

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

APPENDIX 8

AGENCIES FUNDED BY GOVERNMENT

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

“When the current data fails you, make the future scarier”

Marc Morano discussing advocates of climate alarm (confirmed by email Th.04.10.12)

In God we trust; all others bring data

Motto of the Apollo Space Team likely adopted from W.E. Deming

We do not believe any group of men adequate enough or wise enough to operate without scrutiny or without criticism. We know that the only way to avoid error is to detect it, that the only way to detect it is to be free to inquire. We know that in secrecy error undetected will flourish and subvert.

J Robert Oppenheimer.

| | |
|--|---------|
| 1. Australian Academy of Science, AAS | page 2 |
| 2. Australia’s Chief Scientist | page 9 |
| 3. Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (DoCCEE) | page 13 |
| 4. UK and USA science academies overturned by members | page 14 |
| 5. NASA (GISS) misrepresents, distorts and avoids empirical science | page 16 |
| 6. USA’s NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) | page 19 |
| 7. USA EPA’s antihuman actions repeatedly contradict empirical science | page 22 |
| 8. Stern Review | page 25 |
| 9. German Academy of Sciences and Engineering restoring sanity | page 28 |
| 10. Conclusions | page 29 |

Definitions

Please refer to Appendix 1d for definitions of significant words used.

1. Australian Academy of Science, AAS

The Australian Academy of Science has no evidence of human CO2 causing global atmospheric warming. Yet it repeatedly contradicts empirical science and implies unfounded claims of human causation of global atmospheric warming.

Academy's Science Policy Manager fails to provide empirical scientific evidence

My letter dated Saturday, October 01, 2011 and sent by Registered Post (with Delivery Confirmation) to Dr. Martin Callinan, AAS Science Policy Manager is self-explanatory. It followed my correspondence with Mr. Rob Oakeshott, MP complaining of his office distributing the academy's booklet entitled *The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers*.

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/81_MartinCallinan,September2011.pdf

That booklet was funded by the Department of Climate Change. It purports to contain scientific evidence of human CO2 causing global warming yet contains no empirical evidence or any logical scientific rationale for its core claim.

Dr. Callinan provided me with a list of 31 references that he said contained evidence of human CO2 causing global warming. In doing so he had personally assured me that they contained evidence and that if I refuted that he would identify specifically the location in each reference of such evidence.

My checking all of Dr. Callinan's listed references revealed that none contain any such empirical evidence of human causation. My letter made it clear that Dr. Callinan had failed to provide evidence for the academy's claim. Contravening Dr. Callinan's earlier personal commitment, no reply was received to my letter.

One third of the references cited by the AAS's booklet are cited by the UN IPCC's AR4 (2007) report. Of the references published before 2007 all were cited by the UN IPCC's AR4. (Appendix 2 discusses the UN IPCC.) Some of the references have been supplanted by recent work accessible to authors when writing the Academy's booklet.

To varying degrees and in various ways, many of the Working Group of authors who produced the Academy's booklet benefit personally from advocating that humans caused global warming.

I conclude that the Academy's booklet simply parroted the UN IPCC and other prominent academic advocates of the notion that human production of carbon dioxide caused catastrophic global warming.

Formal complaint to the Academy's President raising deficiencies in its approach on climate change

Dr. Callinan's failure to meet his specific commitments to provide me with empirical evidence of causation and to discuss same led me to lodge a formal complaint by Registered Post (with Delivery Confirmation) to Dr. Suzanne Cory, the Academy's President and a CSIRO Board member.

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/82_Cory,AAS,September,2011.pdf

My letter outlines facts to the Academy's President. It raises serious deficiencies in the Academy's approach to climate 'science' and specifically its booklet. I received no reply.

Please refer to appendices documenting my conclusions of extensive corruption of science by the UN IPCC and CSIRO. Both work intimately with each other and with other organisations spreading unfounded climate alarm. Their interwoven interdependency can be seen in analysis of references cited in the Academy's booklet *The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers* available here:

<http://tome22.info/AAS-QNA/AASQNA-V3.html>

This legend will assist in understanding analysis of the AAS's booklet at the link cited:

Blue = UN IPCC;

Yellow = Australian universities, UK Met Office, CSIRO, NASA-GISS, Climate Research Unit;

Red = in Climategate emails, team that made hockey stick temperature fabrication;

Green = NonGovernment activist organisations including Greenpeace and WWF;

Pale green = Bali Declaration;

Pink = journals.

That resource leads to this: <http://tome22.info/AAS-QNA/InvolvementOfPersons.xls>

Peter Bobroff AM states on the website, quote: "*The Department of Climate Change commissioned the Australian Academy of Science to produce this [Q&A document](#). It is relevant to note that the then President of the AAS was a member of the ANU Institute of Climate Change. The Secretary of the AAS Executive Committee has stated:*

"AAS imprimatur helps its credibility."

and

"Needless to say, any adverse findings do great damage to the credibility of climate scientists as a whole, especially in the current climate of almost religious opposition to the acceptance of climate change science as a whole."

<http://tome22.info/SteffenMtgCooma/IncompetentBriefing.html>

A detailed objective analysis of the Academy's booklet published close to the time of release of the IAC's damning review of the UN IPCC is available here:

<http://tome22.info/Top/AnnotatedDocuments.html>

And then further here:

<http://tome22.info/Docs/AASQNA-Sum.html>

And:

<http://tome22.info/Docs-Refs/AASQNA-Refs.html>

Academy's close ties with UN IPCC and CSIRO

Several authors of the Academy's booklet are associated with the UN IPCC. They include authors of UN IPCC assessment reports. I am advised that many of the booklet's other authors are from CSIRO or connected with CSIRO, an organisation benefitting enormously from government funding on climate and enmeshed in discredited UN IPCC activities. Please refer to Appendix 2 (UN IPCC) and Appendix 6 (CSIRO).

Retired journalist Tony Thomas has reported on the Australian Academy of Science's integrity in his article available here:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science>

He explains, quote: *"Of the sixteen-member author and review team on the Academy's booklet, seven had signed the activist Bali (Climate) Declaration, one had also served on the green lobbyist Worldwide Fund for Nature Advisory Panel and was also a member of the Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists, one had signed a Guardian petition-letter on climate change, Kurt Lambeck** had signed a petition-letter to Science magazine, and two had signed a petition-letter to the Wall Street Journal.[67] The team was not independent of the government (\$55,600 funding), nor of the IPCC (nine of sixteen had IPCC involvement. Would the "IPCC nine" nitpick the IPCC's work?). The team was devoid of both statistical and economics experts, which might explain its blithe endorsement to reduce global emissions to "near zero" by 2100, consistent with progress in North Korea."*

** former AAS President

Is Tony Thomas getting closer to identifying reasons for publication of the Academy's booklet when he says, quote: *"Lambeck explained at the launch: "There was a sense of frustration...consensus was being reached and somewhere along the line the debate started to fall apart, I think partly because of the [growing] complexity of the science."[69] Climate-gate e-mails, Himalaya-gate, Hockey-Stick-gate, Flannery's scare-gate: Lambeck might have cast his net wider than "complexity" for why the debate fell apart.*

The rationale was put more crudely in an e-mail from a top Academy office-bearer, who said the booklet was written "to help resolve many issues which have been deliberately rendered obscure by climate change deniers ... and the AAS imprimatur helps its credibility."[70]

The rest of Lambeck's speech included his trademark bagging of ignorant sceptics, and warnings to reporters to distinguish between the true climate scientists and "smokescreens thrown up by those with little understanding of the science".

Empirical facts and observations of Nature reveal climate alarm to be based on an unscientific and unfounded fabrication. The AAS's booklet is misleading. It purports to

be scientific yet is a reassembly of material used by the UN IPCC, CSIRO and similar organisations misrepresenting climate and science.

Is the Academy's unscientific booklet simply unfounded advocacy?

Professor Lambeck's foreword for the Academy's booklet contains significant misrepresentations of climate science. These include unfounded perceptions of certainty where significant doubt exists and despite strong disagreement among reputable scientists within the international and Australian scientific communities. These disagreements involve fundamental aspects on causation of supposedly threatening global warming.

The Academy's unfounded and unscientific implied endorsement of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) contradicts the damning report by the Inter Academy Council (IAC) discussed in Appendix 2.

The Academy's booklet entitled '*The Science of Climate Change Questions and Answers*' falsely implies existence of evidence of human causation of supposedly dangerous global warming.

Respected atmospheric physicist Professor Garth Paltridge was a member of the booklet's Oversight Committee. He refused to have his name associated with the document.

Independent journalist raises many telling concerns

Tony Thomas raises many significant points:

- The Academy chooses to not make its accounts public;
- *"The bulk of the Academy's revenues are from federal government funding, about \$5m in 2010-11"* (quote). The Department of Climate Change is a substantial financial contributor and client;
- Quote: *"In 2010, Cory presided over a serious omission by the Academy. The matter concerned the Inter-Academy Council (IAC) report of August 30, 2010 on faulty IPCC processes."* (Please refer to Appendix 2);
- On global warming (aka climate change) he discusses, quote: *"The Academy's partisan nature."* He provides evidence to support his statements;
- Quote: *"Since 2005 the Academy has greeted twelve IAC-type studies with enthusiasm"*. Yet the academy was publicly quiet on the damning IAC report revealing serious deficiencies in UN IPCC processes and procedures. Some of these, such as the Stern Review have been publicly discredited by experts in their fields;
- The Academy's false statement about Australian affluence in its submission to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Climate Change, Environment and the Arts, quote: *"Humans are ultimately the main threat to the environment, especially in Australia, per capita the world's most effluent and most affluent"*

nation ...[7] *The first priority must be containing human population growth ... to preserve our biodiversity.*” According to Tony Thomas, quote: “Neither is correct. In CO2 emissions per capita, Australia ranks about 11th. In wealth per capita, about 12th.” Through such statements the Academy aligns itself with the basis of UN Agenda 21 for global governance and control as discussed in Appendix 14;

- Contradictory statement on regional climate modelling for which the Academy is seeking funding;
- The Academy aligns itself with CSIRO and BOM;
- The Academy elected Tim Flannery as a Fellow despite his startlingly unscientific and false statements, his numerous failed climate projections and despite protests from Tim Flannery’s associated climate alarmists. Another Academy Fellow is ABC-Radio presenter Robyn Williams quoted as making an absurd forecast about sea levels. (See Appendix 13 for more on Robyn Williams’ behaviour);
- Association of the Academy’s Past-President Kurt Lambeck with disgraced activist Peter Gleick as signatory of a petition relying on a tragically faked photo of a polar bear;
- Cites the Academy’s current President Dr. Suzanne Cory as endorsing the Academy’s booklet (entitled *The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers*): “endorse in general terms the Academy’s climate booklet of August 2010. “I stand right behind our Academy’s booklet and don’t distance myself from it one skerrick,” she says. “I can’t comment on it as a climate scientist, but I respect the views of those who compiled it.”[22] She has said she prefers, incidentally, the term “earth systems change” to “climate change/global warming”.”
- The Academy in the past participated fully in advocating a political position on climate;
- Offensive comments from the Academy’s President Cory after she failed to verify reported yet untrue claims that sceptics were threatening and intimidating ANU climate scientists;
- Following a revolt of its members, Britain’s Royal Society revised its executive’s earlier endorsement of human CO2 as a cause of global warming. Yet the Australian Academy has not publicised that change by scientist members of the Royal Society. Tony Thomas reveals five serious contradictions by the Academy with the Royal Society’s revised position;
- The Academy’s apparently unscientific selective use of data;
- Academy President Suzanne Cory admits that (climate) science is not settled.

Did the Academy fail to do its due diligence and mislead parliamentarians?

Various sources lead me to conclude that the Academy has not done its due diligence on the UN IPCC. Given its role as supposedly the premiere scientific organisation in Australia it is unconscionable that the AAS implies endorsement of the UN IPCC.

The Academy referred to the IAC report some months later in its annual report. Nonetheless, the question arises as to whether or not the Academy’s past-President Kurt

Lambeck minimised discussion of the IAC's comprehensive list of severe deficiencies in UN IPCC processes and procedures? If so did this not mislead the public and parliamentarians by omission?

Was publication of the AAS's booklet linked in any way to timing of release of the IAC's report into the UN IPCC?

Additionally, the IAC review first listed the then AAS President Kurt Lambeck as a member of the IAC board and then as a review monitor charged with "*ascertaining that the independent examination of this report was carried out in accordance with IAC procedures and that all review comments were carefully considered.*" (Please see IAC review.)

Reportedly Kurt Lambeck was also a co-author of the IAC report's Executive Summary. Yet the Executive Summary conflicts in both material content and tone with the body of the IAC report. In doing so it seems that the IAC's own guidelines for producing the Executive Summary were contravened.

Please refer to <http://tome22.info/> and specifically <http://tome22.info/IAC-Report/>.

Is the Academy an unscientific government-funded advocacy group?

Professor Cory's failure to respond to my complaint is disappointing and raises questions. Has she, for example heeded my request to please make an effort to understand the body of the IAC report?

On the topic of climate change has the Academy become just another advocacy group? Why has the Academy been unscientifically highly restrictive in use of references for its flagship booklet on climate change? Why did it exclude hundreds of scientific references disagreeing with its opinion?

My conclusion is that the Australian Academy of Science has no empirical evidence or logical scientific rational to support the claim that human CO2 caused Earth's latest modest cyclic global atmospheric warming that ended in 1998.

Despite this, its climate publication '*The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers*' employs pictures and artwork with carefully scripted statements to imply scientific support contrary to empirical science.

The Academy's endorsement of the UN IPCC's unscientific documents tarnishes the Academy's reputation.

Appendix 9 reveals the web of government-funded academic advocates on taxpayers' payroll. For example, the Academy's previous President, Kurt Lambeck wrote the booklet's Foreword. David Karoly is a member of the Working Group that produced the AAS booklet.

The booklet was paid for by the Department of Climate Change.

The Academy's current President seems unwilling to respond to legitimate criticism of opinions of comments and presentations in the Academy's booklet. Has the Academy been influenced by government-driven, taxpayer-funds?

2. Australia's Chief Scientist

Australia's Chief Scientist has no evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Yet both Chief Scientists since 2008 have repeatedly contradicted empirical science and falsely implied claims of human causation.

My letter dated Friday, February 12th, 2010 to Professor Penny Sackett, then Australia's Chief Scientist, sought empirical evidence that human CO2 caused global warming (aka climate change). She failed to respond.

[www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/83_10.02.12Sackettsigned copy.pdf](http://www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/83_10.02.12Sackettsigned_copy.pdf)

She publicly spread the claim despite not having empirical scientific evidence for her claim. That office's website continues to make false and unfounded alarming climate claims yet presents no supporting empirical scientific evidence or reasoning.

Penny Sackett was Australia's first full-time Chief Scientist since the role was downgraded in 1996. According to the ABC, Professor Sackett revealed that she never briefed the current Prime Minister and only once briefed former Prime Minister Kevin Rudd. Why did the Rudd-Gillard government bring back the office of Chief Scientist that subsequently misled the public and parliamentarians on climate alarm?

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2011-02-23/resigning-chief-scientist-never-briefed-gillard/1954718>

The Current Chief Scientist, Professor Ian Chubb was appointed on May 23rd, 2011. He was formerly Vice-Chancellor of the Australian National University. Like his predecessor he falsely makes claims of global warming due to human CO2. In doing so he contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

<http://www.chiefscientist.gov.au/2011/04/new-chief-scientist-appointed/>

John McLean's letter to the Chief Scientist is available here:

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

John McLean:

- Reveals the Chief Scientist's misplaced reliance on the position of the national science academies that the Chief Scientist holds in regard;
- Exposes the Chief Scientist's unscientific reliance on the apparent notion that consensus somehow determines scientific truth;
- Scientifically debunks the nature and quality of evidence that the Chief Scientist seems to think exists;
- Provides empirical evidence for the Chief Scientist's consideration; and,
- Challenges the Chief Scientist to take action on empirical evidence with which he has been provided.

Independent Member of Parliament Rob Oakeshott is in coalition with Julia Gillard. In his letter dated August 9th, 2011 he advised me that he requested a meeting for me with Professor Chubb in October 2011. No response has been received from the Chief Scientist. Rob Oakeshott's letter is available here:

www.conscious.com.au/docs/new/84_OakeshottReply2,August09,2011.pdf

Chief Scientist not aware of any advice to government of threat to Great Barrier Reef, Kakadu or Australian snowfields if no carbon tax

Please refer to the transcript of the Senate Estimates hearing on February 15th, 2012 involving the Economics Legislation Committee. It's available here:

<http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;db=COMMITTEES;id=committees%2Festimate%2F16bb4111-084d-4c58-8cae-96ecba7e7e6e%2F0002;query=Id%3A%22committees%2Festimate%2F16bb4111-084d-4c58-8cae-96ecba7e7e6e%2F0000%22>

Senator Mason asked about advice of threats to the Great Barrier Reef, Kakadu and the Australian snowfields, quote:

“Senator MASON: ... As Chief Scientist, have you provided any advice to the government that failing to implement the government's carbon tax would precipitate the loss of the Great Barrier Reef, Kakadu or the Australian snowfields? Was there anything as specific as that?”

Prof. Chubb : No.

Senator MASON: Are you aware of any advice being provided to the government by any other agency or official in the Department of Innovation, Industry, Science, Research and Tertiary Education or its predecessor that failing to implement the government's carbon tax would precipitate the loss of the Great Barrier Reef, Kakadu, and the Australian snowfields?”

Prof. Chubb : I am not aware of any.

Senator MASON: Are you aware of any advice being provided to the government by any other department or federal government agency that failing to implement the government's carbon tax would precipitate the loss of the Great Barrier Reef, Kakadu, or the snowfields?”

Prof. Chubb : No.

Senator MASON: As Chief Scientist, have you provided any advice to the government that failing to implement the government's carbon tax will lead to Australians experiencing higher rates of infectious and vector-borne diseases, as well as food- and water-borne diseases?”

Prof. Chubb : No. I have steered clear of making comments about the carbon tax. I think I said that the last time I was here, and probably the first time—no, that was a bit earlier, but certainly the last time I was here. I am not an expert in economics; I am not an expert in the whole issue surrounding the carbon tax. I have taken the view that, if I am asked to provide advice on where the science sits—potentially to interpret some of the science if I were asked—that that is entirely within my brief, but comments on academic matters are not my game.”

Consider Appendices 4 and 4a. There is no scientific basis for the government's fabricated false claimed threats to emotive Aussie environmental icons.

Chief Scientist had not reviewed Climate Commission's report

At the same Senate Estimates hearing Senator Colbeck and Australia's Chief Scientists discussed the Climate Commission's report in Senate Estimates Committee hearings on

Quote:

“Senator COLBECK: I just want to go to the Climate Commission's report, The critical decade. Are you familiar with the document?”

Prof. Chubb : Yes.

Senator COLBECK: Do you think all of the science in that report was correct?

Prof. Chubb : All of it?

Senator COLBECK: All of it.

Prof. Chubb : I do not know.

Senator COLBECK: That is a fair answer. Have you reviewed the document at all?

Prof. Chubb : Not at that level.

Senator COLBECK: Professor Chubb does not—

CHAIR: Order!

Senator COLBECK: Actually, that is not the headline that I am looking for. So you have not reviewed it at the level that would you allow you to give an opinion on that?

Prof. Chubb : Not as precisely as you would like the answer.

Senator COLBECK: So you could not say which parts of it might be of concern?

Prof. Chubb : Not now—no.”

Separately, Senator Mason asked, quote: *“Good morning. Professor. Since becoming Chief Scientist, have you provided any advice, whether written or oral, to the Prime Minister or to her department on the specific issue of the science surrounding climate change?”*

Reading Ian Chubb's vague responses to Senator Mason's questions raises questions as to his advice, if any, to the government on climate change.

By misrepresenting climate science, the Chief Scientist takes the climate *debate* and bureaucracy to new lows

On ABC-TV's *4 Corners* program broadcast Monday, September 19th, 2011 the current Chief Scientist, Ian Chubb in an exchange with interviewer Marian Wilkinson said, quote:

“MARIAN WILKINSON: What do you think of the quality of the debate on climate change in Australia at the moment?”

PROFESSOR IAN CHUBB: I think it's very poor. I think every time I think it's reached a low, we then go on and reach a new low. And I think that's of very little benefit to us as we're trying to grapple with what is a very serious problem that needs serious discussion.”

<http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/stories/2011/09/15/3318364.htm>

Ian Chubb lacks empirical scientific evidence that it is a “*very serious problem*”? Ian Chubb and Penny Sackett have repeatedly made or implied false claims that contradict empirical science.

On the same program, Ian Chubb declared that national academies support the notion of human CO2 causing global warming, quote:

*“PROFESSOR IAN CHUBB, CHIEF SCIENTIST OF AUSTRALIA: I would urge politicians too to look at all the evidence and to wonder why it might be that something like 32 national academies of science** all around the world are all saying that it's very likely that human activity has adversely affected our climate through global warming. Why would they do that if it were not true?”*

** Will Steffen claimed only 12-13 academies. That claim too was false. See Appendix 9.

He should know that only two national academies of science surveyed their members, Russia and China, and they did not endorse the UN IPCC's view.

Is Ian Chubb not aware of the scathing report into UN IPCC processes and procedures by the peak international body of national science academies, the Inter Academy Council? If not why not? Its report was released in August 2010 and the body of its report is scathing in exposing UN IPCC processes as unscientifically producing claims that cannot be relied upon.

Is he not aware that statements from other academies were written by their executive bodies or by subcommittees in isolation from members and are being challenged by academy members? Is he not aware, for example, of the members' of prominent national academies such as the UK Royal Society revolting against that society's executive hijacking the society's name and contradicting empirical science? Is he not aware that the Royal Society's members required the executive to restore some balance to the debate and that the Royal Society did in fact revise its statements? Is he not aware of similar events in the USA and the comments of the late Professor Frederick Seitz, former President of the USA's National Academy of Science?

Does he condone the Australian Academy of Science's misrepresentation of climate science? Has he critically audited the Australian Academy's booklet entitled '*The Science of Climate Change: Questions and Answers*'. Has he done so in the proper objective scientific manner which is to show scepticism and demand empirical scientific evidence? If not why not? If so, what are his findings?

I conclude that the office of the Chief Scientist has made claims contradicting empirical scientific data. The office of Chief Scientist has failed to do its due diligence on behalf of the Australian public. The office of Chief Scientist is funded by government and has misled members of parliament and the public.

3. Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency (DoCCEE)

Australia's Department of Climate Change and Energy Efficiency has no evidence that human CO₂ caused global warming. Yet the department repeatedly contradicts empirical scientific evidence and falsely implies or states claims of human causation.

The Department of Climate Change website provides no empirical scientific evidence that human CO₂ caused warming. Despite this it has splashed around taxpayer cash for many publications, events, conferences, grants and propaganda deceitfully driving its core claim.

The DoCCEE drives misrepresentations of climate using taxpayer funds:

<http://www.climatechange.gov.au/climate-change/understanding-climate-change/~media/climate-change/prof-plimer-101-questions-response-pdf.pdf>

Accessed through:

<http://www.climatechange.gov.au/climate-change/understanding-climate-change/response-to-prof-plimer.aspx>

The DoCCEE misrepresents the work of international award-winning Australian scientist Professor Ian Plimer in his book entitled *How to Get Expelled from School*. Ian Plimer is highly respected for his scientific acumen yet the DoCCEE responds by contradicting and misrepresenting science, climate, Nature and humanity.

Consider the documents cited by the DoCCEE. None of the cited documents contains empirical evidence of the department's core claim about human CO₂ driving climate and temperatures. They contradict empirical evidence.

All five documents cited by the department are funded by government. All are discussed in other appendices.

The DoCCEE seems to have failed to objectively analyse Tim Flannery's book entitled *The Weather Makers*, falsely publicly portrayed as scientific yet repeatedly contradicting empirical science. Why? Please refer to Appendix 9, *Academic Advocates*.

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science>

David Karoly is a member of the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel and thereby funded by the department. Will Steffen is a member of the Department's Climate Commission.

Other appendices reveal a close-knit cabal of academics misrepresenting climate science while funded by DoCCEE.

4. UK and USA science academies overturned by members

Overseas science academies have no evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Yet some have been hijacked by government funding to repeatedly contradict empirical science and falsely imply claims of human causation.

Reportedly only two national academies of science surveyed their members, Russia and China, and they did not endorse the UN IPCC's view.

In August 2010 the world's peak body academic scientific body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC), produced a report on UN IPCC processes and procedures. The body of the report is scathing in exposing UN IPCC processes as producing unscientific climate claims.

Statements from other academies were written by their executive bodies or by subcommittees in isolation from members. They're being challenged by academy members. For example, members' of the UK Royal Society revolted against that society's executive hijacking the society's name and contradicting empirical science? Royal Society members subsequently required the executive to restore some balance to the debate. The once-respected Royal Society then revised its position to admit doubt that human CO2 drove climate. Similar events are underway in America where the late Professor Frederick Seitz, former President of the USA's National Academy of Science rightly condemned the UN IPCC.

The UK Royal Society has been politicised:

http://thegwpc.org/images/stories/gwpc-reports/montford-royal_society.pdf

And:

http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science#_ednref29

The unthinkable has happened. British science has been corrupted to achieve a political agenda directed seemingly by British politicians to an agenda pushed from outside Britain.

<http://notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2012/06/02/royal-society-funding/>

The UK Royal Society was scientifically derailed because its executive bypassed Society member scientists by unilaterally relying on the corrupt UN IPCC.

<http://www.nysun.com/opinion/foggy-science-in-london/77404/>

Similarly, America's National Academy of Science has been criticised for its position on the unfounded and unscientific claim that human CO2 caused global warming. Past President, the late Professor Frederick Seitz led a petition that collected over 31,000 signatures from dissenting scientists:

http://www.petitionproject.org/seitz_letter.php

An elected member of America's National Academy of Science, Peter Gleick has recently admitted to fraudulently taking material from the sceptic Heartland Foundation.

Additionally he spread a fraudulently fabricated document to apparently discredit climate sceptics. (Appendix 15)

Peter Gleick's reliance on fraud reveals his damning lack of empirical evidence for the claim that human CO2 warms the atmosphere. It seems to reveal the corruption among some advocates of human causation and increasingly desperate strong forces involved.

Real scientists upset with the hijacking of some supposedly scientific institutes express their dismay and then resign. Quote: "*Dr. Ivar Giaever, former professor with Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and the 1973 winner of the Nobel Prize in physics, resigned yesterday as a Fellow from the American Physics Society over its 'incontrovertible' position on global warming.*

*Giaever wrote in an email to APS's executive director (via [Climate Depot](#)): In the APS it is ok to discuss whether the mass of the proton changes over time and how a multi-universe behaves, but the evidence of global warming is **incontrovertible**? The claim (how can you measure the average temperature of the whole earth for a whole year?) is that the temperature has changed from ~288.0 to ~288.8 degree Kelvin in about 150 years, which (if true) means to me is that the temperature has been amazingly stable, and both human health and happiness have definitely improved in this 'warming' period."*

5. NASA (GISS) misrepresents, distorts and avoids empirical science

This formerly respected body has been tarnished by serious allegations of corruption within its Goddard Institute of Space Studies, GISS. NASA continues to fail to provide empirical scientific evidence of human causation of warming.

Appendix 7 reveals NASA-GISS reportedly '*adjusted*' temperature data to exaggerate modest warming cycles and reverse actual cooling trends to fabricate warming.

NASA's position is publicly decried by NASA associates for being contrary to science and for being politically driven. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/04/10/hansen-and-schmidt-of-nasa-giss-under-fire-engineers-scientists-astronauts-ask-nasa-administration-to-look-at-emprical-evidence-rather-than-climate-models/>

And:

<http://www.real-science.com/hansen-slammed-by-nasa-scientists>

And:

<http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2010/03/30/nasa-data-worse-than-climategate-data/>

And:

http://icecap.us/index.php/go/joes-blog/nasa_lying_about_the_past1/

And:

<http://www.real-science.com/hansen-dragging-science-historical-lows>

Please see comments by retired award-winning NASA Atmospheric Scientist Dr. William W. Vaughan, recipient of the NASA Exceptional Service Medal, a former Division Chief of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center and author of more than 100 refereed journal articles, monographs, and papers, also now points to natural causes of recent climate changes:

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=10fe77b0-802a-23ad-4df1-fc38ed4f85e3

NASA's website presents no empirical evidence or scientific logic showing causation by human CO₂. Like some other sites falsely promoting climate alarm it trades on its name as a scientific body. It presents alarming statements of events not connected in any way to human CO₂. It uses colourful yet false depictions of CO₂ in the atmosphere and predictions based on the UN IPCC and on unvalidated computer models already proven hopelessly wrong.

According to award-winning journalist Marc Morano, NASA-GISS's James Hansen distorts climate science to support unfounded climate alarm. Marc Morano reveals a tight-knit cabal of scientists and politicians fabricating science to produce the science desired by the politics.

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120530-aj-morano.mp3>

James Hansen is being accused by many people of unscientifically fiddling temperature records to fabricate global warming. He cites corrupted ground-based temperature measurements as evidence of global warming yet ignores accurate satellite measurements validated by weather balloon radiosonde measurements. Both latter

datasets reveal no warming since 1998. Radiosonde data reveal modest cyclic atmospheric warming from 1976 through 1998 after cooling from 1958 through 1976.

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120530-aj-morano.mp3>

And:

<http://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2012/06/11/uncorrupted-us-temperature-data-showed-cooling-from-1930-to-1999/>

And:

<http://www.climategate.com/australiagate-now-nasa-caught-in-trick-over-aussie-climate-data>

James Hansen has been accused of inventing temperatures where measurements do not exist:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/01/25/another-giss-miss-this-time-in-iceland/>

And:

<http://www.c3headlines.com/2012/03/google-warming-google-sponsors-student-to-fabricate-global-warming-temperatures-for-nasa.html>

And:

<http://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2012/06/11/why-hansen-had-to-corrupt-the-temperature-record/>

James Hansen caught misrepresenting climate yet again?

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/08/06/nasas-james-hansens-big-cherry-pick/>

NASA-GISS revealed changing temperature data records dubiously, again?

http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2012/09/nasas_rubber_ruler.html

Internationally respected Alabama State Climatologist and UN IPCC Lead Author John Christy reveals unfounded claims in statements on weather by James Hansen:

Part 2:

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2012/08/fun-with-summer-statistics-part-2-the-northern-hemisphere-land/>

James Hansen has been repeatedly accused of global warming fraud at a time when the powerful science journal, *Nature* admits, “*research is riddled with systematic errors.*”

<http://principia-scientific.org/supportnews/latest-news/142-top-scientists-vent-on-nasas-sub-prime-greenhouse-gas-hoaxer>

Is NASA-GISS’s James Hansen dodging and misrepresenting the issues, again as discussed here?

<http://www.sepp.org/twtwfiles/2012/TWTW%20-%209-15-12.pdf>

Quote: “*When Fred Singer** asked Hansen for his best physical evidence that human emissions of carbon dioxide caused the recent warming, Hansen accused Singer and Michaels** of obfuscation. Requesting clear physical evidence is obfuscation of empirical science?*”

**S. Fred Singer: physicist, weather and climate expert and environment professor

**Pat Michaels: climate, weather and environmental expert

Both have served the UN IPCC. Both are outspoken in revealing UN IPCC corruption of climate science.

Quoting Tony Thomas: "*Hansen's one-time NASA supervisor, the atmospheric scientist John S. Theon, wrote in 2009 that Hansen "embarrassed NASA" with his alarmism: NASA in 1988 knew little about any human-caused warming. Theon himself was responsible for all NASA weather and climate research, including Hansen's*".

James Hansen is reportedly Al Gore's '*science adviser*'. Reportedly he recently endorsed a book calling for ridding the world of industrial civilisation.

This topic will be revisited in Appendix 14 discussing motives driving climate corruption.

Former NASA Principal Investigator for NASA's Apollo moon landing program, Oliver K. Manuel documents his understanding of government corruption of climate science here: http://dl.dropbox.com/u/10640850/Climategate_Roots.pdf

My conclusion is that activists in NASA's GISS are blatantly corrupting climate science.

They have hijacked NASA's formerly proud brand. This is similar to CSIRO contradicting empirical science by acting as a politicised advocate for government policy.

Would Apollo astronauts trust James Hansen's claims? No. Some have already said so. Remember Apollo Space Team's motto: *In God we trust; all others bring data*.

Cracks are appearing in the façade conjured by NASA-GISS's prominent fabricator of unfounded claims of global climate change due to human CO₂, James Hansen. It's reported that he was protected by senior people in American presidential administrations. That enabled him to falsely conjure weather into his unfounded claims of unusual climate change due to human CO₂:

<http://principia-scientific.org/supportnews/latest-news/98-breaking-nasa-u-turn-admits-global-warming-bias-on-sun-s-key-role.html>

Note the political motives and tricks intermingled with his early media presentations: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/hotpolitics/interviews/wirth.html>

NASA is now admitting that the sun's influence on climate is very significant. This has consistently been the message from real climate scientists all along.

6. USA's NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)

Like NASA-GISS, America's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration has no evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Yet some NOAA staff have contradicted empirical science and falsely implied claims of human causation of global warming.

American government agency NOAA has been exposed for manipulating temperatures, quote: "U.S. Temperature trends show a spurious doubling due to NOAA station siting problems and post measurement adjustments":

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/29/press-release-2/>

Adjustment of data by NOAA reveals that adjustment nearly triples the warming recorded. (Quote: "Well sited rural stations show a warming nearly three times greater after NOAA adjustment is applied")

And:

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2012/06/13/doctored-data-not-u-s-temperatures-set-a-record-this-year/>

Tampering of ground-based temperature data is allegedly rife:

<http://www.climategate.com/is-the-noaa-not-cru-is-ground-zero-for-exaggerated-warming-data>

Quote: "Well, well, well. In a new report (read PDF), computer expert E. Michael Smith and Certified Consulting Meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo discovered extensive manipulation of the temperature data by the U.S. Government's two primary climate centers: the National Climate Data Center (NCDC) in Ashville, North Carolina and the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) at Columbia University in New York City. Smith and D'Aleo accuse these centers of manipulating temperature data to give the appearance of warmer temperatures than actually occurred by trimming the number and location of weather observation stations.

In turn the source quotes Meteorologist D'Aleo and computer expert Smith: "[The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration] NOAA is seriously complicit in data manipulation and fraud. After the Climategate emails were leaked, the East Anglia Hadley Centre has been the focus for data obstruction, destruction and manipulation issues and Phil Jones has temporarily stepped aside during a three year investigation as director of the Hadley Climatic Research Unit (CRU) until the completion of an independent Review resulting from allegations of inappropriate scientific conduct.

But CRU's Director at the time Phil Jones acknowledges that CRU mirrors the NOAA data. "Almost all the data we have in the CRU archive is exactly the same as in the Global Historical Climatology Network (GHCN) archive used by the NOAA National Climatic Data Center."

NOAA appears to play a key role as a data gatherer/gatekeeper for the global data centers at NASA and CRU. Programmer E.M. Smith's analysis of NOAA's GHCN found

they systematically eliminated 75% of the world's stations with a clear bias towards removing higher latitude, high altitude and rural locations, all of which had a tendency to be cooler. The thermometers in a sense marched towards the tropics, the sea and to airport tarmacs."

Please note the comments on NOAA/NASA-GISS rankings for month and year. Meteorologist Joe D'Aleo concludes that NASA/NOAA cannot be trusted. He supports that recommendation with data.

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/NOAAroleinclimategate.pdf>

Quote: *"The NOAA, NASA and the Hadley Center press releases should be ignored. The reason which is expanded on with case studies in the full report is that the surface based data sets have become seriously flawed and can no longer be trusted for climate trend or model forecast assessment in decision making by congress or the EPA"*

And:

<http://www.climategate.com/is-the-noaa-not-cru-is-ground-zero-for-exaggerated-warming-data>

Internationally respected Alabama State Climatologist and UN IPCC Lead Author John Christy reveals unfounded claims in NOAA's weather statements:

Part 1:

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2012/08/fun-with-summer-statistics-part-i-usa/>

NOAA has a history of fabricating and/or implying false claims that drive scary headlines and then subsequently quietly correcting the claims. From the Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP), quote: *"NOAA's State of the Climate (SOTC): As discussed in last week's TWTW, John Christy reported that for the US, except Hawaii, 2012 was the hottest in the 34 year old satellite record and the 9th warmest year globally. In its report, NOAA's National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) announced that for the US, 2012 was the hottest ever and the second worse for extreme weather events. NOAA claims the records go back to 1895.*

NOAA's announcement was immediately picked up by the global warming chorus, demanding the government take greater control over the climate, namely reduce CO2 emissions. The mechanism by which atmospheric CO2 controls the severe cold occurring in Eurasia is not clear.

2There are several major issues with the NOAA report, which are discussed in the links below and few mentioned here. NOAA made no effort to bring out that the US temperatures are inconsistent with global temperatures. Globally, 2012 is far from the hottest ever. Further, NOAA made no mention that, globally, severe weather events were down significantly.

Further, NOAA has demonstrated that there are significant issues with its temperature record, with manipulation of historic data, changing instruments sites, and poor siting of instruments that make them subject to small changes in the surroundings. One of the biggest issues is the severity of the heat and drought in the 1930s. Earlier, NOAA announced July 2012 was the hottest July ever, only to quietly back down as it became

evident that July 1938 was hotter. We can expect that NOAA's announcement will be modified in the near future, but without major press releases – the damage to science and credibility already complete."

<http://www.sepp.org/twtwfiles/2013/TWTW%20-%201-12-13.pdf>

NOAA's position on human CO₂ as a driver of global climate contradicts empirical science. NOAA is engaged in unscientific political advocacy.

Next, consider another American government agency, the EPA. It goes well beyond NASA and NOAA by implementing the UN's global governance agenda. It breaches the American constitution and acts contrary to the best interests of American taxpayers, Americans and America.

7. USA EPA's antihuman actions repeatedly contradict empirical science

America's Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has no evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Yet it is pushing an agenda to enforce regulation of human CO2. It repeatedly contradicts empirical science and falsely implies human causation of global warming.

America's Environmental Protection Agency has been pushing regulation of carbon dioxide production while bypassing America's Congress. That action started in earnest under President Bill Clinton and Vice-President Al Gore, continued under President GW Bush and accelerated under President Barack Obama. America's EPA repeatedly subverts the United States of America's Constitution.

<http://sppiblog.org/news/epa-to-impose-carbon-limits-on-power-plants>

"I am appalled at the state of discord in the field of climate science...There is no observational evidence that the addition of anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions have caused any temperature perturbations in the atmosphere." - Award-winning atmospheric scientist Dr. George T. Wolff, former member of the EPA's Science Advisory Board, served on a committee of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and authored more than 90 peer-reviewed studies.

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=10fe77b0-802a-23ad-4df1-fc38ed4f85e3

The USA's EPA has a record of circumventing science and overturning science for political goals. An earlier action contradicting science led to banning DDT. That is responsible for the deaths of an estimated forty million of people. See page 1, here:

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

Robert Zubrin's book entitled *Merchants of Despair* provides more examples of the EPA's extensive history of global antihuman activities.

The EPA's history of using dubious regulations to pursue its agenda is noted and of grave concern:

<http://sppiblog.org/news/court-strikes-down-obama-epas-cross-state-air-pollution-rule-as-an-illegal-flawed-regulation>

The EPA's action regulating carbon dioxide is unfounded and unscientific. States and energy companies are challenging it in court. The EPA's action is nonsensical because Nature alone controls atmospheric CO2 levels regardless of human production. The EPA's action is thus a blatant attempt to control energy and thereby people.

The EPA's connections, control and activities are revealed on page 38 here:

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

It's time to understand the connection between bogus, corrupted science and those pushing it on people through increased control of energy, resources, private property, taxes and national finances.

The EPA's connections with the United Nations in pushing the UN's agenda for global control are discussed here:

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

The EPA is shown to:

- Disregard science and contradict extensive empirical evidence revealing vast improvements in recent decades in environmental performance;
- Use deceit;
- Use division and separation and alienation;
- Disperse taxpayer funds to buy favours and support;
- Be closely and intimately interconnected with various activist groups and agents for the UN's Agenda 21 and other campaigns for global governance;
- Use various tools to control people and groups including disbursing jobs.

The EPA's goals and methods are damaging. The EPA deceitfully spreads taxpayer funds with no regard for taxpayers who will be hurt by its own unlawful campaigns flouting the American constitution.

Quote: "*Under (Administrator) Lisa Jackson, the EPA has issued \$27 million in foreign grants⁵⁰ to recipients such as China and Russia, including a grant to UNEP.***"

** UNEP is the United Nations Environmental Program with a history of dishonestly contradicting empirical science to establish the myth that human CO2 caused global warming.

Quote: "*On March 30th 2009, Lisa Jackson announced a proposal to the International Maritime Organization to designate US coastal waters as Emission Control Areas.⁶ It means the EPA can control all shipping and port activity once in force.*"

The Science and Public Policy Institute posted a critique of EPA activities. The EPA is contradicting documented empirical measurements. The EPA is bypassing and overturning the wishes of Congress and the will of the American people.

<http://sppiblog.org/news/government-of-by-and-for-the-epa>

Quote: "*As EPA itself acknowledges, between 1970 and 2010, those six "criteria" air pollutants declined by an average of 63% and will continue to do so under existing regulations and technologies. Moreover, those dramatic reductions occurred even as coal-based electricity generation increased 180% ... overall US energy consumption rose 40% ... miles traveled soared 168% ... and the nation's population increased by 110 million. However, EPA intends to go much further, to advance its radical agenda.*"

Quote: "*Since hydrocarbons provide 85% of the energy used to power America, this single ruling gives EPA effective control over our transportation, manufacturing, heating, cooling and other activities – virtually our entire economy – while making it all but impossible to operate existing coal-fired power plants or build new ones.*"

Quote: "*The agency also pays activist groups millions of taxpayer dollars a year to promote and applaud its farfetched claims and rogue actions.*"

Quote: “EPA is out of control, and thus far unaccountable for its abuses of power, its disinformation and fraud, and the harm it is inflicting – for little or no health or environmental benefit.”

Quote: “Finally, EPA ignores the clearly harmful impacts its regulations have on human health and welfare. The rules cost jobs, thereby increasing the risk of depression, alcohol abuse, spousal and child abuse, cardiovascular disease and suicide. They just as obviously raise the cost of food, electricity, heating, air conditioning, commuting, healthcare and other necessities, thereby reducing health, welfare, living standards, civil rights progress and environmental justice – especially for poor, elderly and minority families.”

The EPA is used to disburse funds to political allies, funding friends, Nongovernment organisations (NGO’s) and environmental and political activists:

<http://www.sepp.org/twtwfiles/2012/TWTW%20-%209-1-12.pdf>

EPA disbursements include so-called “*environmental justice grants*”:

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

It’s no surprise that this rogue agency contradicting and bypassing the American constitution is the subject of a Citizen’s petition seeking to rein in the EPA:

<http://sppiblog.org/news/8415>

The EPA’s actions over many decades illustrate its antihuman policies contradicting empirical science. They reveal that government has been captured by an antihuman ideology. Taxpayers’ funds have been captured to push policies that do not protect citizens. Instead, some EPA policies have seriously harmed people worldwide.

The UN’s campaign for global governance is being implemented through many government agencies in various developed nations. These include America’s NOAA, NASA-GISS and EPA.

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

The connection is increasingly being revealed between bogus, corrupted science and those pushing it on people through increased control of energy, resources, private property rights, taxes and national finances.

Author Robert Zubrin documents the extensive role of American taxpayer funds in American government campaigns that have caused millions of people’s deaths. According to Robert Zubrin one of the prime vehicles for the government’s push on behalf of various global organisations is the American EPA.

The EPA demonstrates the UN’s global *stealthy revolution by regulation*.

8. Stern Review

The Stern Review has no evidence that human CO2 caused global warming. Yet it recommended a policy of severe cuts to human CO2.

The report was exposed by a voluntary international group of eminent scientists, economists and statisticians severely critical of flawed and false scientific and economic assumptions used by Nicholas Stern. The voluntary group's work published by the World Economics Journal reveals that Nicholas Stern's report contradicts empirical scientific evidence and contradicts fundamental principles in science and economics.

<http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/World%20Economics%20-%20Stern%20Review,%20Part%201.pdf>

And:

<http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/WE%20Riposte%20to%20Critique.pdf>

And:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/bob-carter-british-report-the-last-hurrah-of-warmaholics/story-e6frg6zo-111112460532>

The discredited 700-page Stern Review was produced by a government economist, commissioned and funded by Tony Blair's British government. It produced the answer the government needed. With politicians lacking the conviction and integrity to challenge the report it became the policy of succeeding British governments. It's now biting and hurting Britons.

The following summary was made from the Executive Summary of a report published by The Global Warming Policy Foundation founded and chaired by Lord Nigel Lawson, former UK Chancellor of the Exchequer (Treasurer). The report is by British Member of Parliament Peter Lilley entitled *What is Wrong with Stern: The Failings of the Stern Review of the Economics of Climate Change* with a Foreword by Professor Richard Tol an author (contributing, lead, principal and convening) of UN IPCC Working Groups I, II and III of the IPCC. The report is available here:

http://www.thegwpf.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/Lilley-Stern_Rebuttal3.pdf

- The Stern Review was not fit for purpose;
- It uses unfounded economic assumptions;
- It uses hidden economic assumptions;
- It is inconsistent when discounting costs compared with discounting benefits;
- It fails to discount for uncertainty;
- It clutches at unfounded catastrophes contradicted by empirical evidence;
- It contradicts Nicholas Stern's own inherent beliefs;
- It is based on selectively cherry-picking unreliable studies;
- It exaggerates monstrously including: (1) forecasting damage to infrastructure from more powerful storms with forecasts up to 100 times too large - being based on extrapolating a non-peer-reviewed paper, (2) food and famine, (3) water supplies, (4) sea levels, (5) disease;
- It neglects adaptation, reduced vulnerability and technological advances;
- It relies on models to predict damage.

Quote: *“The Review’s conclusions were way outside the consensus of economic studies it supposedly reviewed and have been roundly criticised by many leading economists. Indeed, Stern’s conclusions, that the costs of a crash programme to reduce emissions are far outweighed by the benefits, contradict even the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.*

Stern’s headline conclusions were that:

“If we don’t act, the overall costs and risks of climate change will be equivalent to losing at least 5% of global GDP each year now and forever.”

whereas

“The costs of action – reducing greenhouse gas emissions to avoid the worst impacts of climate change – can be limited to around 1% of GDP each year.”

They succeeded in giving the clear impression that we face huge losses now which could be averted at a fifth of their cost. But this is achieved by verbal virtuosity combined with statistical sleight of hand. In fact, even on Stern’s figures, the cumulative costs of reducing greenhouse gases will exceed the cumulative benefits until beyond 2100. Stern’s misleading headlines rely on comparing apples and pears as well as conflating predictions centuries hence with the present”

It is difficult to see how any serious study could contain so many illogical, unfounded and plainly wrong assumptions and data contradicting empirical science and established economics.

One of many serious fundamental complaints about the report includes inconsistent use of hidden assumptions. eg, reportedly different discount rates are used in discounting costs compared with benefits. The benefits of cutting CO₂ production are discounted at an ultra-low rate that reportedly remains hidden in the report. Yet the normal market rate is apparently used to discount the economic cost of cutting CO₂. The report’s estimated benefits of preventing climate change are exaggerated by between 2.5 and five times compared to the costs.

That ignores the fundamentally flawed and false assumption that humans can affect global climate by cutting CO₂ production. The Stern Review produces an unfounded conclusion and recommendation based on a contradiction of empirical climate science embellished along the way by many contradictions and falsities.

Years after its publication the Stern Review was stealthily changed without notice seemingly to reflect erroneous predictions based on unverified ‘evidence’.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7111618/Stern-report-was-changed-after-being-published.html>

Quote: *“But it can be revealed that when the report was printed by Cambridge University Press in January 2007, some of these predictions had been watered down because the scientific evidence on which they were based could not be verified.*

Among the claims that were removed in the later version of the report, which is now also available in its altered form online ...”

Journalist Tony Thomas reveals, quote: *“The UK published the contentious Stern Review after all IPCC deadlines for the 2007 report had expired. Stern nonetheless got 26 references across 12 chapters of the IPCC report, subject neither to scientific peer review nor even IPCC reviewer review.”*

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/10/delinquent-science>

Tony Thomas credits (in email 31.08.12) this comment to Canadian Donna Laframboise.

I conclude that the Stern Review is essentially propaganda falsely camouflaged as science and economics.

Yet the Stern Review was given credibility by organisations such as the ALP and The Australian Academy of Science.

Tony Thomas says, quote: *“Here’s the Academy on the UK Stern Review (2006) that urged colossal spending to head off global warming (the Academy has no economics expertise):*

Let’s get on with it now! – that’s the message, loud and clear, from Australian Academy of Science President Professor Kurt Lambeck in commenting on the Stern Review ... Professor Lambeck added: “... The Australian Academy of Science emphasises therefore, that it deserves a considered, immediate and positive response from Federal, State and Territory Governments.”[45]

The Stern review was torn apart by economists such as Australia’s former Statistician, the late Ian Castles, and Dr David Henderson, former head of the Economics and Statistics Department of the OECD”.

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science>

9. German Academy of Sciences and Engineering restoring sanity

The German Academy of Sciences and Engineering (Acatech) completed a study (September, 2012) commissioned by the German Federal government. According to Acatech President Reinhard Hüttl coping with climate change will not pose any difficult challenges to Germany.

<http://climaterealist.com/index.php?id=10197>

And:

<http://www.acatech.de/uk>

9. Conclusions

It seems unlikely that all misrepresentation or even most misrepresentation of climate science has been deliberate. Instead, my conclusion is that misrepresentation has been sub-conscious across various organisations, individuals, politicians and groups enmeshed in groupthink or even simply misguided in thinking their actions were caring for the environment.

Nonetheless, the recurring incidence of tampering with temperature and other data in some developed nations points to a coordinated attempt to corrupt data globally. It confirms the conclusion of highly regarded Canadian Climatology professor Tim Ball who states that the UN's World Meteorological Organisation acted as a vehicle for Maurice Strong to corrupt national agencies in many countries.

<http://drtimball.com/2012/nasa-scientist-out-of-control/>

That global corruption of science is a topic revisited in Appendix 14.

“When the current data fails you, make the future scarier.”
Marc Morano referring to corruption of climate science by government