<http://wattsupwiththat.files.wordpress.com/2009/10/un-fccc-copenhagen-2009.pdf>

A colleague and practicing lawyer advises, quote: “For example Section 38 on page 18 of UNFCCC describes how any scheme agreed upon will have the status of a government with vast financial capacity and enforcement capability. The document allows for the creation of a supervising board of UN bureaucrats with powers to issue fines based on multiples of the market price of carbon. So, for instance, if Australia does not confine its output to a target specified by UNFCCC and as agreed ... fines up to \$1 billion could be levied.

As well as penalties for non-compliance with emission targets, the main purpose of UNFCCC is to facilitate a massive transfer of wealth from developed nations to the economies of poorer nations. The justification for this is contained in Section 17 of annex 111 E on page 122 which states the developed nations should compensate the poorer nations “for lost opportunities, resources, lives, land and dignity, as many will become environmental refugees”.

The expected total of this compensation is described in Section 33, page 39, as being in the range of \$US 70 – 140 billion per year. Each offending developed nation shall have at least 0.7% of its annual Gross Domestic Production assessed for compulsory contribution [Section 41, page 43]. In Australia’s case this would amount to \$7 billion per year.”
End of quote.

More significantly please refer to Appendix 14.

A brief timeline is provided in *The Eco Fraud: Part 1 A Timeline of International Fraud* is available here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

Note that 1974’s preoccupation with projections of catastrophic global cooling was blamed on the use of coal and oil. It followed cyclic atmospheric cooling from 1958 through 1975. At the time, the late Stephen Schneider was prominent in scaring people about projected imminent catastrophic global cooling. He later became involved with the UN IPCC and a strong supporter of the UN IPCC’s unscientific claims blaming supposed catastrophic global warming on use of coal and oil.

Based on Nature’s uncooperative event in one year, 1976, the original claim of forecast imminent, irreversible catastrophic global cooling blamed on use of fuels containing carbon was reversed to forecast imminent, irreversible catastrophic global warming blamed on fuels containing carbon. ie, global atmospheric warming due to human CO₂. That was subtly altered to become climate change due to human CO₂. Then subtly reworked to become climate change due to carbon. That was followed by attempts to rework it into climate disruption due to carbon.

Despite changes in terminology, two characteristics remain constant:

- Nature’s empirical data reveals Nature alone determines global climate; and,
- The real issue is fabricated global warming due to aligning vested interests aiming to control industry and government worldwide as stated by Maurice Strong.

Maurice Strong's outstanding networking skills and intelligent understanding of human nature enabled him to install key people in influential positions to establish systems that drove aligned behaviours. A large number of diverse groups were aligned as listed on page 40 here:

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

The bandwagon was formed and underway.

His effectiveness can be measured by widespread use of the political term *consensus*. That is fundamentally against science that relies on objective repeatable measurements not consensus. Yet *consensus* almost prevailed and almost replaced real science.

Subtle, astute use of propaganda, control of finances, clever use of fear and guilt and an appeal to authority preyed on people's vulnerability and inherent care for the natural environment.

UN IPCC Chairman Dr. Rajendra Pachauri illustrates the insanity of the position advocated by Maurice Strong. Quoting Dennis Ambler on Dr. Pachauri: *"He was effectively saying that the West should de-industrialise and let developing nations industrialise in the interest of solving poverty. This has also been a long stated aim of his friend and colleague on many boards and institutions, Maurice Strong."*

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

Their plan for bringing developing nations out of poverty is to plunge developed nations into poverty. That is not only antihuman, it contradicts history. Development is not a zero-sum game. Instead, the more wealth that's generated, the more there is to share.

The problem is that governments have claimed to be fairer at redistributing yet history shows that central control always destroys wealth creation. Central control kills wealth and brings poverty because millions of independently creative hearts and minds are replaced and thwarted by a few bureaucrats focused fearfully on maintaining control.

Their ignorance of basic human behaviour and history is astounding. That so many people could fall for it is even more astounding. That people are awakening is refreshing.

Maurice Strong is now recognised as deceitful yet impressively intelligent and capable. He almost succeeded.

21. The so-called ‘*climate science*’ was settled politically before the *science* even started. By his own words, the UN IPCC’s first Chairman, Bert Bolin was an advocate for taxing CO₂ before the UN IPCC had even been formed and without scientific evidence for his position. Bert Bolin became UN IPCC Chairman after first working in the corrupt UNEP.
(See Section 8, above)

Typically, after each of many various scandals the UN IPCC initially denies allegations, then admits some truth to the allegations and then states it will clean up its act. Yet subsequently little changes as the UN IPCC continues corrupting science and misrepresenting climate.

The UN IPCC’s next Assessment Report, No. 5, is already being revealed to be corrupt.
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/02/22/omitted-variable-fraud-vast-evidence-for-solar-climate-driver-rates-one-oblique-sentence-in-ar5/>

A broader initial analysis of AR5 is available here:
<http://tome22.info/Top/AnnotatedDocuments.html#id4>

On the supposedly ‘*scientific*’ challenge that political leaders shrieked as being ‘*the greatest moral ... challenge of our time*’ the UN IPCC failed to win a Nobel science prize. Instead, it ‘*won*’ a Peace Prize adjudicated by a political committee of the Norwegian parliament. That its co-winner was Al Gore fraudulently pushing his personal financial interests by contradicting empirical scientific evidence is of further concern.

By spreading the UN IPCC’s propaganda after failing to do its due diligence, the media generally has betrayed the public’s trust.

Contradictions within, and problems with, the UN IPCC abound:
<http://sppiblog.org/news/ipcc-confirms-we-do-not-know-if-the-climate-is-becoming-more-extreme>
<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.co.uk/2012/03/handy-bullshit-button-on-disasters-and.html>

Yet:
http://bigpondnews.com/articles/TopStories/2012/03/30/Global_warming_linked_to_extreme_weather_734390.html

Additional material on the UN IPCC is available in my earlier documents at www.conscious.com.au. Specifically, these are *Thriving With Nature & Humanity*, *Two Dead Elephants in Parliament* and the *Eco-Fraud* series.

Graham Williamson provides a succinct summary of problems with the UN IPCC in Part 3, pages 24 to 35 in ‘*Loss of Independence and Integrity*’ available here:
<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/CSIROpaperFinalNoLink.pdf>

22. UN IPCC reporting strategy deceptively misled key people

Section 2 above illustrates how the UN IPCC converted a lack of scientific evidence for its core claim into a report that fooled key politicians, media and even scientists.

Employing fearful alarm pushed through scientifically illiterate mass media the UN IPCC converted its false and unfounded core claim into political pressure. Politicians and journalists lacking understanding of science and scientific logic are swamped in overwhelming misrepresentations. They are buried politically in a massive propaganda campaign from the UN IPCC and its intimate prominent Nongovernment* allies including Greenpeace, WWF and EDF. These were previously developed for the UN's 1992 Rio Conference. Evidence reveals that NGO's have cultivated UN IPCC claims. Politicians are forced to act or face political suicide.

* Their roles are discussed in Appendix 15.

UN IPCC reports in 2001 and 2007 reveal the UN IPCC's apparent deceptive strategy. It employs massively voluminous reports too daunting in terms of structure, writing style, convoluted language and scientific jargon for harried journalists and politicians. Instead journalists and politicians are steered to each report's *Summary* (SPM) that contradicts empirical scientific evidence to falsely imply evidence of human causation.

Funding to influence scientists susceptible to confirmation bias provided grants for scientists' continued employment. Many of the people involved in the UN IPCC's deception seem to have been innocent of any wrongdoing. Gullibility, lack of thought and innocent bias reveal faults in the system of awarding grants by government. History reveals humans are vulnerable in a mob. History reveals a minority of people ready to use that vulnerability in meeting a fundamental need for acceptance and belonging.

Only the informed, honest and morally courageous politicians did their due diligence on behalf of voters. For that they're ridiculed and vilified to deter free speech. Parliament and national governance are smashed.

The UN IPCC pulls off a remarkable feat in using language to defeat science. Consider that climate is known to contain many massive scientific uncertainties and unknowns. The UN IPCC's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 contains no empirical scientific evidence. Yet many massive uncertainties and unknowns are conjured into the basis for a global emergency supposedly requiring drastic global action through global treaties controlling national, regional, local and personal rights.

The UN's tactics are revealed by close open scrutiny. Through the UN IPCC the UN aimed to fabricate scientific authority to move people systematically as momentum built. Strategically it applied public pressure to politicians through media and nongovernment organisations and to prevent dissent and frighten the public. Its tactics included creating the illusion of scientific authority through corrupted reconstructions, blatant use of falsities and corrupt use of unvalidated computer models. It buried these tricks deep within massive reports that were avoided by journalists and politicians who read the political Summary for Policy Makers. Journalists and politicians rarely accessed the core

reports and those who spoke out were ridiculed. To that were added false claims by senior UN IPCC officials claiming imminent, fearful catastrophes.

The strategy was to maintain momentum using fear and guilt and systematize the crisis in ways that align financial beneficiaries such as major international bankers, national governments seeking new taxes while implementing 'trading' schemes to provide the UN with massive funding.

Four phenomena stopped the UN's run-away train:

- The so-called global financial crisis that provided a delay allowing;
- Nature to reveal she controls climate;
- Persistent scientists working to restore scientific integrity;
- Revelations of corruption within the UN IPCC.

23. Many real scientists were initially fooled by UN IPCC corruption. Unlike many journalists they awoke to the scam.

The deliberately deceptive message to politicians, media and the public through unfounded headlines screaming alarm originated in the difference between the supposed science report and the Summary for Policymakers (SPM). Seemingly, senior UN IPCC officers expected nobody would read or understand the Science Report—especially the media. It seems that they expected they could later isolate and attack the few who dared to challenge the science and what the UN IPCC was doing. This they did. Meanwhile enough scientists initially swallowed UN IPCC's unscientific claims without reading the Reports and in too many cases not understanding what the reports claimed. This was summarised recently by German physicist and meteorologist Klaus-Eckhart Puls who admitted, quote:

"Ten years ago I simply parroted what the IPCC told us. One day I started checking the facts and data – first I started with a sense of doubt but then I became outraged when I discovered that much of what the IPCC and the media were telling us was sheer nonsense and was not even supported by any scientific facts and measurements. To this day I still feel shame that as a scientist I made presentations of their science without first checking it. The CO2-climate hysteria in Germany is propagated by people who are in it for lots of money, attention and power."

<http://notrickszone.com/2012/05/09/the-belief-that-co2-can-regulate-climate-is-sheer-absurdity-says-prominent-german-meteorologist/>

Another scientist with the courage and integrity to admit he was wrong in initially assuming the UN IPCC was reliable is David Evans. He worked in the Australian government's Carbon Accounting computer modelling says that it's a scam:

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

He too admits that initially he simply accepted it was true. When things didn't fit he asked questions, investigated and came to the clear conclusion that it's a scam. He had the courage to speak out. One thousand peers, including eminent scientists have had the courage to publicly reveal they are now sceptics. Many initially assumed the UN IPCC

was, as its Chairman falsely claimed, science of gold-plate standard. It is not. Scrutiny proves the UN IPCC repeatedly contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

24. Big government using big tobacco's tactics and methods?

Tricks used by the UN IPCC to hide data reportedly included and went beyond those used by the tobacco industry lobbyists to prevent discovery of the data showing smoking to be dangerous:

- Scientists were paid for research to provide desired conclusions;
- Journalists were paid to write articles claiming global warming was due to human CO₂;
- Scientists were paid to produce results (using models);
- Data was falsified (hockey stick graph);
- Data was hidden and audit prevented;
- Tobacco industry ridiculed opponents;

The tobacco industry ceased its tricks when the case eventually went to court where evidence is required under oath.

Is that why the UN is seeking immunity from prosecution?

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/06/14/un-climate-scientists-plead-for-immunity-from-criminal-prosecution/>

John O'Sullivan says, quote: "[John Bolton](#), a former U.S. Ambassador to the UN, questioned the motives, "The creeping expansion of claims for privileges and immunities protection for UN activities is symptomatic of a larger problem." Especially worrisome is that in conjunction with the application for a sweeping "get out of jail free card" for all it's scientists the UNFCCC is remorselessly promoting a mammoth Green Climate Fund, intended to help mobilize as much as \$100 billion a year for projects to lower global greenhouse gases. At the Rio conference the UN plans to trumpet a new [draft planning and agenda document](#), "[The Future We Want](#)," that will compel American families to pay \$1,325 per year to "stop" climate change. Bolton, alongside many savvy taxpayers, is right to worry when such an organization seeking to manage a \$100 billion a year fund based on dodgy science is at the same time demanding immunity from prosecution. Can you think of a better recipe for corruption?"

Surely on such an issue as supposed catastrophic climate alarm, if the UN IPCC and governments had evidence they would want to go to court.

Conclusions:

The UN IPCC is the antithesis of science. It contradicts science.

CSIRO's endorsement of the UN IPCC reveals that Australia has ceded scientific sovereignty to the UN. It reveals that CSIRO has failed to do its due diligence. It reveals that on the topic of global warming and climate CSIRO is not scientific. Endorsing corruption is corrupt.

The UN IPCC has no empirical scientific evidence for its core claim of CO₂ from human activity causes global warming. The UN IPCC contradicts empirical scientific evidence answering all four fundamental questions on alleged global warming (aka climate change). Empirical scientific evidence reveals:

- There is no unusual or unnatural global atmospheric warming trend or pattern;
- Temperature determines atmospheric CO₂ levels. That's the opposite of the UN IPCC's core claim;
- Nature alone determines atmospheric CO₂ levels, regardless of human CO₂;
- Warmer periods are beneficial to people, humanity, civilisation and the environment.

The UN IPCC shamelessly and falsely propagates three core climate misrepresentations. The UN IPCC:

- Reverses empirical science to falsely claim human CO₂ drives climate;
- Contradicts empirical scientific evidence to falsely project future disasters and unfounded sea level scares;
- Falsely promotes the lie that a consensus of scientists supports its position and that it is an eminent scientific organisation.

The UN IPCC Summary for Policy Makers seems, in my view, to move subtly—without causation—from no proof to inferred causation, to implied causation, to future conjecture to forecasts of catastrophe. ie, without justification it simply implies and then assumes correlation and causation. None of the many government funded advocates requested to, quote: “*find any supporting scientific justification*” have found any such evidence.

On climate, the UN IPCC is completely corrupt. Scientifically, it is completely discredited. It fails the ultimate arbiter of science: empirical scientific evidence. The UN IPCC's core claim contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Conclusions:

- The UN IPCC's severest critics include its own contributors and Lead Authors;
- The UN IPCC's documented behaviour, actions and outputs are evidence against it;

- The UN IPCC is unscientific. It corrupts science. Given that the UN IPCC and some corrupters benefit financially and/or in other ways from corruption, is it fraudulent?
- The UN IPCC is not a scientific body. It is a political body fabricated to drive a political agenda to falsely concoct an unfounded crisis. By their own words, fomenting unfounded perceptions of crisis is reportedly part of the strategy of a small cabal of UN bureaucrats seeking to force global governance within the UN's Agenda 21 '*Sustainability*' campaign;
- • The UN IPCC has used propaganda techniques to falsely cultivate a public aura of being a leading scientific body when it is not;
- • Corruption and conflicts of interest are documented as infecting the 'work' of key UN IPCC officeholders;
- CSIRO plays a significant role in processes developing UN IPCC reports;
- CSIRO contradicts empirical scientific evidence by endorsing and promoting the UN IPCC's deception and unscientific reports;
- CSIRO has thus ceded sovereignty over Australian science to an unscientific foreign political organisation pushing its own political agenda;
- CSIRO is thus abetting massive systemic, systematic and pervasive documented orchestrated corruption of science.

A fundamental question: If the UN IPCC cannot find and present evidence of an association between CO₂ and temperature, how can it find causation between CO₂ and temperature?

The UN IPCC's claims and projections on climate cannot and should not be relied upon. Basing policy in part or in full on UN IPCC projections is a failure of due diligence by public officials. Such policies and resultant legislation need to be struck down and rescinded. The legislation's movers and active advocates should resign from parliament.

David Karoly's connection

The Lead Author of the 2001 UN IPCC report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ (chapter 12) is David Karoly. That chapter contains no empirical scientific evidence of that claim.

Despite that, he was appointed Review Editor of the 2007 UN IPCC report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ (chapter 9). That chapter contains no empirical scientific evidence of that claim yet implies there is evidence.

David Karoly contributed papers that he authored or co-authored in his 2001 chapter and in his 2007 chapter.

David Karoly was a writer of the 2007 UN IPCC draft Summary for Policy Makers sent to all national governments and media worldwide. The SPM implied evidence for warming despite the UN IPCC having no such empirical scientific evidence of human causation

and despite scientific doubt that any significant warming occurred at all.

David Karoly publicly misrepresents the UN IPCC in public as a credible body.

Will Steffen's connection

Will Steffen is a contributing author to the UN IPCC.

He is aware of the Inter Academy Council (IAC) report yet has publicly advised audiences that the report endorses UN IPCC science. That's false. The report condemns UN IPCC processes and procedures and undermines reports' conclusions.

Will Steffen publicly misrepresents the UN IPCC by claiming it's a credible body.

UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri is quoted as saying, "*If the IPCC wasn't there, why would anyone be worried about climate change?*" Claims of catastrophic global warming supposedly due to human CO2 have been fabricated without any evidence and while contradicting empirical scientific evidence. The UN IPCC's purpose has been to falsely fabricate global warming and blame it on human CO2.

My analysis of the UN IPCC produces two main conclusions and one simple question:

1. UN IPCC reports are corruptions of science. The UN IPCC's implied core claims contradict empirical scientific evidence. They're based on beliefs. The UN IPCC is driven by ideology and is an ideological tool.
2. Through a clever network in developed nations, the corruption is being perpetrated by misappropriating government spending and resources. Some involved are seemingly doing this deliberately. Many others are unwitting supporters.
3. Why? What's the motive? Could it be Maurice Strong's stated goal: establishing centrally controlled socialist global governance?

These conclusions provide reassurance on climate. As explained in later sections, it provides huge opportunity for improving human life and for caring for the natural environment. Restoring science will pave the way for resumption of humanity's proven relentless march to safer, easier, more comfortable, abundant, secure and fairer lifestyles with even greater understanding, respect and care of our planet and our natural environment.

"People's beliefs and convictions are in almost every case gotten at second-hand, and without examination, from authorities who have not themselves examined the questions at issue but have taken them at second-hand from other non-examiners, whose opinions about them were not worth a brass farthing." Mark Twain.