

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.
180 Haven Road
PULLENVALE QLD 4069
Phone: 07 3374 3374
Mobile: 04 1964 2379
E-mail: malcolmr@conscious.com.au
www.conscious.com.au

Monday, March 19th, 2012

Mr Mike Steketee
Contributing Writer
The Australian newspaper
GPO Box 4245
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Steketee:

Re: Your article entitled ‘*Scientists who trade in doubt*’, Sa.17.03.12

Reading your article I feel appalled that a journalist writing for The Australian newspaper could make so many errors and spread so many falsities. Your article fails to meet standards of integrity expected across Australia. From my reading it contains many errors including errors of omission and it states many falsehoods.

My analysis of your article accompanies. **False statements are highlighted in yellow. Statements depending on dubious sources are highlighted in blue. One-sided statements that fail to present the true picture or that are irrelevant statements are highlighted in green.**

Please refer to my letter to Greg Hunt, dated March 10th, 2012. A paper copy accompanies. It is available online here:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/Greg_Hunt_March_2012_Highlight.pdf

An annotated transcript of an interview of Professor Will Steffen on October 20th, 2011 accompanies. It is available online here:
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/Steffen_transcript_highlighted.pdf

Please refer to a succinct summary of four fundamental questions on climate on pages 3-5 of my letter to Greg Hunt.

By his own words Will Steffen makes startling confessions about the UN IPCC

and his own role in apparently misleading the Multi Party Climate Change Committee.

Your article contains strong comments and implied statements about Professor Bob Carter. I presume you have empirical scientific evidence that proves human CO₂ production caused Earth's latest period of modest cyclic global *ATMOSPHERIC* warming that ended around 1998/2002.

Item 1: I please request that you provide me with such empirical evidence to support your position.

The reasons for my classification of your various statements can generally be deduced from statements in the accompanying material. Where not so, please refer to this site: <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/> Specifically:

(1) On the empirical science:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/science_futility.php
[http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom1-CO₂.pdf](http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom1-CO2.pdf) pages 1-4
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WdgpBfEGCbg> together with
<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/malcolm3script.pdf>

(2) On the corruption of climate science:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/political_scam_exposed.php
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf
http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php

(3) On Peter Gleick's apparent theft of Heartland documents and his apparent fraud:

<http://sppiblog.org/news/heartland-institute-responds-to-rep-markey-letter-on-fakegate>
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/03/14/professional-forensic-stylometric-analysis-of-the-fake-heartland-climate-strategy-memo-concludes-peter-gleick-is-the-likely-forger/>
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/02/heartland-vs-climategate>

Item 2: Given my analysis and given what I see as your pattern of promoting unfounded climate alarm and illogically misrepresenting science, could you please advise the reasons for your misrepresentations? Is your position based on gullibility? Or a desire to follow the herd? Or, given your propensity to make these errors that are almost entirely in one direction, are your motives otherwise?

Item 3: Prior to writing your article did you discuss the matter in detail with Professor Carter? Did you discuss the science forming his position's foundation?

Item 4: Given what has been written publicly about the Climate Commission and its woeful misrepresentations purported to be science, why are you quoting

that unscientific body with its clear record of distorting science and fabricating untruths? Does the Climate Commission's report name its authors? Reviewers? Are authors or reviewers funded by parties with political or financial interests such as government? Are such bodies independent and has their work been independently scrutinised? These are fundamental questions for journalists.

From my personal experience with Professor Carter I conclude that he is a man of great integrity, competence and dedication. He is a stickler for detail and accuracy. He is a passionate yet eminently logical guardian of, and advocate for, the scientific process. I conclude that he is honestly motivated and sincerely and deeply concerned about organizations such as The Climate Commission that is misrepresenting, corrupting and destroying science.

Given that modern science has made our lives easier, safer, more secure, more productive, more environmentally responsible and more comfortable his passion for science is inspiring. His advocacy for science is highly desirable and admirable. Reading your article I conclude that you do not value modern science. Why?

My experience with members of the Climate Commission such as Will Steffen, Tim Flannery and Lesley Hughes though reveal them to be misrepresenting science, making false and unscientific statements and spreading unfounded fear. I conclude all three are acting unscientifically and some quite possibly dishonestly or, at best, with breathtaking irresponsibility and ignorance.

Are you aware that much of Bob Carter's work is voluntary? He flies to speaking engagements asking only for reimbursement of airfares and assistance with accommodation. His passion for science and restoration of scientific integrity has fueled his drive for years.

Using your figure on Bob Carter's allowance and comparing it with Tim Flannery's reported salary funded by taxpayers, it appears that Bob Carter receives each month less than Tim Flannery is paid for each day.

Have you ever discussed Tim Flannery's reported \$180,000 salary as Chief Climate Commissioner? Reportedly he's paid that for working eight months at three days a week. Have you ever analysed this and his many conflicts of interest and contradictions? Have you read Dr Wes Allen's authoritative review of Tim Flannery's outlandish and largely unfounded or questionable book entitled '*The Weather Makers*'? Wes Allen's book is entitled '*The Weather Makers Re-Examined*'. An introduction to the book is available here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/TWM_Spreadsheet-11.pdf

A spreadsheet summary of Wes Allen's analysis of Tim Flannery's statements is available here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/TWM_Spreadsheet-11.pdf

Are you aware that Will Steffen has held four positions with the government? In

addition to direct payments he personally receives from government, the organization he heads as Director receives government grants. Yet when he was introduced as the sole *'Expert Adviser'* on climate science to the government's Multi Party Climate Change Commission, Greg Combet introduced him as *'independent'*. Hardly.

Neither Tim Flannery nor Will Steffen has any empirical evidence for their core claim on human CO₂ production. Parts of their presentations contradict empirical science. Will Steffen's public presentations rely on material widely discredited scientifically worldwide. Based on what I've seen and read, both have a record for misrepresenting science.

Would you be so kind as to please send me your critiques or investigations of the stance, conduct and financial interests of advocates of the position you promote?

My declaration of personal interests has been publicly available on the Internet since publication of my first summary document. It is available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/Personal%20declaration%20of%20interests.pdf>

If you consider my analysis, conclusions or statements to be in error I will be pleased to receive your response addressing claimed errors in detail. Additionally, I am available to discuss your views on this letter and will readily and publicly retract any error you can prove on my part.

Item 5: In the hope that you value scientific integrity, I advise of my visit to Sydney this Friday, 23.03.12 through Monday, 26.03.12. I would be delighted to meet you and discuss my analysis and this letter in detail. I please request an appointment with you. If these dates are not convenient, please advise suitable dates to arrange a mutually convenient appointment to develop understanding.

Yours sincerely,

Original personally signed

Malcolm-Ieuan: Roberts.

BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)

Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Enclosures:

Analysis of your article dated Sa.17.03.12, below

Letter to Greg Hunt dated Sa.10.03.12

Annotated transcript of interview of Professor Will Steffen, October 20, 2011

cc:
Chris Mitchell, Editor-In-Chief, The Australian
Andrew Bolt, News Limited
Hedley Thomas, The Australian
Terry McCrann, The Australian
Christopher Pearson, The Australian
Bob Carter
The Galileo Movement web site

Article entitled ‘Scientists who trade in doubt’, by Mike Steketee, copied and pasted from The Weekend Australian, Sa.17.03.12

My analysis of your article follows below. False statements are highlighted in yellow. Statements depending on dubious sources are highlighted in blue. One-sided statements that fail to present the true picture or irrelevant statements are highlighted in green.

CARBON dioxide levels in the atmosphere have ranged between 170 and 300 parts per million across most of the past 800,000 years, according to the CSIRO and the Bureau of Meteorology.

Last year they reached 390ppm and they are increasing at 2ppm a year. Should we be worried? Not according to sceptics such as Bob Carter, a former head of James Cook University's school of earth sciences. He says he has seen no evidence that the climate change that is occurring is caused by human activity or is dangerous.

How does this square with the overwhelming majority of expert scientific opinion? It doesn't.

In their joint report this week on the state of the climate, the CSIRO and BOM argue "that the dominant cause of the observed CO₂ increase is the combustion of fossil fuels" - that is, it is not due to natural variation. They arrive at this conclusion from looking at the change in the composition of atmospheric CO₂, as measured through isotopes; that is, different forms of a chemical element.

This identifies the burning of fossil fuels as accounting for more than 85 per cent of CO₂ emissions caused by human activity, with the next biggest factor, land use change, mainly deforestation, responsible for less than 10 per cent.

The CSIRO-BOM report concludes that, although both natural and human factors have affected the climate during the past century, "it is very likely that most of the surface global warming observed since the mid-20th century is due to anthropogenic (human-induced) increases in greenhouse gases", including CO₂.

Even though this is now widely accepted, to critics such as Carter it creates enough doubt to provide an opening. The evidence that he demands really is absolute proof, an impossible test given the complexity of the world's climate, as well as other areas of science.

If 90 per cent of people receiving a vaccination develop immunity, this is not proof the vaccine works. But it does seem likely, even if some will continue to argue against its effectiveness.

Confidential documents leaked last month show Carter receiving \$US1667 (\$1590) a month from the Heartland Institute, an American organisation that campaigns against action on global warming.

He is described as a co-editor on the non-governmental international panel on climate change - a project designed to challenge the UN body of a similar name, whose reports are accepted as authoritative by governments across the world, despite occasional errors.

What's wrong with that? Nothing, necessarily. Carter confirms that he is doing the work, though he won't comment on the amount he is being paid. "I am retired from the university," he tells Inquirer. "I have no salary and I sometimes do consulting work."

However, Carter's biography on his website says: "He receives no research funding from special interest organisations such as environmental groups, energy companies or government departments." Isn't the Heartland Institute a special interest organisation? "Of course not," says Carter. "They are a think tank."

Whatever it is, it devotes a great deal of its time to lobbying and public advocacy. The Heartland documents show it spending \$US4.2 million of its planned \$US6.6m budget for this year on editorial, government relations, communications, fundraising and publication. Heartland describes the project on which Carter is working as "the most comprehensive and authoritative rebuttal of the United Nations IPCC reports".

Another Heartland project, in which Carter is not involved, is developing a curriculum for schools. "Many people lament the absence of educational material suitable for K-12 students on global warming that isn't alarmist or overtly political," one of the documents says. Proposed teaching modules include "whether humans are changing the climate is a major scientific controversy".

Carter argues that, as a professional scientist, he does not take positions, other

than to base whatever he says on scientific evidence. But he does not always sound so dispassionate. In a review for Quadrant of the climate debate last year, he wrote that "the political year yielded a spectacular display of chicanery, scientific malfeasance, media bias and economic and social irresponsibility, all underpinned by a confusion of both purpose and morality".

Alongside Carter as co-editor on Heartland's climate change panel is Fred Singer, a physicist and one-time senior US government figure with a long track record as a contrarian, as documented by Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway in their 2010 book Merchants of Doubt.

He was the co-author of a report, funded by the Tobacco Institute, attacking the findings of health risks from passive smoking.

In 1982, as a member of a panel appointed by the Reagan administration, he argued against taking action on acid rain, the sulphur and nitrogen emissions from industries and motor vehicles that destroyed soils and waterways.

The strategy that Oreskes and Conway identified as common to all these debates, and climate change, was "doubt-mongering".

In one of the documents made public in litigation against tobacco companies, an industry executive wrote in 1969: "Doubt is our product, since it is the best means of competing with the body of fact that exists in the minds of the public." This, wrote Oreskes and Conway, was the tobacco industry's key insight: "that you could use normal scientific uncertainty to undermine the status of actual scientific knowledge".

No doubt the views of Carter and some other contrarians are sincerely held. The motives of others are not so clear. The donors to the Heartland Institute include tobacco and oil company interests.

In the meantime, the evidence for global warming and its consequences keeps growing.

A Climate Commission paper released this week says record sea surface temperatures caused by global warming may have contributed to the intensity of the rainfall in Australia in recent years, even though the long-term drying pattern in the south continues.

No doubt Carter would dismiss this as far too qualified to consider.