

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2013
 Latest update: Tuesday, March 18th, 2014

APPENDIX 5

MASSIVE MISREPRESENTATIONS

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

“Don't you believe in flying saucers, they ask me? Don't you believe in telepathy? — in ancient astronauts? — in the Bermuda triangle? — in life after death? No, I reply. No, no, no, no, and again no. One person recently, goaded into desperation by the litany of unrelieved negation, burst out "Don't you believe in anything?" Yes", I said. "I believe in evidence. I believe in observation, measurement, and reasoning, confirmed by independent observers. I'll believe anything, no matter how wild and ridiculous, if there is evidence for it. The wilder and more ridiculous something is, however, the firmer and more solid the evidence will have to be.” Isaac Asimov

The alternative to Asimov’s quote has been adopted to spread climate alarm:



Contents	Page
Three Massive Climate Misrepresentations. All completely false	2
1. The core unfounded claim of UN IPCC reports	2
2. The unfounded claim of an overwhelming consensus of scientists	3
3. The unfounded claim of projected catastrophic future events	6
Recent strong emergence of sceptics and growing majority of sceptics	7
Conclusions	10

Three Massive Climate Misrepresentations. All completely false:

Understanding empirical scientific evidence enables easy identification of three frequent, major misrepresentations of climate, science and Nature. These are:

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

The UN IPCC deliberately fabricated and spread these fundamental misrepresentations. Many advocates for cutting CO₂ production cite these false claims in support of their advocacy.

All three misrepresentations contradict empirical scientific evidence. The second is a blatant invoking of authority that confirms lack of evidence. The third often involves naked use of unfounded fear and guilt.

1. The core unfounded claim of UN IPCC reports

The core unfounded claim is that human CO₂ production is causing global atmospheric warming through a supposed enhanced greenhouse effect. This is false. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Appendix 4 reveals and empirically proves that human CO₂ production does not and cannot control Earth's global climate or global temperature. This negates any claim of future catastrophic impacts due to human CO₂.

Appendices 2, 3, 6, 6a, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 reveal that none of the prominent agencies and academics promoting unfounded climate alarm has any scientific empirical evidence for their claim. They contradict empirical scientific evidence using a variety of tricks, misrepresentations and subtly implied falsehoods.

They use, for example, CO₂ levels in air specified in parts per million. That gives the public the perception that Nature's trace gas essential for all life on Earth is plentiful. It misleadingly converts 0.039% into 390 parts per million. They create the illusion of significance.

They show graphs of CO₂ with most of the vertical axis scale removed and without past CO₂ measurements that were higher than today.

They use circumstantial anecdotes, cherry-pick partial data and omit complete data to make speculative and unfounded connections that falsely imply causation.

They use language to confuse and to divert.

They use obvious statements such as “*climate change is real*” to imply that human CO2 caused climate change. Such statements are like claiming water is wet or women have babies. They’re truthful yet imply a falsity—that human CO2 is driving global warming. This and many associated tricks complement misrepresentations and deceptions.

Senator Penny Wong and Greg Combet use Machiavellian tactics to falsely misrepresent CO2 as a pollutant. Are their false claims blatant lies or extreme ignorance?

My initial conclusion was that the UN IPCC and prominent academic and government advocates were simply misled by coincidental and circumstantial speculation. My subsequent observations though raised many serious questions about the behaviour of prominent advocates’ wildly unfounded falsities contradicting empirical scientific evidence. Are their wildly false statements deliberate to deceptively mislead people, media and politicians? Or are they extremely incompetent and irresponsible?

2. The unfounded claim of an overwhelming consensus of scientists

The second unfounded claim is that there is an overwhelming consensus of scientists agreeing with the UN IPCC’s core claim. This is blatantly false. The UN IPCC’s own data verifies this as false.

Firstly, science by head count or consensus is politics. It’s an appeal to authority needed by people with no empirical scientific evidence. Otherwise they would present empirical scientific evidence. That they can’t requires them to resort to appeals to authority.

The reality is that UN IPCC Lead Authors and contributing scientists are leading the spontaneous, worldwide people’s movement exposing UN IPCC misrepresentations.

Analysis of comments received in correspondence and conversation with prominent academics and agencies funded by government reveal the claimed consensus to be nonsense. Please refer to John McLean’s papers presenting UN IPCC data on UN IPCC reporting processes discussed in Appendices 2, 9 and 10.

My correspondence with Kevin Rudd during his period as Prime Minister reveals that this misrepresentation was apparently deliberate and not corrected after he was advised of the error. It seems the misrepresentation was deliberately allowed to remain.

An associated claim is that scientifically peer-reviewed literature supports the UN IPCC’s core claim. Yet the UN IPCC’s own data reveals that to be false. An independent international audit confirms extensive use of non-peer-reviewed material including political activists’ campaign material. The UN IPCC has converted scientific peer-review into ‘*buddy-endorsement*’ yet claimed the seal of quality and authority from *scientific* peer-review. (Appendix 2)

This is discussed in greater detail in Appendix 2, UN IPCC. The reality is that rather than 4,000 *scientists* claiming human CO2 caused global warming, only five (5) UN IPCC reviewers of chapter 9 (2007 UN IPCC report) endorsed the claim.

Chapter 9 is the sole chapter in the UN IPCC's latest report, 2007 claiming global warming and attributing it to human CO2. According to UN IPCC figures from the UN IPCC itself, 53 contributors wrote that chapter. Many of the contributors had conflicts of financial interest. The chapter's claim about human CO2 as the cause of warming was endorsed by only five (5) UN IPCC Reviewers. Five.

The claim was that 4,000 scientists claim human CO2 caused global warming. The reality though is the claim is five reviewers and, being generous, 53 authors many of whom have conflicts of financial interest. They rely on unvalidated computerised numerical models contradicting empirical scientific evidence.

Separately, a frequently repeated yet false claim is that 97% of scientists agree that global warming is occurring and that it's caused by human CO2. The claim emerged from a faulty study using unscientific methodology. It's been extensively debunked yet Australian ABC reporters continue to spread it. Canadian environmentalist Lawrence Solomon debunks it here:

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/01/03/lawrence-solomon-97-cooked-stats/>

John Cook et al released a paper implying a 97 percent (97%) consensus of climate scientists who think CO2 from human activity causes global warming and that it will cause catastrophic consequences. Analysis of their data reportedly reveals their approach and methodology are not scientific and misrepresent reality.

<http://joannenova.com.au/2013/09/monckton-honey-i-shrunk-the-consensus/>

Here's a summary of their relevant data:

- The paper's co-authors claimed to have examined 11,944 abstracts of scientific papers on climate;
- 7,930 did not mention an opinion on climate change. These were discarded. 66 percent (66%) discarded;
- That left 4,014. Of those 3,896 opined that humans caused (1) **some** or (2) **most** warming since 1951 or said (3) human activity **would cause catastrophic warming**. All three categories were combined. 3,896 of 4,014 is 97.1 percent (97.1%). Remember, none have empirical scientific evidence for their conclusion;
- Legates et al show that only 41 papers concluded catastrophic warming would occur. Of the 4,014 papers that's one percent (1%);
- Of the 11,944 abstracts surveyed, that's zero point three percent (0.3%);
- Ninety nine point seven percent (99.7%) do **not** claim human activity would cause catastrophic warming.

Remember, none has empirical scientific evidence that CO2 from human activity causes warming.

- Advocates fabricating unfounded climate alarm fabricate an unfounded *consensus*. (Appendix 9)

Misrepresentations typically can occur in many forms: by omission, subtle unstated implied statements, exaggerations and ignoring contradictory data. Consider the preceding link debunking the falsely claimed 97% consensus. Researchers started with a survey supposedly of 10,257 Earth scientists. They, quote: *“chose to highlight the views of a subgroup of just 77 scientists, 75 of whom thought humans contributed to climate change. The ratio 75/77 produces the 97% figure that pundits now tout”*

Misrepresentations are ingrained through repetition of false statements. They can be cultivated by withholding scientific data. They can be enabled by allowing journalists and citizens to jump to unsupported conclusions without correction. In this way even fundamental laws of science contradicted by laypeople and uninformed politicians or journalists became part of the climate alarm mythology.

In the pseudo-green world of spurious science, raw climate data is routinely adjusted, revised, hidden or even lost when evading FOI requests. Pseudo-science requires doing whatever it takes. Widespread manipulation of data, concealment of evidence that doesn't fit the agenda, cherry picking trend data, censorship of facts, denying hotspots and colouring-in tricks reveal corruption.

Real scientists welcome dissenting views. That is the way science progresses. Yet adherents of politically driven science deny facts, routinely suppress discussion, play word games and hide from authentic debate. Obfuscation and censorship of climate facts prove that they are more interested in shaping public perception than presenting accurate climate science. By perpetrating a hoax and dispensing faulty research to the government, academics and agencies funded by government bring shame to what was once a noble profession.

An allied misrepresentation is that opponents of the core claim about human CO₂ are ignorant, tainted by massive funding, delusional, or pushing outdated science. This misrepresentation was carefully crafted by Al Gore's movie, by the UN IPCC and subtly by alarmist academics and politicians. It is a sign that devoid of scientific logic and evidence they resort to clever yet unfounded demonising.

It's claimed or implied by many prominent advocates and by the ABC that climate realists/sceptics are highly organised and well funded. Both claims are absurd. Most realists/sceptics are volunteers with a strong, informed desire to protect freedom and restore scientific integrity. Humans who engage their minds and hearts display enormous power.

All too often advocates of climate alarm rely on false and unfounded smears of those with whom they disagree. Appendix 9 presents an example of Ove Hoegh-Guldberg openly smearing professions such as geologists and engineers. Other alarmist advocates have smeared individuals publicly and/or privately. These smears take the form of ad-hominem attacks and subtle implied innuendo.

These claims invoke authority. Appealing to authority is a tactic often used by those lacking empirical scientific evidence and logical scientific reasoning of causality.

3. The unfounded claim of projected catastrophic future events

Many advocates of the core claim about human CO₂ make alarming claims of projected catastrophic effects at some future date. These are false and contradict empirical scientific evidence.

First though, even the bases for the catastrophic claims are an often-repeated claim by politicians that we need to avoid a two-degree warming. The reality is that the original two-degree warming was plucked out of the air. It's not scientific: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/climate-catastrophe-a-superstorm-for-global-warming-research-a-686697-8.html>

Empirical data on sea levels discussed in Appendix 4a reveals no threat whatsoever from human CO₂.

As described and referenced in Appendix 4a, similar conclusions apply to fabricated claims of all supposed catastrophic impacts including frequency and severity of floods, droughts, bush/forest fires, storms, insect-borne diseases, ocean alkalinity rainfall, snowfall, Arctic ice, Antarctic ice, ...

Those fabricated claims misrepresent and contradict empirical scientific evidence and rely on corruption and even reversal of empirical scientific evidence.

Specific deadlines initially convinced people the threat was real. As deadlines came and went without catastrophe and as deadlines became more frequent and more diverse people understandably became sceptical:

<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/7115/Laugh-Riot-190year-climate-tipping-point-issued--Despite-fact-that-UN-began-10Year-Climate-Tipping-Point-in-1989>

Why do they now invoke images of people walking the footpath wearing sandwich boards proclaiming the end of the world is nigh?

Misrepresentations permeate the global warming (climate change) '*discussion*'. They are pervasive and used by major NGO's, government agencies including and especially the UN IPCC, the government and CSIRO.

The latter has devoted whole documents to these misrepresentations. They are sometimes employed directly. At other times they're used cleverly, subtly and sublimely. Journalists and politicians then unconsciously spread and reinforce the misrepresentations. Teachers in classrooms and people in everyday conversations, web chats and social media then spread the misconceptions. They have become pervasive and widely assumed to be true. Yet they misrepresent science, climate and Nature.

Despite the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars on programs, communication and propaganda, the majority of the public now questions these misrepresentations.

Despite massive deliberate orchestration of misrepresentations abetted widely by unconscious reinforcement across society and in our once-trusted institutions people are awakening. The unfounded myth of catastrophic global warming supposedly due to human CO₂ is unravelling. This leads to two observations.

Firstly, as it has done many times since 1972's formation of the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), the UN is introducing its next programs promoting new controls supposedly justified by science: biodiversity, ocean alkalinity, desertification, ...

http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2010/09/the_next_big_ecoscare.html

UN organisers admitted prior to the recent Rio Conference agenda that climate change was being downplayed. It's gone off the boil as a result of UN scandals and Nature revealing that she really controls climate. At the Rio conference UN bureaucrats sought immunity for UN IPCC contributors from prosecution:

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/06/14/un-climate-scientists-plead-for-immunity-from-criminal-prosecution/>

It seems that Ove Hoegh-Guldberg hasn't got the message? He reportedly conjures fanciful dreams while continuing to contradict empirical scientific evidence on both atmospheric temperatures and ocean alkalinity. In his correspondence with me he repeatedly failed to provide empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused global atmospheric warming that ended in 1998. He cited the UN IPCC 2007 Summary for Policy Makers yet was not able to advise where in that document there is empirical scientific evidence of causality:

<http://www.news.com.au/national/scientists-want-more-protection-for-oceans/story-fndo4eg9-1226453766559>

Could it have anything to do with his funding by extreme activists Greenpeace and WWF? See appendix 9.

Secondly, climate alarm's unravelling leads to this review's surprising core conclusion in section 18.

Recent strong emergence of sceptics and growing majority of sceptics in the public and among scientists

Although sceptics were maligned in an attempt to silence their voices, recent glaring examples explain the emergence of strong and widespread scepticism.

The greatest factor has been Nature exposing the unscientific misrepresentations of climate alarmists.

Arguably the second greatest factor has been Julia Gillard's monstrous lie and associated unfounded falsities by Tanya Plibersek and Tim Flannery contradicting empirical scientific evidence. These have insulted people's intelligence and raised questions about the veracity of a core claim that relies on support from lies.

Although some of us have been scientifically sceptical from the start we were joined initially by engineers and scientists who questioned government statements. For example, David Evans was on the government's team modelling carbon. When he started asking questions and checking the supposed science for himself he became sceptical.

Even established scientists initially simply assumed climate alarm to be valid. When events triggered questions they started investigating. Based on real-world science they became sceptics.

<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/9035/SPECIAL-REPORT-More-Than-1000-International-Scientists-Dissent-Over-ManMade-Global-Warming-Claims--Challenge-UN-IPCC--Gore>

We are now being joined by so-called green investors converting from endorsers of climate alarm to sceptics.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/9338939/Global-warming-second-thoughts-of-an-environmentalist.html>

We're being joined by genuine environmentalists tiring of extremist greens pushing unfounded fear and guilt. Recently, eminent devout environmentalist James Lovelock turned sceptic. He apparently can see damage being done by unfounded climate alarm eroding the genuine environmental movement's credibility. This drove me in 2008 to speak out because I'm a genuine environmentalist who has got my hands dirty cleaning environmental legacies. The genuine environmental movement is one of Earth's most important movements and needs to be protected with the armour of truth.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2161379/This-meaningless-green-drive-environment-guru-Scientists-U-turn-doomsday-claim.html>

Who now remains in the alarmist camp? The variety of adherents include ideologically driven advocates preoccupied with their belief that humans and humanity are evil; dishonest politicians pursuing personal and political agenda; dishonest financial beneficiaries of climate alarm; unscientific, incompetent and/or dishonest academics funded by governments handing out taxpayer funds to support a political agenda; UN bureaucrats pushing global governance; people failing to do their due diligence; busy and trusting people whose priorities and resources prevent personal investigation and instead rely on perceived authority; weak politicians afraid of media notoriety.

Social media contain a rump of people lacking the ability to question and scrutinise logically, and/or pushing an ideology and/or lacking the strength of character to admit an error and/or naively believing antihuman Malthusian ideology contrary to real-world facts.

As UN IPCC members reportedly scramble for immunity from prosecution, quote:
“(Former US Ambassador to the UN, John) *Bolton*, alongside many savvy taxpayers, is right to worry when such an organization (UN IPCC) seeking to manage a \$100 billion a year fund based on dodgy science is at the same time demanding immunity from prosecution. Can you think of a better recipe for corruption?”

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/06/14/un-climate-scientists-plead-for-immunity-from-criminal-prosecution/>

David Karoly’s connection 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 actively publicly spread all three misrepresentations

Conclusions:

The UN IPCC and its allies are deceitful on:

- Global temperatures;
- Claiming scientific consensus;
- Scientific peer-review;
- CO₂'s relationship to temperature;
- Sea levels;
- Natural weather events such as floods, droughts, bush/forest fires, storms, insect-borne diseases, ocean alkalinity rainfall, snowfall, Arctic ice, Antarctic ice, warm weather, ...
- Eradicating in people's minds the many benefits of warm weather's

Climate alarm can be summarised in 12 statements with each rated as true or false:

- Supposedly, humanity and Earth are confronted by unusually high global temperatures: False.
- This supposedly proves unusual global warming: False.
- Purported correlation of rising temperatures and rising CO₂ shows CO₂ drives temperature: False.
- This is claimed to be caused by increased CO₂ through greenhouse gas warming *supposition*: False.
- The increase in CO₂ is due to human production of CO₂: False.
- There is a scientific consensus world-wide: False.
- That supposed consensus forecasts catastrophic impacts: False.
- Climate alarm is purported as justified by scientific data of supposedly catastrophic effects: False.
- Global warming can be prevented: False.
- Human production of CO₂ must be reduced: False.
- Imposing higher costs on energy produced from fuels containing carbon will reduce their use: True.
- Supposedly there is world-wide political agreement supporting this: False.

There is not one scrap of evidence that human production of carbon dioxide causes higher global temperatures. None.

There is much evidence human activity does *not* cause global warming and much scientific proof of global warming's enormous benefits.

Climate alarm has been fabricated through clever and repeated spreading of three misrepresentations. These are:

- Human CO₂ controls and determines global temperature and climate;
- There is an overwhelming consensus of scientists supporting that claim;
- Catastrophic consequences projected at an unspecified future time from human

disruption of global climate causing sea level rise, extreme weather, floods, drought, snowfall, fires, ocean pH (alkalinity) disease, species extinction, ...

These misrepresentations have been spread by many methods. These include funding by taxpayers through government programs, campaigns and salaries paid to academic advocates.

The government's campaign mirrors and appears to be orchestrated with the global campaign pushing unfounded climate alarm.

There is no consensus of scientists claiming that human CO₂ will cause future climate catastrophe. The reality is that there is no scientific evidence or logic supporting climate alarm. It has been fabricated and spread by massive misrepresentations through multiple channels giving the appearance of independent verification. Scrutiny reveals climate alarm to be a hoax.

Blatant misrepresentations contradicting science erode confidence in science. They destroy scientific integrity that has enabled modern civilisation and our way of life. Repeatedly using massive misrepresentations destroys science and threatens the fabric of our society and civilisation.

Identifying these misrepresentations reveals a major opportunity.

"To truly care, first understand the core, then apply a cure."
Malcolm Roberts