

4.8 Comments on Land Court case Exhibit 50

In his court testimony Professor Hoegh-Guldberg spoke to Exhibit 50 being the first four pages including the cover and pages 134 and 135 from the UN IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report – Working Group One, 2013. The UN IPCC labels Figure 1.8 from Chapter 1 on page 134 as “Figure 1.8 | Schematic representation ...”

In preparing this complaint I revisited the UN IPCC's Working Group One 2013 report. I read the Technical Summary and Chapter 1. My previous analysis of the report's sole chapter (chapter 10) claiming warming and attributing it to carbon dioxide from human activity is in section 15 (pages 28-41) of *CSIROh!* Appendix 2 and specifically pages 30-32. There is no empirical evidence of human causation of global climate change anywhere in the UN IPCC's 2013 report.

Internationally reputable scientists, including UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewers Dr. Vincent Gray and physicist Professor Fred Singer confirm this fact.

Figure 1.8 is a *schematic* depiction yet in the context of Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's testimony is meaningless without evidence of unusual rise in temperatures caused by human production of carbon dioxide. There is no empirical evidence of such temperature rises and there is no empirical evidence of temperature or climate variability caused by human or natural production of carbon dioxide. Indeed, it is widely accepted from empirical evidence (including that cited and relied upon by the UN IPCC) that variability in carbon dioxide levels in Earth's atmosphere are due largely to variability in temperature and are determined by temperature. **That is, changes in carbon dioxide levels are a result of, not a cause of, temperature changes. This is the reverse of the core claim implicit in Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's testimony.**

Although not referred to in his testimony, Figure 1.9 appears to show that the incidence of hot days and days with higher maximum temperature are increasing or will increase. Yet the figure's label states, quote: “**Figure 1.9** | *Change in the confidence levels for extreme events based on prior IPCC assessments: TAR, AR4 and SREX. Types of extreme events discussed in all three reports are highlighted in green. Confidence levels are defined in Section 1.4.*” Yet Exhibit 50 does not include Section 1.4 that reveals such confidence levels as depicted in Figure 1.9 are qualitatively derived. Despite this, they falsely imply statistical validity and support.

Section 1.4 | is close at hand on pages 138-142 of the same chapter, being chapter 1 in the UN IPCC Fifth Assessment Report's Working Group One. It repeats information on page 36 of the preceding chapter entitled *Technical Summary*. Why did the exhibit not include these high relevant pages? Regardless, why did Professor Hoegh-Guldberg not qualify his testimony?

http://www.climatechange2013.org/images/report/WG1AR5_ALL_FINAL.pdf

The UN IPCC uses terminology that falsely conveys unfounded statistical certainty where there is no empirical evidence. This is noted in *CSIROh!* Appendix 2 accessed at: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> See specifically pages 9 (second paragraph), 12 (first paragraph), 29 (second and third paragraphs), and 35 (last paragraph, first bullet point).

Please note that a copy of my main *CSIROh!* report was posted early in 2013 to Professor Hoegh-Guldberg by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation.

He and his University Vice Chancellor were recently provided with the URL website link to Appendix 2 and directed to specific pages illustrating the UN IPCC's lack of empirical evidence and its misrepresentation of climate science.

The world's peak academic scientific body, the Inter Academy Council's (IAC) reviewed UN IPCC reporting processes and procedures used in preparing the UN IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report. The IAC report in August 2010 is scathing and its findings are summarised in Section 1 (pages 4-6) of *CSIROh!* Appendix 2. These findings apply to the UN IPCC's Fifth Report in 2013 since processes and procedures were not substantively changed, and as in the preceding report, the Fifth Report contains no empirical evidence of human activity causing climate variability. Peter Bobroff's quote on page 4, paragraph 3 succinctly summarises the *body* of the IAC's report.

Note the analysis of the UN IPCC Fifth Assessment Working Group One report's sole chapter (chapter 10) claiming warming and attributing it to human production of carbon dioxide, provided in *CSIROh!* Appendix 2 pages 28-41. Pages 7-12 confirm that the UN IPCC has never provided any empirical evidence of human carbon dioxide causing climate variability.

UNIPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray reviewed all five UN IPCC science reports and publicly confirmed the UN IPCC's complete lack of empirical evidence for its core claim of human causation. Distinguished atmospheric physicist Professor Fred Singer and many leading climate scientists and climatologists including Canadian climatologist Professor Tim Ball confirm this fact. **There has never been produced any empirical evidence that carbon dioxide from any source affects global climate.**

The empirical evidence confirms that changes in carbon dioxide level are a result of temperature changes.

The UN IPCC operates for and under the control of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change whose head Christiana Figueres admitted, quote: "*This is a centralised transformation that is taking place*". She re-committed to a complete overhaul of national sovereignty and removal of private property rights.

Climate alarm's genesis is traced to Canadian Maurice Strong who organised 1972's politically triumphant first Earth Summit, The Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. His action led the same year to forming the UN Environment Program (UNEP) with him as its first Secretary-General. Three examples illustrate UNEP's and Maurice Strong's lack of ethics and his agenda.

Firstly, UNEP combined with America's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to contradict scientific evidence in banning the pesticide DDT in a political move that led to an estimated 40-50 million deaths from malaria before the UN World Health Organisation (WHO) lifted the ban in 2006.

Secondly, Strong has repeatedly advocated for unelected UN global socialist governance to control energy, resources including water, food consumption, land use, housing, electrical appliances, transport, development, finances, politics, national sovereignty and lifestyles. On one such occasion, the exceptionally canny networker led almost global adoption the UN's 1992 Rio Declaration for twenty-first century global governance. It seeks to usurp national governance through three outwardly attractive labels driving rules and restrictions bypassing democracy:

1. UN '*biodiversity*' revoking private property rights;

2. UN 'sustainability' replacing state and national laws with UN regulations and control systems; and,
3. UN 'climate' claims fabricating an issue transcending national borders to enable centralised global control and funding via levies and carbon dioxide 'trading'.

Thirdly, he is a director of the defunct Chicago Climate Exchange that 'traded' carbon dioxide credits. He is now reportedly in exile in China wanted for questioning following investigations into the UN's Oil-for-Food Program and his questionable personal North American land and water deals.

At first glance it seems preposterous. Yet multiple sources and multiple lines of evidence confirm. The money involved is enormous. The UN IPCC's first chairman was Swede Bert Bolin who advocated for taxing carbon dioxide before the UN IPCC had been formed. **The politics always preceded and drove the 'science'. It still does.** The summary on pages 8-9 of the report entitled *CSIROh! Climate of Deception? Or First Steps to Freedom?* is revealing.

Public awareness of this is now widening and building momentum. On 21 July 2013 at its annual state convention, the Queensland LNP passed the motion, quote: *"That, the LNP opposes laws and/or regulations being made by Local, State, and Federal governments that enact the policy objectives of United Nations Agenda 21*." *The name given to the UN's 1992 Rio Declaration.*

On Saturday, 11 July 2015 the Queensland LNP passed the following motion No. 20 unopposed, quote: *"That this Convention of the LNP requests the Australian Government instruct its representatives attending the UN FCCC COP21 Meeting in Paris from 30 November to 12 December 2015 that they must not agree to or sign any binding agreement that jeopardizes Australian National Sovereignty."* As a result, both motions are part of LNP policy.

UN IPCC Lead Authors, Expert Reviewers and expert contributors such as John Christy, Paul Reiter, Chris Landsea, Fred Singer, Vincent Gray and many other UN IPCC contributors have led the spontaneous worldwide scientific movement condemning the UN IPCC's misrepresentation of climate and science. The world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) reviewed UN IPCC reporting processes and procedures. The body of its August 2010 report was scathing. Despite his peers' well-founded condemnation of the UN IPCC, Professor Hoegh-Guldberg continues to support the UN IPCC.

My February 2015 report to federal Senator Simon Birmingham and The Hon Bob Baldwin, MHR following correspondence with the former succinctly explains the UN's motives and connections. Please see pages 19-23 of the report entitled *False Claims Reveal Hidden Opportunities* available through: <http://ow.ly/JO5GM> or <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/SBbboh.html> it accompanies.

Pages 13-16 discuss the impact of a small group of federal public servants causing CSIRO and the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) to misrepresent climate. *CSIROh!* Appendices 6, 6a and 7 detail both agencies' misrepresentations.

Canadian climatologist Professor Tim Ball reveals the UN's World Meteorological Organisation falsifying national weather bureau data.

My parents were stationed in the Indian state of West Bengal during my birth and after visiting there last year it confirmed the urgent need to make decisions based on empirical data and engineering fundamentals to assess whether

there is any evidence for cutting human production of carbon dioxide. To cut human production without evidence will cause enormous pointless damage to people worldwide, especially the poor and those living in developing nations.

The UN IPCC's core claims, together with Professor Hoegh-Guldberg's active and repeated endorsement, contradict empirical evidence and engineering principles to focus on carbon dioxide from human activity. This distracts attention and resources away from real humanitarian and environmental challenges.