

**From:** Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>  
**Subject:** BOM (Fwd: Reference ID = 'REF2011-347-38' [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED])  
**Date:** 13 March 2012 4:14:40 PM AEST  
**To:** Roberts1 Malcolm <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Malcolm Roberts <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>  
**Date:** 20 February 2012 7:12:26 PM AEST  
**To:** Brock Bob <bobbrock@internode.on.net>, helpdesk.climate@bom.gov.au, v.lazarevska@bom.gov.au  
**Cc:** 3a All federal MP's  
**Subject:** BOM (Fwd: Reference ID = 'REF2011-347-38' [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED])

To:  
Mr Bob Brock, Chapel Hill, Brisbane  
Dr Greg Ayers, Director of Meteorology, Australian Government Bureau of Meteorology

### Copy being sent to BOM by Registered Mail (with Delivery Confirmation)

Dear Bob and Greg:

Thank you for your email, Bob.

Greg, due to concerns documented below, I am writing to you seeking your response please to fundamental questions and requests presented in red text below. In providing your answers please consider material and references provided for you.

I have accepted Bob's invitation to respond directly to you Greg. This email is being copied to all members of federal parliament. A notice is being sent by facsimile to various members of federal parliament concerned about misrepresentation of science by agencies funded by taxpayers.

On reading the BOM's reply to Bob's simple inquiry I'm feeling disappointed, concerned, alarmed and appalled. The BOM's reply fails to meet needs for integrity, reassurance and accountability. From what I've seen, the BOM's reply misrepresents climate science. Or at best, the BOM's reply shows an alarming lack of understanding of science, data analysis, causation and due diligence.

In four years voluntarily investigating the science of global warming I've seen many misrepresentations of climate, science and Nature by those advocating that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming. That claim by the UN IPCC and the government is fraudulent\*.

\*Fraud is defined in the dictionary as: *the presentation of something as it is not for personal gain.*

In that context and given the BOM's dependence on government funding, it leads me to question the BOM's integrity and its understanding of science and scientific process—particularly the concept of scientific causation.

#### 1. The UN IPCC's 2007 report referred to in BOM's reply

I'm stunned that the BOM cites and relies on the UN IPCC's 2007 report.

In the UN IPCC's latest report (2007) the sole chapter claiming detection of unusual warming and attribution of warming to human production of CO<sub>2</sub> is 'Chapter 9: Understanding and Attributing Climate Change'. I've read it completely—twice. It contains no scientific empirical evidence for the IPCC's core claim of human warming.

[http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch9.html](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch9.html)

**Greg, please specify where in that sole core chapter 9 is the evidence that human production of carbon dioxide, CO<sub>2</sub> caused global atmospheric warming.**

To check my comment for yourself I suggest you read the comments of UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr Vincent Gray. He has around 60 years' real-world experience as a research scientist, with 21 years in climate. Dr Gray has reviewed all four (4) UN IPCC reports—1990, 1995, 2001, 2007.

Dr Gray provided 16% of the total review comments for the UN IPCC's 2007 report including a mammoth 575 on chapter 9 alone. Dr Gray says publicly that there is scant scientific evidence of warming and no evidence whatsoever of human causation.

His review comments can be accessed through: [www.conscious.com.au](http://www.conscious.com.au) and then by scrolling down to 'Dr Vincent Gray'. For his review for the UN IPCC on Chapter 9, specifically:  
<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/gray%20documents/Chapter%209%20UN%20IPCC%20WG1%20AR4%20Vincent%20Gray.pdf>

In the UN IPCC's previous report (2001), the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of CO<sub>2</sub> is 'Chapter 12: Detection of Climate Change and Attribution of Causes'. I've read and checked it. There is no scientific real-world empirical evidence for the IPCC's core claim of human warming.

Recall that the UN IPCC's 2001 report was built around the fabricated 'hockey stick' temperature graph purporting unusual temperature increases. As you know, that graph has been scientifically completely discredited world-wide. When it released its 2001 report, the UN IPCC featured and relied upon that unscientific graph that contradicts science. In doing so it made a huge media splash worldwide. Later, after the graph was scientifically discredited, the UN IPCC quietly withdrew the graph's use.

## **2. The InterAcademy Council's damning report on UN IPCC processes and procedures**

Please do not rely on my conclusions alone. Nor rely on only the conclusions of UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr Vincent Gray. The InterAcademy Council's August 2010 report on its review into UN IPCC processes and procedures completely discredits the UN IPCC's 2007 report on which the BOM relies.

As a result of the IAC's August 2010 report there is no statement in the 2007 report that can be relied upon.

I'm stunned that the BOM relies on and cites the IPCC. Its processes and procedures used in developing the 2007 report stand completely discredited.

The InterAcademy Council's report was requested by the IPCC itself. Apparently in response to the public and scientific mauling of the UN IPCC that followed release of Climategate emails.

The report can be accessed in various forms here:  
<http://tome22.info/IAC-Report/>  
<http://Tome22.info/IAC-Report/IAC-Report-Introduction.html>  
<http://Tome22.info/IAC-Report/IAC-Report-Annotated.html>

**Greg, is the BOM aware of the IAC's 2010 report? If not, why not? If the BOM is aware of the IAC report, why does it continue to cite the IPCC's discredited report?**

By the way, please note that the IAC report's Executive Summary fails to accurately reflect the body of the report. That raises more questions about ANU Professor Kurt Lambeck who is associated with the ANU's Climate Change Institute. Professor Lambeck was one of two monitors responsible for enforcing the IAC's Guidelines requiring that the Executive Summary should reflect the body of the IAC report. Yet it fails to do so. He and the ANU benefit from government funding.

At the time Professor Lambeck was the President of The Australian Academy of Science. He wrote the foreword to the Academy's glossy booklet entitled '*The Science of Climate Change: Questions & Answers*' that implies evidence of human causation of global warming. Yet my reading of that booklet reveals that it contains no evidence supporting its claim.

That conclusion is supported by my written and verbal communication with the Academy's Science Policy Manager, Martin Callinan, a former staffer in the Rudd government. He too has failed to provide scientific evidence of human causation of global warming. He and the Academy's current President, Professor Suzanne Cory, failed to rebut my material provided them in writing.

## **3. Independent analyses of the UN IPCC's 2007 Report reveal the UN IPCC's unscientific, corrupt and fraudulent\* practices**

\*Fraud is defined in the dictionary as: *the presentation of something as it is not for personal gain.*

There have been other independent investigations conducted into the UN IPCC's 2007 report. These provide clear and strong evidence that the UN IPCC's report is not scientific. Indeed UN IPCC reports contradict empirical science. Some examples of these investigations include:

3.1 Journalist Donna Laframboise's thorough analysis of the UN IPCC entitled '*The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert*'.

3.2 An international team's audit of UN IPCC references available at this web site:

<http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/findings-main-page.php>

This mocks reported claims by the UN IPCC Chairman Dr Rajendra Pachauri that the UN IPCC's report relies on 100% peer-reviewed science.

3.3 My documentation of the corruption of climate science is available. I conclude that the UN IPCC is not a scientific body, it is a political body. Further, it misrepresents climate, science and Nature. It is fraudulent.

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/political\\_scam\\_exposed.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/political_scam_exposed.php)

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom\\_exposing.pdf](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf)

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific\\_untruths.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php)

Within these links you will find documentation by John McLean. He presents the UN IPCC's own statistics on its reporting processes. McLean's work cannot be sensibly refuted since he merely presents UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC.

Separately at the above links McLean documents the history of the UN corrupting climate science. That corruption has plagued the UN IPCC since its inception in 1988. From 1972 through 1988 science was corrupted by the UN IPCC's co-sponsor and predecessor, the United Nations Environmental Program, UNEP.

I am concerned that the BOM cites and relies upon the UN IPCC for the BOM's position and claim that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming.

#### **4. Was the BOM's reply to Bob Brock aimed at deterring his understanding of climate?**

Given the BOM's strong public advocacy for the claim that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global atmospheric warming, one would think the BOM would have easily met Bob's request. Yet BOM failed.

In my experience, the BOM's response to Bob uses an approach that seems common from government agencies advocating that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming.

It provides no scientific evidence of any causal relationship and fails to cite its own specific data as evidence of causation. It contradicts empirical science. It then directs Bob to read hundreds of pages of UN IPCC reports.

I've seen this before from CSIRO, The Australian Academy of Science and various academics advocating action against human production of CO<sub>2</sub>. Yet none provide any evidence of causation. All are funded by the government. All contradict real-world empirical climate science.

It seems to me that such responses are hoping to deter people from investigating the false claims being made by such government agencies and academic advocates.

Fortunately I've read the UN IPCC's core chapters and checked references cited by various organisations and individuals. In addition, I rely on Dr Vincent Gray's amazing scientific work, the IAC's report and the work of many fine scientists worldwide, including UN IPCC Lead Authors.

I cite the work of investigative journalists such as Ian Wishart, author of the excellent book entitled '*Air Con*'. I refer you to the work of environmentalists such as Canadian Lawrence Solomon who documents advice and conclusions from experts in many climate-related scientific fields in his outstanding book entitled '*The Deniers*'.

I can assure you that from my reading and investigations there is no evidence that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused Earth's latest modest period of cyclic global atmospheric warming that ended around 1998.

My investigations and those of many other people including eminent climate scientists worldwide reveal that the BOM's claim, quote: "*The link between CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature is strong and supported by numerous lines of evidence*" is false.

There is strong real-world empirical scientific evidence that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> did not cause global warming and cannot cause global warming.

Having read the UN IPCC's 2007 Summary For Policy Makers I conclude that it is misleading. Canadian Climate scientist

and expert environmental policy adviser Professor Tim Ball and others have revealed that the UN IPCC's own guidelines for report writers require the Summary to be written and released before the science reports are finalised. Further, those guidelines reportedly require that where there is a disagreement between the science and the summary, the summary prevails.

The UN IPCC's Summary for Policy Makers is a political document that does not reflect the science. This conclusion has been confirmed by many people worldwide including UN IPCC scientists and Lead Authors.  
[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom\\_exposing.pdf](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf)

## **5. The CSIRO has no scientific evidence of AGW\* due to human production of CO<sub>2</sub>**

\*AGW: Anthropogenic Global Warming, often labelled more recently as Climate Change

In their replies to my requests for evidence that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming, the CSIRO Chief Executive Dr Megan Clark and CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment Dr Andrew Johnson both failed to provide any scientific evidence. I have their written responses.

My analysis of CSIRO '*climate change*' documents reveals that CSIRO's implied claims of human causation of global warming are not supported by empirical scientific evidence.

## **6. The Australian Academy of Science has no evidence of AGW due to human production of CO<sub>2</sub>**

My communication with the Australian Academy of Science's Science Policy Manager Martin Callinan reveals that the Academy has no scientific evidence for the claim that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global warming.

## **7. Ground-based temperature measurements relied upon by the UN IPCC are proven to be corrupted**

It's widely reported that the database relied upon by the UN IPCC for its claim is in a '*hopeless state*'. They are the words of that database's programmer at the Climactic Research Unit that holds the database. Please see page 4, first three paragraphs of the report by American meteorologists Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts. It's entitled '*Surface Temperature Records: Policy-Driven Deception?*' and is available here:  
[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface\\_temp.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf)

Additionally, it's widely reported that the CRU prevents access to the database's raw temperature measurements. It thus prevents peer-review. That immediately prevents it from being considered scientific.

I find it startling and disquieting that despite the prevention of peer-review the BOM cites and relies upon the UN IPCC.

**Greg, has the BOM conducted its own due diligence on the UN IPCC's reports? If so, please describe the due diligence processes used by the BOM and provide the names of BOM's officers who conducted that due diligence.**

**How did the BOM fail to detect the UN IPCC's fundamentally unscientific processes, especially given that detailed documented evidence of the UN IPCC's extensive misrepresentation of science is readily available in the public domain?**

**If the BOM failed to conduct its own due diligence, please explain why. The BOM's role and responsibilities surely would insist it conducts rigorous due diligence, wouldn't it?**

**Is the BOM aware of the significance of the claim of human causation of atmospheric warming to the nation and to all Australians?**

## **8. The BOM's own manipulation of temperature data is under a cloud**

Warwick Hughes and Ken Stewart provide analyses of BOM data and data manipulations. These raise serious questions and concerns about the BOM's 'work':

Warwick Hughes:

<http://www.warwickhughes.com/climate/>

Specifically, for instance: <http://www.warwickhughes.com/climate/quality.htm>

And: <http://www.warwickhughes.com/climate/bom.htm>

<http://joannenova.com.au/tag/australian-temperatures/>

A formal request has been made to the Auditor-General for Australia to investigate the BOM:

<http://jonova.s3.amazonaws.com/audit/anao-request-audit-bom.pdf>

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/announcing-a-formal-request-for-the-auditor-general-to-audit-the-australian-bom/>

## 9. Why has the BOM failed to provide scientific evidence in its response to Bob's request?

Why is the BOM not able to provide Bob with scientific evidence as he requested? I conclude that the BOM has failed to do its due diligence on behalf of Australia and thus failed in its charter. That charter is available here:

[http://www.bom.gov.au/inside/services\\_policy/serchart.shtml](http://www.bom.gov.au/inside/services_policy/serchart.shtml)

And specifically, 'Who we are': [http://www.bom.gov.au/inside/services\\_policy/serchart.shtml#who](http://www.bom.gov.au/inside/services_policy/serchart.shtml#who)

Note this quote from the BOM's charter: "Our services are aimed at helping people make better-informed decisions affecting their lives and their community and business activities".

The tax on carbon dioxide will seriously affect Australians, Australia and Australian business activities. From what I've learned, in making its recommendation to tax carbon dioxide the Multi Party Climate Change Committee was seemingly misled or misinformed by its sole Expert Adviser on climate science, Professor Will Steffen.

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/political\\_scam\\_exposed.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/political_scam_exposed.php)

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

<http://Tome22.info/Submissions/JSCACEF-Peter-Bobroff.html>

<https://www.quadrant.org.au/Steffen-2%20-%20Climate%20Change%20-%20latest%20science%20-%20March%202011-%20QO%20commentary%20-%205z.pdf>

Below is the link to an interview summarising my experience and observations with Professors David Karoly and Will Steffen. Professor Karoly is arguably the single most significant scientist involved in manufacturing chapters 9 and 12 referred to above as the UN IPCC's sole core chapter in each of its 2007 and 2001 reports respectively:

[http://fairdinkumradio.com/?q=climate\\_podcasts](http://fairdinkumradio.com/?q=climate_podcasts)

Then click on the blue text '**26.1.12 Evidence of political fraud**'

Then click on the blue text '**9.2.12 Evidence of Political Fraud. 2.**'

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

[http://www.conscious.com.au/\\_documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January,%202011.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January,%202011.pdf)

Professor Karoly was a writer of the 2007 draft '*Summary for Policy Makers*' on which the BOM relies in its reply to Bob.

From what I've seen and experienced, my conclusion is that the BOM is relying on unscientific material that misrepresents science.

Returning to the BOM's charter: Under the heading '**Our services to you**' the BOM states, quote: "We provide the community with:" and "Data and information services on the weather and climate of Australia and surrounding areas"

Under the heading, "**What you can expect from us**" and sub-heading "**Quality - we will:**" it claims, quote:

- "Treat you with respect and courtesy, maintaining confidentiality where required;
- Identify ourselves when we speak to you;
- Be clear and helpful in our dealings with you, giving reasons for our decisions;
- Act with care and diligence as we prepare a response, behaving honestly and with integrity in accordance with the APS Code of Conduct"

Yet in the reply Bob received the writer of the BOM's response is not even identified.

The BOM web site says, further, quote: "**Responsiveness - we will endeavour to:**

- Deal with your enquiries and complaints quickly and effectively;"

**Greg, do you consider the BOM's response to Bob as being effective? If so, why?**

It says further, quote: "To help us to give you the best possible service, we ask that, if you are not satisfied with our services, you:

- Advise us of your needs; and
- Tell us about the difficulties you are experiencing, understanding that at crucial times such as during dangerous weather, our staff, services and systems may be under great pressure."

The BOM's response to Bob's genuine and reasonable request does **not** meet my needs for:

- Scientific rigour. The BOM fails to provide scientific evidence of specific causal relationships showing human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused Earth's latest period of modest cyclic global **ATMOSPHERIC** warming that ended around 1998/2000;
- Accuracy and integrity;
- Reliability and dependability;
- Clarity and understanding of the science and causal relationships. The BOM fails to justify the BOM's stance and advocacy that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> is a driver of climate;
- Accountability and personal connection. The BOM fails to provide a personally signed response.

When I think of these needs not being met I feel disappointed, concerned, frustrated and somewhat alarmed and annoyed.

That the guardian of Australia's climate '*data and information*' has failed to meet such basic needs is of grave concern.

**Greg, why has the BOM's reply to Bob failed to meet fundamental needs clearly defined in Bob's basic request?**

## 10. The BOM fails to understand fundamentals governing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels

Referring to the second paragraph in the BOM's response, it seems the BOM is ignorant of the significance of the measurements of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels used by the UN IPCC itself. Those measurements prove that Nature alone completely controls atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels.

Annually, Nature overwhelmingly produces 97% of Earth's entire CO<sub>2</sub> production. All human activity comprises only 3%. Of greater significance though is the fact that Nature alone determines the reabsorption of CO<sub>2</sub> back into its sinks. Thus Nature alone determines atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels.

Of far greater significance than the relative levels of production are the **patterns of variation** in production of CO<sub>2</sub>. This proves that Nature alone completely controls atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels.

By understanding the variation of natural and human production of CO<sub>2</sub>, it's clear that the BOM's statement, quote: "*Specific to CO<sub>2</sub>, the often quoted 3% figure is irrelevant*" is false.

Greg, with respect I suggest you consider these links:

[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/science\\_futility.php](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/science_futility.php)

Note specifically the link to comments by UN IPCC contributing scientist Prof Murry Salby:

[http://www.conscious.com.au/\\_documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January.%202011.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January.%202011.pdf)

Pages 1-4 of <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom1-CO2.pdf>

The three remaining BOM statements on CO<sub>2</sub> in the BOM's reply to Bob are similarly revealed as misleading or false.

Quote: "*Natural factors tend to be in balance meaning that emissions by nature (such as through wildfires) are balanced by absorption by nature (such as the growing back of forests).*" Misleading.

Quote: "*Over the last century human emissions have been responsible for all the increase in CO<sub>2</sub> that has been observed - indeed humans have emitted more than the entire increase observed in the atmosphere.*" False.

Quote: "*What matters is that accumulation of CO<sub>2</sub> once you add all the emissions (by nature and humans) and all the absorptions (by nature).*" False.

Given the BOM's management of statistics, I'm surprised that the BOM seems to not understand that variation is of far greater importance than understanding level of production alone.

**Greg, why does the BOM contradict the increasingly widely understood reality that Nature controls atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels and that CO<sub>2</sub> levels change as a result of changes in global temperature?**

In the BOM's reply to Bob, the BOM sates, quote: "*The link between climate change and CO<sub>2</sub> is based on more than 100 years of scientific research.*"

That is false. There is much evidence and many scientists who dispute the BOM's statement. Scientist Tim Casey has researched the early work of Tyndall and Fourier and others. Please see these links:

<http://tyndall1861.geologist-1011.mobi/>

<http://geologist-1011.mobi/>

<http://greenhouse.geologist-1011.net/>

It seems that the early suppositions of CO<sub>2</sub>'s effect suggest those early scientists did not have a clear understanding of the science involved. Secondly, it seems that their conclusions could have been taken out of context by their contemporaries and by later scientists.

It seems that the early work of Arrhenius is unconfirmed. Please note that his later paper on the topic guessed a greatly reduced effect. In other words, the so-called settled science is merely conjecture.

In fact it has been disproved empirically by physicist RW Wood. This has recently been confirmed experimentally by scientist Nasif Nahle.

Thirdly, there is evidence within the real-world that CO<sub>2</sub> in the open atmosphere behaves in ways that prevent simple extrapolation of primitive laboratory results in sealed glass containers. I'm sure you're both aware that Earth's open dynamic atmosphere behaves quite differently. The atmosphere is ruled by heat from the sun and impacted by many variables including the daily cycle of light and dark.

For further details, please refer to the book entitled '*Slaying the Sky Dragon*' by an international team of scientists.

In regard to the supposed '*greenhouse*' effect, there are now three broad groups of scientists:

1. Those who believe in catastrophic global warming caused by the supposed '*greenhouse*' effect of CO<sub>2</sub>;
2. Those who believe in a supposed '*greenhouse*' effect yet claim its effect is at most negligible and more likely offset by Earth's natural negative climate feedbacks; and,
3. Those who believe that there is no supposed '*greenhouse*' effect and who see that in the real-world the movement of air accelerates cooling of the Earth's surface.

The empirical observational data clearly disprove the first group. Adherents to the growing third group claim empirical evidence and laws of physics in support of their claim. Aside from the merits of each case, there is clearly considerable doubt about the fundamental science.

It is clear though that there is no observational data supporting the BOM's claim about human production of CO<sub>2</sub> as a significant cause of global warming. There is extensive, sound empirical data disproving the BOM's claim.

### **11. Why is the BOM an advocate claiming or implying that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused climate change when there is no empirical evidence supporting its claim?**

Please refer to the BOM's own web site: <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/change/>

Most people understand that climate is dynamic. Like the Earth, climate can be subject to continual change. Yet the BOM falsely claims human causation when there is no evidence of any change in global climate caused by human production of CO<sub>2</sub>. Significantly, there is extensive, sound evidence disproving the BOM's claim.

### **Greg, why is the BOM an advocate claiming or implying that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused global climate change when there is no empirical evidence supporting its claim?**

#### **Conclusions**

There seem to be many parallels in the BOM with the practices of its New Zealand counterpart. The kiwis folded with a startling admission when faced with a court case.

Bob, the key point is that in its response to your question, the BOM has failed to provide any scientific empirical evidence. It has instead cited and relied upon the UN IPCC's 2007 report that was fabricated using processes and procedures that are scientifically completely discredited.

Secondly, I conclude the BOM has shown that it fails to understand the real-world empirical science and fails to understand the behaviour of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels determined wholly by Nature.

The BOM has enormous responsibility to the people of Australia who fund its activities. Like many Australians, my family and I depend on the BOM for our personal safety, security and livelihood. Indeed, many industries are affected by the scientific accuracy of the BOM's services. Many communities and regions depend for their security on the BOM's advice. It is essential that the BOM can be trusted.

Greg, on climate does the BOM understand and take responsibility for people's lives and livelihoods that appear to have been threatened by false claims about climate? I conclude that in recent years, false claims about drought and rainfall by Professors Karoly, Flannery, Steffen and other academic advocates of human causation of global warming likely contributed to deaths and/or to extensive property damage by worsening last year's Brisbane floods.

I cite a comment received from a prominent national journalist, quote: "I agree that the government's education campaigns around water conservation were a bit too effective. When the rains returned, people thought it was all too precious to let go. This folly meant the dam\* could not effectively mitigate flood."

\*Wivenhoe Dam

The Queensland state government appears to have been unduly influenced by unfounded and false claims by prominent academic advocates funded by the federal government and spread by the Greens party and the ABC.

### **Greg, the BOM apparently remained silent on such claims proven to be false. Why?**

Bob, I hope that I have fulfilled your needs. Greg, I look forward to your response to my questions.

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.

BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)

Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

My personal declaration of interests is at:

[http://www.conscious.com.au/\\_documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf)  
(manually go to [www.conscious.com.au](http://www.conscious.com.au) and look for 'Summaries' and then click on 'Aims, background and declaration of interests ...')

180 Haven Road  
Pullenvale QLD 4069  
Phone:

Home 07 3374 3374

Mobile 04 1964 2379

E-mail: [malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.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.

Project Manager (voluntary)

The Galileo Movement (non-profit and in existence only until the carbon dioxide tax is axed)

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/>

Facebook: The Galileo Movement (link <http://www.facebook.com/pages/The-Galileo-Movement/101728306584541>)

Twitter: search for GalileoMovement or visit <http://twitter.com/#!/GalileoMovement>

[www.conscious.com.au](http://www.conscious.com.au)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Bob Brock" <[bobbrock@internode.on.net](mailto:bobbrock@internode.on.net)>

**Date:** 19 February 2012 2:36:26 PM AEST

**To:** <[malcolmr@conscious.com.au](mailto:malcolmr@conscious.com.au)>

**Subject: FW: Reference ID = 'REF2011-347-38' [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]**

**Dear Malcolm**

**I am forwarding a copy of a self-explanatory email I sent to the BOM on 13 December 2011, together with their response of 16 January 2012. I would be grateful for your comments.**

**Further, as I have been distracted with other issues for some time and am likely to be out of circulation for several weeks, you might even like to respond on my behalf.**

**Kind regards**

**Bob Brock**

---

**From:** Helpdesk Climate [mailto:Helpdesk.Climate@bom.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Monday, 16 January 2012 1:09 PM  
**To:** [bobbrock@internode.on.net](mailto:bobbrock@internode.on.net)  
**Subject:** re: Reference ID = 'REF2011-347-38' [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Robert,

All the Bureau Climate Change relevant datasets are available at <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/change/> .  
The link between climate change and CO2 is based on more than 100 years of scientific research. An easy to read summary of the research is published by the IPCC in the Summary for Policy Makers ([www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-spm.pdf](http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg1/ar4-wg1-spm.pdf)). The full report of the IPCC Working Group One provides many hundreds of pages of climate change research and thousands of associated references to scientific papers. The link between CO2 and temperature is strong and supported by numerous lines of evidence.  
Specific to CO2, the often quoted 3% figure is irrelevant. Natural factors tend to be in balance meaning that emissions by nature (such as through wildfires) are balanced by absorption by nature (such as the growing back of forests). What matters is that accumulation of CO2 once you add all the emissions (by nature and humans) and all the absorptions (by nature). Over the last century human emissions have been responsible for all the increase in CO2 that has been observed - indeed humans have emitted more than the entire increase observed in the atmosphere.

Kind regards,  
National Climate Centre

**National Climate Centre - Bureau of Meteorology**  
| email: [helpdesk.climate@bom.gov.au](mailto:helpdesk.climate@bom.gov.au) | fax: +61 3 9669 4678  
*Please consider the environment before printing*

The Director  
Bureau of Meteorology  
13 December 2011  
Dear Sir or Madam

I have contacted a Federal politician involved with climate change issues with the following questions but have been referred to the Bureau of Meteorology.

The questions are:

1. Can you tell me the science that proves the connection between historical climate change and carbon dioxide levels? This would seem to me to be particularly important as a knowledge of the causes of historical climate change must be relevant to predicting future change.
2. How can any measures introduced by Australia directly affect the world's climate even if the measures are intended to cut up to 20 percent of our meagre contribution of 1.5 percent of global human emissions of carbon dioxide, which according to the IPCC comprise only 3 percent of total global carbon dioxide emissions?

I look forward to your response.

Regards  
Robert J Brock  
XXXXXX St  
XXXXXX XXXX Qld 4069  
07 XXXX XXXX

At stake is human freedom, your freedom, *our* freedom