From: Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Subject: **Fwd: Is this another pseudo-scientist treating the ATO as his ATM?**
Date: 23 February 2011 3:40:47 PM AEST
To: Roberts Malcolm <catalyst@eis.net.au>

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>
> **Date:** 21 February 2011 1:31:03 PM AEST
> **To:** 3 Climate miscellaneous - expert, 3 Climate Realists Aust, 3 Climate Realists overseas, 3 GetUp!, 3 Hope for Queensland, 3 Independents, 3 Labor MHR's, 3 Labor Senators, 3 Liberal MHR's, 3 Liberal Senators, 3 National MHR's, 3 National Senators, 3 Open Accurate Journalism, 3 PM & Cabinet, 3 Probus, 3 Reality emerges - all, 4 Greens, 3 The Australian
> **Cc:** Matthew England <M.England@unsw.edu.au>, Mitchell Chris <ratcliffey@theaustralian.com.au>
> **Bcc:**
> **Subject:** **Is this another pseudo-scientist treating the ATO as his ATM?**
>
> To federal MP's, friends, scientists, journalists.
>
> Copied to UNSW Professor Matthew England, Co-Director of Climate Change Research Centre (CCRC).
>
> Professor Matthew England responded to my request for real-world evidence of claims that carbon dioxide (CO2) produced by humans caused global warming, Below I reveal his complete failure.
>
> Exposed are glaring falsities driving the government's climate fraud.
>
> Below the summary is my detailed analysis sent to Matthew. It contains references so you can check for yourself—including what seems to be the Australian Bureau of Meteorology's corruption of temperature data.
>
> # Executive Summary
>
> Government and Greens climate policies are based on reports by the UN's climate body, the UN IPCC.
>
> • Each of the UN IPCC's four (4) reports to national governments and media is based on a falsity at the core of its world-wide media campaign—1990, 1995, 2001, 2007. These are revealed below;
>
> • There is **no observational (empirical), physical, theoretical or logical basis** for the UN IPCC's core claim that human production of CO2 caused global warming. This is proven below.
> Real-world data including that provided by the UN IPCC itself exposes the UN IPCC's claim as fraudulent;
>
> • UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC itself reveals that only five UN IPCC (5) reviewers endorsed the UN's claim that human CO2 caused warming—and there's doubt they were even scientists.
> Not 4,000 scientists as publicly stated by former PM Kevin Rudd and by UN IPCC Chairman Pachauri;
>
> • Contrary to UN claims, its reports are not peer-reviewed and are not scientific;
>
> • The UN IPCC conducts no scientific research. It's not accountable to any national governments;
>
> • The UN IPCC's predecessor, UNEP has been attributed with deaths from malaria of more than 30 million people due to UNEP's politicised 1970's actions contradicting science;
>
> • The UN IPCC's claim about human CO2 relies purely on falsities and erroneous unvalidated computer models. These are based on factors that even the UN IPCC admits have low and very low levels of understanding. And on outdated '*theory*' using assumptions from the 1800's that contradict reality;

• CO_2 is less than 0.04% of Earth's atmosphere. Annually Nature produces 97% of Earth's CO_2 production. This means that in every 33 molecules of CO_2, only one is from human activity. That's 1 molecule in 85,800 molecules of air. It's impossible for that molecule to produce warming. It's insane to claim it produces warming while Nature's 32 molecules in 85,800 do not;

• No net atmospheric warming since 1958—just inherent cyclic variation in natural cooling, warming, cooling cycles;

• UN omitted 90,000 reliable measurements of CO_2 levels and separately corrupted its CO_2 data;

• **Real-world scientific evidence show Carbon Dioxide levels are a consequence of temperature not a cause. Temperature determines CO_2 levels**;

• **Thus government and Greens policies cannot have any impact on global temperature or climate**;

• **The government and Greens climate policies are based entirely and only on fraud. No real-world scientific evidence. They contradict real-world science**.

• The policy's effect on the environment is demonstrably damaging to the environment. That's proven.

• Their policy is designed to increase energy prices to reduce energy availability and use. To have any impact on energy use it has to increase the cost of energy to consumers. Claims of protecting some users is nonsense because costs are passed on. If all consumers aren't impacted, nothing happens.

• It's designed to increase the cost of living. Nowadays, energy affects every part of our lives. Raising energy prices affects every part of your cost of living. Yet can have no impact on climate because temperature drives CO_2 levels. **'*Energy policy*' is simply a tax and a control on people's lives**;

• Prof England's responses show he does not understand real-world science. Yet the government-funded ABC repeatedly broadcasts him nation-wide as an expert;

Check for yourself below—you're being deceived. Now it's clear, take action.

Plenty more evidence coming next month.

Malcolm Roberts
BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

www.conscious.com.au

180 Haven Road
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone:
Home 07 3374 3374
Mobile 04 1964 2379
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Please note: Apart from suburb and state, my contact details are not for publication nor broadcasting and are provided only for your own personal use to respond.

Abound in the Oneness of Nature and Life

Context:
Professor England responded to my requests following his Co-Director, Professor Andy Pitman fleeing from my questions about supposed global warming. My earlier questions of Professor Pitman were asked after he publicly stated falsities spread by the media. My Registered Post letter to Professor England was copied electronically to you on 09.02.11. He replied by e-mail. My response is below and includes his responses.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Malcolm Roberts <catalyst@eis.net.au>
Date: 21 February 2011 11:28:23 AM AEST
To: Matthew England <M.England@unsw.edu.au>
Cc: VC Chancellor <Chancellor@unsw.edu.au>, VC Vice-Chancellor <Vice-Chancellor@unsw.edu.au>, Les Field <l.field@unsw.edu.au>, Carol Kirby <c.kirby@unsw.edu.au>, andy.pitman@gmail.com, Andy Pitman <a.pitman@unsw.edu.au>, Steve Sherwood <s.sherwood@unsw.edu.au>, University Secretary <universitysecretary@unsw.edu.au>, Helen Parks <h.parks@unsw.edu.au>, stewart.franks@newcastle.edu.au, Mitchell Chris <ratcliffey@theaustralian.com.au>
Bcc:
Subject: Reply to Matthew England (Climate Capers: Letters to Chris Mitchell, Andy Pitman, UNSW Chancellor & V-C, UNSW Climate Change Research Centre)

Copied to UNSW Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research), Dean of Science Faculty. Their action will reveal standards to which they aspire for science and for their university.

Dear Matthew:

Thank you for your prompt responses.

I appreciate the insight they provide into you and your perspective. I value the opportunity for discussion.

Reading your responses I feel disappointed and deeply concerned with what your responses reveal about you and your University of NSW Climate Change Research Centre (CCRC). You fail to provide any real-world scientific evidence of your claim that carbon dioxide (CO2) from human activity caused Earth's latest period of modest cyclic global warming that ended around 1998. Yet claim you do. Why?

Based on your response it seems you treat your Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor with little regard. Why?

You apparently have little regard for the environment. Why?

I bought and read the paper by Harries et al you recommended and read the article you attached.

Below is my response to your two e-mails of Th.10.02.11. Your issues and implied claims are addressed systematically in context. References are provided beside my statements so that you can verify for yourself.

(1) UN IPCC's systematic, serial fraud exposes your claim

D*ictionary definition of fraud: presenting something as it is not to secure unfair gain.*

First, consider the United Nations Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) that you have publicly endorsed. You and your UNSW CCRC seem to rest your core claim about human CO2 on the UN IPCC.

Each UN IPCC report to national governments has relied on a blatant falsity.

1990. The first UN IPCC report has been documented to be based on a 1985 report from its predecessor, the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP). That report **contradicted the scientific evidence** showing no human warming due to carbon fuels. Why?
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_science_corrupted.pdf

1995. The second UN IPCC report relied on politicians overturning UN IPCC scientists. Five times, UN IPCC scientists stated there was no evidence of global warming due to humans. Yet in their summary to national governments and media, UN politicians reported, quote: "*The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate*". Why?
http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=5206383248165214524#

http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

The UN IPCC **contradicts science and feeds falsities to national governments and media**. Why?

2001. The third UN IPCC report relied on the infamous '*hockey stick temperature graph*' fraudulently purporting global temperatures to be rising rapidly and attributing that to rising atmospheric CO2 levels. Media and political campaigns were based on this fraud to drive alarm internationally. Yet the graph was thoroughly discredited by scientists world-wide. As a result it was quietly withdrawn—after falsely spreading world-wide alarm. The graph tried to erase the Medieval Warming Period that is documented in history and accepted scientifically world-wide. The report **contradicted real-world science**. Why?
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

UN IPCC 'scientists' prevented access by others to their supposed 'data'. That breaches scientific process and immediately disqualifies their claim. Yet the UN IPCC used it as the basis for a world-wide media and political campaign by **corrupting real-world science**. Why?

2007. The fourth UN IPCC report is its latest. Its core, chapter 9 is the sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human production of CO2. I've read it twice. It contains no real-world scientific evidence. It relies on **unvalidated computer simulations whose forecasts have driven alarm yet quickly proved to be false and in great error**. Why?
The UN IPCC's chapter 9 is available here: http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch9.html

The **UN IPCC's own Expert Science Reviewer**, Dr Vincent Gray (PhD, Cambridge) has around 60 years real-world experience as a scientist including 20 years in climate. He has reviewed all four UN IPCC reports. **He says there's no evidence anywhere.** Why?
www.conscious.com.au provides Dr Gray's comprehensive and detailed reviews of UN IPCC draft reports.
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

Contrary to UN IPCC claims, its reports are not peer-reviewed and are not scientific.
The UN IPCC Chairman, Dr Rajendra Pachauri publicly claims UN IPCC reports are based on 100% peer-reviewed literature. Yet an independent international audit in February, 2010 revealed the UN IPCC's latest report cites and relies upon 5,587 references not peer-reviewed—including newspaper stories, bushwalkers stories and political activists campaign material. **A blatant falsity from the top of the UN's climate body.** Why?
http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/findings-main-page.php

UN IPCC data on its own reporting processes shows peer-review processes are corrupted and often completely bypassed. Links to McLean's work presenting UN IPCC figures are provided below. Dr Vincent Gray's personal experience shows UN IPCC reports are not scientifically peer-reviewed. Why?
www.conscious.com.au provides access to their work.

In key components of UN IPCC reports, data has been deliberately with-held from scrutiny. Thus, those components and the **UN IPCC reports themselves cannot be peer-reviewed and have not been peer-reviewed**. In effect, UN IPCC reviews merely review grammar and spelling and sanitise reports politically.

The UN IPCC Chairman, Dr Rajendra Pachauri has repeatedly publicly stated that 4,000 UN IPCC scientists claim global warming caused by humans. Yet UN IPCC figures themselves reveal only five (5) UN IPCC reviewers endorsed the claim—and there's doubt they were even scientists. **Not 4,000 scientists, just five (5) reviewers of dubious background. Another blatant falsity from the top of the UN's climate body**. Why?
www.conscious.com.au and refer to McLean's work using UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC itself.

There is no scientific consensus as claimed by academic advocates and politicians pushing carbon taxes.
http://www.climatedepot.com/a/9035/SPECIAL-REPORT-More-Than-1000-International-Scientists-Dissent-Over-ManMade-Global-Warming-Claims--Challenge-UN-IPCC--Gore

The 2007 report's only chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 was written by a tight-knit cabal of computer modellers with no real-world evidence. Many are compromised by financial conflicts of interest. One man, David Karoly was Lead Author of the equivalent chapter in the 2001 report. Then building on his own 2001 work, he was Review Editor of the 2007 report. His papers were cited by the chapter and he had close connections with many of the authors. He drafted the Summary for Policy Makers that influenced national governments. Yet he has no real-world evidence that warming was caused by human CO2. Why?

This raises concerns about the objectivity of the report. It leaves the UN IPCC vulnerable to doubts and questions as to whether or not peer review was objective. It certainly cannot be seen to be independent, can it?

David Karoly has received millions of dollars of taxpayer funding. Even after the 2007 report was closed to input, he received government funding to study the detection and attribution of climate change. Yet we had previously been advised the "*science was settled*". He continues making public statements broadcast by our ABC paid by taxpayers. Why?

Sixty percent of references cited by the equivalent chapter (12) in the UN IPCC's 2001 report in which David Karoly was Lead Author were written or co-written by the chapter authors. Of the remaining 40% how many could not or would not provide source data? If source data was not available, how could any other scientist validate the data?

There are thousands of scientists, including internationally eminent experts in their field and UN IPCC Lead Authors who publicly expose the UN IPCC's misrepresentation and contradiction of science. Why?
http://www.climatedepot.com/a/9035/SPECIAL-REPORT-More-Than-1000-International-Scientists-Dissent-Over-ManMade-Global-Warming-Claims--Challenge-UN-IPCC--Gore
This list continues to grow based on a list started by USA Senator James Inhofe. Separately, the late Professor Frederick Seitz, Past President of the USA's National Academy of Sciences, led over 30,000 scientists to petition their opposition to the UN IPCC's core claim:
http://www.petitionproject.org/

Advocates of global warming commonly dismiss opponents lacking scientific qualifications even when such people are simply exposing unscientific practices. Yet the **UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri is not a scientist and reportedly has written parts of UN IPCC scientific reports**. Why?

Much is explained by understanding the structure of the UN IPCC, the United Nations Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change. It selects scientists, activists and associated Non-Governmental Organisations to read literature. Politicians and bureaucrats then provide summary reports to national governments and media. These **summary reports by politicians have often over-ruled and contradicted reports by the UN IPCC's own scientists**. Why?

Refer to pages 9-14 of '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*' available at:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf
and "*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*", at http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/dead%20elephants.pdf

These documents summarise the relevant science. They provide associated references for readers to verify the science themselves.

The UN IPCC conducts no scientific research. It's not accountable to any national governments.

The UN IPCC was co-sponsored by the United Nations Environmental program, UNEP in 1988. UNEP had and has a history of falsely cloaking political issues in to achieve political objectives. Refer to McLean's '*Climate Science Corrupted: How the IPCC's sponsor, the UNEP and key individuals have misled Governments into supporting the notion of manmade warming*' available at:
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/climate_science_corrupted.html

Quoting senior UNEP and UN IPCC officials, he documents a history of corruption within both climate bodies, initially UNEP and later the UN IPCC. The UN's political claim of warming is an unfounded falsity cloaking a political agenda. It is not scientific. **You've fallen for it because you have failed to rely on real-world scientific evidence.** Why?

'*The Eco Fraud: Part 1, A timeline of International Fraud*' provides a brief introduction to, and partial summary of the UN IPCC's shady practices. It's available at:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

Are you aware that, through its politicised actions contradicting science the UNEP is responsible for the deaths of more than 30 million people? That puts its toll in the league of Earth's worst mass-murderers—Hitler, Mao and Stalin.

Matthew, please refer to '*The Eco Fraud: Part 3, Black Deaths in Green Custody*' available at:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%203.pdf
Is this the company you want to keep?

Matthew, it seems you have been conned by the UN IPCC's strategies pushing a political agenda. It is supposedly based on science yet contradicts science. The UN IPCC presents politicians and journalists with overwhelmingly thick reports entangled in scientific jargon. Facing this daunting prospect **journalists and politicians have understandably relied on brief Summaries for Policy Makers written by UN IPCC politicians and on UN IPCC press releases, glossy literature and choreographed presentations.**

To avoid all this all it needed was to ask one question: can you show me your real-world scientific evidence?

That you have apparently failed this basic test of a scientist reveals to me that your approach is not scientific. Thus I conclude you are not a scientist.

Maybe you have sought the source data underpinning the UN IPCC's core claim. If so could you please provide it? If not, you have not peer-reviewed the data.

The following reports by McLean cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present UN IPCC data on its own reporting and reviewing processes. McLean obtained the data from the UN IPCC itself. They expose the unscientific practices fabricating UN IPCC reports and expose the tight-knit cabal of computer simulators relying overwhelmingly on their own work and driven it seems by their own financial interests.

• '*The IPCC can't count its "expert scientists": - Author and reviewer numbers are wrong*'
http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf
• '*An Analysis of the Review of the IPCC 4AR WG I Report*'
http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf
•'*Prejudiced Authors, Prejudiced Findings. Did the UN bias its attribution of 'global warming' to humankind?*'
http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/23573.pdf
• '*Peer review? What peer review? Failures of scrutiny in the UN's Fourth Assessment Report*'
http://folk.uio.no/tomvs/esef/McLean_ipcc_review.pdf

Other reports by McLean exposing quotes and data from senior officials of the UN IPCC:
• '*We have been conned: An independent review of the inter-governmental panel on climate change*'
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean_we_have_been_conned.pdf
• 'Why the IPCC should be disbanded'
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer, Dr Vincent Gray provides an excellent paper succinctly exposing UN IPCC tricks. He is a scientist with around 60 years experience in real-world science including 20 years researching climate. He has reviewed all four (4) UN IPCC reports: 1990, 1995, 2001, 2007.
'*Spinning the Climate*' by Vincent Gray is available at:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/gray%20documents/SpinningThe%20Climate.pdf

UN IPCC Lead Authors have personally exposed the UN IPCC's fraud and unscientific ways.
'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', pages 9-14.

'*The Deniers*' by Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon is a book providing ample evidence from scientists internationally eminent in their fields. These include UN IPCC scientists. They expose the UN IPCC's many contradictions and distortions of science.

'*Air Con*' by New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart similarly exposes UN IPCC fraud.

Matthew, I respectfully suggest you learn from real-world scientists and their real-world data.

Climategate e-mails between UN IPCC collaborators show that climate scientist Chris de Freitas was targeted by UN IPCC collaborators. Some advocated that his work be knocked out. Based on the merits of de Freitas' work, UN IPCC collaborators justifiably feared his work would smash the UN IPCC's core claim.

After his paper co-written with Carter and McLean was peer-reviewed, accepted and published the publisher permitted an appeal. That appeal was conducted in a way that breached the scientific publishing body's own review guidelines. de Freitas' paper was knocked out contrary to the scientific guidelines. He was allowed no appeal.
'C*ensorship at AGU—Scientists denied the right of reply*'
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/agu_censorship.pdf
This is only one of apparently many examples of **UN IPCC collaborators conspiring to prevent opponents' papers being published.**

Matthew, can you imagine the fear this triggers in real scientists when their own scientific research cannot be published and their work unscientifically discarded? Perhaps not—you're a beneficiary of such unscientific and unethical behaviour.

McKitrick shares his experience trying to publish a paper correcting a serious error made by the UN IPCC.
'C*ircling the bandwagons: My adventures correcting the IPCC*'

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/Circling_the_Bandwagons_Correcting_the_IPCC.pdf

Climategate. The British Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) ruling found a breach of the law by scientists in key UN IPCC roles. Yet the Climategate scandal has still not been independently investigated. '*The Eco Fraud: Part 1 A timeline of international fraud*' and its associated references '*The Eco Fraud: Climategate 'inquiry' references*' provide additional material:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf and
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf

The detailed work of McLean, Gray, McIntyre, McKitrick, Singer and many others world-wide is supported independently by quotes from eminent UN IPCC scientists. **Combined, they prove that within the UN IPCC, peer-review has been corrupted and often completely bypassed.**

At times, when scientists advised there was no evidence of global warming by humans, politicians overturned the science by telling governments and the public there was evidence.

In such instances governments and media were handed politicised summaries that contradicted the science. Contradicting the science and misleading governments is fraud.

The efforts of the UN IPCC and some proponents of human global warming remind of tactics reportedly used by the tobacco industry in the latter half of the last century to quash medical and scientific findings against tobacco. Reportedly, that industry paid for research to provide the answers it sought; it paid scientists to produce custom results; it falsified reports and claims; it lobbied to prevent release of the truth; it spread propaganda to influence public opinion; it suppressed information; it allegedly paid journalists to write favourable articles; it ridiculed opponents; and, corporations manipulated political and legal processes and wilfully distorted and suppressed scientific findings.

When the matter eventually went to court requiring evidence under oath the tobacco industry campaign in developed nations rapidly collapsed. Already global warming is in early stages of lengthy court action in the USA. Where will you be when evidence is called?

Surely, Matthew, if proponents of human global warming had proof they would love to use it in court.

Note this weekend's news: The USA's House of Representatives has voted to kill funding of the UN IPCC.
http://joannenova.com.au/

Matthew, I did not hitch your star to the UN IPCC. That was, and apparently is, your choice. Are you aware of the consequences of your personal support for the UN IPCC's claims and your Climate Change Research Centre's (CCRC) endorsement of the UN IPCC? Your actions are causing the UNSW to wear the consequences. Why?

Can you see how the Australian government, politicians and citizens have been misled into thinking there is a scientific consensus when there is no consensus and no science at all behind the UN IPCC's core claim on human CO2?

Thanks in part to your public advocacy, UN IPCC reports are the unfounded basis of the government's and Greens' climate policies. Why?

I've exposed the immoral and unethical UN IPCC you endorse. Now consider the science ...

(2) Real-world Observations and Evidence expose your belief as nonsense

Your e-mail responses are based on spuriously assuming connections that contradict science. Instead, lets approach this scientifically. Science deals in using observations to prove or disprove theories proposed to explain Nature.

(3) Carbon Dioxide levels—a consequence of temperature not a cause

The UN IPCC omitted 90,000 reliable measurements of atmospheric CO2 levels taken in the last 180 years. These show natural fluctuations in CO2 levels up to 40% ABOVE current levels. Many of these measurements were taken before modern industrialisation in the last century.

The UN IPCC avoiding the evidence, Matthew. Why?

'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', page 10 summarises comments from internationally eminent scientist Zbigniew Jaworowski in Solomon's book '*The Deniers*'. **The UN IPCC not only ignores measurements of CO2 it then distorts those it selects.** Jaworowski explains how the UN IPCC moved a graph's data 83 years along the graph's axis to fraudulently imply their case. **The UN IPCC corrupts and misrepresents data.** Why?

Atmospheric CO2 levels are not a driver of temperature, they are a consequence of temperature. ie, they are driven and determined by temperature. This is well understood in science and completely contradicts your core claim and the UN IPCC. Did you not know this Matthew? Why?

This is explained in the book '*Climate: the Counter Consensus*' by internationally eminent palaeoclimatologist Bob Carter. And in '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*', pages 37 and 38. It is revealed even in Al Gore's science fiction movie '*An Inconvenient Truth*' in a graph used by Al Gore. Not surprisingly, Al Gore skipped the details in that graph that showed seasonal temperature changes drive and determine atmospheric CO2 levels.

Pages 16 and 17 of '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*' summarises key CO2 data and explains their significance. Oceans contain 50 times more CO2 in dissolved form than in Earth's entire atmosphere. The solubility of CO2 in water increases as water temperature decreases.

As solar activity varies seasonally the variation in heat energy varies ocean surface temperature. When massive southern hemisphere ocean surfaces rise in temperature during the southern summer, oceans liberate CO2 into the atmosphere raising global atmospheric CO2 levels. As surface water temperature decreases in southern winters, CO2 is absorbed from the atmosphere into the ocean, reducing global atmospheric CO2 levels.

Temperature drives CO2. NOT the other way around, as you claim Matthew. **The real-world reveals the reverse of what you claim.**

Matthew, don't you claim to do computer modelling/simulation of the ocean? Do you not know that in the real world ocean surface temperature is driven largely by the sun to determine CO2 levels?

In the longer term, with a lag of 400-800 years, variation between solar maxima and minima change the temperature of the ocean body. As the massive ocean water body temperature slowly changes, it affects atmospheric CO2 levels.

Contrary to Al Gore's movie, finer resolution of ice core data shows temperature leads and thus drives atmospheric CO2 levels. This was published two years before Al Gore's movie was released yet his movie stated the opposite. Why?

Like much of his movie, it contradicted science. His emotive Hollywood production by Hollywood producers spread misinformation world-wide to misrepresent climate and science. Why?

This is explained succinctly on pages 41-43 of '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*'.

Annually, Nature produces 97% of Earth's CO2 production. That overwhelms humanity's 3% (data source, UN IPCC). More significant, Nature controls reabsorption of CO2 from the atmosphere back into the main carbon dioxide sinks: ocean (containing 50 times more CO2 in dissolved form than in Earth's entire atmosphere), near surface rocks, soils and bio mass (plants and animals). Nature alone determines atmospheric CO2 levels.

Matthew, neither the government nor the mainstream media seem to publish the tiny proportion of CO2 in our atmosphere. Are you aware CO2 is described scientifically as a naturally occurring **trace gas** with a **concentration below 0.04% (0.0385)%. That's less than a mere four 100ths of 1%. As a fraction: in every 2,600 molecules of air only one is CO2.** The significance of this is discussed below.

Are you not aware that Earth's current atmosphere is its third? Prior to the current atmosphere Earth had far higher levels of CO2. Even in the early days of our current atmosphere, Earth had CO2 levels 1,800 times higher than now.

In more recent periods of high atmospheric CO2 levels, plants thrived and thus animals thrived. Especially in the warmer periods when life thrives even more vigorously.

Matthew, you've named satellite interferometry to justify your claim. Can you please explain in your own words how it measures what you claim to be the warming due to CO2 produced by humans? How does it isolate the effect of CO2 on atmospheric temperature? Specifically, how does it isolate and measure the human component?

Matthew, you have contradicted observational and physical data presented above and you rely on UN IPCC fraud. Thus I want real-world scientific justification for your faith-based claim that human CO2 affects Earth's atmospheric

temperature.

The UN IPCC has not been able to provide evidence. Neither has any academic nor any government agency I've contacted including CSIRO.

(4) Temperature: Scientific evidence shows no unusual or sudden warming of Earth and no net warming since 1958

The only reliable and accurate measurements of global atmospheric temperature are by weather balloon and satellite. These show no net warming since 1958, just inherent variation in natural cooling, warming, cooling cycles.

Current temperatures are lower than the average for Earth's last 3,000 years.
http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

Current temperatures are lower than temperatures in 8,000 of the last 10,000 years of Earth's history.
http://www.nipccreport.org/index.html

Even in recent times, North America was warmer in the 1930's than it has been in recent decades. Arctic temperatures were warmer in the 1940's than in recent decades.

Yet the UN IPCC tried to fraudulently rewrite Earth's history by removing the Medieval Warming Period that was much warmer than today. It tried to erase the even warmer Roman Warming Period.

Many kids know that during the Medieval Warming Period Vikings had a thriving colony in Greenland growing grapes. Are you not aware of this? Why?

Rural temperatures in Australia and the USA show no net warming since the 1890's. They show slight cooling. Urban temperatures show a marked rise as expected in growing cities as asphalt, concrete, glass and steel replace plants.

The three ground based temperature records used by the UN IPCC to make its claim rely on similar data. That data has been corrupted. That is well known.
'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', pages 18-21:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

You reportedly made many comments broadcast by ABC-TV's Lateline program, February 09, 2011. It referred to you as being a professor from UNSW. From the transcript, you said of temperature, quote:
"*MATTHEW ENGLAND: The bushfires in Victoria were another good example of where the temperatures weren't just broken by a little bit, but they were smashed. And when you see that, you've either got a freakish weather event well above the average or there's a climate change signal to that.*
The alarm bells being rung at the moment aren't based on single events, it's based on all the statistical calculations that are done on many of these events."
http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2011/s3134677.htm

Are you aware record temperatures on all continents were set many decades ago? On a majority of continents records were set in the late 1800's or early 1900's. Australia's occurred in 1889 (or arguably 1960).
http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/globalextremes.html
For an accurate real-world analysis of temperatures and disaster trends by an international group of eminent real-world scientists see: http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf
Contrary to your claim broadcast by ABC-TV, real-world evidence shows no increasing trend in temperatures or disasters. See '*The Deniers*', by Solomon and '*Air Con*' by Wishart.

In our winter of 2008 many parts of Australia witnessed record cold temperatures. Southern portions of the Great Barrier Reef bleached due to low temperatures.

Meteorologists (weathermen) Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts exposed the corruption of American ground-based temperature measurements. 90% breach measurement standards. Those of other nations are even less accurate and less reliable.
'*Surface Temperature Records—policy driven deception?*' by D'Aleo and Watts.
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf

Statisticians including Ross McKitrick expose the unscientific manipulation of temperature measurements used to derive the UN IPCC's misleading, unscientific temperatures used to fabricate its claim of warming.
http://www.uoguelph.ca/%7Ermckitri/research/nvst.html
http://www.staff.ncl.ac.uk/david.harvey/AES829/McKitrick2007.pdf

Jo Nova exposes the apparently unscientific and unfounded inconsistent manipulation of Australian temperatures by the Australian Bureau of Meteorology.
'*Announcing a formal request for the Auditor General to audit the Australian Bureau of Meteorology*' available at:
http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/announcing-a-formal-request-for-the-auditor-general-to-audit-the-australian-bom/
Especially: http://jonova.s3.amazonaws.com/audit/anao-request-audit-bom.pdf
Appendices 1, 3, 4, 5, and top of page 37, page 63 by 'computer geek'.

NASA-GISS uses ground based temperature measurements even though NASA satellite measurements of atmospheric temperature are far more reliable and measure actual atmospheric temperatures. Why?

Could it be because James Hansen from NASA-GISS is an adviser to Al Gore and devoted advocate of the UN IPCC's unfounded claims? NASA/James Hansen have apologised for large errors and refused to share data. Why?

Even Dr Phil Jones, made infamous by the Climategate scandal that engulfed him, reportedly stated there has been no statistically significant warming since 1995.

Despite the known inaccuracies, UN IPCC scientists refuse to allow scrutiny of their ground-based temperature 'data'. Why?

That breaches scientific process and peer-review. **In real science, when claims cannot be tested, they are dismissed. They are not accepted as science. Yet the UN IPCC shields such hiding of data from scrutiny**. Why?

Matthew, you base your position and claims on such non-science. Why?

(5) Temperature drives CO2 levels—FACT

'*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*', pages 21 to 23 summarises another paper by meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo showing that CO2 and temperatures are not well correlated and often for long periods negatively correlated.
'*US Temperatures and Climate Factors since 1895*'
http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US_Temperatures_and_Climate_Factors_since_1895.pdf

D'Aleo's work with data reaching back more than a century shows temperatures well correlated with solar activity and most highly correlated with multidecadal cycles—natural oscillation cycles between atmosphere and ocean similar to La Nina and El Nino experienced in Australia.

Carter, de Freitas and McLean scientifically prove that global atmospheric temperature is driven by El Nino cycles.
'*Influence of Southern Oscillation on tropospheric temperature*'. Journal of Geophysical Research 114, D14104, doi:10.1029/2008JD011637 available at http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_4.htm

Kiwi Brian Leyland used this proven causal relationship to accurately predict temperatures in the past decade.
http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/the-soi-still-rules/

Now we get to the causal relationships. There are two (2) of note:
- El Nino cycles determine temperature; and
- Temperature drives atmospheric CO2 levels seasonally and on a 400-800 year lag.
(Over intermediate periods of many decades other factors superimpose to affect CO2 levels. Climate is complex.)

This confirms the cyclic nature of climate variation complicated by the superimposition of many, many cycles of varying duration. It is clear that galactic, solar and planetary cycles drive temperature.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer, Dr Vincent Gray has provided by far the most detailed and comprehensive review of UN IPCC draft reports. He is scathing in his 575 comments on chapter 9 alone. That's the sole chapter in the UNIPCC's 2007 report claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2. He repeatedly raised the UN IPCC's avoidance of attributing significance to solar activity and El Nino cycles. **The UN IPCC avoiding the data—again.** Why?

Timothy Ball, PhD professor of climatology and renowned environmentalist says, quote:
"The most fundamental assumption in the theory that human CO2 is causing global warming and climate change is that an increase in CO2 will cause an increase in temperature. The problem is that in every record of any duration for any period in the history of the Earth exactly the opposite relationship occurs: temperature increase precedes CO2 increase".
From '*Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the greenhouse gas theory*', 2011, Stairway Press page 1.
www.slayingtheskydragon.com

Lately much has been speculated in the media about 2010 temperatures. This illustrates further falsities as easily seen from the following links:
- http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/2010_warmest_on_record.pdf
- http://www.spaceandscience.net/
- '*Why NOAA and NASA Proclamations should be ignored*':
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/noaa_2010_report.pdf
- http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/8290469/How-BBC-warmists-abuse-the-science.html

This raises serious questions about another UN organisation, the World Meteorological Organisation, WMO. In 1988 it co-sponsored the UN IPCC with UNEP. Peas in a pod?

Australia's own Bureau of Meteorology is under its own cloud for seemingly tampering with data to suit government policy. Refer to Jo Nova's report above. The Bureau is funded by the Australian government currently pushing carbon taxes and carbon dioxide 'trading'.

Note that New Zealand's counterpart to our Bureau of Meteorology has been taken to court by climate realists in New Zealand and is being exposed for apparently misrepresenting temperatures.

Whenever court action is involved and evidence is required under oath, why is it that proponents of global warming get hammered? Matthew, it's because the evidence exposes them.

Summary: Temperatures are not high. Even if temperatures were high Matthew, you provide no causal link showing human CO2 determines temperature. The reason: there is no link. Quite the opposite—the real-world proves temperatures drive atmospheric CO2 levels.

Having twice read the UN IPCC's chapter 9 claiming global warming and attributing it to human production of CO2 I know there is no evidence in that chapter.

The UN IPCC's own Expert Science Reviewer, Dr Vincent Gray goes further. He says there is no evidence in any of the UN IPCC's four reports to national governments and media (1990, 1995, 2001, 2007).

The reality is that temperature, and many other factors determine atmospheric CO2 levels.

You and your CCRC are seemingly supporting UN IPCC fraud and you contradict real-world evidence. Why?

(6) There is no causality or correlation showing CO2 levels drive temperature

(6.1) Causality
It seems, Matthew that you do not understand causality defined in the dictionary as:
1. the relationship of cause and effect;
2. causal agency or quality.

There is no real-world causal relationship between CO2 and temperature showing that temperature is determined by atmospheric CO2 levels.

There is a real-world empirical (measured observation), theoretical, physical and logical basis showing that temperature drives atmospheric CO2 levels.

(6.2) Correlation studies are complicated by other factors yet contradict your claim
To understand this one needs to understand correlation. Lets use the dictionary:
Statistics: the degree to which two or more attributes or measurements on the same group of elements show a tendency to vary together.

Causality requires correlation. Correlation by itself is not sufficient to prove causality. Correlation between two factors may be due to them both being dependent on other factors.

Because causality requires correlation though, a lack of correlation is sufficient to prove lack of causality.

We are currently in a period of negative correlation. From the 1940's through the 1970's Earth experienced another period of negative correlation for 30 years. Science shows Earth has had ice ages with periods of high atmospheric CO2. CO2 does not determine temperature.

Seasonally, there is strong and direct correlation showing temperature leading CO2 levels. Because changes in CO2 follow changes in temperature, it seems temperature determines CO2 levels.

In the longer term, finer resolution analysis of ice core data reveals changes in temperature lead changes in CO2 levels by 400-800 years. Thus temperature determines CO2 levels.

In the intermediate term over periods of decades there is a lack of correlation because of other powerful superimposing factors such as El Nino and solar variation. **Temperature is not independent. It is determined by many climate factors—especially solar—and cycles not yet fully understood.**

It is clear though that CO2 levels depend on many factors, including temperature.

Paleaeoclimatologist Professor Bob Carter disproves the hypothesis that CO2 drives temperature. Refer to item number 67 at http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_1.htm and to two other demolitions of your claim at Professor Carter's site.

Bob Carter is a distinguished scientist of the real-world. He has the integrity and discipline to be pedantic by insisting that proponents of a theory prove their claimed theory. He has published more than 100 peer-reviewed publications. Many of those deal with reconstructing and researching environments and climate.
http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_4.htm

Matthew, any one of the many above points is sufficient to refute your claim. Nonetheless, lets continue.

(7) Physical Reality and Reasoning shows your position as illogical, nonsensical

Consider the physical reality and apply logic. Lets have a bit of fun and play.

In every 2,600 molecules of air, only one (1) is CO2. That's 0.04% (0.0385%), the current atmospheric CO2 level.

Secondly, Nature annually produces 97% of the CO2 produced annually on Earth. Thus for every molecule of CO2 produced by human activity, there are 32 produced by Nature (humans produce just 3%). Lets put aside the fact that Nature alone determines and thus controls atmospheric CO2 levels. Lets pretend, as the UN IPCC tries to pretend, that the atmosphere is separate and not affected by the rest of our planet that contains 100,000 times more carbon than is contained in the entire atmosphere.

Over the long term, in every 33 molecules of atmospheric CO2 only one is produced by humans. This means that in every 2,600 x 33 = 85,800 molecules, only one is from human activity. That's only 1 in 85,800 molecules of air. As a percentage, that's 0.0012%.

Lets understand the consequences then, Matthew of your claim.

You're claiming that one molecule in every 85,800 molecules of air irreversibly and catastrophically warms the planet and generates storms, incubates diseases, raises sea levels. 1 in 85,800 molecules of air—that's quite an amazing molecule you have, mate.

What's more insane, it seems, is that among those 85,800 molecules, one molecule of (human) CO2 causes catastrophic warming yet 32 identical molecules from Nature have no effect!

How can this be in periods of massive forest fires and above-average volcanic eruptions producing huge quantities of CO2?

Please help me with this, Matthew.

Away from your computer simulations, Matthew, in the real world Earth sees far more powerful generators of CO2 than puny humanity. During Earth's past far warmer periods and during ice ages, atmospheric CO2 levels were many times current levels. Even in relatively recent times CO2 levels have been six times higher than current levels—during periods warmer than currently and during periods cooler than currently.

Lets play a little more. Australia's CO2 production is estimated to be around 1% to 1.3% of all CO2 generated annually by humans. Lets be kind to you and use a conservative figure, say 1.5%. That means Aussies are responsible for a mere 1 molecule of CO2 in 5.7 million molecules of air!

Wait, it becomes funnier: if we cut our production of CO2 by 5%, Australian CO2 would be cut to one molecule in 6.0 million molecules of air. Wow.

Are you not aware that China, India, the USA, much of the EU and many other nations are increasing their output dramatically—some exponentially? Yet even their increasing output pales beside a volcano or two. Earth has thousands of active volcanoes with most under the oceans that cover 71% of Earth's surface.

These calculations depend on the assumptions used. No one could claim perfect accuracy in this. Yet the order of magnitude is beyond dispute.

Lets understand then that you advocate destroying Australia's economy and taxing Aussies and their families for this nonsense. Why?

All for no possible impact on climate because CO2 does not, and cannot, raise global temperatures.

:)

Another approach, Matthew, is to suspend the science and assume a greenhouse gas effect. Then use the calculations provided and qualified in '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*', pages 27 and 28.
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

Because UN IPCC assumptions are so rubbery, only order of magnitude is important. Use conservative figures that favour the UN IPCC. Contradict science for a moment by assuming the greenhouse effect is valid. Then, it seems the effect of human CO2 on temperature would be about 0.0007 degrees C.

The supposed greenhouse gas effect is entirely dominated by water vapour. CO2's effect would be trivial. http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/greenhouse_data.html Even Al Gore says that water vapour is responsible for 95% of his supposed greenhouse effect and CO2 3% or less.

Some advocates of warming then claim supposedly positive feedbacks amplify CO2's effect. Yet this contradicts Nature as Hans Schreuder showed you in his e-mail of February 14th, 2011 copied to you in response to your e-mail. A pity, because it would enable generating unlimited energy with no fuel cost.

Instead, Nature's natural feedback loops tend to offset changes. Many real-world scientists have stated this based on real-world measured evidence and on the water-cloud cycle.

Otherwise, Earth's first warming period would have led to our planet experiencing runaway global warming. Or Earth's first global cooling would have led to Earth becoming an ice ball. Last time I looked it's not freezing or burning outside.

Lets return to estimating the significance of CO2's supposed effect: cutting Australia's production of CO2 by 5% would reduce global temperature one half of one millionth of a degree, 0.0000005 C.

Or using the Greens' target of 40% cut, we could reduce Earth's global temperature by 0.000004 degrees C.

Remember, this is only indicative. Anyway, it requires suspending science because as we now know, **temperature drives CO2 levels**.

The above show your claim is nonsensical and contradicts theory.

Matthew, my reference to the trace amount of CO2 in our atmosphere does not by itself mean CO2 is not dangerous. After all, arsenic in small quantities is lethal. Please note though two contradictions to the claim that CO2 is harmful:
- like oxygen, CO2 is not toxic in anything other than very high concentrations far higher than anything ever projected

to occur by even the most extreme radical advocate of human warming. CO2 is beneficial at concentrations many times greater than the wildest projections. CO2 is essential for all complex life on Earth. It is a plant food and plants thrive on higher levels;
- humans produce 3% of Earth's annual production of CO2 and you claim that is dangerous and damaging. Yet Nature produces 97% of Earth's annual CO2 production and that's not even mentioned. Why?

Poisons such as arsenic in small quantities administered by one person are dangerous. Large quantities of arsenic administered by Nature are dangerous. **By your logic though CO2 is different: small quantities produced by humans are dangerous while overwhelming quantities produced by Nature are not.** Why?

CO2 is a naturally occurring trace gas essential for life on Earth. It is not a poison. It is not a pollutant.

Please do not claim that Nature's CO2 production is stable. Variation in volcanic CO2 production alone is estimated to greatly exceed the production of CO2 from humanity. Yet even massive volcanoes have only a short term effect as CO2 levels quickly return to their pre-eruption levels. Nature, not humans, determine atmospheric CO2 levels.

The sun has a huge impact on atmospheric CO2 levels. Variation in solar energy reaching the surface of Earth's oceans has enormous impact on atmospheric CO2 levels.

It is difficult to believe that even a mathematician enmeshed in computer simulations using unvalidated computer models could be so lost on these basic elements of science and Nature.

That politicians and journalists fell for the scam is not surprising given that they were convinced by the self-proclaimed 'authority' of 'scientists' relying on computer models and avoiding real-world data.

Are we on the way to becoming a Nintendo and X-Box planet?

Your claim has failed four tests: observational (empirical), physical, logical and—given UN IPCC fraud—ethical. There is another test we can apply—the theoretical.

(8) Consider the theory: your position is unfounded—it contradicts the Laws of Nature

(8.1) Slaying the Sky Dragon

Matthew, are you aware that an international team of physicists, chemists, meteorologists and writers last year released their book completely smashing the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas supposition?
'*Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the greenhouse gas theory*' is available at Amazon.com
http://www.amazon.com/Slaying-Sky-Dragon-Greenhouse-ebook/dp/B004DNWJN6/ref=sr_1_3?ie=UTF8&s=digital-text&qid=1297683280&sr=8-3-catcorr

(8.2) Believers in the greenhouse theory are flat-earthers

Matthew, have you read the 1909 real-world, replicable work of physicist RW Wood who smashed the so-called greenhouse gas effect supposition that emerged back in the mid 1800's?

After reading many scientists, I reasoned that the UN IPCC's greenhouse gas effect supposition is not even a 'theory'. It contradicts the laws of physics and the laws of Nature. To be a theory it must be consistent with proven theories. It is not. Thus it is not even a 'theory'. It is a supposition that contradicts the real-world.
My summary is on pages 35 to 37 of '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*'.
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/dead%20elephants.pdf

From my reading and unattributed communication with many scientists of the real-world, lets explore the '*theory*':

The '*theory*' is based on assumptions rooted in the 1800's and that contradict reality. These assumptions include: Earth is a flat disc; it does not spin on its axis and instead all parts continually receive sunlight (no night-day); the '*theoretical Earth*' is something that cannot be found in Nature—a reflecting blackbody, a contradiction in terms; sunlight has equal strength all over the planet; a planet's irradiance can be divided by four to determine the planet's average temperature while ignoring specific heat, conductive transfer, rotation period. This means the model is a constant temperature model.

The last time I checked: Earth is approximately spherical; Earth rotates; at any moment only half the Earth is in

sunlight—we have sunshine during the day and no sunshine at night; Earth's temperature varies; amount of sunlight reaching Earth varies with latitude.

There are other differences between reality and the greenhouse gas model. These include the reality that radiance and temperature don't operate 1 to 1 together but on the basis of a 4th power law.

The greenhouse model contradicts Earth's reality. It can not accommodate the reality that atmospheric heat increases with pressure. This applies on all planets with or without CO2 in their atmosphere.

It causes actual atmospheric temperature to rise above the theoretical, predicted temperature as calculated by the '*theory*'. This reality of an actual temperature greater than that calculated using the assumptions applies to all planets.

The concocted 'greenhouse gas' is a fabrication attempting to explain the difference between Earth's theoretical, calculated temperature and its actual temperature. It becomes a '*theory*' when the huge and expected difference is 'explained' by the presence of trace gases that are opaque to infra-red radiation.

This explanation begins by citing the infra-red opacity of glass even though spectral selectivity has been proven to have nothing to do with heat gain in a glass enclosure. (physicist, RW Wood, 1909, as above).

Theorists ignore conduction and convection in the swirling reality of Earth's atmosphere. Yet, unbelievably, they persist in claiming the swirling atmosphere will do what even a solid, glass filter (more opaque to infra-red) does NOT.

Then they use a '*thought experiment*' depicting a '*theoretical*' blackbody layer hovering over a heated surface while they simultaneously mimic and discredit a glass greenhouse. After being warmed by the warmer Earth's surface this layer supposedly radiates back to Earth the energy it acquired from Earth's surface. This fantasy doubles the amount of radiation involved and contradicts the laws of thermodynamics and real-world empirical testing. After further adjustments to this mental model, multiple layers back-radiate more than 100% of the surface energy.

Using this mental model, the multiplying of energy by the '*greenhouse gas*' explains Earth being warmer than theoretically calculated without the magical energy multiplication. They rest their case and advise taxing energy users to save the world. Not the blackbody disc they use to calculate, the real world.

The calculations are based on nonsensical fantasy to justify taxing the real world.

At its core, the term '*greenhouse gas*' is an attempt to explain the reality that actual temperatures are higher than those calculated using the '*theory*' based on false assumptions that contradict Nature's reality.

Quoting from '*Slaying the Sky Dragon*' referring to the blackbody calculations used to estimate Earth's theoretical temperature: "A blackbody calculation is merely guesswork that an actual body is under no obligation to obey".

Again, Nature wins.

Matthew, the '*theory*' you promote is baseless—from its introductory assumptions to its desperately stupid proof.

The '*theory*' you promote fails to meet the test of being a theory. To be credible, a theory must be consistent with laws already proven. The UN IPCC's '*theory*' that you support and promote is not.

There are many other invalid assumptions. The above though explain the reason why Earth's actual temperature is higher than as '*theoretically*' calculated. The difference is not due to 'greenhouse gases', the difference is due to flawed assumptions in the '*theoretical*' calculations.

This error underestimates Earth's temperature and blames the difference on '*greenhouse gases*' instead of on ridiculous assumptions.

The greenhouse gas effect is a nonsense that contradicts the Laws of Nature and real world observation. It is a fabrication based on theories from the mid-1800's using false assumptions.

If we were still in the mid-1800's the error would be understandable. Since then science has progressed. The assumptions were long ago disproven.

Yet on these old assumptions the UN IPCC bases its case.

The erroneous '*theory*' has been revived by the UN IPCC. It's now due to an unscientific fabrication labelled as a scientific '*theory*' to promote a flawed political ideology.

A pity it's merely fantasy. If this fantasy were real we could generate infinite energy to end all our energy needs forever, for free—theoretically.

(8.3) An astronomer's view

Here's an evaluation of the greenhouse gas supposition by astronomer Gregg Thompson who investigated the supposition through wide reading and in discussions with scientists internationally. Using layman's words, he writes:

• CO2 can absorb heat a little faster than nitrogen and oxygen but it becomes no hotter because it cannot absorb anymore heat than there is available from the Sun to the other gases. Gas molecules are constantly colliding with one another so CO2 almost instantly shares any excess heat with nitrogen and oxygen. That's why the air is all one temperature in any limited open volume. The greenhouse effect violates the well proven laws of thermodynamics. Physics experiments long ago proved the greenhouse effect to be a myth. See http://wapedia.mobi/en/Joseph_Fourier:

•The following facts show that CO2 produces no measurable heating of the atmosphere – even with extremely high concentrations.

1. The planets Venus and Mars have atmospheres that are almost entirely CO2 (97%) yet they have no 'runaway' greenhouse heating effect. Their temperatures are stable. CO2 has no effect because Mars is bitterly cold. Venus' atmosphere is hotter than Earth's almost entirely because it is 92 times more dense, its sulphuric acid clouds are nearly totally black and absorb far more ultraviolet light from the sun. And it is 40 million kilometres closer to the Sun. (Venus' atmospheric temperature is due mainly to its density and opacity. Yet Venus' atmospheric temperature is as stable as Earth's. **Like Earth its atmospheric temperature changes very slightly with changes in the sun's activity from solar minimum to maximum. Similarly, the very much cooler Martian atmosphere varies according to solar activity.)** *See http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/05/08/venus-envy/*

2. ***Glasshouses with high levels of CO2 (to make plants grow faster) have levels 300% or more higher than the air does yet they heat up no more during the day than glasshouses with air****. This is also true for bottles of pure CO2 compared to those containing air.*

3. The geological record over hundreds of millions of years has shown that when CO2 levels were tens to hundreds of times higher, this has had no affect whatsoever on climate. At such times, when there were ice ages!

4. In recent times when Earth was considerably warmer during the Roman Warming and the Medieval Warming, these much higher temperatures were totally natural because there was no industrialisation back then. (End of quote)

(8.4) The UN IPCC admits low levels of understanding of greenhouse drivers

Are you aware that in Table 2.11 of its 2007 report, the UN IPCC lists 16 factors affecting radiative forcing (back-warming) that supposedly drive its greenhouse gas effect? Of these 16 factors incorporated into its models, Matthew, do you know that one is given a claimed high level of understanding? That single factor is the greenhouse gas effect demolished above.

Two are given moderate levels of understanding.

Do you know that the remaining 13 are admitted to have low or very low levels of understanding? Yet UN IPCC models and claims are based on this low level of understanding.

This is the unfounded sole basis for its core claim.
http://www.staff.ncl.ac.uk/david.harvey/AES829/McKitrick2007.pdf

Is it any wonder these models remain unvalidated and erroneous?

The UN IPCC relies purely on falsities and erroneous unvalidated computer models using factors low in understanding and supposedly 'justified' by 1800's formulae using assumptions that contradict reality. Why?

(9) Now, Matthew, your responses

Your e-mail has a line in its left margin interrupted by my responses in italics within your e-mail text.

On 10/02/2011, at 7:44 AM, Matthew England wrote:

> Dear Malcolm,
>
> Thanks for your interest in climate science. You asked for specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused global warming.
>
> The link between CO2 concentrations and warming has been measured directly by something called a “satellite interferometer” – reported in a paper by Harries et al., Nature, “Increases in greenhouse forcing inferred from the outgoing longwave radiation spectra of the Earth in 1970 and 1997”, Nature 410:355, 2001.

I bought and read the paper by Harries et al you recommend.

Matthew, since human vs natural CO2 emissions constitute 3% and 97% respectively, how much of the annual CO2 increase do you attribute to humans alone?

The authors provide no real-world measured evidence of the impact of human CO2. Yet you imply their paper provides real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused global warming. Why?

Matthew, would you please be so kind as to advise specifically where it is in the paper you referenced that the authors provide specific real-world evidence showing human CO2 caused global warming?

The title says 'inferred', not definite real-world.

The paper's opening paragraph is false. Atmospheric temperatures contradict their claim. Evidence of corruption of ground-based temperatures presented previously renders their claim as unfounded.

The authors rely on satellites for measuring radiation spectra yet avoid reliable satellite temperature data in preference to corrupted ground-based data. Why?

The authors use two (2) data points to infer a trend over almost three decades in a highly complex and dynamic atmosphere. Their work seems to be based on questionable assumptions. They lightly dismiss significant real-world climate factors. Why?

The authors base their inference on comparison with output from models and simulations. Are these like the other models known to be are based on low levels of understanding of climate drivers?

The authors invoke the greenhouse 'theory' that is nonsense.

You fell for this. Significantly, you are a Co-Director of the UNSW CCRC and present yourself publicly as a climate expert. Yet you put forward this paper as real-world evidence. Why and on what basis?

> These direct satellite measurements have shown that human emissions of CO2 have increased radiative forcing of the earth – via their well-known heat trapping capacity (*) - by 1.6 Watts per meter squared. (* I say well-known here as John Tyndall first worked on this in the UK in the 1850’s.)

Please provide specific real-world evidence that human production of CO2 increased radiative forcing.

In the laboratory, CO2 contained within a bottle seem to 'trap' heat. (Very loose use of the word 'trap'). As explained above, in the real-world's open atmosphere it cannot 'trap' heat.

Regarding your alleged 1.6 W/m² disparity: with constantly changing surface and cloud reflectance, atmospheric light scattering and absorption, measured over the whole planet in a one year period (and not to mention the anomalously quiet sun recently) — how is it that a mere 1.6 W/m² variance can be winnowed out of an approximate 342 W/m² total? 1.6 ÷ 342 = 0.004678 or 0.47%. Do you actually claim, then, that we are now able to pin down the entire energy budget to ½%? Isn't it widely agreed that the Earth’s average temperature requires about 390 W/m² of combined solar and supposed greenhouse forcing:

390.11 W/m² = 288.000 Kelvin

So add 1.6 W/m² to this:

391.71 = 288.295

That's a 0.295° difference. Are you claiming that our global network of thermometers is able to discern this fraction of a degree?

References above by Nova, D'Aleo, Watts and McKitrick and the summaries and further references provided in 'Thriving with Nature & Humanity' provide context.

Based on your e-mail responses, you will likely benefit from discussing your claim with Joseph D'Aleo or Ross McKitrick, experts in analysing the corrupted temperature databases used by the UN IPCC.

> One Watt = one Joule per second. That is, 1.6 * 86400 (seconds in a day) * 365 (days in a year) * 30 (years in a climatologically significant period) Joules per m2 per 30 years. So that's 1.6 * 86400 * 365 * 30 = 1,513,728,000 Joules of extra energy per meter squared - for every square meter on the Earth's land and ocean. (By the way, this is equivalent to every person on the planet holding 29 hairdryers running 24/7 and every year we are handing them an extra hairdryer).
>
> Conservation of energy is a fundamental law of physics. It means that this extra energy trapped has got to translate into extra heat (warmth) in the system. E.g., via melted ice, warmer oceans, warmer air etc. If not we would have to ask the question, where did this extra 1,513,728,000 J per m2 for each m2 of the Earth go? It turns out that much of this trapped heat is in the oceans, a smaller amount in the atmosphere and melted ice. We are lucky to live on a planet that is dominantly ocean-covered, as it is far more energetic to heat a m^3 of water than it is to heat a m^3 of air.

Matthew, regarding your question—"If not we would have to ask the question, where did this extra 1,513,728,000 J per m2 for each m2 of the Earth go?"

Exactly! In the face of declining ocean temperatures, that's the very question Trenberth was asking in the Climategate emails: Where did the supposed heat go?

Could it be that Nature's real-world is exposing your assumptions and the UN IPCC's assumptions as not valid?

The answer is provided above and below and in reading 'Slaying the Sky Dragon': yes, definitely.

> In summary, we know the 1.6 Watts per m2 from direct satellite measurements. We know conservation of energy is right - a basic law of physics. We know the amount of energy trapped by GHG's to date, and we can account for this extra heat via temperature changes in the ocean, atmosphere, and melted ice. The amount of warming that has occurred – adding up the changes seen on land, ocean, air and ice - is completely consistent with the amount of energy calculated to have been produced by GHG's.
>
> I hope this explanation helps. I am happy for you to forward my response to any individuals that you originally cc'ed in your communication to us.

This is being copied to the same address list as was my original e-mail, Matthew.

> Sincerely, Matthew England
>
> ---
> Professor Matthew England
> Climate Change Research Centre (CCRC)
> Faculty of Science
> The University of New South Wales
> UNSW SYDNEY NSW 2052
> Australia
>
> Telephone: +61-2-9385-7065
> Facsimile: +61-2-9385-8969
> E-mail: M.England@unsw.edu.au
> Web: http://web.science.unsw.edu.au/~matthew
> Copenhagen Diagnosis: www.copenhagendiagnosis.org
> CCRC Web: www.ccrc.unsw.edu.au
> _____

Secondly, On 10/02/2011, at 7:57 AM, Matthew England wrote:

> Malcolm, the attached is also a worthwhile read. I hope this helps. Matthew

To which of my questions were you responding by attaching Pierrehumbert's article? You have again failed to provide any specific real-world evidence that human production of CO2 caused Earth's latest period of modest, cyclic global warming.

Matthew, would you please be so kind as to advise specifically where in* Pierrehumbert's article *you think he provides the specific real-world evidence showing that human CO2 caused global warming?

Pierrehumbert is from the University of Chicago. I'm a graduate of, and recipient of awards from, the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business. My respect for UChicago developed first hand.

Yet I trust first in Nature not in Pierrehumbert's theoretical discussion of a supposition heavily infected and driven by political agenda. Why do you trust a supposition born in the 1800's and since proven false?

Are you aware of Lindzen and Choi's 2009 analysis of satellite measurements of real-world radiative flux? They're the opposite to that assumed by the UN IPCC. Lindzen and Choi measured climate sensitivity directly using satellites to observe outgoing radiation. The models all react the wrong way.
'*On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data*' by Lindzen and Choi, 2009
http://www.drroyspencer.com/Lindzen-and-Choi-GRL-2009.pdf

Please refer to section 8 above and pages 5-83 of '*Slaying the Sky Dragon*' by an international team of scientists.

The article you provided by Pierrehumbert ignores the most basic evidence that totally contradicts his assumptions. His closing paragraph sums up his apparent naivety.

He relies on laboratory measurements of CO2 contained in sealed containers. He extends that to the real-world's open atmosphere without mentioning heat energy affected by powerful dynamic factors and natural phenomena such as conduction and convection.

It's public knowledge that models fail to incorporate the enormous effect of clouds. Which everybody feels whenever a cloud passes overhead. That's what happens in the real-world.

Matthew, why do you think that a theoretical paper relying on assumptions contradicting Nature and the real-world is real-world evidence? Are you serious?

Pierrehumbert seems to use many UN IPCC tricks including: appealing to authority; translating models out of context; not specifying basic assumptions that violate Earth's real-world reality; and, contradicting Nature's real-world reality.

Along the way he contradicts the laws of physics and facts in astronomy.

He singly raises the relative power of the supposed greenhouse gas effect more than eleven fold compared with claims by others who believe in the greenhouse gas supposition.

The result is that his complexities and assumptions amount to laughter as he tries to prove that Nature's empirical, physical and logical reality are impossible. Yet we witness Nature daily. Nature wins by showing us what is really happening on this planet outside his models and '*theory*'.

His 'theory' fails to explain Nature. It contradicts Nature. I conclude it is scientifically invalid.

You claim to be a scientist. Yet in answer to my request for real-world evidence you send me a paper that relies on a '*theory*' based on assumptions that conflict with the real world and that contradicts scientific evidence.

Real science attempts to explain Nature for people's benefit. You contradict Nature to people's detriment. I conclude you are a pseudo-scientist.

Matthew, are you trying the UN IPCC trick of appealing to authority? Nature in the real-world is a far greater authority.

You present yourself as a climate expert when you are clearly not. Then attach silliness cloaked in scientific terms yet not scientific.

Overwhelmingly and with few exceptions, politicians and journalists lack the time, skills and knowledge to challenge such material. They defer to your supposed '*expert*' status.

(One exception is federal MP Dennis Jensen, parliament's only physicist. His understanding of science combines with his integrity to courageously speak out against the myth of human global warming. He values scientific integrity.)

Your response is valuable in emphasising that many politicians, journalists and lay-people have been misled and seemingly exploited by people such as yourself. Yet you have no evidence for your bold, unfounded and frightening statements.

All the more reason for you, Matthew, to investigate the real-world science.

(10) Sea levels, Storms, Diseases—more dead ends for you Matthew

What about the claimed consequences of supposed global warming?

(11) Sea levels are stable

Queensland state government Maritime Safety Queensland (MSQ) data reveals that during the last 15 years Australian sea levels have risen by a “very low” 0.3 mm annually. This is less than one-fifth (20%) the supposed international average annual rate (1.6-1.8mm pa) stable over the last century.
Refer to “Sea Level Rise” at: http://www.icsm.gov.au/SP9/links/msq_tidalreferenceframe.html

Relative sea levels, as measured on land, depend on vertical land movements (rise/fall) as well as sea levels.

In contrast to unfounded alarm about Pacific Island sea levels as fomented by some media and academics, please note that science shows sea level is stable.
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/southpacific.pdf
http://joannenova.com.au/2010/08/south-pacific-sea-levels-no-rise-since-1993/

Using the MSQ's data, sea levels over 100 years will rise by 3.0 centimetres—a little over an inch.

With each successive report, even the UN IPCC has lowered its forecast rate of sea level rise. Its lower limit for projections is now almost equal to the average annual rate for the last century. Please refer to page 16-19 of '*Nature, not Human Activity Rules the Climate*', a reader-friendly scientific document produced by internationally eminent climatologists, environmentalists, physicists and scientists across many scientific disciplines:
http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

Yet the wild and unfounded claims commonly spread by government politicians and the media are based on unvalidated computer models contradicting reality.

People's lives depend on MSQ data. Tampering could lead to deaths and lawsuits. Media reports based on unvalidated models such as those spread by the government's Department of Climate Change though have no accountability. Assumptions are often not divulged and on close examination found to be spurious. That explains huge divergences between models and real world real science.

In your interview with ABC-TV's Margot O'Neill broadcast on February 9th, 2011, you stated, quote: "MATTHEW ENGLAND: And if it wasn't happening, why are the glaciers melting as well? I mean, there's no glacier on the planet, I don't think, that hasn't melted significantly over the last century. Why would they be doing that if warming wasn't occurring?"
http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2011/s3134677.htm

Matthew, it seems you've identified the problem—you don't think, and apparently don't read first to get facts.

Last year the UN IPCC was exposed for its overtly politicised presentation of Himalayan glaciers and water. The UN IPCC Lead Author confessed to using a recycled report from WWF activists to politicise water issues.

Are you not aware that Indian experts in Himalayan glaciers later stated some of those glaciers are advancing, some are retreating and some appear to be stationery? The same applies to other glaciers around the world.

Even India's glacier scientists don't know how many glaciers are in the Himalayas. They're honest enough to admit they don't know... Yet you say you think you do.

'*The Deniers*' provides experts' explanations about sea level rises and falls during Earth's recent history. They explain glacier movement triggers.

For Himalayan glacier scandal, see '*Two Dead Elephants in Parliament*', pages 8 to 11.
For explanation of glacier movement triggers and sea levels please refer to various pages within '*The Deniers*'—especially comments about Rhodes Fairbridge's determinants of sea level, pages 172 to 175.

Although the government-funded ABC seems to prefer you—a mathematician lost in unvalidated computer simulations—I'll accept the real-world experts eminent in their fields of science.

When some glaciers are retreating, others are stationery and others are advancing, how can it be attributed to human CO2?

Matthew, after recognising your falsity in stating all glaciers are retreating, we return to cause-and-effect. Even if all glaciers were retreating, how can it be attributed to human CO2 when there are hundreds of factors affecting climate and glaciers?

I conclude that your broadcast statement was not that of a true scientist—it's not scientific. Your false statement is pseudo-science.

Why are you fomenting fear using falsities in an area in which you apparently lack expertise?

By the way, ex-Prime Minister Kevin Rudd who fabricated and rode climate alarm to election victory and Greg Combet, current Minister for Climate Change reportedly bought beach-front and ocean-front properties respectively. Despite their dire warnings of sea level rises.
http://blogs.news.com.au/couriermail/andrewbolt/index.php/couriermail/comments/warmist_rudd_doesnt_fear_sea_level_rises_after_all/

(12) Disease is not rising

Contrary to those fomenting unfounded climate alarm, the incidence of insect-borne diseases is not rising. The incidence of other diseases blamed on 'global warming' are not rising.

Read the conclusions of internationally eminent Professor Paul Reiter, head of the Insects and Infectious Diseases Unit at the acclaimed Pasteur Institute on pages 183 to 190 of Solomon's book '*The Deniers*'. There is no rise in disease frequency or severity. Paul Reiter exposes alarming falsities and contraventions of science by the UN IPCC. He was a member of the UN IPCC until he resigned in disgust.
Refer to '*The Deniers*', '*Air Con*', *NIPCC (2008)*, '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*' all listed previously.

(13) Natural weather events are not increasing in frequency or severity

The frequency and severity of weather events such as floods, cyclones/hurricanes, tornados, droughts, fires and storms are not increasing. This is well known. What has changed is that such natural events are now described as '*extreme weather events*' instead of by their common, historical names.
Refer to '*The Deniers',* '*Air Con*', *NIPCC (2008),* '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*' all listed previously.

Your comment about Victoria's recent tragic fires defies history and fact. More severe fires reportedly occurred in Victoria in the late nineteenth century (1800's) with similar weather conditions. Why?

(14) Where is your real-world scientific evidence that warming is harmful?

Matthew, no one has evidence showing warming is harmful. There is much contemporary scientific knowledge and history (human and geological) showing warming and higher CO2 levels are blessings.

Science and history show colder periods are dangerous. It's well known that humanity has reason to fear cold periods because disease increases and productivity decreases.

It's well known that Earth's past warm periods are highly beneficial to humanity and plants and animals.

Where's your evidence that warming is harmful? Where is your evidence that warming is not beneficial?
http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

(15) It's not CO2, so what does drive climate?

Contrary to your claim, CO2 cannot possibly be driving Earth's global average temperature.

I previously showed that cyclic temperature variation has been grossly exaggerated and misrepresented. Nonetheless, what does cause Earth's temperature to vary?

Page 24 of '*Thriving with Nature and Humanity*' summarises the main drivers of climate and global temperature. Science shows six likely dominate. Two have been proven strongest:
- El Nino, SOI (Southern Oscillation Index)
- solar.
'*Influence of the Southern Oscillation on tropospheric temperature*'
http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/McLean_deFreitas_Carter_JGR_2009.pdf
'*US Temperatures and Climate Factors since 1895*'
http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US_Temperatures_and_Climate_Factors_since_1895.pdf
'*The SOI still rules*'
http://joannenova.com.au/2011/02/the-soi-still-rules/

Matthew, the UN IPCC downplays proven effects of El Nino (SOI) and solar. Do you wonder why?

Dr Vincent Gray explains the UN IPCC's unfounded neglect of El Nino and solar. www.conscious.com.au

Are you aware that each hour our sun delivers more energy to Earth than does all human industrial, transport and other activity in one year. Have you any idea how significant heat differences and transfers are to Earth's weather and climate?

Ultimately, weather and climate are driven by temperature differences and heat energy. That is basic.

Atmospheric CO2 levels though are driven, among other factors, by heat energy. Yet you claim, without evidence, that human CO2 drives climate. That is impossible as real science shows. Ably supported by logic.

Yet you're stumbling around, lost in unvalidated computer models that have repeatedly proven wrong. You're clutching at a bastardised supposition masked wrongly as 'theory' and peddled by a fraudulent organisation running to its political agenda.

Although I have not met Professor Stewart Franks, I suggest you contact him. He is published in the scientific literature. He understands climate/weather cycles and reportedly publicly predicted floods when La Nina broke. For your convenience, he's copied on this e-mail.

We have arrived at the conclusion. There is no scientific or moral justification in your core claim. Science is confident it knows the major drivers of real-world climate and temperature and knows CO2 is not a driver of temperature.

(16) Your unscientific falsities are red-herrings risking people's lives and security

Professor Stewart Franks provided warnings of the natural, cyclic El Nino change that led to Queensland's recent floods. Yet, contradicting Nature and science, your peers in academia riding the government grants gravy train blame human CO2. They exploit the media fomenting unfounded fear and guilt.

Matthew, have you considered that when scientists and politicians are lost chasing a harmless trace gas they are diverting science from real-world climate studies? In this way they're preventing improved understanding of natural weather events and climate. They're putting lives at needless, avoidable risk.

Neglecting real-world experts' warnings about El Nino is dangerous, life-threatening and costly. I conclude that your misdirecting of our politicians onto Nature's harmless, essential trace gas (CO2) is irresponsible.

Your unfounded claim is at the core of climate alarm. It is a threat to science, lives and livelihoods—ours and our children's.

(17) Conclusion

Your core claim is that human production of CO2 determines temperature. Yet your claim has no empirical (observational), theoretical, physical or logical basis.

Based on systematic UN IPCC fraud and misrepresentation of science it has no ethical or moral basis.

What does it have? It is driven by a political agenda along an outdated and ill-conceived ideology that contradicts human nature and the real-world. An ideology rooted in grabbing control by eroding people's freedom through control of finances, energy, water, food and even the air we exhale.

Energy is fundamental to modern civilisation, our standard of living and minimising our cost of living. Those who control energy control society—and people.

Page 40 of '*Thriving with Nature & Humanity*' lists unfounded **climate alarm's bandwagon of beneficiaries**.

Now we have arrived at the core. This is what's driving the agenda you support. Can you specifically counter this, Matthew with real-world data as evidence?

(18) Your claims and responses damage others and the environment

It seems from your response that you treat the UNSW Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor with little regard. In considering what I present above, how could you pretend that your e-mails provided any evidence or in any way answer the questions I put to you?

Or are you not aware of the science and facts about Nature? If so, why?

Matthew, your responses simply deepen the hole you are digging for yourself.

In my view, your response treats me with disregard. It treats politicians and citizens with disregard. It reveals you apparently treat yourself with disregard. Given your title and your self-promotion as a climate expert, it is difficult to believe that you could believe your own e-mail response.

Please refer to '*The Eco Fraud: Part 2, The Environmental Casualties*' available at:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%202.pdf
and to page 31 of '*Thriving with Nature & Energy*'.
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

This explains why your public recommendations to increase prices of fuels containing carbon is detrimental to the environment. Do you not understand these basics? Or do you not care?

Matthew, please refer to '*The Eco Fraud: Part 3, Black Deaths in Green Custody*' available at:
http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%203.pdf

This explains why your public recommendations supporting the UN IPCC hurts humanity. Do you care about people?

Matthew, **you seem oblivious to the crucial role of low cost energy in protecting the environment, reducing birth rates and improving human life. Yet without real-world evidence you want to reverse the amazing environmental improvements of developed nations in the last 40 years and the improvements of Eastern European nations since 1989's fall of the Berlin Wall.** Why?

Meanwhile, the real-world market is working. It witnesses collapsing subsidy-riddled government carbon pseudo-markets in Europe and America.

The Chinese use our coal to generate cheap energy to manufacture costly windmills. They sell these to us and other '*developed countries*' so we can generate unreliable, costly wind energy.

Can you now understand how distracting people from real science is detrimental to science, humanity and

the environment?

(19) Why do you spread falsities?

Matthew, it's sad that you seem to not understand what's happening in the field you promote as your own—climate. It's of concern that you abandon the real world and empirical evidence to rely on unvalidated computer models producing erroneous simulations and projections while accepting UN fraud.

Yet you present yourself in the media and to the public as an expert to advise citizens and politicians on life and death matters.

It's clear you are not an expert on climate. Aren't your qualifications in mathematics and your expertise apparently in computer simulation?

On what basis do you claim to be an expert on climate? Matthew, on what basis are you making your pronouncements on climate? Why?

You are a prominent public figure spreading unfounded fear and guilt that mislead people and resource allocation across society.

Matthew, my education is as an engineer. That is the discipline of real-world implementation of scientific discoveries. I have been personally responsible in statutory, managerial and executive positions for people's health and safety. My practical, working knowledge of CO2 and other atmospheric gases was a vital part of fulfilling my responsibility for thousands of people's lives.

I earned a Masters degree from the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, one of the world's most rigorous business schools. I understand the importance of rigorous analysis. I ask that you start to do some rigorous real-world analysis.

Despite academic awards won during university studies, of greater value to me are my experience in Nature on many continents and working with a huge diversity of people in many nations.

Matthew, underlying every human's every behaviour are fundamental universal human needs. Please consider your needs. What is driving your explicit and implied falsities and your apparent ignorance of the basics while presenting yourself as an expert?

(20) What are your needs? What is your intent?

From what I've seen here and overseas, every person does their very best. We all do what we think necessary to meet our needs, including our need to contribute to the wider world.

Maybe you see your need as exploring new developments in computer modelling? Or science? Protecting, in some way, the environment? Or humanity? Or maybe, like senior UN IPCC officials, you justify exaggerations, unfounded alarm and falsities as the price to pay for moving people to your agenda.

Or maybe you've been swept along by the culture of fomenting alarm that is documented as existing in the UN IPCC?

Maybe you're enmeshed in protecting your computer models after unvalidated computer projections have proven completely erroneous? Maybe you're attempting to protect your career? Your reputation? Obtain more grants?

Maybe you enjoy the status and media attention that accompany preachers of climate alarm? Do you seek travel to meetings and conferences at resorts? Maybe you seek acknowledgment? Or want to contribute?

From your response I conclude that you are either grossly incompetent or deliberately deceptive. Matthew, your e-mail comments and attachment are nonsense and distract from the real science. While people like you are making nonsensical statement such as yours, valuable finite funds are being diverted from real science. Yet real science could further liberate humanity from natural disasters and further protect our natural environment.

As with your earlier false statements and implied claims, your public remarks and now your e-mail replies directly

contradict or imply circumstances that contradict real-world science and real-world data.

The dictionary defines a lie as: a false statement made with deliberate intent to deceive; an intentional untruth; a falsehood; something intended or serving to convey a false impression; ..

You lack real-word scientific evidence of your public pronouncements. You have contradicted extensive real-world evidence that disproves your core claim.

You now purport to provide real-world evidence yet it is supposition contradicting scientific theory. It contradicts real-world evidence.

I conclude your position is dishonest, fraudulent, incompetent or irresponsible. Have you been conned or are you conning? Regardless, your approach does not follow scientific process and this is not scientific. Thus you are not a scientist.

Instead your position seems to be a belief based on ideology or faith and thus is either political or religious. Your behaviour is taking our society back to the Dark Ages from which science liberated humanity.

Based on your response and your failure to address the questions I raised, and regardless of my conclusions about your behaviour and character, I conclude that your UNSW CCRC is not scientific. Your approach and that of Andy Pitman are unscientific.

Although I know you have implied and stated falsities, I cannot know your purpose in so doing. Given your background and your financial interest via millions of dollars of taxpayer grants, I am swayed to conclude your falsities are deliberate and thus lies.

I doubt that you're consciously using computer simulations as a way to obtain grants. I doubt yours is a new form of computer fraud. Instead, from what I've seen in people, telling lies seems to be a form of control. Underlying control is fear.

Given your stance and observing your public actions as the UN IPCC is exposed by the growing public and scientific scrutiny, I'm guessing you may be feeling afraid, vulnerable?

Or, maybe your falsities are unwitting. Maybe you're swept up in the UN IPCC's carefully choreographed momentum. History proves groupthink is powerful. In that case though I conclude your stated and implied comments display scientific negligence or incompetence.

You may not be conscious that you are spreading falsities. Nonetheless, in spreading falsities, Matthew, what is your underlying intent?

My needs in obtaining clarity through answers to my questions and in exposing the UN IPCC's unfounded claims are:
- protecting freedom. Ensuring individual freedom. Ensuring Australian sovereignty from the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change's (FCCC) policies and from UN climate treaties and global financial controls such as the Kyoto treaty and the draft Copenhagen treaty;
- protecting the environment;
- protecting science and scientific integrity—the truth is vital;
- protecting our economy and civilisation from the threat of huge increases in energy prices from politicians reacting in fear to the constant emotive, false bombardment by UNEP since 1972—aided since 1988 by the UN IPCC;
- peace by ending the unfounded global warming fear and guilt constantly bombarding our kids and communities. Instead, lets restore people's connection with Nature's wonder and abundance.

In recent years, as well as learning more about climate I have been learning more about true forgiveness. Associated with the power of forgiveness, the work of Marshall Rosenberg and my own personal experience shows that knowing one's needs and identifying another person's needs enables both to find ways to fulfil their real needs. **After understanding your needs I'm confident I will be able to assist you in meeting your needs.**

Matthew, like its UNEP forebear and co-sponsor, the UN IPCC is corrupt. You have dropped yourself into that mess. Whether you are part of the corruption or an innocent bystander swept up in the fame and attention is not for me to decide. The key decision is now yours: will you cease fomenting unfounded alarm and cease spreading unscientific and false claims?

My personal declaration of interests available at:

http://www.conscious.com.au/__documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf

Without your declaration of personal interests and knowing that no science body or public climate spokesperson can provide evidence of your claim what am I to conclude? When these same government bodies such as CSIRO and Bureau of Meteorology and public spokespersons such as yourself, David Karoly, Kurt Lambeck, Will Steffen, Andy Pitman, Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, Tim Flannery and Australia's Chief Scientist, Penny Sackett all receive funding from a government now hopelessly enmeshed in Kevin Rudd's legacy of spin, what am I to conclude? That you repeatedly fail to provide any real-world evidence makes your position untenable.

We need a Royal Commission or judicial inquiry requiring evidence to be provided under oath.

With due respect, Matthew, please get your snout out of the computer and into the real world. Computers have a role to play. Mathematics is essential to our everyday life. Yet all that's needed to understand basic climate reality is simple arithmetic, two eyes and, above all, an open mind that understands scientific method and a heart that cherishes scientific integrity.

(21) Please address my questions and requests

Please provide real-world scientific evidence and address my requests and questions from which Andy Pitman fled and which you have failed to address. Succinctly, these are to:

- provide one piece of specific real-world scientific evidence that human production of CO2 caused Earth's latest period of modest cyclic global that ended around 1998;

- provide real-world scientific evidence justifying your Co-Director Andy Pitman's statement, quote: "we know with certainty that continued emissions of carbon dioxide will lead to warming, rising sea levels and ocean acidification at unprecedented rates, and that these changes will trigger expenses and outcomes that dwarf the costs of actually solving the problem";

- confirm Andy Pitman is a Lead Author of the UN IPCC 2007 report;

- explain your understanding of peer-review as practiced by the UN IPCC;

- explain the UNSW CCRC's understanding of the meaning of the term scientific peer-review;

- advise whether or not the CCRC is aware that UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri has been cited for publicly issuing false and misleading claims about UN IPCC peer-review;

- advise whether or not the CCRC independently scrutinised the UN IPCC's core claim about human production of CO2, or simply accepted the UN's fraudulent claim without due diligence? If CCRC did its independent scientific real-world analysis, please provide your real-world evidence supporting the UN IPCC's claim;

- advise whether or not you are aware that the UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies upon 5,587 references not peer-reviewed;

- advise whether or not you consider that the UN IPCC's reliance upon papers from the close-knit cabal of authors and reviewers of the UN IPCC 2007 report's chapter 9 is scientific;

- advise whether or not you are aware that the close-knit cabal includes many people with vested interests in promoting use of unvalidated computer models;

- advise whether or not you consider papers and reports relying on references to papers preventing scrutiny of raw data to be peer-reviewed;

- advise whether or not you are aware that UN IPCC data (obtained from the UN IPCC itself) reveals that the UN IPCC's supposed 'peer-review' processes have been corrupted and at times completely bypassed;

- advise whether or not you see that providing specific real-world scientific evidence for your claim would end doubt about your claim;

- advise whether or not you are aware of the huge number of scientists from many disciplines including scientists internationally eminent in physics, climate, oceanography, geology, chemistry, biology and hydrology who disagree with the UN IPCC's core claim. Are you aware that many are severely critical of the UN IPCC and its processes as

unscientific, politically corrupt and/or fraudulent?

- advise whether or not you are aware of Table 2-11 (starting on page 201) of the Working Group 1 contribution to the UN IPCC's 2007 report;

- list the 16 factors in Table 2-11 and for each factor specify its level of understanding and explain how accurate climate models can be created from those levels of understanding;

- advise as to whether or not your fellow Co-Director of the CCRC, Andy Pitman's apparent pattern of repeatedly making unfounded and/or false statements reflects policy of the CCRC or of UNSW;

- advise whether or not Andy Pitman's apparent avoidance of being accountable for his statements reflects CCRC policy?

After reading both the papers you referenced, please advise *specifically where it is in the two papers that the authors provide specific real-world evidence showing human CO2 caused global warming.*

By working your way through my questions you will discover for yourself the reality of the UN IPCC's fraud that you have been spreading and that you and your CCRC apparently endorse.

Until you provide specific, real-world scientific evidence for the policy you advocate, I conclude that it is:
- **immoral** to advocate restricting energy use based on **fraud** to steal money from Australians;
- **impossible** for **CO2** produced by human activity to do what you claim;
- **irresponsible idiocy** to impose a carbon tax or emissions trading scheme on our **economy**;
- **injurious** to the **environment and humanity** to adopt the policies you advocate.

A 2006 TV interview of you and of Bob Carter is one of the keys that started my research into global climate alarm. I was aghast at the statements you made. Your current failure to provide real-world evidence confirms my concern.

Although Al Gore's science fiction movie 'An Inconvenient Truth' was the main motivator that stimulated me to protect our community, your falsities played a role. For that I thank you. In the last four (4) years since first watching you on TV in 2006, I've learned much about Nature, life and human behaviour.

I am amazed at the UN's global warming political bureaucracy and fraud onto which I have strolled. The UN IPCC has for 22 years been engaged in systematic fraud. It adopted the ways of its co-sponsor, the highly politicised and fraudulent United Nations Environmental Program. UNEP itself initiated a trail of fraud that built politically driven unfounded global climate alarm.

Matthew, if you continue fomenting climate fraud you will be abetting UN fraud.

(22) Are you treating the ATO (Australian Taxation Office) as your ATM?

Your core claim that human CO2 production determines Earth's global temperature contradicts science and Nature. There's much evidence showing human CO2 cannot be responsible for warming.

Your behaviour is not scientific. I conclude you are a pseudo-scientist.

Yet you receive government grants.

I object that pseudo-scientists masquerading under the banner of science draw on government funds to seemingly treat Australia's ATO as their ATM.

Your ability to draw from taxpayer funds without real-world evidence has given me a new meaning to the term '*The Bank of England*'.

Many of us are fed up with what we see as pseudo-scientists stealing from the future of our kids and our nation and from Nature.
(Dictionary definition of Stealing: *taking away from someone without right or permission; slyly or secretly getting for oneself*)

Matthew, in both your responses you have failed to provide any specific real-world scientific evidence of your claim. Why?

Four simple requests

Please provide one piece of specific, scientifically measured real-world evidence that human production of CO2 warmed our planet.

Please apologise to ABC-TV and through it to the Australian people for misleading them and for misrepresenting climate.

Until you have real-world evidence, please stop fomenting unfounded climate fear and alarm.

In light of the comprehensive evidence I present, Matthew, do you have the character and integrity to withdraw your endorsement of the UN IPCC's core claim about CO2 produced by humans? Does the UNSW CCRC have the integrity to abandon its endorsement?

Providing you address my questions above and provide specific real-world scientific evidence that human CO2 warmed our planet I will forward your response to all this e-mail's recipients.

I await your answers to my straight-forward questions.

Malcolm Roberts
BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)
Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

www.conscious.com.au

180 Haven Road
Pullenvale QLD 4069
Phone:
Home 07 3374 3374
Mobile 04 1964 2379
E-mail: catalyst@eis.net.au

Abound in the Oneness of Nature and Life