

Based on government advertising and campaigns, you may be worried that humans are warming our planet catastrophically. From what I've seen from IPCC data provided by the IPCC itself, the government's position is unfounded.

**This letter's specific information enables you, as an MP to support and protect yourself against committing fraud.**

(IPCC - Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change as created by the UN, not by international governments)

All Australian federal MP's have previously been provided by e-mail with links to outstanding papers by John McLean. I mailed a paper copy of McLean's five page summary exposing IPCC fabrications to all senators and many senior parliamentary members of the Liberals, Nationals, ALP, Greens and some Independents. Senior members of parties and some independents have been mailed paper copies of four of McLean's papers (see point 4 for links).

McLean's papers cannot be sensibly refuted since they merely present IPCC data provided by the IPCC itself. They clearly highlight that the IPCC has deliberately falsified its claim of scientific 'consensus'. Having been informed of IPCC realities, MP's continuing to push climate alarm and support an Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) are committing fraud. Here's why:

### **The Evidence:**

The Australian government has repeatedly claimed the need for its ETS is based on IPCC advice so lets consider the IPCC's core claim that human production of CO<sub>2</sub> caused the modest global warming that ended around 1998. This consideration will include significant scientific information released publicly just this past week.

#### **1. The IPCC began spreading unfounded climate alarm with fabrications contradicting IPCC scientists' advice.**

According to Lord Monckton's 2007 public speech at Cambridge University, the IPCC's 1995 Scientific Report draft included the following three statements:

- **“None of the (scientific) studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed (climate) changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases”. Source, IPCC, 1995.**
- **“No study to date has positively attributed all or part (of observed climate change) to anthropogenic causes”. Source, IPCC, 1995.**
- **“Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced.” Source, IPCC, 1995.**

Yet, in the IPCC's 1995 summary Report for Policymakers widely distributed through the media and governments, all three of the above statements by IPCC scientists were removed and replaced with: “The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate”. Source, IPCC 1995 rewrite.

Please refer to: <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=5206383248165214524>

#### **2. The IPCC built momentum spreading alarm with a scientifically discredited fabrication.**

In its 2001 Summary for Policymakers, the IPCC based its promotion of unusual global warming on the infamous hockey stick graph purporting to show dramatic recent increases in Earth's temperature. (The graph's shape is akin to that of an ice hockey stick.) **World-wide, the IPCC's graph has been completely discredited scientifically as a fabrication of unscientific tricks.**

An excellent 20-page summary exposing the IPCC's hockey stick fabrication is available at: McKittrick, R author of chapter 2, in Michaels, P J, PhD, Editor, 2005. Shattered Consensus - The True State of Global Warming. (Rowman & Littlefield: Plymouth, UK). Pages 20-49

McIntyre, S, 2009. <http://www.climateaudit.org/pdf/mcintyre.mckittrick.2003.pdf> and in general <http://www.climateaudit.org/>

### 3. Scrutiny of the IPCC's key graph 'data' reveals recent temperatures are entirely normal.

Early last week, welcome news was released that statisticians were at last able to access the hockey stick graph's data and have proven that the graph was fabricated using tree-ring data from just 12 of 200 trees. The processes used to fabricate the hockey stick graph and the data problems show very poor scientific practices.

That the fabricators have been persistently withholding their data in contravention of recognised scientific process and in breach of IPCC protocol highlights the distinct possibility they have been calculatedly dishonest.

When the appropriate data is used correctly there is NO temperature increase in recent decades. For a reliable, reader-friendly summary, please refer to:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/09/27/quote-of-the-week-20-ding-dong-the-stick-is-dead/>

Additional discussion is provided by the statistician who exposed the fabrication. Refer to: <http://www.climateaudit.org/>

A key tenet of the scientific process is ready availability of data for independent scrutiny. Despite repeated requests for access to their data, the fabricators of the hockey stick graph have failed to make their data available until recently forced to do so. Although methods used to fabricate the hockey stick graph were already discredited world-wide as unscientific, that has now been emphasised by analysis of actual data sets.

That graph and similar graphs fabricated with similar tainted data sets spread climate alarm around the world via the IPCC's highly publicised 2001 Report. Once the fabrication was exposed, the IPCC omitted the hockey stick graph from subsequent reports. Yet the damage had been done world-wide and the IPCC has failed to acknowledge or retract its gross error. The IPCC has allowed people to remain in fear spread by the IPCC's misrepresentation.

Climate alarm was magnified and spread via Al Gore's movie, particularly his 'scissor-lift scene' using the hockey stick graph. Despite the graph's complete discrediting, Al Gore continues to use the graph to spread unfounded climate alarm and fear.

### 4. With its fabricated 'evidence' destroyed, the IPCC fabricated unscientific 'data' using flawed computer models.

After being embarrassed into dropping its 'hockey stick temperature graph', the IPCC's core claim that human activity caused the modest global warming that ended around 1998, has been based entirely on computer models. In their ten year forecasts made in 1998 these models have completely failed. Although human production of CO<sub>2</sub> has continued rising since 1998, temperatures have fallen. This is the opposite of the IPCC's 1998 forecasts and contradicts the IPCC's *theory*, thereby discrediting the IPCC *theory* and the IPCC.

Please refer to these references by McLean with the first being a powerfully concise five pages. Note that McLean's articles cannot be refuted since they simply present IPCC data provided by the IPCC:

- [http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC\\_numbers.pdf](http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf)

- [http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC\\_review\\_updated\\_analysis.pdf](http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf)

- [http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod\\_policybot/pdf/23573.pdf](http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/23573.pdf)

- [http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband\\_the\\_ipcc.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf)

Computer models of Earth's complex climate have been scientifically discredited. The IPCC has been stripped of any justification of its core claim that humans caused global warming. Its claim lies in tatters. Its credibility is shredded.

### 5. Even the IPCC discredits its own computer models - IPCC Table 2.11 (4AR).

The IPCC itself provides information discrediting its own computer models and claims. Although not mentioned in the IPCC's Summary for Policymakers handed to governments and the media, the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report of 2007 (4AR) discloses that climate models could not reproduce the average temperatures observed unless those models included *estimates* of the impact of human production of 'greenhouse gases'. Even though human production of 'greenhouse gases' is trivial besides Nature's overwhelming production, the IPCC explains the failure of its models by blaming the errors on the tiny human portion (3%) of Earth's annual CO<sub>2</sub> production.

This conclusion by the IPCC is based on an implication that the computer models of natural climate were 100% accurate and reliable. **But the IPCC report itself advises that the level of scientific understanding of the majority of climate drivers is very poor.**

Even though there are possibly hundreds of climate drivers, the IPCC Fourth Assessment report lists 16 climate drivers known as 'forcings'. Of the 16, the IPCC's Table 2.11 reveals only two (2) have a 'Medium' Level of Scientific Understanding. Thirteen (13) have 'Very Low' (5), 'Low' (6) or 'Medium to Low' (2) Levels of Scientific Understanding.

The IPCC claims only one theoretical driver has a 'High' Level of Scientific Understanding - 'greenhouse gases'. Yet the IPCC *theory* of greenhouse gases contradicts the laws of Nature and the Laws of physics. The IPCC's depiction of its failed greenhouse gas *theory* of global warming contradicts the very operation of a greenhouse which itself is a false depiction of Earth's atmosphere. The *theory* is a sham to cover flawed computer models.

More disturbing, the IPCC's list of climate drivers ('forcings') omits climate drivers increasingly recognised as true drivers of climate. These include ocean-atmospheric interactions known as oscillations and substantial aspects of the sun. Such oscillations have in the last two years been proven to be highly correlated with Earth's temperature. Yet IPCC computer models fail to include these climate drivers and the IPCC's list of drivers neglect to mention them. Why?

It is at least farcical and certainly not scientific for the IPCC to make claims based on the output from computer models claiming to model natural climate drivers when over 80% of its listed drivers have low levels of understanding and when known significant drivers are omitted entirely. The IPCC's claims are farcical and unscientific - and apparently blatantly dishonest.

**Thus, the IPCC claims human production of CO2 causes global warming simply because that is its excuse for the error in its models. No logic, no data. Only a political need.**

There is no proof human activity caused global warming. None. Scientific work on the major natural climate drivers shows Nature is responsible for the modest global warming that ended around 1998.

D'Aleo, J, 2007. US Temperatures and Climate Factors since 1895, International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project. [http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US\\_Temperatures\\_and\\_Climate\\_Factors\\_since\\_1895.pdf](http://icecap.us/images/uploads/US_Temperatures_and_Climate_Factors_since_1895.pdf) [Accessed: February, 2009]

McLean, J D, de Freitas, C R, Carter, R M, July, 2009. Influence of the Southern Oscillation on tropospheric temperature. Journal of Geophysical Research, Vol. 114, D14104, doi:10.1029/2008JD011637, 2009

**6. The IPCC's core claim has no supporting scientific data and only five (5) IPCC reviewers explicitly endorse the claim - not 4,000 as the IPCC repeatedly falsely implies.**

The IPCC repeatedly implies that its core claim (that human activity caused global warming) is supported by 2,500 or 4,000 scientists. McLean's transparent presentation of IPCC data provided by the IPCC itself shows this is false.

**The IPCC's core claim is explicitly endorsed by only five (5) reviewers of the IPCC's 2007 report. Just five, and there is doubt they were even scientists.**

McLean's scrutiny of IPCC data reveals that there were not even close to 4,000 scientists involved. Many names on IPCC lists are double counted and the IPCC's list of 'scientists' include personal assistants and support staff.

Based on the IPCC's own data, McLean finds it is clear there have been major breaches of scientific process including bypassing of peer-review and major breaches of IPCC protocol.

The IPCC claims IPCC Reports for Policymakers have been written based on reports of IPCC scientists. Yet, the Report for Policymakers in 2007 was written long before scientific reports were completed.

Even in the IPCC's 2007 Fourth Assessment report, purported to be written by scientists, the IPCC's core claim that humans caused global warming is based on the report's chapter 9. That chapter was written by just 53 people, including many computer modelers, who based their conclusion on no hard data whatsoever tying temperatures to atmospheric CO2. Not 4,000 scientists, 53 people. No hard data.

In direct contravention of IPCC protocols, the writing of chapter 9 involved a closely knit authorship. Many of the chapter's 'reviewers' have close links with the authors. Reviewers and authors are entangled in vested interests that raise substantial suspicion and destroy the IPCC's core claim.

Note that the authors of the preceding chapters were not called on for their opinion as chapter 9 was written. Apparently the authors of chapters after chapter 9 either knew what 9 was going to say (unlikely) or worked from the findings of the previous IPCC report.

Despite this, as recently as this week on ABC TV's 7.30 Report, the IPCC Chairman, Rajendra Pachauri, was at it again making claims and inferences that the IPCC's processes are open and properly reviewed. His claims and inferences contradict IPCC data provided by the IPCC and thus his claims are false.

The transcript of the interview is available at: <http://www.abc.net.au/7.30/content/2009/s2700047.htm>

As an aside, during the interview, Pachauri made predictions, with no substantiation, that warming is headed for the upper range of IPCC predictions. Those predictions were made using faulty computer models proven to be in gross error. Kerry O'Brien meekly sought no substantiation.

Meanwhile Nature continues to rule - and cool.

### **7. Science shows temperature drives atmospheric CO2 with a lag of 400-800 years.**

Scientific analysis of ice core data claimed by Al Gore to be proof CO2 drove temperature, in fact, shows that Earth's temperature determines atmospheric CO2 levels. For a simple, scientifically correct, reader-friendly explanation, please refer to:

- <http://sciencespeak.com/EvidenceLinks.pdf> This summary provides links to
- <http://icebubbles.ucsd.edu/Publications/CaillonTermIII.pdf>
- <http://www.no21.org/dvd2/Global%20Warming%20FAQ%20-%A0%20temperature.htm>
- <http://motls.blogspot.com/2006/07/carbon-dioxide-and-temperatures-ice.html> - a reader-friendly description

This scientific information is not new. It was publicly available two (2) years before the release of Al Gore's movie. Twelve months after the movie's production, the information was again omitted from the movie's Update.

Earth's recent rise in atmospheric CO2 levels started before human industrialisation and could well reflect Earth's higher temperatures during the Medieval Warming Period.

The IPCC says of Earth's annual CO2 production, humans produce just 3%, Nature 97%. CO2's residence time in the atmosphere was thought to be 2 to 18 years, likely 5-7 years. Recent research shows CO2 is removed from the atmosphere in just one year. Although annually Nature produces 97% of Earth's CO2 production, Nature entirely controls atmospheric CO2 levels because Nature determines absorption of CO2 from the atmosphere. Earth's near surface rocks, oceans, soil and biomass contain 100,000 times the carbon contained in the atmosphere and continually exchange carbon with the atmosphere.

Thankfully, politicians are powerless to control atmospheric CO2 levels. Nature rules.

### **8. There is no rise in atmospheric temperature in Earth's troposphere as predicted by IPCC theory.**

None. This is confirmed by satellite measurements and weather balloon radiosonde measurement. Please refer to a concise reader-friendly paper by the former consultant to the Australian Government's Australian Greenhouse Office and the author of a carbon accounting model for Australia's compliance with elements of the Kyoto Protocol, scientist David Evans. Note that he states western governments have spent 50 billion dollars searching for evidence of warming and found none. Other estimates put the figure well above 50 billion. All for nought.

Refer to: Evans, D, 2008. No smoking Hot Spot, The Australian newspaper, July 18, 2008  
<http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,24036736-7583,00.html>

### **9. Science reveals no unusual temperatures and reveals the IPCC's alarm is unfounded fabrication.**

Removal of IPCC fabrications shows temperatures in recent years to be completely normal. Indeed, temperatures during the warmest period of the 1990's/2000's were below 1930 peak temperatures and much cooler than Earth's average temperature for the last 3,000 years. Please refer to: Singer, F, 2008 editor for NIPCC –  
[http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC\\_final.pdf](http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf) (NIPCC - Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change)

This concise 28-page report presents an outstanding summary of the 'global warming' issue. It was written by internationally eminent expert scientists, including IPCC scientists and edited by Professor Fred Singer, a physicist and professor of ecology and environment. He is an IPCC scientist.

## **10. There is no evidence that atmospheric CO2 drives temperature as the IPCC claims.**

Please ask yourself whether you've actually seen any hard proof that human CO2 drives Earth's temperatures. There has never been any proof provided of the notion that human production of CO2 drives temperature. The claim is based on a *theory* that contradicts the laws of Nature and physics. The claim and climate alarm were driven by falsities and fabrication, enhanced by unfounded innuendo and inference from Al Gore and the IPCC.

Don't you think that had there been any proof it would have been widely splashed by the IPCC? That it has not been splashed around, directly condemns the IPCC's fabricated 'science' and condemns the IPCC.

## **11. Advocates of global warming caused by humans are now fabricating new 'evidence', also false.**

Atmospheric temperature was once the IPCC's claim to unusual warming of Earth. As that claim has crumpled under sheer weight of scientific facts disproving the IPCC, some advocating unusual global warming have resorted to other spurious claims of rising ocean temperatures or ocean acidity. These claims too have been scientifically disproved.

Please refer to:

<http://www.lavoisier.com.au/articles/greenhouse-science/climate-change/NewTrendinClimateAlarmism-DavidEvans.pdf>

It is disturbing that in her failed attempt to address Senator Steve Fielding's request for proof that global warming was caused by humans, Senator Wong now apparently ignores atmospheric temperature as proof of warming. That's handy because atmospheric temperatures have dropped. Apparently, instead, she now claims rising ocean temperatures are proof of human warming. Yet, ocean temperatures show a slight and ongoing cooling.

Please refer to:

[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/ocean\\_temps.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/ocean_temps.pdf)

A penny for your thoughts?

## **12. Senator Penny Wong has no evidence humans caused global warming that ended around 1998.**

Senator Fielding approached global warming with an open mind. He self-funded his own due diligence including overseas discussions with internationally eminent climate scientists. On June 15, 2009 after his return to Australia, he asked Senator Penny Wong for the government's proof that humans caused global warming.

Steve Fielding's needs for proof that humans caused global warming that ended around 1998 have still not been met by Senator Penny Wong. Senator Penny Wong has failed to provide Senator Fielding with any evidence supporting her claims that global warming was due to human activity. The government has failed and is exposed.

Ask Mr Rudd: "where's your data"? Don't let him refer you to the IPCC's falsities. Ask Mr Rudd: "where is the proof human activity warms the planet globally?"

## **13. IPCC scientists continue to lead the world-wide, spontaneous, people's movement to expose the IPCC's falsities.**

For example, publications by IPCC scientists:

- Michaels, P J, PhD, Editor, 2005. Shattered Consensus - The True State of Global Warming. (Rowman & Littlefield: Plymouth, UK). Individual chapter authors include IPCC scientists. References 729 sources
- [http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC\\_final.pdf](http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf) references 167 plus 41 additional recommended reading
- Singer, S F and Avery, D T, 2007. Unstoppable Global Warming - Every 1,500 Years. (Rowman & Littlefield, Plymouth, UK). Comprehensive, reader friendly book on all aspects of climate alarm. References 534 sources.
- Michaels, P J and Balling, R C, 2009. Climate of Extremes - Global Warming Science They Don't Want You to Know. (Cato institute, Washington, USA). References to 278 sources and reading.
- IPCC scientists' personal statements in video interviews in documentary directed by Durkin, M, 2007. "The Great Global Warming Swindle", produced by Wag TV. <http://www.greatglobalwarmingswindle.co.uk/> [Accessed: March, 2009]
- Climate Change Reconsidered, Edited by Singer and Idso, 2009. <http://www.nipccreport.org/> This mammoth comprehensive report shows what could have been produced had the IPCC not been politically motivated.

#### **14. The IPCC's Purpose is restricted to finding human causes of global warming.**

Hence, if claims are not made by the IPCC that humans caused global warming, the jobs of IPCC's bureaucrats and the IPCC chairman become redundant.

Al Gore uses a quote from Upton Sinclair: "You can't make somebody understand something if their salary depends upon them not understanding it."

The IPCC is making claims humans caused Nature's modest warming that ended around 1998 despite there being not one scrap of evidence.

#### **15. The truth slipped out briefly and was soon buried.**

McLean's analysis (November, 2007, page 3) of the IPCC's 2001 Third Assessment Report reveals "chapter 1 admitted that the changes in temperature did not necessarily mean that a human influence on climate had been identified and that the changes may be natural."

#### **Buried by a *theory* that contradicts laws of Nature and physics.**

McLean notes that the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report (2007) covered over those observations by burying this topic deep in the (lengthy) document after chapters that presented an overview followed by a chapter detailing the *theoretical* greenhouse effect and discussions of changes in atmospheric components and radiative forcing (ie, greenhouse gas production) and then three chapters dealing with observations. With each IPCC assessment report, discussion of *theoretical* greenhouse effects precedes discussion about observations. Says McLean: "We've also seen each report increasing the probability of a human influence in climate but the quality of evidence has scarcely improved so it looks like the IPCC is trying to justify its own existence."

#### **16. IPCC Tricks - as revealed by IPCC scientists.**

According to internationally eminent climate scientists world-wide, including scientists on the IPCC's own scientific panel, the IPCC has knowingly altered IPCC scientists' graphs and data to support IPCC's political reports (Singer, NIPCC, 2008 - listed above)

IPCC political summaries have been written before scientific summaries and on occasion forced changes to the IPCC's own scientific reports (Singer, NIPCC, 2008)

In producing its reports for policymakers, the IPCC has engaged in numerous practices that in business would constitute fraud (Singer, NIPCC, 2008 and Michaels, 2005 and Michaels and Balling 2009 - listed above)

It is widely recognised that in producing its reports the IPCC has bypassed its own 'scientific' procedures and has neglected peer review practices (Singer, NIPCC, 2008) (McLean various - listed above)

Britain's Lord Lawson makes many comments summarising the IPCC's unscientific and unethical, dishonest, fraudulent behaviour, including:

- "There are concerns about the objectivity of the IPCC process, and the influence of political considerations in its findings", and

- "The IPCC's consistent refusal to entertain any dissent, however well researched, which challenges its assumptions, is profoundly unscientific."

[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband\\_the\\_ipcc.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf)

## 17. My Conclusions.

It is clear that IPCC reports are not scientifically prepared and contradict science.

The IPCC ignores natural causes of global warming.

Very few scientists support the IPCC's core claim and a huge number world-wide oppose the IPCC's core claim.

There is no evidence human production of CO2 caused global warming.

Many IPCC claims are unscientific.

Many claims of the IPCC are false.

The lack of an effective peer review process and the unjustified dismissal of well-founded comments demonstrates IPCC reports were written to a predetermined aim to ensure a predetermined outcome.

**The science is indeed settled - CO2 is NOT causing global warming!**

## 18. Ross Garnaut admits his review found no proof that human activity caused global warming - None.

Ross Garnaut's review and report states it "draws extensively on the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change". It falsely assumes IPCC reports are based on science. Surely, this makes the whole premise of the Garnaut Review false? And makes the government's self-proclaimed foundation of its Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) a falsity.

Additionally, the Garnaut Review's first Term of Reference stated "*To report to the Governments of the eight States and Territories of Australia, and if invited to do so, to the Prime Minister of Australia, on: 1. The likely effect of **human induced** climate change on Australia's economy, environment, and water resources in the absence of effective national and international efforts to substantially cut greenhouse gas emissions;*

The first Key Point and first three paragraphs in the Review's Chapter 2 (Understanding Climate Science) state the Review lacks the science and relies on the IPCC. The comments seem to completely avoid addressing Term 1.

Fulfilling this first, and essential responsibility demands a clear statement, based on solid observational science, as to the cause of human induced global warming. The next step would be to quantify the effects.

Until Terms of Reference Item 1 is fulfilled using the full light of available observational and empirical science, the Garnaut review should be entirely dismissed.

Science has proved the IPCC's core claim (that human production of CO2 warms our planet) to be false and unfounded. Nature too has exposed the IPCC because Earth's temperature since 1998 has fallen.

## 19. The IPCC was assisted in spreading unfounded climate alarm.

Al Gore combined the politician's use of fear with Hollywood's use of raw emotion in his movie 'An Inconvenient Truth' ('AIT') produced by Paramount Pictures which consistently ranks as one of Hollywood's top grossing studios. Detailed analysis of Al Gore's movie reveals:

- 234 images of natural and everyday events falsely depicted as unnatural and inferred to be caused by global warming
- 71 images and instances of unscientific and unfounded mixing of projections and actual data to imply future climate
- 59 instances of comments/images out of context or misrepresenting reality
- 74 instances of using the 'crowd effect'
- 0 hard data supporting his core claim that human production of CO2 drives temperature

All this in a movie whose duration is under 90 minutes. All wrapped by Hollywood's core skill of creating emotion to have viewers suspend reality.

Measurements of the use of raw emotion, fear, guilt and the invoking of care reveal a cleverly choreographed work. Merged with the clever use of the powerful 'crowd effect', this movie is not scientific, it is skilfully crafted propaganda.

Here's an example of Al Gore's 'science' in his movie - he claims northern hemisphere (deciduous) leaves exhale CO2 in the winter. Consciously setting aside the crafted emotion and using objective analysis reveals the movie is completely devoid of sound, scientific data in context.

A documentary exposing Al Gore's fabrications is having its world-wide premiere on October 18.

The British High Court (2007) ruled that 'An Inconvenient Truth' is a political work containing numerous factual inaccuracies. Some detailed reports of the ruling claim virtually every assertion Al Gore makes in his movie has been strongly contradicted by sound science. My detailed analysis agrees.

Marlo Lewis' 'Congressional Working Paper' citing 324 references, provides an outstanding analysis of Al Gore's book 'An Inconvenient Truth' showing the book contains:

- Wrong statements, false statements - 19
- Misleading statements - 17
- Exaggerated statements - 10
- One sided statements - 25
- Speculative statements - 28

Lord Monckton (2007), well versed in climate science and data, has cited 35 serious scientific errors and distortions all "pointing to invention of a threat that does not exist at all, or exaggerations of phenomena that do exist". He makes it clear his list is not complete. In the freely available video recording of his speech to Cambridge University, Monckton exposes Al Gore's falsities in detail item by item.

Please refer to:

<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/monckton/goreerrors.html> and,  
<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=5206383248165214524>

Here are quotes from an interview of Professor Stephen Schneider, described as "a senior member of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and a close advisor to former vice-president Al Gore". Note: Stephen Schneider's roles for the IPCC include Co-ordinating Lead Author.

*Schneider*: "I was initially in 1970 and '71 more worried about cooling." (supposedly caused by the use of fuels containing carbon)

*Documentary makers*: "Indeed Professor Schneider in the 1970s published papers and praised books which warned of the devastating consequences of the forthcoming man made ice age. But within ten years Professor Schneider and the scientific consensus was claiming the Earth was experiencing global warming."

*Schneider*: "The scientific community is very, very confident that it's warming." (again supposedly caused by the use of fuels containing carbon)

*Documentary makers*: "Despite this dramatic reversal of the scientific consensus Prof. Schneider, Al Gore and their supporters are now urging governments to increase taxes and ban oil, coal and gas, the fossil fuels, that are the main source of the world's cheap energy."

Remember, since 1998, Earth's temperature has fallen.

The quotes are available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZwvUz0mtrOk>

Why has the government linked itself to Al Gore's apparently deliberate misrepresentations and falsities?

## **20. Despite the heavily funded onslaught of unfounded alarm, reality is emerging.**

Brendan Nelson, the newly appointed Australian Ambassador to the European Union, is reported to have recently said that public opinion on global warming is reversing.

And not just in Australia.

Last Thursday (October 2nd, 2009) an aide of President Obama's publicly conceded that USA climate legislation will almost certainly not be passed before December's Copenhagen meeting. Please refer to:

[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/03/us/politics/03climate.html?\\_r=1&th&emc=th](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/03/us/politics/03climate.html?_r=1&th&emc=th)

There is strong, credible opinion the USA senate will never pass climate legislation through the senate.

### **World-wide, politicians and the press are reversing. Here are two examples from the past weekend:**

Poland on Friday put a giant spoke in European negotiations on financing the fight to tame global warming when it refused to stump up for richer, western partners. "Quite frankly, from our point of view it's totally unacceptable that the poor countries of Europe should help the rich countries of Europe to help the poor countries in the rest of the world," said Polish Finance Minister Jan Rostowski. "We will not agree to a mechanism which would lead to such a completely unjust proposal," he added.

--AFP, 3 October 2009'

The great global warming scare is over — it is well past its peak, very much a spent force, sputtering in fits and starts to a whimpering end. You may not know this yet. Or rather, you may know it but don't want to acknowledge it until every one else does, and that won't happen until the press, much of which also knows it, formally acknowledges it. I know that the global warming scare is over but for the shouting because that's what the polls show.  
--Larry Solomon, National Post, 3 October 2009'

(Solomon is described by Canada's Financial Post as one of Canada's leading environmentalists)

Politicians have an opportunity to dodge the coming fallout.

**An opportunity for honest politicians - expose the government's ETS fraud.**

From what I've seen, if the IPCC was a company it would be up for fraud. When a United Nations body with the IPCC's high profile is willing to fabricate, misrepresent and mislead that becomes the core issue.

In providing the 20 points above I emphasise that four of McLean's papers were mailed as packages to the Prime Minister, Senator Wong, Malcolm Turnbull and various senior Liberal, National, Labor, Greens and independent MP's. Through Australia Post, all Australian Senators have been sent paper copies of the first McLean reference listed above. These MP's all have the IPCC data provided by the IPCC itself.

Due to the apparent inability of Senator Wong's staff to amble from their offices to collect my Registered Post parcel at the Parliamentary Post Office within four weeks of Australia Post's notification, I personally sent her five of McLean's papers by facsimile.

**If the recipients of these papers and e-mails containing links to McLean's papers continue to promote global warming and/or continue calling for an ETS, the recipients will be committing fraud.**

**To fulfill their responsibilities, every politician, whether opposition, Green or Labor needs to ask the government for specific evidence of human activity causing global warming.**

This is essential given:

- the IPCC has a clear record of dubious practices and lack of honesty (eg, distorted review processes, unfounded and/or wildly exaggerated inferences about the number of endorsing scientists, allowing a lead author to feature his hockey stick graph without any independent verification of its accuracy and supporting scientists withholding data from peer review)
- the sole basis for the IPCC's core claim that human CO2 warmed Earth is now faulty computer models that are in gross error. This is accompanied by the IPCC's own admission that many natural climate drivers are not understood. The most significant climate drivers are omitted altogether from its computer models.

**Thus, currently based only on erroneous computer models, the opinions of the IPCC count for nought.**

Policies should not be based on assumptions and innuendo. Especially when the hard evidence shows clearly that Earth's temperature has cooled over the last ten years. Even at their modest recent peak in 1998, temperatures were below the 1930's peaks and were below Earth's average temperature for the last 3,000 years.

**It's not energy that needs to come clean.**

**Every MP has the responsibility to hold the government to account. As Senator Fielding found, individual politicians can tap a huge quantity of reliable scientific data to counter IPCC and government falsities. Please use science to call for a judicial inquiry that would destroy any need for any ETS in any form.**

**By protecting Australians from a needless, expensive ETS that cannot change climate, individual politicians would regain people's respect. As climate alarm unravels and reality emerges, politicians doing their due diligence will protect their integrity and their political reputation.**

Malcolm Roberts

BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)

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

E-mail: [catalyst@eis.net.au](mailto:catalyst@eis.net.au)

In June, 2009 as part of a series of e-mails discussing the IPCC I sent all federal MP's a declaration of my interests. Please note that I receive no remuneration for my entirely voluntary work exposing climate alarm falsities. If requested I will be pleased to again send you my declaration.