

**INTERVIEW WITH MALCOLM ROBERTS**  
**BEN CUBBY, SYDNEY MORNING HERALD**

**30 JULY 2012**

---

**MR:**           **Malcolm Roberts**

**BC:**           **Ben Cubby**

MR:           I'm well, thank you Ben. How are you?

BC:           I'm good. Thanks for taking the call and getting back to me. Do you have time for a chat now.

MR:           Sure. By the way, would you like to talk to someone who's a Climatologist Professor, well retired now, in Canada?

BC:           Oh, well, who? Yeah, maybe.

MR:           Tim Ball. He's very, very good.

BC:           Oh, yeah.

MR:           He's the best in the world as far as I'm concerned.

BC:           Okay. If we can fit him into our time zone then I'd be happy to do that. Yeah, sure, have you got a number for him?

MR:           Yes, I called him half an hour ago and he said he's fine.

BC:           Oh, okay.

MR:           It's only about quarter to eight his time – well, it's now probably quarter past eight. His country code of course is 1.

BC:           Uh-huh.

MR:           And his area code is .... (*number redacted to protect privacy*)

BC:           Uh-huh.

MR:           And his number is .... (*number redacted to protect privacy*)

BC:           Uh-huh.

MR: ..... (number redacted to protect privacy)

BC: I've got 1-...-...-..... (number redacted to protect privacy)

MR: Yes.

0'55''

BC: Fantastic. All right, I'll give him a call after this. So I'll just explain what the piece we're hoping to run tomorrow is about. It's a follow-up from the piece Leo Hickman had in The Guardian which we're also running in The Herald today on the Muller/BEST work with Muller sort of saying that – describing himself as a 'converted climate sceptic' and saying that, you know, as scientists, it's our duty to let the evidence change our minds. So I'm interested in speaking to as many in the sceptic community in Australia and, I suppose, including Mr Ball, elsewhere, that I can find and seeing what they think about that: whether ... how they think this plays into the politics of the debate around climate science and to see if you and others think that perhaps findings like the BEST study will in fact change the minds of some climate sceptics. So, what do you reckon?

MR: I'm up for it. Yep, sure.

BC: Yep. Okay, well that's the question then.

MR: By the way, Ben -

BC: I presume you haven't had a Road to Damascus moment in the last sort of twelve hours, Malcolm, but maybe you have. What's your feelings, and what do you make of the Berkeley study?

MR: By the way, Ben, I just want to make it clear that I'm recording the conversation. I always do with all people in the media, it doesn't matter what their background is.

BC: Yeah, no worries at all.

MR: Good.

BC: I'm not recording it but I am taking notes.

MR: Okay. I have a Damascus morning – a Damascus moment every day, because I just rely on empirical science and it reconfirms what we've seen. Now the BEST study ignores the corruption of the data that is underpinning his data analysis. And are you aware of Anthony Watts' paper combined with – well, he's a co-author with Steve McIntyre.

BC: Yeah, I've read that one.

MR: Yep.

BC: Well, most of it.

MR: And that is -

BC: It's quite long; I'll have finished it by the time I write this story – yeah.

MR: I've only read the press release, but that underlines the detailed analysis that I read some time ago about the **corruption** of the ground-based temperature measurements in the United States, and that was done by two meteorologists, Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts. And that explains in detail the **corruption** of the temperature measurements that are relied upon by the IPCC by Muller, the BEST study, by NOAA, by NASA – well, that's it, the three main ones plus Muller.

BC: Yeah, look, I'll get to Watts in a minute – and I do want to talk about it – but if we could just stay on Muller.

MR: Yep.

BC: For the time being. I suspect those two questions are in fact closely related but nobody actually knew what Watts was going to announce until, you know, early this morning Australian time.

MR: Yep.

BC: So in terms of your interpretation of the BEST Paper and the meaning of it for debate around climate change, do you expect anyone to change their minds about it? And will anyone at the Galileo Movement, do you think, change their mind about it?

MR: Well, we base our views on empirical science and there's nothing in the Muller Study to indicate that. One of his cohorts, Judith Curry, even says that herself, and she was part of the original BEST team I believe. And she's known as, what do you want to call it, a warmist, an alarmist, whatever, who's slightly more open than others and she says there's nothing new in this study. And as I said, again, it comes back to the **corruption** of the underlying data and that **corruption** is in two forms: it's unintentional, in other words, substandard measurement of the temperature that Muller uses; and intentional **corruption**, that's the manipulation that NOAA has exercised over some of the data in the United States. So, I mean, it just keeps coming back, it doesn't matter which way we look at it Ben, the **corruption** keeps coming back. And there's another big elephant in the room. And that is that the Greenhouse Effect supposedly is an atmospheric effect, and I said 'supposed effect' is an atmospheric effect so we should be measuring atmospheric temperatures not ground-based temperatures. And the atmospheric temperatures reveal quite clearly from satellites that since 1998 there's been no warming. Every year since 1998, has been lower in temperature than 1998.

And then we say: okay, well, hang on, how far back do satellites go? They only go back to the mid-seventies/late-seventies. So let's look at the radiosonde data – now, that's not truly global, but it is a proxy for that – and that goes back to '58. All we've seen in the last, what's that, 54 years, is cyclic global warming, global cooling. And it's very, very modest at that. So, there's nothing there.

5':35''

BC: So to get onto Watts then -

MR: Uh-huh.

BC: Now from what I've read of the publication, and I had a look at, he's put a PowerPoint series of slides together as well to try and ... to sort of illustrate the findings that he and McIntyre have reached – now, you mention two types of corruption: one is the 'unintended corruption', and I presume you're talking about some kind of urban heat island process there, and then 'intended corruption' which is data adjustment after the raw data has been harvested. Is that what you mean by those assertions?

And the second part of that question is – now, he's ... those guys are still finding that there's, you know, been significant warming going on decade upon decade even with their new analysis of the weather data that's been gathered – how do you account for that warming process?

MR: Sure. The first one on the corruption, what do I mean by 'unintentional'? I was referring more to the sub-standard recording measurement ... methods that are used to capture the temperatures. Now the urban heat island effect is, of course, a corruption if you like in the sense that it is being used to ... as a proxy for the global temperature but it's not, it's just an isolated effect. So the 'unintentional' is just the sloppiness that a lack of compliance with standards a sub-standard measurement. So did that answer your first question?

BC: Yeah, no, that's what I was asking what you meant, and that does answer it perfectly.

MR: Okay. The second one was about the warming that's ongoing. Well, if we ... you know, if you look at the earth's temperature over any period you pick, the duration that you select, the time period, determines whether it's warming or cooling. And we can go back to the period from the '40's to the, let's see, 1958 through to the mid-seventies, it was cooling. From the sudden shift in the great Pacific climate shift in 1976, that accounted for a significant portion of the increased since the mid-seventies. And that was in one year. Now, you know, it's carbon dioxide has been moving up gradually yet we had a sudden shift. And since then it's been pretty much gentle. And since 1998, it's actually been lower than 1998.

So the temperature: Is it rising? Is it falling? It all depends upon the scale you use. Now if you go back to the uncorrected – while they may be

erroneous in places because we weren't around 120 years ago – but Joseph D'Aleo has done a fabulous study, which I'd be happy to send you, for the rural ... of the temperature records from 1895 through till 19 ... I think 2000, I think. There's been a similar study done on Australian rural temperatures by Lance Endersbee. And if we look at the temperature in 1890, 1895, and the temperature now, there's no difference. But gee, Ben, it's gone down in places, it's increased and then it's gone down and then it's increased – there's no nett difference.

And so it all depends upon the time scale which you're using. And then it also depends upon your reference point. If you're sitting in the middle of the little ice age, then of course it's warmer now. But there is nothing unusual happening. And that's another significant point that I'd like to raise and that is that – and Tim Ball speaks to this in an excellent paper he's written – but Muller failed to identify what is the natural, underlying temperature variation. And without that, the whole thing is meaningless Ben, because if we don't know what occurs naturally, how can we superimpose our conclusions about what is unnatural? He has no basic reference point.

And then to add further lack of credibility, and that taints Muller, is that he claims the increase in temperature is proof of human carbon dioxide causing warming. That flies in the face of empirical evidence that says the atmospheric temperatures have not increased for 14 years; it flies in the face of the fact, the empirical fact, that shows that carbon dioxide is a consequence of temperature, not a cause; it flies in the fact (sic) of the variation in the IPCC's own carbon dioxide measurements that reveal human carbon dioxide does not determine the atmospheric level of carbon dioxide. And that's very clear. There's a professor in Sydney who's done some fabulous work on it recently, explaining -

BC: Sorry, who's that in Sydney?

MR: Murry Salby, he's a professor in Sydney. He explains what determines the atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide: it's largely the temperature change that precedes the carbon dioxide change, and it's, the second greatest factor, is the moisture content in the soil. And Tim Ball can talk to you about that. He can tell you, just increasing the speed of wind across the land surface by one kilometre, has a dramatic effect; it has an effect far greater than even the theorised impact of human carbon dioxide.

And then the fourth thing that, you know, humans – sorry, anecdotal evidence, historical records and scientific records reveal that warming is beneficial. So what we've got is we've got four basic questions: Are atmospheric temperatures rising? No. Does carbon dioxide drive atmospheric temperature? No, the reverse applies – that's proven. Third: Does human carbon dioxide production determine atmospheric carbon dioxide levels? No, nature does – nature's variation alone in annual carbon dioxide production is four times the total production by humans. And we just cannot influence that. And the fourth thing is that – Is temperature ... is warm ... is rise ... is

warming detrimental? No, it's not; it's highly beneficial to the natural environment and to humanity.

Now to claim that we need to take action on carbon dioxide, we need “yes’s” to all four of those questions – all four have strong, empirically-based “no’s”. It’s a complete fraud, and Muller exposes himself by not explaining the temperature variation to make it meaningful as against the natural cycles; he doesn’t discuss the database **corruption**. Are you aware that the CRU, the Climatic Research Unit in the UK that is the holder of the raw data, it alone ... the programme manager there, the database programmer, he says that the database is in a ‘hopeless state’? Muller makes no comment about that. It’s almost as though he’s trying to mislead.

And the fourth point that I’d make is that Muller is not a sceptic - far from it. He did a nice, slick PowerPoint presentation exposing the hockey stick ... sorry, hide the decline – he’s not a sceptic. And then looking at this work that he’s put out, it certainly doesn’t bode well for science.

- BC: Hmm. Okay. So just to pick up ... well, look, I mean, you know, we could probably spend all day knocking your four points back and forth, Malcolm. I’m not gonna do that right now.
- MR: I’d be happy to do it whenever you want.
- BC: Yeah, yeah, no, I understand that the offer remains open, but I do have deadlines to work to. But I just wanted to pick up on a couple of them quickly, and if we could just run through that. You’re saying that the atmospheric composition has not changed because of human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions?
- MR: Correct.
- BC: What’s causing the rising level of CO<sub>2</sub> then? Is it underwater volcanoes? Because I got an email from Paul Evans to that effect this morning; he has a theory to do with underwater volcanoes.
- MR: Well, there are three million, more than three million, volcanoes. But I don’t want to go onto that – and I doubt whether Paul would be saying that, the little bit that I’ve had to do with Paul, he wouldn’t be claiming that the volcanoes are driving carbon dioxide levels.
- BC: He has made that claim on an email – I mean, I’m not gonna harp on about it.
- MR: Okay.
- BC: But, you know -
- MR: Okay.
- BC: He, you know, yeah, that’s what he said.

MR: Okay.

BC: So, you know, so be it.

MR: Okay, are you aware that carbon dioxide is soluble in water?

BC: Look, I'm not going to go through a science lesson Malcolm.

MR: No, no ... but okay ... that ... I just needed to get that clear to start with. The oceans contain – and even the IPCC admits this Ben – the oceans contain 50 times the carbon dioxide in dissolved form than in the entire earth's atmosphere. Now if you look at the measurements that are presented by NOAA of the Mauna Loa carbon dioxide measurements, you'll notice a sawtooth, it's a nice, rounded sawtooth – an upward trend. There are two particular trends we need to take note of: the first one is the seasonal trend, and the seasonal trend shows a dramatic decrease in carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere just after the Southern Hemisphere winter. Now the oceans cover 71 per cent of the earth's surface; most of the ocean is in the Southern Hemisphere. There's very little land in the Southern Hemisphere – I think it's less than 20 per cent of the Southern Hemisphere is land.

What happens is that as the Southern Hemisphere is in winter, the ocean surfaces cool. That means they absorb more carbon dioxide and because the oceans are 71 per cent of the earth's surface they actually reduce the atmospheric level of carbon dioxide dramatically. And then, at the same time Ben, the Northern Hemisphere is growing in its vegetation, in its, what do you call it, the photosynthesis, and so we have uptake or intake of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere into plants up in the Northern Hemisphere. So we have a dramatic decrease every year in the Northern Hemisphere summer, our winter.

That's the sawtooth. And Al Gore just glosses over that in his movie. Now the -

BC: Hang on a minute Malcolm.

MR: Yes.

BC: You're saying that the Mauna Loa observations don't show rising CO<sub>2</sub> levels?

MR: No, no, no ... that's the first trend, that's the seasonal. And what the seasonal trend shows is that the intra-annual variation is greater by far than the inter-annual. And so what that means is the variation within each year is far greater than the variation between years. And that means that even ... that means that because human carbon dioxide level production is roughly uniform throughout the year, it means that something else is driving that down. Now that's the first point. Then we look at the second point which is the overall trend.

BC: Malcolm, I don't know of any climate sceptics that would tell you that the Mauna Loa observations don't show a rising level of CO<sub>2</sub>.

MR: No, that's what ...

BC: It's not something that they can challenge.

MR: No, no, that's -

BC: Cos it's crystal clear, look at the numbers.

MR: That's what I'm getting at Ben. The first one is the seasonal pattern, and then the second one is the overall trend. The overall trend is exactly as you've said: It is quite clear, it's increasing steadily. Now the ice core data that followed the finer resolution of the ice core data, and also the fact that the oceans contain a huge volume of water, reveal that carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere follow with a lag of 800 to 1,000 years, follow changes in temperature. And that is believed to be due to the fact that it takes so long for the ocean to change its temperature. So if the fun were to cool now, it would take 1,000 years for the ocean to entirely to cool and therefore the carbon dioxide levels to be doing down.

And so the trend we see now in the atmosphere reflects what was happening 1,000 years ago. And that, 1,000 years ago, we were in the warming period, known as the Medieval Warming Period, where global temperatures were on average one to two degrees warmer than now. And so what we are seeing reflects what was happening in the past because the ocean is such a monstrous sink that has to be heated through the circulation of currents. It's also affected by salinity, by the currents themselves, by atmospheric winds – I mean, it's not a simple little thing.

BC: Well, I think there's a few counter arguments to lay on that. But I'm not gonna do it.

MR: Would you like me to send you a few links, and you can do it at your own time.

BC: No, I've had a look at your website Malcolm.

MR: No, no -

BC: I honestly think you're barking up the wrong tree with the Mauna Loa stuff; I do know it pretty well but look -

MR: But I'm agreeing with you. There is a season trend – surely you've seen that in the sawtooth – and there's an overall trend which I'm agreeing with you. I don't think I'm barking up any wrong trees, Ben.

BC: No, but if you're saying that this is a natural result of ... a current rise trajectory is a natural result of what you're describing as the Medieval Warm Period, then the rate of trajectory doesn't make any sense.

MR: The rate of trajectory -

BC: Well, it's been rising gradually over that time at the same pace.

MR: The rate of trajectory -

BC: You don't see that, do you?

MR: The rate of trajectory is trivial because – well it's small, it's not trivial, it's small – because what they do is they show a graph from 300 parts-per-million up and it looks very steep when presented that way. But when you present it as a graph from zero to 380, then it's not at all steep. And when you look at it over the time, then it's not at all steep. And do you realise that earth's past, the geological records show that carbon dioxide increases and decreases have been far quicker and far, far greater, Ben, in earth's past. And we weren't around – that was even before humans were around, let alone four-wheel drives and power stations. So, I mean, the thing that's going on now is trivial, not in the sense that when you look at the percentage change each year, but it's trivial compared to earth's past. That is beyond doubt. That is beyond doubt – there's no question about that.

BC: Okay, so, am I to take from this that the position of the Galileo Movement in any case is one which is, you know, fairly dismissive of Muller's findings and very, very active welcoming of Watts' findings? Is that right?

MR: In the sense that Muller ignores the basic science, which is that the database is corrupt, unintentionally and also intentionally; in the sense that he dismisses or ignores the atmospheric temperatures when it's an atmospheric effect; and thirdly, he dismisses the poor coverage of the temperature database that he uses – it's skewed largely to America and to Europe. He pretends to put out temperatures to four decimal places so I understand but it's only measured to a half a degree. He also claims that this temperature rise that he's found is proof of human CO<sub>2</sub> carbon ... human CO<sub>2</sub> causing warming. That's ludicrous. So in that sense, we disagree; we don't think his approach is at all scientific.

Now with Watts – I haven't read it in detail – but with Watts, it backs up the known corruption of the temperature database and it gives examples, it's consistent with the empirical science. So, in answer to your question, “yes” and “yes”.

BC: Yep. So what effect do you think the Muller finding will have on climate sceptics in Australia? Will it be harder to win debates and win arguments when, you know, a prominent scientist like Professor Muller is coming out and saying, “Well, I was a sceptic and now I've looked more closely at the data and I've changed my mind.” ?

MR: Well what I think you'll find Ben, and this is no slur to you and I don't know your position, I can guess, but what you'll find is it takes a fair bit of courage to be a sceptic. Even though that's the natural position that a scientist or anyone should take really - show me, let me discover for myself. Once you've proven it, then I'll accept it but, until then, I remain a sceptic. Now the sceptic position is taken by a growing number of people, but the ones who were

sceptics all along are the ones who've done their research. And this won't affect them at all because what they'll see is they'll go into the data just as they have and they'll look at Muller's points, and they'll say "this is nonsense". Just as his own partner, Judith Curry, has said, that this is not what Muller claims.

BC: Hmm.

MR: So I don't think it's gonna make much difference, the sceptics. It'll be beaten up by some politicians and by the usual alarmists who are funded by government but, other than that, I don't think it's gonna ... they've already worked out Muller.

BC: Hmm. Okay. One thing I wanted to ask was, who would you suggest I talk to in the sceptic community about this? Cos I literally wanted to run the same questions, you know, by some other sceptics here – I was gonna have a chat to Leon Ashby and his group etc. - but who would you recommend that I have a chat to about this story so I can gather, you know, a good group of impressions from the sceptic community?

MR: Okay, if you want Australian, I would discuss with Jo Nova.

BC: Yep.

MR: Maybe Bob Carter, if he's read the stuff. Now, Bob tends not to comment until he's done a thorough analysis. You may want to contact Bill Kininmonth – I don't know if he's available. Who else?

BC: Yeah.

MR: But the one that I would -

BC: Have you got a number for Jo?

MR: Can I call you back on that one?

BC: Yeah, I'd appreciate that.

MR: Okay.

BC: Yeah. I mean, I know that she's been pretty reluctant to talk to the media sometimes before, but this is a good opportunity to air some of her views. So, it's just out there as an offer.

MR: The other thing, Ben, is – I can't emphasise enough, Tim Ball. I've talked to many prominent sceptics. I've talked to many of the prominent, government-funded academics who are advocates for the government's position. There is ... no-one comes close to Tim Ball.

BC: Do you have an email address for Tim as well, please?

MR: Yes, have you got an email address and I'll shoot it to you?

BC: Yeah, it's just – have you got a pen, Malcolm?

MR: Yes, mate.

BC: It's bcubby – so that's b-c-u-b-b-y-

MR: Yes.

BC: @smh

MR: Yep.

BC: .com.au.

MR: Okay, I'll send that to you. I've given you his phone number. Look, I just want to just emphasise Tim, his background is one as a climatology professor at one of the Canadian universities, but he's also an environmental consultant. He's also got a very rigorous approach; he's very well read across all kinds of human activities. He's very technically-oriented but he's a proven media guy because he's worked out over the years, you've gotta keep it really simple, and what he's done is he's spent a lot of time in the bush in Canada and flying search and rescue patrols over the Arctic. So he understands the variation of weather.

Now Tim not only is an environmentalist and a climatology professor, but Tim has the best understanding that I've seen of the carbon dioxide behaviour; he understands, he can just, he – I don't know where he gets it from – his recall, and then he backs it up in writing, but his recall is phenomenal. He understands carbon dioxide; he understands the way the IPCC has **corrupted** carbon dioxide measurements; he understands the temperature measurements; he understands the physical science behind it all; he understands, because he's worked a lot in, what do you call it? ... policy development, at, I think it's all levels of Canadian politics, local, state provincial and national; he understands the bureaucrat; and he was able to detect the **corruption** in the IPCC 20 years ago.

I mean, the guy is just very, very capable at understanding how the bureaucrats work. And he's a lovely guy. So if I was given \$100,000 and say you could fly anyone to Australia and introduce to all the media, he would be the man I'd pick.

BC: That'd be good. Yeah, righty-o. Well, if you can email me his email, I'd appreciate that. And I'll just wanna endeavour to get in touch with Tim today. But can I just ask you one more thing before I forget as well, Malcolm?

25'26"

MR: Yeah.

BC: And that's – I mean, you've got a position which, you know, obviously you're very passionate about – that position is predicated though on a lot of people being completely wrong in their areas of expertise. It's one thing to sort of attempt a point-by-point argument which is, you know, difficult for one, you know, individual to do, but what I'm interested in is “why” – is this really is all about, you know, **corruption** and it is about scientists not bothering to check their results and other scientists backing them up and hiding inconvenient truths, why are they doing that?

MR: Well, just ... the motives are really simple. To give you some of my background – I do this voluntarily by the way and I've been selling some of our own, my own family's assets ... my wife's starting to get a bit pissed off about it, which is understandable.

BC: Sorry to hear that.

MR: I've been doing this for about five years now, and I started doing it because – I worked in the mining industry, I've got a technical background, but my passion is with managing and leading people. And I've been a management consultant. I now work in all – well, I don't take paid work at the moment because of this, my preoccupation.

BC: Uh-hum.

MR: But I, in the last years when I started ... when I was working, I've consulted in all industry sector so I'm not just a mining lackie. But, anyway, when I was working in the underground mining sector, I was responsible statutorily for hundreds of people's lives at any one time. And those lives depended upon my knowledge of atmospheric gases, so my basic antenna went up and said, “hang on, what's going on?” when I started hearing these claims. And, you know, I thought, “this is bullshit”. But then the same old doubt creeps in and I said, “Who is little ol' me, to say that thousands of scientists and hundreds of politicians are wrong?”

And then I started researching it and reading about it. I said, “No, I'm right; no, I can't be right, it's just little ol' me?” And then I started understanding the IPCC and the massive, orchestrated **corruption** in that organisation. And then one day I had a talk with Plimer – I pulled him aside after a fabulous lecture he gave on another topic – and I said, “Hey mate, let's come back to climate change – what are the motives?” And he and I discussed the motives on the general sense as well as the more detailed. And that's when I got it. And that's why your question is a very, very important one.

I've noticed Ben, that I can give empirical science till I'm blue in the face, and people say: yeah, I've got that. And then I can give them the massive documentation of the **corruption** of science and that is clear. And they say: I've got that. But they don't do anything till they understand the motives. **The motives are very simple.**

BC: Hmm.

MR: At an individual level, we have got scientists who are paid to come up with these results. Now I don't think most of them are dishonest. But what I will say next is – there's a very, prominent Canadian, what do you call him? ... he's looked upon as one of the world's leading experts on corporate governance, he says that after the failure of HIH and Enron and those other companies, countries started to legislate. He said, "You cannot legislate human behaviour." He said, "The fundamental problem is that we have weak characters in charge of many companies."

Now that might surprise you, but my experience as a consultant to boards; to chairmen, having been on the board of a company myself and being chairman of a board, Ben, the biggest problem we have is people afraid, especially males, afraid to say, I'm sorry, I don't know. Can you help me? Can you make that more clear? Once a person is in a position, especially males, we seem to be very reluctant to depart from that position.

And so once a climate alarmist has got funds, probably through a justifiable reason, an honest reason, it's very hard for him to see anything else. And that's the first reason: so we've got the human ego, and we've got the need for research grants. The second one is: we've got politicians like Kevin Rudd and Penny Wong who beat this up. Now I wrote to Prime Minister Rudd and gave him the hard evidence. He acknowledged the letter but he didn't change. Now this is hard **corruption**.

The other thing is we've been told – so one is political, what do you call it? ... advantage – and he beat a path into the lodge using that, especially and also work choices ... so there's political advantage. You've got the Opposition who have said ... Abbott has said, "I am a sceptic on the science." But all of a sudden he's changed, two years ago. And he realised that he had to have a position that endorsed that otherwise he'd be done in the media.

Now that's now changing, more and more Australians are sceptics. But nonetheless, you've got cowardice there; you've got cowardice from Rudd who wouldn't admit an error; you've got corporations who are on the gravy train, they're making money out of this; you've got people like Heather Ridout who said that we need to have the uncertainty – she's the what, chairman of one of the, or is the chief executive of one of the industry groups? And she said, "We need to have the uncertainty removed - give us a carbon tax." Hell, there's no uncertainty until it was raised. Now, significantly – and I'm not accusing her of anything – but, significantly, she's now been appointed as a Governor to the Reserve Bank.

Now the very big driver of this is the **United Nations**. The United ... this staggered me, what I'm about to tell you – if someone had told me this five years ago, I would have laughed at them Ben -

BC: Uh-huh.

MR: But there is no doubt whatsoever now – and I don't do this research on the internet, I go to credible books ... I've read books from eminent historians, eminent politicians in the United States, neutral politicians, eminent, what do you call them? ... economists – they all point to the same thing: the corruption by some major banking families in the world. Their collusion in a tight-knit cabal with the United Nations. The United Nations – are you familiar with Maurice Strong?

BC: No, who's that?

MR: Maurice Strong – my God, Ben -

BC: I don't know much about this stuff, Malcolm. Who's Maurice Strong?

MR: Okay, well I'm sorry, I didn't mean to be disparaging.

BC: Not at all.

MR: But Maurice Strong was a Canadian billionaire who at the age of 17 worked as an intern in the United Nations in New York – it was brand new then, it was 1947 – and he came away from that internship and someone asked him: what was your impression of the United Nations? And he said, at the age of 17, this boy said, "That place is going to wield enormous power." Now he then went, by the time he was 25 he was a multi-millionaire with his own oil company, this guy is phenomenal, he's very, very – you ask Tim Ball about him because they're fellow Canadians.

BC: Uh-hum.

MR: There's a wealth of data on Maurice Strong. He's a complete crook. Now at the age of 25 he was a multi-millionaire with his own oil company, he then left that, I believe, maybe he kept ownership of it, but he left that and he hooked up with Canada's leading family that has massive connections into both the main parties in Canada. And what he did was, by becoming associated with that family, he became connected with the power base in Canada.

Then over the years, what he did was, he started working on the environment before it became a really big issue. He is the grandfather, in many ways, of the sensationalism of the environment. Now what he then did was, I think he commissioned himself a study of the environmental health of the planet. It was very negative. He put that to the United Nations in 1972 in June, I think it was, but certainly the middle of the year, the United Nations Environmental Programme was formed. In December of that year, Maurice Strong was appointed its first Secretary-General. That means he was second-in-charge ... he was in charge of the environmental programme and he was sitting at the right-hand of the Secretary-General of the whole United Nations.

And he held that position, and he corrupted the whole of the United Nations Environmental Programme. The United Nations Environmental Programme contradicted the science that said DDT was not harmful to the environment

and he dismissed that – he banned DDT to jump on the environmental bandwagon. That was responsible for the deaths of over 40 million people. Maurice Strong has been tainted by the food-for-oil scandal; he's left America and now lives in China; he's been tainted by many other scandals in his own business dealings; he is the man who drove the United Nations Environmental Programme to **corruptly** manipulate and fabricate the basic climate fraud in the early 19 and mid-1970's. In 1988, he engineered with the World Meteorological Organisation and the United Nations Environmental Programme to sponsor the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 1990, in 1988.

Now there's an Australian called John McLean who's gone into this in enormous detail – Tim Ball can also tell you the details on this – but since 1988, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has extended the **corrupt** tactics that the UNEP used and made a complete mockery of climate science. Bert Bowlin was the first president of the ... first chairman sorry, of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. He was a buddy of Maurice Strong's. In early 1988, in March of 1988, he co-authored an article in Sweden's largest newspaper in which he said, "We need a carbon dioxide tax." In late 1988, the IPCC was formed. So even before the IPCC was formed, Maurice Strong's buddy, who became the IPCC chairman, was pushing carbon dioxide tax.

Now Maurice Strong is famous for two other things: apart from generating all the hype around the Rio conference – the guy is a phenomenal networker, he's power-mad but he's a phenomenal networker; he's got incredible intelligence – now in Bert Bowlin, he was able to pick the man who then manufactured the IPCC. Maurice Strong is famous, as I started to say, for two things: for saying that humanity ... we must for the preservation of the planet, we must "de-industrialise Western civilisation". They're his words: "de-industrialise Western civilisation."

BC: I've heard this quote floating around, yeah.

MR: He's also said, his objective is to install a global governance over the whole world and that it is to be based on socialist principles.

BC: Right.

MR: He is a socialist out to destroy free enterprise and free markets and free civilisation; he is a control freak. And the amount of material on him -

BC: Well, he must be dead by now?

MR: No, he's 80-odd -

BC: Right.

MR: He's living in China.

BC: But he's out of the game, right?

MR: I don't know that you could ever put people like Maurice Strong ...?

BC: Fair enough. Look, I don't know much about Maurice -

MR: Can I tell you ... can I tell you one more story?

BC: Yeah, yeah, yeah – I'm not trying to cut you off.

MR: Oh, okay.

BC: I was gonna ask you something else.

MR: Okay, 1985 – in 1980, I'm sorry – 1980, the United Nations Environmental Programme convened a climate conference in the town of Villach, Austria, it said to the governments around the world: send us your representatives. The governments selected representatives to represent them on the science; they went to Villach, Austria; they had a conference. The United Nations Environmental Programme then tried to steer the scientists into signing a declaration that human production of carbon dioxide was causing global warming. The scientists refused, in 1980, saying there is no scientific evidence for that claim.

Then in 1985, the United Nations Environmental Programme realised it needed to learn from its methods so it didn't ask governments for nominees, it selected nominees to its next conference in 1985, same place – Villach, Austria. Out of that conference, the United Nations Environmental Programme got a declaration stating that human carbon dioxide is causing global warming. Now that was complete nonsense, there's no science to back it up.

Bert Bowlin – I just mentioned him as the first chairman – he, this was three years before he became chairman, it is believed he wrote the report from the 1985 conference. In 1988, he became chairman of the IPCC. In 1990 – sorry, in 1990 ... gosh -

BC: 1990.

MR: In 1990, the IPCC released its first report to national governments and media in which they claimed global warming was occurring. Now, that was reportedly based upon Bert Bowlin's work in 1985. There is no evidence in that 1990 report for human carbon dioxide causing warming. There is evidence, they even show graphs, that show the Medieval Warming Period – and rightly so – was significantly warmer than the 1990 temperature. And yet by 19 ... by 1995, they'd already started slimming down that graph; by 2001, it was completely obliterated and replaced by the fraudulent hockey stick graph.

So in 1995, the report there was based upon one scientist, Ben Santer, changing what his co-authors had stated and misrepresenting the science by stating that there was discernible proof that human carbon dioxide was driving, or humans were causing global warming. Yet five times in the scientific report the scientists said specifically, “We do not have the evidence.”

So in 1990, there was no evidence; in 1995 there was no evidence, and we had a scientist lie and overturn what the scientists said; in 2001 it was the fraudulent hockey stick that was splashed around the world; in two thousand – and then was proven to be bogus and was withdrawn by the IPCC, but quietly withdrawn; in 2007 there is one chapter in the whole of the science report that claims to detect warming and attribute it to human carbon dioxide.

And that is chapter 9. I’ve read that chapter twice; there is no evidence anywhere in that chapter that human carbon dioxide caused warming. And I’ve written to the Review Editor of that chapter. He cannot provide me with any evidence. Vincent Gray has around 60 years’ real-world experience as a research scientist – he is one of the reviewers, the, what do they call themselves? ... UN IPCC expert science reviewer -

BC: Yes.

MR: He has reviewed that and he has said, he’s said this publicly: “There is nowhere in the IPCC report that contains any evidence of human production of carbon dioxide.” Chapter 9 relied upon two models -

BC: Yeah, look, Malcolm I’m familiar with Vincent Gray’s work; I’ve written about him before. Look, you know, we can’t just talk over every single point. Could I just get you back onto the question that I asked, which is the question of “Why?”

MR: Oh, I’m sorry.

BC: You explained views on “how” – I didn’t know about Maurice Strong, for example.

MR: Yeah, okay, I’m sorry, sorry for going off.

BC: No, that’s all right. I mean, you know, it’s interesting to talk to you about it.

MR: The “why?” is very simple, the why is -

BC: What I’m trying to get to is the “Why?” question. Now if you’re telling me that – I mean, your words there were, it’s you know, basically flowing on from Maurice’s words that, you know, there’s an intention to establish, to de-industrialise the Western world then establish a world government along socialist principles, and you mentioned that your words were “a group of very wealthy European bankers were involved,” or something along those lines.

MR: Correct, yep.

BC: I've got my notes for the exact wording. Are you aware that, I mean, people read this in a newspaper, they are gonna think you're a bit nuts. Like, does it concern you?

MR: One of the -

BC: I mean, is that genuinely where you sit on this issue? **That it is in fact a cabal of wealthy bankers trying to establish global socialism?** Do you understand what I'm saying -

MR: Yep.

BC: When I say that that does sound a little bit outlandish?

MR: It does sound outlandish but what has very pleasantly surprised me is that I, like you, was reluctant to use those words until I started speaking at these rallies. And what I noticed was that more and more people are raising this. There are little groups around Australia who – I didn't realise it until they'd pop up to me and talk to me at the rallies – there are significant things going on in Australia that people are waking up to. The agenda ... the UN's climate fraud, and I use that word deliberately -

BC: Uh-huh.

MR: And you can quote me – **the UN's climate fraud is just a part of the overall UN Agenda 21 which is the sustainability programme and the biodiversity programme. And those programmes work at a national level. Do you know how many treaties the Australian Government has signed with the UN?**

BC: No, dozens – I don't know.

MR: **7,000.**

BC: Hmm.

MR: They control many aspects of our country. Now, one of the key platforms, one of the key objectives of the UN – see, I didn't know this and like I said, I started this part of the conversation Ben, by saying five years ago I would have laughed at someone saying what I'm about to say -

BC: Yeah, I'm not laughing at it, I'm just - I'm aware that your average person in the street is gonna read you saying that and is gonna go, **"Oh, I thought they were hard-headed sceptics maybe and then here they are talking about global socialist conspiracies run by wealthy bankers."**

MR: Well -

BC: It does just sound a bit loopy. I mean, now -

MR: Well, I'll send you a document in about -

BC: You know, I don't think it's just me saying that.

MR: No, no, I agree with you. And I would have said it -

BC: Sure.

MR: Three years ago. And it's only the hard facts – I'm a very technically oriented person -

BC: I understand – like, I'm not trying to trap you.

MR: No, no.

BC: I'm just asking you the “Why?” question, you know, which I think is an important question.

MR: So the “Why?” question -

BC: if one is positing enormous fraud that you're talking about here. The question of motive has to be addressed.

MR: Yes, and the question of motive is individual benefits in terms of ego -

BC: Yeah.

MR: And grants for academics; political control; but the bigger ones are the UN's agenda for global governance – if you look at the UN Agenda 21 provisions, they're already in place here. Are you aware that – you'd be aware that Howard said that he refused to sign the Kyoto Protocol?

BC: Yeah.

MR: But under the constitution, if you resume ... if the Commonwealth Government resumes land or takes it from the farmer, then it has to pay compensation - but the State Governments do not. Now what Howard did - it's in Hansard, it's in writing - Howard wrote to Beattie asking him for assistance to take land rights off farmers. Bob Carr is, when he was former environmental minister in the NSW government, Bob Carr conducted an interview – it's a three-minute interview, it's available on YouTube – in which he is virtually bragging, I won't quite say bragging, but he is stating it with a smile.

He took the farmers' property rights off them without compensation and he mentions that he did that for Johnnie Howard. Now when you want to comply

– because Johnnie Howard was also very proud of saying, “We don’t sign Kyoto, but we comply with Kyoto.”

BC: Yeah.

MR: And so what happens is, you can comply with Kyoto in two ways: you can either cut back on carbon dioxide production that you had planned to produce, or you can, not cut down trees that may have been cut down.

BC: Yeah, I’m familiar with the requirements, yep.

MR: Yeah, so you take away – so what you say is to the farmers and the native title ... and native vegetation or whatever provisions you put – and Beattie did this and Carr did this ... “You can’t develop that land any more.” Bang. So they get Kyoto compliance based upon the sacrifices of farmers having their land stolen from them. The sea level rises, they’re all based on unvalidated computer models. The computer models generate theoretical forecasts of carbon dioxide projections into the future; they then convert that through unvalidated and bogus, erroneous computer models into theoretical temperatures in the future; they then convert that into, through other unvalidated models, into sea level rises.

Now if you look at the actual sea level rises, they’re basically negligible in the last 20 years. That, I mean, that’s empirical evidence – hard measured data. Vincent Gray ... many others. Now what happens though -

BC: Again, Malcolm, I do feel we’re veering a little bit onto other -

MR: Okay, but what I’m getting -

BC: I’m sorry, but I don’t have all day to sit down and run through -

MR: Okay, right-o. What I’m getting to -

BC: Sea level risers.

MR: What’s I’m getting to -

BC: If we could talk about it another time. Just one more quick question and then I will -

MR: No, hang on, hang on – what I’m getting to Ben.

BC: Have to let you go cos I have to go off and file a news listing here.

MR: Yep.

BC: And that is: are you around today if we can get a photographer somewhere near your place? Would you be in a photo to go with the story?

MR: Sure.

BC: Okay. You're up on the Sunshine Coast or something – is that right?

MR: No, I'm in Brisbane.

BC: You're in Brisbane. Okay, would you be willing to – I mean, obviously I'm in Sydney but we do have photographers in the Brisbane bureau – would you be willing, sort of, within a couple of hours to just receive a photographer at your place and have a portrait shot done -

MR: Sure.

BC: For the story tomorrow?

MR: Yep.

BC: Okay. In that case, where do we find you? What's your best address – either the one you're at or where you'd like to be?

MR: ... .. Road. (*street number and name redacted to protect privacy*)

BC: ... Road? (*road name redacted to protect privacy*)

MR: Yep. ..., (*spelled out suburb name*). (*suburb redacted to protect privacy*)

BC: One word, yep?

MR: Yep. .... (*postcode redacted to protect privacy*)

BC: Okay.

MR: And just coming back to that sea levels – and I know you've got to run –

BC: Yep.

MR: But sea levels are used to then ... to restrict private property rights of coastal residents. And private property rights are the main tactic of UN Agenda 21. So I don't need to say anymore. These are actual facts going on right now.

BC: Look, I've read the material on Agenda 21 from the rally in Sydney, the carbon tax rally, the day after, oh I think it was July 1 or whatever, which I attended and met some of the Galileo people and other people there – I think they were Galileo. Anyway, the pamphlet was being circulated around. I'm familiar with the broad brushstrokes of the concepts. So, look, I don't have time to run over it now, Malcolm.

MR: No, no, that's fine.

BC: What I will do though is – can I, I’ll just check with our photographers whether or not we can get someone from our Brisbane bureau to come and get a shot and I’ll ring you back to confirm that in five minutes, okay?

MR: All right, that’s fine. I can send you an old photo if you want.

BC: Look, we’ll try and get a fresh one. But I’ll – let me call you back in five if that’s okay.

MR: Okay. Thanks mate.

BC: All right, bye-bye.

MR: Bye Ben.

48’25” total interview time.