

Restoring Scientific Integrity

Senator Malcolm Roberts, 31 August 2020

Introduction

Australian politics has been seduced into endorsing policies aiming at decarbonising and consequently deindustrialising our economy from 2050.

Climate policies and renewables subsidies are already costing households \$13 billion per year through higher electricity costs, \$1,300 for each Australian household. High electricity prices are dismantling our productive economy. Manufacturing, agriculture, small and large businesses cannot flourish under increasing electricity prices. Crucial energy intensive industries and value-adding processors of food and minerals are moving to countries with cheap energy.

At the core of the climate claims that push policies to cut the human use of hydrocarbon fuels like natural gas, coal and oil, is the claim that the output of carbon dioxide from burning those fuels is warming our planet, and that warming is a danger to humans and to our planet. Costly government policy must therefore be based on evidence that proves human CO₂ directly causes climate change.

Politicians have the highest duty of care to base all policies on rigorous scientific evidence, especially policies that bring about radical change with severe consequences for people's livelihoods and lifestyle. Expensive policies need justification, with impacts specified and quantified before implementation, and this can only be achieved when based on the solid scientific evidence that proves causation.

Our nation's productive capacity, economic sovereignty and economic resilience have been decimated by climate policies and we are on the slide from independence to dependence on other nations. In my meetings with CSIRO's senior offices I requested empirical evidence that justifies Australia's climate policies. This document summaries my findings.

CSIRO has never stated that CO₂ from human activity is dangerous

CSIRO would not attribute danger to carbon dioxide from human activity and have not provided evidence to allow any politicians, including ministers, to attribute danger.

CSIRO stated that the determination of danger was a matter for the public or for politicians.

CSIRO has refused to correct claims of danger made by government ministers reveals that it has been afraid to speak out about obvious politically driven deviations from science.

CSIRO admitted temperatures today are not unprecedented

At CSIRO's second presentation where I requested evidence for anything unprecedented in climate, CSIRO after almost 50 years of climate research, provided one sole paper; Marcott (2013). This paper claimed that today's temperatures are unprecedented.

Under further examination, CSIRO admitted that today's temperatures are NOT unprecedented.

CSIRO withdrew discredited papers it had cited as evidence of unprecedented rate of temperature change

In addition to admitting that today's temperatures are NOT unprecedented, CSIRO representatives were surprised to learn from my team that within two weeks of the release of Marcott's paper in 2013, its flaws had been comprehensively exposed. Marcott was forced to admit this and said, quote: "the 20th century portion of our paleo-temperature stack is not statistically robust, cannot be

considered representative of global temperature changes.”

This led to CSIRO withdrawing Marcott’s paper as CSIRO representatives agreed that his paper did not scientifically justify their claim and was scientifically discredited. CSIRO then cited Lecavalier and we showed it was not valid.

CSIRO has never quantified any specific impact of CO2 from human activity

CSIRO acknowledged the need for empirical data within a causal framework that proves cause and effect yet failed to prove that carbon dioxide from human activity causes global warming or climate change.

CSIRO never specified the amount of temperature changes attributed to carbon dioxide from human activity.

CSIRO relies upon unvalidated models that give unverified and erroneous projections as “evidence”

For the Anthropogenic Global Warming hypothesis to be scientifically accepted, it must be based on physical data. During the first meeting it was confirmed that CSIRO relies on unvalidated computerised climate models, not physical data. This is an admission of CSIRO’s lack of empirical evidence proving causation.

Climate model failures are demonstrated by their output which consistently over-predict warming trends compared to the physical data and observations. The erroneous results are the result of having limited knowledge of the factors affecting global climate, and due to the fact that modellers are trying to show carbon dioxide to be the main factor in driving temperature, when there is a wide range of assumed sensitivities to CO2.

CSIRO relied on discredited and poor quality papers on temperature and CO2

Harries (2001) was the sole paper cited for CSIRO’s claim of an unprecedented level of atmospheric carbon dioxide, yet this paper could not support CSIRO’s claim.

CSIRO seemed unaware of the serious flaws in the Harries’ paper due to the unscientific and statistically invalid methodology used.

After the failure of Harries’ paper to support CSIRO’s CO2 claims, CSIRO offered the Feldman et al (2015) paper. Incredibly the Feldman paper refutes the Harries paper, and ongoing discussions raised even more objections to the Harries’ paper

CSIRO admits to not doing due diligence on reports and data from external agencies

When CSIRO’s chosen papers were unable to definitively support its claims, CSIRO then offered the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) report, which also relies on unvalidated and inadequate climate models. The UN climate report has no empirical data within a logical scientific framework proving that carbon dioxide from human activity affects climate. Alarmingly, and despite relying on the UN’s climate reports, CSIRO admitted that it has never done due diligence on the UN IPCC or its reports.

CSIRO demonstrated little understanding of papers it cited as evidence

The question must be asked - how can CSIRO eventually offer up four scientific papers and show limited understanding of them? Instead CSIRO made a series of assertions and conclusions that were imprecise, weak and unscientific.

CSIRO's appearance at these meetings with the four papers discussed in this report, which CSIRO had not read nor understood in their entirety, is reprehensible. It may be that the academic and intellectual arrogance of CSIRO prevented them from appropriate preparation and they expected that we would glaze over at the sight of a few scientific papers. Or more likely, that CSIRO could not genuinely offer any empirical evidence for climate policies, hence their poor performance at these meetings.

CSIRO allows others to misrepresent CSIRO science without correction

Politicians frequently reference CSIRO as the basis for claiming danger from CO₂. CSIRO appears to not correct politicians, academics or journalists who make false, alarmist or exaggerated statements on climate, and allows CSIRO reports to be misrepresented.

Dr Alex Wonhas from CSIRO refused to say there is any danger from carbon dioxide from human activity, and suggested we ask ministers and politicians to state the source of their claims of danger. According to CSIRO, it has never advised politicians that human CO₂ is dangerous.

CSIRO has misled parliament

Broadly speaking, the "evidence" CSIRO provided as a basis for climate policy development and coming from inadequate climate modelling or discredited scientific papers, is a gross misleading of the Parliamentary process.

Quite specifically at Senate Estimates (October 2019 & March 2020), in Dr Larry Marshall's presence, Dr Peter Mayfield, (CSIRO's Executive Director Environment, Energy and Resources) stated to the panel of senators that CSIRO had provided me with the statistically significant data proving there has been climate change outside of natural, cyclical variation. This was not true.

Interviews with international scientists

After listening to and discussing with CSIRO their chosen scientific papers, I consulted with a range of scientists and experts in the area of climate. There was overwhelming confirmation that the evidence that CSIRO provides for policy development is inadequate. Below is a list of the scientists interviewed.

Prof John Christy: Mathematician, Climatologist

Prof David Legates: Climatologist, Statistician

Dr Craig Idso: Climatologist

Dr Nils Morner: Sea level expert

Prof Nir Shaviv: Atmospheric Physicist

Prof Will Happer: Physicist

Dr Willie Soon: Atmospheric Physicist

Emeritus Prof Ian Plimer: Geologist

Mr Steve McIntyre: Mathematician, Statistician

Mr Bill Kininmonth: Former senior BOM official and Meteorologist

Emeritus Prof Garth Paltridge: Former CSIRO senior researcher

Dr Howard Brady: Geologist, Antarctica researcher

Dr John McLean: Climate Scientist, first audit of Global Historical Climatic Network temperature data

Mr Tony Heller: Geologist, engineer auditing NASA-GISS data

Ms Susan Crockford: polar bear researcher

Prof Luiz Molion: Brazil meteorology bureau

Dr David Evans: Climate Modeler

Mr Alex Epstein: Energy expert, Philosopher

Mr Marc Morano: Former staff of USA Senator James Inhofe

Mr Dan MacDonald: Farmer who lost property rights due to UN Kyoto climate protocol.

Conclusions

- CSIRO's "evidence" for unprecedented change was easily refuted and a failure of peer-review was revealed in Marcott and Lecavalier.
- CSIRO specified no quantified evidence of human impact on any climate factor.
- CSIRO would not attribute danger to carbon dioxide from human activity and has not provided evidence to allow any politicians, including ministers, to attribute danger.
- CSIRO stated that the determination of danger was a matter for the public or for politicians.
- Australian climate policies have never been based on empirical evidence and logical scientific reasoning.
- After assessing CSIRO's cited peer-reviewed papers, it is inconceivable that government policy should be based on the unverified assumption that a peer-reviewed paper is accurate and contains the best available research, particularly when key data has been unscientifically fabricated.
- As Australia's premier government-funded climate science agency, CSIRO's gross deficiencies need to be investigated to establish reasons for CSIRO's deterioration.
- CSIRO's failure to correct government ministers claims of danger reveals that it has been afraid to speak out about obvious politically driven deviations from science.
- Integrity and accountability need to be restored for both research and for presenting scientific conclusions, as well as for scrutiny of political claims and policies.
- The CSIRO climate group's inadequate case does not justify spending tens of billions of dollars, nor does it justify the destruction of trillions of dollars of wealth as a result of climate policies that hurt families, export Australian jobs and erode national security.
- The onus is now on the federal parliament to scrap climate policies unless CSIRO can provide accurate, repeatable and verifiable empirical scientific evidence, within a logical scientific framework, that proves carbon dioxide from human activity affects climate variability and needs to be cut. Any proposed cuts need to be specified in terms of the amount, the impact and effects, together with the costs of making and not making the cuts.

Recommendations

1. Until the government provides scientific proof of specific quantified effects of human carbon dioxide, all climate policies need to stop immediately.
2. Australia needs a Royal Commission into climate science to restore scientific integrity into all government-funded climate science.
3. Australia needs to consider measures to ensure ongoing scientific integrity, including an Office of Science Integrity. Such an office would:
 - a) ensure scientific accuracy and robustness of all science used as a basis for policy development;
 - b) present a more accurate picture of science and guard the people of Australia against political interference in science and against vested interests misinterpreting science for personal gain;
 - c) establish a mechanism to fact check and review the science being used for policy;
 - d) manage the mandatory public posting of the science supposedly justifying policy that is claimed to be based on science. This is a policy proposal from America's administration to ensure public scrutiny in the same way that transparency portals have been successful in increasing public service accountability for expenditure in American states.
4. The employment of CSIRO's Chief Executive, Dr Larry Marshall and of Dr Peter Mayfield, needs to be reviewed. Both these executive officers contributed to tarnishing CSIRO's reputation for scientific integrity. Scientific integrity needs to be restored and given the behaviour of Drs Marshall and Mayfield and their failure of oversight as a minimum they would seem not capable of restoring scientific integrity.
5. The parliamentary debate that has never been held, needs to start with parties that are advocating climate policies presenting to parliament their empirical evidence in a framework proving causation and justifying their climate policies with specific quantified targets and impacts.

The full report can be viewed at:

<https://www.malcolmrobertsqld.com.au/restoring-scientific-integrity/>