

From: Judy Ryan judyryan@grapevine.com.au

Subject: Re: Forward the Escape Route 12

Date: 4 February 2018 at 2:00 pm

To: judy Ryan judyryan@grapevine.com.au

Cc: Marjorie Curtis marjorie.curtis17@gmail.com, Chief Scientist Inquiry chief.scientist@chiefscientist.gov.au, Frydenberg, Josh (MP) Josh.Frydenberg.MP@aph.gov.au, Turnbull, Malcolm (MP) Malcolm.Turnbull.MP@aph.gov.au, Sinodinos, Arthur (Senator) Senator.Sinodinos@aph.gov.au



Dear Judy and Margaret,

Many thanks and I respect your views.

I would respectfully note that I am not the Minister for the Environment and do not have responsibility for the BOM.

In addition, I would also note that in fact contrary to your statement there was a review of BOM data during the previous term of Parliament.

I would therefore suggest that any inquiries regarding the BOM be referred to Minister Frydenberg.

Regards,

Greg Hunt

Sent from my iPad

On 29 Jan. 2018, at 10:20 am, Judy Ryan <judyryan@grapevine.com.au> wrote:

Dear Minister Hunt,

We sent the email shown below to you on the 8th December 2017. We gave you 21 days to take the appropriate ethical action and reopen the investigation into the BoM with the terms 'due diligence' and data 'quality assurance' reinserted into its terms of reference. Twenty-one days plus have passed and you have done nothing. Therefore, we now forward the email to you as a public email. The people of Australia and elsewhere can read the evidence and judge for themselves if you have performed your judiciary duties appropriately, or whether you have committed crimes of 'Wilful Ignorance' and or 'Malfeasance in Public Office'.

Dear Readers, Please read the short succinct email below.

=====

Dear Minister Hunt,

In the interests of openness and transparency we inform you that, although this email may be used in future as evidence in a court of law, nobody, except our chief legal adviser, is privy to its contents at this early stage. Therefore you have an opportunity to avoid

at the early stage therefore, you have an opportunity to avoid litigation. The evidence of fraud by the Lysenko-like pseudo scientists at the Australian BoM is robust:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/Rutherglen2015version_opt.pdf

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/NonInteractivePosterForDecember1931.pdf>

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/AtmosphericCO2LevelsFromThe1990s-2.pdf>

Maybe it is the BoM scientists who should be facing litigation?

Surely you are aware that, for a number of years, many people, including Dr. Curtis and myself, have tried to alert you to possible fraudulent data manipulation practices at the BoM. The evidence indicates that you have willfully turned blind eyes and deaf ears to the evidence we provided.

Below is a brief history of your performance of fiduciary duties under the Abbott and Turnbull governments (circa 2014). The Abbott government called for a full enquiry into the BoM's data management practices. Terms of reference included 'due diligence' and 'quality assurance'. The evidence indicates that, as Minister for the Environment, you argued against an enquiry at that time:

<http://thenewdaily.com.au/news/national/2015/09/24/abbott->

[wanted-investigate-weather-bureau/](#)

The evidence also indicates that when you, as Minister for the Environment, were required to set up the public enquiry, you deceived and undermined Prime Minister Abbott and Cabinet (circa 2015). You set up the Technical Enquiry Forum but ensured that all references to 'due diligence' and 'quality assurance,' relating to the BoM's data management practices were removed.

Meanwhile hundreds of concerned citizens lodged submissions to the enquiry based on the BoM's questionable data management practice, its 'due diligence' and data 'quality assurance'. Is it possible that your due diligence was a little flawed at that time?

Dr Curtis' and my submission were among the later submissions. We lodged it on 4th March 2015 (Keyword search on Karoly)

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/jr/GregHuntSubmission_20150304.pdf

As you can see, our submission provided the evidence that Professor David Karoly, whilst he was editor of the AMOJ, published a paper in that journal using data that, the evidence indicates, he knew had been maladjusted. In our opinion that meets the definition of fraud.

On 15th March 2015 there was a one day closed forum, which did not address the issues of due diligence and quality assurance by the BoM scientists.

September 14-15th 2015 saw Malcolm Turnbull oust Tony Abbott as PM.

Only 9 days later.....

September 24th 2015: You, Minister Hunt, on mainstream media claim credit for killing the idea of the enquiry.

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-09-24/environment-minister-greg-hunt-killed-idea-of-bom-review/6803572>

Is it possible that by stopping the investigation into the BoM's data management practices you have become liable to a charge of malfeasance in public office?

We, the Independent Scientists are a cohesive, global organisation. We have the will and the wherewithal to commence litigation against you. Do you want to avoid this outcome? If so, confer with all your colleagues copied in to this email. Then take the appropriate ethical action. Within 21 days of receiving this email have the appropriate politician announce the reopening of the investigation into the BoM. Announce that the reopened investigation includes 'due diligence' and data 'quality assurance' in its broadened terms of reference. Announce it on the nightly televised news on both the Government funded and commercial channels.

Respectfully Yours

Dr Judy Ryan and Dr Marjorie Curtis

Members: WWWeb of Independent Scientists

Email judyryan@grapevine.com.au

Affiliated With

Citizens Electoral Council

Australia

Dr David Evans

Perth

Principia Scientific International

John O'Sullivan

Britain

The Carbon Sense Coalition

Qld

The Climate Realists of Five Dock

Sydney

The Climate Sceptics

NSW

The Galileo Movement

Qld

The Sensible Environmentalist

Dr Patrick Moore

Canada,US,Mexico

Members

World Council for Nature

As truly independent scientists we will always debate the Science. However, we are united in our recognition and rejection of the politically driven post-normal science (such as climate alarmism)

