

Emails to Bob Baldwin, Secretary for Minister for the Environment

Email of 29/8/2015

Dear Mr Baldwin,

Thank you for your response of 28th August. In that response you refused to answer any of the questions I asked, and even though I supplied conclusive evidence that your claims contradict science, you continued to make hollow unsupported claims that you support the science. In view of these continuing claims I have taken the liberty of attaching background documents to this email so readers can easily discern the status of the science.

I note that you declined to answer any of my questions or explain why government policy contradicts the scientific evidence detailed by the IPCC, which I cited in my earlier correspondence below. You state that *"The government is committed to integrating science into decision-making as a key principle of good environmental policy"*, yet in your letter's second and third paragraphs provided no evidence and instead made hollow and unfounded appeals to authority. It is a fact that all the organisations you named—CSIRO, Bureau of Meteorology and IPCC— have never provided empirical evidence that human production of carbon dioxide affects global climate or raises global temperature in any way. It is also a fact that many people have given you irrefutable empirical evidence that proves carbon dioxide from human activity has no effect on climate or temperatures.

You further state that BOM, CSIRO, and IPCC have found *"that the Earth's climate is changing and humans are primarily responsible."* But when I asked you to produce scientific evidence of human induced climatic changes in Australian cities you completely ignored my question so I repeat it again.

"In spite of spending billions of dollars on research, and in spite of the many alarmist claims, so far no scientist, politician or researcher has been able to document and quantify the degree of human caused global warming or sea level rise in any city or local council area in Australia. Can you?"

Your statements and policies are contradicted by both the CSIRO and the Minister for the Environment who clearly state there is no reliable evidence of human induced climatic changes in Australian cities or local municipalities (you would be aware of this evidence, but let me know if you are not). In spite of this you claim *"The government is committed to integrating science into decision-making as a key principle of good environmental policy"*. If you have evidence could you please provide it so this matter may be settled.

Please provide the scientific evidence of local human caused climatic changes upon which local policy is based? For instance, please reveal evidence of the extent of human caused climatic changes in Sydney and Melbourne.

As I pointed out previously: *"IPCC scientists and CSIRO scientists have not been able to detect and quantify CAGW in cities and local council areas in Australia – shouldn't we be publicising this overwhelming consensus amongst scientists?"*

Your statements, and policies, are completely contradicting this consensus.

In spite of your emissions target, the government has yet to provide any scientific link between human output of carbon dioxide and the climate in Australia.

In view of your claims about supporting the IPCC version of the science, previously I pointed out, in regard to droughts, the IPCC had reversed their previous alarmist claims and I asked you:

- [According to the IPCC they got it wrong regarding worsening droughts and supposed human caused droughts.](#) *Sceptics have long said IPCC were alarmist and incorrect. Now IPCC agree with sceptics in this regard but yet most authorities still spread misinformation and pretend this is not so. Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?*

You will find full details of the IPCC's reversal of their earlier alarmist drought claims in the Appendix below. In summary, the latest [IPCC AR5 scientific report was very clear about droughts](#), reversing earlier alarmist statements:

- **Globally droughts are NOT increasing & any previous 'evidence' that humans were causing droughts is now seen to be exaggerated, alarmist or totally false.**
- **Droughts are much less severe in modern times as atmospheric CO2 levels have risen.**

The important points here are that previous statements were alarmist, droughts are less severe in modern times, and evidence increasingly shows humans are NOT causing droughts.

However, [the Australian government's report](#), prepared by BOM and CSIRO, entirely misrepresents and cherry picks the IPCC report, even though BOM and CSIRO scientists assisted in producing the IPCC report:

"Assessment of changes in the behaviour of droughts over time is complex, with the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report finding that results varied greatly between studies, depending on the drought indicator used (in particular, whether it was purely rainfall-based or incorporated other variables) and the timescale of drought considered (IPCC, 2013). Major studies in Australia include those of Hennessy et al. (2008), which considered rainfall and soil moisture below the 5th percentile at the 12-month timescales, and Gallant et al. (2013), which considered rainfall and soil moisture below the 10th percentile over rolling 3-month periods. Observed trends in the areal extent and frequency of exceptionally low rainfall years over Australia are highly dependent on the period of analysis due to large variability between decades, with those trends which exist superimposed on those decadal-scale variations (Hennessy et al. 2008)."

Why is the Australian government condoning and encouraging this misrepresentation of the IPCC scientific report by CSIRO and BOM?

Successive Australian governments have created this corruption of science by their blind ideological pursuit of their political climate change agenda.

The direction in which scientific evidence is progressing is abundantly clear. Increasingly the so called sceptics are being shown to have been correct all along.

Will you correct this misrepresentation by advising the public the IPCC got it wrong, sceptics were correct, and adjust your policies accordingly? Or will you continue the deception?

Many people have independently presented the facts to you, repeatedly. You have never countered. Instead, you have limply quoted 'policy'. Yet, now you claim, falsely, that you base policy on science. Unless you can provide clear evidence, which so far you have been completely unable to do, then your statement is clearly false, and your policies are based upon something other than science, such as the global political agenda. Interestingly, government greenhouse expert [Dr David Harrison made precisely this point when he stated that scientific evidence is irrelevant as the only thing that matters is the UN global agenda:](#)

“Even if some brilliant scientist was, overnight, able to show that science of global warming was invalid, it would not make any difference” he said. “One hundred and eighty nations have signed onto the Kyoto Protocol. There is no turning back”.

Do you agree with this government scientific expert from the Australian Greenhouse Office? Are your policies based upon the dictates of the UN global agenda rather than science? The Australian Greenhouse Office which employed Dr Harrison [was administered by David Kemp and Ian Macfarlane](#), so they could no doubt supply further evidence that Australian policy is based upon the UN agenda, not science. Interestingly, David Kemp, Ian Macfarlane, and Robert Hill were all involved in undemocratically implementing the UN Agenda 21 program, so all have a long history in the importance of the UN global agenda (see encl).

Your persistent determination to refuse to supply scientific evidence, and the eagerness you expressed in your letter for a “[global agreement](#)” certainly reinforces Dr Harrison’s assessment, [especially given your claim](#) that the impact of Australia’s man-made greenhouse gas emissions could be compared to “[that of a single strand of human hair on a 1km bridge.](#)” Do you still hold this view?

You also emphasise in your letter that the government is dedicated to the UNFCCC global campaign. However, the goal of the UNFCCC (see [Article 2 of the UN Convention](#)) is to prevent *dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system*, a goal that has been accepted by Australia ([1](#), [2](#)). Given this fact why does your policy contain no such climatic goals.

You mentioned in your letter that the government is dedicated to the UN climate conference in December, however, as Secretary to the Minister for the Environment are you not much more concerned about the UN SDG Summit which will take place in only a few weeks time? This Summit, and the December climate conference, are part of the post-2015 UN agenda yet you failed to mention this. Why?

The UN post-2015 agenda is [described on your web site as ‘non-binding’](#), however, for more than 2 decades you have been forcing Australians to abide by the dictates of the UN’s Agenda 21 program, even though this too was described as ‘voluntary’ or ‘non-binding’. The Commonwealth admits introducing legislation to force Australian citizens to comply with the requirements of this undemocratic UN program, even though giving Australians no democratic choice for an astonishing period of more than twenty years. As the government admits in their [“Road to Rio+20” fact sheet](#):

“Australia has participated in sustainable development discussions for more than four decades. We have signed international treaties, supported regional initiatives and enacted international commitments through new laws and policies at home.....”

In spite of this sorry saga of deceit and betrayal of the Australian people, in 2012 then Prime Minister Julia Gillard renewed Australia’s undemocratic commitment to AG21 at the [Rio +20 Conference](#), and further committed Australia to implement AG21 through the [SDG’s & the UN post-2015 agenda](#). Details were recorded in the outcomes document from Rio +20 – [“The Future We Want”](#).

The Abbott government has not withdrawn from this process but rather is continuing the commitments made by Gillard. Is this correct? Will the government also legislate to enforce these ‘non-binding’ UN programs?

While steps may be proceeding to lock Australia into the UN's post-2015 agenda, most Australians no doubt would like to know the full details of this agenda and why it is being undemocratically driven by the UN with the approval of the Australian government. [According to Mr Sean Batten, Director Global Development Section](#), Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, this UN agenda will be "transformational":

"Under your guidance, we have made good progress towards crafting an inspiring post-2015 development agenda that will focus global efforts on poverty eradication and sustainable economic growth.

As we enter the final phase, we look forward to the timely release of the zero draft outcome document, and subsequent iterations, to allow time for our capitals to consider the text.

On the zero draft itself we have the following comments.

The declaration should be short and inspiring with strong references to the transformational potential of gender equality, governance and economic growth and a revitalised global partnership. It should speak to our shared ambition for the new agenda, as well as common values to guide its implementation."

Do you support the SDG summit in New York? When will you reveal the details?

You also refused to answer the following questions I asked previously so I therefore give you a further opportunity to supply the scientific evidence which you claim you have.

- [IPCC now admits there has been what they term a "15 year hiatus" in global warming which their computer models failed to predict](#). Although IPCC scientists confirm that AR5 climate models got it wrong as far as predicting the hiatus is concerned, they also point out that AR4 climate models were even more unreliable. Once again the IPCC have come to agree with so called sceptics. Interestingly, in an attempt to repudiate sceptic claims about a 'hiatus', [many scientists often prefer to cite only the politicised SPM and avoid citing the scientific report directly](#). Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?
- In spite of spending billions of dollars on research, and in spite of the many alarmist claims, so far [no scientist, politician or researcher has been able to document and quantify the degree of human caused global warming or sea level rise in any city or local council area in Australia](#). Can you? Additionally, many scientists have pointed out so called 'global warming' is also NOT global. According to the science then, since local AGW cannot be detected, local climate policy is being based upon average data which comes predominantly from the other side of the world. Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?
- IPCC reports reveal widespread false and alarmist information is being circulated, particularly about [AGW causing human morbidity and mortality](#) and [conflicts](#). Why the need to resort to making up stories, exaggerating, or cherry picking, if the facts are so revealing? And why are later reports now not confirming previous predictions and mortality? Is climate change now considered less dangerous? Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?
- In keeping with accepted standards of justice and accountability, countries which are allegedly more responsible for climate change should be targeted proportionally. Currently this is not the case, with the Australian government supporting an ad hoc scientifically baseless discriminatory policy. Why?

- There is an assumption that there is only one 'cure' for climate change and that is to hand global economic and political power to the UN, but where is the scientific evidence indicating this is the one and only 'cure', assuming of course that a cure is needed? So far there has been no scientific evidence whatsoever to confirm this one and only cure.

Previously I wrote to you in good faith expecting a serious response to the serious issues I raised. You responded with total denial and dismissiveness, even seeking to dismiss scientific facts. And though I thought you would be concerned about the misrepresentation of science and deception I documented, you not only expressed no concern, you continued the deception.

I understand your eagerness to support the UN's global agenda, even if it is fundamentally undemocratic, unscientific, and built upon deception. However, you must realise that any such reforms built upon deception are totally unsustainable.

It is simply a matter of time before the entire agenda disintegrates. Will you be seen as part of the problem or part of the solution?

I urge you to stand up for Australia, stand up for honesty and integrity, stand up for democracy.

Regards

Graham Williamson

APPENDIX – IPCC REVERSES PREVIOUS ALARMIST CLAIMS ABOUT DROUGHTS

In [Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis](#). Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC are very clear about droughts, admitting in the [Technical Summary](#) that their previous AR4 report was wrong:

“The most recent and most comprehensive analyses of river runoff do not support the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) conclusion that global runoff has increased during the 20th century. New results also indicate that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s are no longer supported.”

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors:** [Lisa V. Alexander](#), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [John Church](#), and **Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#).

In [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) the IPCC confirm again that they had previously exaggerated:

“Based on updated studies, AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated..... Based on evidence since AR4, SREX concluded that there were not enough direct observations of dryness to suggest high confidence in observed trends globally, although there was medium confidence that since the 1950s some regions of the world have experienced more intense and longer droughts.”

Australian scientists involved in writing [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) include **Lead Author** [Lisa V. Alexander](#), and contributing author, [Markus Donat](#).

According to the IPCC in their AR5 [Technical Summary](#):

“There is low confidence in a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall), owing to lack of direct observations, dependencies of inferred trends on the index choice and geographical inconsistencies in the trends. However, this masks important regional changes and, for example, the frequency and intensity of drought have likely increased in the Mediterranean and West Africa and likely decreased in central North America and northwest Australia since 1950. “

And in [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) the IPCC state:

“Confidence is low for a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall) since the middle of the 20th century, owing to lack of direct observations, methodological uncertainties and geographical inconsistencies in the trends.”

The IPCC summarise in [Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report](#):

“In summary, assessment of new observational evidence, in conjunction with updated simulations of natural and forced climate variability indicates that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s should be tempered. There is not enough evidence to support medium or high confidence of attribution of increasing trends to anthropogenic forcings as a result of observational uncertainties and variable results from region to region (Section 2.6.2.3). Combined with difficulties described above in distinguishing decadal scale variability in drought from long-term climate change we conclude consistent with SREX that there is low confidence in detection and attribution of changes in drought over global land areas since the mid-20th century.”

Australians responsible for writing [Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report](#) include Coordinating Lead Author [Nathaniel L. Bindoff](#) and Contributing authors [Catia M. Domingues](#), [Paul J. Durack](#), and [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#),

But most alarming, and incriminating, is the admission by the IPCC in the AR5 [Technical Summary](#), that droughts during the “last millennium”, before the industrial revolution and rise of atmospheric CO₂, were much worse than today:

“There is high confidence for droughts during the last millennium of greater magnitude and longer duration than those observed since the beginning of the 20th century in many regions. There is medium confidence that more megadroughts occurred in monsoon Asia and wetter conditions prevailed in arid Central Asia and the South American monsoon region during the Little Ice Age (1450–1850) compared to the Medieval Climate Anomaly (950–1250).”

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors:** [Lisa V. Alexander](#), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [John Church](#), and **Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#).

According to the IPCC in their AR5 Physical Science Report the evidence is very clear.

- **Globally droughts are NOT increasing.**

- **There is no reliable evidence that humans are causing droughts.**
- **Droughts are much less severe in modern times as atmospheric CO2 levels have risen.**
- **Previous IPCC reports, as long claimed by ‘sceptics’, were alarmist or completely wrong in regard to droughts.**

From: Hussey-Smith, Sam [mailto:Sam.Hussey-Smith@environment.gov.au]
Sent: Friday, 28 August 2015 11:27 AM
To: 'grahamhw@iprimus.com.au'
Subject: RE: Climate policy [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Mr Williamson,

Please find attached a letter from the Hon Bob Baldwin MP in response to your email below.

Kind regards,

Sam Hussey-Smith

Departmental Liaison Officer | Office of the Hon Bob Baldwin MP
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for the Environment
p: (02) 6277 4200 | m: 0428 783 065 | e: sam.hussey-smith@environment.gov.au
Parliament House, Canberra, ACT 2600

From: Graham <grahamhw@iprimus.com.au>
Date: 16 June 2015 7:25:11 am AEST
To: <Bob.Baldwin.MP@aph.gov.au>
Cc: 'Birmingham Simon' <senator.birmingham@aph.gov.au>
Subject: **Climate policy**

Dear Mr Baldwin,

Both you and The Minister for the Environment, have often stated “*The Australian Government accepts the science of climate change*”, as presented by the IPCC and CSIRO, but yet your policy blatantly contradicts the science. For instance.

- [According to the IPCC they got it wrong regarding worsening droughts and supposed human caused droughts](#). Sceptics have long said IPCC were alarmist and incorrect. Now IPCC agree with sceptics in this regard but yet most authorities still spread misinformation and pretend this is not so. Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?
- [IPCC now admits there has been what they term a “15 year hiatus” in global warming which their computer models failed to predict](#). Although IPCC scientists confirm that AR5 climate models got it wrong as far as predicting the hiatus is concerned, they also point out that AR4 climate models were even more unreliable. Once again the IPCC have come to agree with so called sceptics. Interestingly, in an attempt to repudiate sceptic claims about a ‘hiatus’, [many scientists often prefer to cite only the politicised SPM and avoid citing the scientific](#)

[report directly](#). Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?

- In spite of spending billions of dollars on research, and in spite of the many alarmist claims, so far [no scientist, politician or researcher has been able to document and quantify the degree of human caused global warming or sea level rise in any city or local council area in Australia](#). Can you? Additionally, many scientists have pointed out so called 'global warming' is also NOT global. According to the science then, since local AGW cannot be detected, local climate policy is being based upon average data which comes predominantly from the other side of the world. Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?
- IPCC reports reveal widespread false and alarmist information is being circulated, particularly about [AGW causing human morbidity and mortality](#) and [conflicts](#). Why the need to resort to making up stories, exaggerating, or cherry picking, if the facts are so revealing? And why are later reports now not confirming previous predictions and mortality? Is climate change now considered less dangerous? Have you publicised the truth about this? How do your policies reflect this scientific evidence?
- Although the goal of the UNFCCC (see [Article 2 of the UN Convention](#)) is to prevent *dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system*, a goal that has been accepted by Australia ([1](#), [2](#)), Direct Action contains no such climatic goals. Why?
- In keeping with accepted standards of justice and accountability, countries which are allegedly more responsible for climate change should be targeted proportionally. Currently this is not the case, with the Australian government supporting an ad hoc scientifically baseless discriminatory policy. Why?
- There is an assumption that there is only one 'cure' for climate change and that is to hand global economic and political power to the UN, but where is the scientific evidence indicating this is the one and only 'cure', assuming of course that a cure is needed? So far there has been no scientific evidence whatsoever to confirm this one and only cure.

IPCC scientists and CSIRO scientists have not been able to detect and quantify CAGW in cities and local council areas in Australia – shouldn't we be publicising this overwhelming consensus amongst scientists?

Given all this misinformation and discredited alarmism it is no wonder the AGW hypothesis is seen as 'on the nose' by so many people. If there is clear evidence, why not produce it?

Please note, I have only considered some of the alleged evidence supporting claims of catastrophic AGW above. Given the lack of credibility of these claims it is not necessary to consider the supposed basis of, and efficacy of, the alleged 'cure' for this alleged problem. This another issue entirely.

If you feel the IPCC are wrong in some of their statements I cite in the links above, please let me know.

Regards

Graham Williamson

