

Dear Minister Greg Hunt,

We are writing to thank you for organising an independent investigation of the Bureau of Meteorology's data management practices. We trust that you have received good advice and chosen independent and objective scientists and statisticians to be members of the Technical Advisory Forum.

We have been very concerned about the advice you are receiving ever since we heard you stating publicly that you rely mainly on the advice from the CSIRO and the BoM.

Unfortunately, as the evidence indicates, scientific integrity in Australia's once iconic institutions, such as the Bureau of Meteorology, (BoM) and our Universities has disintegrated. The scientific 'peer review' has also collapsed. For that reason we reference this document to robust evidence based internet sites. This includes Wikipedia, which in the discipline of climatology, is more robust.

The evidence also indicates that the human caused Global Warming hypothesis and its associated demonisation of carbon dioxide is a global scam. It is driven by the desire for power by politicians, and money and prestige for the funded climate scientists.

The evidence shows that the CO2 demonisation scam is well established in Australia. Unfortunately it has continued under your stewardship of the Department of Environment. This is illustrated by the unhelpful response (dated 19th December 2013) to my formal complaint to the Department of Environment http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/4_DOE'sFirstResponse.pdf

It is further evidenced by the Ombudsman's final response dated 27th February 2014. http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/11_Ombudsman's2ndRebuttal.pdf

However, on the 4th September last year at the Fenner School of Environmental at the Australian National University a prominent Australian climate scientist, Professor Michael Raupach, publicly conceded that the term 'carbon' is shorthand for 'carbon dioxide'. He also conceded that it is definitely not a pollutant. Sadly Professor Raupach has passed away, but we will always remember him and the words he spoke when responding to a question from the audience. The question and Professor Raupach's response can be heard here at 1.06.33 into the recording. <http://fennerschool.anu.edu.au/news-events/event-recordings/climate-change-why-facts-and-opinions-are-both-important>

Dear Minister, we feel that it is necessary to provide you and the Technical Advisory Forum members with the historical evidence to what we believe to be the greatest fraud yet perpetrated against humanity. You may wonder what a bit of history has to do with the BoM's data homogenisation practices, but please read on. We will be as brief as possible

>> Early 1900's a young ecologist Eugene Odum set out test the hypothesis that "Nature is in Equilibrium". His data supported that hypothesis. He went on to experience wealth and prestige. He wrote the book , "The Fundamentals of Ecology" . It was published in 1953, and became a school text book in many different countries. Consequently, his wealth and prestige increased. The hypothesis that "Nature is in Equilibrium" also known as the "Balance of Nature" or "Gaia" prevailed.

>> However, with the advent of desktop computers in the late 1960s the theory was retested by a new generation of ecologists.

>> The evidence from all the those later studies showed that no matter what the sample size the data showed no such relationship. To the contrary, it showed nature to be a wild thing; a dynamic natural system with huge variance.

>>The nature in equilibrium theory was not only disproven but discredited in the 70s http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balance_of_nature

>>It was replaced by chaos theory which states that “In the disciplines of Meteorologyand Biology.....Small differences in initial conditions (such as those due to rounding errors in numerical computation) yield widely diverging outcomes for such dynamical systems, rendering long-term prediction impossible in general. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chaos_theory

>>The problem was that there was much money, power and corruption associated with the Gaia theory by that time. Eugene Odum, already wealthy, became a member of the hugely influential entrepreneur orientated ” Club of Rome”. He was highly regarded by the establishment until he died peacefully in 2002 aged 88.

History shows that it was a grave error of judgement by the academic establishment of the time not to investigate Eugene Odum for possible scientific fraud. The ramifications of that error were profound. Chaos theory was quietly discarded and in the early 1970’s the disproven Gaia theory was resurrected and rechristened “Sustainability” .

One only has to look at the 2009 Australian High School Science curriculum to realise that the disproven Gaia is still the order of the day in our country http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Australian_Curriculum_-_Science.pdf

To quote the bottom two lines from page 6 “Order and change are necessary ideas to understand systems. Understanding systems provides the basis for appreciating the nature of equilibrium and interdependence.”

Australia dare not allow history to repeat itself in our nation. For if we do, the Gaia scam and all its associated academic funding scams will continue and science in Australia will continue to be mired in uncertainty.

The definition of fraud is, “a false representation of a matter of fact, whether by words or by conduct, by false or misleading allegations, or by concealment of that which should have been disclosed, which deceives and is intended to deceive another so that he shall act upon it to his legal injury.” (Black’s Law Dictionary).

It is true that the Australian people are experiencing financial disadvantage as a result of the host of policies and administrative decisions driven by advice regarding the science of climate change. Is that advice false or misleading? Does it deceive by concealing or omitting or embellishing or misrepresenting relevant facts?

You may wonder how this definition could apply to the BoM. Please read on. During Professor Karoly’s time as editor of Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Journal he and other scientists published a paper in AMOJ Vol 62, 2012. To quote from the paper “Trend analysis confirmed that the 1.1 °C increase in maximum temperature and 0.9 °C increase in minimum temperature since 1960 are the largest and most significant trends in Southeastern Australian temperature in the last 152 years”.

http://www.google.com.au/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=8&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CEIQFjAH&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.researchgate.net%2Fprofile%2FLinden_Ashcroft%2Fpublication%2F236886588_Temperature_variations_of_southeastern_Australia_18602011%2Flinks

<https://www.ecowho.com/foia.php?search=australia>

The evidence indicates that those predictions were based on weather stations where the BoM may have maladjusted the data. <https://kenskingdom.wordpress.com/2012/05/14/acorn-sat-a-preliminary-assessment/>

This is one of the issues the Technical Advisory Forum will no doubt be addressing.

It is our humble opinion that a legitimate question is; have BoM scientists disseminated information to the Australian people in a deceptive manner. Does their behaviour meet Black's legal definition above.

An early example of the BoM scientists' attitude towards the dissemination of information to the the Australian people, who incidentally have provided the money for their salaries and grants, is shown below.

```
n, 3 Sep 2007 4:22:04 am
37.txt-Prof David Karoly
37.txt-School of Earth Sciences
37.txt:University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
37.txt-ph: +61 ???
37.txt-fax: +61 ???

i, 6 Sep 2007 9:28:03 pm
01.txt-
01.txt- Thanks Phil for the input and paper. I will get back to you with comments next week.
01.txt- Fortunately in Australia our sceptics are rather scientifically incompetent. It is also
01.txt- easier for us in that we have a policy of providing any complainer with every single
01.txt- station observation when they question our data (this usually snows them) and the
01.txt- Australian data is in pretty good order anyway.
01.txt- Truth be know, climate change here is now running so rampant that we don't need
01.txt- meteorological data to see it. Almost everyone of our cities is on the verge of running out
01.txt- The odd things is that even when we see average rainfall our runoffs are far below average,
01.txt- which seems to be a direct result of warmer temperatures. Recent polls show that
01.txt- Australians now rate climate change as a greater threat than world terrorism.
01.txt- Regards,
01.txt- David
01.txt- dealt with! Don't mention this to anyone at the moment - except Neil Plummer
01.txt- and Mile Coughlan. I suspect the skeptics will move on the
01.txt- Australian and Russian
01.txt- aspects of the 1990 paper at some point.
01.txt- Happy Days !

i, 9 Sep 2007 8:42:16 am
38.txt- anything commercial is being undertaken. This situation (which the Met
38.txt- Office started by the way) is common around the world. Only the US,
38.txt- Australia, Canada and a few other countries put their data up for all to use.
38.txt- Even then they put up the raw (as measured) data and have homogenized
38.txt- data on another page (which is often not linked from the one with the raw

i, 27 Sep 2007 12:58:27 am
08.txt-> >Prof David Karoly
08.txt-> >School of Earth Sciences
08.txt:> >University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, AUSTRALIA
08.txt-> >ph: +61 ???
08.txt-> >fax: +61 ???
```

<http://www.ecowho.com/foia.php?search=australia>

We believe that Australia with its strong democracy under the Abbott government needs to take strong steps to address the climate change scam. The historical evidence indicates that Australia should hold the Australian perpetrators accountable. Australia can lead the world back to scientific integrity and sanity.

In closing we reiterate we are two senior citizens expressing the opinion we formed as a result of our own research. Whether the evidence backs it up or is for others to decide. The BoM scientists are openly copied in to this email. We request them to respond by clicking reply all if they dispute anything we have said.

Respectfully yours

Drs Judy Ryan and Marjorie Curtis
Members World Wide Web of Climate Realists.