

CSIROh!

CLIMATE OF DECEPTION? ... OR FIRST STEP TO FREEDOM?

Management consultant's
report on CSIRO document
prepared at request of
ABC-Radio's Steve Austin



Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts. | Brisbane | Australia | February 2013

© **Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.**

BE (Hons, U of QLD), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK),
Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Brisbane, Australia
04 1964 2379
malcolmr@conscious.com.au

First published: February 4th, 2013

Latest update:

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with, all parts of and appendices to the document entitled CSIROh! Appendices are available at URL links provided electronically within the report.

This document and its appendices are provided in good faith and without malice or ill will. They are part of an open and continuing public and political debate about a challenging topic of public and political interest and controversy and with serious and important adverse consequences affecting all Australians. It's of declared interest to Steve Austin and to federal politicians. It analyses public claims made primarily by advocates in public functions funded by government using the public purse.

I've written to many of the people whose behaviours, opinions and/or claims are discussed in this report and whose core claim is that human carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming—that ended in 1998. Most have responded. All have failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning for the basis of their core claim. All seemed reluctant to address my questions adequately. They failed to meet my reasonable need for integrity, reassurance and understanding.

To the best of my knowledge, my work is substantially true, correct and fair. My report is based on five years' voluntary research and investigation to protect my family and taxpayers affected by serious issues raised in this report and appendices as a result of activities and claims of people funded by taxpayers. It's based on facts and is contextually true.

As noted in my declaration of personal interests (Appendix 1c) my personal aims include restoring scientific integrity. It has slipped as the reputations of many involved in public climate discussions were eroded by their contradiction of Nature and/or of their previous statements. Some academics funded by government have placed themselves in a position of public ridicule.

Copies of this report are being sent to Australians whose actions and claims are discussed herein with opportunity for them to identify, specify and justify any claimed material errors and to provide supporting evidence for claimed errors. I express my regret for any substantial material errors within this report that aims to be comprehensive and accurate in the interests of all Australians.

Contents

PART 1		
	Review of CSIRO report in context	iv
1.	Introduction	1
2.	The UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is corrupt	3
3.	Al Gore’s alarmism is based on corrupt UN IPCC	4
4.	Empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning on climate and human CO2	5
5.	Three frequent major misrepresentations of climate	7
6.	CSIRO and review of CSIRO’s report	8
7.	Why? Motives driving corruption of climate science	11
8.	Consequences of climate corruption	13
9.	Our two core challenges	15
10.	Solutions	15
PART 2		
	Summary review of observations of organisations and individuals funded by government	17
11.	Bureau of Meteorology (BOM)	18
12.	Government-funded organisations, agencies and departments	19
13.	Australian academic activists and advocates	20
14.	The government’s discredited Climate Commission	21
15.	Prominent universities funded by government	22
16.	Prominent national politicians	22
17.	Government-funded ABC radio and TV and The Sydney Morning Herald	23
18.	Nongovernment organisations, NGO’s	25

This report including appendices is available at www.conscious.com.au or directly at www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html

“The time is always right to do what is right” Martin Luther King, Jr



PART 1

Review of CSIRO report in context

1. Introduction

Background

This report was prepared at the invitation of Steve Austin, host on ABC-Radio 612 Brisbane. The invitation and my acceptance are available in Appendix 1a, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1a_EmailReplySteveAustin.pdf

Steve Austin invited a management consultant's review of CSIRO's document entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change*. He specifies that the report is, quote "*The official CSIRO document provided by the head of CSIRO, Dr Megan Clarke. As you know CSIRO¹ had a great number of scientist [sic] contributed to the IPCC report, as Dr Clarke told the National Press Club in Canberra late 2009. I interviewed the Chief Executive of the CSIRO Dr Clarke recently and she made it quite clear that they stood by their research and the data they have provided that supports the general concerns about sea levels rises, shifting climate and water data.*"

My brief from Steve Austin is to, quote: "*Please read through the Australian scientific paper and identify where you believe the CSIRO data has been falsified or is wrong.*"

Work started immediately on reviewing CSIRO's report. My review progressively uncovered ever more disturbing insights into CSIRO and the global warming industry. Investigation eventually led to the inescapable conclusion that Australia's national governance is threatened.

Consequently this report was prepared for all members of Australia's national parliament. It's being posted to each MP via Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation.

This report is being distributed initially to people listed in Appendix 1b, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1b_appendix.pdf

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with, all parts of and appendices to the document entitled CSIROh! To minimise paper and resource usage and to enable readers to easily verify facts, detailed appendices are available electronically since they comprise over 700 pages. Internet links are provided.

My background and declaration of personal interests are available in Appendix 1c here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1c_appendix.pdf

My tertiary education qualifications are similar to those of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) Chairman, Dr. Rajendra Pachauri. My rigorous statutory qualifications and past statutory responsibilities for the lives of hundreds of people are based on my knowledge of atmospheric gases including carbon dioxide (CO₂).

Various definitions and comments on the scientific process, science's purpose, and Nature are available in Appendix 1d, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1d_appendix.pdf

1

Australia's government-funded Commonwealth Scientific and Industry Research Organisation

Dedication and acknowledgments are listed in Appendix 1e, here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/1e_appendix.pdf

CSIRO's misrepresentations are so alarming that before presenting my analysis it's necessary to provide context. The pain of discovering the truth about an Aussie science icon is deeply disturbing. CSIRO developed a justifiably proud reputation over many decades and contains many fine, dedicated scientists and people across disciplines. Why though does CSIRO corrupt science? Why does CSIRO's executive management contradict empirical scientific evidence? What does it reveal about Australian national governance?

Methodically using solid data, sound analysis and considered judgment to analyse CSIRO identifies core issues. Understanding gives birth to solutions that provide hope and reassurance. We can convert despair to celebration of the human spirit and use this huge opportunity to secure a far wealthier and fairer future in Australia.

Executive Summary

CSIRO executives provided written responses to my requests for empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused Earth's latest modest global atmospheric warming period². In their responses CSIRO's Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark and CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment Dr. Andrew Johnson both failed to provide any such evidence. Their responses and CSIRO's report entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* (released in October, 2009) repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence³. Responses from CSIRO executives and CSIRO's report to media and the public do not contain the necessary logical scientific reasoning for the claim that human carbon dioxide (CO₂) caused global warming (aka climate change). (Appendices 6 and 6a)

CSIRO's report grossly misrepresents science, climate and Nature. Its structure and bias mislead the public to support the government's tax on carbon dioxide (CO₂). Yet CSIRO Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark provided the report to Steve Austin as reportedly the official CSIRO document that she stood by. (Refer Appendix 1a.)

Analysis of CSIRO comments, behaviour and publications reveal that on the topic of climate, CSIRO is unscientific and blatantly political. In advocating government policy it contradicts empirical scientific evidence. CSIRO has no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused warming (aka climate change).

CSIRO has many fine people and a proud heritage. In areas outside climate it appears to have capability and credibility. That is threatened by CSIRO's politicisation.

Speaking at United Nations (UN) conferences, CSIRO scientists use taxpayer funds to advocate for global governance. This is consistent with CSIRO's actions supporting implementation of UN Agenda 21, the UN's campaign pushing global governance. It bypassed Australia's parliament and people and threatens Australia's sovereignty and our personal freedoms.

² That period ended in 1998.

³ Similar requests were made to agencies funded by taxpayers and to the nine most prominent Australian academics advocating that unusual global warming occurred and was due to human CO₂. Most responded. All failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning. All are funded by government. (Part 2, Appendix 9)

Research raises questions about conflicts of interest among CSIRO's executives.

In good faith the people of Australia are funding CSIRO to provide science. The CSIRO though is using that money to misrepresent science. That misrepresentation assisted passage through parliament of the government's deceitful tax on carbon dioxide (CO₂) based on a lie. Taxpayer funds are being misappropriated to plunder more tax from Australians via an open-ended upward-ratcheting tax designed to be repeatedly and sharply raised. Extensive research reveals that Australia's national governance has been undermined and taxation is used as plunder to control people.

People now serve governments when governments should be serving people.

Solutions for restoring governance are offered.

2. The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is corrupt

CSIRO scientists are deeply enmeshed in producing corrupt UN IPCC reports. They act as contributing scientists of various rank, have papers referenced and presumably act as reviewers. CSIRO endorses UN IPCC reports despite those reports being demonstrably corrupt and pushing a political agenda.

All four UN IPCC reports to national governments and media—1990, 1995, 2001 and 2007—contradict empirical scientific evidence and provide no logical scientific reasoning for their core claim that human CO₂ caused, causes or will cause global warming.

The corruption is pervasive, systemic and driven by a political agenda to achieve a political outcome.

Specific details are in Appendix 2, available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/2_AppendixIPCC.pdf

Key conclusions include:

- **The body of the August 2010 report by the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) comprehensively condemned UN IPCC processes and procedures. It exposed many concerns including conflicts of interest;**
- The UN IPCC has no empirical scientific evidence for its core claim of warming by human CO₂ (see Appendix 2);
- Each of the UN IPCC's four reports to national governments and media is based on an unscientific falsity. The UN IPCC uses propaganda techniques;

- Prominent independent scientists including UN IPCC contributing scientists and at least one Lead Author condemn the UN IPCC as unscientific and / or dishonest;
- There is no scientific consensus claiming warming by human CO₂;
- **UN IPCC contributors and officials have corrupted, bypassed and at times prevented scientific peer-review. As a method of quality assurance, the process of peer-review is now worthless;**
- UN IPCC guidelines require the science to be modified to suit the politics;
- UN IPCC data on its reporting processes reveals that the UN IPCC is unscientific;
- The UN IPCC's rot starts at the top with conflicts of financial and other interests;
- Significant chapters and parts of UN IPCC reports are written by junior scientists and by political activists, ideologues and extremists funded by foundations with close connections to international bankers pushing global governance;
- The UN IPCC originated in the corrupt United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) having a record of contradicting empirical scientific evidence and hurting humanity. UNEP policies have led to the deaths of more than 40 million people. The UN IPCC extended and deepened UNEP's methods of corrupting science;
- So-called *climate science* was settled politically before the science even started;
- UN IPCC reporting strategy deceptively misled key people;
- UN IPCC uses and relies on big tobacco's tactics and methods to confuse.

The UN IPCC's unfounded core claim about human CO₂ is part of UN Agenda 21 campaign for global governance.

UN IPCC reports are admitted by senior ALP and Greens leaders to be the basis of those parties' climate policies.

3. Al Gore's alarmism is based on corrupt UN IPCC

Specific supporting points are documented in Appendix 3, available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/3_AppendixAlGore.pdf

The British High Court ruled in 2007 that Al Gore's movie entitled *An Inconvenient Truth* is a political work containing many factual inaccuracies. Independent quantitative analyses of the movie and book of the same name reveal they contain: 19 Wrong statements or false statements; 17 Misleading statements; 10 Exaggerated statements; 25 One sided statements; 28 Speculative statements; 234 images of natural and everyday events falsely depicted as unnatural and implied to be caused by global warming; 71 images and instances of unscientific, unfounded mixing of projections with actual data to falsely fabricate future climate; 59 instances of comments / images out of context or misrepresenting reality; 74 instances of using the crowd effect; 35 major errors on climate alone; and, ZERO empirical scientific data supporting the movie's core claim that human production of CO₂ drives global temperature and climate. The movie fabricated the unfounded concept of a *Tipping Point* in climate yet never specified any basis for determining the point.

Al Gore's Hollywood produced movie contradicts empirical scientific evidence. It's packed with falsities and misrepresents climate and science. It's ideologically driven political propaganda. It uses Hollywood propaganda techniques to carefully, subtly, calculatedly and emotionally demonise opponents.

It silenced dissent by making it shameful to disagree with its falsely fabricated and unscientific claim and its conjured non-existent scientific consensus.

It emotionally entrenched unfounded climate alarm. It was silent on Al Gore's extensive conflicts of financial interest that included the Chicago Climate Exchange in which his company Generation Investment Management was the fifth largest shareholder. The movie laid the foundation for cap-and-trade that falsely purports to be market driven. It's a ration-and-tax scheme centrally controlled by global organisations. Al Gore is a beneficiary. Doesn't that make his actions fraudulent?

Al Gore has publicly pushed for global governance to tackle his unfounded crisis.

4. Empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning on climate and human CO2

Specific supporting points are documented in Appendix 4, available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/4_AppendixBasicQuestions.pdf

To honestly advocate cutting human production of CO2 based on global warming (aka climate change), ALL four basic questions need to be answered yes:

1. Is global ATMOSPHERIC⁴ temperature warming unusually in either amount or rate and is it continuing to rise?
2. Does the level of carbon dioxide (CO2) in air control or determine Earth's temperature?
3. Does human CO2 production determine the level of CO2 in air?
4. Is warming catastrophic or even damaging?

A foundation of science is logical scientific reasoning proving or disproving causal relationships. The core and ultimate arbiter of science is scientifically measured repeatable empirical evidence. It provides answers to all four questions. Logically, only one negative answer ends claims to cut CO2 to avert catastrophe. Empirical scientific evidence answers all four negatively:

1. Global atmospheric temperatures peaked in 1998. Temperatures have since been flat with every year since colder than in 1998. Since the start of atmospheric temperature measurement in 1958 temperatures cooled slightly from 1958 to 1976. A sudden small

4

The UN IPCC claims its greenhouse gas supposition is an atmospheric effect.

step change known as the Great Pacific Climate Shift occurred in one year, 1976. Temperatures very slightly increased to 1998. Temperatures have since been flat with the possible start of a cooling trend in 2006. CSIRO and the UN IPCC use ground-based temperature measurements that are corrupted and unscientifically manipulated. Rural ground-based temperatures uncorrupted by urban heat sources reveal no net change since 1890 with modest cyclic cooling, warming, cooling, warming, stasis;

2. **Carbon dioxide (CO2) levels in air are a consequence of temperature, not a cause.** This is the reverse of UN IPCC, CSIRO and government claims. It applies throughout Earth's history and over every duration. It's true seasonally and long-term;
3. Nature alone determines levels of CO2 in air. This is the reverse of UN IPCC, CSIRO and government claims. It means that cutting or increasing human CO2 production cannot affect CO2 levels in air. It's useless to cut human CO2 production;
4. Warmer periods in Earth's history are highly beneficial to people, humanity, civilisation and the natural environment. This is the opposite of UN IPCC, CSIRO and government claims. Warmer periods are scientifically classified as *optimums*.

All four core claims or implied claims by the government, UN IPCC and CSIRO are false and contradict empirical scientific evidence. Logical scientific reasoning and empirical scientific evidence proves human CO2 cannot affect global warming.

Empirical scientific evidence and discussion in Appendix 4 reveals corruption of ground-based temperature data and of CO2 data used by the UN IPCC and CSIRO.

The atmosphere is not warming, much less unusually. Fluctuations since 1958 reveal modest natural cyclic temperature variation. Ground-based rural measurements reveal the same since 1890. Appendix 4 discusses the strongest natural factors proven by empirical scientific evidence to control global climate. They are El Nino, La Nina and other regional ocean-atmosphere decadal cycles. Scientists have identified many factors driving climate. These include galactic, solar system, solar, planetary and lunar cycles ranging from 150 million years to 11 years. Strong drivers include:

- Solar: (1) variations in sun's solar output; (2) Output of solar particles; (3) Sun's magnetic field polarity and strength;
- Water vapour: (1) atmospheric water content; (2) Cloud cover;
- Cyclic regional decadal circulation patterns such as North American Oscillation and the southern Pacific ocean's El Nino together with their variation over time;
- Ocean: (1) temperature; (2) salinity; (3) currents; (4) sea surface temperatures;
- Volcanic activity.

These are either omitted from, or downplayed in erroneous unvalidated computerised numerical models used by the UN IPCC and CSIRO. Model projections contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Empirical data reveal no changes in trends of weather events, sea levels, ocean alkalinity, diseases, species survival and no threat to Aussie icons

Please refer to empirical scientific evidence presented in Appendix 4a revealing no changes in frequency or severity of weather events.

CSIRO and the closely connected UN IPCC contradict empirical scientific evidence to falsely misrepresent science, climate and Nature by projecting unfounded future catastrophic changes.

Empirical scientific evidence and discussion in Appendix 4a is available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/4a_AppendixEmpiricalData.pdf

Is the rooster crowing at sunrise evidence that the rooster causes the sun to rise⁵? No.

5. Three frequent major misrepresentations of climate

Understanding empirical scientific evidence combined with observations documented in Appendix 5 enables easy identification of three frequent, major misrepresentations of climate, science and Nature. These are:

1. Human CO₂ controls and determines global temperature and climate. False;
2. There is an overwhelming consensus of scientists supporting that claim. False;
3. Catastrophic consequences will result at some unspecified future date from human disruption of global climate: sea level rise, extreme weather, floods, drought, snowfall, fires, ocean pH (alkalinity), disease, species extinction, ... All false.

CSIRO publications and claims have included all three misrepresentations.

Specific supporting points are documented in Appendix 5, available here:
www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/5_AppendixMassiveMisrepresentations.pdf

Appendix 19 currently simply provides a summary of views on the supposed greenhouse effect of back-radiation central to UN IPCC and CSIRO claims that human CO₂ warms the planet. Appendix 19 is available here.

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/19_Appendix.pdf

6. CSIRO and review of CSIRO's report

My conclusions on CSIRO are based on: (1) correspondence with CSIRO's Chief Executive Dr. Megan Clark and CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment Dr. Andrew Johnson; (2) extensive analysis and research of CSIRO reports by me and by Graham Williamson; (3) reading of publicly available material; and (4) publications by and communication with former CSIRO scientists including former chief research scientist with the CSIRO division of atmospheric research, Professor Garth Paltridge.

They're documented in Appendix 6, available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/6_AppendixCSIRO.pdf

My conclusions on CSIRO are that:

- Written responses from CSIRO Chief Executive and CSIRO Group Executive—Environment reveal that neither have empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 affects global climate. On all four basic climate questions (Section 4, above), CSIRO and its executives contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- CSIRO relies on projections from unvalidated computerised numerical models already proven wrong by contradicting empirical scientific evidence;
- In his replies, CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment has twice failed to refute my specific conclusion that CSIRO documents and references he provided contain no supporting empirical evidence or logical scientific reasoning;
- CSIRO, its executives and reports falsely claim human CO2 drives global climate;
- CSIRO and its executives propagate all three major misrepresentations of climate;
- **Chief Executive is a former director of international banking firm Rothschilds Australia and is currently on the Advisory Board of major international banking firm Bank of America Merrill Lynch. (Appendix 6). International banking firms will profit enormously from trading in CO2 credits. This relationship raises perceptions and questions about the opportunity for conflicts of interest;**
- CSIRO scientists are enmeshed in discredited UN IPCC reports and procedures;
- CSIRO endorses and supports the corrupt UN IPCC. Thus CSIRO endorses corruption of science;
- CSIRO has thereby ceded sovereignty over Australian science to an unscientific and corrupt foreign political organisation pushing a global political agenda;
- CSIRO is thus abetting systemic and pervasive documented corruption of science;
- **Scientists paid by taxpayers advocate global governance at overseas conferences;**
- CSIRO's Group Executive—Environment is aware of the Inter Academy Council's (IAC) August 2010 review of the UN IPCC. Yet CSIRO has not withdrawn support for the UN IPCC despite the body of the IAC report revealing crippling deficiencies in UN IPCC processes and procedures;
- **CSIRO is supporting implementation of UN Agenda 21, the greatest threat to Australian sovereignty;**
- CSIRO is heavily dependent on government funding and is a politicised advocate for government policy;
- On climate, CSIRO is political, not scientific. It's destroying science;

- CSIRO scientists are driven into political advocacy;
- Within Australia, CSIRO scientists act as political advocates;
- CSIRO's glossy print and website brochures are not objective and not scientific. They merely advocate the 'alarmist' or 'political' view on climate;
- Activists are involved in CSIRO climate publications contradicting reality;
- CSIRO climate reports reveal traits of carefully constructed propaganda;
- CSIRO's culture has led to formal complaints of bullying;
- CSIRO is now not focused on science. This is hurting its effectiveness in industry;
- The international and Australian scientific community is in revolt at CSIRO's destruction of climate science;
- CSIRO's dominant position enables its views to control and manipulate other Australian scientific institutions including universities;
- Undermining science by short-term political agenda will hurt politicians;
- CSIRO's false claims have influenced public opinion and policy to the detriment of many people, communities, research institutes, state governments, local councils and other groups affected by CSIRO misrepresentation of climate.

I conclude that CSIRO has misled the media. Through the National Press Club and media, CSIRO misled the people and parliament of Australia. CSIRO has been actively engaged in UN IPCC corruption of climate and science.

Management consultant's analysis of *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* as requested

Your request, Steve, for a report on CSIRO's "*climate change scientific theory*" is in respect to climate science. Thus my review of CSIRO's glossy booklet entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* is restricted to comments on its pages 2-11. I do not comment on CSIRO's work on alternative energy and other topics discussed in the booklet's subsequent pages.


Analysis of CSIRO'S document reveals it contains no empirical scientific evidence or any logical scientific reasoning for the claim that human CO2 caused global warming. The document repeatedly contradicts empirical scientific evidence and misrepresents science, climate and Nature.

Statements in *The Science of Tackling Climate Change* were analysed and classified into one of six categories. Although many statements could have been categorised into multiple categories each CSIRO statement was assigned only one category. eg, a statement could be false, unfounded, contradict empirical scientific evidence and falsely blame human CO2 yet was assigned to only one category.

Appendix 6a presents detailed analysis of the CSIRO document. It includes justification for each statement's categorisation. Please check and assess for yourself, here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/6a_AppendixTheScienceOfTacklingClimateChange.pdf

My experience is in providing a specialised management and leadership service internationally to people of varied education and backgrounds. Experience reveals that data is often most effectively presented graphically for easy and rapid analysis, interpretation and summary.

This is the summary of CSIRO statements on pages 2-11 of its booklet entitled *The Science of Tackling Climate Change*.



CSIRO contradicts empirical scientific evidence and relies instead on unvalidated computerised numerical models contradicting empirical scientific evidence and proven to be wrong.

The Foreword by Dr. Andrew Johnson and the succeeding ten pages (numbered 2-11) contain many misrepresentations of science and climate.

Significantly, in the page discussing climate alarm's biggest unfounded scare—projected future sea levels—CSIRO makes 12 statements contradicting empirical scientific evidence. That was followed by the page discussing temperature and climate projections with ten contradictions of empirical scientific evidence.

CSIRO knows how to scare people. The CSIRO report's relatively short script is crammed with misrepresentations. Yet it has no empirical scientific evidence of human causation and often contradicts empirical scientific evidence. Why?

A sixteen year-old student's science report similar in quality to CSIRO's glossy booklet would fail for absence of scientific reasoning of causation and for contradicting empirical scientific evidence. A financial prospectus of the standard set by CSIRO's brochure would lead to investigation by authorities. I conclude that CSIRO's report is unscientific, misleading and deceptive. It's corruption of science.

CSIRO's glossy booklet is a cocktail of falsities, contradictions of empirical scientific evidence and unsubstantiated implied conclusions based on low levels of understanding. Section 3 of Appendix 6 quotes from, references and discusses correspondence from CSIRO senior executives. Contrary to claims by CSIRO's

Group Executive—Environment, the list of references he separately provided for the CSIRO document contains no empirical scientific evidence for his false core claim that human CO2 caused/causes/will cause global warming.

Why then did so many people initially fall for and then help spread the unfounded claim that human CO2 would catastrophically warm our planet? To understand corruption of climate science needs more than empirical scientific evidence. It requires understanding motives pushing corruption of climate science.

7. Why? Motives driving corruption of climate science

The forty-year campaign inventing and fabricating unfounded global warming (aka climate change) shares strategies, tactics, methods and goals with another prominent international scam: the forty year campaign by international bankers to create and own the American Federal Reserve Bank. The Fed controls America. It's not an American government department. It's privately owned by an alliance of European and American banks. The Bank of England is privately owned.

This conclusion is based on many independent reference books documenting events and facts associated with a concerted push for unelected global governance. They're cited in Appendix 14 available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/14_Appendix.pdf

Ellen Hodgson Brown's book *The Web of Debt* is highly recommended. Books referenced by Matt Ridley and Robert Zubrin are also highly recommended. See <http://booko.com.au/>

Appendix 14 reveals that the main pushers of unfounded climate alarm and corruption of science are international bankers seeking to make money for nothing by trading CO2 credits. They seek to magnify that using derivatives.

Understandably many informed people consider the climate scam to be history's worst. It's not. It's merely the third worst deceit of modern times.

It joins the second worst deceit: international bankers' money fraud creating currency as debt out of nothing. Our fiat money is not backed by anything. If citizens behaved as do international bankers we would be gaoled for counterfeiting and fraud.

Appendix 14 documents UN corruption of climate science as one part of its deceitful UN Agenda 21 campaign. It aims to remove people's private property rights and to control land, water, air, space, resource allocation, finance and energy. It's part of a deceitful push for global governance and control. This is clear and widely documented. It's based on antihuman ideology.

The late Henry Lamb provides an outstanding summary of international bankers pushing global control via UN agencies.

<http://shelf3d.com/Search/The%2BRise%2Bof%2BGlobal%2BGovernance%2BPlaylistIDPLKjJE86mQRtsd2abcjQkgq4uw-H5MLvMa>

Antihuman ideology is the worst deceit of modern times. During the last century it caused hundreds of millions of deaths. It's driven by international bankers pushing global governance using antihuman fabrications contradicting empirical scientific evidence. (Appendix 14)

Appendix 14 reveals the core problem: government control over people. It pushes tax plunder costing every Australian family thousands of dollars each year. Australian Taxation Office Deputy Commissioner Jim Killaly revealed in 1996, quote: "Since 1953 Multinationals have paid little or no tax." He reinforced it in 2010.

Each week the typical Australian works from Monday to smoko on Thursday (3.4 days) to pay government taxes, fees, rates, levees ...

Foreign companies use infrastructure funded by Australian families and small businesses yet they pay less than 10% of Australia's tax. That's not a fair go. We now face another tax. It's an open-ended upward-ratcheting tax on CO2. The government admits it's designed to be dramatically raised in future to cause pain to change people's behaviour. Growing central control within Australia and globally is hurting Aussie families. It's threatening our nation's existence, people's security and our children's future.

In good faith the people of Australia are funding CSIRO to provide science. The CSIRO though is using that money to misrepresent science. That misrepresentation and others by taxpayer-funded advocates and the Prime Minister's broken pre-election promise assisted the government's deceitful tax on carbon dioxide (CO2) to pass through parliament. (Appendices 9 and 12). Taxpayer funds are being misappropriated to plunder more tax from Australians.

Exposing the international bankers' scams raises enormous opportunities for Australians to increase national and personal wealth and to restore freedom.

This report could trigger typical responses from those pushing, supporting, hiding or benefitting from corrupting climate science. Some are listed in Appendix 14, Section 20.

8. Consequences of climate corruption

Appendix 16 documents enormous direct and indirect costs of unfounded climate alarm. It reveals that international bankers are the greatest global environmental and humanitarian threat. Other threats include enormous economic and social costs to Australian families as listed. Corruption driving unfounded climate alarm is significant and extends across society at huge cost to Australians.

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is not a pollutant. Focusing on a non-problem diverts valuable time, attention, money, research, energy and resources away from cutting toxins and stopping real pollution. Appendices reveal that climate alarm is one of the greatest threats to the global environment. We need to drop unfounded climate alarm and return to cutting real land, air and water pollution.

Consider the advocates' financial and personal interests. Consider the behaviour of CSIRO, academics and politicians contradicting empirical scientific evidence in falsely advocating that human CO₂ drives global climate. Their public work reveals characteristics of political advocacy. CSIRO's climate advocacy is destroying its scientific reputation. They've placed themselves in a position of being perceived as compromised. I do not trust their claims, statements or intent.

Appendix 16 is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/16_appendix.pdf

Part 2 discusses other groups funded by government and pushing unfounded climate alarm and advocating taxing and/or trading CO₂. During investigations of climate advocacy within government-funded organisations a small group of Australian academics identified itself through recurrence of their names within and across organisations. Some names recurred more often and/or more significantly than did others. Two were most prominent: David Karoly and Will Steffen. Both staunchly publicly advocate government policy cutting human CO₂ production.

To illustrate this linkage across government-funded organisations, consider David Karoly's publicly reported interactions and links. Reportedly, he:

- is linked with many CSIRO staff as a co-author of papers cited by the UN IPCC and as a UN IPCC contributor;
- holds a significant position with the BOM;
- admits receiving payments from the government's Department of Climate Change;
- is a member of the Science Advisory Panel of WWF, a politicised activist organisation corrupting climate science and pushing global governance;
- is a member of the working group that produced the Australian Academy of Science's unscientific booklet funded by the Department of Climate Change;
- is a member of the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel funded by the Department of Climate Change;
- is arguably the most senior UN IPCC contributor to its core claim that human CO₂ caused global warming. He is a Lead Author and Review Editor of the sole chapter making that claim in the 2001 and 2007 reports respectively and draft writer of the 2007 Summary for Policymakers given to media and politicians worldwide;

- features prominently in ABC broadcasts misrepresenting climate science;
- is employed as a professor at a prominent Australian university receiving government grants for studying climate;
- receives government grants including a federal government grant in 2006 of \$1.9 million to study, quote “detection and attribution of climate change”. That was given after closure of the UN IPCC report that supposedly presented what politicians and academics misrepresented as the ‘settled science’;
- makes unfounded claims following natural weather events. Such claims are presented as expert comment yet contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- reinforces publicly all three major climate misrepresentations;
- is connected with several self-interested global organisations including some pushing global governance and control;
- is connected directly or indirectly with most academics listed in section 13 and Appendix 9.

Why are prominent professors sceptical of the claim that human CO2 caused warming excluded from government-funded positions and broadcasts? Why are the opinions of eminent scientists such as Ian Plimer, Bob Carter, Garth Paltridge, Stewart Franks and Bill Kininmonth excluded? Is it because they’re scientists of the real world and rely on empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning? Why are they excluded in favour of scientists relying on unvalidated erroneous computerised numerical models and contradicting empirical scientific evidence?

The government’s obvious bias raises broader issues. Through awarding grants reportedly heavily biased in favour of climate alarm is government pushing scientists to restrict research of sceptic views or to be advocates? How can individual scientists independently explore Nature when one of the consequences seems to be loss of scientific independence and objectivity?

Why does government make appointments to its bodies from a tight-knit, small clique of people. Why exclude those who factually challenge the unfounded claim that human CO2 caused Earth’s latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming period that ended in 1998? Can objectivity come from a small group funded by any self-interested government and contradicting empirical scientific evidence?

It triggers the question: is there a tight-knit cabal spreading alarm within the global warming *industry*?

Appendix 20 is set aside for the future.

9. Our two core challenges

Appendix 17 reveals the two greatest problems we face: (1) the stifling control of socialist over-government and, (2) its driver, the Human Condition or ego. The ego is underlain by fear that triggers guilt and greed. It manifests as a grab for power by manipulating to control.

The push for global governance is Australia's most severe threat. Taxation has become plunder. Private land and property rights and freedom are being stolen. Government funding enables destructive, costly direct and indirect control of people. Our inherent care and trust are manipulated and used against us.

Details are provided in Appendix 17 available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/17_appendix.pdf

When people seek to control, it's revealing because always beneath control is fear. Control often masks weakness.

10. Solutions

Appendix 18 acknowledges that government's fundamental duty is to protect life and protect property.

Democratic governments are formed BY the people to serve the people. Today though, government plunders and controls the people to serve government.

How can excess government control by egotistical manipulators be minimised?

Appendix 18 provides information on systemic and personal changes to restore freedom and efficiency. It enables greater environmental and humanitarian care:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/18_appendix.pdf

Useful reports do more than list serious problems. They offer constructive solutions for consideration. This report offers the following:

- Follow due process restoring governance consistent with our country's constitution;
- Instil direct democracy via Citizens Initiated Referenda proven by the Swiss to raise political accountability, stability, creativity, efficiency and environmental care;
- Exit the corrupt UN immediately;
- Introduce a simple transaction tax whose rate is determined and modified by voters in referenda. It would replace all other taxes and be levied by states with some revenue apportioned to a national government with vastly reduced responsibilities. Restore Australia's federation;

- Cap government expenditure using caps set by the people using direct democracy;
- Restore freedom of speech;
- Eliminate regulations across the board to enable citizens to live freely and to stimulate creativity needed to improve environmental protection and efficiency;
- Restore honest currency to replace fiat money currently issued as debt with no tangible backing and of no inherent value;
- Unshackle education from government control to enable creativity and responsibility to flourish and to improve teacher satisfaction and salaries;
- Remove science from government control after an impartial investigation of CSRIO and BOM and of grants awarded to institutions claiming unfounded climate alarm. Require funds to be repaid to taxpayers;
- Recharge Australian industry by providing fairness through fair trade;
- Allow ideas and people to emerge in response to our country's needs. Twenty two million Aussies will detail solutions to the mess made by international bankers;
- Give compassion to those trying to control. Giving compassion benefits givers too;
- Celebrate and appreciate the wonderful reality of humanity and Nature.

First step to freedom

The depth of corruption shocked me. People use many methods to control others. These include: overthrowing nations, fraudulently creating money as debt out of nothing, using camouflage such as *sustainability* and *biodiversity* for stealing land, smearing, corruptly fomenting unfounded alarm, lying, manipulating, making unlawful regulations and stealing money under false pretences. Those seeking to control others are desperate. They're in pain and in fear. People corrupting science and people using antihuman ideology to push global governance are misguided or misinformed.

We cannot condone their damaging control. Yet blaming them will not assist. To prevent recurrence we need to understand. That requires avoiding value judgments that cloud our minds and hearts and drive us to control. (Appendix 18) Forsaking ego-driven value judgments enables true forgiveness that clears our minds and hearts. It brings us peace and real freedom regardless of events.

We're all doing the best we can. By not making value judgments about others we can truly forgive. With real freedom's inner clarity we are conscious of core issues as a basis for taking effective action to free people.

International bankers' antihuman strategies have been choking nations worldwide—from Africa to Australia—for centuries. Despite an estimated \$100 billion spent on climate science, media and propaganda, people worldwide are seeing through the scam. We've earned our freedom from international bankers' greed.

Australians can restore integrity and return to having the world's highest per capita income, securing our nation and securing a future for our children.

STOP INSANITY | RESTORE HUMANITY

A close-up photograph of a vibrant green tree frog with yellow-orange underparts, perched on a patch of green grass. The background is a soft, out-of-focus green, suggesting a natural outdoor setting. A semi-transparent dark green rectangular box is overlaid on the upper right portion of the image, containing the title and subtitle text.

PART 2

Summary review of observations
of organisations and individuals
funded by government

11. Bureau of Meteorology (BOM)

Correspondence with BOM executives and comments about BOM's claims are documented in Appendix 7, available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/7_appendix.pdf

My conclusions on BOM are that:

- In his response to my requests for empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 caused warming, the BOM's head failed to provide evidence. He merely claimed such evidence exists. His statement is false;
- BOM cites and relies upon a nonexistent scientific consensus, an unscientific term;
- The head of BOM cites a joint BOM-CSIRO report implying evidence. Yet that report contains no empirical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused warming. It relies on prior false assumptions, presumably in UN IPCC reports that falsely claim human CO2 caused warming;
- BOM makes false claims about human CO2 causing climate change;
- BOM cites, relies upon and endorses UN IPCC corruption;
- BOM has failed to do its due diligence on UN IPCC climate claims and thereby ceded Australian sovereignty on climate science;
- BOM's climate reports misrepresent climate, science and Nature;
- BOM is funded by government;
- BOM's climate advocacy appears to allow public misrepresentations to go unchecked;
- BOM contributes to World Meteorological Organisation reports contradicting empirical scientific evidence and falsely claiming human CO2 changes climate;
- BOM's reputation on climate is tarnished by inaccurate work revealed by Australian and international scientists.

12. Government-funded organisations, agencies and departments

Correspondence with Australian Academy of Science executives and details about interactions with the Academy are documented in Appendix 8. These are combined with experience and/or investigations of other agencies, available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/8_appendix.pdf

My conclusions are:

- In his response to my request for empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO₂ caused warming the Academy's Science Policy Manager failed to provide such evidence. He falsely claimed such evidence exists and provided 30 references that he said contain the evidence sought. Checking every reference revealed no empirical evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming. All were references cited in the Academy's glossy flagship climate booklet falsely implying global warming due to human CO₂. My detailed formal complaint to The Academy's President, Professor Suzanne Cory, a CSIRO board member, produced no response. Was it coincidence that the Academy's booklet emerged around the time that the Inter Academy Council's report damned UN IPCC processes and procedures? (Appendix 8 provides details)
- Government funds the Academy. Its glossy flagship climate booklet was commissioned and funded by the Department of Climate Change. The Academy and its booklet repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence and falsely imply human CO₂ caused global warming. It's not scientific, it's propaganda;
- The Academy has close ties with the UN IPCC and CSIRO;
- Another organisation funded by government is the office of Australia's Chief Scientist. My request to the Chief Scientist for empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming failed to provide any evidence. The Chief Scientist falsely publicly advocates that human CO₂ needs to be cut;
- The Chief Scientist's office makes fundamental errors in misrepresenting climate science, contradicting empirical scientific evidence and failing to do its due diligence;
- The Chief Scientist is funded by government;
- Another organisation with no evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming (aka climate change) is the government's Department of Climate Change. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence and misrepresents climate;
- National academies around the world have no evidence that human CO₂ caused warming. The body of the August 2010 report from the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) comprehensively condemned UN IPCC processes and procedures. It exposed many serious issues including conflicts of interest. Despite having no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming and without members' consent, the executives of some academies endorsed their government's policy. Members of some academies have censured executives for that position and forced a more honest appraisal of science effectively admitting the lack of evidence;

- There are no organisations overseas with evidence that human CO2 caused warming. NASA affiliates condemn NASA's rogue Goddard Institute of Space Studies (GISS) for its climate advocacy and corruption. James Hansen leads GISS's position. Both he and GISS have repeatedly contradicted empirical scientific evidence. Both lack evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Government funds NASA-GISS's corruption of climate science;
- The American government's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) provides no empirical scientific evidence for the claim that human CO2 caused warming. It's implied statements contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- America's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is similar. Beyond climate, its corrupt antihuman policies contradicting empirical scientific evidence have helped to cause millions of third-world deaths. (Appendices 8 and 14);
- Britain's infamous Stern Review has no evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Yet it recommended a policy of severely cutting human CO2. Its methods have been debunked scientifically, economically and statistically. It contradicts known principles in all three disciplines and contradicts empirical scientific evidence. The Stern Review has been comprehensively exposed for its disgraceful unscientific advocacy on behalf of Tony Blair's government;
- These agencies make all three misrepresentations of climate.

13. Australian academic activists and advocates

During recent years I contacted all nine most prominent Australian academics who claim that human CO2 causes global warming (aka climate change). I asked them to provide empirical scientific evidence for their claim. Most responded. All failed to provide evidence. Analysis of their statements and behaviour is in Appendix 9 available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/9_appendix.pdf

The nine are professors: David Karoly, Tim Flannery, Will Steffen, Ross Garnaut, Lesley Hughes, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Kurt Lambeck, Matthew England and Andy Pitman. They share the following traits:

- All failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 causes global warming. All contradict empirical scientific evidence;
- All are funded by government;
- Additionally, almost all have prominent government-paid positions;
- Some receive additional payments from political activists pushing global governance;
- Many have working associations with CSIRO;
- The UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies extensively on papers written or co-written by seven of these academic advocates;

- The majority contribute to UN IPCC reports;
- All failed to disclose their personal financial interests associated with their claims;
- All misrepresent climate science;
- Some have falsely smeared those who disagree with their claims or view;
- Some are associated with organisations pushing global control;
- Ross Garnaut is reportedly a member of the Trilateral Commission. Appendix 14;
- Two thirds are connected with or depend on the government's discredited Climate Commission for their careers and financial income.

A tenth academic who I've not contacted and whose work is discussed briefly in Appendix 9 is Stefan Lewandowsky. Reportedly, quote: "*Lewandowsky gets \$1.7m of taxpayer funds to denigrate people who disagree with him*". I conclude that if true such a taxpayer-funded approach is a threat to science and to free expression.

The academics' behaviour produces many serious questions and consequences discussed in Appendix 9.

14. The government's discredited Climate Commission

Analysis of the Climate Commission is in Appendix 10 available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/10_appendix.pdf

Climate Commission members and reports contradict empirical scientific evidence and provide no logical scientific evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Members and reports fabricate, exaggerate and project unfounded catastrophe and spread all three major misrepresentations of climate science discussed in Part 1, Section 5 and in Appendix 5. The Climate Commission has become the subject of ridicule after wild exaggerations, alarmist statements and contradictions by members, particularly the Chief Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery. The Climate Commission is not scientific, it's political. It displays traits of propaganda. It corrupts science.

Given politicians' (false) statements that thousands of scientists support the government's claim about CO2, why are so many positions handed to the same small cabal of academics? There seems to be a wider cabal of academics supporting government policy who move among boards of government-funded agencies, universities, NGO's and like-minded organisations capturing taxpayer funds.

15. Prominent universities funded by government

Analysis of prominent Australian universities is in Appendix 11 available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/11_appendix.pdf

As a result of their government dependency and high public profile some universities appear locked into operating in a way that supports government's agenda. That support appears to be in the form of comments supporting the political agenda and discrediting those with opposing views. The University of New South Wales, University of Melbourne, University of Queensland and the Australian National University all vigorously promote the claim that human CO2 caused global warming. All universities claiming human CO2 causes global warming lack any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for their claim. All contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Prominent universities in Britain and America known to be closely associated with the global warming *industry* have failed to transparently and independently investigate complaints of serious corruption, including complaints referred by British parliament. My complaints to the Universities of Queensland and Melbourne about behaviour and/or ethics were lightly dismissed.

Section Appendix 9 reveals that a university academic reportedly received '\$1.7m of taxpayer funds to denigrate people who disagree with him'.

What is happening at universities with taxpayer funds?

16. Prominent national politicians

Appendix 12 contains detailed analysis of correspondence with prominent Australian politicians. It provides analysis of their statements and behaviour and is available here: www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/12_appendix.pdf

Prominent politicians advocating cutting human CO2 have no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning that human CO2 caused global warming. They contradict empirical scientific evidence.

Prominent Members of Parliament have been provided with empirical scientific evidence and extensive detailed documentation of corruption of climate science. That material has been sent by Registered Post with Delivery Confirmation. Despite this, MPs fail to fulfil their responsibilities.

ALP, Greens and Liberal climate claims are purely political and are corrupt. Of most concern are statements and/or actions of Kevin Rudd, Senator Penny Wong, Greg Combet, Robert McClelland, Julia Gillard, Craig Emerson, Senator Christine

Milne, Bob Brown (retired), Greg Hunt, Malcolm Turnbull, Rob Oakeshott and Tony Windsor. Reasons are provided in Appendix 12. The behaviour and/or comments of some politicians raise serious questions. Are some politicians behaving deceitfully?

Many MPs are reluctant to discuss corruption. The rapidity and ease with which some deflect accountability is of grave concern. Groupthink seems rife. Known sceptics within the federal parliamentary ALP have failed to publicly speak their truth.

MPs were advised that the Gillard-Brown Multi Party Climate Change Committee (MPCCC) recommending that parliament pass the tax on CO2 seems to have been misled by its government-appointed Expert Adviser. MPs seem unconcerned.

Generally, federal politicians have failed to do their due diligence and/or speak their truth effectively. Some politicians have demonstrated integrity yet parliamentary and party systems act to suppress them.

Collusion between Liberals and Labor destroyed farmers' private property rights. Largely through ignorance MPs are ceding Australian sovereignty and destroying Australian industries. This has been occurring for decades. Appendices 12 and 14 discuss the UN's current Agenda 21 campaign stealing private property rights.

Politicians have smashed national governance, undermined Australia's federation and bypassed our constitution.

Some politicians around the world and in Australia reveal strength, due diligence and integrity. In 2012 American state Alabama banned UN Agenda 21 to protect private property rights and the Alabama State constitution.

17. Government-funded ABC radio and TV and The Sydney Morning Herald

Detailed methodical analyses of six Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) programs is in Appendices 13 and 13a-13g accessible here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13_appendix.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13a_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingWorkingTranscript.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13b_AppendixABCBackgroundBriefingNotes.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13c_AppendixQandAClimateDebateWorking.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13d_AppendixMediaWatchTranscriptMarch2011.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13e_AppendixMediaWatchTranscriptMay30-2011.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13f_AppendixCatalystTranscriptWorking.pdf

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/13g_Appendix4CornersTranscriptWorking.pdf

The analyses demonstrate extreme bias in the ABC. On climate, the ABC is demonstrably an advocate for government policy. Some examples include:

- *Media Watch* (TV) purports to hold commercial media accountable. It fails to lead by example with serious misrepresentations implied by smear and innuendo. Its methods are deceitful and damage innocent taxpayers. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence;
- *Catalyst* (TV) program;
- *QandA* (TV) program;
- *Four Corners* (TV) program;
- *Background Briefing* (radio): people interviewed by former Four Corners reporter Wendy Carlisle saw her attempt as a concerted hatchet job on the volunteer⁶ Galileo Movement. Her extreme attempts failed. That confirmed The Galileo Movement as clean and credible. The same cannot be said for her methods. Her ignorance of science is astounding;

The ABC responded to my complaint about *Stateline* (TV). The ABC denies any responsibility for checking the accuracy of people it interviews as supposed climate experts. Yet it repeatedly broadcasts comments from a narrow group of academic advocates funded by government and misrepresenting climate science.

ABC science programs hosted by showmen Robyn Williams and Dr. Karl Kruszelnicki misrepresent climate science and corrupt public understanding of science.

ABC programs repeatedly contradict empirical scientific evidence. None have provided empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning for the ABC's repeated claim that human CO2 caused global warming. The ABC repeatedly broadcasts all three major misrepresentations of climate. Has the ABC failed to do its due diligence or is its swarm of investigative reporters incompetent and/or extremely biased? That so many failed to unearth and expose massive corruption of climate science raises serious questions.

ABC climate bias is extreme and conducted through omission and complicity. In some programs the bias is structural and is advocacy. It's not clear whether the bias across the ABC is cultural or systematic as revealed in the ABC's British sister, the BBC. Taxpayers fund ABC broadcasts of government's misrepresentations. These broadcasts are used to steal more money from taxpayers via the Deceit Tax on CO2.

The ABC is joined in its biased advocacy for government policy by Fairfax newspapers. In August 2012 Sydney Morning Herald (SMH) reporter Mike Carlton falsely smeared two prominent Aussie journalists (Andrew Bolt and Alan Jones), myself as a volunteer and the voluntary Galileo Movement. He falsely implied it's anti-Semitic.

It's not. Both co-founders of The Galileo Movement are intimately connected with Jewish people. Why did Mike Carlton contradict facts to drag into climate reporting a religion and race that has been murderously persecuted for centuries? Why did he need to falsely smear people? Why did he raise conspiracy? Why does he resort to changing the topic? Why does he avoid accountability? Earlier, why did he run from my email of March 8th, 2010 asking him for evidence and reasoning?

6

The author is affiliated with The Galileo Movement

Appendix 14 explains standard responses of climate alarmists lacking evidence and reasoning. It reveals methods typically used to discredit people whose views differ. Appendix 13 explores Mike Carlton's outburst to reveal and illustrate significant lessons. It reveals methods some journalists use without any evidence and contrary to facts to trigger panic and shut debate. They can do so because science has been muddied by corruption and politicisation. It's not '*settled science*'.

Appendix 13 reveals that SMH environmental reporter Ben Cubby fails to report on corruption of climate science. His actions demonstrate his ignorance of science. His stories endorse claims that contradict empirical scientific evidence. They reveal an apparent lack of honest inquiry and desire to hold people accountable for corruption of climate science. This is not accurate news journalism.

The ABC and SMH spread corruption of climate science. They have prevented an Australian public debate on climate science.

Around the same time, a reputable and formerly strong journalist Andrew Bolt admitted his behaviour has been influenced by fear. This demonstrates the power wielded by media and government. It supports growing calls to protect free speech and freedom.

18. Nongovernment organisations, NGO's

Appendix 15 documents deceitful roles played by some nongovernment organisations. It's available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/15_appendix.pdf

NGO's such as WWF and Greenpeace are responsible for corrupting UN IPCC reports. They falsely use and then spread political campaign material as science. Their frequent public claims contradict empirical scientific evidence. WWF is a UN agent pushing global governance and funded by major foundations connected with international bankers. Its antihuman agenda does not protect the environment, it severely damages the environment.

Activists write significant chapters and parts of UN IPCC reports. Their connection with CSIRO and the UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri is documented in Appendix 6.

This report including appendices is available at www.conscious.com.au or directly at www.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html

"The time is always right to do what is right" Martin Luther King, Jr