

From: <Andrew.Johnson@csiro.au>
Subject: **Climate Science - response to your email**
Date: 30 March 2010 4:32:18 PM AEST
To: <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Cc: <Annemaree.Lonergan@csiro.au>, <Ben.Creagh@csiro.au>, <Simon.Torok@csiro.au>

Dear Mr Roberts,

Thank you for your email of 25 March 2010, copied below in which you raise further concerns about the IPCC and about the causal relationship between human production of CO2 and global climate.

You are correct in your assumption that the CSIRO will not be calling for an inquiry into the IPCC beyond the review currently being conducted by the InterAcademy Council at the request of the United Nations and IPCC. I suggest that you direct your concerns about the IPCC directly to them.

Regarding the detection and attribution of climate change I suggest you search online. A good place to start would be <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com>. For a summary regarding the causal link between human activity and global warming see <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/man-made-climate-change-evidence-stronger-study/story-e6frg6n6-1225837229301>.

References for CSIRO's "Science of Climate Change" document are available online at http://www.csiro.au/resources/Climate-is-changing--ci_pageNo-6.html.

Regards

Andrew Johnson

Dr Andrew Johnson
Group Executive - Environment
CSIRO
Queensland Bioscience Precinct
306 Carmody Road, St Lucia Q 4068 AUSTRALIA
Phone: 07 3214 2383; 0419 759 616
Fax: 07 3214 2308
<http://www.csiro.au/>

From: Malcolm Roberts [mailto:catalyst@eis.net.au]
Sent: Thursday, 25 March 2010 3:07 PM
To: Johnson, Andrew (Group Exec, St. Lucia)
Cc: Lonergan, Annemaree (OCE, Campbell)
Subject: Re: Climate Science - response to your letter to Dr Clark

Dr Andrew Johnson
Group Executive - Environment
Queensland Bioscience Precinct
306 Carmody Road
ST LUCIA QLD 4067

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

Andrew, Jenny:

Thank you for your reply on behalf of Dr Megan Clark, Chief Executive CSIRO, in response to my letter to Dr Clark dated February 12th, 2010.

Firstly, Andrew your letter dated March 25, 2010 does not specifically state whether or not CSIRO will recommend or initiate a formal independent inquiry into the UN IPCC's advice to the government. I assume from your comments that CSIRO will not be initiating any request for an inquiry. From your comments it appears that CSIRO's decision is based on UN IPCC statements, namely those on

<http://www.ipcc.ch>, as provided by you.

From that link I selected five 'News' items, as follows:

[The role of the IPCC and key elements of the IPCC assessment process\(*\)](#)

Issued on 4 February 2010

http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/press/role_ipcc_key_elements_assessment_process_04022010.pdf

Accessing this link triggers greater concern about the UN IPCC. After accessing this link you that recommended please access links to John McLean's articles exposing serious breaches in UN IPCC guidelines and peer review.

Those links were provided in the document entitled '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*'. McLean's articles cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes. That data was obtained from the UN IPCC itself.

The document entitled '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*' accompanied, and was specifically referred to in, my letter to Dr Clark. The document catalogs many of my concerns with the UN IPCC.

[Statement on IPCC principles and procedures\(*\)](#)

Issued on 2 February 2010

<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/press/ipcc-statement-principles-procedures-02-2010.pdf>

Similarly, accessing this link triggers greater concern about the UN IPCC. Please refer to McLean's articles listed in '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*'.

[IPCC statement on trends in disaster losses](#)

Issued on 25 January 2010

http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/presentations/statement_25_01_2010.pdf

This link considers only one of the many inaccuracies and misrepresentations publicly and credibly itemised by scientists and media and catalogued in '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*'. The link fails to address my concern on the topic it addresses.

Further, I am now even more concerned that in answer to my concerns about the UN IPCC, CSIRO is relying on the UN IPCC itself.

Melting of Himalayan glaciers:

[IPCC statement](#)

Issued on 20 January 2010

<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/presentations/himalaya-statement-20january2010.pdf>

For the reasons mentioned above, paragraphs three and four of this UN IPCC statement exacerbate my concerns and my need for an independent inquiry into the UN IPCC and its reports to our government.

Launch of Independent Review of IPCC Processes and Procedures

New York, UN Headquarters, 10 March 2010

[Press release](#) (PDF)

[More information](#)

<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/press/pr-1003210-UN.pdf>

and

http://www.ipcc.ch/press_information/press_information.htm

I note from the latter link that UNEP and WMO will be involved in providing, quote: '*technical and secretarial support and financial resources*'.

McLean highlights in his recent article on the UN IPCC's formation and history that the UN IPCC's unscientific processes and resulting corruption of science were simply a continuation, refining and extension of unscientific practices used by the UNEP. Please refer to '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*' for links to McLean's history of the UN IPCC including many quotes from UN IPCC and UNEP officials.

In the USA, major legal challenges have recently been lodged by a rapidly growing number of states into that country's EPA basing its decisions on UN IPCC reports. Those legal challenges cite two among many concerns: firstly, that decisions affecting USA policy rely on a foreign organisation (UN IPCC) and further that the UN IPCC has produced many instances of unscientific conclusions.

ie, American state governments are questioning and challenging the loss of sovereignty AND the many blatant

errors/falsities in UN IPCC reports. For these and other reasons, I wonder why CSIRO does not instigate an independent formal inquiry.

Given CSIRO scientists' own involvement in UN IPCC work, that inquiry needs to be structured to be transparently independent from CSIRO.

I feel disappointed and deeply concerned that your letter's first point (*Inquiry into IPCC*) has heightened my concerns about the UN IPCC and CSIRO's apparent acceptance of, and reliance upon, the UN IPCC.

Andrew, attached is a copy of *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'*. It lists many specific complaints about the UN IPCC's reports as obtained from credible scientific and media sources. Due to the burgeoning credible public exposure of UN IPCC falsities and unscientific practices, that list is already incomplete. The list is lengthy and demands attention from any Australian organisation espousing views on global warming and purporting itself to be scientific.

Secondly, on the issue you label *'Cooling'*, please refer to *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'*, pages 14 through 17. Pages 16 and 17 summarise the work of D'Aleo and Watts in their paper entitled *'Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception?'* Their work is independently supported by that of other eminent climate scientists and statisticians.

Andrew, based on your reply, I am wondering whether you have read the catalogue of concerns about the UN IPCC as documented in *'Two Dead Elephants in Parliament'*. That catalogue was specifically referred to in my letter to Dr Megan Clark. The list illustrates the gravity of UN IPCC's falsities and breaches of its own protocols.

Thirdly, Andrew, your letter fails to provide any documented scientifically verified real-world data proving causal relationship between human production of CO₂ and global climate, most notably global temperatures.

Checking the links you provided, I cannot find such a causal relationship. Please indicate specifically within your links any scientifically measured real world data evidencing causal relationships:

<http://www.csiro.au/news/Has-Global-Warming-Stopped.html>
<http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/change/datasets/datasets.shtml>
<http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/change/datasets/datasets.shtml>

Two links you provide - Raupach et al and Canadell et al - discuss atmospheric CO₂ yet do not provide any causal relationships between human production of CO₂ and global temperature or climate.

<http://www.pnas.org/cgi/reprint/0700609104v1>
<http://www.pnas.org/cgi/reprint/0702737104v1>

If my conclusion is in error, please refer me to the specific pages, paragraphs and data in their papers.

Your reliance on the brochure - <http://www.globalcarbonproject.org/carbonbudget/08/files/091115%20USU-PB10%20CARBON%202%20BasseDEF.pdf> - raises considerable concerns for many reasons. It too provides no causal links.

My letter to Dr Megan Clark asked her to, quote: *'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'*. Your response fails to address either of these requests.

A second document entitled *'Thriving with Nature & Humanity'* is attached. It provides a broader understanding of the UN IPCC's serious falsities and misrepresentations of science as identified by UN IPCC scientists themselves.

It provides context and specific references to Nature's role in driving climate. Please note particularly the references to McLean, de Freitas and Carter and the reference to D'Aleo.

I am currently evaluating two CSIRO publications, being *'State of Climate'* and *'The Science of Tackling Climate'*

Change'. My intent is to respond further in the future. For now I simply state that these documents broaden and deepen my concern about the UN IPCC.

Based on your letter and CSIRO documents, my concern now includes concern about CSIRO's lack of specific, scientifically measured real-world data proving existence of any causal relationship between human production of CO2 and global climate.

Respectfully, Andrew, your letter provides no reassurance of your understanding - nor of CSIRO's understanding - of what constitutes scientific evidence, causality and scientific process.

Your letter fails to adequately address the two questions raised in my letter dated February 12th, 2010 to Dr Megan Clark and CSIRO.

To check my own understanding I will be sharing this e-mail with prominent Australian scientists.

This e-mail letter will be copied to Dr Megan Clark's assistant and posted by Registered Mail to Dr Megan Clark and to yourself. I look forward to you addressing my specific requests.

Malcolm Roberts
Brisbane, Australia