

copy .

Hon. Danna Vale BA LLB

Senator the Hon Kim Carr
Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

15 September 2010

Copy: Dr. Dennis Jensen MP
Dr. Megan Clark

Dear Minister, *Kim*

Re: CSIRO August 2010 Response to My Letters of 15 & 19 July 2010

Firstly, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to you on your reappointment as Minister for Innovation, Industry, Science and Research.

I refer to previous correspondence, namely your letter 29 April 2010 which attached a "Response by CSIRO to the scientific issues raised by the Hon Ms Danna Vale MP in her letters of 15, 16 and 26 March 2010" (the Response), my replies of 15 & 19 July 2010 and Dr. Megan Clark's response, on your behalf, of 13 August 2010.

I reiterate that taxpayers, through their State and Federal governments, are providing billions of dollars in subsidies to 'green' initiatives. Also, as a consequence of governments' prescriptions regarding the use of renewable and lower carbon electricity, households and businesses, small and large, are paying more for their electricity and gas, with further steep increases likely.

Consequently, the issue of whether a mooted doubling of atmospheric CO2 would cause a barely perceptible increase in average global temperature of 0.2°C to 0.5°C spread over the next century (para. 14 of my letter of 16 March), or an increase in the range of 3.0°C to over 6.0°C is of the greatest importance to government policy decisions.

Dr. Megan Clark, in her response of 13 August to my letter of 15 July seeks to clarify which of the CSIRO's global climate models (GCM) was used when and for what purpose. This is largely irrelevant, since all of the variants of GCMs used by the CSIRO to inform their advice to government suffer from the same severe structural flaw, insofar as they underestimate changes in evaporation by a factor of around four.

I am informed that this is a severe flaw because evaporation has three times the cooling power of the radiation affected by greenhouse gases. Evaporation cools the earth's surface by around three times as much (78 Watts per square metre) as net outgoing greenhouse gas absorbable long wave radiation (26 W/sqm). Evaporation cools not just the surface, but also planet earth because the latent heat transferred from the surface,

mainly the oceans (86%), to the atmosphere is released above most of the greenhouse gases, where it can easily radiate into space, but only a small percentage can penetrate the lower greenhouse gases and re-warm the earth's surface.

As I pointed out in my letter of 19 July 2010, the use of such severely flawed GCMs in relation to the attribution of most of the global warming in our recent past to increases in greenhouse gas emission calls into question the probity of the CSIRO's climate scientists. We all understand that there can be legitimate differences of scientific opinion about theories and hypotheses and predictions of the future. However, there can be no dispute about the fact that the GCMs used by the CSIRO (and the other contributors to the IPCC) in relation to the attribution of most of the global warming in our recent past to increases in greenhouse gas emission are severely flawed, insofar as they falsely purport that the increases and decreases in evaporation over the last quarter century are only around a quarter of the historical, measured and accepted, actual increases and decreases.

It appears that the CSIRO's scientists and management, even at the highest level, are unable to comprehend that the past and the future are distinctly different. As I said in my letter of 19 July 2010 "The future is unknown, but there are records of what actually happened in the past." In her 13 August response Dr. Clark states that the empirical discoveries made by Wentz et al. (2007) "do not, alone, disprove the underlying theories on which the global climate models (GCMs) are based and nor do they invalidate the outputs from GCMs." In respect of the past, historical records show that this statement is demonstrably false, as I point out in the previous paragraph.

The misconceptions, inaccuracies and misleading statements in the Response from the CSIRO, as detailed in my letters of 15 July and 19 July, seriously call into question the competence and probity of the CSIRO's climate scientists.

The Chief Executive of the CSIRO has responded, on your behalf, to my letters by failing to answer the specific questions that I put to you and by failing to address the probity issue that I raised with you. Dr. Clark then put forward the breathtakingly arrogant proposition that in effect these CSIRO climate scientists, who have repeatedly documented their own incompetence, should be self appointed as both judge and jury and rule on the correctness of their own decisions, answerable to no one. This proposition is unacceptable, not only to me and the wider Australian community but also I am sure to you.

Furthermore, ordinary Australians and their elected representatives have the right to direct questions related to the science of climate change to you, as the responsible Minister, and it is highly improper of the CSIRO to seek to deny us that right.

Since we now have almost a year of correspondence behind us on these issues, I have summarised below the questions that need to be answered, before you, the Government and the Parliament, can have any confidence in the advice given by the CSIRO in respect of the attribution of likely causes to past global warming and the prediction of likely future global warming, attributable to increases in atmospheric CO₂.

No false rewriting of the earth's climate history

Wentz et al. in their May 2007 paper (Fig. 2) showed that since July 1987 the GCMs that contribute to the IPCC falsely purported that the magnitude of increases and decreases in precipitation and evaporation were only around a quarter of the actual increases and decreases.

Question A

By what date will the CSIRO's climate scientists have reconfigured their GCM(s) so that the increases and decreases in virtual evaporation within the GCM(s), since at least July 1987 (the start of the satellite data) to the present, are of a similar magnitude to the measured and accepted real world increases and decreases in evaporation?

In its "State of the Climate" report the CSIRO stated "There is greater than 90% certainty that increases in greenhouse gas emissions have caused most of the global warming since the mid-20th century."

Question B

By what date will the CSIRO's climate scientists have used their GCM(s), thus reconfigured, to assist them in reassessing the proportion of global warming, since the mid-20th century and caused by increases in greenhouse gases, to which a greater than 90% certainty can be assigned?

Twenty three years of data is enough

Wentz et al. in their May 2007 paper (Fig. 2) showed that for the then 20-years since satellite data became available increases and decreases in evaporation (E), atmospheric water vapour (V) and precipitation (P) were of a similar magnitude.

We now have several more years of satellite data and there has been thorough examination of the data, which has confirmed that increases and decreases in E, V & P were indeed of a similar magnitude.

Notwithstanding these tested and accepted findings, the CSIRO's climate scientists persist in configuring the GCM(s) used by the CSIRO to predict future temperature changes, in such a way that the predicted magnitude of future changes in virtual E & P are around a quarter of the predicted magnitude of future changes in virtual V.

The real world water cycle provides negative feedback which reduces any temperature rise due to an increase in atmospheric CO₂, whereas the virtual water cycle configured into the CSIRO's GCM(s) provides positive feedback which amplifies any temperature rise due to an increase in atmospheric CO₂.

Question C

Just how many more years of satellite data are the CSIRO's climate scientists likely to require before they reconfigure their GCM(s), so that it is compliant with the above tested and accepted empirical discovery made by Wentz et al.?

Validated empirical data exposes a second serious structural flaw in the CSIRO's GCM(s)

In their February 2009 paper "Trends in middle- and upper-level tropospheric humidity from NCEP reanalysis data" Paltridge et al. estimated (Fig. 10) that a doubling of CO₂ with no consequential feedback effects would increase global near surface temperatures by around 0.8°C. They further estimated that the consequential changes in virtual atmospheric water vapour predicted by the major GCMs, as they are currently configured, would provide strong positive feedback and double the predicted increase in virtual global near surface temperatures to around 1.7°C. Paltridge et al. also estimated that reconfiguring the major GCMs so that the consequential changes in virtual atmospheric water vapour were compliant with their empirical discovery, would provide negative feedback and so halve the predicted increase in global near surface temperatures to around 0.4°C.

In their paper Paltridge et al. made it abundantly clear that they took data only at altitudes and latitudes where radiosonde humidity data is reliable. They validated their data by demonstrating that their findings were consistent across three geographic regions (tropics, northern & southern mid-latitudes) and for both summer and winter seasons. They further showed their findings were as predicted by climate theory.

In response the CSIRO's climate scientists argued that because radiosonde humidity data taken at higher altitudes, above the altitudes where Paltridge et al. took their data, are unreliable the findings made by Paltridge et al. were unreliable. Although this argument appears to be illogical science, it has been accepted by the CSIRO's senior scientists and management.

The CSIRO went on to state that its climate scientists are unable to express a definitive view on the reliability of the empirical discovery made by Paltridge et al., but did note the need for further analysis and funding for that analysis.

Question D

What would be the scope of work and cost for a study that would allow the CSIRO to take a definitive view on the reliability of the empirical discovery made by Paltridge et al.?

The Labor – Green Coalition cannot justify placing a price on ‘carbon’

The Labor – Green Coalition government is determined to place a large new tax on emissions of carbon dioxide. Their Coalition Agreement says “That Australia must tackle climate change and that reducing carbon pollution by 2020 will require a price on carbon. Therefore the Parties agree to form a well resourced Climate Change Committee which encompasses experts and representative ALP, Greens, independent and Coalition parliamentarians who are committed to tackling climate change and who acknowledge that reducing carbon pollution by 2020 will require a carbon price. The Committee will be resourced like a Cabinet Committee. The Parties will, by the end of September 2010, finalise the structure, membership and work plan of the Committee.”

I note that the experts and elected representatives who will be appointed to the Climate Change Committee by the Labor-Green Coalition must be “committed to tackling climate change and who acknowledge that reducing carbon pollution by 2020 will require a carbon tax.”

It would therefore be very dangerous for ordinary Australians, if such an extremely biased committee was to commence its deliberations before it had available to it the answers to Questions A, B, C & D above.

Indeed, before Members and Senators could give informed consideration to such an economy-changing large new tax, they and the people of Australia need as a minimum the answer to Question B above.

A doubling of atmospheric CO2 would greatly benefit humanity and the environment

In my speech to Parliament on 28 October 2009 I pointed out for the benefit of Members that “Carbon is not a pollutant. It is a potent fertiliser and up until now a free fertiliser at that. At the outset I say that it is madness and morally reprehensible for the Rudd Labor government, and indeed for the well-fed Western democracies, to take actions that intend to limit, capture and bury a free fertiliser like CO2 and thus deny the billions of undernourished people in the developing world a free 20 to 50 per cent increase in food production as well as increased rainfall in a world that is experiencing water shortages as populations increase.” It is of course not just food crops that benefit from increased atmospheric CO2 and higher rainfall, but native vegetation as well.

There is a need for haste in responding to my Questions

With every passing day large sums of taxpayers’ and private money are most likely being wasted. The Labor-Green Coalition Agreement mandates an end September deadline for setting up the Climate Change Committee.

I first wrote to you almost a year ago on 26 October 2009 to point out that the empirical discoveries made by Wentz et al. and Paltridge et al. and published in two peer reviewed scientific papers disprove two key climate theories incorporated in the CSIRO's GCM(s). The CSIRO has therefore had more than ample time to consider the issues addressed by my Questions and should be able to respond promptly.

Therefore, mindful of the significant costs that are likely to be imposed upon the people of Australia by the Labor-Green Coalition's Climate Change Committee, I respectfully urge your due consideration be given to the matters raised, and that you will ensure that answers to these important questions will be forthcoming as a matter of urgency.

As you are no doubt aware I did not stand at the recent election and accordingly, respectfully request that your response to this letter be forwarded to my good colleague Dr. Dennis Jensen MP Federal Member for Tangney.

Thank you very much for your efforts to resolve these most important issues.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Danna Vale', written over a horizontal line.

Hon. Danna Vale