

29th October 2013

Mr Matt Scully

board@your.abc.net.au

Dear Mr Scully

I refer to the letter (10th April, 2013) you sent to Mr Malcolm Roberts, following his complaint about the bias and scientific inaccuracies inherent in the *Catalyst* programs whenever they discuss the issue of climate change. Mr Roberts has placed this letter in the public domain and I would like to respond and, hopefully, show you exactly what the science says on this topic.

Now retired, my academic background is in the geosciences and I have lectured in the earth sciences (climate and paleoclimate) at several universities in Australia and the USA and I have never been employed by any energy provider. As a tertiary science educator over several decades, I have always impressed upon my students the need to place scientific integrity above all else when they embark on their various careers.

I would like to provide you with some of the latest information about climate change since you appear to hold a number of misconceptions, as do members of *Team Catalyst*. This of course is to be expected since you and your presenters clearly lack expertise in this complex, interdisciplinary area.

Let me first address the point you made to Mr Roberts about the IPCC. You said:

“The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a group of 1,300 independent scientific experts from around the world, concluded that there is a more than 90 percent probability that human activities over the past 250 years have warmed our planet.”

I have closely followed the climate change discussions/arguments as initiated by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). In fact I'm probably one of the few people to have read both the IPCC technical reports and their summaries and I am confident that neither you nor anyone from *Team Catalyst* have done this.

The IPCC technical reports were prepared by scientists in good faith whilst the *Summaries for Policymakers* (SPM's) were prepared by UN bureaucrats. These political summaries are made available to the media and politicians and bear little resemblance to the technical reports prepared by the IPCC's contributing scientists.

Dr Vincent Gray has reviewed every IPCC report to date. He says:

“Since the First Report made it plain that constructive critics are unwelcome these have been very few. I believe I am the only one who has commented on every Report. They did not answer my comments and most were ignored.”

Gray's comments about the latest IPCC report and SPM sound familiar:

*“As I have pointed out many times, this is actually a Summary **BY** Policymakers because it is approved by anonymous Government Representatives who actually control the entire Report. They approve this Summary line by line..”*

I don't recall Dr Vincent Gray being invited to comment on the IPCC on any *Catalyst* program.

The IPCC officials know there is an extremely low level of scientific literacy amongst journalists and politicians such that most are likely to assign credibility to the IPCC process and pronouncements without question.

I recognize scientific fraud when I see it and I'm appalled at the process that has been followed and the “conclusions” reached by the IPCC. You and *Team Catalyst* apparently remain oblivious to these major problems.

The IPCC's central claim is that human activity is contributing significantly to global warming and that this claim is supported by 2,500 or 4,000 scientists. In fact Dr John McLean has pointed out that this claim was endorsed by only 5 reviewers of the IPCC's 2007 report and there is some doubt that they were actually scientists. It would appear then that the entire catastrophic anthropogenic global warming edifice has been promoted by a small, incestuous political/ideological group.

I don't recall Dr John McLean being invited to comment on the IPCC on any *Catalyst* program.

Dr. Timothy Carter from the Finnish Environment Institute observes:

"It seems that a few people have a very strong say, and no matter how much talking goes on beforehand, the big decisions are made at the eleventh hour by a select core group."

When Dr William Schlesinger was asked by Dr John Christy how many members of the IPCC were climate scientists, he answered that many if not most of its members are not scientists at all, including the non-scientist Chairman Dr Rajendra Pachauri. Schlesinger went on to say that:

"Something on the order of 20 percent have had some dealing with climate."

In other words, 80% of the IPCC membership have no formal qualifications in climate science.

Has *Team Catalyst* ever been aware of this major shortcoming?

Chapter 9 in the IPCC's 2007 Fourth Assessment Report (FAR), was written by just 53 people, including many computer modelers. No empirical data were provided to link temperatures and atmospheric carbon dioxide levels.

Contributing IPCC scientist and former lead author, Dr Richard Lindzen, said:

"It is no small matter that routine weather service functionaries from New Zealand to Tanzania are referred to as 'the world's leading climate scientists.' It should come as no surprise that they will be determinedly supportive of the process."

I don't recall Dr Richard Lindzen being invited to comment on the IPCC on any *Catalyst* program.

The IPCC's Dr Mike Hulme was clear:

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

In fact your claim that the: *"Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is a group of 1,300 independent scientific experts from around the world"* has no basis in fact and you are merely repeating what you have heard. As so many in the media have done.

You said that the IPCC: *"concluded that there is a more than 90 percent probability that human activities over the past 250 years have warmed our planet."*

Did you ever bother to ask how this ridiculous figure was arrived at? Dr Richard Lindzen observes:

"I think that the latest IPCC report has truly sunk to a level of hilarious incoherence. They are proclaiming increased confidence in their models as the discrepancies between their models and observations increase."

The IPCC summary claims that it is *"extremely likely"* and 95% certain that human influence caused more than half the temperature increases between 1951 and 2010. This is a step up from the 90% certainty of 2007. So how can the IPCC possibly justify this increased certainty?

Now you might not be aware that *"significance"* is a statistical term that tells us how certain we are that a difference or relationship exists. Yet there was never any statistical analysis of the question: *Is most of the warming between 1951 and 2010 due to anthropogenic carbon dioxide emissions?*


Because the IPCC cannot provide any empirical evidence to link carbon dioxide with global warming, they have invented a *"system"* whereby they state *"levels of confidence"* such that the IPCC's claim of 95% certainty is based on a show of hands and not by any statistical process. High levels of certainty cannot be justified

without evidence and to claim otherwise constitutes deception.

You told Mr Roberts:

“There is very solid evidence that the planet is warming and that human activity is mostly responsible for this, as vouchsafed by the Australian Academy of Science and similar academies around the world.”

It should come as no surprise that the planet saw some mild 20th century warming. After all, we are still emerging from the Little Ice Age. Any claim that recent warming has been either dramatic or unusual is clearly wrong. Consider the following:



Note the rapid temperature rise about 14,000 years ago and 12,000 years ago. Note also the continued warming from 11,000 to 9,000 years ago and the numerous warming and cooling episodes since then.

IPCC contributing scientist Dr Don Easterbrook notes that the IPCC (AR5) reported:


“Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and since the 1950’s, many of the observed changes are unprecedented over decades to millennia.”

Easterbrook comments:

“There just isn’t any nice way to say this—it’s an outright lie. A vast published literature exists showing that recent warming is not only not unusual, but more intense warming has occurred many times in the past centuries and millennia. As a reviewer of the IPCC report, I called this to their attention, so they cannot have been unaware of it.”

I don’t recall Dr Don Easterbrook being invited to comment on the IPCC on any *Catalyst* program.

If warming was taking place (it isn’t) we shouldn’t be surprised. After all, we are in the mild part of an interglacial phase and the previous 4 interglacials peaked at temperatures higher that we have currently attained. We should expect further warming and it hasn’t happened. The following plotted data are from peer reviewed published papers, not the political/ideological IPCC summaries:



You made the comment that (imaginary) anthropogenic global warming is happening “*as vouchsafed by the Australian Academy of Science and similar academies around the world.*”

Again, you demonstrate your willingness to simply accept these beliefs without any due diligence. Allow me to enlighten you here.

In fact position statements from science academies and associations are usually made without debate or consultation with their wider membership. Of the international science bodies that have issued statements in support of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming (CAGW), none have provided evidence that the majority of their members subscribed to such a statement.

Such statements may represent the opinions of a mere handful of members. These governing boards are well aware of where their funding originates and the rank and file members could be blissfully unaware of alarmist, unsubstantiated statements released by their governing board until it is too late.

Fellow of the *Royal Society of Canada* (RSC) and a leading Canadian energy expert, Dr Archie Robertson explains:

“The president of the Royal Society of London ... drafted a resolution in favour and circulated it to other academies of science inviting co-signing. ... The president of the RSC, not a member of the [RSC’s] Academy of Science, received the invitation. He considered it consistent with the position of the great majority of scientists, as repeatedly but erroneously claimed by Kyoto proponents, and so signed it. The resolution was not referred to the Academy of Science for comment, not even to its council or president.”

I don’t recall Dr Archie Robertson being invited to comment about academy views on any *Catalyst* program.

In fact a survey of statements from other science bodies shows they are usually the opinions of the executives or committees specifically appointed by the executive. The scientist membership is rarely consulted. For instance, the *US National Academy of Sciences*, under the leadership of Ralph Cicerone, has taken on the role of an alarmist climate advocacy group intent on promoting the CAGW narrative.

In contrast, *Britain's Royal Society* shifted its position on climate change in 2010 away from total support of the IPCC toward expressing much more uncertainty. In fact a review of the Royal Society's initial position was forced on the society by 43 of its Fellows who demanded that its publication *Climate Change Controversies*, produced in 2007 and published on its website, should be rewritten to consider the views of CAGW skeptics. In a statement about global warming, the Royal Society now says:

"There remains the possibility that hitherto unknown aspects of the climate and climate change could emerge and lead to significant modifications in our understanding."

Sir Alan Rudge, a society Fellow of the Royal Society and former member of the Government's Scientific Advisory Committee, said that the society had previously adopted an:

"unnecessarily alarmist position on climate change."

In 2009, *the American Physical Society (APS) Council* decided to review its current climate statement when more than 250 of its membership urged a change in the APS climate statement.

Many physicists wrote to the APS governing board, pointing out:

"Measured or reconstructed temperature records indicate that 20th - 21st century changes are neither exceptional nor persistent, and the historical and geological records show many periods warmer than today."

Dr Roger Cohen, a respected fellow of the APS, said:

"The APS response to the petition was the appointment of a committee that took months to review the 157-word Statement. Only one of the members was familiar with the climate science field, and more than one had a vested interest in continued climate alarm. The committee's final report referred only to IPCC reports and its supporting material, and so we had the predictable outcome: not a single change to the original Statement. Thus, as is the practice of bureaucracies, a position once taken is rigidly adhered to, even when the process that produced it was flawed."

Dr Lance Wallace agrees:

“This is truly upsetting to me, as a physicist. I had seen the revolt against the original policy statement (“the science is incontrovertible”) and expected that surely the voices of reason would prevail, particularly since physicists are (I thought) less dependent on CAGW funding than atmospheric chemists, oceanographers, dendrochronologists, etc. But it was not to be. Feynman, as far as I know, is the only person to resign from the National Academy of Sciences, on the grounds that the organization only exists to select (or blackball) new members. But now there is an order of magnitude more funding at stake, so we see that such organizations also exist mainly to assure future funding for their members. So the “policy statements” are created by Society bureaucrats (e.g., Leshner of AAAS), for government bureaucrats (Chu of DOE), without troublesome input from members.”

Dr Roger Cohen again:

“Thus far more than two dozen (members) have told me that they have resigned or will resign from the APS climate activity.”

And

“There is evidence that the process itself that produced the Statement was at least highly questionable if not downright illegitimate. It is known that a small group of individuals, not satisfied with the degree of alarm contained in the original draft produced by the officially charged committee, acted unilaterally and without authority to raise the level of alarm. A senior APS professional confides in writing that”

And:

“As I reflect on my experience, I cannot avoid the question of whether we have passed the point of no return, whether the descent of once grand scientific societies into advocating bureaucracies and self-satisfied clubs lobbying for funds can be arrested, reversed, and integrity restored; or is what we have now a permanent feature of modern science – a postmodern distortion

of the best values of the scientific tradition that has served humanity well for centuries.”

I don't recall Dr Roger Cohen or Dr Lance Wallace being invited to comment about academy views on any *Catalyst* program.

In 2011 Nobel Prize winner Dr. Ivar Giaever resigned from the APS in disgust over the group's promotion of man-made global warming fears. He objected to their statement that: *“the evidence is incontrovertible.”*

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

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

and

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

The *American Chemical Society* considers itself to be the world's largest scientific society. In 2009, skeptical members of the ACS openly revolted against the ACS Editor in Chief, Rudy Baum with many ACS scientists demanding he be removed after he promoted, without due consultation, the position that:

“The science of anthropogenic climate change is becoming increasingly well established.”

ACS members also rebuked Baum's use of the word “deniers” stating that it was a derogatory term “associated with Holocaust deniers.” In addition, the scientists called Baum's editorial: “disgusting”; “a disgrace”; “filled with misinformation”; “unworthy of a scientific periodical” and “pap.”

A survey of members, published in the *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* found that 50% disagreed or strongly

disagreed with the statement: *“Most of the warming since 1950 is likely human induced.”* In fact only 8% strongly agreed.

The *Royal Statistical Society* is the UK's professional and learned society devoted to the interests of statistics and statisticians. The Society has members in over 50 countries worldwide.

The RSS submitted a memo critical of scientists withholding of data by members of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia. The RSS stated:

“The Society welcomes this opportunity to submit evidence to the Science and Technology committee on the disclosure of climate data from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia inquiry.”

And

“The RSS believes that the debate on global warming is best served by having the models used and the data on which they are based in the public domain.”

In 2010 the *British Institute of Physics*, with a worldwide membership of over 36,000, made a statement to the House of Commons Science and Technology Committee's inquiry into the integrity of the IPCC and scientists at the CRU. They stated:

“The Institute is concerned that, unless the disclosed e-mails are proved to be forgeries or adaptations, worrying implications arise for the integrity of scientific research in this field and for the credibility of the scientific method as practised in this context.”

In fact the emails were genuine.

And

“The CRU e-mails as published on the internet provide prima facie evidence of determined and co-ordinated refusals to comply with honourable scientific traditions and freedom of information law.”

And

“The e-mails reveal doubts as to the reliability of some of the (climate) reconstructions and raise questions as to the way in which they have been represented.”

And

“There is also reason for concern at the intolerance to challenge displayed in the e-mails. This impedes the process of scientific 'self correction', which is vital to the integrity of the scientific process as a whole, and not just to the research itself.”

The *French Academy of Sciences* has also indicated that there still remains uncertainty regarding the climatic effects of human-induced carbon dioxide emissions. Their 2010 report was critical of the IPCC's claim of scientific certainty regarding climate change and the central role of anthropogenic carbon dioxide. The French Academy statement pointed to the role of other factors such as clouds and solar radiation.

In 2012 the *German Academy of Sciences and Engineering* rejected the notion of climate catastrophe and stated that coping with climate change would not pose any difficult challenges. In a study commissioned by the German Federal Government, Acatech President Reinhard Hüttl said:

“No climate conditions are going to occur here that already do not exist on the globe elsewhere and that we cannot cope with.”

In 2009 the *Polish Academy of Sciences* produced a report which pointed to the IPCC's position on CAGW as becoming increasingly untenable. The Geologic Science Committee of the PAS reported:

“Experiments in natural science show that one-sided observations, those that take no account of the multiplicity of factors determining certain processes in the geo-system, lead to unwarranted simplifications and wrong conclusions when trying to explain natural phenomena.”

And

“Politicians who rely on incomplete data may take wrong decisions. It makes room for politically correct lobbying, especially on the side of business marketing of exceptionally expensive, so called eco-

friendly, energy technologies or those offering CO2 storage (sequestration) in exploited deposits. It has little to do with what is objective in nature.”

The *Russian Academy of Science* completely rejects the notion of anthropogenic global warming, predicting that:

“In the coming years the temperature over the entire planet will fall.”

And

“The average temperature on Earth is now returning to the level of the 1996-1997 years, 0.3°C lower.”

A *Japanese Geoscience Union* symposium survey in 2008 *“showed 90 per cent of the participants did not believe the IPCC report.”* Dr's Maruyama, Akasofu, Kusano and Maruyama state that large influences on global climate over time may be global cosmic rays and solar activity.

In May 2012, 49 *NASA* scientists and engineers sent a petition to the *NASA* and *GISS* administration requesting they *“Not draw conclusions and issue claims about research findings”* about dangerous anthropogenic climate change. Their petition included the following statement:

“We, the undersigned, respectfully request that NASA and the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) refrain from including unproven remarks in public releases and websites. We believe the claims by NASA and GISS, that man-made carbon dioxide is having a catastrophic impact on global climate change are not substantiated, especially when considering thousands of years of empirical data. With hundreds of well-known climate scientists and tens of thousands of other scientists publicly declaring their disbelief in the catastrophic forecasts, coming particularly from the GISS leadership, it is clear that the science is NOT settled.”

In 2008 A survey of more than 51,000 scientists from the *Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta, Canada (APEGGA)* found 68% of them disagreed with the statement that:

“The debate on the scientific causes of recent climate change is settled.”

The APEGGA concluded:

“Furthermore, the majority of scientific participants in the survey agreed that the theoretical climate models used to predict a future warming cannot be relied upon and are not validated by the existing climate record. Yet all predictions are based on such theoretical models.”

And

“We are disturbed that activists, anxious to stop energy and economic growth, are pushing ahead with drastic policies without taking notice of recent changes in the underlying science.”

In 1991 A survey of *U.S. atmospheric scientists* confirmed that there is no consensus about the cause of the slight warming observed during the past century. They pointed to sunspot variability, rather than anthropogenic carbon dioxide, as being responsible for the global temperature fluctuations recorded since the 1800's.

As far as the *Australian Academy of Science* is concerned on this issue, it would take me too long to describe exactly why their views on climate change should not be taken seriously. However, you might want to read the following:

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

You told Mr Roberts:

“Among the scientific community, most of the debate now surrounds questions of details – such as how much will the world continue to warm by 2100.”

You still do not appear to grasp the fact that there has been no global warming since at least the turn of this century. Please look carefully at the following statements of fact:

UAH temperature data show stasis since 2008; GISS temperature data show stasis since 2001;

Hadcrut4 temperature data show stasis since 2000;

Hadcrut3 temperature data show stasis since 1997;

Hadsst2 temperature data show stasis since 1997;

RSS temperature data show stasis since 1997.

Temperature stasis has occurred whilst atmospheric carbon dioxide levels continue to increase yet you and *Team Catalyst* ask the public to believe, without any supportive empirical evidence, that carbon dioxide drives global temperature.

I suppose everyone at *Team Catalyst* will also ignore acceptance of temperature stasis from the following:

The Chairman of the IPCC, Dr Rajendra Pachauri, has now conceded there has been no global warming for the past 17 years

Professor Phil Jones from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia, where global temperature data are collated, admitted that from 1995 to 2009 there was no statistically significant global warming;

Dr Mojab Latif, climate modeller and IPCC author told more than 1,500 climate scientists at the UN's World Climate Conference in Geneva we could be entering one or even two decades of cooler temperatures;

Dr David Gee, chairman of the science committee of the 2008 International Geological Congress, asks the question: *"For how many years must the planet cool before we begin to understand that the planet is not warming? For how many years must cooling go on?"*

Climate scientist Dr Richard Lindzen says: *"There has been no warming since 1997 and no statistically significant warming since 1995."*

Climate scientist Dr Judith Curry said it is clear that the IPCC's unvalidated computer modeling, which predicted continual warming, is deeply flawed and suggested that all climate scientists should: *"Use this as an opportunity to communicate honestly with*

the public about what we know and what we don't know about climate change. Take a lesson from other scientists who acknowledge the "pause".

Dr Habibullo Abdussamatov, head of space research at Pulkovo Astronomical Observatory in St. Petersburg, Russia, says: *"The Earth as a planet will henceforward have negative balance in the energy budget which will result in the temperature drop in approximately 2014."*

I don't recall Dr Habibullo Abdussamatov or Dr Judith Curry or Dr Mojib Latif, etc. being invited to comment about the lack of warming on any *Catalyst* program.

The UK Met. Office has released data from 3,000 stations from 1997 through 2012 showing no overall warming during this time.

The Central England Temperature record (CET), maintained since the middle of the 17th Century, shows a temperature rise of around +0.45°C per century since 1850, marking the end of the Little Ice Age. CET records from 2000 onwards reveal that recent cooling has already negated about 80% of the temperature rise since 1850.

Activist climate scientist Dr James Hansen in a recent paper concedes: *"The 5-year mean global temperature has been flat for a decade, which we interpret as a combination of natural variability and a slowdown in the growth rate of the net climate forcing."*


In a leaked email from Dr Peter Thorne of the UK Met. Office to Professor Phil Jones at the CRU we see a frank admission (and warning) about global temperature stasis:

"Observations do not show rising temperatures throughout the tropical troposphere unless you accept one single study and approach and discount a wealth of others. This is just downright dangerous. We need to communicate the uncertainty and be honest. Phil, hopefully we can find time to discuss these further if necessary."

Thorne added a further prophetic warning:


"I also think the science is being manipulated to put a political spin on it which for all our sakes might not be too clever in the long run."

Uncontaminated satellite data show that rising carbon dioxide levels have not led to global warming:



Again, this can be checked against peer-reviewed, published literature – not from statements issued by the IPCC.

Of course the lack of correlation between atmospheric carbon dioxide and global temperature is well known. Carbon dioxide has never driven global temperatures at any time over the last 500 million years:



The lack of a long-term correlation between CO₂ and temperature is very apparent when GEOCARB is compared to Veizer's $\delta 18\text{O}$ -derived Phanerozoic temperature reconstruction. As can be seen in the figure above, plant stomata indicate a much greater range of CO₂ variability; but are in general agreement with the lower frequency GEOCARB model.

When carbon dioxide levels and global temperature have appeared to track closely, data from the Vostok ice cores show that it is always temperature which precedes carbon dioxide levels.

You told Mr Roberts that *“Other uncertainties surround what the impact of this temperature change will be on global weather patterns.”*

I assume you mean by “*temperature change*”, the imaginary global warming that you mentioned previously. The climate has always changed, it is changing as you read this and it will continue to change irrespective of the trivial amounts of carbon dioxide we put into the atmosphere. As Dr Will Happer, atmospheric physicist from Princeton University said:

“We have been in a period of global warming over the past 200 years, but there have been several periods, like the last ten years, when the warming has ceased, and there have even been periods of substantial cooling, as from 1940 to 1970.”

And:

“But what about the frightening consequences of increasing levels of CO2 that we keep hearing about? In a word, they are wildly exaggerated.”

And:

“Since most of the greenhouse effect for the earth is due to water vapor and clouds, added CO2 must substantially increase water’s contribution to lead to the frightening scenarios that are bandied about. The buzz word here is that there is “positive feedback.” With each passing year, experimental observations further undermine the claim of a large positive feedback from water. In fact, observations suggest that the feedback is close to zero and may even be negative.”

I don’t recall Dr Will Happer being invited to comment about the inability of carbon dioxide to produce dangerous global warming on any *Catalyst* program.

You told Mr Roberts:

“Evidence from worldwide trends suggest that the changes to Australia’s temperatures are not a statistical outlier, but part of a pattern of global warming.”

There is no pattern of global warming. Even the IPCC has finally had to admit to that as they now grudgingly try to explain why their computer models were so wrong.

No doubt *Team Catalyst* will now try to shift the emphasis away

from the temperature stasis not predicted by the IPCC and continue the drama with extreme weather being linked to carbon dioxide emissions along the lines of Anja Taylor's program (Catalyst, July 4, 2013). She told us:

"Understanding exactly how a warmer world drives weather wild is crucial to predicting just how bumpy a ride we're in for."

Even the IPCC has concluded there is no evidence pointing to an increase in extreme weather and any scientist with expertise in extreme weather events, would agree. Dr Roger Pielke Jr. who recently testified before the US Congress said:

"It is misleading, and just plain incorrect, to claim that disasters associated with hurricanes, tornadoes, floods or droughts have increased on climate timescales either in the United States or globally."

Hurricanes have not increased in the US in frequency, intensity or normalized damage since at least 1900. The same holds for tropical cyclones globally since at least 1970 (when data allows for a global perspective).

Floods have not increased in the US in frequency or intensity since at least 1950. Flood losses as a percentage of US GDP have dropped by about 75% since 1940.

Tornadoes have not increased in frequency, intensity or normalized damage since 1950, and there is some evidence to suggest that they have actually declined.

Drought has for the most part, become shorter, less frequent, and cover a smaller portion of the U. S. over the last century. Globally, there has been little change in drought over the past 60 years.

I don't recall Dr Roger Pielke Jr. being invited on *Catalyst* to comment about the lack of correlation between extreme weather and rising carbon dioxide levels.

Dr Roy Spencer provided a statement to the US Environment and Public Works Committee in which he said:

"Public perception of weather is skewed by short memories and increasing media sensationalizing of weather disasters."

Media sensationalism? Surely not from Team Catalyst.

Spencer continued:

"There is little or no observational evidence that severe weather of any type has worsened over the last 30, 50, or 100 years, irrespective of whether any such changes could be blamed on human activities, anyway."

And:

"The belief that global warming and associated climate change involve more severe weather cannot be supported observationally. And even if we were to observe a trend in severe weather, it would not be possible to determine with any level of confidence the extent to which the change was due to human activities versus natural variability."

I don't recall Dr Roy Spencer being invited on *Catalyst* to comment about the lack of correlation between extreme weather and rising carbon dioxide levels.

You advised Mr Roberts:

"Catalyst will continue to present peer reviewed evidence based science relating to climate change as it emerges."

I suspect *Catalyst* will do no such thing, especially where the peer reviewed, published science does not support the IPCC's alarmist mantra of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming. I also suspect that none of the presenters at *Team Catalyst* are even aware of the vast body of non-alarmist literature that is available. Let me guide you.

Simply Google: 1100+ Peer-Reviewed Papers Supporting Skeptic Arguments Against ACC/AGW Alarm

If you think the consensus amongst scientists is in support of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming you should also look up:

"More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims."

And:

The Heidelberg Appeal; The Oregon Petition; The Manhattan Declaration; Open Letter to UN Secretary General; The Petition by

German Scientists to the Chancellor; The Leipzig Declaration; Statement from Atmospheric Scientists; Letter to the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate; Memorandum submitted by the Institute of Physics; Statement from scientists to President Obama; 2 petitions from NASA scientists to their administration.

Tens of thousands of scientists say you and *Team Catalyst* are wrong to promote the mantra of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming so why don't you exercise some intellectual honesty and report this?

If you think that the IPCC represents an impartial examination of climate science, consider the following cases of IPCC errors and malfeasance:

1.The IPCC's 1988 Statement of Intent and statements from IPCC members made clear that there was never any serious intention to consider factors other than human activity as a principal driver of climate change;

2. IPCC contributing scientists have observed how politicized the organization has become with the IPCC using global warming as a political "cause" rather than the basis for balanced scientific inquiry;

3. IPCC members have admitted that the IPCC is more about ideology and wealth distribution rather than a dispassionate analysis of climate science;

4. The IPCC's non-scientist Chairman, Dr Rajendra Pachauri has publicly declared his bias about climate change, Western lifestyles and his desire to transform the world's economy by demonizing carbon dioxide;

5.The IPCC's claim that human activity is contributing significantly to global warming and that this claim is supported by up to 4,000 scientists is demonstrably false;

6. The IPCC gives the impression that a large number of scientists contribute to the writing of IPCC reports when only a "select few" actually do;

7. The IPCC gives the impression that its reports are prepared by the world's best scientists yet many contributors are graduate

students and environmental activists;

8. The IPCC's selection of literature is biased towards those scientists and papers which support the mantra of anthropogenic global warming;

9. The IPCC claims to use only peer-reviewed published literature when it clearly does no such thing;

10. The IPCC has not only incorporated "grey literature" in its reports but has also allowed NGO operatives, such as Greenpeace personnel, to make significant contributions;

11. The IPCC attempts to include the names of experts on their reports even if those experts disagree with the IPCC summary statements;

12. When IPCC scientists resigned over perceived malfeasance the IPCC simply ignored this;

13. The IPCC ignored data which show that carbon dioxide is a minor greenhouse gas and has never driven global temperature;

14. Computer models were developed to give a predetermined outcome yet they all failed to predict the current 16 year temperature stasis whilst carbon dioxide levels continue to increase;

15. The IPCC predicted that Arctic summer ice would disappear by 2013. It hasn't;

16. Because the predicted warming failed to materialise, the IPCC changed its terminology from "global warming" to "climate change" to "extreme weather";

17. There has been no increase in severe weather since the IPCC's inception in 1988;

18. The IPCC does not allow any criticism of the anthropogenic global warming meme to progress through to the final IPCC Summaries for Policymakers;

19. Some statements in the technical reports were deleted or changed if they did not conform with the requirements of UN officials and bureaucrats;

20. Comments from IPCC expert reviewers were often ignored if they did not conform with the more alarmist requirements of UN officials and bureaucrats;

21. IPCC Summaries for Policymakers, made available to the media and politicians, were essentially written by UN officials and bureaucrats;

22. IPCC associates have brought pressure to bear on journal editors who have published papers critical of the anthropogenic global warming meme;

23. IPCC scientists have attempted to change well established climate history including the existence of the Medieval Warm Period, the Roman Warm Period and Little Ice Age;

24. The IPCC Chairman Dr Rajendra Pachauri claimed that the InterAcademy Council, established to investigate the IPCC, found the IPCC's work to be solid and robust. In fact the IAC concluded that there were significant shortcomings in each major step of the IPCC's assessment process.

I can provide you with hard evidence to support all of the above statements but I doubt that *Team Catalyst* will be investigating any of the above cases of questionable scientific practice?

If you think that IPCC contributing scientists haven't noticed the IPCC's consistent abuse of the scientific process, you might consider the following statements:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr George Filippo: “I feel rather uncomfortable about using not only unpublished but also unreviewed material as the backbone of

our conclusions (or any conclusions) ... I feel that at this point there are very little rules [sic] and almost anything goes.”

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

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

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

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

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

Dr Kenneth Green: "We can expect the climate crisis industry to grow increasingly shrill, and increasingly hostile toward anyone who questions their authority.”

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

Dr Kiminori Itoh: "There are many factors which cause climate change. Considering only greenhouse gases is nonsense and harmful. When people know what the truth is they will feel deceived by science and scientists."

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

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

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

Dr Aynsley Kellow: "I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."

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

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

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

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

Dr Judith Lean: "Climate models failed to reflect the sun's cyclical influence on the climate and that has led to a sense that the sun isn't a player ... they have to absolutely prove that it's not a player."

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

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

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

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

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

Dr Patrick Michaels: "The rates of warming, on multiple time scales have now invalidated the suite of IPCC climate models. No, the science is not settled."

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

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

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

Dr Jan Pretel: “It’s nonsense to drastically reduce emissions ... predicting about the distant future - 100 years can’t be predicted due to uncertainties.”

Dr Alec Rawls: “What I found interesting in the IPCC report is how blatant the statistical fraud is, omitting the competing explanation from the models completely, while pretending that they are using their models to distinguish between anthropogenic and natural warming. These people are going to hang on to their power grab until the bitter end.”

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

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

Dr Ben Santer: “It’s unfortunate that many people read the media hype before they read the chapter we (the IPCC) say quite clearly that few scientists would say the attribution issue was a done deal.”

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

Dr. Keith Shine: "We produce a draft, and then the policymakers go through it line by line and change the way it’s presented They don’t change the data, but the way it’s presented. It is peculiar that they have the final say in what goes into a scientists’ report.”

Dr Jagadish Shukla: ”It is inconceivable that policymakers will be willing to make billion-and trillion-dollar decisions for adaptation to the projected regional climate change based on models that do not even describe and simulate the processes that are the building blocks of climate variability.”

Dr Fred Singer: “Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because

the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?”

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

Dr Roy Spencer: “The IPCC is not a scientific organization and was formed to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. Claims of human-cause global warming are only a means to that goal.”

Dr Peter Thorne: “Observations do not show rising temperatures throughout the tropical troposphere unless you accept one single study and approach and discount a wealth of others. This is just downright dangerous. We need to communicate the uncertainty and be honest.”

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

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

Dr Fritz Vahrenholt: “Doubt came two years ago when I was an expert reviewer of an IPCC report on renewable energy. I discovered numerous errors and asked myself if the other IPCC reports on climate were similarly sloppy. I couldn’t take it any more.”

Dr Heinz Wanner: “ I was a reviewer of the IPCC-TAR report 2001. In my review ... I criticized the fact that the whole Mann hockeystick is being printed in its full length in the IPCC-TAR report.

In 1999 I made the following comments:

1. The spatial, temporal (tree-ring data in the midlatitudes mainly contain “summer information”) and spectral coverage and

behaviour of the data is questionable, mainly before 1500-1600 AD.

2. It is in my opinion not appropriate already to make statements for the southern hemisphere and for the period prior to 1500 AD.

My review was classified “unsignificant”

Dr Robert Watson: “The (IPCC) mistakes all appear to have gone in the direction of making it seem like climate change is more serious by overstating the impact. That is worrying. The IPCC needs to look at this trend in the errors and ask why it happened.”

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

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

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

Dr. Eduardo Zorita: “Editors, reviewers and authors of alternative studies, analysis, interpretations, even based on the same data we have at our disposal, have been bullied and subtly blackmailed. By writing these lines... a few of my future studies will not see the light of publication.”

I don't recall any of these IPCC contributing scientists being invited on *Catalyst* to comment about the IPCC's blatant political/ideological bias.

Hardly one or two disgruntled scientists here wouldn't you say. So will *Team Catalyst* interview a few of the above IPCC dissenting scientists? I doubt it.

So what does *Team Catalyst* think about that significant number of scientists and others who are now publicly accusing the IPCC of scientific fraud. Consider the following:

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

“An orchestrated litany of lies.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

and

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

Dr. Christopher Kobus, Professor of engineering at Oakland University says:

“In essence, the jig is up. The whole thing is a fraud. And even the fraudsters that fudged data are admitting to temperature history

that they used to say didn't happen...Perhaps what has doomed the Climategate fraudsters the most was their brazenness in fudging the data."

Dr Hilton Ratcliffe, physicist, mathematician and astronomer was equally clear:

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

Russian glaciologist and geomorphologist, Dr Andrei Kapitsa also considered the Kyoto Protocol as:

"The biggest ever scientific fraud."

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

"Climategate was a fraud on a scale I have never seen."

and

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

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

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

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

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

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

Astrophysicist Piers Corbyn says:

“It is in the interests of the whole world for the whole UN Climate Change policy to be totally abandoned. The CO2 theory is failed science based on fraudulent data.”

Research chemist, Dr William Gilbert wants his feelings known:

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

Professor Will Alexander, hydrology and flood analysis expert says:

“I believe that this whole global warming/climate change issue is no more than a monumental scam.”

Princeton Physics Professor Robert Austin and other APS members signed a statement which said:

“By now everyone has heard of what has come to be known as ClimateGate, which was and is an international scientific fraud, the worst any of us have seen...”

Professor Don Easterbrook from Western Washington University:

“The corruption within the IPCC revealed by the Climategate scandal, the doctoring of data and the refusal to admit mistakes have so severely tainted the IPCC that it is no longer a credible agency.”

IPCC expert reviewer Professor Tom Segalstad shows how silly the IPCC's claims really are:

"It is a search for a mythical CO2 sink to explain an immeasurable CO2 lifetime to fit a hypothetical CO2 computer model that purports to show that an impossible amount of fossil fuel burning is heating the atmosphere. It is all a fiction."

Clive Crook is the *Financial Times* Chief Washington Commentator and former believer in anthropogenic global warming and supporter of carbon dioxide reduction measures might have had a change of heart:

"The closed-mindedness of these supposed men of science, their willingness to go to any lengths to defend a preconceived message, is surprising even to me. The stink of intellectual corruption is overpowering."

IPCC expert reviewer Dr Kiminori Itoh is equally scathing:

"Man-made warming is the worst scientific scandal in history."

Swedish climatologist, Dr Hans Jelbring is equally specific:

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

Dr Michael Schrage (MIT):

"A small cabal of scientists were engaged in malice, mischief and Machiavellian maneuverings."

The Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Mr. Cuccinelli, issued a press statement on May 28, 2010, repeating an earlier statement that :

"The revelations of Climategate indicate that some climate data may have been deliberately manipulated to arrive at pre-set conclusions. The use of manipulated data to apply for taxpayer-funded research grants in Virginia is potentially fraud. ... This is a fraud investigation."

As Christopher Monckton points out:

“Fraud, in the Commonwealth of Virginia as in most jurisdictions, is a criminal offence. The Attorney-General’s investigation is being conducted in terms of the Fraud Against Taxpayers Act 2000.”

Dr Fred Singer was clear:

“The people who did the IPCC reports were essentially crooks.”

Statistician and IPCC expert reviewer Dr Alec Rawls reflected on how the IPCC ignored the fact that the empirical evidence in favor of the solar explanation (for warming/cooling) is overwhelming. He said:

“What I found interesting in the IPCC report is how blatant the statistical fraud is.”

Dr David Evans on IPCC temperature measurement:

“If it really is warming up as the government climate scientists say, why do they present only the surface thermometer results and not mention the satellite results? And why do they put their thermometers near artificial heating sources? This is so obviously a scam now.”

Former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt has called for an independent inquiry into the IPCC saying:

“The IPCC have encountered skepticism, especially since some of their researchers have shown themselves to be fraudsters.”

Has *Team Catalyst* considered interviewing any of the above to reveal to the public their accusations of fraud? I doubt it.

Why is it that investigative journalists such as Donna Laframboise has been able to expose the IPCC as a political/ideological group that masquerades as an independent scientific body. Is *Team Catalyst* incapable of such investigation?

Laframboise has written 2 books on the IPCC: *The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert* and *Into the Dustbin: Rajendra Pachauri, the Climate Report & the Nobel Peace Prize*.

I suggest that *Team Catalyst* read both books to see how real investigative journalism works. They should reflect on Laframboise's conclusions that:

The IPCC is not a trustworthy organization;

The IPCC is a political/ideological organization that has never reported in an even-handed way about climate science;

The IPCC was established by UN bureaucrats as a means of helping them achieve the UN's climate agenda;

Billions of taxpayer dollars have been wasted on policy decisions around the world based on the IPCC's highly questionable work.

In an interview with Pan Pantziarka of *London Book Review* Donna Laframboise said:

"I've given up expecting the IPCC to demonstrate any sort of professionalism or accountability. I think the internal culture there is so rotten, the situation is quite hopeless."

Laframboise writes of the IPCC and Chairman Pachauri's claims:

"It was like fact-checking a pathological liar's resumé. One by one, I worked my way down a list of IPCC claims, attempting to verify their accuracy. Again and again, I found no evidence to support them."

And:

"I expect a lot of journalists to reject the main message of my book (that the IPCC is neither credible nor trustworthy) because to do anything else would be to admit that they - personally and professionally - were suckered."

It's not only journalists who appear to have been suckered. So have many politicians and scientists. However, in terms of journalists being suckered by the IPCC's pseudoscience, *Team Catalyst* appears to be a prime candidate.

Complaints from Mr Roberts about the bias and scientific inaccuracies inherent in the *Catalyst* programs about climate change are totally justified.

I look forward to your evidence-based reply.

Sincerely,

Dr John Happs M.Sc. (Hons.); D.Phil.