

Committee Secretary  
Senate Standing Committees on Environment and Communications  
PO Box 6100  
Parliament House  
Canberra ACT 2600  
Australia

Re Senate Extreme Weather Inquiry

Dear Sir/Ms

I set out below for your consideration my studied perceptions in relation to the Climate Change debate (the Anthropogenic Global Warming hypothesis) which for the present seems to have captured the minds of those in government in Australia and some other countries.

My observations are intended to highlight a context in which considerations for extreme weather planning options ought appropriately be examined by the Committee, rather than being a submission of extreme weather data and future actions, preventative or protective. They are limited in scope to certain issues which I perceive as key only.

I do not present my observations as a learned and academically professional treatise with myriad appendage of references, nor with extensive details of various points of science and analysis. It is the presentation of an ordinary citizen, an amateur I acknowledge, but one who has studied the AGW hypothesis in depth, and likewise the only other alternative explanations in science, those relating to solar system planetary dynamics in respect of which there are two or three plausible and somewhat related hypotheses which have been developed over many years and for which the evidence in support I find considerable, indeed of superior weight to that for AGW.

Personal Background - I am what might be classified as a 'Citizen Scientist' never having engaged as a professional scientist in any climate or related field as such; the majority of my career having been in business management – culminating in CEO status of a mid-cap business within the forest products field in Australia; but involving also extensive international exposure. I am now retired, aged 77.

However my initial academic background was in chemistry & chemical engineering (Swinburne) and later Economics (Univ. Melbourne), supplemented with business training exposures at such as Stanford University – full details available if required. I mention these details to demonstrate that I have the capability to study in depth the science, mathematics, as well as the economics of the AGW debate and its attendant issues, political included (I think). I have through my life maintained an active amateur interest in matters of science in particular astronomy and astrophysics, and the natural sciences.

During progression towards full retirement over the past 15 years I have devoted considerable of my available free time to deep study of these areas and most particularly of the alleged AGW matter; I have studied intensively literally several hundred learned (and a few not so learned) papers on the issue – papers from all sides and on all aspects of the issue – as well as dozens of opinion essays by science related writers; as a refresher I recently undertook a short course at Swinburne on Solar System aspects of astrophysics; I engage regularly in a climate change internet based exchange and discussion forum which has some of the world's most renowned scientists as participants.

I have also been able to establish direct contacts with senior astrophysicists at Swinburne, Cambridge and Cornell University astrophysics institutions in order to validate various aspects related to solar origin forcing component of the debate.

IPCC & AGW Hypothesis - Some 15 years or so ago when the first IPCC reports were published I studied these (and subsequent revisions) and ensuing discussion on them by scientists and serious opinion writers (I do not include in these ranks most public media journalists); my initial tendency, as with most people, was to accept the IPCC's conclusions resting on the apparent weight of experienced scientist assessment on which they were based; and their claim of consensus.

As my interest and depth of study progressed however I came to firstly have serious doubts, and in due course to reject the main conclusions as being unproven and largely unfounded; not being based on valid scientific process; not in fact being supported by a 'consensus' as claimed; and more recently becoming convinced that there have been serious distortions of the science, the analysis, and the logic – indeed to the point of and inclusive of outright fabrication of certain key 'evidences'.

The infamous 'Hockey Stick', the Climategate disclosures, and many other instances which are well documented in the literature (print and electronic) being fabrications, subtle distortions or gross carelessness by those writing the IPCC conclusions; conclusions which are not infrequently not supported by the sectoral input by scientists of various disciplines who have made input contributions. Details of all of these distortions are readily available in various publications which this Inquiry may readily access.

Equally serious is the exclusion, other than occasional token reference, from the IPCC's data input of the reality of natural solar forcing influences for which more than sufficient evidence is readily available in support of a sound hypothesis for climate cycling (warming and cooling). Indeed, the correlation evidence can be shown to be substantially more powerful than that for the AGW hypothesis. But it has not been considered by IPCC, indeed the IPCC's charter seems designed to rule out other than the CO<sub>2</sub> option being considered by it.

That exclusion I have found has also extended to many of the learned journals and societies wherein one might expect all sides and aspects of a serious matter of science to be published and undergo objective peer review process; to the contrary and to the shame of these venues forms of censorship and bias have been allowed to permeate editor/administration ranks to prevent alternate perspectives and evidences from being presented. I regard these developments as disgraceful and an affront to the profession of science.

Not surprisingly, new avenues via internet opportunities have allowed alternate science to become visible to those whose openness of mind seeks it.

I readily accept that the correlation of warming trend over the 100 or so years the IPCC has chosen to study, in relation to the increasing CO<sub>2</sub> trend is adequate for a hypothesis to be mounted – indeed the warming trend has been proceeding steadily for some 200+ years as recovery from the so called Little Ice Age (Maunder and Dalton Minimums) continues, with regular periodic shorter term up/down trends within. However once mounted, valid scientific process then requires those mounting an hypothesis to produce the evidence and publish it for robust peer review by truly independent and objective professional scientist review.

A correlation, no matter how strong statistically, is not evidence of causation. Evidence must be based on either real world observational data or reproducible laboratory analysis.

IPCC readily quotes evidence of the correlated warming trend (about which there is little debate anyway) and immediately assumes this to be evidence of causation – it is not. Furthermore, it builds computer models and builds into them programmes which assume causation and then proceed to study warming consequences under various scenarios of influencing factors. All very engaging of course and of potential value were it ever to be proven the CO<sub>2</sub> factor is the causative influence – which it has not been.

It is beyond question that CO<sub>2</sub> is indeed a ‘greenhouse gas’, but it has also been shown that its effect alone is quite limited (it is essentially a logarithmic relationship); further for the AGW hypothesis to have any basis the IPCC turns to the major greenhouse gas in the atmosphere, water vapour including as clouds, the atmospheric content of which it claims is expanded from ocean evaporation by each addition of CO<sub>2</sub> and the associated small increment of temperature increase it causes, and the water vapour then becomes the alleged real culprit in major acceleration of temperature rise. So called ‘positive feedback’, indeed with the alleged potential to lead to catastrophic ‘run away warming’.

The assumptions/predictions IPCC made for this to become progressively evident in the future was via static relative humidity (which in a rising temperature regime means more H<sub>2</sub>O in the atmosphere), and in particular what it describes as a ‘hot spot’ to form in the tropics and thereafter to spread towards the poles, as global atmospheric heat transfer is known to occur. The reality is otherwise, with clear evidence (satellite observation) of both relative as well as absolute humidity having in fact declined over the past 30 years – in other words less water vapour is the reality, and no ‘hot spot’ whatsoever showing up in infrared records over similar period. Instead of ‘positive feedback’ the emerging evidence is of ‘negative feedback’ – in which event the AGW hypothesis fails. *[The work of Dr Ferenc Miskolczi succinctly explains the science and why positive feedback would not occur]*

To date IPCC simply ignores this evidence, and the work of Miskolczi, et al.

There are numbers of other areas of prediction and assumption made by IPCC in support of its AGW hypothesis which the Committee may access by intelligent reference to the various literatures, which also fail to support IPCC’s claims, but the CO<sub>2</sub>/Water Vapour claim goes to the heart of the ‘science’ of its proposition and its failure alone renders the hypothesis as being unsupported.

Since its first output IPCC has had to make continual adjustments to its models and conclusions/projections as real observed climate and related conditions have been found not to follow the predicted paths, and by substantial amounts. As widely reported the world has now experienced 16 years of zero temperature growth which is totally contrary to IPCC predictions by very wide margins notwithstanding continuing steady growth in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> content.

Further, even NASA and the British Bureau of Meteorology have announced their expectation that this cooling trend will continue for the next 5 years at least.

These announcements from organisations regarded as 'consensus'/conformist, is significant, and is in line with the numbers of forecasts made by solar origin forcing scientists over many years. The latter's forecasts project real cooling to continue well beyond this period.

Is it not time minds opened at least to the point of examining independently and objectively the alternative science and evidence that is available. Should not the Inquiry's collective mind be open.

These developments illustrate that the often extreme indeed exaggerated predictions and claims of impending climate disaster scenarios which have been made by IPCC have at the very least questionable bases in science, that the AGW hypothesis is certainly far from proven, and at the same time has almost no supporting observational evidence. Indeed, as alluded, existing evidence is to the contrary. *[On record are admissions by AGW proponents of deliberate exaggeration in publicity as a means of capturing public and political attention]*

Extreme Weather Events - In respect to such events, the primary subject of this Inquiry, such entities as NASA and NAOO and some engaged universities have regularly issued their assessments that no such evidence exists as to worsening trends in frequency and severity of a global nature in extreme events such as cyclones, hurricanes, droughts, floods, etc – if anything to the contrary. The highlighting of such claims derives from exaggerated extremist propaganda, and assisted by sensational media reporting motivated by either bias and or media sales impacts. The evidence indicates that natural oceanic and atmospheric dynamics continue to routinely influence such events – for our part of the world, ENSO and PDO, and their cousins in the Atlantic and Indian oceans.

If the AGW hypothesis is invalid, as I believe it is, and if we are globally about to enter a period of sustained cooler climate conditions, as I believe we are, the latter will almost certainly entail a quite different regime of weather across the Australian continent than that of the AGW projection. The Committee would be wise to be as certain as possible that it is considering the right future scenario. At the very least it would be prudent to spend some time contemplating the differing options and consequences rather than blindly or exclusively following the AGW 'consensus' group think line.

Most certainly the conclusions of IPCC are a totally unsound basis on which governments/bureaucracies ought to be making policy and initiating actions within their national economies which will have massive economic consequences, the very beginnings of which are just starting to be felt with major escalations from carbon taxes and renewables costs in many western countries. Far worse is set to come if these policies continue without check and review, and as these costs roll and multiply through all sectors of the economy; and as industries seek relief by moving production components offshore.

Carbon Dioxide – this gas has become by sensational journalism and extreme AGW alarmist propaganda effort, the villain of the piece – poisonous, toxic, a killer if ever there was one. This is such outlandish rubbish it is laughable except it really is a sad sad tale of mislead of the public. CO<sub>2</sub> is in fact the essence of life on Earth, human, animal and vegetable, as important as water and nitrogen. Increased atmospheric content (and more) at the levels experienced over the past hundred or so years is beneficial to all life. Further increase can only be of benefit for global food supply particularly if the world is entering an extended cooler climate period.

It is why horticulturalists in cold climate countries have for a century or more pumped the gas into their hothouses to enrich the 'food' requirement of their crops, resulting in yield increases up to 60%. Significantly, NASA/NAO have recently announced their satellite observations of increased greening of the planet over the past 30 years of satellite recordings.

Atmospheric contents have regularly exceeded current levels significantly in past millennia as evidenced by various isotopic proxy measurement of wood/trees, ice cores, soil and sediment cores – and have been accompanied by lower atmospheric and surface temperatures than presently experienced. The long term evidence is equally clear that periods of higher CO<sub>2</sub> content have followed periods of ocean warming and have not preceded it. Our oceans are the largest sink of CO<sub>2</sub> on the planet, releasing and re-absorbing the gas as naturally induced temperature cycles proceed.

There may well be other arguments for limiting the ultimate CO<sub>2</sub> content, but temperature rise is not one of them. Further, such testing that has been carried out I have read indicates that in the order of 5000ppm (presently 380ppm) may be a level at which human respiratory function could become an issue. Obviously no one would wish content to grow to anywhere near that level, but nor should the panic programme on which our nation and a few others seem to have embarked be motivated at current global food production supporting levels as we have, with such damaging economic consequences as a high probability.

Consensus - The 'consensus' proposition is equally unsound; science is never about consensus nor is it to be based on any form of elitism or assumed superior 'Authority'. It must be based on evidence derived from real life observation and controlled experiment, logical analysis, objective peer review, and iterative revision.

The so called consensus in favour of AGW is I believe substantially sustained by large doses of 'group think', captured by political correctness within many organisations, expanded by a compliant and unprofessional media and many of its journalists/editors, and is arguably also well lubricated by financial grant 'gravity train' motivations which governments have seen fit to support. It must be very difficult for scientists whose career and economic livelihood is locked to generous grant funding to go against the 'party line' whatever their personal views.

Will this become a revised well known saying in the future 'never get between a Premier, or a reliant scientist, and a bucket of money'.

The AGW 'consensus' contradiction mimics some examples of past eras, to wit the heliocentricity 'consensus' for which Copernicus, Bruno and Galileo paid a price; and the arrogant inanity of one of the world's great scientists (and he was), Lord Kelvin who as President of The Royal Society late 19<sup>th</sup> century made a fool of himself not once but twice with his pronouncements 'Heavier than air flying machines will never fly', then 'There is nothing new to be discovered in science now, all that remains is more and more precise measurement'. Elitism and Authority on display – the RS has real form.

I know of no measure of how many scientists across the world support the AGW as a proven concept – no doubt there will be many thousands outside of the IPCC establishment. IPCC talks of some 5000+ involved in its work but such analysis of the make up of these numbers that have been carried out independently and published indicates the numbers of actual scientists has been closer to half that.

Furthermore that most of these made narrow sectoral contributions only and played no part in the composite interpretations and final conclusions reporting, indeed a number disassociating from the final conclusions because it either ignored or contradicted their inputs. On at least one occasion it is reported that the final summary of conclusions was written prior to all of the input papers being contributed or studied. What form of science is this ?

The Oregon Petition signed by over 32000 scientists including over 9000 PhD holders was organised as a means of demonstrating that there are many many scientists around the world who do not accept the AGW hypothesis as valid or proven. Similar petitions exist within the European science communities also. Such petitions serve that purpose only.

Clearly even these numbers carry no weight whatsoever in proving or disproving anything about the validity or invalidity of the AGW or any other climate change hypothesis. Science as alluded is not about numbers for and against, consensus or non-consensus, or about any computer model programmed with pre-committed outcomes in mind; it is about real evidence only, derived from real world observation and controlled experiment, peer reviewed and reproducible.

In due course I have no doubt the truth will prevail, indeed within the next decade I believe the cooling trend which has emerged (precisely as had been predicted on the basis of solar system science dynamics by the many eminent scientists) and has proceeded now for 16 years to the consternation of AGW protagonists, will continue and almost certainly intensify, numbers of scientists forecasting to the equivalence of at least Dalton Minimum magnitude, and will prevail as the dominant cyclical trend for the next 30-40 years until a new natural reverse cycle might be expected to again emerge.

Solar Forcing Hypotheses - Just a few of the notable scientists who have conducted research and published papers and books in support of solar origin climate cycling of decadal/multidecadal and millennial term are Nicola Scafetta at Yale, Nir Shaviv in Israel, Henrik Svensmark in Denmark, Ivana Chavratova in the Czech Republic, but there are many others from most parts of the globe pursuing research in the general solar origin field. Svensmark's work is also presently the subject of deep study at the new CERN research facility in Switzerland with some promising early results. His work centres around Cosmic Ray/Solar Wind interaction and influences on upper and lower atmosphere cloud formation.

A highly experienced amateur astrophysicist 'citizen scientist' in England, Frederick Bailey, a naval architect by background has laid out a somewhat variant hypothesis also based on solar dynamics and the same key driver origins (all of which concern relative movements of the Jovian planets and consequential influence on the Sun, solar cycles, sunspots, etc) and what is known as Solar Inertial Motion (SIM) a reality of the movement of the Sun first described by Isaac Newton and expanded on by later scientists in particular the late Jose, Landscheidt and Rhodes Fairbridge, the latter a quite brilliant Australian scientist who was engaged at Columbia university for most of his work in this field. The works of all of these scientists may be accessed via internet search, their work and themselves regarded as leaders in the solar origin field.

As I have alluded it has not been my intention in this submission to lay out the detail of any of these works, rather to bring to the attention of the Committee (if it does not receive the alert by more credentialed contributors) that such plausible alternative fields of research and explanation of climate cycling exist, are very well developed and are based on hundreds of years (even longer in fact when paleoclimatic science is included) of study and repetitive correlation which far surpasses that of the AGW hypothesis.

Recommendations - I believe before governments and bureaucracies embark on programmes (extreme weather planning included) carrying high risks of major downside consequences for national economies, all relevant fields of science and related issues as enumerated should be thoroughly and independently examined.

The only possible way which I am able to see which can approach objectivity and independence is via a Royal Commission of the most eminent judges with open minds and as free as possible of biases and pre-conceptions, fully supported by the most eminent and emotionally stable scientific expertise representing all fields of related science and possible climate change hypotheses. I believe the Committee's recommendations should make reference to the desirability of such a Commission into the broader context of the Inquiry's evaluations.

The title of the Senate Inquiry may be seen to imply the assumption that the AGW hypothesis is proven, or accepted as proven or highly likely to be so; the extension of this implication may be that there is to be no questioning of the basis of AGW hypothesis per se, nor any questioning of alleged but equally invalid consequences of climate change in terms of incidence of extreme weather frequency.

I propose the Committee stand back from such preconceptions, and question the validity of all of the related sciences comprehensively, as well as the validity or otherwise of the alleged extreme weather incidence. Most importantly the Committee should include in its considerations the implications for Australia in the (likely) event that a period of cooling, even greater than normal cooling, is imminent.

Lawrence A Wilson