


From: Malcolm Roberts malcolmr@conscious.com.au 
Subject: Fwd: Mc14-004671 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]
Date: 15 March 2014 3:07 pm
To: Roberts Malcolm malcolmr@conscious.com.au

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Graham" <xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au> **Email address redacted**
Subject: **FW: Mc14-004671 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]**
Date: 21 February 2014 1:43:16 pm AEST
To: "Malcolm Roberts" <catalyst@eis.net.au>

From: Graham [<mailto:xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au>] **Email address redacted**
Sent: Friday, 21 February 2014 12:09 AM
To: Greg.Hunt.MP@aph.gov.au
Cc: 'Climate Science'
Subject: RE: Mc14-004671 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Greg Hunt MP
Minister for the Environment

Dear Greg,

I refer to the enclosed reply of 20th Feb from Jo Mummery.

Firstly, in my previous communication I asked a number of questions which, for some reason, you chose to completely ignore. I start by repeating those questions.

1. A human influence in local regions can neither be identified or quantified. Do you agree or can you provide scientific evidence which so far you have failed to do?
2. What is the degree of human caused global warming in Sydney (which is reversible by mitigation strategies)?
3. In deriving the (global) data for Sydney what percentage of the data sets were actually obtained from Sydney? Are you suggesting that local climate policies should be based upon what is happening around the world rather than a direct analysis of local data? Could you please provide the scientific evidence showing overseas climate data provides the best basis for local policies?
4. If you have scientific evidence of the degree to which humans have raised temperatures and sea level in Sydney why are you so determined to refuse to release this evidence and settle this whole matter?
5. You state that the Australian government "*accepts the science of climate change*". But which version of the science do you accept and are you referring to human caused climate change or natural climate change? ***Yes, impossible to believe though it may be, you were not even able to define what you meant by 'climate change'. Why?***
6. CSIRO, the Chief scientist, and professor Flannery, have all stated that climate change mitigation in Australia is based upon average per capita emissions. Is this the science you accept? Or do you disagree with these scientists?
7. Exactly what climatic impacts is your Direct Action Plan intended to prevent?
8. **In view of the above evidence, and your claim that humans can control climate, why has this vitally important matter been excluded from the Direct Action Plan?**
9. **Clearly, any commitment to save the planet or lower temperatures and sea level have been thoroughly expunged from Coalition Direct Action policy. Why? The goal of**

Direction Action is totally unclear. Is the goal to mitigate climate change and control temperatures and sea level? Or, on the other hand, is the goal simply to lower emission levels and meet emission targets?

It would be much appreciated if you could answer these simple questions and save time and the necessity for further correspondence.

In regard to the first 2 questions you did state *“few studies have focussed on identifying this (human) influence at a local scale”*. Interestingly, CSIRO and BOM, whom you claim are responsible for your policy, also agree there is no evidence of human causation in local areas (see Kevin Hennessy, Scott Power, *Australian Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO, 2011. [Climate Change in the Pacific: Scientific Assessment and New Research. Volume 1: Regional Overview. Volume 2: Country Reports](#)*):

“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.” “little research has been conducted to quantify the relative importance of human-induced change and natural variability as causes of the observed trends in the PCCSP region.”

Yet, amazingly, in spite of all these facts, the [Australian government](#) is encouraging local councils to waste taxpayers and rate payers money because *“Local government is at the forefront of managing the impacts of climate change”*, even though, as you admit, there is no evidence at the local level.

Do you endorse this? Is there any scientific justification whatsoever for basing local policies on statistical global averages? Can you please reveal the scientific evidence which dictates that local policy is best based upon global averages rather than local changes?

Since there is no evidence of human causation in any local area around the world, is your government formulating local policy on false or irrelevant data? Unless you can immediately quantify the degree to which humans have increased temperature and sea level in Sydney, Brisbane, Melbourne etc, then all your policy disintegrates into a mire of scientific double talk, if not outright fraud. Where is the evidence? You state you agree with CSIRO and BOM, but yet you promote local policies for which CSIRO and BOM say there is no evidence. Can you name just one city in Australia where the human influence on temperature and sea level has been identified and quantified?

You also stated you based your policy upon data from the Australian Academy of Science, but as I pointed out in my last communication, [the Academy points out](#) *“It is difficult, if not impossible, to prove the causes of this warming, but many scientists are convinced that increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere are at least partly to blame.”* The [Academy further highlights the uncertainty](#):

*“It is **very likely** that **most** of the recent observed global warming is caused by increasing greenhouse gas levels**many** aspects of climate change will likely remain difficult to foresee despite continuing modelling advances, leaving open the possibility of climate change **surprises**.....**some** aspects of climate science are still quite **uncertain**Uncertainty about future climate change works in both directions: there is a chance that climate change will be less severe than current best estimates, but there is also a roughly equal chance that it will be worse.”*

You said you agree with the Academy, so you believe the uncertainties of climate change are so huge that there will be many surprises and these surprises could be positive or negative. Is this correct? Is this the basis of your policy? I asked you previously if this is the 'science' you accept but you refused to answer. Consider the question repeated.

I find it extremely disturbing that you were unable to support your own Direct Action policy when I asked, **Is the goal to mitigate climate change and control temperatures and sea level? Or, on the other hand, is the goal simply to lower emission levels and meet emission targets? Are you unaware of the goal of your own policy?**

All of this makes the Coalition look incredibly ridiculous.

In your response you mention some claims about hottest days, hottest years etc, in the context of climate policy. Once again this makes you look absolutely ridiculous because again you are contradicting BOM, one of your claimed sources of the 'science'. As clearly noted by BOM, anything less than 30 years is weather, NOT climate, as you see from BOM below:

<http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/glossary/climate.shtml>

In brief: the weather of any place refers to the atmospheric variables for a brief period of time. Climate, however, represents the atmospheric conditions for a long period of time, and generally refers to the normal or mean course of the weather.....Climatic data are usually expressed in terms of an individual calendar month or season and are determined over a period (usually about 30 years) long enough to ensure that representative values for the month or season are obtained.

<http://www.bom.gov.au/lam/climate/index.htm>

Climate & Weather: what's the difference?

*There is a variety of ways to explain the difference. Here are a few that may shed some light: **Climate** is what you expect; **Weather** is what you get*

Do you disagree with BOM's definitions?

Why is it that you repeatedly contradict your own scientific sources. It makes it appear your policy is based upon deliberate fraud and deception and has nothing whatsoever to do with genuine science.

I notice also that although CSIRO, the Chief Scientist and many others base their climate science upon per capita emissions, when I asked you about this you refused to answer. Do you disagree with your own scientific sources yet again? With the resources available to you, you could clarify all these issues so simply but yet you consistently refuse to do so, preferring instead to obfuscate and create an impression of complete incompetence or outright fraud. Why? Is your policy based upon per capita emissions or do you once again disagree with CSIRO?

Interestingly, [according to the South Australian government however](#), Australia should forget about mitigation because of Australia's inconsequential contribution to global emissions:

"South Australia is, however, increasingly moving the focus pragmatically from mitigation to adaptation, as efforts in South Australia and Australia are modest in a global context."

Do you agree that pursuing 'mitigation' in Australia is useless, or does the SA government have the wrong version of the science?

I must admit, I am finding it absolutely impossible to locate the 'science' to which you refer

I must admit, I am finding it absolutely impossible to locate the science to which you refer.

Incidentally, you also refer to the IPCC as one of your scientific sources. Do you fully endorse the IPCC and its claims?

Sir, your persistent evasiveness and obfuscation, and your repeated contradicting of your own scientific sources, seems to strongly support the recent views of Tony Abbotts advisor [Maurice Newman](#) regarding what he termed 'climate change madness':

"Since its first report in 1990, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change progressively has applied mass psychology through a compliant media to spread the delusion that wicked Western industrialists are causing irreparable damage to the climate.....Australia, too, has become hostage to climate change madness. It has been a major factor in the decimation of our manufacturing industry.....If the IPCC were your financial adviser, you would have sacked it long ago. Yet, undaunted, some NSW councils still restrict beachside development based on IPCC predictions, which are 10 times the 80 years observed record.....From the UN down, the climate change delusion is a gigantic money tree. It is a tyranny that, despite its pretensions, favours the rich and politically powerful at the expense of the poor and powerless."

The picture you paint, with your determination not to answer simple questions, certainly reinforces Newman's assessment. Nevertheless I extend to you yet another opportunity to correct this perception. If you are unable to answer my queries then please forward them to the appropriate person.

By the way, who exactly is the 'parliamentary clearance officer' to whom you cc'd this?

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: Climate Science [<mailto:DCCEE-ClimateScience@environment.gov.au>]
Sent: Thursday, 20 February 2014 2:28 PM
To: 'xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au' **Email address redacted**
Cc: Parliamentary Clearance Officer
Subject: RE: Mc14-004671 [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Mr Williamson

Please see attached the response to your email of 6 February 2014 to the Minister for the Environment, the Hon Greg Hunt MP, concerning climate change.

Kind regards,

Climate Change Science Team

Department of the Environment

Nishi Building, Level 2
2 Phillip Law Street, Canberra ACT 2601
GPO Box 854 Canberra ACT 2601

</

Text inserted by PIS for Netbooks:

This message has NOT been classified as spam. If it is unsolicited mail (spam), click on the following link to reclassify it: [It is spam!](#)



Australian Government
Department of the Environment

PDR: MC14-004671

Mr Graham Williamson
grahamhw@iprimus.com.au

Dear Mr Williamson

Thank you for your email of 6 February 2014 to the Minister for the Environment, the Hon Greg Hunt MP concerning climate change. The Minister has passed your email to me for reply.

As mentioned in my previous email, the Australian Government accepts the science of climate change. It takes its primary advice on climate science from the Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO. This advice aligns with information provided by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and national and international organisations such as the Australian Academy of Science, World Meteorological Organisation, the Royal Society in the UK, and the National Academy of Sciences, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in the United States of America.

I refer you to information on climate science published by the Australian Academy of Science in 2010, which states that 'Human activities are increasing greenhouse gas levels in the atmosphere. It is very likely that most of the recent observed global warming is caused by this increase in greenhouse gases'. (www.science.org.au/reports/climatechange2010.pdf)

Australia experiences fluctuations in temperature from year to year due to natural variability. However, direct observations taken from observing stations around the country indicate a long-term warming trend in both national averages and at many individual locations. For example, 2013 was the warmest year on record observed at Sydney's Observatory Hill station. In 2013, this station also recorded the hottest day, the warmest winter, and the warmest spring on record. Additionally, every month during 2013 was warmer than average and 2013 was the 21st consecutive year with above-average temperatures. Further information is available at: www.bom.gov.au/climate/change/.

The majority of scientific research to date has focused on identifying the influence of human activities to the observed warming trend on a global or continental scale. Few studies have focused on identifying this influence at a local scale. On a continental scale, Lewis & Karoly (2013, *Anthropogenic contributions to Australia's record summer temperatures of 2013*), show that the record temperatures experienced across Australia in the summer of 2012/13 are unlikely to have been caused by natural influences alone.

As I mentioned in my previous email, the Government's approach to climate change is to focus on practical responses which provide positive local environmental outcomes.

Yours sincerely

Ms Jo Mummery
Assistant Secretary
Science and International Adaptation Branch

20 February 2014

At stake is human freedom, your freedom, *our* freedom