

Mr Mark Butler
Shadow Minister for the Environment
Dear Mr Butler,

24th August 2015

We recently had the pleasure of hearing you speak at the Canberra Community Forum. The title for the Forum was “We Need Action on Climate Change”. In the interests of scientific integrity, honesty and transparency we will call it “Human Caused CO₂ Global Warming” (HCCO₂GW) in this public letter.

The reason we feel we can do this is because you conceded that it should be described as such during the evening. In our opinion, the term “climate change” is ambiguous, misleading and based on political ideology rather than any scientific evidence or hypothesis.

Thank you for allowing us the opportunity to ask you two questions. I will now address my question. Retired Geologist, Aert Driessen, has written to you separately regarding his question.

Suffice to say here, I informed you of the fact that at the previous Canberra Community Forum in 2013 both Professors Will Steffen and Leslie Hughes agreed to go to jail if it turned out they had knowingly misled the Australian politicians and the Australian people. I then requested that if this statement turned out to be true, and if you were Minister for the Environment would you hold those professors accountable.

I expected a straight-forward response along the lines of an unqualified “Yes, absolutely. However, your reply was very disappointing and did not adequately address my request at all. You totally ignored the word “knowingly”, yet it is clearly there on the audio. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ovswhzGVIsc>

It is for the listener to determine if your other ambiguous statements regarding the ideology of the entire, tiny discipline of Climate Science is any assurance of scientific integrity at all.

Our public letters to Professors Steffen and Hughes following the 2013 forum provided robust evidence to support the null hypothesis. They also provided the professors with Black's legal definition of fraud. Neither professor responded to our letters. Those letters can be seen here <http://www.principia-scientific.org/two-alarmist-professors-called-out-for-alleged-climate-fraud.html> and here <http://www.principia-scientific.org/open-letter-on-question-of-australian-climate-science-fraud.html>

Yet, recently we heard Professor Will Steffen yet again in public using ambiguous, non scientific, non-evidence based, terminology. The term "extreme weather events" appears to be his latest misleading catch phrase.

This ongoing non scientific conduct, by Professor Steffen particularly, is now a very serious matter as it could be that it fits Black's definition below.

Fraud is "a false representation of a matter of fact, whether by words or by conduct, by false or misleading allegations, or by concealment of that which should have been disclosed, which deceives and is intended to deceive another so that he shall act upon it to his legal injury." http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/docs/new/id_appendix.pdf

The Australian citizens have suffered legal injury as a result of the maladroit policies arising from the 'science' of 'climate change'. However, under Australia's democracy, while it still exists, no one is above the law. Judges, politicians, scientists, academics, senior public servants, and CEOs can be tried for fraud, or failure in their fiduciary duty.

The evidence now indicates that the Australian Labor Party may have a fraudulent ideology. For this reason it is important that you read and respond to the evidence provided below, and please excuse the tedious, but necessary repetition.

The null hypothesis for both the pseudo-scientific term “Climate Change” and HCCO₂GW scientific hypothesis is the same “Our climate is changing pretty much as it always has since long before and since the arrival of humankind on planet Earth”.

We now publicly provide you with the evidence that supports the null hypothesis as opposed to the alternative hypothesis . Please take note that science is an honourable discipline based on Karl Popper’s method of empirical falsification.

The first few bullet points are links to the evidence for the null hypothesis versus HCCO₂GW. They are just a few references out of many, many thousands.

>Roy Spencer and John Christie (all the IPCC models have failed validity testing) <http://www.drroyspencer.com/2013/06/epic-fail-73-climate-models-vs-observations-for-tropical-tropospheric-temperature/>

>Wolfgang Knorr 2009 (no significant change in the airborne fraction of human caused CO₂ since 1850) <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2009GL040613/abstract>

>Murry Salby (temperature, not man-made CO₂, drives CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere.) Now published in poster format: [http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/SatelliteObservationsOfGlobalCO₂Levels.pdf](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/SatelliteObservationsOfGlobalCO2Levels.pdf) This poster is based on>Professor Salby’s presentation at the Sydney Institute in 2013 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YrI03ts--9I&feature=player_embedded

>>Murry Salby’s work has been replicated by Pehr Björnbohm <http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com.au/2013/07/swedish-scientist-replicates-dr-murry.html>

The next few bullet points provide the evidence that indicates that from as early as 1998 there was no overwhelming scientific consensus supporting HCCO₂GW.

There are only a few studies that claim to have measured overwhelming scientific consensus for HCCO₂GW. They are all seriously methodologically flawed. The two main earlier ones are:-

- > Doran and Zimmerman http://probeinternational.org/library/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/012009_Doran_final1.pdf (where the researchers selectively whittled down a sample of over 10,000 geologists to just 77 then measured scientific consensus on the basis of two questions neither of which mentioned carbon-dioxide). (see this poster <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/TheFalseConsensusPoster.pdf>)
- >The Anderegg et al study 2010 was not a survey. It was merely a methodologically flawed, subjective count and categorisation of publications. (Ref 'Taxing Air 2013' by Robert Carter and John Spooner)
- >The 2013 study by Cook et. al. is also a methodologically flawed count and categorisation of publications. <http://joannenova.com.au/2013/08/richard-tol-half-cooks-data-still-hidden-rest-shows-result-is-incorrect-invalid-unrepresentative>.

By contrast there are several robust measures of scientific rebuttal of HCCO₂GW

- >A petition which was launched in 1998 by the first group of dissenting scientists and has over 31,000 scientists signatures <http://www.petitionproject.org>
 - >The annual reports of the Non Governmental panel for Climate Change NIPCC (which is a scientific body founded in 2003) <http://climatechangereconsidered.org/about-nipcc/#tabs-1-2>
- Various other methodologically sound surveys.

The next few bullet points refer to evidence that indicates that HCCO₂GW is the current politically driven pseudo-scientific scam.

> Climategate Emails 2009 (The text of the emails speaks to considerable wide spread scientific misconduct and fraud). Yet, the early investigations by the British Information Commissioners Office and the British parliamentary Select Committee, which found breach of the law by UN IPCC scientists Committee, were both forestalled by maladroit political and/or legal procedures.

>Subsequent UEA 'inquiries' (Russell 'inquiry' and the Oxburgh Science Appraisal Panel) have been revealed as secretive, contrived, whitewashes of the events Those pseudo-investigations flouted and insulted the integrity of the British parliament. http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf page 4

>Armstrong, Green and Soon (Their audit found that the IPCC procedures violated as many as 72 of the 89 relevant forecasting principles (p. 997))<http://www.forecastingprinciples.com/files/WarmAudit31.pdf>

>Appendix 2 here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html> and particularly section 2 pages 7-II. Noted there that 'you now know the UN IPCC has no empirical evidence of humans causing global climate variability or warming'.

>The seemingly apparent misconduct by the scientists at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology as evidenced by:

><http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/CharlesSturt.pdf>

><http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/Eucla1920.pdf>

> <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/WilliamCreekHeat.pdf>

> <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/1.HoldingGregHunt&theBomAccountable.pdf>

(Read from bottom paragraph on page 2 and through page 3)

> And Appendix 7, here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

Mr. Butler, science is decided by empirical evidence. You have never provided any empirical evidence of human CO₂ affecting climate. Your claim of human causation contradicts empirical evidence that supports the null hypothesis. Due to your ongoing wilful ignorance, the issue is now integrity.

In the interests of openness, honesty and transparency we inform you that this letter has been emailed to close to 1700 recipients. We reiterate that we are simply two retired scientists expressing our opinion formed on the basis of our own independent research. If there is anything that we have stated in this letter that you think is untrue please click 'Reply All' and let us know and we will apologise. But, please do not turn a blind eye to the evidence above. Please, do not keep yourself wilfully ignorant any longer.

Respectfully yours

Dr Judy Ryan

Dr Marjorie Curtis

Members: World Wide Web of Independent Scientists.