

The Director of the Climate Change Institute
Professor Michael Raupach

16th September 2014

Dear Professor Raupach

On Thursday 4th September we attended an event hosted by the Fenner School of Environmental Science which was held in conjunction with the ANU Climate Change Institute. The title of the event was "Climate Change- Why facts and Opinion are both important".

This letter is to inform you of our concern regarding what the MP3 recording <http://fennerschool.anu.edu.au/news-events/event-recordings/climate-change-why-facts-and-opinions-are-both-important> evidences as an underlying political agenda directed against the Abbott Government. Both the petition and invitation to join a protest march on the 21st September are clearly a political agenda and have no place in a science forum.

As the recording evidences, the presentations by Professor Smithson, Ms Bruer and Dr Will Grant were littered with seemingly unfounded misrepresentations. The recording also evidences what appears to be an attempt to seize the high moral ground and use it to provoke antagonism against the Abbott Government amongst University and High School Students. Let us remind you that the Abbott Government was overwhelmingly voted in and given a mandate to remove the carbon tax and all its dysfunctional hangers on.

Professor Raupach my question to you (1.06.33 on the recording) quote "*.....when you talk about carbon pollution and carbon emissions you are, actually I think it was Will, referred to it as carbon dioxide, which is what the full word is. It is carbon-dioxide emissions. Carbon dioxide has two states: its gaseous state and its solid state, which is dry ice. How can it be either a pollutant or a warming agent?*"

To quote your response (1.07.23):-

"It is not a pollutant any more than water is a pollutant....."

Professor Raupach, how long have you been aware that the Carbon-dioxide emissions from fossil fuel power plants are not a pollutant?

With your strong science background, it is reasonable to assume that you have known that basic scientific fact since High School. Therefore, in the interests of scientific integrity, why have you never questioned the accuracy of the term "carbon pollution".

The promulgation of this term has misled the Australian people for a significant ongoing period of time, by omission of relevant information. It has resulted in the creation of a

perceived problem where there was none. It appears to have then assisted in the exaggeration of effects from this erroneously perceived problem.

Black's Law Dictionary defines fraud as:- *“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.”*

Professor Raupbach we refer to the second part of your response to my question now,

To quote *“.....So the fact that there is a greenhouse effect is absolutely a given and the fact that it makes earth habitable is a given. The fact that we can change it by altering the composition of some of these gases in the atmosphere is also by now very, very well established.”*

Surely you are aware that the Greenhouse Effect in the lower atmosphere is only an hypothesis, which many scientists challenge. Are you aware that the evidence supports the null hypothesis, i.e there is no Greenhouse Effect in the lower atmosphere.

Here is NASA's evidence that **carbon-dioxide actually acts as a coolant** in the outer atmosphere. http://www.nasa.gov/mission_pages/sunearth/news/solarstorm-power.html. It is 4 minute video, well worth watching. But, just in case you are disinclined to view the video consider this quote from it :-

“Infrared radiation from CO₂ and NO, the two most efficient coolants in the thermosphere, re-radiated 95% of that total (kWh of Energy) back into space.”

The term “Greenhouse Effect” was coined for the whole atmosphere by the French scientist Fourier in 1824. It has always been **only** an hypothesis. It came from the works of early pioneers such as Lavoisier who described oxygen in 1824. Later, an attempt was made to measure the infra red properties of some gasses by Langley in the 1890s using equipment he designed himself. He was followed by Arrhenius, using the same type of equipment. Arrhenius thought he was measuring the infra red properties of carbon dioxide, but it turned out that Langley's equipment was actually only capable of measuring the properties of water vapour. So, from honest errors during the 19th Century comes the modern concept of the Greenhouse Effect in the lower atmosphere.

It has failed testing on a number of occasions, the most notable being the famous experiment by Robert Wood in 1909. http://www.tech-know-group.com/papers/Note_on_the_Theory_of_the_Greenhouse.pdf

Wood's experiment has been recently replicated by Nasif Nahle http://www.biocab.org/Experiment_on_Greenhouses_Effect.pdf who concluded that:-

(1)The "*greenhouse*" supposition has been comprehensively disproved by scientists as long ago as 1909 by physicist Professor RW Wood, and was later discarded by the distinguished Nobel Prize winner in physics, Neils Bohr.

(2) In 100 years no one has disproved Professor Woods' practical, replicable, experiment. He proved selective transmission in greenhouse glass does not magically create more heat.

Evidence of another kind indicates that whilst the ANU Climate Change Institute is located at the ANU it is a non-government organisation with global connections. It claims that its "Climate Scientists" are experts in their field.

Therefore we ask you Professor Raupach, as the Director of the Climate Institute and an expert in the field of Climate Science to provide (1) the evidence that supports the claimed established knowledge that there is a Greenhouse Effect in the lower atmosphere, and (2) that carbon-dioxide is a warming agent.

As you are an expert you will have this information in your head so we look forward to an early enlightenment. Please click reply all when you respond.

Regards

Drs Judy Ryan and Marjorie Curtis