

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2012
Latest update:

APPENDIX 4a

EMPIRICAL DATA ON ALARMING CLIMATE CLAIMS

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with,
all parts of and appendices to the document entitled *CSIROh!*

“For care to be effective, care needs to be informed.”
Malcolm Roberts

Empirical Sea Level Data

Analysis of empirical temperature data discussed in Appendix 4 reveals no threat whatsoever.

That explains recent purchases of waterfront properties by prominent buyers including:

- Kevin Rudd at Peregrine Beach, Queensland’s Sunshine Coast in 2010;
- Greg Combet, Newcastle in 2007;
- Al Gore owns two waterfront properties. The ‘*Fisherman’s Wharf*’ address of one property should’ve been a clue;
- Cate Blanchett in Vanuatu,

They join Tim Flannery already living on tidal coastal waterfront.

Dr. Nils-Axel Morner is an internationally eminent authority on sea levels. He presents facts, here:

<http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202007/MornerInterview.pdf>

Or here:

<http://www.mitosyfraudes.org/Calen7/MornerEng.html>

Quoting Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon’s book entitled ‘*The Deniers*’:
“Rhodes Fairbridge an early expert on climate change ... hypothesised that sea levels had been rising for the last 16,000 years, during which there were periodic rapid oscillations of rise and fall ... even within the past 1,000 years, sea levels have several times changed by up to two meters and—suddenly—each of these large changes occurred in fewer than 40 years ... As Richard Mackey wrote recently in the Journal of Coastal Research, ‘Rhodes Fairbridge was the first to document that the ocean levels rose and fell over long time scales.’”

In summary sea levels were estimated to have risen at the annual rate of 1.1-1.8 mm per year for the century prior to 2000 and according to Morner, until 1970. Since 2000, accurate GPS measurements show sea levels flat.

Contrary to claims of accelerating sea level rise from prominent advocates of unfounded climate doom, the rate of sea level increase is not accelerating. Empirical measurements show sea levels are rising slowly and possibly not rising at all.

Their rate of increase, if any, is so small as to be meaningless in terms of practical application and scientific significance.

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

This outstanding summary by Gold Coast businessman, investor and scientist Gregg Thompson provides an authoritative compilation of empirical assessments of sea level. Please particularly note his references to data from Maritime Safety Queensland; the SeaFrame Study (Sea Level Fine Resolution Acoustic Measuring Equipment) of 12 Pacific islands including Tuvalu, Kiribati, Vanuatu; and Nils Axel Morner, Past President of the INQUA international Commission on Sea Level Changes and Coastal Evolution and Leader of the Maldives Sea Level Project.

The SeaFrame tidal gauge records for Tuvalu and other Pacific islands have shown a virtually constant sea level for 20 years.

Gregg and others have requested the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM), CSIRO and National Tidal Centre for real-world evidence of catastrophic sea-level change. These agencies all failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence. All are funded by government.

American government agency NOAA's own data reveals rate of sea level rise is around two inches per century. Page here:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/un_agenda_21_will_rule_the_us_waves.pdf

Note the political campaign driving NOAA's actions contradicting empirical scientific evidence.

Alberto Boretti, PhD has studied empirical sea level data around Australia and presented conclusions in his peer-reviewed paper entitled '*Is there any support in the long term tide gauge data to the claims that parts of Sydney will be swamped by rising sea levels?*', Boretti (2012), Coastal Engineering. It is available here:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378383912000154>

(Boretti, A., *Is there any support in the long term tide gauge data to the claims that parts of Sydney will be swamped by rising sea levels?*, Coast. Eng. (2012), doi:10.1016/j.coastaleng.2012.01.006)

His paper's many graphs present data over recent decades from tide gauges around Australia. They reveal sea levels varying naturally with an overall flat and stable trend.

Based on empirical data, Alberto Boretti projects a rise for the next 100 years similar to the rise during the past 100 years. That's 50mm, around two inches.

Quote: **“3. Conclusions**

Consideration of the measured data recorded over a significant period of time shows that the sea levels are raising weakly without any acceleration component.

The worldwide average tide gauge result obtained considering all the data included in the Permanent Service for Mean Sea Level data base show a modest sea level rise and about zero acceleration.

The Fort Denison, Sydney tide gauge result shows the same modest sea level rise and about zero acceleration in perfect agreement with the worldwide result.

The Fremantle tide gauge result, the only other tide gauge operational in Australia over more than a century, shows the same modest sea level rise and about zero acceleration in perfect agreement with the worldwide result and the result of Sydney.

The other tide gauges operational along the coastline of Australia over shorter time scales of 30 to 40 years on average also show the lack of any acceleration component in the rate of rise of sea levels.

The most likely rise of sea level in the bay of Sydney by 2100 is therefore more likely less than the 50 mm measured so far over the last 100 years rather than the metre predicted by some models.”

Alberto Boretti's first position in employment at a prominent Australian university was revealing for him. He found that science was not the objective. Rather it was politically driven. He left and went to a regional university with a lower profile that actually studied science scientifically.

A supporter of The Galileo Movement, Greg Harrison provided a copy of the 'Wollongong City Council Coastal Zone Study', June 30, 2010. First paragraph, quote: *“It was found that there is presently no evidence of long term shoreline recession or loss of beach volume”.*

The report says that for almost all locations in the Wollongong Council's coastline, minimum beach volume occurred in 1974. That was soon after storms. That's 40 years ago.

Quote: *“However, since then almost all the profiles have shown a steady accretion of beach width and beach volume. To this end no long-term shoreline recession could be identified and was therefore adopted to be zero (for present Mean Sea Level) for the determination of erosion hazard lines”.*

Wyang Coastal Hazard Study, October 2011, prepared by SMEC. Page 11, quote: *“Generally it was found that most of the beaches in the study area are not undergoing significant long term beach recession and that since storms of May 1974, most of the beaches have been recovering in sand volume as a result of recent storm activity.”*

That's 40 years. That's what The Weekend Australian front-page picture article on March 31 revealed: according to residents in their 80's, all that was occurring was natural erosion and rebuilding of beaches. Nothing unusual.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/fighting-on-the-beaches-as-council-orders-retreat-from-climate-change-threat/story-e6frg6nf-1226308725029>

Based on current rates of sea level increase, projections of sea level rise over the next century are around 30-50 mm total. Around one to two inches, total.

Even Monash University presents information revealing dramatic past sea level variations that were entirely natural:

<http://sahultime.monash.edu.au/explore.html>

Each successive UN IPCC report's sea level projections for future levels have fallen as shown on page 18 here.

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

Note James Hansen's unfounded, ridiculous claim spread by Al Gore.

Note that even the NIPCC is contradicted by empirical scientific evidence in the last two decades as revealed by Gray, Boretti and Morner. That reveals no rises. Recent satellite data even reveals recent small drops in sea level.

Reportedly, "uncorrected" satellite altimetry records zero sea level variability between 1992-2010. Based on satellite data, EU researchers predict insignificant sea level rises over the next century.

Corruption of sea level data continues:

<http://www.real-science.com/sea-level-data-corruption-worse-than-it-seems>

In summary, the common finding of researchers not in the IPCC/CSIRO network is near stability or a very small rise in sea levels worldwide;

Extreme Weather? Floods or Droughts? Why not project increases in both?

Reviewing Australia's rainfall data patterns for the last 100 years reveals nothing unusual in rainfall in recent years.

Flooding in the last two years has not been unusual. Brisbane's floods in 2011 were actually less severe than six previous floods since 1840.

http://blogs.news.com.au/couriermail/andrewbolt/index.php/couriermail/comments/before_you_scream_global_warming_two_items_of_fact_about_brisbane/

Sadly, the unfounded and false dire claims and/or unfounded predictions by prominent advocates such as Tim Flannery and David Karoly abetted by politically inspired falsities from Senators Brown and Milne likely influenced seeming mismanagement of Wivenhoe flood mitigation Dam during Brisbane's 2011 floods. That apparently caused greater loss than would otherwise have occurred.

Advocates of unfounded alarm drove fear of never-ending drought:

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/warmists_washed_out/

Australia's recent drought is recognised as less severe than the Federation Drought 110 years ago.

As discussed in Appendix 9, David Karoly is a prominent advocate of unfounded alarm contrary to empirical scientific evidence. He claims higher temperature causes drought. Yet hydrologist Stewart Franks has repeatedly reminded him that droughts cause higher temperatures.

Carl Brewer confirms that drier air leads to higher temperatures:

<http://principia-scientific.org/index.php/latest-news/the-greenhouse-effect-and-droughts-are-mutually-exclusive.html>

The presence of water vapour leads to cooler days, not warmer.

Although its accuracy has not been verified, this site presents interesting statistics:

<http://home.iprimus.com.au/foo7/droughthistory.html#8>

Dorothea Mackellar's poem *My Country* is a useful reminder of reality known by Aussies for generations yet contradicted by academic advocates funded by government, the ABC and sensationalist media:

<http://www.dorotheamackellar.com.au/archive/mycountry.htm>

Weather extremes such as droughts and floods are part of Australia. There is no empirical scientific evidence of any changes in trends.

Extreme weather events are not on the rise and some categories appear to be decreasing:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/extreme_n_america.pdf

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

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

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/flood_activity.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/rest_of_globe.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/extreme_n_america.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/droughts_in_mexico.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/storm_trends_australia_new_zealand.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/indian_ocean_hurricanes.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/north_american_flood_activity.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/hail_storm_trends.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/droughts_in_africa.pdf

Nor are fires:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_and_fire.pdf

Weather events and known weather systems have repeatedly been falsely represented by academic activists, the UN IPCC and extreme green activists as supposed evidence of climate shifts. For example:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/current-global-weather-patterns-normal-despite-government-and-media-distortions/>

The following website claims to show a history of world weather events:

<http://www.breadandbutter-science.com/Weather.pdf>

The site's accuracy has not been checked. It seems reasonable though to reflect entirely natural variation in Earth's weather over almost two millennia.

A colleague sends a partial list of weather events in Australia and overseas. Weather events are not unusual.

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/30_EarlyWeatherEvents.pdf

Ocean Alkalinity

Oceans are currently alkaline, not acidic. Their level of alkalinity varies naturally. A real scientist with strong connections to the land and vast primary industry experience in applying geology reveals that there have been no unusual or unnatural changes in alkalinity:

<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/acid-ocean-bogeyman.pdf>

This article reveals interesting issues about likely dodgy claims of past ocean alkalinity levels. It reveals yet another reliance on computer models instead of real-world empirical scientific evidence, quote: *"There are hundreds of articles on "ocean acidification". Almost all of them include this statement somewhere:*

"surface ocean pH is estimated to have dropped from near 8.25 to near 8.14 between 1751 and 2004".

As pH was first defined and measured in 1909, and is seldom measured to two decimal points, I wondered where this very accurate figure for the year 1751 came from.

It seems to go back to Mark Jacobson who, in 2005, published a report on a "new ocean chemical equilibrium model" (a computer simulation of the chemical processes going on in the oceans) that included this statement:

"Whereas surface ocean pH is estimated to have dropped from near 8.25 to near 8.14 between 1751 and 2004, it is forecasted to decrease to near 7.85 in 2100 under the SRES A1B emission scenario, for a factor of 2.5 increase in H^+ in 2100 relative to 1751. This "ocean acidification" is calculated to cause a nontrivial transfer of ammonia from the atmosphere to the ocean and a smaller transfer of hydrochloric acid, nitric acid, and sulfurous acids from the ocean to the atmosphere. The existence and direction of these feedbacks are almost certain, suggesting that CO_2 buildup may have an additional impact on ecosystems."

Link: <http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2005JGRD..11007302J>

Since that report was published, the phrase "the increase in ocean acidity from 8.25 in 1751 to 8.14 in 1994" is quoted ad nauseum as if it were gospel truth, measured accurately. It is not a measurement. It is yet another computer model of something so large, so complex, and so interdependent that no computer model will ever model it accurately, and no lab experiment will prove it. (But careful observations of the range of current conditions, and of the past as recorded in the rocks and sea sediments, will provide valuable clues.)"

Insect-borne diseases are not on the rise due to global warming

Internationally eminent expert on insect-borne disease Professor Paul Reiter strongly refutes increased incidence of disease in sensational yet false claims by Al Gore.

Paul Reiter's disgust with the UN IPCC's corrupt and shoddy *science* is discussed in this documentary:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YtevF4B4RtQ>

and in investigative reporter Donna Laframboise's book on the UN IPCC, here:

<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2011/10/13/a-book-is-born/>

And on page 26 of '*Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate*'. This is a Summary for Policy Makers produced by the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, NIPCC an international team of expert scientists eminent in their fields and concerned with restoring scientific integrity destroyed by the UN IPCC.

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

The United Nation's Environment Program (UNEP) poses serious risks to humans and the natural environment. Its contradiction of empirical scientific evidence over many decades have cost the lives of an estimated more than 40 million people:

Page 1 here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_Part%203.pdf

And:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gPtC5K8wck8&feature=gv>

Stirring unfounded fear for emotive Aussie icons

The Great Barrier Reef is often the focus of claims of imminent doom. Refer to the annotated transcript of ABC-TV's broadcast of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's lop-sided misrepresentations on coral bleaching, here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/ABC%20transcripta.pdf>

Other scientists and people making a living from the reef reveal the reef is thriving:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/scientists-crying-wolf-over-coral/story-e6frg6xf-1225811910634>

And:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/ipcc-warming-assessments-attract-the-activists-and-snob-the-sceptics/story-e6frg6zo-1226180881974>

And:

<http://nqr.farmonline.com.au/news/state/agribusiness-and-general/general/barrier-reef-still-pristine-despite-concerns-scientist/1532999.aspx>

The real causes of intermittent coral bleaching?

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/12/viruses-linked-to-coral-bleaching/>

Climate analyst John McLean reveals that empirical measurement contradicts Ove Hoegh-Guldberg's alarmist claims about the Great barrier Reef:

http://mclean.ch/climate/GBR_sea_temperature.htm

And:

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/GBR_SST_and_ENSO.pdf

Kakadu is not under threat from human CO₂.

Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon's excellent book entitled '*The Deniers*' began as a work to debunk sceptics. On gathering facts from experts in their field, the inescapable conclusion is that climate alarm is unfounded and contradicts science.

His book is an outstanding and authoritative compilation of material from interviews of the world's leading scientists in the many various fields comprising climate. It is succinct and easy to read.

New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart has produced a revealing critique of false claims by alarmists misrepresenting science and climate in his book entitled '*Air Con*'. He provides empirical scientific evidence destroying global warming catastrophe myths.

'Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years' by Professor Fred Singer and Dennis Avery scientifically refutes supposed consequences of false global warming claims.

Marlo Lewis' Congressional Working Paper entitled '*A Skeptic's Guide to An Inconvenient Truth*' comprehensively addresses every claim made by Al Gore in his book

‘*An Inconvenient Truth*’ that was the basis of his movie of the same name. Al Gore stands unmasked as misrepresenting climate and falsely terrorising people and especially children. He’s a terrorist. If his advice is adopted it would kill millions of people, mostly the poor in undeveloped nations.

<http://cei.org/pdf/5820.pdf>

Even Al Gore’s *cuddly* polar bears are not facing extinction or any threat from climate. Their numbers are growing rapidly:

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/healthy-polar-bear-count-confounds-doomsayers/article2392523/>

And:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1545036/Polar-bears-thriving-as-the-Arctic-warms-up.html>

Canadian climate professor Tim Ball discusses polar bears and unfounded species extinction claims:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/it-occurred-to-me-global-warming-is-another-undelivered-government-promise-polar-bear-propaganda-in-context-a-useful-tool-for-the-promotion-of-environmental-hysteria-and-politicized-science/>

And:

<http://drtimball.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Polar-Bear2.pdf>

All large complex animal species trace their ancestors to a period 3-6 million years ago when Earth’s global temperatures were more than three degrees warmer than today. Science reveals plants and animals thrive in warmer periods. That’s why warm periods are scientifically labelled as Optimums.

Tim Ball discusses area of forests and agriculture:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/importance-of-urban-trees/>

Summary and sources of unfounded alarm

The Galileo Movement's page dedicated to empirical scientific evidence provides additional information:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/science_futility.php

'Thriving with Nature & Humanity' provides a succinct summary.

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

Empirical scientific data reveals no unusual changes in sea levels, storm frequency activity or severity, insect-borne disease incidence, bush/forest fire frequency or severity, weather events such as floods and droughts, ocean alkalinity, rainfall, snowfall, Arctic ice, Antarctic ice, glaciers, species extinction, species diversity, ... After all, atmospheric temperatures have not changed unusually at any time in the last 160 years since the industrial revolution started. Temperatures for the last 14 years have been lower than 1998.

News media today frequently spread stories by advocates of unfounded climate alarm converting normal weather events into misrepresentations about climate.

<http://drtimball.com/2012/current-global-weather-patterns-normal-despite-government-and-media-distortions/>

In apparent attempts to gain credibility and drive fear alarmists often make specific claims that appear credible yet are false. eg, some claimed specifically that 2010 was the warmest on record. In January 2011 Viscount Monckton cited empirical data to dispel that false claim, quote:

- *"Satellite datasets show last year was not the warmest on record. It was not the least snow-covered year but the most snow-covered: a largely unreported gain in Antarctic sea ice since 1979 almost matches the widely reported loss of Arctic sea ice.*
- *It was not the worst year for hurricanes, but the best year: the accumulated-cyclone-energy index shows less tropical-cyclone activity worldwide than for 30 years.*
- *The forest fires in Russia and southern Australia, and the floods in Pakistan and eastern Australia, were far from the worst ever. Nor can they be attributed to human influence: the UN's climate panel has warned us against that.*
- *They were caused by naturally occurring weather patterns called blocking highs. And global warming can scarcely be blamed after a decade without any.*
- *Nor did 2010 see the second-highest level of natural catastrophes. Yes, 90 per cent of them were weather-related, but in most years that is true, and was true long before we could have influenced climate.*
- *Nor is sea level rising fast. It has risen at the rate of just 0.3m a century since satellites measured it reliably in 1993, under a quarter of the average rate during the past 11,400 years. The Greens don't believe their own whining about sea level: their Hobart office is just metres from the "dangerously" rising ocean.*

- *Nor do most scientists believe man-made global warming will be catastrophic. Most are not climate scientists and take no view, and only a few climatologists have published on the central question how much warming there will be.*

Academic alarmists and advocates use warm weather to invent unscientific claims of global warming that grab headlines. Then real scientists attempt to rectify the error:

<http://www.fox54.com/story/18920344/uahuntsville-study-on-heat-and-climatology>

John Christy is a UN IPCC contributor who has publicly revealed the UN IPCC's unscientific ways.

On recent American weather he says, quote: *"Despite the recent warm summers, Alabama's long-term summer temperature trend over the entire 129-year period is cooling at the rate of about 0.12 degree Fahrenheit per decade. That means summer high temperatures for the several summers before 2006 were about 1.5 degrees F cooler than they were in the late 1800s and early 1900s. That won't make it any cooler outside this weekend.*

The hottest summers in the 129-year record were 1954, with an average summer high of 95.6 degrees, and 1902 at 95.36."

Everything normal and natural. Entirely normal.

Source of political shrieking over sea levels: unvalidated computer models funded by government

When Tanya Plibersek and her lying cronies in Julia Gillard, Greg Combet, Penny Wong and Peter Garrett spread falsities on catastrophic sea levels they're relying on *projections* by unvalidated computer models that have already been proven grossly and hopelessly wrong.

Reality is different from computer models. Firstly, empirical scientific evidence reveals temperature determines CO₂ levels in the air. Sydney Prof Murry Salby confirms that. So does Canadian climate professor Tim Ball with access to data worldwide—for every time period and over every duration in Earth's past. As does empirical data on CO₂ levels cited by the UN IPCC.

Secondly, measurements cited by the UN IPCC and federal government reveal CO₂ levels in the air are determined entirely by Nature. Alone. She overpowers human CO₂ production to drive CO₂ levels up and down seasonally.

The UN IPCC, the government and Greens and government agencies such as CSIRO reverse both facts to say CO₂ levels determine temperature. Then they make computer models of future human CO₂ production.

Those economic models are akin to computer economic models that failed to predict 2008's crash.

Those projections are then used as the basis for other computer models projecting future CO2 levels in air despite contradicting and reversing reality.

Then they use these projections to make computer models of temperature assuming CO2 drives temperature. They reverse reality. Twice.

By the UN IPCC's own Table 2-11 in its latest report, 2007, 13 of the 16 factors driving those models have low or very low levels of understanding. They're unvalidated. That's why they've failed completely. Yet the government relies on them to spread fear.

Then they take the output from the garbage computer models and claim it as *data*. They feed that into computer models projecting future sea levels.

That's the false basis of Tanya Plibersek's fearful shrieking on doomsday sea level scenarios.

Such political shrieking reinforces unfounded guidelines established by the previous NSW state Labor government, driven apparently by the federal government, with CSIRO's input. These unscientific guidelines and regulations already seriously threaten local residents' welfare, ease, comfort, wealth and future security.

Please refer to my correspondence with Port Macquarie-Hastings Council available here:
[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/Administrator1.pdf?zoom_highlight=lake+cathie#search=\"lake%20cathie\"](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/Administrator1.pdf?zoom_highlight=lake+cathie#search=\)

Response from council Administrator, here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/31_13Apr12_Malcolm_IeuanRobertsreLakeCathieCMS_CRM8915_2012_copy.pdf

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/government/31%2013Apr12_Malcolm_Ieuan%20Roberts%20re%20Lake%20Cathie%20CMS_CRM%208915_2012%20copy.pdf

My response and lodgement of submission:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/32_AdministratorJune.pdf

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/government/32%20AdministratorJune.pdf>

Acknowledgment from council Administrator, here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/33_PMHCreply2.pdf

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/government/33%20PMHCreply2.pdf>

Acceptance by council Administrator of my submission to council's public consultation process, here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/34_PMHCreply3.pdf

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/government/34%20PMHCreply3.pdf>

Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon published his interviews of prominent independent scientists expert in many fields in his succinct and readable book entitled

The Deniers. They confirm nothing unusual occurring in climate and reveal natural causes of climate variability.

Another easily readable and comprehensive book is entitled by *Air Con* by New Zealand investigative journalist Ian Wishart.

David Karoly's and Will Steffen's connection

David Karoly and Will Steffen are prominent advocates of human causation of catastrophic global warming. Both are funded by government. Both publicly falsely contradict empirical scientific evidence presented above.

Conclusions

From this appendix I draw two conclusions and ask four questions:

1. Empirical scientific evidence reveals that nothing unusual is occurring due to human CO₂. We have nothing to fear from producing CO₂. There is no need to cut CO₂ output;
2. Unfounded, unscientific alarm has caused considerable losses;
3. Why is government contradicting empirical scientific evidence and funding dishonest claims of catastrophic consequences from human industry and activity?
4. Did government fail to do its due diligence? Why is it wasting taxpayers' funds echoing unfounded claims by the UN IPCC spreading unfounded alarm?
5. What is the impact on people's mental health and especially on children constantly bashed with unfounded fear and guilt?