

From: Malcolm Roberts malcolmr@conscious.com.au
Subject: Fwd: Climate change
Date: 16 March 2014 10:08 am
To: Roberts Malcolm malcolmr@conscious.com.au

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Graham" <xxxxxxx@xxxxxx.com.au> **Email address redacted**
Subject: RE: Climate change
Date: 8 January 2014 5:41:59 am AEST
To: "'Helpdesk Climate'" <Helpdesk.Climate@bom.gov.au>, <X.Xxxxx@bom.gov.au> **Email address redacted**
Cc: <Greg.Hunt.MP@aph.gov.au>, <tony.abbott.mp@aph.gov.au>, <w.truss.mp@aph.gov.au>, **Email addresses redacted**

Hi there,

Thank you for your response.

I have also addressed this response to Dr Power and other parties due to the public importance of these issues.

Your report <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/current/annual/aus/>, and your claim that "*the purpose of the Annual Climate Statement is to describe the climate of the past year*", make no sense at all. How can you have an annual climate statement when you admit, by your definitions below, that such short term weather data is 'weather', not 'climate'? Your own definitions contradict your report and create the clear impression that your report has no scientific basis whatsoever. This creates the clear impression that BOM is merely a sensationalised media or political organisation with no scientific credibility. Will you correct this?

YOUR DEFINITIONS OF 'CLIMATE' AND 'WEATHER'

<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.

Clearly, this definition seeks to underline the reality of weather as distinct from the very theoretical and vague nature of climate. Will you amend the report, including clear definitions, so the public will be correctly informed? Don't you think, in the interests of accuracy, the official BOM definitions of weather and climate should have been included to make it abundantly clear that the cited figures are only weather, and do not reflect climatic changes?

I also asked '*How much of the alleged warming in Sydney for instance, is human caused and therefore reversible?*' But your response "*It is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century,*" completely avoids my question.

I repeat: *How much of the alleged warming in Sydney for instance, is human caused and therefore reversible?*

You cite the IPCC as your source, however, not only do you ignore the fact that this organisation

has been completely discredited as a scientific organisation, you also fail to mention that the IPCC claims global warming has ceased. According to [the IPCC analysis](#) “The rate of warming over the past 15 years (1998-2012; 0.05 deg. C/decade) is smaller than the trend since 1951 (1951-2012; 0.12 deg. C/decade)(SPM-3)”, and [IPCC boss Rajendra Pachauri has announced that there has been no warming for 17 years](#). Why did you fail to mention this?

Additionally, in spite of all the invented hysteria about humans causing droughts around the world, [according to IPCC in their latest Report](#):

“Owing to the low confidence in observed large-scale trends in dryness combined with difficulties in distinguishing decadal-scale variability in drought from long-term climate change, there is now low confidence in the attribution of changes in drought over global land since the mid-20th century to human influence.”

Why have you failed to publicise this and celebrate the good news that it is now known that humans are not causing droughts?

I further stress that according to [the IPCC 5th Assessment Report](#):

“Warming trends associated with global change are generally more evident in averages of global temperature than in time series of local temperature (“local” here refers generally to individual locations, or small regional averages). This is because most of the local variability of local climate is averaged away in the global mean..... Future warming trends cannot be predicted precisely, especially at local scales, so estimates of the future time of emergence of a warming trend cannot be made with precision..... In the present climate, individual extreme weather events cannot be unambiguously ascribed to climate change, since such events could have happened in an unchanged climate. However the probability of occurrence of such events could have changed significantly at a particular location..... The most convincing scientific evidence for the effect of climate change on local scales comes from analysing the global picture, and from the wealth of evidence from across the climate system linking many observed changes to human influence.”

So the “most convincing scientific evidence for the effect of climate change on local scales comes from analysing the global picture”. And because “most of the local variability of local climate is averaged away in the global mean” then of course “Warming trends associated with global change are generally more evident in averages of global temperature than in time series of local temperature.”

So because no clear warming trend is evident from local data, such data must be averaged to produce an imaginary global average and then this fictitious global average must then be applied to every local region on earth to reveal a warming trend.

In other words, global warming is a statistical aberration made possible by creating an imaginary global average which is of absolutely no relevance to any place in the world, especially every local region in the world. This is according to the science.

Can you explain the scientific justification for basing local policy on global averages? In other words, please explain why local policy should be based upon temperature changes on the other side of the world.

You can see from recent media reports that CAGW supporters are looking increasingly ridiculous

and isolated (1, 2, 3). The complete inability of once respected organisations like BOM to answer simple questions such as I have outlined is further evidence of the extent to which they have become politicised and abandoned science.

I extend to you yet another opportunity to respond with clear decisive answers.

If you are unable to do so I urge you to end the charade and the colossal wastage of money on the political myth of CAGW and begin the long process of restoring science to some level of credibility.

Regards

Graham Williamson

From: Helpdesk Climate [<mailto:Helpdesk.Climate@bom.gov.au>]

Sent: Tuesday, 7 January 2014 11:42 AM

To: xxxxxxxx@xxxxxxx.com.au **Email address redacted**

Subject: Re: Climate change [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Graham,

Regarding your query which is repeated below; the purpose of the Annual Climate Statement is to describe the climate of the past year, rather than to undertake a detailed analysis of the cause of warming trends.

However, we know from work described in the recent IPCC reports (see www.ipcc.ch) that the dominant driver of large scale warming trends is the enhanced greenhouse effect – to quote the summary for Policy Makers (See http://www.climatechange2013.org/images/uploads/WGI_AR5_SPM_brochure.pdf).

"It is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century."

regards,
Climate Analysis Section

National Climate Centre - Bureau of Meteorology
| email: helpdesk.climate@bom.gov.au | fax: +61 3 9669 4678
Please consider the environment before printing

>Sir,

>Your climate change article <http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/current/annual/aus/> is interesting but it fails to spell out exactly how much of the alleged warming is >human caused and therefore is reversible by mitigative strategies.

>How much of the alleged warming in Sydney for instance is human caused and therefore

> How much of the alleged warming in Sydney, for instance, is human caused and therefore reversible?

>Regards

>Graham Williamson

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!](#)
