

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE



PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067

Australia

Mob: 61+401692057

Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org

Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828

March 2010 No 491

ABC Radio National – *Counterpoint* Christopher Monckton: a passionate sceptic 25 January 2010

Christopher Monckton, a leading critic of the catastrophic global warming scenario, is about to begin an Australia lecture tour. He says there are more pressing environmental issues to deal with than a changing climate *adaptation rather than mitigation* he argues *is the smart way to go*.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Our next guest on *Counterpoint* is Christopher Walter Monckton, the Viscount Monckton of Brenchley. Lord Monckton is highly critical of the anthropogenic global warming orthodoxy, and he played a role in an October 2007 legal action which aimed to prevent Al Gore's documentary *An Inconvenient Truth* from being shown in English schools. Shortly before the Copenhagen climate conference, the prime minister of Australia Kevin Rudd delivered a speech to the Lowy Institute about climate change sceptics in which he referred to Lord Monckton six times. A response entitled 'An Open Letter to Australian Prime Minister Rudd' was published by the Science and Public Policy Institute on the 3rd of January, 2010. On the eve of his Australian tour, I asked him to outline his principal message.

Christopher Monckton: What I'm going to say is that you need to have a royal commission now to reassess climate science. I mean, look what's happened just in the last few months. We've had the 'climate-gate' emails revealing that all of the principal players in the IPCC who have been most articulate and most forthright in pushing the notion that climate change may prove catastrophic, have been linked together in what can only be described as a small but powerful conspiracy to bend, distort, invent, manufacture, fabricate, budge, shift, tamper with, tinker with and even destroy scientific evidence for the sake of over-sexing the dossier, to use an old phrase.

So I'm going to say, first of all, that now needs to be reassessed, and it's got to be done by an independent royal commission. Don't let the scientists do it on their own, you've got to pull in people from outside science to see whether the scientists are actually telling the truth and whether, even however passionately they may themselves believe what they're saying about climate, whether they actually really know, because the uncertainties in all this are far greater than the UN's climate panel would like to admit. So that's part one of my message.

Part two is that you really don't want to go down the ETS route. An emissions trading scheme would be the

largest tax in the history of Australia, it would have zero benefit to the climate, it would basically make no difference to it at all, it would cost trillions to no good purpose, and the only people who would benefit are absolute bankers. Is that really what you want?

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Your critics, you have many, and Tim Lambert, for example, says you only take low range data to reach a conclusion that catastrophes probably won't happen. Then of course alarmists, it could be said, only use worst-case data. So how does a member of the public balance these two competing claims?

Christopher Monckton: That's a very fair and sensible and proportionate question. You have people shrieking at you from both directions and you wonder who on earth is right. And that, if you like, is the policy makers' dilemma. Let me declare, first of all, so everybody knows exactly what the truth is, I am not a scientist. Yes, I am a reasonably competent mathematician and mathematics is the language of science, which means I can understand the scientific papers I read on this subject. But I'm not a scientist myself, so when you're listening to me I will say to you now on the air what I say whenever I begin my lectures, and I will be saying this all the way across Australia, and that is do not believe a word I say. I am not here to proselytise or preach. What I am here to do is to point out to you that we're not just in the territory of uncertainty now, we now know that the effect of CO₂ in causing warming, though it is a real effect, is a very small and harmless and beneficial one.

How do we know? Well, first of all we need to look at the last 150 years of temperature data, that's called the instrumental record. The only reliable part of that data is from about 1980 onwards when satellites were up there checking it, and if you look at that period and if you take the period between 1983 specifically and 2001, that's the only period in the recent record that we could have influenced because there just wasn't enough CO₂ being put out by us before then.

From 1983 to 2001 there was rapid warming, which stopped in 2001, since when there has been rapid

cooling. That period of sustained rapid warming, which is exactly parallel to and at the same warming rate as 1860 to 1880 or 1910 to 1940, so there's nothing unprecedented in it...that period of warming, what caused it? We can't tell what caused the previous two periods of warming at a similar rate equivalent to 1.6 Celsius per century just over those short periods. We don't know what caused those because we didn't have enough instruments to look at the time. Now we do. We have satellites up there that monitor what is happening in particular to outgoing radiation, which is what the debate is all about. We can also see what is happening to clouds.

And the key paper on this is Pinker et al, 2005. Pinker is not even a climate scientist. He's not involved in the global warming debate, he doesn't mention global warming in this paper, which is why I find it such impressive testimony. What he says is that he is an expert in working out whether satellites can tell us things about what's going on down here, and one of the things he found is that between 1983 and 2001, and particularly during the 1990s, there was a continuing, entirely natural, unconnected with anything we're doing, decline in cloud cover. If you have fewer clouds over you here in Australia, it gets hotter, right? Very, very simple.

So he then worked out what was the radiative forcing in watts per square metre from this naturally occurring change in cloud cover. He found it was three watts per square metre, compared with at maximum 0.8 watts per square metre for CO₂ and all other anthropogenic influences on the climate during that period. Therefore, four times as much warming was caused in that period by natural factors than by anthropogenic man-made factors.

And from that it's a relatively simple calculation, because we know there was 0.45 Celsius of warming over that period of 19 years, to work out what amount of warming a doubling of CO₂ would cause. And the answer is 0.43 Celsius, and not the 3.3 that the UN imagines. Less than half a degree Celsius is not a problem. That is a measured result, and the rule in science is that measurement always trumps models, and it's the only measurement of its kind that we have so far.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Let's move from science to politics. During the northern autumn of 2009, you embarked on a tour of North America to issue a warning against 'the binding implications that could follow for countries that signed the proposed Copenhagen treaty'. What specifically concerns you about the draft document?

Christopher Monckton: This draft treaty, which was dated September the 15th, and it had been buried where you couldn't really find it on a UN website, and a talented colleague of mine noticed that a note by the secretariat appeared to be rather longer than a note should be, and he found that annexed to the two-page note was a 168-page treaty draft which had not been issued to the world. But there it was. He sent it straight to me, and I read it and was horrified to find that at paragraph 38 of annex 1 there were two references and very clear references to the establishment of a world government. The word 'government' actually appeared in that context twice, and it's the first time I've seen the word 'government' appear in that context in any global treaty, and I've negotiated, written, interpreted

global treaties for a long time, so I know of what I speak.

So I was horrified at this, particularly because this world government was going to be given enormous powers to regulate all markets. There'd be no such thing as free markets anymore, they were going to transfer the operation of all markets to the control of this world government. It was going to have enormous powers of taxation and of regulation, not only in the environmental field but right across. It was going to take control of the commanding heights of the economy of the west.

And yet in these 186 pages, the words 'democracy', 'ballot', 'vote', 'election' do not occur even once. Why? Because they were wanting to set up a dictatorial government. It's long been the ambition of totalitarians on every side, and here they thought they were going to get away with it.

So I screamed and shouted and said this treaty draft exists. Once again, don't believe a word I say, go and look it up. If you think I've misinterpreted it, fine, but this is what I think it means. And four million people have now seen the speech in which I first announced that this treaty existed, and enormous numbers of them got onto their senators both here and in of course the USA, and said this treaty shall not pass. And by the time Copenhagen began they'd already backed off from trying to pursue that draft, and they came out instead with the damp squib which is the Copenhagen Accord, a very different animal, far less dangerous. Still expensive enough and still entirely pointless, but at least we're not going to have our democracy taken away this year.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Let's look at that damp squib. President Obama flew in, flew out, nothing binding was agreed, so what happens to cap and trade in America now?

Christopher Monckton: I think the significant thing there is the election result in Massachusetts where for the first time since 1972 a Republican has taken a Massachusetts senate seat, in a very hard-fought contest, by actually quite an impressive 5% majority, so he won it quite convincingly. And the Republicans in the senate are now hardening their line, not just by going against climate change on the economics, which everyone except Lord Stern agrees simply doesn't add up. There's no way it's worthwhile to mitigate carbon emissions. It's much, much better to wait and see whether you get any problem and then adapt to it if you do, that's the smart thing to do.

But I think therefore that they're not only arguing that economic point, they're now beginning to get into the scientific point. I've had letters copied to me from a couple of senators just while I've been here in Australia, writing to the administration and asking them difficult questions about the science. And that's the first time any major political party has systematically started asking questions about the science of the scientists who had just previously just lectured to it and said, 'You've got to believe this.'

I'll give you an example of this. When Sir David King, then the government science advisor in the UK, went in front of the environment committee of the House of Commons on the 30th March 2005, the first thing he said was that half the ice at the South Pole has gone. And those dumplings sat and looked at him. Not one of them asked him, 'What on earth do you mean?' In fact

none of the ice at the South Pole has gone, it's 8,850 feet deep last time I measured it and it's still accumulating.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: What about China post Copenhagen? Are they going to do anything different or..?

Christopher Monckton: China played a very interesting role. First of all, before Copenhagen, China got together with India and South Africa and Brazil, and these were the forthright four who got together and they said, one, we're not going to have any compulsory emissions cuts because our people are poor and the fastest way to get them out of poverty is to burn fossil fuels and if that emits CO₂, well, at least we'll stabilise our populations by making them more prosperous. That was point one.

Point two, they said, if you want us to make any emissions cuts, you in the west have got to pay. Point three, we will not accept any verification or monitoring of any emissions cuts we make unless those are cuts that you're paying for in the west. And four, we're not going to have climate change used as an excuse for reintroducing protectionism and prevention of free trade in our goods.

They took that line, and President Obama...and I was there, he went in and spent nearly an hour, 55 minutes with Wen Jiabao who is the president of the state council of China who went to Copenhagen, and at Copenhagen they had this meeting of nearly an hour, and at the end of that, Wen Jiabao told Obama, 'I am not going to vary from the policy which I and these other countries have agreed,' and he went straight out onto the stage and told them so. And I knew then that all was over and we're not going to get this binding treaty this year. They are going to try again in Mexico next year, we're not yet out of the woods.

So those Australians who are listening to this who happen to believe in the old fashioned concept of democracy, which I happen to love, then watch out because your governing class would still quite like to hand your powers of election over to an unelected world government if they possibly could, and you must stop them.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Since Copenhagen, and a lot has happened, the BBC for one has announced that it will carry out a probe into 'the accuracy and impartiality of its science reporting'. Does that surprise you?

Christopher Monckton: It surprises me very much that they have finally admitted that there's something wrong with the BBC's coverage. It has been relentlessly biased and really flagrantly biased to a degree that I haven't seen among any other broadcaster. Most other broadcasters, even if they tend to have a general proclivity towards the totalitarianism, towards being not merely mirrors but poodles of the governing establishment of the day, would nevertheless at least retain a little modicum of distance so that they could occasionally allow the other side to be heard. The BBC virtually never allowed the other side to be heard on this question, and they developed a marvellous variety of excuses of why they shouldn't have balance of this question.

And finally, so many people complained (including me) to the BBC trust that it has now given in and accepted that if the BBC is to retain its right to levy a 2-billion-pound licence fee tax on the population, then it's going to have to justify itself as still retaining the

independence that its charter requires. And I welcome this inquiry and I hope it will be straight.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Looking at the BBC and broadening it out to journalism in general, in commentary about climate, 'sceptic' has become a dirty word, especially for journalists. And yet you have crafted and trade as a journalist. Journalists pride themselves on their sceptical approach to the utterances of politicians...

Christopher Monckton: They used to.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Well, why has the IPCC had such a dream run?

Christopher Monckton: I think it's because what you've got here is a conspiracy...and I use this in a very wide sense, not in a [unclear...] conspiratorial sense...of the governing class worldwide against the government, the rich against the poor, the powerful against the weak, the big guy against the little guy. This is the age-old struggle actually of government and politics, and the great triumph of the United States constitution which had such profound influence all around the world, including back in our own country and in Australia, is in saying that the little guy, the guy with the vote, should prevail. And this, to the chattering classes, has always been something that they've never quite liked. They've had to tolerate it but they don't like the possibility of being thrown out by the electors. And so there's always a very strong tendency (and I'm not talking of right or left here, it's strong right across politics) to minimise the role of democracy and maximise the role of the politician, regardless of whether he's been elected to his post or not.

What has happened here is that the IPCC came along just at the moment when a number of strands of thinking, particularly in western countries, were moving away from allowing democracy, because the people were regarded, frankly, as too stupid to be allowed to vote on things and therefore it all had to be done by 'we, the politicians who were cleverer than they were', not a point of view I agree with but it was a widely spoken point of view among governing circles worldwide.

So when the IPCC came along and said, right, we need a world government, we need to deal with this major issue, a lot of politicians who were in search of an issue said, oh, now we can stand up and make speeches about saving the planet, no less, that makes us really sound important. So a number of interests came together. Bankers in particular wanted to make a fortune out of carbon trading. All the boys with red braces in the city of London who call it 'trading hot air', they were all there. The schoolteachers wanted to motivate their kids to save the planet from the sins of their parents. What can be more appealing for kids than a story like that? The media for whom it would always sell more newspapers of advertising space if you say 'World to End: Shock' than if you tell the truth which is 'Climate Continuing Changeable: Yawn'.

And so you put all these interests together and therefore it's not so much a conspiracy as a coalition of interests, all of whom wanted this to be true while at one part of them there was still a kind of corner of sanity somewhere saying, well, actually we don't want this to be true. The fact is it isn't true, and what has happened is the ordinary people have begun to smell...I can't use the word on the air, but it doesn't smell very nice. They've smelled the propaganda, the sheer

hysteria of those who have been trying to promote this scare, and their unwillingness to debate.

So what we're seeing now is a collapse in this belief system, as it was, it had become a kind of religion. And to take your point about scepticism, which is where you started with this question, TH Huxley when he was debating with Bishop 'Soapy Sam' Wilberforce, this was back in 1860, on the question of evolution, in the great hall of the Oxford Museum of Natural History, a huge crowd gathered. Huxley stood up and said this, 'To the improver of natural knowledge,' that was his phrase for a scientist... 'The improver of natural knowledge,' he said, 'does not recognise authority as such.' For him, scepticism (and he used the word 'scepticism') is the highest of duties, blind faith the one unpardonable sin. And I agree.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: This weekend there's some more clouds that have appeared with relation to hurricanes and floods. The IPCC has stated that the link to global warming of hurricanes and floods has perhaps been overstated. The vice chairman of the IPCC said the UN body was now reassessing the evidence, and the author who wrote the original report, a Mr Robert Muir-Wood, he was a contributing author of the IPCC report, he said, 'The idea that catastrophes are rising in cost because of climate change is completely misleading.' So, again, we have some problems here with hurricanes and floods.

Christopher Monckton: This is very interesting because the original error about hurricanes and floods came from, once again, the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, the one on whom all the terrestrial temperature records depend. I testified in front of Congress six months ago alongside Tom Karl who is the director of the National Climatic Data Centre, which is a subdivision of NOAA which produces all this hurricane material. And I had said in front of the Congress that in fact there was no link between warmer weather and hurricanes and that, indeed, as proof of this, NOAA were saying there's been 0.6 to 0.7 Celsius of warming over the last 100 years but the number of land-falling Atlantic hurricanes on the coast of the United States during that time had remained absolutely constant right across the period, no trend at all.

Tom Karl tried to say that I wasn't telling the truth, and so he got out a chart to show to the congressmen, and his own chart showed that I was in fact wrong in one respect; it wasn't 100 years, it was 150 years which they had records of land-falling hurricanes which had shown no trend. So how did he then try to get around the point? He said, 'Ah, but look at the last 30 years where there's been a huge increase in non-hurricane tropical storms.' And I said, 'Yes, because 30 years ago they introduced satellite monitoring and the increase you're seeing there is purely an artefact of the better method of measurement and you know it.' And he had the grace to blush.

He then went on...I produced a graph showing that there had been global cooling since 2001, very, very sharp global cooling on all measures. And he was asked by Joe Barton, the ranking minority member on the

committee I was appearing in front of, which was the Energy and Commerce Committee, he was asked, 'Is Lord Monckton lying to us? Here we've had all these officials like yourself coming in front of us for months telling us global warming is a problem, and we now get told, by a peer from the UK, that in fact we've had nine years global cooling. Would you care to explain?' And so Tom Karl flannelled, and he said, 'Well, I wouldn't quite put it like that.' So we were both asked to write to the committee to justify our positions, and I wrote simply sending a graph where I plotted the data from Tom Karl's own NCDC global temperature dataset, and it showed a very clear, very decisive decline in temperatures over the nine-year period.

And so what we've got is these people making money, these scientists, out of pretending there's a problem, giving bogus facts, even in front of their own elected officials. We've seen it with David King in London, we've seen it with Tom Karl there in the States, I've seen it over and over again, straightforward falsehoods being put in front of electric representatives who are then misled. But when I'm there they don't get away with it because I've gone back and checked the actual data and plotted it for myself. That's the way science is or ought to be done.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Let's stick with the UK and look to the future. Ed Miliband, the UK climate change secretary of state, he says that the UN talks in Mexico at the end of the year are likely to produce 'a legally binding climate change treaty'. Is he on the money?

Christopher Monckton: That's what he said just before the Copenhagen conference and it didn't happen. There is however, and we mustn't get triumphalist or complacent here...there is a danger that this momentum to set up a world government via a binding treaty, using the climate as the Trojan horse, as the excuse for doing this, may yet succeed. I will of course be going to Mexico to do what I did at Copenhagen and try to talk to the delegates and say, 'Look, for heaven's sake, the science doesn't add up. Don't throw away the future development of the Earth by going down this road.'

There are so many real environmental problems that need to be dealt with. Deforestation, which I was talking to the Prince of Wales about the other day, there he's right. He's wrong about the climate but he's right about that. You've got the encroachment of humanity on the fragile habitats of so many of our fellow creatures. You've got overfishing of the oceans. These are real problems that need to be addressed and where, if we were to start throwing billions or trillions around, let's at least spend on them on the real problems and not on what is now nearly universally recognised by all sane people to be the non-problem of climate change.

Paul Comrie-Thomson: Christopher Walter Monckton, the Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, who was starting an Australian lecture tour this week. A link to his pamphlet, 'An Open Letter to Australian Prime Minister Rudd' will be posted on the *Counterpoint* website.

AN OPEN LETTER TO AUSTRALIAN PRIME MINISTER RUDD

by *The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley* | January 3, 2010

From The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley:

Shortly before the Copenhagen Climate Conference, the Prime Minister of Australia, Kevin Rudd, delivered a canting, 45-minute rant about the "Denialists", "Climate Change Deniers", and "Skeptics" who, he said, were entirely funded by special interests and who were now so dangerous that they were putting Our Planet's Future And The Future Of Our Children And Our Grandchildren in jeopardy.

Kevin Rudd seems not to like me very much: he mentioned me by name six times in the speech, in generally uncomplimentary terms. I was too busy to reply to him before Jokenhagen, but, since I shall be travelling to Australia in a couple of weeks for a barnstorming three-week lecture-tour (watch this space for dates and venues), I thought it was time to reply to Mr. Rudd.

On New Year's Day I sent him the following letter, but I am not holding my breath for a reply. The unanswerable is seldom answered.

1 January 2010

The Honourable Mr. Kevin Rudd, Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia.

Prime Minister,

CLIMATE CHANGE: PROPOSED PERSONAL BRIEFING

Your speech on 6 November 2009 to the Lowy Institute, in which you publicly expressed some concern at my approach to the climate question, has prompted several leading Australian citizens to invite me come on tour to explain myself in a series of lectures in Australia later this month. I am writing to offer personal briefings on why "global warming" is a non-problem to you and other party leaders during my visit. For convenience, I am copying this letter to them, and to the Press.

Your speech mentioned my remarks about the proposal for world "government" in the early drafts of what had been intended as a binding Copenhagen Treaty. These proposals were not, as you suggested, a "conspiracy theory" from the "far right" with "zero basis in evidence". Your staff will find them in paragraphs 36-38 of the main text of Annex 1 to the 15 September draft of the Treaty. The word "government" appears twice at paragraph 38. After much adverse publicity in democratic countries, including Australia, the proposals were reluctantly dropped before Copenhagen.

You say I am one of "those who argue that any multilateral action is by definition evil". On the contrary: my first question is whether any action at all is required, to which – as I shall demonstrate – the objective economic and scientific answer is No. Even if multilateral action were required, which it is not, national governments in the West are by tradition democratically elected. Therefore, a fortiori, transnational or global governments should also be made and unmade by voters at the ballot-box. The climate ought not to be used as a shoddy pretext for international bureaucratic-centralist dictatorship. We committed Europeans have had more than enough of that already with the unelected but all-powerful Kommissars of the hated EU, who make nine-tenths of

our laws by decree (revealingly, they call them "Directives" or "Commission Regulations"). The Kommissars (that is the official German word for them) inflict their dictates upon us regardless of what the elected European or any other democratic Parliament says or wishes. Do we want a worldwide EU? No.

You say I am one of "those who argue that climate change does not represent a global market failure". Yet it is only recently that opinion sufficient to constitute a market signal became apparent in the documents of the IPCC, which is, however, a political rather than a scientific entity. There has scarcely been time for a "market failure". Besides, corporations are falling over themselves to cash in on the giant financial fraud against the little guy that carbon taxation and trading have already become in the goody-two-shoes EU – and will become in Australia if you get your way.

You say I was one of "those who argue that somehow the market will magically solve the problem". In fact I have never argued that, though in general the market is better at solving problems than the habitual but repeatedly-failed dirigisme of the etatistes predominant in the classe politique today.

The questions I address are a) whether there is a climate problem at all; and b) even if there is one, and even if per impossibile it is of the hilariously-overblown magnitude imagined by the IPCC, whether waiting and adapting as and if necessary is more cost-effective than attempting to mitigate the supposed problem by trying to reduce the carbon dioxide our industries and enterprises emit.

Let us pretend, *solum ad argumentum*, that a given proportionate increase in CO₂ concentration causes the maximum warming imagined by the IPCC. The IPCC's bureaucrats are careful not to derive a function that will convert changes in CO₂ concentration directly to equilibrium changes in temperature. I shall do it for them.

We derive the necessary implicit function from the IPCC's statement to the effect that equilibrium surface warming **delta-T** at CO₂ doubling will be **(3.26 ± ln 2) C°**. Since the IPCC, in compliance with Beer's Law, defines the radiative forcing effect of CO₂ as logarithmic rather than linear, our implicit function can be derived at once. The coefficient is the predicted warming at CO₂ doubling divided by the logarithm of 2, and the term (C/C₀) is the proportionate increase in CO₂ concentration. Thus, **delta-T = (4.7 ± 1) ln(C/C₀) | Celsius degrees** we are looking at the IPCC's maximum imagined warming rate, so we simply write – **delta-T = 5.7 ln(C/C₀) | Celsius degrees**.

Armed with this function telling us the maximum equilibrium warming that the IPCC predicts from any given change in CO₂ concentration, we can now determine, robustly, the maximum equilibrium warming that is likely to be forestalled by any proposed cut in the current upward path of CO₂ emissions. Let me demonstrate.

By the end of this month, according to the Copenhagen Accord, all parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change are due to report what cuts in emissions they will make by 2020. Broadly speaking, the Annex 1 parties, who will account for about half of global emissions over the period, will commit to reducing current emissions by 30% by 2020, or 15% on average in the decade between now and 2020.

Thus, if and only if every party to the Copenhagen Accord complies with its obligations to the full, today's emissions will be reduced by around half of that 15%, namely 7.5%, compared with business as usual. If the trend of the past decade continues, with business as usual we shall add 2 ppmv/year, or 20 ppmv over the decade, to atmospheric CO2 concentration. Now, 7.5% of 20 ppmv is 1.5 ppmv.

We determine the warming forestalled over the coming decade by comparing the business-as-usual warming that would occur between now and 2020 if we made no cuts in CO2 emissions with the lesser warming that would follow full compliance with the Copenhagen Accord. Where today's CO2 concentration is 388 ppmv – **Business as usual: $\Delta T = 5.7 \ln(408.0/388) = 0.29$ C°** – **Copenhagen: $\Delta T = 5.7 \ln(406.5/388) = 0.27$ C°** = **"Global warming" forestalled, 2010-2020: 0.02 C°**

One-fiftieth of a Celsius degree of warming forestalled is all that complete, global compliance with the Copenhagen Accord for an entire decade would achieve. Yet the cost of achieving this result – an outcome so small that our instruments would not be able to measure it – would run into trillions of dollars. Do your Treasury models demonstrate that this calculation is in any way erroneous? If they do, junk them.

You say "formal global and national economic modelling" shows "that the costs of inaction are greater than the costs of acting". You ask for my "equivalent evidence basis to Treasury modelling published by the Government of the industry and employment impacts of climate change". I respond that the rigorous calculation that I have described, which your officials may verify for themselves, shows that whatever costs may be imagined to flow from anthropogenic "global warming" will scarcely be mitigated at all, even by trillions of dollars of expenditure over the coming decade.

Every economic analysis except that of the now-discredited Lord Stern, with its near-zero discount rate and its absurdly inflated warming rates, comes to the same ineluctable conclusion: adaptation to climate change, in whatever direction, as and if necessary, is orders of magnitude more cost-effective than attempts at mitigation. In a long career in policy analysis in and out of government, I have never seen so cost-ineffective a proposed waste of taxpayers' money as the trillions which today's scientifically-illiterate governments propose to spend on attempting – with all the plausibility of King Canute – to stop the tide from coming in.

Remember that I have done this calculation on the basis that everyone who should comply with the Copenhagen Accord actually does comply. Precedent does not look promising. The Kyoto Protocol, the Copenhagen Accord's predecessor, has been in operation for more than a decade, and it was supposed to reduce global CO2 emissions by 2012. So far, after billions spent on global implementation of Kyoto, global CO2 emissions have risen compared with when Kyoto was first signed.

Remember too that we have assumed the maximum warming that the CO2 imagines might occur in response to a given proportionate increase in CO2 concentration. Yet even the IPCC's central estimate of CO2's warming effect, according to an increasing number of serious papers in the peer-reviewed literature, is a five-fold exaggeration. If those papers are right, after a further decade of incomplete compliance and billions squandered, warming forestalled may prove to be just a thousandth of a degree.

Now ask yourself this. Are you, personally, and your advisers, personally, and your administration's officials, personally, willing to make the heroically pointless sacrifices that you so insouciantly demand of others in the name of Saving The Planet For Future Generations? I beg leave to think not. At Flag 1 I have attached what I have reason to believe is a generally accurate list of the names and titles of the delegation that you led to Copenhagen to bring back the non-result whose paltriness, pointlessness and futility we have now rigorously demonstrated. There are 114 names on the list. One hundred and fourteen. Enough to fill a mid-sized passenger jet. Half a dozen were all that was really necessary – and perhaps one from each State in Australia. If you and your officials are not willing to tighten your belts when a tempting foreign junket at taxpayers' expense is in prospect, why, pray, should the taxpayers tighten theirs?

You say that climate-change "deniers" – nasty word, that, and you should really have known better than to use it – are "small in number but too dangerous to be ignored", and "well resourced". In fact, governments, taxpayer-funded organizations, taxpayer-funded teachers, and taxpayer-funded environmental groups have spent something like 50,000 times as much on "global warming" propaganda as their opponents have spent on debunking this new and cruel superstition. And that is before we take account of the relentless prejudice of the majority of the mainstream news media.

How, then, it is that we, the supposed minority who will not admit that the emperor of "global warming" is adequately clad, are somehow prevailing? How is it that we are convincing more and more of the population not to place any more trust in the "global warming" theory? The answer is that the "global warming" theory is not

true, and no amount of bluster or braggadocio, ranting or rodomontade will make it true.

You say that our aim, in daring to oppose the transient fashion for apocalypticism, is "to erode just enough of the political will that action becomes impossible". No. Our aim is simply to ensure that the truth is widely enough understood to prevent the squandering of precious resources on addressing the non-problem of anthropogenic "global warming". The correct policy response to a non-problem is to have the courage to do nothing. No interventionist likes to do nothing. Nevertheless, the do-nothing option, scientifically and economically speaking, is the right option.

You say that I and others like me base our thinking on the notion that "the cost of not acting is nothing". Well, after a decade and a half with no statistically-significant "global warming", and after three decades in which the mean warming rate has been well below the ever-falling predictions of the UN's climate panel, that notion has certainly not been disproven in reality.

However, the question I address is not that but this. Is the cost of taking action many times greater than the cost of not acting? The answer to this question is Yes.

Millions are already dying of starvation in the world's poorest nations because world food prices have doubled in two years. That abrupt, vicious doubling was caused by a sharp drop in world food production, caused in turn by suddenly taking millions of acres of land out of growing food for people who need it, so as to grow biofuels for clunkers that don't. The scientifically-illiterate, economically-innumerate policies that you advocate – however fashionable you may conceive them to be – are killing people by the million.

You say my logic "belongs in a casino, not a science lab". Yet it is you who are gambling with poor people's lives, and it is you – or, rather, they – who are losing: and losing not merely their substance but their very existence. The biofuel scam is born of the idiotic notion – a notion you uncritically espouse – that increasing by less than 1/2000 this century the proportion of the Earth's atmosphere occupied by CO₂ may prove catastrophic. At a time when so many of the world's people are already short of food, the UN's right-to-food rapporteur, Herr Ziegler, has roundly and rightly condemned the biofuel scam as nothing less than "a crime against humanity".

The scale of the slaughter is monstrous, with food riots (largely unreported in the Western news media, and certainly not mentioned by you in your recent speech) in a dozen regions of the Third World over the past two years. Yet this cruel, unheeded slaughter is founded upon a lie: the claim by the IPCC that it is 90% certain that most of the "global warming" since 1950 is manmade. This claim – based not on science but on a show of hands among political representatives, with China wanting a lower figure and other nations wanting a higher figure – is demonstrably, self-servingly false. Peer-reviewed analyses of changes in cloud cover over

recent decades – changes almost entirely unconnected with changes in CO₂ concentration – show that it was this largely-natural reduction in cloud cover from 1983-2001 and a consequent increase in the amount of short-wave and UV solar radiation reaching the Earth that accounted for five times as much warming as CO₂ could have caused.

Nor is the IPCC's great lie the only lie. If you will allow me to brief you and your advisers, I will show you lie after lie after lie after lie in the official documents of the IPCC and in the speeches of its current chairman, who has made himself a multi-millionaire as a "global warming" profiteer.

However, if you will not make the time to hear me for half an hour before you commit your working people to the futile indignity of excessive taxation and pointless over-regulation without the slightest scientific or economic justification, and to outright confiscation of their farmland without compensation on the fatuous pretext that the land is a "carbon sink", then I hope that you will at least nominate one of the scientists on your staff to address the two central issues that I have raised in this letter: namely, the egregious cost-ineffectiveness of attempting to mitigate "global warming" by emissions reduction, and the measured fact, well demonstrated in the scientific literature, that a largely-natural change in cloud cover in recent decades caused five times as much "global warming" as CO₂. It is also a measured fact that, while those of the UN's computer models that can be forced with an increase in sea-surface temperatures all predict a consequent fall in the flux of outgoing radiation at top of atmosphere, in observed reality there is an increase. In short, the radiation that is supposed to be trapped here in the troposphere to cause "global warming" is measured as escaping to space much as usual, so that it cannot be causing more than around one-fifth of the warming the IPCC predicts.

My list of the Copenhagen junketers from Australia's governing class is attached. All those taxpayer dollars squandered, just to forestall 0.02 C° of "global warming" in ten years. Yet, in the past decade and a half, there has been no "global warming" at all. Can you not see that it would be kinder to your working people to wait another decade and see whether global temperatures even begin to respond as the IPCC has predicted? What is the worst that can happen if you wait? Just 0.02 C° of global warming that would not otherwise have occurred. It's a no-brainer.

Yours faithfully,

VISCOUNT MONCKTON OF BRENCHLEY

THE RUDD GOVERNMENT'S COPENHAGEN JUNKETLIST, Dec. 2009

The following 114 officials or representatives of the Australian Government and of State administrations attended the UN climate conference at Copenhagen in December 2009 – 8

1. Kevin Michael Rudd, Prime Minister; 2. Penelope Wong, Minister, Clim. Chg. & Water; 3. Louise Helen Hand, Ambassador for Clim. Chg.; 4. David Fredericks, Dep. Chf. of Staff, Dept. of the Prime Minister; 5. Philip Green Oam, Sen.

Policy Advr., Foreign Affairs Dept.; 6. Andrew Charlton, Sen. Advr., Prime Minister's Dept.; 7. Lachlan Harris, Sen. Press Sec., Prime Minister's Office; 8. Scott Dewar, Sen. Advr., Prime Minister's Office; 9. Clare Penrose, Advr., Prime Minister's Office; 10. Fiona Sugden, Media Advr., Prime Minister's Office; 11. Lisa French, Prime Minister's Office; 12. Jeremy Hilman, Advr., Prime Minister's Office; 13. Tarah Barzanji, Advr., Prime Minister's Office; 14. Kate Shaw, Exec. Sec., Prime Minister's Office; 15. Gaile Barnes, Exec. Asst., Prime Minister's Office; 16. Gordon de Brouwer, Dep. Sec. Prime Minister's Dept.; 17. Patrick Suckling, 1st Asst. Sec., Intl. Div., Prime Minister's Office; 18. Rebecca Christie, Prime Minister's Office; 19. Michael Jones, Official Photographer, Prime Minister & Cabinet; 20. Stephan Rudzki; 21. David Bell, Federal Agent, Aus. Federal Police; 22. Kym Baillie, Aus. Federal Police; 23. David Champion, Aus. Federal Police; 24. Matt Jebb, Federal Agent Aus. Federal Police; 25. Craig Kendall, Federal Agent, Aus. Federal Police; 26. Squadron Leader Ian Lane, Staff Offr., VIP Operations; 27. John Olenich, Media Advr., to Minister Wong, Office of Clim. Chg. & Water; 28. Kristina Hickey, Advr. to Minister Wong, Office of Clim. Chg. & Water; 29. Martin Parkinson, Sec., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 30. Howard Bamsey, Special Envoy for Clim. Chg., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 31. Robert Owen-Jones, Asst. Sec., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 32. Clare Walsh Asst. Sec., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 33. Jenny Elizabeth ; ilkinson, Policy Advr., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 34. Elizabeth Peak, Princ. Legal Advr., Intl. Clim. Law, Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 35. Kristin Tilley, Dir., Multilat. Negots., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 36. Andrew Ure, Actg. Dir., Multilat. Negots., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 37. Annemarie Watt, Dir., Land Sector Negots., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 38. Kushla Munro, Dir., Intl. Forest Carbon Sectn. Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 39. Kathleen Annette Rowley, Dir., Strategic & Tech. Analysis, Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 40. Anitra Cowan Asst. Dir., Multilat. Negots., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 41. Sally Truong, Asst. Dir., Multilat. Negots., Intl. Div. Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 42. Jane Wilkinson, Asst. Dir., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 43. Tracey Mackay, Asst. Dir., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 44. Laura Brown, Asst. Dir., Multilat. Negots., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 45. Tracey-Anne Leahey, Delegation Mgr., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 46. Nicola Loffler, Sen. Legal Advr., Intl. Clim. Law, Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 47. Tamara Cull, Legal Advr., Intl. Clim. Law, Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 48. Jessica Allen, Legal Support Offr., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 49. Sanjiva de Silva, Legal Advr., Intl. Clim. Law, Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 50. Gaia Puleston, Political Advr., Dept. of Clim. Chg. 51. Penelope Morton, Policy Advr., UNFCCC Negots., Intl. Div., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 52. Claire Elizabeth Watt, Policy Advr., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 53. Amanda Walker, Policy Offr., Multilat. Negots., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 54. Alan David Lee, Policy Advr., Land Sector Negots., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 55. Erika Kate Oord, Aus. Stakeholder Mgr., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 56. Jahda Kirian Swanborough, Comms. Mgr., Ministerial Comms., Dept. of Clim. Chg.; 57. H.E. Sharyn Minahan, Ambassador, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 58. Julia Feeney, Dir., Clim. Chg. & Envir., 9 Dept. of Foreign Affairs & Trade; 59. Chester Geoffrey Cunningham, 2nd Sec., DFAT, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to Germany; 60. Rachael Cooper, Exec. Offr., Clim. Chg. & Envir., Dept. of Foreign Affairs & Trade; 61. Rachael Grivas, Exec. Offr., Envir. Branch, Dept. of Foreign Affairs & Trade; 62. Moya Collett, Desk Offr., Clim. Chg. & Envir. Sectn., Dept. of Foreign Affairs & Trade; 63. Rob Law, Dept. of Foreign Affairs & Trade; 64. Robin Davies, Asst. Dir.

Gen., Sustainable Devel. Gp., Aus. Agency for Intl. Devel.; 65. Deborah Fulton, Dir., Policy & Global Envir., Aus. Agency for Intl. Devel.; 66. Katherine Vaughn, Policy Advr., Policy & Global Envir., Aus. Agency for Intl. Devel.; 67. Brian Dawson, Policy Advr., Aus. Agency for Intl. Devel.; 68. Andrew Leigh Clarke, Dep. Sec., Dept. of Res. Devel., Western Aus.; 69. Bruce Wilson, Gen. Mgr., Envir. Energy & Envir. Div., Dept. of Resrc. Devel., W. Aus.; 70. Jill McCarthy, Policy Advr., Dept. of Resrc., Energy & Tourism; 71. Simon French, Policy Advr., Dept. of Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry; 72. Ian Michael Ruscoe, Policy Advr., Dept. of Agriculture, Fisheries & Forestry; 73. David Walland, Acting Supt., Nat. Clim. Centre, Bureau of Meteorology; 74. Damien Dunn Sen. Policy Advr., Aus. Treasury; 75. Helen Hawka Fuhrman, Policy Offr., Renewable Energy Policy & Partnerships; 76. Scott Vivian Davenport, Chf., Economics, NSW Dept. of Industry & Invest.; 77. Graham Julian Levitt, Policy Mgr., Clim. Chg., NSW Dept. of Industry & Invest.; 78. Kate Jennifer Jones, Minister, Clim. Chg. & Sustainability, Qld. Govt.; 79. Michael William Dart, Princ. Policy Advr., Office of Kate Jones, MP, Qld. Govt.; 80. Matthew Anthony Jamie Skoien, Sen. Dir., Office of Clim. Chg. Qld. Govt.; 81. Michael David Rann, Premier, S. Aus. Dept. of Premier & Cabinet, S. Aus.; 82. Suzanne Kay Harter, Advr., Dept. of Premier & Cabinet, S. Aus.; 83. Paul David Flanagan, Mgr., Comms., Govt. of S. Aus.; 84. Timothy O'Loughlin, Dep. Chf. Exec., Sust. & Wkfc. Mgmt., S. Aus. Dept. of Premier; 85. Nyla Sarwar M.Sc, student, Linacre College, University of Oxford; 86. Gavin Jennings, Minister, Envir. & Clim. Chg. & Innovation, Victorian Govt.; 87. Sarah Broadbent, Sustainability Advr.; 88. Rebecca Falkingham, Sen. Advr., Victoria Govt./Office of Clim. Chg.; 89. Simon Camroux, Policy Advr., Energy Supply Ass. of Aus. Ltd.; 90. Geoff Lake, Advr., Aus. Local Govt. Assoc.; 91. Sridhar Ayyalaraju, Post Visit Controller, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 92. Tegan Brink Dep. Visit Controller & Security Liaison Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 93. Melissa Eu Suan Goh, Trspt. Liaison Offr. & Consul, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 94. Lauren Henschke, Support Staff, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 95. Maree Fay, Accommodation Liaison Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 96. Patricia McKinnon, Comms. Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 97. Eugene Olim, Passport/Baggage Liaison Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 98. Belinda Lee Adams; 99. Jacqui Ashworth, Media Liaison Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 100. Patricia Smith, Media Liaison Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 101. Martin Bo Jensen, Research & Public Dipl. Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 102. Mauro Kolobaric, Consular Support, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 103. Susan Flanagan, Consular Support, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 104. Stephen Kanaridis, IT Support Offr., Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 105. George Reid, Support Staff, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 106. Ashley Wright, Support Staff, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 107. Jodie Littlewood, Support Staff, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 108. Thomas Millhouse, Support Staff, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 109. Timothy Whittley, Support Staff Driver, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 110. Julia Thomson, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 111. Donald Frater, Chf. of Staff to Minister Wong Office of Clim. Chg. & Water; 112. Jacqui Smith, Media Liaison, Dipl. Miss. of Aus. to DK; 113. Greg French, Sen. Legal Advr. (Envir.), Dept. of Foreign Affairs & Trade; 114. Jeremy Hillman, Advr., Prime Minister's Office.

Source: <http://sppiblog.org/news/lord-monckton-replies-to-australias-canting-ranting-prime-minister>.
