

From: "Graham" <grahamhw@iprimus.com.au>
Subject: Lesley Hughes
Date: 5 September 2012 7:11:08 AM AEST
To: <malcolmr@conscious.com.au>

Hi Malcolm,

Below is a run down on my correspondence regarding the Lesley Hughes report. The bottom line is she has virtually suggested she can differentiate diseases caused by human caused climate change from those due to natural variation or severe weather events. Her report is clearly scientifically indefensible, even to a layperson! Hope the below is of use
Graham

CORRESPONDENCE RE HUGHES REPORT

I sent emails to Lesley Hughes (mostly cc'd to Tony McMichael also) re her report , [The Critical Decade; Climate Change and Health](#), on 30th Nov, 5th Dec, 21st Dec, 24th Feb, 9th March, 3rd April, and 16th April but have received no reply from her though twice Paul Ryan of Climate Commission responded on her behalf. I did however receive this curious non reply from Tony McMichael on 28th Jan

Paul and Lesley,

I think this must be in your hands. (I have previously sent my fairly detailed comments-in-reply to Paul.)

Tony

In the Hughes report she claims:

"The full range of risks to human health from climate change is mostly foreseeable from our existing knowledge about how natural variations in climate and weather, and the level of human-induced climate change already experienced, have affected rates of illness, disease and death. Climate change affects our health in a number of ways, some of which are direct and others that flow on from other changes. Direct risks include:

- » more frequent and intense heat waves resulting in more heart attacks, strokes, accidents, heat exhaustion and death;*
- » more frequent or intense extreme weather events—particularly storms, floods and cyclones— resulting in more injuries, deaths and post-traumatic stress; and*
- » more fires increasing the number of cases of smoke-induced asthma attacks, burns and death."*

"Health effects of climate change are already being felt in Australia and are likely to grow worse as time goes on (see figure 8). Effects will be wide-ranging and will be felt in many different ways. Everyone is likely to be affected in one way or another.... The most important and urgent strategy to protect our health and way of life is to reduce the emissions that cause climate change. The risks of future climate change to our health are serious, and grow rapidly with each degree of temperature rise. Most scientists agree that the potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change can be avoided if we keep the global temperature rise to no more than 2°C above pre-industrial levels."

I repeatedly asked the following questions:

Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.

Please supply case histories.

To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.

Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.

Since the mitigating climate change strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.

Paul Ryan responded first on 22nd Dec.

Dear Mr Williamson

Thank you for your emails to Climate Commissioner Professor Lesley Hughes concerning the Climate Commission report *The critical decade: climate change and health*. The Commissioner has asked me to respond on her behalf.

The Climate Commission was established by the Australian Government to provide all Australians with an independent and reliable source of information about the science of climate change, the international action being taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and the economics of a carbon price. The Commission is independent of Ministerial direction and does not comment on policy or provide policy advice.

The Climate Commission report *The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses*, provides up-to-date information on the science of climate change. The report shows that it is beyond reasonable doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate.

In relation to your questions about evidence for the impacts of climate change on human health, the information contained in the report *The critical decade: climate change and health* is based on scientific literature from Australia and overseas. The report includes a list of references that provide further information.

Regards

Paul Ryan
Director
Climate Commission Secretariat
GPO Box 854 Canberra ACT 2601
Phone +61 2 6159 7624
Email info@climatecommission.gov.au
Web climatecommission.gov.au

In my reply to Paul I repeat my above questions and respond, in part:

Dear Paul,
Thank you for your response.

You state:

"The Climate Commission report *The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses*, provides up-to-date information on the science of climate change. The report shows that it is beyond reasonable doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate."

You provide absolutely no evidence to substantiate this extremely loose non specific statement. What does primary mean? 60%? 65%? 70%? And is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?

Paul Ryan responded again on 8th March

Dear Mr Williamson

I refer to your email to me of 28 January 2012 and your email to Professor Lesley Hughes of 9 February 2012. Professor Hughes has asked me to respond on her behalf. I apologise for the delay in responding to your emails.

The Climate Commission's report *The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses* specifically addresses the issue you raised in your question about the evidence for human-induced emissions of greenhouse gases being the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate. The report (p21) refers to findings of the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that "most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations". As the Commission's report goes on to explain, under IPCC definitions of uncertainty, 'very likely' means there is a greater than 90% certainty that the statement is correct.

*In relation to your questions about the evidence for the impacts of climate change on human health discussed in the Commission's report *The critical decade: climate change and health*, the report presents numerous examples, drawn from published sources provided in the reference list, that demonstrate known links between climatic factors and human health and show how changes in incidence of particular health problems are associated with observed climate change. The Commission has prepared this report with the aim of helping Australians understand the risks of climate change to their health. The Commission has not sought to produce a comprehensive review of the literature on this issue; other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health.*

You also asked about the effect of a carbon tax in preventing health problems. As you would be aware, the Climate Commission does not comment on government climate change policies. However, the Commission recognises that economic studies show that a broad-based carbon price is a cost-effective way to help achieve the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions needed to reduce the threat of climate change, including the risks to human health.

Regards

Paul Ryan
Director
Climate Commission Secretariat
GPO Box 854 Canberra ACT 2601
Phone +61 2 6159 7624
Email info@climatecommission.gov.au
Web climatecommission.gov.au

My final and so far unanswered response to Paul is reproduced in full below, main points being:

You state in your response:

"I refer to your email to me of 28 January 2012 and your email to Professor Lesley Hughes of 9 February 2012. Professor Hughes has asked me to respond on her behalf. I apologise for the delay in responding to your emails."

In those emails I posed the following questions (in red) in response to your assertion *"it is beyond reasonable doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate"*:

You provide absolutely no evidence to substantiate this extremely loose non specific statement. What does primary mean? 60%? 65%? 70%? And is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?

According to the scientific evidence from world climate experts and IPCC lead authors such a Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy there is no scientific evidence of significant human caused global warming ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)). You seem to disagree with these scientists, do you regard them as wrong? Why?

.....

In your response for some reason you avoided answering the following questions in regard to the percentage of human causation:

Is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?

According to the scientific evidence from world climate experts and IPCC lead authors such a Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy there is no scientific evidence of significant human caused global warming ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)). You seem to disagree with these scientists, do you regard them as wrong? Why?

.....

I repeat my earlier unanswered question:

Why do you disagree with the thousands of scientists, including former IPCC lead authors and CSIRO scientists who claim the effects of humans upon climate is uncertain and there is no scientific evidence humans are causing catastrophic climate

change?

I also made the following unanswered queries in my previous correspondence.

Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.

Please supply case histories.

To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.

Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.

In regard to these issues once again you decided to refuse to answer, responding thus:

*"In relation to your questions about the evidence for the impacts of climate change on human health discussed in the Commission's report *The critical decade: climate change and health*, the report presents numerous examples, drawn from published sources provided in the reference list, that demonstrate known links between climatic factors and human health and show how changes in incidence of particular health problems are associated with observed climate change. The Commission has prepared this report with the aim of helping Australians understand the risks of climate change to their health. The Commission has not sought to produce a comprehensive review of the literature on this issue; other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health."*

Do you have any evidence at all or is this report sheer unadulterated propaganda and scientific nonsense? I have asked repeatedly for the evidence differentiating human caused climate change diseases from those due to natural climate variation or severe weather events and your best response is to state there are links between climatic factors and human health" and "other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health."

Are you serious? Is the Hughes and McMichael report based upon science or science fiction? Where is the science underlying your apparent claim that you can differentiate diseases caused by human caused climate change from those due to natural climate variation or severe weather events? Why are you so determined NOT to divulge this evidence? By your stubborn refusal to supply this evidence you are creating the very clear perception that the Hughes and McMichael report is sheer political propaganda. I urge you to rectify this impression immediately by supplying the requested evidence.

In my earlier correspondence I drew attention to the following claim in the Hughes and McMichael report (22):

"The most important and urgent strategy to protect our health and way of life is to reduce the emissions that cause climate change."

Although you claim that *"the Climate Commission does not comment on government climate change policies"*, the above statement is a clear vindication of government policy. Until you can supply convincing scientific evidence quantifying *"the emissions that cause climate change"*, which you have not been able to do to date, then the above statement is obviously nothing more than an attempt to justify government policy. The claim that (22) *"the most important and urgent strategy to protect our health"* is reducing CO2 levels (ie *"the emissions that cause climate change"*) has also not been supported by any scientific evidence and is therefore once again blatantly political. If you can supply the evidence why not do so?

You further claim that *"the Commission recognises that economic studies show that a broad-based carbon price is a cost-effective way to help achieve the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions needed to reduce the threat of climate change, including the risks to human health."* But this is just another blatantly political endorsement of government policy. Are you suggesting there is no scientific evidence, only economic evidence? Are you suggesting climate policy and health policy are determined by economists? Please explain.

I continue to be alarmed by the apparent determination with which you seek to avoid answering my questions. You create the very clear perception that you have no convincing scientific evidence and the Hughes and McMichael report is just political propaganda. You continue to do a disservice to those who continue to warn of the alleged dangers of global warming. In fact, your inability to supply clear evidence supports the claims of sceptics who say there is no evidence.

Is this your intention? If not, why not correct it?

I appreciate your time is valuable, so why not supply clear concise answers and make further communication unnecessary? If you feel incapable of answering my questions then please forward it to someone who is more capable. I look forward to settling these matters so that any doubts about underlying scientific evidence may be dismissed.

.....
BELOW IS MY COMPLETE EMAIL RESPONSE TO PAUL

Dear Paul,
Thank you for your email.

You state in your response:

"I refer to your email to me of 28 January 2012 and your email to Professor Lesley Hughes of 9 February 2012. Professor Hughes has asked me to respond on her behalf. I apologise for the delay in responding to your emails."

In those emails I posed the following questions (in red) in response to your assertion "it is beyond reasonable doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate":

You provide absolutely no evidence to substantiate this extremely loose non specific statement. What does primary mean? 60%? 65%? 70%? And is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?

According to the scientific evidence from world climate experts and IPCC lead authors such as Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy there is no scientific evidence of significant human caused global warming ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)). You seem to disagree with these scientists, do you regard them as wrong? Why?

Further according to former CSIRO scientist John Reid ([12](#)):

"The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not. If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. The IPCC claims to have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid."

And according to the latest IPCC report in their Summary for Policymakers ([13](#)):

"Projected changes in climate extremes under different emissions scenarios generally do not strongly diverge in the coming two to three decades, but these signals are relatively small compared to natural climate variability over this time frame. Even the sign of projected changes in some climate extremes over this time frame is uncertain. For projected changes by the end of the 21st century, either model uncertainty or uncertainties associated with emissions scenarios used becomes dominant, depending on the extreme."

And according to the latest CSIRO/BOM report ([14](#)):

"Trends in climate are evident over the Pacific as a whole, including the PCCSP region, however the extent to which these trends are attributable to natural variability and to human activities is not yet well understood."

And these scientists are further backed up by thousands of scientists around the world, including the NIPCC, who state that science cannot confirm any significant human caused global warming ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#)).

Why do you disagree with the scientific facts? Do you regard all these scientists, including IPCC and CSIRO scientists, as being wrong. Please explain their error. Clearly your views contradict the scientific facts from these climate experts. Why?

You respond to my above queries thus:

The Climate Commission's report The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses specifically addresses the issue you raised in your question about the evidence for human-induced emissions of greenhouse gases being the primary cause of the

observed warming of the Earth's climate. The report (p21) refers to findings of the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that "most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations". As the Commission's report goes on to explain, under IPCC definitions of uncertainty, 'very likely' means there is a greater than 90% certainty that the statement is correct.

In your response for some reason you avoided answering the following questions in regard to the percentage of human causation:

Is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?

According to the scientific evidence from world climate experts and IPCC lead authors such as Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy there is no scientific evidence of significant human caused global warming ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)). You seem to disagree with these scientists, do you regard them as wrong? Why?

I also cited evidence from various scientists, including scientists from the CSIRO, pointing out that the influence of humans on climate is poorly understood and asked you:

Why do you disagree with the scientific facts? Do you regard all these scientists, including IPCC and CSIRO scientists, as being wrong. Please explain their error. Clearly your views contradict the scientific facts from these climate experts. Why?

However, once again, for some reason, you refused to answer these questions. Why?

I also made the point that you rely upon evidence from the discredited IPCC to support your claims. I cited evidence from the scientists below (in red) discrediting the IPCC and asked the reasons why you seem to disagree with these scientists, but once again you decided to completely ignore my question, Why?

Former CSIRO scientist John Reid ([12](#)):

"The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not. If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. The IPCC claims to have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid."

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

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 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 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."*

Professor Christopher Landsea, renowned internationally as the eminent Authority on storms was a UNIPCC scientist who resigned in disgust at the UN IPCC's tactics: *"My view is that when people identify themselves as being associated with the IPCC and then make pronouncements far outside current scientific understandings that this will harm the credibility of climate change science and will in the longer term diminish our role in public policy."*

The confessions of Professor Landsea in his resignation letter to the IPCC are particularly illuminating ([18](#)):

"After some prolonged deliberation, I have decided to withdraw from participating in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns..... It is beyond me why my colleagues would utilize the media to push an unsupported agenda that recent hurricane activity has been due to global warming. Given Dr. Trenberth's role as the IPCC's Lead Author responsible for preparing the text on hurricanes, his public statements so far outside of current scientific understanding led me to concern that it would be very difficult for the IPCC process to proceed objectively with regards to the assessment on hurricane activity..... The IPCC leadership saw nothing to be concerned with in Dr. Trenberth's unfounded pronouncements to the media, despite his supposedly impartial important role that he must undertake as a Lead Author on the upcoming AR4..... a scientist with an important role in the IPCC who represented himself as a Lead Author for the IPCC [Dr. Trenberth] has used that position to promulgate to the media and general public his own opinion that the busy 2004 hurricane season was caused by global warming, which is in direct opposition to research written in the field and is counter to conclusions in the TAR..... Because of Dr. Trenberth's pronouncements, the IPCC process on our assessment of these crucial extreme events in our climate system has been subverted and compromised, its neutrality lost..... I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by preconceived agendas and being scientifically unsound. As the IPCC leadership has seen no wrong in Dr. Trenberth's actions and have retained him as a Lead Author for the AR4, I have decided to no longer participate in the IPCC AR4."

But there is nothing new about this as Professor Landsea joins a long list of scientists who have blown the whistle on the shoddy practices of the IPCC and completely discredited the organisation. These criticisms have been confirmed by the IAC review of the IPCC ([19](#), [20](#)). Some of the main criticisms of the IPCC by the IAC include the following ([20](#)).

Unclear means of choosing IPCC authors which may result in authors being chosen on political grounds rather than in accord with scientific qualifications.

IPCC policy results in inclusion of non peer-reviewed data in their reports but the use of such possibly flawed data is not necessarily identified as non-peer reviewed in the reports. In other words, IPCC policy enables the disguising of suspect data sources within their reports. See Himalayan glaciers fiasco.

IPCC reports favour confirmation bias and suppression or inadequate consideration of opposing points of view. Lead authors are permitted to censor or exclude opposing viewpoints. See Himalayan glaciers fiasco.

IPCC processes authorise political editing of scientific reports to maximise their acceptability to governments in the final Summary for Policymakers. As a result of this process the Summary for Policymakers tends to be a more sensationalised and less scientific document. For instance, in the 1995 report, scientists state 5 times there is no evidence of humans causing global warming (Is there new evidence since then?) Yet the summary of the 1995 report reads “The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate”. Which section of the report is correct?

Unspecified authorship criteria and political interference of Synthesis Reports.

IPCC processes do not deal adequately with the inherent uncertainties of climate science. This includes statements of certainty when there is little supportive evidence and the use of vague difficult to refute statements to imply a level of certainty. Downplaying or ignoring uncertainties has led to many errors in IPCC reports. Furthermore, the origin of such mistakes is often not traceable due to the fact the IPCC does not require accountability in this respect.

IPCC Chairman should be suitably qualified in climate or allied science, unlike present Chair Rajendra K. Pachauri who has a background in railway and mechanical engineering.

The IPCC does not exclude anyone with a conflict of interest as they have no conflict of interest policy.

IPCC leaders make non-scientific public statements which could be construed as flagrant political statements.

IPCC is very slow and reluctant to publicly acknowledge errors.

The IAC review of the IPCC has been summarised by Peter Bobroff ([21](#)).

The fact that you seem determined to continue to cite the discredited IPCC as the exclusive and sole basis of your claims of human causation raises extremely serious questions about the credibility of the Commission. Do you have any real evidence which is not tainted by association with the IPCC? Why is it you seem totally dismissive of the criticisms of eminent scientists who have witnessed the shoddy unscientific practices of the IPCC from the inside? And when there is blatant contradiction between the main IPCC report and the Summary for Policy Makers, which version do you support?

I repeat my earlier unanswered question:

Why do you disagree with the thousands of scientists, including former IPCC lead authors and CSIRO scientists who claim the effects of humans upon climate is uncertain and there is no scientific evidence humans are causing catastrophic climate change?

I also made the following unanswered queries in my previous correspondence.

Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.

Please supply case histories.

To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.

Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.

In regard to these issues once again you decided to refuse to answer, responding thus:

“In relation to your questions about the evidence for the impacts of climate change on human health discussed in the Commission's report The critical decade: climate change and health, the report presents numerous examples, drawn from published sources provided in the reference list, that demonstrate known links between climatic factors and human health

and show how changes in incidence of particular health problems are associated with observed climate change. The Commission has prepared this report with the aim of helping Australians understand the risks of climate change to their health. The Commission has not sought to produce a comprehensive review of the literature on this issue; other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health."

Do you have any evidence at all or is this report sheer unadulterated propaganda and scientific nonsense? I have asked repeatedly for the evidence differentiating human caused climate change diseases from those due to natural climate variation or severe weather events and your best response is to state there are *links between climatic factors and human health*" and "*other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health.*"

Are you serious? Is the Hughes and McMichael report based upon science or science fiction? Where is the science underlying your apparent claim that you can differentiate diseases caused by human caused climate change from those due to natural climate variation or severe weather events? Why are you so determined NOT to divulge this evidence? By your stubborn refusal to supply this evidence you are creating the very clear perception that the Hughes and McMichael report is sheer political propaganda. I urge you to rectify this impression immediately by supplying the requested evidence.

In my earlier correspondence I drew attention to the following claim in the Hughes and McMichael report (22):

"The most important and urgent strategy to protect our health and way of life is to reduce the emissions that cause climate change."

Although you claim that "*the Climate Commission does not comment on government climate change policies*", the above statement is a clear vindication of government policy. Until you can supply convincing scientific evidence quantifying "*the emissions that cause climate change*", which you have not been able to do to date, then the above statement is obviously nothing more than an attempt to justify government policy. The claim that (22) "*the most important and urgent strategy to protect our health*" is reducing CO2 levels (ie "*the emissions that cause climate change*") has also not been supported by any scientific evidence and is therefore once again blatantly political. If you can supply the evidence why not do so?

You further claim that "*the Commission recognises that economic studies show that a broad-based carbon price is a cost-effective way to help achieve the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions needed to reduce the threat of climate change, including the risks to human health.*" But this is just another blatantly political endorsement of government policy. Are you suggesting there is no scientific evidence, only economic evidence? Are you suggesting climate policy and health policy are determined by economists? Please explain.

I continue to be alarmed by the apparent determination with which you seek to avoid answering my questions. You create the very clear perception that you have no convincing scientific evidence and the Hughes and McMichael report is just political propaganda. You continue to do a disservice to those who continue to warn of the alleged dangers of global warming. In fact, your inability to supply clear evidence supports the claims of sceptics who say there is no evidence.

Is this your intention? If not, why not correct it?

I appreciate your time is valuable, so why not supply clear concise answers and make further communication unnecessary? If you feel incapable of answering my questions then please forward it to someone who is more capable. I look forward to settling these matters so that any doubts about underlying scientific evidence may be dismissed.

Regards

Graham Williamson