

EXPERTS UNABLE TO SUPPORT ALARMING CLAIMS REGARDING HEALTH CONSEQUENCES OF HUMAN CAUSED GLOBAL WARMING

Graham Williamson
January 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper documents some of the alarming claims made regarding the supposed health consequences of alleged human caused global warming and the amazing refusal or inability of experts **to back up their claims**. Problems with the reports typically include the following.

- The term '*climate change*' is used loosely resulting in confusion with the term '*human caused climate change*'. Failure to scientifically differentiate between the two creates the impression that there has been a deliberate attempt to confuse or obfuscate. Since '*climate change*' is not human caused, it is also not controllable by man.
- In the Climate Commission report cited below, there have been attempts to causatively link '*climate change*' or '*human caused climate change*' to various human diseases or deaths. Of vital importance however, the report **omits the scientific methodology which was utilised to quantify and distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events**.
- In the absence of a reliable scientific method to make this distinction such claims are meaningless as far as the health consequences of alleged human caused climate change are concerned. Further, **any attempt to deliberately mislead and cause alarm by falsely implying that the health consequences of human caused climate change have been scientifically differentiated from those due to normal climate variation or severe weather events, warrants a public apology by the Commission and the most severe disciplinary action**.

The [Climate Commission claims](#) it "*was established to provide all Australians with an independent and reliable source of information about the science of climate change.*" It has completely failed in its duties and continues to completely abandon its responsibility to accurately inform the public. It must be disbanded and funds allocated to areas of genuine need.

Background -Alarming Claims About the Health Consequences of Human Caused Global Warming

This paper documents some of the alarming claims made regarding the supposed health consequences of alleged human caused global warming and the amazing refusal or inability of experts **to back up their claims**. The following claims by [CAHA Convenor](#) Fiona Armstrong illustrate the type of alarming claims which have been used to support government climate change policy (1):

*“Why are we acting on **climate change**? Well, because of the evidence that it poses risks to the global economy, to infrastructure, and to our natural environment. All that is true and makes for a compelling case for action. But at its very core – **climate change** is a health issue.*

*It places the safety and wellbeing of our species in jeopardy. **Climate change** is already responsible for the deaths of more than 300,000 people each year.[1] Five million more deaths are expected during the next decade if no effective action is taken to reduce climate risk.[2] Over 80% of the disease burden attributable to **climate change** falls on children.[3]*

*The international medical journal *The Lancet* outlined the stark facts in 2009: that the effects of **climate change** from global warming “puts the lives and wellbeing of billions of people at increased risk”.*

***Climate change** presents serious immediate and long term threats to the health and wellbeing of the Australian and global population.*

*The direct health effects of **climate change** include deaths, injury, and hospitalisation associated with increasingly frequent and intense bushfires, cyclones, storms and floods and heatwaves.[4] Indirect effects include increases in infectious and vector borne diseases, worsening chronic illness, and health risks from poor water quality and food insecurity.[5]*

Health care services in Australia are already experiencing dramatic increases in service demand from climate related events, such as heatwaves and floods.[6][7] The heatwave that preceded the Black Saturday bushfires in Victoria in 2009 saw a 62% increase in mortality from heat related illnesses and worsening chronic medical conditions. During this five day event, there was a 46% increase in demand for ambulances; an eight-fold increase in heat related presentations to emergency departments; a 2.8 fold increase in cardiac arrests; and a threefold increase in patients dead on arrival.[8]

*So there are many compelling reasons to act on **climate change** from the point of view of reducing health risks. This story is missing however from the policy debate – it is missing in the explanations from our leaders about why we must act, it is missing from the narrative of many advocacy groups who imagine that a threat to polar bears will be sufficient to elicit support for action. This is not proving to be the case.*

Of course such claims often depend upon a very loose or ‘sloppy’ unscientific use of the term ‘**climate change**’, which is mentioned 8 times in the passage above. Political or alarmist reports, or reports deliberately intended to confuse or mislead, often seem to prefer not to make a clear distinction between ‘**climate change**’, and ‘**human caused climate change**’. In doing so of course, they confuse health consequences of severe weather events or normal climatic variability on the one hand, with the consequences of alleged human caused climate change on the other.

Looking at the above passage for instance we see that by *acting on climate change* we may be able to benefit the global economy. This clearly implies reversibility and therefore human causation although the author has refrained from using the term ‘**human caused climate change**’. Similarly, the suggestion that *the effects of climate change from global warming puts the lives and wellbeing of billions of people at increased risk* also implies human causation. In fact, the entire passage above implies that ‘**climate change**’ is reversible or human caused although, for some reason, this is not specifically stated.

Is this confusion deliberate? Why not clearly state whether the claim relates to ‘**climate change**’ or ‘**human caused climate change**’? Is health simply being falsely used to justify some kind of political or ideological agenda?

As a result of the above claims I asked Fiona Armstrong to supply substantiating evidence to confirm the health consequences of human caused climate change, but as seems so often to be the case, she was unable to do so (see Appendix B). She did refer me to a media report (2) and a [DARA report](#),

neither of which substantiated the claims as far as identifying and quantifying the health consequences of human caused climate change is concerned. As I pointed out in my final and unanswered correspondence:

*“Severe weather events have caused human tragedies since the beginning of time but your claim that “Climate change is already responsible for the deaths of more than 300,000 people each year” is simply not supported by the scientific facts.
I have given you every opportunity to substantiate your claims but you have failed to do so, however I remain ready to reconsider if you can supply scientific evidence to support your claim that human caused climate change is causing 300,000 deaths annually.”*

As a result of alarming health claims made by Professors Lesley Hughes and Tony McMichael in their [Climate Commission](#) report [The Critical Decade; Climate Change and Health](#), I asked them to substantiate their claims and answer the following questions (see Appendix A).

1. Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.
2. Please supply case histories.
3. To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.
4. Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.
5. Since the mitigating climate change strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.

Their continuing decision to refuse to answer these questions over a 12 month period (see Appendix A) is alarming and creates a clear perception that the claims referred to are indefensible and therefore, until substantiated, fall into the category of unscientific alarmist propaganda. Indeed, publication of false health claims have always been treated very seriously by the health establishment and have often been relegated to the charlatan’s world of quackery and snake oil. In fact, modern medicine is often distinguished from quackery by its evidential basis and the use of what is often referred to as the gold standard of medical evidence, namely the double blind trial. In the case of the alleged health consequences of human caused climate change it seems these standards have been abandoned.

For these reasons it is incumbent upon the authors, and the Climate Commission, to promptly substantiate their very serious and alarming claims. Not to do so supports the sceptic case against global warming, invites continuing speculation about the credibility of this report and the Climate Commission itself, and may even call into question the integrity of all those responsible. As I state in my correspondence:

“Try as I might I cannot reconcile the fact that you are so vocal in expressing public concern, and even alarm, regarding the alleged effects of human caused climate change upon health, and yet you are so persistently unwilling (or unable) to answer simple questions. Am I expected to believe your claims

lack any convincing scientific basis and your public concerns are therefore merely a façade? Your continuing refusal to support your own claims certainly creates this perception.”

Although for 12 months I have persistently implored Professors Hughes and McMichael to answer the above questions and supply the evidence to support their claims my efforts have been in vain. Why?

Conclusion

Very serious and alarming claims have been made regarding the health consequences of alleged human caused global warming. The fact that these claims are also supportive of government policy further underlines their importance. Since there is the clear possibility that these claims were intended to cause public alarm, and were also intended to be supportive of government policy, it is absolutely essential they have a solid factual or scientific basis. Yet, in spite of this, the authors of the papers have consistently refused or been unable to authenticate the factual basis of their claims. Continuing refusal to substantiate their claims reinforces the arguments of so called sceptics and undermines government policy.

If these claims cannot be authenticated then clearly disciplinary action should be taken. But given the possible consequences of these claims this alone is clearly insufficient. If the claims are false, exaggerated, or not based upon empirical science, then they must clearly be retracted publicly and any inappropriate endorsement of government policy must be seen to be reversed.

The [Climate Commission claims](#) it ***“was established to provide all Australians with an independent and reliable source of information about the science of climate change.”*** It has completely failed in its duties and continues to completely abandon its responsibility to accurately inform the public. It must be disbanded and funds allocated to areas of genuine need.

APPENDIX A

Unsupported Health Claims Made by the [Climate Commission](#)

Email of 25th Nov, 2012

**Professor Lesley Hughes
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University**

My attempts to obtain answers to the questions outlined below in my earlier correspondence on 30th Nov 2011, 5th Dec 2011, 21st Dec 2011, 24th Feb 2012, 9th March 2012, 3rd April 2012, 16th April 2012, and 25th Sept 2012, have met with absolutely no response from you.

When can I expect a meaningful response? Is your continuing non-response indicative of your complete lack of concern about these issues or do you regard your claims as indefensible?

Regards

Graham Williamson

Sent: Tuesday, 25 September 2012 9:10 AM
To: lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au; tony.mcmichael@anu.edu.au

Professor Lesley Hughes
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University

Dear Dr Hughes,

I refer to your Report the [The Critical Decade; Climate Change and Health](#).

My attempts to obtain answers to the questions outlined below in my earlier correspondence on 30th Nov, 5th Dec, 21st Dec, 24thFeb, 9th March, and 3rd April, 16th April have met with absolutely no response from you. Your continued refusal or inability to defend or explain your Report lends weight to the claims of sceptics that alarming climate reports are exaggerated, unfounded, and indefensible.

Try as I might I cannot reconcile the fact that you are so vocal in expressing public concern, and even alarm, regarding the alleged effects of human caused climate change upon health, and yet you are so persistently unwilling (or unable) to answer simple questions. Am I expected to believe your claims lack any convincing scientific basis and your public concerns are therefore merely a façade? Your continuing refusal to support your own claims certainly creates this perception.

In the public interest I remain hopeful you will reconsider and address the issues I have raised.

Regards

Graham Williamson

Sent: Monday, 16 April 2012 4:58 PM
To: lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au; tony.mcmichael@anu.edu.au

Professor Lesley Hughes
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University

Dear Dr Hughes,

I refer to your Report the [The Critical Decade; Climate Change and Health](#).

My attempts to obtain answers to the questions outlined below in my earlier correspondence on 30th Nov, 5th Dec, 21st Dec, 24thFeb, 9th March, and 3rd April, have met with absolutely no response from you. Your continued refusal or inability to defend or explain your Report lends weight to the claims of sceptics that alarming climate reports are exaggerated, unfounded, and indefensible.

In the public interest I remain hopeful you will reconsider and address the issues I have raised.

Regards

Graham Williamson

Sent: Tuesday, 3 April 2012 10:00 PM
To: lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au; tony.mcmichael@anu.edu.au
Subject: RE: Climate change and Critical Decade Report

Professor Lesley Hughes
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University

Dear Dr Hughes,

I refer to your Report the [The Critical Decade; Climate Change and Health](#).

My attempts to obtain answers to the questions outlined below in my earlier correspondence on 30th Nov, 5th Dec, 21st Dec, 24thFeb and 9th March, have met with absolutely no response from you. Your continued refusal or inability to defend or explain your Report lends weight to the claims of sceptics that alarming climate reports are exaggerated, unfounded, and indefensible.

I trust you will reconsider.

Regards

Graham Williamson

I repeat my request for the following scientific evidence.

1. Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.
2. Please supply case histories.
3. To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.
4. Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.
5. Since the mitigating climate change strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.

I remind you again of the importance of clear scientific substantiation of your various claims.

The medical profession has long campaigned to ensure health claims have a sound scientific basis and prevent false health claims from those who seek to profit or cause undue anxiety and alarm from such claims. I am sure that you would agree with me regarding the importance of accurate health claims and the avoidance of claims which may cause undue alarm in susceptible people.

In your report your draw attention to the contribution of fossil fuels as far as emissions are concerned and the importance of reducing transportation needs.

“Transport generates 13% of Australia’s emissions, and is one of the largest sources of increasing emissions in Australia (DCCEE, 2010). Passenger cars make up about half of transport emissions (DCCEE, 2010) and several studies have suggested that active transport can reduce reliance on private car-use and significantly reduce emissions (Giles-Corti et al., 2010).”

I applaud your concern about reducing fossil fuel pollution, especially the excessive and unnecessary pollution and resource depletion from the importation of locally available commodities, particularly agricultural products. As has been pointed out by the UN, in an ideal green world we will need to have local production and consumption, minimising or eliminating the need for importation of foods and agricultural products. Obviously we can make an immediate impact here by encouraging local production and cutting back on importation of primary products, a move which will have numerous additional benefits for the Australian economy and employment. **Do you agree with this? What proposals have you put forward to achieve these ends?**

As I pointed out previously.

Firstly I should perhaps draw your attention to the fact that an increasing number of scientists from around the world claim the effects of humans upon climate is uncertain and poorly understood. Most recently for instance, the latest CSIRO/BOM climate report ([1](#)), made the following astounding claim ([2](#)):

“Trends in climate are evident over the Pacific as a whole, including the PCCSP region, however the extent to which these trends are attributable to natural variability and to human activities is not yet well understood.”

Even world famous climate scientists and lead authors of the IPCC such as Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy have acknowledged that there is no evidence that humans have any significant impact upon climate, let alone a catastrophic influence. Do you disagree with these scientists?

I was amazed at the alarmist language of your Report, especially given the fact that an increasing number of climate scientists, including the IPCC itself, are seeking now to downplay or completely reverse previous exaggerated claims about human causation of climate change. When it comes to medical matters it is grossly irresponsible to falsely or unnecessarily generate public fear or anxiety. Don't you agree?

In the past we have seen all sorts of charlatans profiting from false health claims and for this reason we must be certain claimed health benefits can be substantiated and do not fall into the category of scientifically baseless magic snake oil cures.

You make the following claims ([1](#)):

“The full range of risks to human health from climate change is mostly foreseeable from our existing knowledge about how natural variations in climate and weather, and the level of human-induced climate change already experienced, have affected rates of illness, disease and death. Climate change affects our health in a number of ways, some of which are direct and others that flow on from other changes. Direct risks include:

» more frequent and intense heat waves resulting in more heart attacks, strokes, accidents, heat exhaustion and death;

» more frequent or intense extreme weather events—particularly storms, floods and cyclones—resulting in more injuries, deaths and post-traumatic stress; and

» more fires increasing the number of cases of smoke-induced asthma attacks, burns and death.”

You appear to make a great many alarming claims about various illnesses with absolutely no supportive scientific documentation.

Do you have any personal case histories of patients whose health has been directly affected by human caused climate change per se? And more specifically, do you have specific case histories for certain diseases such as anthropogenic global warming induced asthma or heart attack cases? (since man is not capable of controlling natural climate variability we are only concerned here with changes which are confirmed as human caused) It is vitally important that we clarify the exact number of patients so affected and assess the effectiveness of climate change mitigation measures such as a CO2 tax as far as reversing or preventing these illnesses is concerned. Do you have clear scientific data pertaining to these matters?

Without such supportive scientific documentation your Report would more closely resemble a scientifically baseless alarmist document designed for political or public impact rather than a soundly based article dedicated to scientific truth.

You further claim (1):

“Health effects of climate change are already being felt in Australia and are likely to grow worse as time goes on (see figure 8). Effects will be wide-ranging and will be felt in many different ways. Everyone is likely to be affected in one way or another.... The most important and urgent strategy to protect our health and way of life is to reduce the emissions that cause climate change. The risks of future climate change to our health are serious, and grow rapidly with each degree of temperature rise. Most scientists agree that the potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change can be avoided if we keep the global temperature rise to no more than 2°C above pre-industrial levels.”

So the most important mitigating strategy from a health point of view is “to reduce the emissions that cause climate change.” Since the mitigating strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.

Failure to provide proper supportive scientific evidence in a report of this nature does create the perception that the report lacks scientific credibility and is intended to target the general media.

Sent: Friday, 9 March 2012 7:38 AM

To: lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au; tony.mcmichael@anu.edu.au

Professor Lesley Hughes
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University

Dear Lesley,

My earlier communication to you was answered by Mr Ryan as below.

However, as you can see from my response to him below, he seemed unable to answer my queries. I therefore seek your response again in attempt to resolve these simple issues.

Regards

Graham Williamson

Paul Ryan
Director
Climate Commission Secretariat
GPO Box 854 Canberra ACT 2601
Phone +61 2 6159 7624
Email info@climatecommission.gov.au
Web climatecommission.gov.au

Dear Paul,
Thank you for your email.

You state in your response:

"I refer to your email to me of 28 January 2012 and your email to Professor Lesley Hughes of 9 February 2012. Professor Hughes has asked me to respond on her behalf. I apologise for the delay in responding to your emails."

In those emails I posed the following questions (in red) in response to your assertion "it is beyond reasonable doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate":

You provide absolutely no evidence to substantiate this extremely loose non specific statement. What does primary mean? 60%? 65%? 70%? And is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?

According to the scientific evidence from world climate experts and IPCC lead authors such a Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy there is no scientific evidence of significant human caused global warming ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)). You seem to disagree with these scientists, do you regard them as wrong? Why?

Further according to former CSIRO scientist John Reid ([12](#)):

"The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not. If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. The IPCC claims to have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid."

And according to the latest IPCC report in their Summary for Policymakers ([13](#)):

"Projected changes in climate extremes under different emissions scenarios generally do not strongly diverge in the coming two to three decades, but these signals are relatively small compared to natural climate variability over this time frame. Even the sign of projected changes in some climate extremes over this time frame is uncertain. For projected changes by the end of the 21st century, either model uncertainty or uncertainties associated with emissions scenarios used becomes dominant, depending on the extreme."

And according to the latest CSIRO/BOM report ([14](#)):

“Trends in climate are evident over the Pacific as a whole, including the PCCSP region, however the extent to which these trends are attributable to natural variability and to human activities is not yet well understood.”

And these scientists are further backed up by thousands of scientists around the world, including the NIPCC, who state that science cannot confirm any significant human caused global warming ([15](#), [16](#), [17](#)).

Why do you disagree with the scientific facts? Do you regard all these scientists, including IPCC and CSIRO scientists, as being wrong. Please explain their error. Clearly your views contradict the scientific facts from these climate experts. Why?

You respond to my above queries thus:

The Climate Commission's report The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses specifically addresses the issue you raised in your question about the evidence for human-induced emissions of greenhouse gases being the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate. The report (p21) refers to findings of the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that "most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations". As the Commission's report goes on to explain, under IPCC definitions of uncertainty, 'very likely' means there is a greater than 90% certainty that the statement is correct.

In your response for some reason you avoided answering the following questions in regard to the percentage of human causation:

- 1. Is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?*
- 2. According to the scientific evidence from world climate experts and IPCC lead authors such as Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy there is no scientific evidence of significant human caused global warming ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)). You seem to disagree with these scientists, do you regard them as wrong? Why?*

I also cited evidence from various scientists, including scientists from the CSIRO, pointing out that the influence of humans on climate is poorly understood and asked you:

Why do you disagree with the scientific facts? Do you regard all these scientists, including IPCC and CSIRO scientists, as being wrong. Please explain their error. Clearly your views contradict the scientific facts from these climate experts. Why?

However, once again, for some reason, you refused to answer these questions. Why?

I also made the point that you rely upon evidence from the discredited IPCC to support your claims. I cited evidence from the scientists below (in red) discrediting the IPCC and asked the reasons why you seem to disagree with these scientists, but once again you decided to completely ignore my question, Why?

Former CSIRO scientist John Reid ([12](#)):

“The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The

IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not. If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. The IPCC claims to have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid."

Dr Robert Balling: *"The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected." (This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers).*

Dr. Lucka Bogataj: *"Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don't cause global temperatures to rise.... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed."*

Dr John Christy: *"Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."*

Dr Robert Davis: *"Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers."*

Dr Willem de Lange: *"In 1996, the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3,000 "scientists" who agreed that there was a discernable human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."*

Dr Vincent Gray: *"The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."*

Dr Kenneth Green: *"We can expect the climate crisis industry to grow increasingly shrill, and increasingly hostile toward anyone who questions their authority."*

Dr Georg Kaser: *"This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing,"*

Dr Aynsley Kellow: *"I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."*

Dr Madhav Khandekar: *"I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."*

Dr Hans Labohm: *"The alarmist passages in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."*

Dr. Andrew Lacis: *"There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department."*

Dr Chris Landsea: *"I cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound."*

Dr Richard Lindzen: *"The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."*

Dr Philip Lloyd: *"I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."*

Dr Martin Manning: *"Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."*

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: *"The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."*

Dr Roger Pielke: *"All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."*

Dr Jan Pretel: *"It's nonsense to drastically reduce emissions ... predicting about the distant future-100 years can't be predicted due to uncertainties."*

Dr Paul Reiter: *"As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."*

Dr Murray Salby: *"I have an involuntary gag reflex whenever someone says the "science is settled. Anyone who thinks the science is settled on this topic is in fantasia."*

Dr Tom Segalstad: *"The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."*

Dr Fred Singer: *"Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"*

Dr Roy Spencer: *"The IPCC is not a scientific organization and was formed to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. Claims of human-cause global warming are only a means to that goal."*

Dr Richard Tol: *"The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices."*

Professor Christopher Landsea, renowned internationally as the eminent Authority on storms was a UNIPCC scientist who resigned in disgust at the UN IPCC's tactics: *"My view is that when people identify themselves as being associated with the IPCC and then make pronouncements far outside current scientific understandings that this will harm the credibility of climate change science and will in the longer term diminish our role in public policy."*

The confessions of Professor Landsea in his resignation letter to the IPCC are particularly illuminating ([18](#)):

"After some prolonged deliberation, I have decided to withdraw from participating in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns..... It is beyond me why my colleagues would utilize the media to push an unsupported agenda that recent hurricane activity has been due to global warming. Given Dr. Trenberth's role as the IPCC's Lead Author responsible for preparing the text on hurricanes, his public statements so far outside of current scientific understanding led me to concern that it would be very difficult for the IPCC process to proceed objectively with regards to the assessment on hurricane activity..... The IPCC leadership saw nothing to be concerned with in Dr. Trenberth's unfounded pronouncements to the media, despite his supposedly impartial important role that he must undertake as a Lead Author on the upcoming AR4..... a scientist with an important role in the IPCC who represented himself as a Lead Author for the IPCC [Dr. Trenberth] has used that position to promulgate to the media and general public his own opinion that the busy 2004 hurricane season was caused by global warming, which is in direct opposition to research written in the field and is counter to conclusions in the TAR..... Because of Dr. Trenberth's pronouncements, the IPCC process on our assessment of these crucial extreme events in our climate system has been subverted and compromised, its neutrality lost..... I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by preconceived agendas and being scientifically unsound. As the IPCC leadership has seen no wrong in Dr. Trenberth's actions and have retained him as a Lead Author for the AR4, I have decided to no longer participate in the IPCC AR4."

But there is nothing new about this as Professor Landsea joins a long list of scientists who have blown the whistle on the shoddy practices of the IPCC and completely discredited the organisation. These criticisms have been confirmed by the IAC review of the IPCC ([19](#), [20](#)). Some of the main criticisms of the IPCC by the IAC include the following ([20](#)).

1. Unclear means of choosing IPCC authors which may result in authors being chosen on political grounds rather than in accord with scientific qualifications.
2. IPCC policy results in inclusion of non peer-reviewed data in their reports but the use of such possibly flawed data is not necessarily identified as non-peer reviewed in the reports. In other words, IPCC policy enables the disguising of suspect data sources within their reports. See Himalayan glaciers fiasco.
3. IPCC reports favour confirmation bias and suppression or inadequate consideration of opposing points of view. Lead authors are permitted to censor or exclude opposing viewpoints. See Himalayan glaciers fiasco.
4. IPCC processes authorise political editing of scientific reports to maximise their acceptability to governments in the final Summary for Policymakers. As a result of this process the Summary for Policymakers tends to be a more sensationalised and less scientific document. For instance, **in the 1995 report, scientists state 5 times there is no evidence of humans causing global warming (Is there new evidence since then?) Yet the summary of the 1995 report reads "The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate". Which section of the report is correct?**
5. Unspecified authorship criteria and political interference of Synthesis Reports.
6. IPCC processes do not deal adequately with the inherent uncertainties of climate science. This includes statements of certainty when there is little supportive evidence and the use of vague difficult to refute statements to imply a level of certainty. Downplaying or ignoring uncertainties has led to many errors in IPCC reports. Furthermore, the origin of such mistakes is often not traceable due to the fact the IPCC does not require accountability in this respect.
7. IPCC Chairman should be suitably qualified in climate or allied science, unlike present Chair Rajendra K. Pachauri who has a background in railway and mechanical engineering.
8. The IPCC does not exclude anyone with a conflict of interest as they have no conflict of interest policy.
9. IPCC leaders make non-scientific public statements which could be construed as flagrant political statements.
10. IPCC is very slow and reluctant to publicly acknowledge errors.

The IAC review of the IPCC has been summarised by Peter Bobroff ([21](#)).

The fact that you seem determined to continue to cite the discredited IPCC as the exclusive and sole basis of your claims of human causation raises extremely serious questions about the credibility of the Commission. Do you have any real evidence which is not tainted by association with the IPCC? Why is it you seem totally dismissive of the criticisms of eminent scientists who have witnessed the shoddy unscientific practices of the IPCC from the inside? And when there is blatant contradiction between the main IPCC report and the Summary for Policy Makers, which version do you support?

I repeat my earlier unanswered question:

Why do you disagree with the thousands of scientists, including former IPCC lead authors and CSIRO scientists who claim the effects of humans upon climate is uncertain and there is no scientific evidence humans are causing catastrophic climate change?

I also made the following unanswered queries in my previous correspondence.

1. Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.
2. Please supply case histories.

3. To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.
4. Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.

In regard to these issues once again you decided to refuse to answer, responding thus:

*“In relation to your questions about the evidence for the impacts of climate change on human health discussed in the Commission's report *The critical decade: climate change and health*, the report presents numerous examples, drawn from published sources provided in the reference list, that demonstrate known links between climatic factors and human health and show how changes in incidence of particular health problems are associated with observed climate change. The Commission has prepared this report with the aim of helping Australians understand the risks of climate change to their health. The Commission has not sought to produce a comprehensive review of the literature on this issue; other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health.”*

Do you have any evidence at all or is this report sheer unadulterated propaganda and scientific nonsense? I have asked repeatedly for the evidence differentiating human caused climate change diseases from those due to natural climate variation or severe weather events and your best response is to state there are links between climatic factors and human health” and “other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health.”

Are you serious? Is the Hughes and McMichael report based upon science or science fiction? Where is the science underlying your apparent claim that you can differentiate diseases caused by human caused climate change from those due to natural climate variation or severe weather events? Why are you so determined NOT to divulge this evidence? By your stubborn refusal to supply this evidence you are creating the very clear perception that the Hughes and McMichael report is sheer political propaganda. I urge you to rectify this impression immediately by supplying the requested evidence.

In my earlier correspondence I drew attention to the following claim in the Hughes and McMichael report ([22](#)):

“The most important and urgent strategy to protect our health and way of life is to reduce the emissions that cause climate change.”

Although you claim that “*the Climate Commission does not comment on government climate change policies*”, the above statement is a clear vindication of government policy. Until you can supply convincing scientific evidence quantifying “*the emissions that cause climate change*”, which you have not been able to do to date, then the above statement is obviously nothing more than an attempt to justify government policy. The claim that ([22](#)) “*the most important and urgent strategy to protect our health*” is reducing CO2 levels (ie “*the emissions that cause climate change*”) has also not been supported by any scientific evidence and is therefore once again blatantly political. If you can supply the evidence why not do so?

You further claim that “*the Commission recognises that economic studies show that a broad-based carbon price is a cost-effective way to help achieve the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions needed to reduce the threat of climate change, including the risks to human health.*” But this is just

another blatantly political endorsement of government policy. Are you suggesting there is no scientific evidence, only economic evidence? Are you suggesting climate policy and health policy are determined by economists? Please explain.

I continue to be alarmed by the apparent determination with which you seek to avoid answering my questions. You create the very clear perception that you have no convincing scientific evidence and the Hughes and McMichael report is just political propaganda. You continue to do a disservice to those who continue to warn of the alleged dangers of global warming. In fact, your inability to supply clear evidence supports the claims of sceptics who say there is no evidence.

Is this your intention? If not, why not correct it?

I appreciate your time is valuable, so why not supply clear concise answers and make further communication unnecessary? If you feel incapable of answering my questions then please forward it to someone who is more capable. I look forward to settling these matters so that any doubts about underlying scientific evidence may be dismissed.

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: DCCEE - Climate Commission Secretariat [mailto:secretariat@climatecommission.gov.au]
Sent: Thursday, 8 March 2012 6:56 PM
To: 'Graham'

Dear Mr Williamson

I refer to your email to me of 28 January 2012 and your email to Professor Lesley Hughes of 9 February 2012. Professor Hughes has asked me to respond on her behalf. I apologise for the delay in responding to your emails.

The Climate Commission's report *The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses* specifically addresses the issue you raised in your question about the evidence for human-induced emissions of greenhouse gases being the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate. The report (p21) refers to findings of the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that "most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations". As the Commission's report goes on to explain, under IPCC definitions of uncertainty, 'very likely' means there is a greater than 90% certainty that the statement is correct.

In relation to your questions about the evidence for the impacts of climate change on human health discussed in the Commission's report *The critical decade: climate change and health*, the report presents numerous examples, drawn from published sources provided in the reference list, that demonstrate known links between climatic factors and human health and show how changes in incidence of particular health problems are associated with observed climate change. The

Commission has prepared this report with the aim of helping Australians understand the risks of climate change to their health. The Commission has not sought to produce a comprehensive review of the literature on this issue; other studies not cited in the report also present evidence of the impacts of climate change on human health.

You also asked about the effect of a carbon tax in preventing health problems. As you would be aware, the Climate Commission does not comment on government climate change policies. However, the Commission recognises that economic studies show that a broad-based carbon price is a cost-effective way to help achieve the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions needed to reduce the threat of climate change, including the risks to human health.

Regards

Paul Ryan

Director

Climate Commission Secretariat

GPO Box 854 Canberra ACT 2601

Phone +61 2 6159 7624

Email info@climatecommission.gov.au

Web climatecommission.gov.au



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Sent: Thursday, 9 February 2012 6:57 PM

To: DCCEE - Climate Commission Secretariat; lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au; tony.mcmichael@anu.edu.au

Professor Lesley Hughes
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University

Dear Lesley,

I have not received a response to my enquiry below regarding your report, [The Critical Decade: Climate Change and Health](#). I take the opportunity to check that you received my previous communication and reiterate my concerns.

I repeat my request for the following answers and scientific evidence.

1. Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.
2. Please supply case histories.
3. To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.

4. Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.
5. Since the mitigating climate change strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.
6. Why do you disagree with the thousands of scientists, including former IPCC lead authors and CSIRO scientists, some of whom are mentioned below, who claim the effects of humans upon climate is uncertain and there is no scientific evidence humans are causing catastrophic climate change?

Let us see what just a few of the thousands of scientists opposed to claims of AGW and the claims of the IPCC have to say.

Dr Robert Balling: *"The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected." (This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers).*

Dr. Lucka Bogataj: *"Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don't cause global temperatures to rise.... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed."*

Dr John Christy: *"Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."*

Dr Robert Davis: *"Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers."*

Dr Willem de Lange: *"In 1996, the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3,000 "scientists" who agreed that there was a discernable human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."*

Dr Vincent Gray: *"The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."*

Dr Kenneth Green: *"We can expect the climate crisis industry to grow increasingly shrill, and increasingly hostile toward anyone who questions their authority."*

Dr Georg Kaser: *"This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing,"*

Dr Aynsley Kellow: *"I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."*

Dr Madhav Khandekar: *"I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."*

Dr Hans Labohm: *"The alarmist passages in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."*

Dr. Andrew Lacis: *"There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department."*

Dr Chris Landsea: *"I cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound."*

Dr Richard Lindzen: *"The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."*

Dr Philip Lloyd: *"I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."*

Dr Martin Manning: *"Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."*

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: *"The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."*

Dr Roger Pielke: *"All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."*

Dr Jan Pretel: *"It's nonsense to drastically reduce emissions ... predicting about the distant future-100 years can't be predicted due to uncertainties."*

Dr Paul Reiter: *"As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."*

Dr Murray Salby: *"I have an involuntary gag reflex whenever someone says the "science is settled. Anyone who thinks the science is settled on this topic is in fantasia."*

Dr Tom Segalstad: *"The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."*

Dr Fred Singer: *"Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"*

Dr Roy Spencer: *"The IPCC is not a scientific organization and was formed to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. Claims of human-cause global warming are only a means to that goal."*

Dr Richard Tol: *"The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices."*

Professor Christopher Landsea, renowned internationally as the eminent Authority on storms was a UNIPCC scientist who resigned in disgust at the UN IPCC's tactics: *"My view is that when people identify themselves as being associated with the IPCC and then make pronouncements far outside current scientific understandings that this will harm the credibility of climate change science and will in the longer term diminish our role in public policy."*

Timeline of shady IPCC practices have been summarised here [\(1\)](#) and the reasons why the IPCC should be disbanded have been summarised here [\(2\)](#).

Do you disagree with all these scientists?

I remind you again of the importance of clear scientific substantiation of your various claims. If you are unable to substantiate the claims referred to above and previously then some may see this as vindication of the claims of so called climate change deniers and conclude your report is merely a sensationalised media or political report. I am sure you would agree with me that this would not be a desirable outcome given the importance of the matters under consideration.

Additionally, while your concerns about possible health consequences in the future are indeed admirable, what about the REAL health consequences and fatalities resulting from the current big freeze in Europe? It seems, strangely, that many who are extremely vocal about possible catastrophic climatic consequences in the distant future seem conspicuously silent about real climatic tragedies occurring NOW. Which is more important in the formulation of current health strategies?

Regards

Graham Williamson

Sent: Thursday, 22 December 2011 8:16 PM

To: 'DCCEE - Climate Commission Secretariat'; lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au; tony.mcmichael@anu.edu.au

Dear Paul,
Thank you for your response.

You state:

"The Climate Commission report The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses, provides up-to-date information on the science of climate change. The report shows that it is beyond reasonable doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate."

You provide absolutely no evidence to substantiate this extremely loose non specific statement. What does primary mean? 60%? 65%? 70%? And is this percentage static or is it influenced by natural variation? And this arbitrary percentage, is it the same all over the world? Since natural climate variability is, by definition, constantly changing, how is it that you claim the percentage due to humans is consistent?

According to the scientific evidence from world climate experts and IPCC lead authors such a Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy there is no scientific evidence of significant human caused global warming ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)). You seem to disagree with these scientists, do you regard them as wrong? Why?

Further according to former CSIRO scientist John Reid ([12](#)):

"The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not. If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. The IPCC claims to

have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid.”

And according to the latest IPCC report in their Summary for Policymakers (13):

“Projected changes in climate extremes under different emissions scenarios generally do not strongly diverge in the coming two to three decades, but these signals are relatively small compared to natural climate variability over this time frame. Even the sign of projected changes in some climate extremes over this time frame is uncertain. For projected changes by the end of the 21st century, either model uncertainty or uncertainties associated with emissions scenarios used becomes dominant, depending on the extreme.”

And according to the latest CSIRO/BOM report (14):

“Trends in climate are evident over the Pacific as a whole, including the PCCSP region, however the extent to which these trends are attributable to natural variability and to human activities is not yet well understood..”

And these scientists are further backed up by thousands of scientists around the world, including the NIPCC, who state that science cannot confirm any significant human caused global warming (15, 16, 17).

Why do you disagree with the scientific facts? Do you regard all these scientists, including IPCC and CSIRO scientists, as being wrong. Please explain their error. Clearly your views contradict the scientific facts from these climate experts. Why?

Unfortunately you completely ignored the questions I posed previously and failed to substantiate the alarming claims contained in the report.

I repeat again my request for the following scientific evidence.

1. Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.
2. Please supply case histories.
3. To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.
4. Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.
5. Since the mitigating climate change strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.

You make the following claims (18):

“The full range of risks to human health from climate change is mostly foreseeable from our existing knowledge about how natural variations in climate and weather, and the level of human-induced climate change already experienced, have affected rates of illness, disease and death. Climate change affects our health in a number of ways, some of which are direct and others that flow on from other changes. Direct risks include:

» more frequent and intense heat waves resulting in more heart attacks, strokes, accidents, heat exhaustion and death;
» more frequent or intense extreme weather events—particularly storms, floods and cyclones—resulting in more injuries, deaths and post-traumatic stress; and
» more fires increasing the number of cases of smoke-induced asthma attacks, burns and death.”

You further claim (18):

“Health effects of climate change are already being felt in Australia and are likely to grow worse as time goes on (see figure 8). Effects will be wide-ranging and will be felt in many different ways. Everyone is likely to be affected in one way or another.... The most important and urgent strategy to protect our health and way of life is to reduce the emissions that cause climate change. The risks of future climate change to our health are serious, and grow rapidly with each degree of temperature rise. Most scientists agree that the potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change can be avoided if we keep the global temperature rise to no more than 2°C above pre-industrial levels.”

You appear to make a great many alarming claims about various illnesses with absolutely no supportive scientific documentation.

Do you have any personal case histories of patients whose health has been directly affected by human caused climate change per se? And more specifically, do you have specific case histories for certain diseases such as anthropogenic global warming induced asthma or heart attack cases? (since man is not capable of controlling natural climate variability we are only concerned here with changes which are confirmed as human caused) It is vitally important that we clarify the exact number of patients so affected and assess the effectiveness of climate change mitigation measures such as a CO2 tax as far as reversing or preventing these illnesses is concerned. Do you have clear scientific data pertaining to these matters?

I remind you yet again of the importance of clear scientific substantiation of your various claims.

The medical profession has long campaigned to ensure health claims have a sound scientific basis and prevent false health claims from those who seek to profit or cause undue anxiety and alarm from such claims. In the past we have seen all sorts of charlatans profiting from false health claims and for this reason we must be certain claimed health benefits can be substantiated and do not fall into the category of scientifically baseless magic snake oil cures.

I am sure that you would agree with me regarding the importance of accurate health claims and the avoidance of claims which may cause undue alarm in susceptible people.

Your apparent dismissiveness and refusal to supply evidence and answer fundamental questions raises serious questions about credibility and serves to supply ammunition to those who criticise the science of climate change.

If you have evidence, what possible reason could you have for continuing to conceal it?

I urge you to reconsider your decision not to answer questions and your decision to refuse to supply scientific evidence.

Please reconsider and supply clear answers and unequivocal scientific evidence so that these issues may be resolved and we may move on.

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: DCCEE - Climate Commission Secretariat [<mailto:secretariat@climatecommission.gov.au>]
Sent: Thursday, 22 December 2011 12:04 PM

Dear Mr Williamson

Thank you for your emails to Climate Commissioner Professor Lesley Hughes concerning the Climate Commission report *The critical decade: climate change and health*. The Commissioner has asked me to respond on her behalf.

The Climate Commission was established by the Australian Government to provide all Australians with an independent and reliable source of information about the science of climate change, the international action being taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and the economics of a carbon price. The Commission is independent of Ministerial direction and does not comment on policy or provide policy advice.

The Climate Commission report *The critical decade: climate science, risks and responses*, provides up-to-date information on the science of climate change. The report shows that it is beyond reasonable doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are the primary cause of the observed warming of the Earth's climate.

In relation to your questions about evidence for the impacts of climate change on human health, the information contained in the report *The critical decade: climate change and health* is based on scientific literature from Australia and overseas. The report includes a list of references that provide further information.

Regards

Paul Ryan
Director
Climate Commission Secretariat
GPO Box 854 Canberra ACT 2601
Phone +61 2 6159 7624
Email info@climatecommission.gov.au
Web climatecommission.gov.au



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

Sent: Mon 5/12/2011 8:05 a.m.
To: lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au;

Professor Lesley Hughes
Department of Biological Sciences
Macquarie University

Dear Lesley,
I have not received a response to my enquiry below regarding your report, The Critical Decade;

Climate Change and Health <http://climatecommission.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/111129_FINAL-FOR-WEB.pdf> . I take the opportunity to check that you received my previous communication and reiterate my concerns.

I repeat my request for the following scientific evidence..

1. Please supply scientific evidence quantifying the number of people, in various countries, whose health has been adversely impacted by human caused climate change per se.
2. Please supply case histories.
3. To confirm your assertion that human caused climate change is causing or aggravating specific diseases, including heart attacks and asthma, please supply disease specific evidence and case histories of cases confirmed as being caused by human caused climate change.
4. Please supply in full detail, the scientific methodology which has been utilised to distinguish health impacts caused by human caused climate change from those due to normal climatic variation or severe weather events.
5. Since the mitigating climate change strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.

I remind you again of the importance of clear scientific substantiation of your various claims.

The medical profession has long campaigned to ensure health claims have a sound scientific basis and prevent false health claims from those who seek to profit or cause undue anxiety and alarm from such claims. I am sure that you would agree with me regarding the importance of accurate health claims and the avoidance of claims which may cause undue alarm in susceptible people.

In your report you draw attention to the contribution of fossil fuels as far as emissions are concerned and the importance of reducing transportation needs.

"Transport generates 13% of Australia's emissions, and is one of the largest sources of increasing emissions in Australia (DCCEE, 2010). Passenger cars make up about half of transport emissions (DCCEE, 2010) and several studies have suggested that active transport can reduce reliance on private car-use and significantly reduce emissions (Giles-Corti et al., 2010)."

I applaud your concern about reducing fossil fuel pollution, especially the excessive and unnecessary pollution and resource depletion from the importation of locally available commodities, particularly agricultural products. As has been pointed out by the UN, in an ideal green world we will need to have local production and consumption, minimising or eliminating the need for importation of foods and agricultural products. Obviously we can make an immediate impact here by encouraging local production and cutting back on importation of primary products, a move which will have numerous additional benefits for the Australian economy and employment. **Do you agree with this? What proposals have you put forward to achieve these ends?**

I have little doubt that your omission of pertinent scientific evidence is an oversight which you will promptly rectify and I therefore look forward to hearing from you so that my concerns may be alleviated.

Regards

Graham Williamson

Sent: Wednesday, 30 November 2011 8:00 PM

To: 'lesley.hughes@mq.edu.au'

Dear Lesley,

I refer to your Report the Critical Decade (1 http://climatecommission.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/111129_FINAL-FOR-WEB.pdf).

Firstly I should perhaps draw your attention to the fact that an increasing number of scientists from around the world claim the effects of humans upon climate is uncertain and poorly understood. Most recently for instance, the latest CSIRO/BOM climate report (1 http://www.cawcr.gov.au/projects/PCCSP/Nov/Vol1_CoversForewordContents.pdf), made the following astounding claim (2 http://www.cawcr.gov.au/projects/PCCSP/Nov/Vol1_Ch8.pdf):

"Trends in climate are evident over the Pacific as a whole, including the PCCSP region, however the extent to which these trends are attributable to natural variability and to human activities is not yet well understood."

Even world famous climate scientists and lead authors of the IPCC such as Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy have acknowledged that there is no evidence that humans have any significant impact upon climate, let alone a catastrophic influence. Do you disagree with these scientists?

I was amazed at the alarmist language of your Report, especially given the fact that an increasing number of climate scientists, including the IPCC itself, are seeking now to downplay or completely reverse previous exaggerated claims about human causation of climate change. When it comes to medical matters it is grossly irresponsible to falsely or unnecessarily generate public fear or anxiety. Don't you agree?

In the past we have seen all sorts of charlatans profiting from false health claims and for this reason we must be certain claimed health benefits can be substantiated and do not fall into the category of scientifically baseless magic snake oil cures.

You make the following claims (1 http://climatecommission.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/111129_FINAL-FOR-WEB.pdf):

"The full range of risks to human health from climate change is mostly foreseeable from our existing knowledge about how natural variations in climate and weather, and the level of human-induced climate change already experienced, have affected rates of illness, disease and death.. Climate change affects our health in a number of ways, some of which are direct and others that flow on from other changes. Direct risks include:

- >> more frequent and intense heat waves resulting in more heart attacks, strokes, accidents, heat exhaustion and death;*
- >> more frequent or intense extreme weather events—particularly storms, floods and cyclones—resulting in more injuries, deaths and post-traumatic stress; and*
- >> more fires increasing the number of cases of smoke-induced asthma attacks, burns and death."*

You appear to make a great many alarming claims about various illnesses with absolutely no supportive scientific documentation.

Do you have any personal case histories of patients whose health has been directly affected by human caused climate change per se? And more specifically, do you have specific case histories for certain diseases such as anthropogenic global warming induced asthma or heart attack cases? (since man is not capable of controlling natural climate variability we are only concerned here with changes which are confirmed as human caused) It is vitally important that we clarify the exact number of patients so affected and assess the effectiveness of climate change mitigation measures such as a CO2 tax as far as reversing or preventing these illnesses is concerned. Do you have clear scientific data pertaining to these matters?

Without such supportive scientific documentation your Report would more closely resemble a scientifically baseless alarmist document designed for political or public impact rather than a soundly based article dedicated to scientific truth.

You further claim (1 http://climatecommission.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/111129_FINAL-FOR-WEB.pdf):

"Health effects of climate change are already being felt in Australia and are likely to grow worse as

time goes on (see figure 8). Effects will be wide-ranging and will be felt in many different ways. Everyone is likely to be affected in one way or another.... The most important and urgent strategy to protect our health and way of life is to reduce the emissions that cause climate change.. The risks of future climate change to our health are serious, and grow rapidly with each degree of temperature rise. Most scientists agree that the potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change can be avoided if we keep the global temperature rise to no more than 2°C above pre-industrial levels."

So the most important mitigating strategy from a health point of view is "to reduce the emissions that cause climate change." Since the mitigating strategy adopted by the government is a CO2 tax, are you suggesting that such a tax is capable of preventing asthma, heart attacks etc? Please provide substantiation.

Failure to provide proper supportive scientific evidence in a report of this nature does create the perception that the report lacks scientific credibility and is intended to target the general media. For this reason I look forward to receiving more details.

Regards

Graham Williamson

APPENDIX B

Unsupported Health Claims Made by the [Climate & Health Alliance](#)

Email to Fiona Armstrong, Climate & Health Alliance, 28th May 2011

Dear Fiona,

Thank you for your response.

Unfortunately all the supplied information fails to supply any scientific evidence linking all the reported tragedies and deaths to human caused climate change. Severe weather events have caused human tragedies since the beginning of time but your claim that "Climate change is already responsible for the deaths of more than 300,000 people each year" is simply not supported by the scientific facts. This assertion assumes that the severe weather events mentioned are all due to climate change, or, more accurately, human caused climate change. Climate scientists agree that severe weather events cannot be blamed upon human caused climate change.

It is extremely unfortunate that these types of sensational media claims continue to be made without supportive scientific evidence.

I have given you every opportunity to substantiate your claims but you have failed to do so, however I remain ready to reconsider if you can supply scientific evidence to support your claim that human caused climate change is causing 300,000 deaths annually.

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: Fiona Armstrong [mailto:fiona-armstrong@bigpond.com]

Sent: Friday, 27 May 2011 9:41 AM

Dear Graham,

Apologies for the delay in replying to your rerequest for information. I have been in Darwin for the last week attending and speaking at the Royal Australasian College of Physicians conference.

My previous email provided you with the information you requested, and I resupply it here below.

The DARA report's data sources and methodology is publicly available here http://daraint.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/CVM_Methodology.pdf. The report itself says of the data used: "The information drawn on must be comparable across the board and is often limited to the lowest common denominator of what is available globally -- in fact a handful of countries are excluded for not meeting even minimal data requirements, leaving a total of 184 countries assessed.... Overall, estimates of impacts could be higher or lower. However, they are more likely too conservative, if only because a number of known impacts have simply been excluded -- such as effects on freshwater marine life, infrastructure damage from permafrost melt, and many others -- which could well be significant to certain communities if not globally."

If you have any further queries regarding this report, I suggest you refer to the reports' authors.

Kind regards,

Fiona

Fiona Armstrong



CLIMATE AND
HEALTH
ALLIANCE

Convenor, Climate and Health Alliance

W: www.caha.org.au

M: 0438 900 005

E: convenor@caha.org.au

Policy, Advocacy and Communications

W: www.fionaarmstrong.com.au

E: fiona-armstrong@bigpond.com

Fellow, [Centre for Policy Development](#)

Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2011 7:23 PM

To: 'Fiona Armstrong'

Hi Fiona,

Thanks for that.

Unfortunately the sources you mentioned not only do not contain any scientific evidence to support their claims of (man made)climate change induced fatalities but they even go so far as to criticise their own methodology and shortcomings.

This is an extremely important matter and the researchers involved deserve the right to avoid the perception that their efforts have been discredited simply by the omission of vital scientific evidence. To this end, can you supply scientific evidence of the 300,000 people who died from climate change last year? How many were in Australia? Can you supply names or specific case studies for a selection of these? How many were in China? And which was the worst month? And how were climate change deaths differentiated from deaths due to normal weather variations?

I am sure you agree that we should not let these reports be discredited because of the inadvertent admission of vital evidence.

Hoping you can assist to clarify these matters.

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: Fiona Armstrong [<mailto:fiona-armstrong@bigpond.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, 17 May 2011 12:57 PM

To: 'Graham'

Hi Graham,

Here is a copy of the article with reference included.

The link for the first reference regarding deaths each year attributable to climate change is here: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/may/29/1>

And the report from which this is drawn is here: <http://daraint.org/climate-vulnerability-monitor/climate-vulnerability-monitor-2010/>

Hope this helps.

Kind regards,

Fiona

Fiona Armstrong



CLIMATE AND
HEALTH
ALLIANCE

Convenor, Climate and Health Alliance

W: www.caha.org.au

M: 0438 900 005

E: convenor@caha.org.au

Policy, Advocacy and Communications

W: www.fionaarmstrong.com.au

E: fiona-armstrong@bigpond.com

Fellow, [Centre for Policy Development](#)

Sent: Sunday, May 15, 2011 3:56 PM

To: convenor@caha.org.au

Sir,

In the media you made the following startling allegation.

<http://fionaarmstrong.com.au/publications/climate-action-has-a-clear-public-health-dividend/>

<http://fionaarmstrong.com.au/publications/health-missing-from-the-climate-story/>

“Climate change is already responsible for the deaths of more than 300,000 people each year. Five million more deaths are expected during the next decade if no effective action is taken to reduce climate risk.”

Could you please substantiate this claim by providing the scientific evidence upon which this claim is based?

Thank you

Graham Williamson