

Dear Fellow Citizens of the World,

Wherever you may live, whatever your colour, culture or creed, we reach out to you with compassion and integrity, even when you are far across the sea. That is the power of the internet; and we use it judiciously.

Why is the IPCC hiding the fact that only 3% of global emissions of CO2 are Human-Made?

$$(23,100/793,100) \times 100 = 2.9\%$$

Table 3. Global Natural and Anthropogenic Sources and Absorption of Greenhouse Gases in the 1990s

Gas	Sources			Absorption	Annual Increase in Gas in the Atmosphere
	Natural	Human-Made	Total		
Carbon Dioxide (Million Metric Tons of Gas) ^a	770,000	23,100	793,100	781,400	11,700
Methane (Million Metric Tons of Gas) ^b	239	359	598	576	22
Nitrous Oxide (Million Metric Tons of Gas) ^c	9.5	6.9	16.4	12.6	3.8

^aCarbon dioxide natural source and absorption of 770,000 million metric tons carbon dioxide, based on balanced flux of 40,000 million metric tons between land and atmosphere and 330,000 million metric tons between oceans and atmosphere, from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), Figure 3.1, p. 188. Human-made emissions of 23,100 million metric tons and distribution of those emissions (atmospheric absorption 11,700 million metric tons, ocean absorption 6,200 million metric tons, and land absorption 5,100 million metric tons), taken from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 39.

^bMethane total sources, absorption, and annual atmospheric increases from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), Table 4.2, p. 250. Distinction between natural and human-made sources based on the assumption that 60 percent of total sources are anthropogenic, from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 248.

^cNitrous oxide total and human-made sources, absorption, and atmospheric increases from Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001), Table 4.4, p. 252. Nitrous oxide natural sources (9.5 million metric tons of gas) derived by subtracting human-made sources from total sources.

Source: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

To verify the source go here to the U.S.2004 Emissions Report <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/1605/archive/gg04rpt/>

To open the original table click on this link <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/1605/archive/gg04rpt/pdf/tb3.pdf>

IF YOU ARE LOOKING AT THE PAPER VERSION OF THIS POSTER GO HERE bit.ly/tgm-j AND SCROLL DOWN TO THE LAST POSTER

For click on link version go here <http://bit.ly/3-percent>

As the poster above evidences, in 2001 the IPCC attributed only 3% of CO2 emissions to human activities. If you have followed the links you will have verified that the poster is true and correct as recorded in the USA Energy Information Report of 2003 which is now in their archived data.

As well as revealing the tiny, tiny amount of human caused CO2 emissions there actually are, the poster illustrates the dishonest practices of pseudo-scientists who persist in applying a totally unsuitable statistical method for measuring dynamical system such as the weather. They measure in meaningless one hundredths of single degree, or one hundredths of a single percentage point. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balance_of_nature https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chaos_theory

If you have attempted to find the source document (IPCC 2001, "The Scientific Basis") referred to 4th line down in the notation, you will have come to the same dead end as we did. So, why have the IPCC removed that table from their report? Did they do it to hide a very inconvenient truth?

The evidence indicates that human caused global warming (HCGW) via the demonisation of a life essential trace gas is a politically driven global scam. The scam is based on pseudo-science

and and false consensus <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/TheFalseConsensusPoster.pdf> . It appears to be orchestrated mainly by the United Nations. But, why would the United Nations want to do such an evil thing. Who knows, but;

> as was predicted about a year ago, the United Nations planted puppet prime ministers in both Australia and Canada <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NG0WcjGHkEw>

> In Australia the evidence shows that the scientists at the Bureau of Meteorology have a fraudulent ideology <http://bit.ly/tgm-bom> <http://bit.ly/bom-bom-bom> http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/6_EmailedLetterToKaroly28thMarch2014.pdf <http://bit.ly/tgm-wc>

>The Turnbull government is possibly knowingly condoning the BOM's fraudulent ideology <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/latest-news/new-77m-super-computer-for-weather-bureau/news-story/439602c83bc3a8a3d04742b9b1f9a3d8> . Or, the Prime Minister and the Minister for the Environment are wilfully ignoring the evidence that indicates that the scientists at the Bureau of Meteorology have succumbed to the crime of Lysenkoism.

>Lysenkoism is used metaphorically to describe the manipulation or distortion of the scientific process as a way to reach a predetermined conclusion as dictated by an ideological bias, often related to social or political objectives. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lysenkoism>

In our humble opinion the crimes of Lysenkoism, fraud, and wilful blindness are inextricably intertwined.

<http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Fraud>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Willful_blindness

What do you, the reader, think after looking at the three links above?

> In Australia we have a Minister for the Environment who does not care that wind turbines are a fatal attraction for birds over either land or sea.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9srPoOU6_Z4

<http://static2.shutterstock.com/sv/video/clip-3710075-stock-footage-beautiful-seagull-flies-between-the-wind-turbines.html?src=/fbopUSqWJ5m8IEC3Ey63iw:1:3/3p>

<http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/articles/2015/11/australia-sees-offshore-wind-on-a-grand-scale-hunt-says.html>

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/1Why_did_Greg_Hunt_stop_the_investigation_into_the_Australian_Bureau_of_Meteorologys_possibly_faked_temperature_data.pdf

Similar examples of data maladjustment are occurring at other Meteorological organisations in many other countries.

<http://joannenova.com.au/2015/01/man-made-adjustments-turn-cooling-in-paraguay-south-america-to-warming/>

<http://www.climatedepot.com/2015/11/20/massively-altered-german-professor-examines-nasa-giss-temperature-datasets/>

So the evidence indicates that the United Nations UNFCCC and IPCC are behind the globalisation of HCGW; which appears to be implemented via pseudo-science, Lysenkoism, Fraud and Wilful Blindness.

In Australia we now have the Turnbull government which is insidiously undoing the good work that Tony Abbott was given a mandate by the voters to complete, i.e. the abolition of the carbon tax and all its dysfunctional hangers on. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/10/21/is-aussie-pm-turnbull-quietly-dismantling-abbotts-climate-legacy/>

In Australia we have a Minister for Education who has shown his derision for the science and the evidence that refutes HCGW. He will stand passively by and allow our corrupted Academy of Science to teach propaganda and advocacy instead of evidence based science to our school children. <http://joannenova.com.au/2015/12/australian-academy-of-science-trains-school-children-to-be-lobbyists-and-teachers-dont-mind/>

We realise that you may find our statements confronting and against everything you have been taught throughout your own education. Your experience possibly illustrates the clear and present threat to democracy. History shows that true democracy only lasts about two hundred years before it slips into tyranny . https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexander_Fraser_Tytler It is partly based on the number of generations of school children who are exposed to Ideological subversion throughout their education. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RDj84NpBs2I>

Further, if you and we logically reason that all scientists, academics and politicians are ethical then history has proven us wrong repeatedly. <http://www.ipa.org.au/publications/1964/a-history-of-scientific-alarms>

So why do the white collar crimes of Lysenkoism, Fraud and Wilful Blindness currently prevail across the globe ? Maybe it is because they underpin the implementation of an intergovernmental, transfer of wealth from the working and middle classes of the affluent countries to the governments of the less affluent countries. It sounds very fair and righteous doesn't it. So, why is it predicated in deceit? Already the oligarchs of the UNFCCC and the IPCC brag that COP21 and all the other tax payer funded junkets are not about the climate at all.

They are about creating a new economic model for the world. <http://www.standupamericaus.org/politics-washington-dc/christiana-climate-change-remaking-world-economy/>

<http://doingadvancework.blogspot.com.au/2011/12/un-climate-boss-figueres-says-us-has.html>

<http://www.foxnews.com/world/2015/09/29/un-ignores-science-council-warnings-in-creating-vast-sustainable-development.html>

If you are still reading we, thank you. If you are prepared to contact your local politician and show him or her this evidence, we thank you more.

If you live in Australia go here <http://joannenova.com.au/reference-pages/australian-politics/australian-parliament-look-up-and-email-your-mp-by-postcode/> to easily find your member's email address, just by entering your postcode. If you live elsewhere, your local members email address will be in the public domain. They need your feedback.

We, citizens of the world must act decisively and quickly. Already the pseudo-scientists are shrilling for International Climate Courts where non-believers of the new religion can be named and shamed into submission. If they succeed it will be a return to the dark ages of the witch hunts and the European Religious Wars. HCGW is not science, it is religious dogma.

To see the rest of the evidence-based posters on the HCGW hoax go here bit.ly/tgm-j . The fact that the evidence supports the opinion we have formed as a result of our independent research may be a coincidence. So, if you find this all too confronting then you may wish to unsubscribe. Please respond and we will oblige. But be careful what you wish for as the evidence we have set out above is fairly clear.

In closing, whatever your religion, GOD equals Good Orderly Direction. At this festive time of the year for some of us we reach out to all of you. GOD be with you.

Respectfully Yours

Dr Judy Ryan
Dr Marjorie Curtis
World Wide Web of Independent Scientists

Respectfully yours

Dr Judy Ryan
Dr Marjorie Curtis