

SUBMISSION FOR THE CARBON TAX BILL

Graham Williamson

To the persons responsible for the carbon tax bills, after a cursory reading of said bills please receive my submission as follows.

As an Australian citizen by birth, I, Graham Williamson, of 7/31 Amy Rd Peakhurst, am deeply concerned that the proposed laws are unsound, have no factual or scientific foundation, undemocratic, discriminatory, and the intent and workings of the proposed law is fundamentally dishonest and deceptive, particularly as:

- 1. There is absolutely no democratic mandate for such an important reform and therefore the perception is created that the government is attempting to forcibly impose this reform upon the people by deliberately denying the traditional democratic rights of Australians and refusing to give them any say.**
- 2. The reforms are NOT based upon real scientific evidence about climate change and or real scientific evidence verifying, & quantifying, any effect of human produced CO2 upon climate, sea level, polar ice, & extreme weather events. Expert scientific testimony has invalidated any claim of climatic effectiveness. See below.**
- 3. The carbon tax/ETS is being proposed as a cure for a condition which has no scientific basis (ie human caused climate change) and therefore there is absolutely no scientific evidence of effectiveness (ie ability to lower temperatures, lower sea level, increase polar ice, and reduce severe weather events). Until a thorough scientifically based cost benefit analysis has been produced (showing CO2 reductions necessary to lower temperatures by 2 degrees, 4 degrees, lower sea level by 0.5m, 1m, and reduce severe weather events, including the time frame of effectiveness) there is absolutely no justification for a CO2 tax or ETS. To date, government climate experts and Climate Change Minister Mr Greg Combet, have been completely unable to answer vital questions about the effectiveness of a CO2 tax so clearly there is no climatic basis for it. See below.**
- 4. There are no specific monitoring provisions and automatic repeal provisions should the environmental results be negative.**
- 5. Legislative and constitutional safeguards to prevent the syphoning of Australian funds and assets to foreign countries and agencies have not yet been introduced and these are an essential safeguard.**
- 6. A CO2 tax or ETS has been a costly environmental failure wherever it has been introduced. See below.**
- 7. There is NO economic benefit to Australians in increasing their cost of energy, particularly as we have an abundant, and relatively cheap, source of coal.**
- 8. There is NO definition of just what is 'carbon pollution', let alone what are the deleterious effects of it on anybody, or anything.**
- 9. Carbon dioxide is NOT a pollutant but an essential ingredient for all plant life, upon which all animal life rely for survival. We should be focussed upon REAL air pollutants as defined by the World Health Organisation. CO2 is NOT one of these REAL pollutants. See below.**
- 10. The need for so-called 'carbon polluters' to buy emission-permits will see a massive transfer of Australia's inherent wealth to other countries with NO benefit for Australians, nor the environment, nor humanity. See below.**
- 11. There are NO details on how emission permits will be vouched, guaranteed, or otherwise proved, to be what they really are.**

12. **NO future government will be able to change these laws easily to suit the prevailing conditions without a substantial expense to the Australian taxpayer. This has been described as a deliberate attempt to subvert democracy. See below.**
13. **If there is really a need to reduce the use of carbon-based fuels then the proposed laws are NOT rational, NOT logical, and do NOT cover all aspects and users of all of those fuels.**
14. **The Federal ALP has determined that because of gagging of CSIRO climate scientists an urgent enquiry is needed. Clearly the ALP concerns about gagging should be respected and an immediate enquiry organised. See below.**
15. **There is widespread consensus across mainstream Australia, and including both the political left and right, that the CO2 tax and ETS will have a disastrous economic effect upon Australia. See below.**
16. **This legislation is fundamentally divisive and threatens the fundamental fabric and cohesion of Australian society.**

In summary, I submit that the proposed laws covered by the carbon tax bills are against the express wishes of a majority of Australian citizens, are not in the best interests of Australia, they are completely devoid of any scientific justification or effectiveness upon climate change, and they do not make any economic sense in any regard whatsoever, especially in today's global financial uncertainty, and that they should be abandoned, immediately.

Yours sincerely

Graham Williamson
18th Sept 2011

Supporting Evidence for this Submission

What Do the Scientists Say?

Previously I asked government scientists who support claims of human caused global warming the following questions, but unfortunately they were unable to answer. These questions were directed to government climate change experts such as Professor Tim Flannery, Professor Will Steffen, and organisations such as the CSIRO, the Department of Climate Change, and the Bureau of Meteorology. The questions were also addressed to the Minister for Climate Change, Mr Greg Combet, who was also unable to answer.

1. **Are the politicians correct with their assertion that they can control global temperatures and sea levels by lowering CO2 emissions? (yes or no)**
As a scientist, will you stand behind the claims of the politicians? Does reducing CO2 emissions have the capability to significantly lower global temperatures and sea levels within the next 90 years? (yes or no)
2. **All scientists who say yes to this, please give your scientific evidence, and your analysis of the CO2 reductions necessary to lower global temperatures by 2 degrees, and lower sea levels by 20cm, 50cm, and 1m. Also include the time frames involved.**
As a scientist, will you stand behind the science? Please provide full details.
3. **Our politicians advise us that climate change is so urgent, according to scientific evidence, that we must have a CO2 tax before the next election, otherwise it will be too late to save**

the world because a tipping point will have been reached.

As a scientist, do you support this claim? (yes or no) Please supply full details of the consequences if we do not have a CO2 tax before the next election.

4. We have seen some scientists clearly aligning themselves with political organisations like the IPCC, even after this organisation has been repeatedly discredited. We need to be perfectly clear about which scientists like to align themselves with this type of discredited organisation.

As a scientist, do you support the anthropogenic global warming claims of the IPCC? (yes or no) Do you support the scientific methods and review processes employed by the IPCC? (yes or no)

5. **Is the science of anthropogenic global warming settled beyond doubt? (yes or no)**

Quite clearly, when the Minister for Climate Change and government scientists are unable to answer these very fundamental questions then it is abundantly clear there is no scientific basis for a carbon dioxide tax or an ETS.

So What do Former CSIRO and IPCC Scientists and Leading World Climate Scientists have to Say?

Former CSIRO scientists.

John Reid (1): *“Back in the early 1990s when I was still working for the CSIRO and the early versions of the AGW (anthropogenic global warming) theory started to gain currency, I was rather bemused by the passions which were aroused in my colleagues and the gullibility with which predictions of future climate disaster were accepted. Surely the jury is still out, I thought.....The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not.....People are entitled to entertain whatever apocalyptic view of the future they choose, but such ideas have nothing to do with science. Climate prediction is not science, it is pseudo-science, and sooner or later more real scientists are going to wake up to this fact.”.....“If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. The IPCC claims to have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid.”*

Art Raiche (2): *“What do we ask of the CSIRO? First, we might ask the CSIRO and other scientists who are in on the carbon dioxide joke to condemn the disgraceful practices revealed in the Climategate emails. They don’t.*

Why do they persist? And here’s my version of the big lie - why do they persist saying that almost all reputable scientists support catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming - that’s a mouthful isn’t it - when even the most simple web search, as all of you know, will reveal research by many eminent scientists worldwide that cast all a lot of doubt on this. Let me just for a moment mention just a few names - Professor Freeman Dyson – one of my heroes, possibly one of the most eminent scientists, mathematical physicists of the last half of the 20th century. Dick Lindzen, Professor of Meteorology at MIT. Will Happer, Professor of Physics at Princeton University. Professor Roy Spencer from University of Alabama and NASA, and Professor Abdussamatov Head of the Space Research Unit of the Russian Academy of Science. Are these people fools? Did they get their job because they believed the earth was flat? No! These are senior scientists working at some of the most prestigious

laboratories in the world and they do not believe that carbon dioxide influences global temperature very much at all, if at all.

How can the testimony before the US Congress of more than 700 eminent international scientists - by the way some of these were IPCC authors and they were reviewers and they have gone before the US Congress saying they do not believe that carbon dioxide has much of an effect on the global climate. Ah, but now CSIRO. We can understand them very easily you see, because their climate researchers live in a state of altered reality; the second life; the state of computer models. In this world it doesn't seem to matter when measured data contradicts their model results.

Now most of you know about Phil Watson. He's from the New South Wales Department of Environment and Climate Change. He's shown that the rate of sea level change in the second half of the 20th century has begun slowing down. He has shown this is contrary to the computer models. The CSIRO - does this bother them? No, they're terrific. They live in "Model World". They defend their projections because these are based on computer models of the earth's system, not on an extrapolation of observed regional trends. In other words, Mr Watson's findings about sea levels around Australia and New Zealand are irrelevant. They have no bearing on global trends, because somehow, Australia is different.

You know, our sea level rise, the fact that it's not rising here doesn't mean it won't rise everywhere else. Well, I have to admire Tim Flannery, because in spite of all of his projections about the terrible things that are going to happen, he just bought a house on the Hawkesbury River. One of the things that really disturbs me is that over, and over, and over, and over again, I hear that the people who come to these meetings don't know anything about the science that all the scientists agree. Let me quote my hero - Professor Freeman Dyson, the brilliant Professor of Physics at the Institute of Advance Study at Princeton. For those of you who don't know that's where Albert Einstein spent his last days - and you have to be very good to get there. Professor Freeman says: Climate models do a very poor job of describing the clouds, the dust, the chemistry, the biology in the fields, the farms, the forests, they do not begin to describe the real world in which we live - one that is muddy and messy and full of things that we do not yet understand. He goes on to say - it's much easier for scientists to sit in an air conditioned building and run computer models than to put on winter clothes and actually measure what's going on outside in the swamps and clouds - and that is why the computer model experts wind up believing their own models. It's too hard to get out. But if CSIRO really believed in their climate projections, why do all the reports contain legal disclaimers protecting them from all responsibility should anyone dare to act on what they said was going to happen.....

I have to tell you, from a personal standpoint, it really pains me to come to Canberra here and think about how the CSIRO has deteriorated so badly. The organisation employed me for 35 years -the last 15 of which I had the rank of Chief Research Scientist - I worked on computer modelling by the way - the CSIRO that I joined in 1971 was a very lean, world class organisation and it was run by scientists for the benefit of Australia."

Former IPCC Scientists and Other Scientists

Dr Robert Balling: *"The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected." (This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers).*

Dr. Lucka Bogataj: *"Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don't cause global temperatures to rise... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed."*

Dr John Christy: *"Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."*

Dr Rosa Compagnucci: *"Humans have only contributed a few tenths of a degree to warming on Earth. Solar activity is a key driver of climate."*

Dr Richard Courtney: *"The empirical evidence strongly indicates that the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis is wrong."*

Dr Judith Curry: *"I'm not going to just spout off and endorse the IPCC because I don't have confidence in the process."*

Dr Robert Davis: *"Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers."*

Dr Willem de Lange: *"In 1996, the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3,000 "scientists" who agreed that there was a discernable human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."*

Dr Chris de Freitas: *"Government decision-makers should have heard by now that the basis for the longstanding claim that carbon dioxide is a major driver of global climate is being questioned; along with it the hitherto assumed need for costly measures to restrict carbon dioxide emissions. If they have not heard, it is because of the din of global warming hysteria that relies on the logical fallacy of 'argument from ignorance' and predictions of computer models."*

Dr Oliver Frauenfeld: *"Much more progress is necessary regarding our current understanding of climate and our abilities to model it."*

Dr Peter Dietze: *"Using a flawed eddy diffusion model, the IPCC has grossly underestimated the future oceanic carbon dioxide uptake."*

Dr John Everett: *"It is time for a reality check. The oceans and coastal zones have been far warmer and colder than is projected in the present scenarios of climate change. I have reviewed the IPCC and more recent scientific literature and believe that there is not a problem with increased acidification, even up to the unlikely levels in the most-used IPCC scenarios."*

Dr Eigil Friis-Christensen: *"The IPCC refused to consider the sun's effect on the Earth's climate as a topic worthy of investigation. The IPCC conceived its task only as investigating potential human causes of climate change."*

Dr Lee Gerhard: *"I never fully accepted or denied the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) concept until the furor started after [NASA's James] Hansen's wild claims in the late 1980's. I went to the [scientific] literature to study the basis of the claim, starting at first principles. My studies then led me to believe that the claims were false."*

Dr Indur Goklany: *"Climate change is unlikely to be the world's most important environmental problem of the 21st century. There is no signal in the mortality data to indicate increases in the overall frequencies or severities of extreme weather events, despite large increases in the population at risk."*

Dr Vincent Gray: *"The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."*

Dr Kenneth Green: *"We can expect the climate crisis industry to grow increasingly shrill, and increasingly hostile toward anyone who questions their authority."*

Dr Mike Hulme: *"Claims such as '2,500 of the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that human activities are having a significant influence on the climate' are disingenuous ... The actual number of scientists who backed that claim was 'only a few dozen.'"*

Dr Kiminori Itoh: *"There are many factors which cause climate change. Considering only greenhouse gases is nonsense and harmful. When people know what the truth is they will feel deceived by science and scientists."*

Dr Yuri Izrael: *"There is no proven link between human activity and global warming. I think the panic over global warming is totally unjustified. There is no serious threat to the climate."*

Dr Steven Japar: *"Temperature measurements show that the climate model-predicted mid-troposphere hot zone is non-existent. This is more than sufficient to invalidate global climate models and projections made with them."*

Dr Georg Kaser: *"This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing,"*

Dr Aynsley Kellow: *"I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."*

Dr Madhav Khandekar: *"I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."*

Dr Hans Labohm: *"The alarmist passages in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."*

Dr. Andrew Lacis: *"There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department."*

Dr Chris Landsea: *"I cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound."*

Dr Richard Lindzen: *"The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."*

Dr Harry Lins: *"Surface temperature changes over the past century have been episodic and modest and there has been no net global warming for over a decade now. The case for alarm regarding climate change is grossly overstated."*

Dr Philip Lloyd: *"I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."*

Dr Martin Manning: *"Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."*

Stephen McIntyre: *"The many references in the popular media to a 'consensus of thousands of scientists' are both a great exaggeration and also misleading."*

Dr Patrick Michaels: *"The rates of warming, on multiple time scales have now invalidated the suite of IPCC climate models. No, the science is not settled."*

Dr Nils-Axel Morner: *"If you go around the globe, you find no sea level rise anywhere."*

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: *"The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."*

Dr Roger Pielke: *"All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."*

Dr Jan Pretel: *"It's nonsense to drastically reduce emissions ... predicting about the distant future-100 years can't be predicted due to uncertainties."*

Dr Paul Reiter: *"As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."*

Dr Murray Salby: *"I have an involuntary gag reflex whenever someone says the "science is settled. Anyone who thinks the science is settled on this topic is in fantasia."*

Dr Tom Segalstad: *"The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."*

Dr Fred Singer: *"Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"*

Dr Hajo Smit: *"There is clear cut solar-climate coupling and a very strong natural variability of climate on all historical time scales. Currently I hardly believe anymore that there is any relevant relationship between human CO2 emissions and climate change."*

Dr Roy Spencer: *"The IPCC is not a scientific organization and was formed to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. Claims of human-cause global warming are only a means to that goal."*

Dr Richard Tol: *"The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices."*

Dr Tom Tripp: *"There is so much of a natural variability in weather it makes it difficult to come to a scientifically valid conclusion that global warming is man made."*

Dr Robert Watson: *"The (IPCC) mistakes all appear to have gone in the direction of making it seem like climate change is more serious by overstating the impact. That is worrying. The IPCC needs to look at this trend in the errors and ask why it happened."*

Dr Gerd-Rainer Weber: *"Most of the extremist views about climate change have little or no scientific basis."*

Dr David Wojick: *"The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates."*

Dr Miklos Zagoni: *"I am positively convinced that the anthropogenic global warming theory is wrong."*

Dr. Eduardo Zorita: "Editors, reviewers and authors of alternative studies, analysis, interpretations, even based on the same data we have at our disposal, have been bullied and subtly blackmailed. By writing these lines... a few of my future studies will not see the light of publication."

Additionally there are the 30,000 scientists who signed the **Petition Project** below (3).

Petition Signed by 31,487 American Scientists (3)

"We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gasses is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth."

The matter is perhaps best summarised by world renowned climate scientist, Professor Richard Lindzen who states (4) that **"as a scientist, I can find no substantive basis for the warming scenarios being popularly described."** Lindzen continues (5):

Professor Richard Lindzen (5)

"In view of the above, one may reasonably ask why there is the current alarm, and, in particular, why the astounding upsurge in alarmism of the past 4 years. When an issue like global warming is around for over twenty years, numerous agendas are developed to exploit the issue. The interests of the environmental movement in acquiring more power, influence, and donations are reasonably clear. So too are the interests of bureaucrats for whom control of CO2 is a dream-come-true. After all, CO2 is a product of breathing itself. Politicians can see the possibility of taxation that will be cheerfully accepted because it is necessary for 'saving' the earth..... With all this at stake, one can readily suspect that there might be a sense of urgency provoked by the possibility that warming may have ceased and that the case for such warming as was seen being due in significant measure to man, disintegrating. For those committed to the more venal agendas, the need to act soon, before the public appreciates the situation, is real indeed. However, for more serious leaders, the need to courageously resist hysteria is clear. Wasting resources on symbolically fighting ever present climate change is no substitute for prudence. Nor is the assumption that the earth's climate reached a point of perfection in the middle of the twentieth century a sign of intelligence."

But Lindzen goes on to point out the disastrous costs and social consequences of falsely seeking political and social control by carbon taxing mechanisms (4)

Professor Richard Lindzen (4)

"As Aaron Wildavsky, professor of political science at Berkeley, has quipped, "global warming" is the mother of all environmental scares. Wildavsky's view is worth quoting. "Warming (and warming alone), through its primary antidote of withdrawing carbon from production and consumption, is capable of realizing the environmentalist's dream of an egalitarian society based on rejection of economic growth in favor of a smaller population's eating lower on the food chain, consuming a lot less, and sharing a much lower level of resources much more equally." In many ways Wildavsky's observation does not go far enough. The point is that carbon dioxide is vitally central to industry, transportation, modern life, and life in general.....Fundraising has

become central to environmental advocates' activities, and the message underlying some of their fundraising seems to be "pay us or you'll fry.....I should add that as ever greater numbers of individuals attach themselves to the warming problem, the pressures against solving the problem grow proportionally; an inordinate number of individuals and groups depend on the problem's remaining.....It is worth noting that about 1.7 trillion dollars have been spent on the environment over the past decade. The environment, itself, qualifies as one of our major industries.....If Wildavsky's scenario is correct, the major losers would be ordinary people. Wealth that could have been used to raise living standards in much of the world would be squandered. Living standards in the developed world would decrease. Regulatory apparatuses would restrict individual freedom on an unprecedented scale.....What the above amounts to is a societal instability. At a particular point in history, a relatively minor suggestion or event serves to mobilize massive interests. While the proposed measures may be detrimental, resistance is largely absent or coopted. In the case of climate change, the probability that the proposed regulatory actions would for the most part have little impact on climate, regardless of the scenario chosen, appears to be of no consequence.....The control of societal instability may very well be the real challenge facing us."

For more scientific evidence please see the Appendix.

Economic effects

According to Berg and Moran of the Institute of Public Affairs the economic effects of the ETS will be disastrous for those who value their current standard of living (6):

"The government's objective is for an ETS to bring snowballing price rises spreading across the economy for at least the next four decades. But the outcome will be far more injurious than this. It will mean-at least if Australia's tax approach is not followed by all nations-the disappearance of staple industries like smelting, cement production, cattle and sheep rearing as well as the coal based electricity industry which supplies 90 per cent of our needs, and for which there is no alternative. It will also mean a vast increase in the taxation of petrol. The price of petrol would need to rise to over \$5 and perhaps \$10 per litre to choke off the demand to the level proposed by the government. As a consequence, the ETS will vastly devalue homes, factories, and commercial premises. It will require revolutionary and painful changes to the way we socialise, work and play."

Berg and Moran summarise (6):

"The ETS is the largest change to the Australian economy since settlement 220 years ago. For such a significant reform, it is being designed, prepared and implemented at unprecedented speed. It lacks the comprehensive nature that would be crucial to ensure its impacts are felt equitably-the inclusion of major sectors like agriculture is being deferred and other sectors are receiving preferential treatment.....The government has to be asked how the ETS will be adjusted if the now ten-year-long period where the global climate has been stable continues. Is the ETS a policy to be pursued no matter what, or is it contingent on long term temperature rises and the sturdiness of the model of relationship between carbon dioxide emissions and temperature?.....Australia is staring down the barrel of long-term, entirely unpredictable price increases, coupled with the opportunity for rent-seeking and political opportunism to redraw the contours of the Australian economy."

But while the ruling elites of the political left continue to drive the emissions agenda they have abandoned the rank and file, the unionists and workers who once comprised the ALP heartland. As is noted by Ben Hillier, writing in the *Socialist Alternative*, the elites are now turning upon the workers and their traditional supporters by introducing an emissions strategy which is expected to destroy jobs and penalise those who can least afford to pay (7):

*“The carbon tax being promoted by the Gillard government and the Greens should be opposed. It is a neoliberal measure designed to push the burden of slightly restructuring the Australian economy onto the working class..... The fact that the tax is being designed in such a way as for costs to be pushed onto the bulk of the population is a clear indication that... the costs will be born by the bulk of the population..... **All the decisions that have led to this critical juncture were made by the ruling class. Every decision they made was based on a calculation about how to make the most money and how to screw over workers most effectively..... These are only some of the reasons why the left and the union movement should be unequivocally opposed to this tax.**”*

Although the CO2 tax will be introduced at \$23 per tonne in order to get the legislation through Parliament, this figure is expected by government to blow out to \$131 or even as high as \$275 per tonne by 2050 ([8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)), a figure which will have severe repercussions for Australia’s economy and standard of living. According to Passant ([8](#)), the CO2 tax and ETS are simply an **“attack on our living standards”** which will have the most affect upon those least able to pay ([8](#)):

“The carbon tax is short term carrot and long term stick.

The politics of “a great big new tax” drove Gillard to introduce a tax for which most people and businesses affected will be compensated. Some in fact will be overcompensated, at least in the first years of the scheme. That compensation will prove illusory over time. The package is designed to soften us up for a future attack on our living standards.....That is the long term goal – a mechanism for increasing prices that slowly but methodically imposes the burden of pollution for profit on the backs of ordinary working Australians. The government and Greens hope the ETS will do that....In addition, the compensation package for individuals will erode over time as inflation moves people into higher income tax brackets and increases the average tax take from their pay. The current compensation package for example is in part paid for by previous bracket creep.

The package will produce a \$4 billion hit to the revenue over the first four years as the compensation and spending associated with it are greater than the revenue raised. It is possible the government will cut budget expenditure on hospitals, schools and roads to pay for that shortfall. Working class people will pay for the largess to the polluters.....It says much about the degeneration of the left in Australian politics that most of it welcomes a market mechanism whose specific long term aim is to make workers pay for the environmental crisis of capitalism. The carbon tax and the ETS scheme are neoliberal solutions to a problem that the market itself has created. The market is the problem, not the solution.....

Workers were right to distrust the carbon tax before they saw the details. They will be right to distrust it now the details are out.”

Not only will the workers and the lower socioeconomic groups be targeted by the Gillard Labor government, but furthermore it seems it may be a matter of all pain but no gain ([12](#)):

“While the Gillard government is determined to give us the carbon price, the action needed to actually reduce carbon emissions is clearly not part of its agenda. However, nobody has ever proven that market mechanisms are actually effective in reducing emissions, let alone that they are essential. In fact, existing carbon markets around the world are in bad shape having suffered a decline last year according to a report released by the World Bank this month. The Guardian newspaper described the decline as an “almost total collapse.....Thus, there is no reason to assume that Gillard’s carbon price is even a small step forward. More likely it will be a step backwards.”

In spite of the fact that the ETS is fundamentally at odds with traditional left wing values, it is the left wing elites who are determined to enforce the current emissions policy upon all members of Australian society ([13](#)). Neither the abandonment of traditional Labor values nor the fact that the underlying science has been debunked seems of any concern to our present leaders. And it seems

democracy will not stand in the way of their dictatorial attitude.

Emissions trading or profiting from pollution is an environmental failure

While the Australian government moves to introduce a market based pollution trading scheme, such profit based schemes are already known to be economically disastrous and environmentally useless ([14](#), [15](#), [16](#)). As is noted by Fred Lee Smith ([17](#)):

“Many nations have ratified Kyoto but the only nations that are meeting their reduction targets are those whose economies have collapsed. Kyoto-type policies would inflate the already high cost of gasoline, natural gas, and home heating oil in this country, placing even more hardship on poor households. Exporting such policies to China, India, and other developing countries, where emissions are growing most rapidly, would doom those nations to perpetual energy poverty.”

Similar sentiments are reiterated by Kevin Smith ([14](#)):

“Carbon trading isn’t working, and doesn’t show any signs of improving either. The biggest experiment in carbon trading so far, the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme, has been a spectacular failure, which has not made significant emissions reductions, has absorbed enormous amounts of political will and attention and has acted as a huge subsidy for some of the biggest polluters in Europe, with a handful of energy companies making billions of Euros in profit without having to reduce their emissions.”

According to Magdoff and Foster, in spite of the enormous profits of emissions trading the environmental effectiveness is not monitored ([18](#)):

“The main result of carbon trading has been enormous profits for some corporations and individuals, and the creation of a subprime carbon market. There are no meaningful checks of the effectiveness of the ‘offsets,’ nor prohibitions for changing conditions sometime later that will result in carbon dioxide release to the atmosphere.”

Former CSIRO scientist Dr Spash, who was gagged for producing a report which was critical of government climate change strategy, has also listed various reasons why the CO2 tax/ETS will not be environmentally effective ([19](#)):

“A contention of this paper is that the serious problems posed by human induced climatic change soon become lost amongst concerns for designing complex exchange mechanisms to handle the large scale transfer and management of financial assets*..... Yet, the design of carbon trading schemes has involved several controversial aspects which undermine the effectiveness of hoped for pollution control..... The first is the calculation of and accounting for the amounts of gases being released and absorbed in the global system (e.g. carbon budgets); the second, the allocation of allowances; the third, permitted actions meant to offset the impacts of GHG pollution after its release.....In practice the carbon budget is surrounded by unknowns, ignorance and social indeterminacy* (see Spash, 2002 Chapter 5).....”
“With very few exceptions, nobody is actually going to be measuring carbon emissions. It’s not a matter of putting a gizmo in a smoke stack and measuring carbon as it goes past, it is really about getting the accounting systems in place.”*
(Hatfield-Dodds quoted in ECOS, 2008: 23).....
***Emphasis added**

Spash drew the following disturbing conclusions (cited in part) in his study into the feasibility of emissions trading (19):

“While carbon trading and offset schemes seem set to spread, they so far appear ineffective in terms of actually reducing GHGs. Despite this apparent failure, ETS remain politically popular amongst the industrialised polluters.* The public appearance is that action is being undertaken. The reality is that GHGs are increasing and society is avoiding the need for substantive proposals to address the problem of behavioural and structural change.....

Perhaps the most worrying aspect of the ETS debate is the way in which an economic model bearing little relationship to political reality is being used to justify the creation of complicated new financial instruments and a major new commodity market.* In 2008 the financial sector was in a global crisis having manipulated bad debts and mismanaged its own finances to the point of requiring international banks to seek government bailouts. Yet ETS proposals place a new multi-billion dollar market in the hands of the same people and organisations. Recent experience illustrates how market players continually seek new ways to profit from adapting institutional rules, and regulators struggle to keep-up. There is also something incongruous in governments proposing to host financial markets in their own countries for competitive advantage on the basis that their institutions are well regulated, secure, trustworthy, have good labour and environmental standards, and so on. The incongruity is because they then wish to buy products (i.e., offsets) from countries which clearly fail to meet the same standards. The justification that this is cheaper, least-cost or economically efficient can only be supported if standards are the same across countries. Basic environmental and social standards clearly do matter more than price across all traded commodities, otherwise we might as well, for example, buy shoes made cheaply using unpaid child labour. Non-equivalence is more than a matter of an accounting system to equate units of some physical product (even if this were possible). Such matters are far from irrelevant to how ETS is designed and operated.

*An ETS can in theory provide a similar incentive as under a tax by pricing of all units of pollution. This is meant to encourage development of pollution control technology so as to reduce abatement costs. **However, the major difference from a tax is that the revenue stream need not go to government,*** depending upon how the scheme is established and run. For example, if the government gives all existing polluters permits for free then the public purse gains no revenue; instead polluters can sell the permits on the open market and so avail themselves of a windfall. This adds an incentive for polluting parties to form lobby groups in order to influence policy design to avail themselves of such gains.*

The billions of dollars now being generated in trading carbon and offsets has created a powerful institutional structure which has many vested interests whose opportunities for making money rely on maintaining GHG emissions, not reducing them.* The transaction costs inherent in these markets are actually being seen as a source of economic growth rather than a deadweight loss to society. Once created, how politicians will cut the market by 80 percent—even within the 40 years they are allowing themselves—is hard to imagine. ***After all, the reason for emissions trading is that corporations and the technostructure proved too powerful for the political process to establish a tax or direct regulation in the first place.”****

*Emphasis added

We should learn from the European experience where Carbon trading experience where carbon trading has been an (35) “expensive and harmful failure.”

The difficulties and impracticalities of an ETS system have been clearly outlined by Clive Spash. **The ETS system will become a self-perpetuating industry in itself. Although nothing will be produced,**

nothing will change hands, and there will be no way of assessing 'value for money', a trading juggernaut will be produced which will see the major players having a clear vested interest in maintaining a level of highly profitable pollution. The losers in all of this are the people. The bankers, economists, and major players are clearly motivated by profits. The politicians of course, will be given unprecedented powers to control people and redistribute wealth in line with their ideological dreams. And when the CO2 tax changes to an ETS in 2015 the huge flow of financial assets from Australia to third world countries will be additional to any government revenue and beyond direct government control. All this, and according to the scientific experts, for no environmental benefit.

United Nations Says Carbon Tax is for Wealth Redistribution, NOT, Lowering Sea Level

Australian CO2 Tax to go to the UN

The government's plan, although they prefer not to discuss the details, is ultimately to hand over the control of emissions trading to the UN and international bureaucracies in a direct sell out of Australia and Australia's sovereignty (6):

"as the government points out, a domestic ETS is only the prelude to an international agreement-one which may take these complications out of the hands of our domestic climate change minister and into international bureaucracies."

The United Nations High Level Advisory Group on Climate Change, on which Bob McMullan was the Australian representative, confirmed the potentially lucrative nature of the carbon tax, up to 10% of which should be sent to the United Nations, and acknowledged the problem of national sovereignty that this would inevitably cause (20):

"For carbon-related revenues (e.g., carbon taxes, wire taxes and removal of subsidies) the assumption used was that only between 2 and 10 per cent 22 of the revenues would be dedicated to international action owing to the domestic nature of the measures.....The Advisory Group emphasized the importance of a carbon price in the range of US\$20-US\$25 per ton of CO2 equivalent in 2020 as a key element of reaching the US\$100 billion per year. The higher the carbon price, the steeper the rise in available revenues and the stronger the mutual reinforcement of abatement potentials and different measures.

*Actual estimates of 2020 revenue potential for new public instruments are sensitive to many assumptions, particularly the carbon price and the share allocated to international climate finance. Based on a carbon price of US\$20-US\$25 per ton of CO2 equivalent, auctions of emission allowances and domestic carbon taxes in developed countries with **up to 10 per cent of total revenues allocated for international climate action** could potentially mobilize around US\$30 billion annually. Without underestimating the difficulties to be resolved, particularly in terms of national sovereignty and incidence on developing countries, approximately US\$10 billion annually could be raised from carbon pricing international transportation, assuming no net incidence on developing countries and earmarking between 25 and 50 per cent of total revenues.....A carbon price of US\$20-US\$25 could generate around US\$100 billion to US\$200 billion of gross private capital flows."*

It should be noted that, according to the Bob McMullan United Nations Advisory Group, it was recommended that there should be an annual transfer to the United Nations of up to "10 per cent

of total (carbon tax) revenues” “going to international climate action” which would have the “potential to generate around US\$30 billion annually.” This is in spite of what they call “the difficulties” of “national sovereignty.”

For the first time in history the suggestion is being made that:

- **Australian tax policy should be determined by a foreign power**
- **Australian tax payers should pay tax to a foreign power**

Given their support for such policies, it is hardly surprising that the Australian government has earned a reputation for avoiding democracy and hiding behind a cloak of deviousness and deceit.

Immediate legislative and/or constitutional reforms must be introduced to prevent interference of foreign agencies in Australian affairs and also to prevent the flow of Australian assets to such agencies.

CO2 Tax for Wealth Redistribution & the UN, Not for the Environment

It should be noted that the United Nations initially proposed the carbon dioxide tax strategy NOT from an attempt to rectify global warming but rather it was one of various taxes they considered in pursuit of their ideological goals to reduce the wealth of affluent nations and redistribute this wealth globally. The fact that the tax may be able to be justified on climatic and environmental grounds was incidental but it also made the carbon tax a very attractive option compared to other wealth redistribution taxes they considered. According to the Secretary General of the United Nations in 2004 ([21](#)):

*“To the extent that emissions impose environmental damage wherever they occur, the corrective tax should be the same. However, this needs to be moderated to take account of the unequal distribution of world income — **the very reason for our current interest in the (carbon)tax.** Considerations of global justice point to poor countries bearing less of the cost burden, and may justify the tax being levied only on high-income or middle-income countries.”*

The United Nations stresses here that the carbon dioxide tax is proposed because of “the unequal distribution of world income” and not because of climate change. In respect of choosing the carbon dioxide tax to raise revenue instead of other taxes the United Nations points out ([22](#)):

“If global taxation is considered desirable, the Conference and the Summit are likely to find more promise in a carbon tax—a tax on the consumption of fossil fuels, at rates that reflect the contribution of these fuels to CO₂ emissions. This tax could serve two important goals: limiting the rise in global temperatures associated with burning these fuels, and raising revenue.”

These facts have been confirmed again more recently by Edenhoffer of the UN ([23](#)):

“Basically it’s a big mistake to discuss climate policy separately from the major themes of globalization. The climate summit in Cancun at the end of the month is not a climate conference, but one of the largest economic conferences since the Second World War”” First of all, developed countries have basically expropriated the atmosphere of the world community. But one must say clearly that we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy. Obviously, the owners of coal and oil will not be enthusiastic about this. One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with the

environmental policy anymore, with problems such as deforestation or the ozone hole.”

The United Nations further emphasises that as they move towards a world government they will need to implement effective global taxes ([21](#)):

“One interesting point of departure is to consider the taxes and transfers that might be instituted by a world government”.....“If such a global government were to act in the interests of world citizens as a whole, then global welfare maximization is likely to imply substantial positive taxes on almost everyone in richer countries and substantial transfers to the majority of people in low-income countries”.....“Any foreseeable global tax will be introduced, not by a unitary world government, but as the result of concerted action by nation states”...“We have both global institutions and national governments, and it is the latter which have to agree to the taxes being levied and which are accountable to their electorates. It could indeed be the case that the global tax is treated as simply a glorified domestic tax, with the revenue being forwarded by national governments to a global spending body”...“ national governments retain not only control over the administration of the tax process but also discretion over the tax rates. In this case, participating governments would agree on their national tax liability but retain the freedom to decide how the revenue is to be raised.”

The United Nations further points out that countries should be taxed according to how wealthy they are ([21](#)):

“Does this mean that the global tax should be levied at the same rate on all countries? To the extent that emissions impose environmental damage wherever they occur, the corrective tax should be the same. However, this needs to be moderated to take account of the unequal distribution of world income — the very reason for our current interest in the tax. Considerations of global justice point to poor countries bearing less of the cost burden, and may justify the tax being levied only on high-income or middle-income countries.”.....“ A global tax on carbon use at a rate equivalent to a tax on gasoline of 4.8 cents per United States gallon (approximately €0.01 per litre) levied only on high-income countries could indeed raise some US\$ 60 billion a year. Such a rate of global tax would represent a very small addition to those applied by many national governments, and is an order of magnitude smaller than the increases considered in proposals to halt global warming.”

So while the UN clearly admits that the carbon tax has always been primarily a global wealth redistribution tool aimed at penalising more affluent nations, this is not communicated to Australians by politicians who prefer to conceal the truth and exploit the situation for their own ideological purposes, even though they eagerly signed the UN agreement and are firmly committed to the global aims of the UN.

UN Says Level of CO2 Tax Should be Set to Maximise Revenue, NOT Prevent Emissions

The United Nations also points out that if the carbon tax is going to continue to generate sufficient revenue then it should not be set at such a high level that it reduces CO2 emissions to zero as this would be counter productive ([21](#)):

“The carbon-use tax can make a major contribution to raising revenue at a much lower rate than that suggested as needed to halt global warming. Taking this argument to the limit, we may note that a carbon tax that reduced emissions to zero would be an environmental success but a revenue failure.”.....“ The energy tax considered here has a rate of one tenth or one twentieth of those typically considered in the literature on global warming. The taxes are not, therefore, guaranteed to have the major behavioural impact, discouraging pollution and speculation, which has been sought. This

conclusion has both negative and positive aspects. On the minus side, it means that the double dividend — of increased revenue plus improved functioning of the economy — may fall short on the second dimension. But it is revenue that is our concern here. The second aspect is positive, which is that the much more modest tax rates envisaged here are more acceptable and less likely to have disruptive economic consequences.”

Once again the UN underlines the fact that the CO2 tax is primarily intended as a wealth redistribution tax, NOT a means of altering the climate. Our politicians continue to conceal and misrepresent the true purpose of the tax and there is absolutely no mandate until the Australian people are fully and correctly informed and given an electoral choice.

Climate Debt: The Discriminatory Heart of Climate Change Politics

So called climate change is a political obsession which has little to do with science or reality. It is a new industry and a new ‘ism’. Climate change offers the political left, extremists, and totalitarians, the type of dictatorial political control of which they have long dreamt. Climate change has been described as “class war” (24):

“Climate change is class war, extended to future generations. Capitalist economic production says, our accrual of wealth is more important than your desire to live a free life, or to live free of exploitation. Climate change is the historical output of capitalist economic relations”

Emissions trading and carbon dioxide taxation, though useless for controlling climate and sea level, create many tempting and exciting possibilities for global wealth redistribution. This “climate change justified” wealth transfer from Australia to the UN and poorer countries is **NOT** considered part of the normal foreign aid budget but rather, according to the requirements of the United Nations, Greens, and socialists, is **additional to** normal foreign aid (25, 26, 27). The philosophy behind such payments dictates that Australia **owes** compensation payments to third world countries because of the climate change damage such countries have allegedly sustained as a result of Australia’s 1.5% of global CO2 emissions (25, 26, 27). **This compensation is considered totally separate from normal foreign aid because it arises from an environmental or climate debt which Australia allegedly owes such countries (25, 26, 27).** This has been termed the “**ecological debt**” or “**climate debt**” (28, 29, 30).

Political supporters of the concept of climate debt seek to discriminate against and impose a collective burden of guilt upon wealthier countries (31) :

- *“For their disproportionate contribution to the causes and consequences of climate change, developed countries owe a two-fold climate debt to the poor majority:*
- *For their excessive historical and current per person emissions – denying developing countries their fair share of atmospheric space – they have run up an “emissions debt” to developing countries; and*
- *For their disproportionate contribution to the effects of climate change – requiring developing countries to adapt to rising climate impacts and damage – they have run up an “adaptation debt” to developing countries.*

Together the sum of these debts – emissions debt and adaptation debt – constitutes their climate debt, which is part of a larger ecological, social and economic debt owed by the rich

industrialized world to the poor majority.”

The concept of climate debt is based upon a new type of politically promoted discrimination. It is discrimination on the basis of emissions. In as much as it involves discrimination against specific countries it is deliberate politically promoted racism.

As is noted by Bullard (32), climate debt is a deliberate attempt to reduce the prosperity and standard of living in wealthier countries:

“The notion of climate debt goes to the heart of climate change politics. It raises the central question of historical responsibility and who owes whom for what. And it turns traditional rich-poor relations upside down.”

At the heart of climate change politics therefore, is the socialistic desire to reverse “*traditional rich poor relations*” or, in other words, make the rich Western nations poor and make the poor countries rich. What appears to be a Marxist’s dream, is of course justified by so called climate change, it is ‘climate justice’, justice which dictates the transfer of billions of dollars from rich countries to poor countries (33):

“The concept of climate justice seeks to restore equity in two ways. Firstly, that richer countries should repay their climate debt by undertaking severe cuts in emissions, reserving “atmospheric space” for the growing emissions of poorer countries. Secondly, that they should provide financial compensation for the costs of low carbon transition and adaptation to the damaging effects of climate change.....The 2009 Copenhagen Accord made a start on scaling up financial support. It promised that Annex 1 countries will provide fast start finance “approaching \$30 billion” for the period 2010-2012, rising to \$100 billion per annum by 2020. The Cancun conference made no progress towards satisfying demands that rich countries provide climate finance in the range of 0.5%-1% of their GDP, equating to \$200-\$400 billion per annum. It did however issue strong instructions to “speed up” support for NAPA projects.”

The concept of climate debt or ecological debt is made possible by the socialistic principle of **distributive justice** which seeks to override individual human rights in preference for a more collective, community, national or global, viewpoint. The individual person or country has no right to reap the rewards of their efforts, there must be equity from enforced sharing, for the common good. Resources must be transferred to those who are not so well off, a central tenet of globalism and socialism (34):

“The poor have a claim on the actions and products of others, whether or not those others freely entered into relationships that might give rise to such claims, whether or not they voluntarily take these claims upon themselves, in charity or as part of an exchange.”

So the poor, and the poor countries, will have a legal claim on those who are better off, merely by virtue of the fact that they are poorer. In other words, conversely, those countries or individuals who are better off, will be legally required to share their resources simply because the ruling elites say so and irrespective of the cause of economic inequalities. This of course is consistent with the communistic dream where there will be little or no right to private property or possessions, unless of course you are in the ruling class. This value system seeks to collectively blame all Australians for the

climatic, economic, and social problems of poorer countries. Within Australia itself of course, the system does not work, unless of course ordinary Aussies have a legal claim on those who are wealthier, such as politicians!

According to Simon Butler's analysis in the **Democratic Socialist Party's** publication **Green Left Weekly**, climate debt has various aspects including an "emission debt", "development debt", "adaptation debt", "migration debt", and "debt to Mother Earth" (36):

"Repayment of the emissions debt requires rich countries to: 'Restore to developing countries the atmospheric space that is occupied by their greenhouse gas emissions. This implies the decolonisation of the atmosphere through the reduction and absorption of their emissions.....The second aspect is the 'development debt': if poor countries are to develop, the First World must pay for the costs and transfer of clean energy and medical technology.....Financial compensation is a part of repaying the adaptation debt, but the Cochabamba conference stressed it also included 'providing the means to prevent, minimise, and deal with damages arising from [the rich world's] excessive emissions'. It also said: 'The focus must not be only on financial compensation, but also on restorative justice, understood as the restitution of integrity to our Mother Earth and all its beings.....The final aspect of climate debt was a broader 'debt to Mother Earth', repayment of which included 'adopting and implementing the United Nations Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth' that was proposed at the summit."

So called climate debt has clearly been moulded by totalitarians and the political left into a powerful discriminatory tool for unprecedented extreme global social and political change and economic disruption (36):

"The concept of climate debt rests on the fact that no solution to climate change is possible unless it also guarantees justice and social equality..... the wasteful, energy-intensive development of the rich countries has deprived the poor countries of their share of 'atmospheric space'. For over-using the Earth's capacity to absorb greenhouse gases, the rich world is in debt to the poor world."

The concept of national CO2 production, or cumulative national CO2 production, is being used discriminatively by greens and socialists to convict wealthier countries of climate crimes against poorer countries and hence prove their guilt and indebtedness to such countries. In the case of Australia, our 1.5% of global CO2 is really inconsequential, even assuming CO2 is a proven climate changing pollutant. When it comes to real air pollutants, as defined by the WHO (see below), which are actually killing people, the government displays very little concern indeed as compared to their obsessive concern about harmless non toxic atmospheric carbon dioxide. In fact, due to their free trade policies, our government is in the business of deliberately promoting the export of toxic industrial pollution to developing countries such as China (see below). While governments accept no responsibility for this very real and toxic pollution, on the other hand they seek to shift the burden of guilt for harmless CO2 emissions collectively onto their own citizens.

Undaunted however, those who seek to impose upon Australia a guilty verdict of climate crimes against poorer countries have created a different way of discriminating and establishing Australia's guilt, namely, the concept of per capita CO2 emissions.

Per Capita CO2 Emissions: How to Discriminate Against Australians & Convict Them of Climate Crimes, & Lower Their Standard of Living

Australia has one of the highest rates of per capita CO2 emissions in the world (37, 38, 39, 40, 41),

but of what significance is this theoretical figure? Is this important, especially given the popularity of cumulative national CO2 emissions as a means of calculating responsibility for climate debt (42)? Given the enormous problem of proving that Australia's 1.5% of global CO2 has had some kind of negative climatic impact upon distant countries, the importance of per capita CO2 is of vital importance to those who need to prove Australia's guilt in order to justify their political policies. In reality of course, assuming CO2 is causing some minor climate change, (43) ***“what is most important is how many CO2 emissions there are from the perspective of Planet Earth”*** and not some fictitious average per capita figure.

Notwithstanding this simple fact however, the current trend is to use a combination of total national emissions and per capita emissions in calculating climate debt (44, 45, 46, 47) as was confirmed at the Bonn Conference (44):

“...the Parties included in Annex I shall implement domestic action in accordance with national circumstances and with a view to reducing emissions in a manner conducive to narrowing per capita differences between developed and developing country Parties while working towards achievement of the ultimate objective of the Convention.”

While total national emissions can be used to justify climate compensation from specific countries, the use of per capita emissions makes possible the targeting of smaller countries as well as individuals, hence making the system much more discriminatory and effective for enforcing social 'equity' and reducing the standard of living (46):

“Sven Bode of the Hamburg Institute of International Economics proposed emission paths that equalize cumulative per capita emissions over a certain period, i.e. the sum of the emissions per capita in the period considered must be equal for all nations.....The historical carbon debt concept opens up the possibility of implementing the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities in the same spirit as the Brazilian Proposal. The basic idea behind historical carbon debt is that countries which have, in the past, emitted levels in excess of an equal per capita allocation should have less than their equal per capita allocation of emission rights in the future. This also works in reverse for countries which have, in the past, emitted levels lower than their equal per capita allocation. Countries with a positive historical carbon debt are considered debtors, while those with a negative historical carbon debt historical carbon debt are considered creditors. This approach to debt compensation seems more realistic than targeting financial compensation, as the latter requires the financial valuation of ecosystem services. Moreover, such an emission rights allocation system might encourage the participation of developing countries via 'entitlements' that would allow them to increase their CO2 emissions.....”

But as is pointed out by Turton (44), per capita climate policy is intended to address the extravagance or wastefulness of individual citizens in wealthier countries, potentially lowering everyone (except the ruling class) to the lowest common denominator:

“In the case of industrialised countries, expectations about the responsibility to take action have been influenced by recognition of each country's overall contribution to the climate problem as well as by perceptions of the profligacy of individual citizens in each country.”

African countries in particular, are looking forward to receiving the lucrative income they are 'owed' by the wealthy capitalist countries of the world such as Australia (49):

“One solution to the payment distribution problem appeared in 2009: the idea of simply passing along a monthly grant – universal in amount and access, with no means-testing or other qualifications – to each African citizen via an individual ‘basic income program’ payment..... It sounds like a communist utopia, but a basic income program pioneered by German aid workers has helped alleviate poverty in a Namibian village..... Under the plan, every citizen, rich or poor, would be entitled to it starting at birth. There would be no poverty test, no conditions and, therefore, no social bureaucracy. And no one would be told what he or she is permitted to do with the money.”

And Australia it seems, under the guidance of globalists and socialists, is only too willing to accept its indebtedness and send billions of dollars to supposed international creditors and dictators ([50](#), [51](#), [52](#)).

Regardless of any justification for the concept of total national emissions, which it could be argued simply amounts to a new form of officially sanctioned racism, the fundamental basis of average per capita emissions is outrageously immoral, unjust, and discriminatory. It is an attempt to compare, penalise, and discriminate against individuals by applying some kind of fictitious assessment system. It is a new morality where a country’s total CO2 level is averaged and fictitiously and unjustly applied to demonise and discriminate against individuals and their life style. In a country where per capita CO2 levels are high due to very cold climate or the prevalence of emissions intensive industry, individuals will be collectively blamed and penalised for these high emissions and compared to countries such as Africa. Countries like Africa will set the standards to which all Australians must aspire.

The concept of per capita CO2 emissions is an attempt to officially authorise and sanction deliberate immoral discrimination and debasement or demonising of individuals based upon a completely bogus assessment system, all for the purpose of social engineering and political self interest.

Climate Debt as a Political Tool to Undermine Western Economies

Though Australia produces less than 1.5% of global CO2, it seems we are all guilty of climate crimes against humanity because of the climate change suffering and hardship we have inflicted upon poorer countries as a result of our selfish and extravagant lifestyle. Believe it or not, some people actually think this way! **They seem to believe that Australians somehow must be personally blamed and punished for all manner of climate problems and social problems in countries that are many thousands of kilometres away. And some of these people may actually be fellow Australians who are eagerly awaiting Australia’s punishment!** According to this form of collective or distributive justice, all Australians are equally to blame though in practice it will be the poorer members of society (who probably produce least emissions) who will be punished most severely by the CO2 tax.

According to Ben Courtice, writing in **Green Left Weekly** ([53](#)), the payment of the climate debt by rich countries like Australia means **“destroying the unjust imperialist economic system that keeps the poor world poor and the rich world rich. These demands are the only conceivable fair and workable way for the world as a whole to address climate change.”**

So although the developed world, including Australia, has been convicted and sentenced without even having a trial, and even it must be said, without the very fundamental basis of climate debt or human caused climate change having been proven, the only solution it seems is to **“destroy the unjust imperialist economic system that keeps the poor world poor and the rich world rich.”**

In other words, the current economic system in Australia must be destroyed in order to address climate change. Seems like everything is going according to plan.

It is abundantly clear, and hardly surprising, that globalists, socialists, Greens & totalitarians generally, see so called climate debt and environmentalism as an exciting opportunity to establish, after the old system is destroyed, a new Green world order (54):

“Ignoring the fallacies behind the “science” of man-made global warming, a new U.N. report on “climate justice” says the U.S. and other countries owe \$24 trillion in “climate debt” to the rest of the world.....President Obama seems prepared to accept this bogus claim by attending the United Nations conference on December 18. The U.S. failure to pay, argues leftist Canadian writer Naomi Klein, has already produced ‘climate rage’ and a ‘global movement for climate justice’ led by Bolivia’s socialist President Evo Morales. The implication is that if the U.S. doesn’t pay up, protests and even violence could break out.....In other words, Americans are supposed to feel guilty over having a successful industrial economy. It is a system that has produced more wealth for more people than any in human history.”

The bottom line when it comes to climate debt, and the reason it is so popular with socialists and those with covert political agendas, is because it is such a pervasive and subversive tool which may be used to surreptitiously undermine and destroy Western economies and transfer wealth to poorer countries (32):

*“.....climate debt is a powerful idea that links issues, constituencies and strategies, with the added attraction of using simple language as a Trojan horse for complex and potentially subversive ideas.....Climate debt is also a measure of the complete folly of capitalism – whether it’s free market or state-run – as a model for managing human society and the earth’s ecosystems. Ultimately, the only way that the debt can be repaid is by ensuring that the historic relations of inequality are broken once and for all and that no “new” debt will accumulate. This requires system change, both in the North and in the South. **That’s why climate debt is such a subversive idea.**”*

Immorality of Wasting Resources on Non Toxic CO2 & ignoring REAL Pollutants that are Killing People

Pollution of land, sea & air, is a very real global problem. But REAL air pollution, according to the World Health Organisation, is measured by 4 contaminants, namely (55, 56, 57); particulate matter, ozone, nitrogen dioxide, and sulphur dioxide. Carbon dioxide, not being a pollutant, is not included in this list of officially recognised atmospheric pollutants. While carbon dioxide is a pollutant to globalists and politicians who seek to exploit the environment for their own political or social engineering agendas, **in the real world genuine environmentalists and health experts are more concerned about pollutants that are actually killing people and causing human misery. Atmospheric carbon dioxide has killed no one.**

Air pollution is claimed by the WHO to kill globally around 2 million people each year (57) or 8000 per day (60) while in China alone, air pollution deaths total more than 600,000 annually (58,59) none of these being caused by atmospheric carbon dioxide poisoning. The World Bank has reported (59) that 16 out of the 20 most polluted cities in the world are in China. Even in Australia, according to the CSIRO (61), air pollution is responsible for 2400 deaths annually, none of these being stated as

being due to atmospheric CO₂ poisoning. **Yet, in spite of this, the CSIRO is devoting enormous resources to studying the atmospheric ‘pollutant’ which has killed no one, even studying emissions from cows with \$3million of tax payers money allocated to so called ‘climate change**([62](#), [63](#)).

Why it must be asked, have so many governments, scientists, and health experts, wasted more than \$79 billion ([64](#)) concerning themselves with atmospheric CO₂ levels while remaining much less concerned about toxic pollutants that are killing people? Why are governments diverting so much money away from solving real pollution causing real human health problems and instead using the money to research a non toxic normal harmless atmospheric gas? Why do they prefer to deprioritise or prevent research on real atmospheric contaminants which are actually killing people?

The matter has been appropriately summarised ([65](#)):

“Far from being green, climate science’s demonizing of CO₂ is damaging the pursuit of sound environmental policy.....Rather than pursue a fools errand—trying to reduce CO₂ emissions at all costs—we should reduce the use of dirty fossil fuels instead..... Far from preserving nature and helping humanity, climate change activism has had the opposite effect. In their bull headed insistence on demonizing CO₂, mainstream climate science has sorely damaged the pursuit of reasonable and rational environment policy. Lying about global warming is no way to save the world.”

The Morality of Climate Change, Climate Change Catastrophism, & Scaremongering

According to climate change alarmists carbon dioxide taxation is a moral tax because it will give money to the poor, give rain to the drought stricken, prevent rain for those who have too much, reduce sea levels for those flooded by sea water and reduce atmospheric temperature for those who are too hot. It is very much a climatic panacea, a cure all for all types of climatic variations. And all this, so the politicians tell us, is endorsed by science. Carbon dioxide taxation is a scientific snake oil climatic cure all.

Given the fact that human caused climate catastrophism has been discredited by independent climate scientists it is clear that the burden for any mental health consequences of climate alarmism falls squarely upon the shoulders of all those who are responsible for instigating or promoting falsely based, exaggerated, or unfounded community fears about man made climate change. Our moral concerns should lie first and foremost with real human suffering and injustices rather than imaginary ones. As has been pointed out by Professor Bob Carter ([66](#)), there are so many grounds for very serious moral concerns about real issues:

“The moral issues concerned with climate change alarmism are numerous. They include the role of the individual scientist who deliberately puts an alarmist spin on his or her results, in order to maximize the chance of receiving further funding; or the parallel behaviour by the managers of research centres or groups whose funding depends upon there being a global warming problem. They include the spectacle of high-sounding environmental NGOs - in pursuit of membership subscriptions and political power - ignoring and distorting science results that do not suit their marketing agenda. They include the behaviour of prestigious science academies that have, unbelievably, tried to suppress rather than foster scientific debate on climate change. They include the bureaucrats in government greenhouse agencies who are more interested in career advancement than with making known the fact that greenhouse theory has been tested, and failed. They include the alternative energy companies

who shamelessly tout their solar, wind power or other wares as a moral good, whereas in fact these means of generating power are expensive and (for wind power) environmentally damaging, and entirely unable to compete in an open market without government regulation that imposes added costs on defenceless citizens. They include the tactic of vicious and libellous personal attacks made on independent scientists who try to present a balanced view on the climate change issue - the so-called climate sceptics. They include the remorseless and shameless promulgation of environmental alarm stories by the press, in pursuit of greater daily sales success. And, finally, they include the actions of politicians who seek political advantage from cynical exploitation of the public's fear of global warming, such as Christine Stewart, a former Canadian Environment Minister, who was quoted in 1998 in the Calgary Herald as saying that: "No matter if the science is all phony, there are collateral environmental benefits ... climate change (provides) the greatest chance to bring about justice and equality in the world".

In spite of these real concerns, and concerns about real air pollutants that are killing people, climate alarmists suggest we should be much more concerned about a non toxic normal atmospheric gas which has killed no one.

Absolutely No Justification for Making Legislation Irreversible

With such controversial and divisive legislation for which there is no political mandate and no scientific justification it is clear that the legislation must involve a temporary or trial period, but only after an electoral mandate has been achieved.

But not only is the government deliberately going to considerable lengths to deny letting the people have any democratic or electoral say, behaviour which is more typical of a despotic third world dictatorship, the government has even sought to include provisions in the Bill which would make it irreversible. In an alarming report by Ergas ([67](#)), these provisions are described as deliberate "poison pills" which are intended to subvert democracy .

"Back to the future in climate debate": Henry Ergas ([67](#))

*The debate over the carbon tax has continued, with Labor attacking the opposition's direct action plan. IT was Mark Dreyfus QC, Parliamentary Secretary for Climate Change, who let the cat out of the bag. Once the carbon change legislation is in place, he said, repeal would amount to an acquisition of property by the commonwealth, as holders of emissions permits would be deprived of a valuable asset. **As a result, the commonwealth would be liable, under s.51(xxxii) of the Australian Constitution, to pay compensation, potentially in the billions of dollars. A future government would therefore find repeal prohibitively costly. That consequence is anything but unintended.*** The clean energy legislation, released this week, specifically provides that "a carbon unit (its generic term for a right to emit) is personal property".*

This, the government says, is needed to give certainty to long-term trades. But that claim makes little sense, for even without such protections there are flourishing markets for fishing quotas and other tradeable entitlements.

*And internationally, governments have generally ensured pollution permits are not treated as conventional property rights, precisely so as to be able to revise environmental controls as circumstances change. **Rather, this provision serves one purpose only: to guarantee any attempt at repeal triggers constitutional requirements to pay compensation, shackling future governments*.***

Nor is it the only poison pill built into the legislation. Also crucial is what happens if a new government rejects the emissions reductions recommendations made by the carbon regulator, the Climate Change Authority. **In that event, unless the government can secure a majority for an alternative target, permitted emissions are automatically cut by up to 10 per cent in a single year, crippling economic activity. A Coalition government, or even a Labor government less wedded to the Greens, would therefore find itself trapped.***

To describe such poison pills as unusual would be an understatement. Provisions that merely hinder future parliaments have long been viewed as abhorrent, as they undermine the democratic process. But they are especially harmful where uncertainties abound, as is surely the case for climate change. With the Kyoto protocol dead, and complete uncertainty as to any successor, a government focused on the public interest would seek flexibility, not a straitjacket.*

That is all the more so as the costs of that straitjacket could be so great. Global warming is a global problem. Unless major emitters engage comprehensive abatement efforts, action by Australia would not only be futile but also extraordinarily expensive. After all, unless it lowers the risk of global warming, the only benefit of a carbon tax is that it raises government revenues. But like all taxes, it distorts economic behaviour, reducing national income. Its economic cost can therefore be measured by how much income loss it causes per dollar of revenue raised. Going by Treasury's modelling, that ratio is 2: for each \$1 of government revenue the carbon tax secures, incomes decline by about \$2. By comparison, the Henry review estimated that for each dollar of revenue raised, mining royalties cause an income loss of about 50c. A unilateral carbon tax is therefore four times more inefficient than the royalties the Henry review excoriated as the most distorting tax on our books.

And it may be even worse than that. Treasury's estimates assume international agreement on emissions reduction is reached relatively soon. Were agreement not reached, the cost could be two to three times greater. That is because unilateral action would undermine our international competitiveness. But it is also because Treasury expects massive purchases of abatement from overseas. By 2018, it says, those purchases will account for 60 per cent of Australia's total abatement, and they remain above 50 per cent right through to 2045.

So if we are creating a "clean, green future", as the Prime Minister asserts, it is not in Australia. Where then do all those low-cost emissions reductions come from? According to Treasury, well over half will come from the former Soviet Union and from "Other Asia". But many of these countries lack any ability to monitor carbon abatement, with corruption so pervasive they are at the top of Transparency International's list of offenders. To assume they will provide a credible source of abatement is wildly optimistic; to think they will do so absent a comprehensive international framework is fanciful.

Abatement costs could therefore prove far higher than Treasury's numbers suggest. But a precise estimate would require access to Treasury's models. And here Treasury's performance has been disappointing. Appearing before the Senate Select Committee on Scrutiny of New Taxes, Treasury said its models were "publicly available" and that anyone willing to pay for those models could obtain them. That evidence was misleading. For Treasury relied on a model developed by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics. And ABARE has now confirmed it will not make available the model Treasury used.

Moreover, Treasury blended the ABARE model with other models and data sets. Given that, only Treasury can provide users with the capacity to test its modelling: and the government clearly does not intend it to do so.

The Regulation Impact Statement released with the draft legislation does nothing to fill the gap that leaves. Indeed, it does not even meet the government's own guidelines for such RISs:

*it is strikingly superficial, given what is at stake; it is vague and qualitative; and it completely ignores the risks created by locking in future governments. **That it was approved by the Department of Finance merely highlights how flawed the RIS process now is. Decisions about this legislation will therefore be based on assertions, not evidence tested in the light of day. And that is a disgrace. Not only because it makes a mockery of the government's claims about transparency. But also because the consequences of those decisions could be so great. And the poison pills built into the legislation would ensure those consequences were felt for decades to come.****

Dreyfus is to be commended for stating that frankly. But whatever one may think of the carbon tax, those poison pills are public policy at its worst. If parliament had any decency, it would throw them out. That it won't says it all."

**Emphasis added*

Not only will the CO2 tax be useless as a climatic cure all, and not only will it have a disastrous effect on our economy and standard of living, but worst of all it seems, it is a deliberate attempt to subvert democracy and promote in Australia a dictatorial political environment where the people have no say.

Australian Labor Party Calls for Investigation into Political Gagging of CSIRO Climate Scientists

The Federal ALP has long wanted an enquiry into gagging of CSIRO climate scientists (68) while Senator Christine Milne also called for changes to ensure the independence of the CSIRO (69). Labor's science spokesperson, Jenny Macklin, even went so far as to call the situation at that time a "national disgrace" and expressed concerns about whether the Howard government had deliberately gagged CSIRO scientists (68):

"Labor is calling for a broad inquiry into allegations by senior CSIRO scientists they were gagged from airing their concerns over climate change. Environmental group Greenpeace also wants an inquiry that would also include wider claims of coal industry interference in government policy-making on climate change. Three eminent Australian scientists have told the ABC's Four Corners program to be broadcast on Monday night that they have been censored.

Labor's science and training spokeswoman Jenny Macklin described the situation as a national disgrace. She said Labor would pursue the claims at Senate estimates this week but wanted a broader inquiry.

***"These scientists have been gagged for talking about one of the most important issues facing the world, and that is climate change*,"** Ms Macklin told reporters.*

"We want to make sure that our scientists can speak freely, can make sure that our politicians, our government departments and the public really do understand the critical importance of the science of climate change, and we cannot afford to have these scientists gagged.*"

"What Labor wants to do is get to the bottom of this.

"We will certainly be pursuing this matter at Senate estimates this week.

"We think that there should be a broader inquiry into whether or not the Howard government has extensively sought to gag these senior scientists."

**Emphasis added*

Clearly now is a most opportune time to establish a broad ranging enquiry into gagging of

scientists, climate science, and the CO2 tax and ETS and accompanying legislation.

Summary

The evidence cited above, from the UN and from a range of political commentators from across the political spectrum reveals that:

1. The CO2 tax and the ETS will NOT be an effective means of lowering emissions and controlling climate.
2. While the CO2 tax and the ETS will have no effect upon climate, most agreed the effects upon our economy and standard of living would be profound, perhaps even destroying the Australian economy. Living standards are expected to be very significantly reduced.
3. In keeping with the fundamental importance of distributive justice to socialism and left wing extremism, various commentators, particularly on the political left, seek to use CO2 emissions or human caused climate change to create the concept of "climate debt" as a means of blaming richer industrialised countries for the poverty or suffering of poorer countries. This collective guilt imposed upon richer countries is used to promote socialism and transfer wealth and resources to the poorer countries.
4. Like Agenda 21, the CO2 tax and the ETS are being imposed upon Australia with the assistance of excessive interference by the UN in consort with the Australian government but against the will of the Australian people. These reforms are therefore being enforced upon Australians in defiance of normal democratic traditions. Such interference in Australian affairs cannot occur without deliberate undermining of Australia's national sovereignty.
5. Australia will be required to send a percentage of the CO2 tax to the UN.
6. The UN has stated that the main purpose of the tax or ETS is for global wealth redistribution and to raise revenue, NOT, reduce emissions, and therefore the level of the tax should be set so that emissions are NOT lowered excessively.

Politicians have asked the public to believe their claims that if they are permitted to introduce a CO2 tax or emissions trading then they will be able to control; global temperatures, sea level, polar ice, Himalayan glaciers, rainfall (whether excess or insufficient), droughts, floods, cyclones and extreme weather events, sea acidity, and even a multitude of human diseases. There is of course no scientific evidence to support such claims.

It is most noteworthy that those who believe the government's emission strategy will dramatically lower the standard of living and have profound economic consequences, are spread across the political spectrum. There is it seems a very broad consensus across mainstream Australia, including conservatives and the political left, that the CO2 tax and emissions trading will have disastrous economic consequences for Australia.

In summary, there seems very little support indeed for the government's claims that the CO2 tax and the ETS will have positive effects upon climate, including lowering of temperatures and sea level and increasing of icebergs. In view of the fact that the government itself has never been able to scientifically substantiate these claims or produce a scientifically based cost benefit analysis, the community response is hardly surprising. On the other hand, while the CO2 tax and ETS will have no effect upon climate, many agree the destructive effects upon the economy and standard of living will be profound. For the public it may be a matter of all pain for no gain, but this may not be true for the government.

References

1. John Reid, **Climate Modelling Nonsense**, *Quadrant Online*, 2008;
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2009/10/climate-modelling-nonsense>
2. **Transcript of address delivered by Dr Art Raiche PHD on August 16, 2011**,
<http://galileomovement.com.au/blog>
3. <http://www.petitionproject.org/http://www.petitionproject.org/>
4. Richard Lindzen, **Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus**; Spring 1992, Cato Institute • 1000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. • Washington D.C. 20001-5403
<http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv15n2/reg15n2g.html>
5. Richard Lindzen, **Resisting Climate Hysteria: A Case Against Precipitous Climate Action**, 26/7/2009.
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2009/07/resisting-climate-hysteria>
6. Chris Berg, Alan Moran, **Emissions Trading: Towards the biggest economic change in Australian history**, *Institute of Public Affairs*, <http://www.ipa.org.au/publications/1358/emissions-trading-towards-the-biggest-economic-change-in-australian-history>
7. Ben Hillier, **Reasons to Oppose the Carbon Tax**, *Socialist Alternative*, 9/6/2011; http://www.sa.org.au/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=6931:reasons-to-oppose-the-carbon-tax&Itemid=398
8. John Passant, **Carbon Tax: Short Term Carrot, Long Term Stick**, *Socialist Alternative*, 11/7/2011; http://www.sa.org.au/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=6974:carbon-tax-short-term-carrot-long-term-stick&Itemid=398
9. David Potts, **Calculating the Costs of the Carbon Tax**, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24/7/2011;
<http://www.smh.com.au/money/tax/calculating-costs-of-the-carbon-tax-20110723-1htxl.html>
10. <http://www.climatechangedenier.com.au/carbon-tax/the-carbon-price-will-always-be-increasing/>
11. John KilKullen, **Robert Nozick: Against Distributive Justice**, 1996;
<http://www.humanities.mq.edu.au/Ockham/y64117.html>
12. Alex Bainbridge, **Carbon Tax or Genuine Climate Action?** *Perth Voice*, 11/6/2011; <http://socialistallianceperth.blogspot.com/2011/06/carbon-tax-or-genuine-climate-action.html>
13. <http://www.thedailybell.com/1838/Australia-to-Introduce-Carbon-Tax.html>
14. Kevin Smith, **Carbon Trading: A Spectacular Failure**, *Climate and Capitalism*, 12/11/2009;
<http://climateandcapitalism.com/?p=1273>
15. John Passant, **Global Warming: The Failure of Capitalism**, *National Times*, 2/10/2009;
<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/politics/global-warming-the-failure-of-capitalism-20091002-gfkn.html>
16. **Carbon Trading in Europe: An Expensive and Harmful Failure**;
<http://williambowles.info/2011/04/13/carbon-trading-in-europe-an-expensive-and-harmful-failure-climate-and-capitalism/>
17. Fred L Smith Jnr, **Eco-Paganism, Eco-Socialism, Severe Threats to America's Future**;
<http://www.policycounsel.org/46101/48601.html>

18. Fred Magdoff and John Bellamy Foster, **What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know About Capitalism**, *Monthly Review*, March, 2010; <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/03/01/what-every-environmentalist-needs-to-know-about-capitalism>
19. Clive Spash, **The Brave New World of Carbon Trading**, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, December 2009; http://www.clivespash.org/MPRA_paper_19114.pdf
20. Meles Zenawi and Jens Stoltenberg, **Report of the Secretary General's High-Level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing**; United Nations, 5/11/2010. http://www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/climatechange/shared/Documents/AGF_reports/AGF%20Report.pdf
21. **Innovative sources of financing for development**, 59th Session of the United Nations; 17/8/2004. http://www.unescap.org/tid/mtg/egmrti_ref272.pdf
22. Ernest Zedillo, **Report of the High-Level Panel on Financing for Development**; *United Nations*, 22/6/2001. <http://www.un.org/reports/financing/recommendations.htm>
23. RAVEN CLABOUGH , **UN Official Admits Cap and Trade is Wealth Redistribution**; *The New American*, 19/11/2010. <http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/world-mainmenu-26/europe-mainmenu-35/5253-un-official-admits-cap-and-trade-is-wealth-redistribution>
24. **Friedman Fantasises About Green Capitalism**, *Climate and Capitalism*, 15/11/2009; <http://climateandcapitalism.com/?p=1280>
25. **United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change**, Article 4, 1992; <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/conveng.pdf>
26. Surya Sethi, **Financing Climate Change**, Indian Government, <http://www.odi.org.uk/events/documents/439-transcript-mr-sethis-speech.pdf>
27. **Financing Adaptation, Why the UN's Bali Climate Conference must mandate the search for new funds**, *Oxfam*, 4/12/2007; http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/policy/climate_change/downloads/bn_bali_adaptation.pdf?m=234&url=http://www.oxfam.org.uk/resources/policy/trade/downloads/bn_wdr2008.pdf
28. **Environmental Justice, Ecological Debt and Environmental Space: a framework for change?**, *Chain Reaction*, No 92, Friends of the Earth, 2004; <http://www.foe.org.au/resources/chain-reaction/editions/92/environmental-justice-ecological-debt-and-environmental-space/>
29. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecological_debt
30. **World People's Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth**, <http://pwccc.wordpress.com/2010/04/30/final-conclusions-working-group-n%C2%BA-8-climate-debt/#more-1637>
31. Patrick Bond, **Climate Debt Owed to the People of Africa**, 5/5/2010; <http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?id=24177>
32. Nicola Bullard, **Climate Debt as a Subversive Political Strategy**, *Climate and Capitalism*, 1/5/2010; <http://climateandcapitalism.com/?p=2334>
33. <http://uk.oneworld.net/guides/climatechange>
34. John KilKullen, **Robert Nozick: Against Distributive Justice**, 1996; <http://www.humanities.mq.edu.au/Ockham/y64117.html>
35. **Carbon Trading in Europe: An Expensive and Harmful Failure**; <http://williambowles.info/2011/04/13/carbon-trading-in-europe-an-expensive-and-harmful-failure-climate-and-capitalism/>

36. Simon Butler, **Climate Debt: Why we're not all in this together**, *Green Left Weekly*, 9/5/2010; <http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/44060>
37. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_countries_by_carbon_dioxide_emissions_per_capita
38. CO2 Emissions (metric tons per capita), *The World Bank*; <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC>
39. Sarah Clarke, **Australia Leads World in Carbon Emissions**, *ABC News*, 18/11/2009; <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2009-11-18/australia-leads-world-in-carbon-emissions/1146496>
40. Adam Morton, **The World's Worst Polluters**, *The Age*, 11/9/2009; <http://www.theage.com.au/environment/the-worlds-worst-polluters-20090910-fjdt.html>
41. Ross Garnaut, **Australia's Emissions in a Global Context**, *Chapt 7, Garnaut Review*, http://www.garnautreview.org.au/pdf/Garnaut_Chapter7.pdf
42. W.J.W. Botzen et al, **Cumulative CO2 Emissions: shifting international responsibilities for climate debt**, *Climate Policy*; <http://globalcitizen.net/Data/Pages/1291/papers/2009103014156814.pdf>
43. <http://www.breathingearth.net/>
44. Hal Turton, **Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Industrialised Countries, Where Does Australia Stand?** *The Australia Institute*, 2004; <https://www.tai.org.au/file.php?file=DP66.pdf>
45. Christian Ellermann et al, **Differentiating Historical Responsibilities for Climate Change**; <http://www.oxfordclimatepolicy.org/publications/documents/Ellermannetal.pdf>
46. **Climate Debt: making historical responsibility part of the solution**, *Friends of the Earth*, 2005; <http://www.foei.org/fr/publications/pdfs/financement-de-la-justice-climatique-declaration-de-principes>
47. Kevin A. Baumert et al, **Navigating the Numbers: Greenhouse Gas Data and International Climate Policy**, *World Resources Institute*, 2005; http://pdf.wri.org/navigating_numbers.pdf
48. Hal Turton, **Greenhouse Gas Emissions in Industrialised Countries, Where Does Australia Stand?** *The Australia Institute*, 2004; <https://www.tai.org.au/file.php?file=DP66.pdf>
49. Patrick Bond, **Climate Debt Owed to the People of Africa**, 5/5/2010; <http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?id=24177>
50. Andrew Bolt, **Kevin Rudd's \$7b UN Wrangle**, *Herald Sun*, 40/11/2009; <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/kevin-rudds-7b-un-wrangle/story-e6frfhqf-1225794045942>
51. Cory Bernadi, **A \$7 Billion 'Climate Debt' – Rudd's Plan for Australia at Copenhagen Summit**; <http://australianconservative.com/2009/11/rudds-plan-to-commit-australia-to-a-7-billion-climate-debt-at-copenhagen/>
52. **Climate Justice Position Paper**, *Friends of the Earth*; <http://www.foe.org.au/climate-justice/policy-position>
53. Ben Courtice, **Summit Calls for Climate Debt Payment**, *Green Left Weekly*, 9/5/2010; <http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/44006>
54. Cliff Kincaid, **UN Socialists Demand Trillions in 'Climate Debt' From the Developed World**, <http://australianconservative.com/2009/12/socialists-demand-trillions-in-%E2%80%9Cclimate-debt%E2%80%9D/>
55. **WHO Air Quality Guidelines**, World Health Organisation, 2006; http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2006/WHO_SDE_PHE_OEH_06.02_eng.pdf

56. http://www.who.int/phe/air_quality_q&a.pdf
57. Air Quality & Health, Fact Sheet No 313, WHO, September 2011;
<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs313/en/index.html>
58. Kevin Holden Platt, **Chinese Air Pollution Deadliest in World, Report Says**, *National Geographic News*, 9/7/2007; <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2007/07/070709-china-pollution.html>
59. <http://factsanddetails.com/china.php?itemid=392&catid=10&subcatid=66>
60. Peter Manins, Nick Goldie, **Air Pollution: eight thousand deaths per day**, *Media release, CSIRO*, 24/8/1999; <http://www.csiro.au/files/mediarelease/mr1999/AirPollution.htm>
61. Tom Beer et al, **Air Pollution Death Toll Needs Solutions**, *Media release, CSIRO*, March 2004;
<http://www.csiro.au/files/mediaRelease/mr2004/PrAirPollution2.htm>
62. Jane Paterson, **CSIRO Says Cow Methane Emissions Lower than First Thought**, *ABC Rural*, 27/5/ 2011;
<http://www.abc.net.au/rural/news/content/201105/s3229224.htm>
63. Andre Wright, *Livestock Horizons*, CSIRO, 2009; <http://www.csiro.au/files/files/ppiu.pdf>
64. <http://climateresearchnews.com/2009/07/79-billion-spent-and-counting-still-no-proof-of-agw/>
65. <http://www.theresilientearth.com/?q=content/fire-ice-black-carbon-vs-sulfate>
66. Bob Carter, **The Morality of Climate Change**;
http://meteo.lcd.lu/globalwarming/Carter/the_morality_of_climate_change.pdf
67. Henry Ergas, **Labor Plants Poison Pills in Carbon Tax**, *The Australian*, 16/9/2011;
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/opinion/labor-plants-poison-pills-in-carbon-tax/story-e6frgd0x-1226138227483>
68. **ALP Wants Enquiry into CSIRO Gag Claims**, *The Age*, 13/2/2006;
<http://www.theage.com.au/news/National/Scientists-gagged-from-climate-debate/2006/02/13/1139679483824.html>
69. Christine Milne, **Public Interest Research Under Threat: Greens**, *Media Release*, 2/3/2006;
<http://greensmps.org.au/taxonomy/term/125/all?page=14>

APPENDIX

IPCC Scientists Discredited

United Nations IPCC Climate Alarmists Discredited Yet Again

Propaganda Disguised as Science and Sold by Supporters of Climate Change

Graham Williamson

June 2011

The United Nations IPCC has been caught again trying to pass off propaganda from environmental activists and vested interests as being “scientific research” (1, 2, 3). According to Gunter (2):

“Canadian researcher Steve McIntyre discovered earlier this week that the IPCC’s recent report on alternative energy — which asserted that it was possible to convert the world to 80% green energy by 2050 if politicians would simply tax conventional sources and spend billions on alternative sources — was lifted largely from Greenpeace reports.

The lead author of the IPCC report turns out to be Sven Teske, a Greenpeace climate and energy campaigner, who the IPCC does not identify as such in either the report or its media releases. Mr. Teske is also the author of much of the Greenpeace material on which the IPCC report is based, in effect making him a peer reviewer of the validity of his own material.

Imagine the reaction, for instance, if a government had produced a fossil-fuel friendly report based on work by an oil sands engineer, without revealing the source, and had paid the same engineer to write its own summary of his initial work.

That is what the IPCC has stooped to in this case and it eliminates any credibility the organization had left on the climate file.”

The seriousness of the IPCC’s misrepresentation that the report is based upon properly conducted scientific research has also been noted by an editorial in the **Washington Post** (1):

“Since this statement was supposedly based on actual scientific research, Steve McIntyre, editor of the Climate Audit blog, did what the IPCC must have assumed nobody would bother doing. He checked the sources cited in the report. He discovered the IPCC’s banner claim was not the work of prestigious and disinterested scientists toiling away in a laboratory, but of hacks with a political agenda and direct financial stake in the issue.”

Although the IPCC replied that they considered the report to be (1) “balanced”, the **Washington Post** responded (1):

“Claims of balance are hardly credible when the process is infiltrated by ideologues and industry insiders looking to apply the veneer of science to their craven grab for other people’s cash. Fortunately, the days when leftists could get away with passing off their global-warming scare stories unchallenged are over. Skeptics smell blood and closely examine every document, frequently identifying gaping holes in logic and credibility.”

Lynas, cited by Lloyd, described the report as being characterised by a “scandalous conflict of interest” (3):

“Activist and author Mark Lynas said: A more scandalous conflict of interest could scarcely be imagined. This campaigner for Greenpeace was not only embedded in the IPCC itself, but was, in effect, allowed to review and promote his own campaigning work under the cover of the authoritative and trustworthy IPCC. While the journal-published version looks like proper science, the propaganda version on the Greenpeace website has all the hallmarks of a piece of work that started with some conclusions and then set about justifying them.”

This latest controversy represents another instance, in a long line of instances, of improper or deliberately fraudulent misuse of supposed “climate science”, or corruption of the scientific process,

by the IPCC ([4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#)), all of course in pursuit of their global political agenda.

The disgraceful history of the IPCC has recently been summarised by Gunter([2](#)):

“The period from November 2009 to March 2010 was a bad time for climate-change alarmists. That four-month period included the posting of thousands of emails and computer files from leading climate scientists showing that they had been cooking their global-warming data, working together to keep independent researchers from examining their raw figures and pressuring academic journals against publishing studies that contradicted the man-made climate-change orthodoxy.

Also during that time, it was shown that the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) had included questionable data on Himalayan glacier melt in its major 2007 climate assessment report and that it had done so deliberately to provoke government leaders to speed up environmental legislation. Indian climate scientist Murari Lal, the scientist in charge of the IPCC’s glacier chapter, admitted he was aware at the time that the melt prediction had not been peer-reviewed, but included it anyway because “we thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action.”

By the end of March 2010 it had been shown that at least 16 claims of impending climate doom in the IPCC’s vaunted 2007 report had been based on work done by environmental activists, most of which had not received independent reviews before being swallowed whole by the UN climate body. For instance, the IPCC’s insistence that up to 40% of the Amazon rain forest was under imminent threat came from a World Wildlife Fund-International Union for the Conservation of Nature joint report written by a scientist-consultant and a freelance environmental journalist.

Of course, since that dark period, the environmental Sanhedrin has worked hard to re-establish its control over the climate-change debate. Four whitewash investigations — one conducted by one of the leading investors in wind power in Europe — have sought to exonerate the scientists most deeply enmeshed in the Climategate email scandal.”

Even former believers in climate alarmism have become aware of the scientific fraud and reversed their position ([4](#), [5](#), [12](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#)). As is noted by David Evans ([12](#)):

“I am a scientist who was on the carbon gravy train, understands the evidence, was once an alarmist, but am now a skeptic. Watching this issue unfold has been amusing but, lately, worrying. This issue is tearing society apart, making fools out of our politicians..... We are now at an extraordinary juncture. Official climate science, which is funded and directed entirely by government, promotes a theory that is based on a guess about moist air that is now a known falsehood. Governments gleefully accept their advice, because the only ways to curb emissions are to impose taxes and extend government control over all energy use. And to curb emissions on a world scale might even lead to world government — how exciting for the political class!”

Professor John Christy, a former lead author of the IPCC who has seen the workings of the IPCC from the inside, warns that IPCC data is biased and unreliable and there is no scientific evidence of catastrophic human caused global warming ([18](#), [19](#), [20](#)). According to Professor Christy ([20](#)):

“Regarding the Hockey Stick of IPCC 2001 evidence now indicates, in my view, that an IPCC Lead Author working with a small cohort of scientists, misrepresented the temperature record of the past 1000 years by (a) promoting his own result as the best estimate, (b) neglecting studies that contradicted his, and (c) amputating another’s result so as to eliminate conflicting data and limit any serious attempt to expose the real uncertainties of these data.”

Christy concludes in his submission to Congress in March, 2011 ([20](#)):

“Because this issue has policy implications that may potentially raise the price of energy significantly (and thus essentially the price of everything else), the U.S. Congress should not rely exclusively on the U.N. assessments because the process by which they were written includes biased, false, and/or misleading information about one of the most murky of sciences – climate.”

Christy has even observed other IPCC lead authors admitting that their contributions are not necessarily determined by the scientific facts, but rather by the desired political objective, which was stated as creating compliance with UN objectives and treaties ([19](#)).

Climate alarmists in Australia and around the world, so eager to enforce compliance with their extreme political agenda, often seek to spread terror, fear and anxiety by blaming extreme weather events upon human caused climate change. Extremists in Australia have even sought to exploit fear in Australians by blaming the Queensland floods on human caused climate change. Professor Christy however, looks in detail at these claims and points out ([18](#)):

“The tragic flooding in the second half of 2010 in NE Australia was examined in two ways, (1) in terms of financial costs and (2) in terms of climate history. First, when one normalizes the flood costs year by year, meaning if one could imagine that the infrastructure now in place was unchanging during the entire study period, the analysis shows there are no long-term trends in damages. In an update of Crompton and McAneney (2008) of normalized disaster losses in Australia which includes an estimate for 2010, they show absolutely no trend since 1966.

Secondly, regarding the recent Australian flooding as a physical event in the context climate history one sees a relative lull in flooding events after 1900. Only four events reached the moderate category in the past 110 years, while 14 such events were recorded in the 60 years before 1900. Indeed, the recent flood magnitude had been exceeded six times in the last 170 years, twice by almost double the level of flooding as observed in 2010. Such history charts indicate that severe flooding is an extreme event that has occurred from natural, unforced variability.

There is also a suggestion that emergency releases of water from the Wivenhoe Dam upstream of Brisbane caused “more than 80 per cent of the flood in the Brisbane River. ... Without this unprecedented and massive release ... the flooding in Brisbane would have been minimal.” (The Australian 18 Jan 2011.) (See <http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2011/02/flood-disasters-and-human-caused.html> where Roger Pielke Jr. discusses extreme events and supplies some of the information used here.)”

Since the IPCC version of the “science” has been thoroughly discredited this probably explains Mr Combet’s determination not to answer enquiries and the government’s refusal to establish a true public scientific debate on the matter. But why does the government continue to base its policies upon discredited pseudoscience? Is it because, as suggested by David Evans ([12](#)), “to impose taxes

and extend government control over all energy use. And to curb emissions on a world scale might even lead to world government”?

IPCC corruption of the peer review process pertaining to their **“The Science of Climate Change 1995** report has also been noted by Professor Seitz ([21](#)):

“This IPCC report, like all others, is held in such high regard largely because it has been peer-reviewed, That is, it has been read, discussed, modified and approved by an international body of experts. These scientists have laid their reputations on the line. But this report is not what it appears to be-it is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists listed on the title page. In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer review process than the events that led to this IPCC report.”

IPCC corruption and distortion of scientific data have been further summarised by Professor Seitz ([4](#)):

“The IPCC is pre- Programmed to produce reports to support the hypotheses of anthropogenic warming and the control of greenhouse gases, as envisioned in the Global Climate Treaty. The 1990 IPCC Summary completely ignored satellite data, since they showed no warming. The 1995 IPCC report was notorious for the significant alterations made to the text after it was approved by the scientists – in order to convey the impression of a human influence. The 2001 IPCC report claimed the twentieth century showed ‘unusual warming’ based on the now-discredited hockey-stick graph. The latest IPCC report, published in 2007, completely devaluates the climate contributions from changes in solar activity, which are likely to dominate any human influence.” And, quote: “we do not currently have any convincing evidence or observations of significant climate change from other than natural causes.”

Booker has described the IPCC as ([13](#)) *“an institution now so discredited and scientifically corrupted that only those determined to shut their eyes could possibly defend it.”*

The problem is, though proven false, many still continue to perpetuate the lies and fraud upon which the carbon dioxide tax is based, just to protect their careers and jobs ([12](#)):

“The whole idea that carbon dioxide is the main cause of the recent global warming is based on a guess that was proved false by empirical evidence during the 1990s. But the gravy train was too big, with too many jobs, industries, trading profits, political careers, and the possibility of world government and total control riding on the outcome. So rather than admit they were wrong, the governments, and their tame climate scientists, now outrageously maintain the fiction that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant.”

Or in the words of Moran ([15](#)):

“The battle against measures to reduce carbon emissions is however hardly over. The issue has fuelled too many careers in politics, science, public service and the media for its beneficiaries to quietly move on. Recent public relations barrages by the CSIRO and gatherings in Canberra and Melbourne of the many beneficiaries of the scare is being repeated around the world.”

Summary

The evidence is clear and unequivocal, the IPCC and their claims of anthropogenic global warming have been thoroughly discredited by independent climate scientists from around the world. Further, the corruption and distortion of scientific data and peer review processes by the IPCC has destroyed the scientific credibility of the organisation.

Why does the Australian government continue to exploit community fears based upon fraudulent claims? Is it just because climate alarmism has become a very attractive and lucrative career choice, or is it to further the global political agenda of the UN and please their masters in the UN?

Of even more concern is the fact that IPCC associated scientists in Australia continue to express more concern about the scientific credibility of their independent non-IPCC aligned scientific colleagues than about the scientifically discredited IPCC which they seem to continue to pledge unconditional support to. The perception that IPCC scientists prefer to align themselves with reports prepared by environmental activists rather than their scientific colleagues should be immediately rectified.

References

1. **UN Climate Propaganda Exposed**, *The Washington Times*, 17/6/2011;
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/17/un-climate-propaganda-exposed/>
2. Lorne Gunter, **The IPCC Loses its Last Credibility**, *National Post*, 16/6/2011;
<http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2011/06/17/lorne-gunter-the-ipcc-loses-its-last-credibility/>
3. Graham Lloyd, **Greenpeaces's Key Role in UN Climate Study**, *The Australian*, 18/6/2011;
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/greenpeaces-key-role-in-un-climate-study/story-fn59niix-1226077352408>
4. S. Fred Singer, ed., *Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate: Summary for Policymakers of the Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change*, Chicago, IL: The Heartland Institute, 2008. http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/22835.pdf
5. Craig Idso, S. Fred Singer et al, **Climate Change Reconsidered**, 2009 *Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC)*, The Heartland Institute 2009.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/2009report.html>
6. Robert M Carter; **Climate: The Counter Consensus**, Stacey International, London, 2010
7. Richard Lindzen, **Resisting Climate Hysteria: A Case Against Precipitous Climate Action**, 26/7/2009.
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2009/07/resisting-climate-hysteria>
8. Richard Lindzen, **Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus**; Spring 1992, Cato Institute • 1000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. • Washington D.C. 20001-5403
<http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv15n2/reg15n2g.html>
9. Richard Lindzen, **The Climate Science Isn't Settled**; *The Wall Street Journal*, 30/11/2009.
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html>
10. http://www.galileomovement.com.au/galileo_movement.php

11. http://www.tech-know.eu/uploads/Understanding_the_Atmosphere_Effect.pdf Joseph E. Postma, **Understanding the Thermodynamic Atmosphere Effect**, March 2011. See also <http://climaterealist.com/index.php?tid=816>
12. David Evans, **Climate Models go Cold; Carbon warming too minor to be worth worrying about**, *Financial Post*, 7/04/2011, <http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/04/07/climate-models-go-cold/>; *Speech given to the Anti-Carbon-Tax Rally in Perth, Australia, on March 23.*
13. Christopher Booker, **Amazongate: New Evidence of the IPCC's Failures**, *The Telegraph* (UK), 30/1/2010; <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html>
14. Marc Sheppard, **The IPCC Should Leave Science to Scientists**, 8/2/2007; http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/02/the_ipcc_should_leave_science.html
15. Alan Moran, **Climate Change Requiem**, *The Drum*, ABC TV, 8/4/2010; <http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/33488.html>
16. Marc Morano, **Manufactured 'Science': Another IPCC Scientist Reveals How UN Scientists talked about 'trying to make IPCC report so dramatic that US would just have to sign Kyoto Protocol'**; <http://www.climatedepot.com/a/5064/Manufactured-Science-Another-IPCC-Scientist-Reveals-How-UN-Scientists-talked-about-trying-to-make-IPCC-report-so-dramatic-that-US-would-just-have-to-sign-Kyoto-Protocol>
17. Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts, **Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception?** *Science and Public Policy Institute* (SPPI), 27/8/2010; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf
18. John R. Christy, **Written Statement of John R. Christy The University of Alabama in Huntsville, Subcommittee on Energy and Power Committee on Energy and Commerce**, 8 March 2011; <http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/Media/file/Hearings/Energy/030811/Christy.pdf>
19. John Christy, **No Consensus on IPCC's Level of Ignorance**, *BBC News*, 13/11/2007; <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7081331.stm>
20. John R. Christy, **House Science, Space and Technology Committee, Examining the Process concerning Climate Change Assessments**, 31 March 2011; http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/ChristyJR_written_110331_all.pdf
21. Frederick Seitz, **A major deception on 'global warming'**, *Wall Street Journal*, New York; Jun 12, 1996; http://stephenschneider.stanford.edu/Publications/PDF_Papers/WSJ_June12.pdf