

Transcript

Station: **CANBERRA CONFERENCE UNIT** Date: **03/02/2010**

Program: **NATIONAL PRESS CLUB** Time: **12:30 PM**

Summary ID: **C00037764462**

Item: **PRIVATE ADDRESS BY LORD MONCKTON ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE.**

Demographics:	Male 16+	Female 16+	All people	ABs	GBs
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

CONVENOR: We're talking about climate science here, we're not worrying about religious beliefs. Now, having said that, in a moment the venerable Dr Edwin Byford will be giving a brief blessing and we look forward to that. But the thing about this climate stuff is that it's terribly important to get the facts straight.

What do they say: the truth is not changed by being ignored or manipulated or any other damn thing, so that's quite important. Governments do strange things when they're badly briefed, like starting wars because there are weapons of mass destruction that don't exist.

Now, we here in Canberra where it's the crossroads where political power gets exercised, it is very clear I think to most people and increasingly clear to the majority that the information that has been fed to the Government on which it's attempting to make policy has gross inaccuracies. By the time that Lord Monckton and Professor Plimer have finished here I think it will be very clear how big the gap is



between what the facts are and what information government's been given.

And about the only other thing that I would like to say is that I was at a seminar involving a lot of farmers years ago and a politician, God bless him, said, well, you people who have survived and succeeded within the business and market process, that's how you've got on in the world. But he said, just be a little bit careful about people in representative organisations because very often they - major success has been with the political process. Never jump to conclusions because they're masters of the political process that they are competent in the other ones that really matter.

Now I think that's very critical because we're in Canberra and I really hope that all of us, and particularly the media, can sort of bear that in mind. We've got to get - got the correct information made clear.

The last thing I would like to say is that, you know, Lord Monckton and Ian Plimer are people who are prepared to put serious information to a royal commission to look into - to make sure we get the facts straight and we can get the politics right and people who give misinformation to royal commissions can tend to get into a fair bit of legal trouble. So it sounds like a fairly good mechanism.



MEDIA MONITORS

Now just in closing this and inviting Dr Byford to do the blessing, I would really like to thank many people, but particularly the support from the New South Wales Farmers Association, who've done so much behind the scenes. Couldn't have - we couldn't have done it without them. So if you're not farmers and not members there's capacity for associate members and so on.

But with that, please Doctor, if you would...

[Applause]

DR EDWIN BYFORD: I am an Anglican which means I am a Christian and I am told that it's rare for Anglicans to believe in God.

[Laughter]

I do actually believe in God so this is going to be a Christian prayer. Oh Lord, our God, you are the God of truth and of justice. Open our minds to your truth and open our hearts that all our actions may be just and equitable. We ask this in Jesus name. Amen.

CONVENOR: Thank you Doctor. Now, I'd just like to invite Professor Ian Plimer up to speak briefly and to introduce Lord Monckton. I believe he's probably known to all of you in one way or another, particularly through his book, *Heaven and Earth*. And just while I'm on books, the Institute of Public



MEDIA MONITORS

Affairs shortly will be releasing a book called *Climate Changes: The Facts* to which both Ian Plimer and Lord Monckton are contributing authors and so just a little quick one for that. Thank you.

[Applause]

IAN PLIMER:

Well ladies and gentlemen, thank you for coming. Lord Monckton has asked me to summarise 4567 million years of geological time in three minutes and 21 seconds.

[Laughter]

LORD MONCKTON:

And I'm counting.

IAN PLIMER:

And you're counting. And the key points are that climate on planet earth has always changed. These changes in the past have been far greater than anything we can measure today. And the rate of change in the past sometimes has been extraordinary.

Point number one, climate has always changed and always will. In the past, the carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere has been very high. It's been up to a thousand times higher than now. And there were times in the past where we had ice ages. We are currently in an ice age, which started 34 million years ago and we are currently in one of the interglacials of that big ice age. Six out of six of our ice ages started when carbon dioxide was much,



much higher than now. Two of the six of these ice ages had ice at sea level and at the equator.

And if we've had carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, up to a thousand times higher than now, how on earth could it drive climate change?

We also see that over time that rock called limestone starts to appear and we get more and more limestone from algal reefs - that's algal not Al Gore...

[Laughter and applause]

...and we have been sequestering carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere and putting it into the rocks. That process started on a Tuesday about four - 2500 million years ago. That process is continuing. That is why we've gone from an atmosphere with 30 per cent carbon dioxide to about 0.04 per cent, because we naturally sequester carbon dioxide which is plant food, it is not a pollutant.

In this room here you are breathing in air with 400 parts per million carbon dioxide. When you breathe out it is 4000 times parts per million. It is not a poison, otherwise you would all drop dead.

In the past we have seen these very high carbon dioxides contents in the atmosphere yet we did not have acid oceans. Why? Because sea water mixes



MEDIA MONITORS

with sediment and with rocks and that sea water is buffered and stays alkaline.

In the past we've had sea levels changes associated with all sorts of things, with ocean floors rising and falling, with continents rising and falling, and these sea level changes are not the couple of millimetres that people are having conniptions about, these sea level changes have been up to 1500 metres. That's a sea level change.

And in the past we have seen that there have been some great changes. Twelve thousand years ago you could have walked - if you'd wanted to, and God knows why you'd want to - but you could have walked from PNG to Tasmania. Sea level from 12,000 years ago to 6000 years ago rose 120 metres, that's that much every year. That's a sea level change.

And during that process we had a rapid temperature change of about 15 degrees Celsius in 20 years. That's global warming.

And then Roman times, it was warm. It was much warmer than now and we had a 600 year period when it was warm, yet no industry made the planet warm. We dropped into the Dark Ages and we had massive depopulation, we had disease. We lost a lot of people because it was cold.



MEDIA MONITORS

Then it - we bounced into the medieval warming and we had a 400 year period when it was warm, so warm that the Vikings grew barley and wheat and had sheep and cattle on Greenland. We know from the depth of the graves that there was no permafrost. It was warm, considerably warmer than now and it was not apparent to me that we had any heavy industry then.

[Laughter]

And then we dropped into the little ice age, which is where Lord Monckton starts his talk. We dropped into the little ice age, it was cold, it was freezing cold and we had massive depopulation. We had famine and the Plague hit Europe in 1347, and what do you think's going to happen after a little ice age? It actually gets warm.

Now I know you're totally gobsmacked about that, but we've had some 300 years of warming and this is what Lord Monckton is going to be talking about, the last 150 years. And Lord Monckton has been educated at Harrow and at Cambridge and he got a real education because he studied the classics. And you will see from that, that allows him to deal with matters of logic, which seem to have abandoned many people in today's world.

But he also has something else under his belt and that's mathematics, something which frightens people witless. And take out your pens and papers



MEDIA MONITORS

because he's going to put up some mathematical equations and there is examination going on afterwards.

Lord Monckton also has used that mathematics and created a mathematical game. He offered a prize of a million pounds to anyone who could solve that puzzle, and it was, and a man to his word, Lord Monckton paid up. But he's not a fool. He created a second mathematical game and the prize is £2 million.

So I have great pleasure in introducing the Viscount Monckton of Brenchley.

[Applause]

LORD MONCKTON: My Lords - that's me...

[Laughter]

...distinguished members of the Federal Parliament, members of the press, ladies and gentleman, g'day Canberra.

[Laughter]

After that magnificent introduction by Professor Plimer I just can't wait to hear what I'm going to say. How many sceptics does it take to change a



MEDIA MONITORS

light bulb? Answer, none, it's far too early to say whether it needs changing.

[Laughter]

It is very good news that you've kindly invited me here and Professor Plimer has introduced me in Australian accent as the Vicount(*) Monckton, because in Scotland it's rather unfortunate. It comes out as the Vacant(*) Monckton.

[Laughter]

First of all I want to begin by saying thank you, first of all to you and to the enormous crowds that have crammed in at every venue right across Australia at which I have had the privilege and pleasure to speak. Will you give yourselves a round of applause.

[Applause]

Now since I'm speaking to you at the Press Club and the first question a good press man always asks of everyone except those who agree with him is who is funding you? So I'm going to tell you who's funding me. You are.

Now what happens is this: two retired engineers from Noosa, Case Smit and John Smeed, who are sitting right in front of me here, with his wife Suzie(*), and they have been very gallantly



MEDIA MONITORS

shepherding me around Australia at all sorts of ghastly hours of the day and night, at an age when most people would have simply given up and got on growing their vegetable marrows. But here they are. They decided that when they saw Kevin Rudd, your Prime Minister, making a speech in which he attacked me personally for 45 minutes and naming me several times in it, they thought why don't we get this guy Monckton out here to Australia to exercise his right of reply?

[Applause]

And they dug very deep into their own superannuations. They had no idea whether I would be playing to 10 people, 100 or 1000 at each venue but they decided between them that whatever it was going to cost them personally - and it might have cost them very dear but for your attendance - they said they were going to do this anyway. And they also very kindly attracted two professors to be my minders, Bob Carter and the man you've just heard kindly speaking about me, Professor Ian Plimer, whose book *Heaven and Earth* is on sale outside after this talk at an unacceptably high price.

[Laughter]

But his book I can also announce is now a world best seller, having sold over 100,000 copies in a few months.



MEDIA MONITORS

[Applause]

I should also like to thank Father Ed very much for saying that short and heartfelt and extremely well targeted prayer about the truth. And he has driven for four hours to get here to give us that prayer and he's got to drive for four hours back again afterwards. Let's hear it for Father Ed.

[Applause]

Now are there any farmers or friends of farmers here?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Yes.

LORD MONCKTON: Yes. Good. Well, I have some news for you. We are very fortunate to have with us here today Mr Peter Spencer. Give him a round of applause.

[Applause]

Peter Spencer needs no introduction at all but that doesn't mean he's not going to get one. Now Peter is the brave farmer who when he discovered that his land had been effectively expropriated by an unholy conspiracy between his State Government in New South Wales and the Federal Government, to declare his farmland, which he and his family have been working in an environmentally responsible way for generations, a carbon sink, whatever that may be.



MEDIA MONITORS

He was suddenly told he couldn't farm his own land and, by the way, nobody else could farm it either. And that meant that he couldn't any longer earn his living and he couldn't sell his one capital asset. His capital and his income were destroyed overnight. And all that without the just compensation for which your constitution explicitly and in writing provides.

Now I'm going to tell you what I think of that. I think it is an outrage.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

LORD MONCKTON: Do you think it's an outrage?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Yes.

LORD MONCKTON: I couldn't hear that.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Yes.

LORD MONCKTON: That's better. So can we have another round of applause for Peter Spencer. I'll tell you why in a moment.

[Applause]

Because this outrage has not just been perpetrated on Peter Spencer, it has also been perpetrated on something like 30,000 farmers across Australia.



MEDIA MONITORS

And let us be make clear, constitutionally speaking, what we are talking about here. We are talking about the effective expropriation of land owned for generations by families of hard-working farmers that put the food on our tables and without any thanks or warning or compensation on the part of the federal and state authorities.

Now that, whatever else it is, is not the democratic way and therefore let me tell you what is going to happen next. You may have heard that there are attempts yet again, for the third time - you'd think they'd learn not to try it again - to introduce an emissions trading scheme. And I can describe very succinctly my attitude to that scheme: ETS, no. Can we hear you say that? ETS...

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No.

LORD MONCKTON: ETS...

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No.

LORD MONCKTON: ETS, no.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No.

LORD MONCKTON: That's good. Now, the reason why we say no, or the reason why, or the reason why Peter Spencer has good reason and heartfelt reasons to say no, is this: one of the provisions in that ETS Bill, I can't remember exactly which provision it is. Article 111,



sub-article 7 if I have it right. In that provision it says that the state has the right to expropriate the land of landholders - and that's not just farmers - throughout Australia in the name of saving the planet from what I shall demonstrate to you is the non-problem of climate change.

And let me tell you this for free: that particular provision is unconstitutional, it against your constitution and your Federal Parliament is not entitled by law to make laws that are against your constitution. So if by some mischance the ETS scheme proceeds any further and actually get passed into law the next thing that will happen is that the courts will call it in and it will be declared unconstitutional, and that would bring the Government down.

So my advice is this - I don't want to intervene in any way in your politics...

[Laughter]

...but I would advise - but you know what I'm thinking. So I would advise those on all sides of the house, because I'm not here in fact to take sides in politics - those on all sides in the house who are thinking of supporting the ETS scheme, at least to make sure that the provision for the expropriation of people's land without the just compensation for which your constitution explicitly provides, should



MEDIA MONITORS

be removed. And if you don't remove it then don't pass the ETS, that's my advice.

Well now, at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change they do not call a spade a spade. That would be too simple. They don't do simple. No, they call it a one-person operated, manually controlled foot-powered implement of simple and robust yet adequately efficacious ligno-metallic composition designated primarily, though by no mean exclusively, for utilisation on the part of hourly paid operatives deployed in the agricultural, horticultural or constructional trades or industries as the case may be, for purposes of carrying out such excavational tasks or duties as may from time to time be designated by supervisory grades as being necessary, desirable, expedient, apposite, or germane with regards to the ongoing furtherance of the task or objective in hand, or on the other hand under foot, secretary-general.

[Laughter and applause]

Now I'm going to make very simple points, very clear points. I prepared this slide for a briefing with Bill Clinton.

[Laughter]

Highlights of that joke, by the way, will be broadcast on both ABC and Sky News later today.



MEDIA MONITORS

Good to see you both, boys. Now, here we have - give them a round of applause, come on.

[Applause]

Now I call this, for stunningly obvious reasons, a brief history of global warming. And what you've got, exactly as Ian Plimer rightly said in his introduction, is there has in fact been 300 years of global warming during 270 years of which humankind cannot on any view have been responsible. The only bit for which we could have been responsible is on the right there, the little skimpy blue number, and the lads among us would actually think that that kind of global warming's probably rather a good thing.

Now it's only in theory that we might have caused even a little warming at the right-hand end there, the last 30 of those 300 years.

And a couple of other preliminary scientific points we need to get out of the way, but first of all the mere fact that warming has taken place doesn't tell us why the warming has taken place. It might have been Al Gore with his flamethrower on the top of the Greenland ice cap.

Likewise, correlation need not have - imply causation. Just because there has been rising CO₂ over the last 50 years and rising temperatures over 25 of those last 50 years doesn't mean that the two



MEDIA MONITORS

are necessarily causally connected. And to prove this I've plotted the number of Republican Senators in the upper house of the US Legislature in Washington and the sunspot numbers on the face of the sun.

Now at the recent US elections a very low number of Republican Senators were elected and there were no sunspots on the sun. It works.

Now of course, on the other side of the case there are people going around giving lectures, telling us like Private Frazer in *Dad's Army* we're all doomed. Well, just look at this one. This is a picture actually produced by a professor of so-called climate change impact at Imperial College London. Who on earth funded a professorship in climate change impact I have no idea. But he thought it would be fun to do a reconstruction of what would have happened if Al Gore's 20 foot sea level rise, in which this particular professor happens to believe - wrongly - would happen. What it would do to the Houses of Parliament. It would drown them, to which I say and your problem is?

[Laughter]

Most people would be only too happy to see both Houses of Parliament done away with and if they had a choice they would actually do away with the Commons and keep the hereditary peer.



MEDIA MONITORS

[Laughter]

Now, one of the points I want to get across is that we are going to be saying some very obvious things today. I mean, here - look at this. A horse goes into a bar and the barman says why the long face? Because it's a horse, you idiot. And it's going to be obvious points like that, that I'm going to be making because those on the other side of this debate like to make the obvious seem absurd and the absurd seem obvious, and I'm just going to turn it back the other way. But do not believe a word I say.

Science is not a belief system. Science is not a religion, it's not a superstition, it is a disciplined process of inquiry, and however much you might like my jokes or my aristocratic demeanour or my general good nature or my wit or my scholarship, all of which are already blindingly evident to you, nevertheless do not believe a word I say, because you should read and listen to both sides of every scientific question.

Do not fall into the trap of being told the science is settled because it never is. Do not allow yourself to be told the debate is over. It plainly isn't. Just look about you, if you want a monument to that. There would not be that many people in this room wanting to hear this whingeing Pom if in fact the debate was over. The debate is plainly not over. Indeed, I think it's fair to say that in Australia, thanks to you, the debate is now beginning.



MEDIA MONITORS

[Applause]

Now why does the truth matter? That's quite an important philosophical and, indeed, moral question. And let us look at this portrait by Tintoretto for a moment. There is our blessed Lord standing in front of Pontius Pilate who asks him quid est veritas? What is the truth?

Now jesting Pilate, as Bacon recalls in one of his essays, did not tarry for an answer. He had the Lord of Light in front of him, he could have asked him anything but he didn't wait for an answer. It was a purely rhetorical question. But in fact that question, Pilate's question, is the question that underlies every true and honest question. The truth alone is what science as well religion are directed towards, the truth alone is worthy of our entire devotion.

And this was well encapsulated in a remark made by the man credited with being the father of the scientific method. You see him here on this Iraqi banknote, for he was a mathematician and philosopher of science and astronomer in eleventh century Iraq. And his name was Abu Ali Ibn al-Hasan Ibn al-Hasan Ibn al-Hasan Ibn al-Haytham(*) and he said this: the seeker after truth does place his trust in any mere consensus however broad and however venerable. Instead he subjects what he has learned of it to his own hard-won scientific knowledge and to measurement and investigation and scrutiny and checking and checking and checking again. The road to the truth,



said al-Haytham, is long and hard but that is the road that we must follow.

And that's the road that we're going to follow today, you and I. and we're going to see why it matters that we should, particularly when globalised groupthink can lead to the deaths of millions when the science is ignored, the policies are wrong and people end up dead.

Malaria is a glaring example of this, and one which I receive a lot of vilification from the other side for when I mention it. Because they don't want it to be reminded that it was very much the same environmental movement, such as the Environmental Defense Fund that argued 40 years ago, and successfully argued, for the banning worldwide of DDT, the only effective agent against the *Anopheles* mosquito that causes malaria. Before the DDT ban it had been so successful, it had eradicated malaria right across the United States and many other regions of the world.

There were only 50,000 deaths a year from malaria. That's still a lot. It would have been nice if they were zero. But look what happened after the DDT ban. A million deaths a year and those million deaths a year persisted for 40 long years until all of those worldwide responsible for that ban on DDT - that murderous ban that killed 40 million, nearly all of them children, had retired or died. Only then did it become possible to get the ban on DDT lifted and it was lifted on 15 September 2006 by Dr Arata



MEDIA MONITORS

Kochi of the World Health Organization who said this: quite often in this field science comes second and politics first. We will now take a stand on the science and the data. And he lifted the ban on DDT, a ban which many people on the left in politics who had originally supported it now pretend did not even exist, ashamed and rightly ashamed are they at the 40 million deaths that their foolishness caused.

And HIV is another example. There it was quite simple. We had a new fatal communicable infection. The rules for handling such infections in public health terms have been long established. The correct response would have been to test and identify all carriers and then isolate them immediately, compulsorily and permanently.

That's not a nice thing to do. No libertarian liked me - like me wants to suggest such a thing but that is the correct policy, because if you don't then the epidemic spreads into the general population and once it does that you can't stop it. And this is what's happened, because they didn't do what they should have 25 years ago.

Twenty-five million people dead of HIV, 40 million infected and going to die. That's what happens if you get the science wrong or if the science is right but you ignore it and get the policy wrong, and now what happens with global warming.



MEDIA MONITORS

But before we get to that, here's just - let's just personalise it for a moment to this lady who had HIV. She had it when this photograph was taken. Two of her sons had contracted it. Two of her sons had contracted it in the womb and died. The third son likewise, he died a month after this photograph was taken. You can see how ill he already is here.

She died a year after this photograph was taken. That's what happens to real people if we get the policy wrong. And look what happened in Haiti as a result of what we are now doing to try to solve worldwide the non-existent problem of climate change.

This man in Haiti is starving. He is trying to keep body and soul together by making for his neighbours mud pies made with real mud for them to eat and he was selling them to his neighbours at three US cents each.

Our own fellow creatures were living on mud pies made with real mud even before the earthquake and I was telling this story in Madrid recently at a meeting of government and opposition leaders and a lady in the front row began to cry. I said I'm sorry madam it is very distressing. I'm not trying to, you know, pluck at your heartstrings too much. She said look, no, I've just come back from Haiti and she said you're out of date.



MEDIA MONITORS

Because of the doubling of world food prices that occurred last year as a result of the biofuel scam which took millions of acres out of growing food for people that needed it and into buying biofuels for clunkers that didn't, starvation has occurred among millions of people in 12 different regions of the world where there have been major food riots almost entirely unreported by the press corps of the world and particularly of the western world because they're too busy reporting on every putative icicle putatively dribbling in putative Greenland.

They are indifferent completely to the actual dying of millions of their fellow human beings, caused not by global warming, but by absurd policies to address an absurd non-problem. That is why it matters that we should get matters right and that is why Heir Ziegler who was the, and still is the, UN's Right to Food Rapporteur who speaks out for those who have no voice for themselves because they are black and they live in countries that are not democratic far away where we don't see them and we don't care enough. He does, he speaks out.

He said: When millions are dying of starvation the diversion of food to biofuels is - and these are his words - a crime against humanity. This is the energy cycle to which the greenies would condemn Africa.

The source of the energy is timber. It's transmission is on the backs of the poor and they burn it in smoke-filled huts where the children die of



MEDIA MONITORS

respiratory diseases. That's what happens when you don't have electricity and what's the cheapest way to give them electricity? Lift them out of poverty and hence stabilise their populations because it's poor populations that breed fastest, as it is well known. The only way of stabilising population is to raise the general standard of living of that population.

Well, what we should do therefore is burn fossil fuels because that's the cheapest way to generate the electricity which is the quickest way out of poverty for the poor people of the world.

Now, if this threat of global warming is so real, why do they lie about it? This is Sir John Houghton, the first chairman of the IPCC, now under criminal investigation because he is a trustee of a charity along with Dr Rajendra Pachauri, the present chairman of the IPCC, that has for the last three years in London filed false accounts under declaring it's income by many hundreds of thousands of pounds each year.

How do I know that they're under investigation? Because I was one of those who reported them to the Charity Commission and have had confirmation from the Charity Commission that they are being investigated for what is an extremely serious and imprisonable criminal offence.

And let us have a look at the science that this man wishes to put in front of us. Unless we announce



MEDIA MONITORS

disasters, he said in a book some years ago, no one will listen. Here's another one, Stephen Schneider, one of the UN's most eminent scientists: We have to offer up scary scenarios.

No we don't. What we have to offer up is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Or this one - one of my favourites - from a Greenpeace campaigner: Global warming can mean colder, it can mean drier or it can mean wetter. That's what we're talking about.

[Laughter]

Where do they get these people? But then here's my favourite of all time, Albert Arnold Gore: I believe it is appropriate to have an over representation of factual presentations on how dangerous it is.

Now, what is he telling you there? If you can hack your way through the mangled pseudo-academic English in which he always talks, is he saying we're going to exaggerate you witless, we're going to add numbers up that don't add up, we're going to lie to you and lie to you and lie to you again and you are going to like it and you are going to make me very rich listening to it?

Now, let's just make sure that we do a little scientific test here. This is the publicity poster for Al Gore's mawkish sci-fi comedy horror movie. Now, can you tell me what is wrong with the graph



MEDIA MONITORS

in that poster? Hands anyone who can - no you - Plimer you haven't washed your hands, be quiet.

[Laughter]

Anybody else? Come on. Come on now. There's something very obviously wrong with that graph. Over there sir, yes.

MALE SPEAKER: It goes backwards.

LORD MUNCKTON: It goes backwards, thank you. Under the word all there, it does a very odd thing. It doubles back on itself in a way which no graph of temperature over time could possibly do. It is simply a fiction made up, like most of Gore's movie, by a public relations executive.

Here are just nine lies which a judge in the High Court in London found in 2007 - and he announced these nine lies in the judgment against Gore's movie - just two days before Gore got his Nobel prize for peace for having collected enough box tops. And those nine lies - we won't go through all of them - I'm going to look at just a couple of them.

First of all, the sea level lie, and here even the UN's climate panel, which is prone to monstrous exaggeration, says that the melting of the Greenland and Antarctic ice caps over the next hundred years might contribute just six centimetres to sea level



MEDIA MONITORS

rise. Al Gore, 610, and he expects people to believe that but he himself doesn't believe it, as we'll see.

This is what the judge had to say about this and they all talk as though they've had too much custard for lunch and so I'm going to do it in his voice: The armageddon scenario that he depicts is not based on any scientific view.

Not based on any scientific view. That was the verdict of a High Court judge, having heard both sides of the argument. And the reason why he found in favour of us and against Al Gore is because in the end the Government had to cave in and admit that the film that it had intended to send round to every school in England contained this and eight other serious lies, serious departures, from scientific truth.

And it was because we forced the Government into admitting this, that we won the case. But Gore himself knew perfectly well sea level wasn't going to rise because in the very year when he was making up that lie and making - yep you've seen it already - he bought a condo for \$4 million in the St Regis Tower on the left there in San Francisco and the map shows where it was, just feet from the allegedly rising ocean at Fisherman's Wharf.

Next lie, the polar bears lie. This one: A scientific study shows for the first they're finding polar bears that have drowned swimming long distances up to 60 miles to find the ice.



MEDIA MONITORS

My accent is being worked on. Here's the truth, four dead polar bears, and did the paper he cited Monnett and Gleeson 2006, did it contain a single reference to them being drowned by global warming because they couldn't find any ice? No, of course it did not. It said there'd been a bad storm, high waves and high winds and they'd just got swamped.

Now, as we scientists call it, shit happens. Here is the record of sea ice extent in the Beaufort Sea where these bears drowned over the last 60 years - sorry over the last 30 years. No sign of any loss of sea ice there.

At no point was there any truth whatsoever in Al Gore's allegation. It was simply made up because polar bears are cuddly. They're not really if you meet one.

Then there's the Kilimanjaro lie, and this one he said: There's Mount Kilimanjaro as it was 30 years ago and, again, more recently with lots less ice. And he says this is because of global warming.

So let's look at how much warming there has been monitored continuously by satellites over the last 30 years, at the summit of Mount Kilimanjaro. Just look how steep this warming is. It's non-existent. It just - 0.01 Celsius per decade. Never has the temperature on the summit of Kilimanjaro risen



MEDIA MONITORS

above minus 1.6 Celsius. Its average is minus seven Celsius.

So it hasn't been melting, it's been ablating because of global cooling and hence drying of the atmosphere or rather regional cooling and drying shown here on a NASA image. And, in fact, most of the ice had already disappeared by 1936, long before we could have had anything to do with it, when Hemingway wrote his novel *The Snows of Kilimanjaro*.

So, Al baby, I'm still waiting. I've challenged you to a debate at every public talk I've given over the last three years, and I've given quite a few, and if you think you can go on running and hiding you can't. I'm coming after you.

So, what about today's climate? Here are some of the things that the people who normally inhabit this building, the press corps, will somehow have found it inexpedient to tell you because they are boring but true facts.

First of all, there is the global warming of the last nine years. The actual data jiggling up and down, as you see, and the least squares linear regression trendline showing which way the data are heading and, as you can see, it is heading downward at quite a rapid rate. Look where the IPCC shows it should have been going and it isn't going there.



MEDIA MONITORS

That's the actual global cooling of the last nine years. How many of you seen that reported in any major news medium? Have they told you? No they haven't, you see, because here we are talking about global warming, acres and acres of coverage, and not one of your news media has bothered to tell you that for the last nine years there has actually been global cooling. Surely that is a relevant consideration when weighing up whether we really are facing the need to do something within 10 years.

If that graph were to reverse itself over the next 10 years, all we would - all that would happen is we'd be back where we were in the year 2001. Is that a problem? No, of course, it isn't and that's why we've got plenty of time to get this right before we drift into ETS schemes or any other such nonsenses.

Here is the regular curve over 10 separate years of the changes seasonally in arctic sea ice. No particular problems there. Let's just look at what you will have seen reported by your mainstream newspapers.

Over on the left you will see the 2007 - the purple area - a great chunk taken out of it at the top because there was probably a lot of undersea volcanic activity warming up the sea so there was quite a large lot of sea ice that year. Al Gore and others immediately came out and said this is because of global warming.



MEDIA MONITORS

Well, no it isn't, and I'll prove why it isn't global warming shortly but, first of all, let's see whether it's recovered. 2008, in the middle, most of the ice is back. 2009, at the right, very very nearly all of the ice is back to its normal summer minimum levels.

Now, you're all told that, of course, this original loss of ice in 2007 was caused by global warming which it wasn't, but how many of you have been told by your news media that over the last two summers that ice has almost entirely recovered to its normal level? Once again, not a single hand goes up.

Don't you think it's relevant if they're wittering(*) on about how global warming is melting the Arctic ice that, in fact, the Arctic ice is growing?

And here is the Greenland ice sheet. How many of you have heard that the Greenland ice sheet is melting at such a rapid rate that sea levels are going to rise dangerously? Hands up. Come on. Yes, just about everyone.

Well, here's the truth, in a paper by Johannessen et al 2005. This is a paper in the scientific literature using laser altimetry, a well-trying, well-tested, well-calibrated method, quite unlike the gravitation anomaly methods that are leading people to say that Greenland ice is disappearing today.



MEDIA MONITORS

And this paper was published in 1995 and it shows that between 1992 and 2003, for a period of 11 continuous years, there was an accumulation of ice on the whole of the Greenland ice sheet on average at five centimetres per year, 55 centimetres - more than half a metre - of ice, accumulated on Greenland just in that 11 year period, and here's proof of it.

I got this from the DOD. I couldn't believe that paper by Johannessen because all the media were telling me that Greenland was melting. So here are the DEW line radar stations as they were when in operation in the 1960s and as they are more recently, and what do you see more recently? What you see is the snow and ice and [indistinct] building up around those stations.

And then let's look at Eurasian snow cover which is what surprised a billion people around the world with their water supply. It's not the glaciers of the Himalayas that supply that water supply, it's snow cover. Gore gets that wrong too.

Rutgers University snow and ice lab, no trend in any of the five vital winter months in Eurasian snow cover in the last 30 years. Indeed, in fact, it's set in the Northern Hemisphere as a whole. There was a record snow extent - snow cover extent - in 2001. That extent was over topped in 2007 and it looks as though 2009 to 2010 will set a new record high for the satellite era for snow cover in the Northern



MEDIA MONITORS

Hemisphere but you're not being told that in your news media.

And here is Antarctic sea ice, it's been on a rising trend for 30 years. And I told you I would prove that the temporary loss of ice at the North Pole in the summer minimum of 2007 was not caused by global warming and I prove it by drawing your attention to the 2007 graph here and you will see that it reaches a peak of Antarctic sea ice, a 30 year peak, just three weeks after the 30 year minimum of Arctic sea ice, the other end of the world.

So, whatever that Arctic sea ice minimum was caused by, it can't have been caused by global warming, can it? And, indeed, one other reason why it can't have been caused by global warming is that there hasn't been any global warming in any significant sense for 15 years. But I don't suppose your news media have gotten around to telling you that either.

So if we look at global sea ice area you will see it follows a regular jiggly-uppy-downny pattern, a sort of heartbeat, and if you had a cardiogram as healthy as this then you would be regarded as a fit little planet.

Hurricanes - well, we've heard all about hurricanes and the gloom and doom about how we get more hurricanes and more frequent hurricanes and more intense hurricanes and tropical cyclones and



MEDIA MONITORS

typhoons, all because of global warming. They have now admitted that, in fact, this was based solely on a report by, not a scientific paper, but by a report by a campaigning group call the Worldwide Fund for Nature which has a colossal financial vested interest in pretending that global warming is a real problem. And the UN's climate panel has now had to accept that all their suggestions that there might be more hurricanes or more intense hurricanes will now have to be re-examined and that also goes for floods and drought.

And you can see, in fact, at the right-hand end of the graph there, that the combined 24 month running sum of the frequency, intensity and duration of all hurricanes, typhoons and tropical cyclones around the world is now at its lowest level in the 30 year satellite record. But you won't have heard that in your mainstream news media because it doesn't fit the storyline.

So now we have to deal with rather an unpleasant business of looking at the economics of the ETS. Let's begin, first of all, with how costly and futile an ETS must be.

Now, here's the central problem with any emissions trading scheme. And here I'm not directing my remarks simply at your government. There are many other governments around the world trying to pursue fatuous and economically illiterate policies too. You're not unique in this respect and I'm not here to embarrass your government, I'm not here to



take sides in your politics. I am here to tell you how completely bonkers an ETS would be.

Now, if you set a price for the right to emit a ton of carbon dioxide that isn't very high, then you won't stop people emitting carbon dioxide. It won't act as a price signal to deter them from emitting carbon dioxide. Therefore they'll go on emitting it and pay you a bit of extra revenue and all you've done is got a bit of extra tax and therefore it makes no difference to the climate.

If, on the other hand, you say, right we're going to show world leadership by destroying more of our economy than anybody else has done, then what you do is you put a high price per ton of carbon dioxide emitted and say we're really going to charge through the nose for anyone who wants to generate electricity by fossil fuels, for instance, or to have a steelworks or an aluminium smelter or dig out the coal and export it. All of these things will come under the ETS scheme, and what happens?

Well, you put a high price on it, then those industries will up sticks and go to countries like China or India which, I can tell you for free, are not going to have an ETS scheme. China publishes an annual statistical communique and it tells you what it's going to do economically and what it says is we are going to go on opening new coal-fired power stations at one or two per week for the whole of the foreseeable future.



MEDIA MONITORS

So people move their businesses to China or India. You lose the business and China and India do not have such efficient production methods as we do so they emit more carbon dioxide per unit of production than we do. Result, you close down your own industries and you increase the carbon footprint of the planet. Now, how lunatic is that?

[Applause]

Well, it's even more lunatic than that because here is a calculation, it's a very simple one, using the UN's own estimates. And what it shows is that if you were to close down the entire global economy for 41 years you would forestall just one Celsius degree of global warming.

Now, imagine the death, destruction, damage and disease that would arise from shutting down the entire carbon economy.

How many of you came here in some kind of motor conveyance? Yep, well, you would have had to walk or use a horse. I mean, it's as basic as that and that's what you have to do. You have to go right back to the Stone Age but without even the right to light a fire in your cave because fire emits carbon dioxide. And you have to do that for 41 years and by golly those caves would be pretty crammed, and all of that just for one Celsius degree of global warming forestalled.



MEDIA MONITORS

That is why attempting to mitigate so-called global warming by cutting down the amount of carbon dioxide you emit makes absolutely no economic sense even if you believe the prodigious exaggeration which the IPCC assigns to the warming effect of CO2 because we're basing all these calculations on assuming, just for the purpose of argument, that the IPCC has got that right.

Now, here is why there's nothing we can do about it in the west. There is what will happen on the basis of China's annual statistical communiqués to China's emissions of carbon dioxide over the next 20 or 30 years. There is the United States levelling off nicely as it already has been and look at little old Australia down the bottom there. We could close down Australia and it wouldn't make the blindest bit of difference. And that, in effect, is what your governing class - and there's plenty of them in both parties - actually seem to want to do.

Will you allow your polities to shut Australia down?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No.

LORD MONCKTON: I didn't hear that.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No.

LORD MONCKTON: That's better. Here's Kyoto and this is the predecessor of the Copenhagen Accord, and what we have here is the business as usual, if we've done



MEDIA MONITORS

nothing at all, to try to comply with Kyoto. There is what would have happened, the red line below, if we had complied with Kyoto. So, have we complied with Kyoto? Well, I'm glad to say we are actually doing splendidly because we were supposed to get back our carbon emissions to their 1990 levels by just two years time, 2012 and here's how we're doing.

We've got 40 per cent more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere than we had in 1990. So there you are, for all this bilious talk, by your pollies of how we're going to save the planet, though even if you did do something like Kyoto, it has no effect on the climate, or very little. And all you do is you impose taxes on yourselves for absolutely no good purpose whatsoever except to allow your pollies to strut and fret their hour on the world stage and feel temporarily important.

[Applause]

Now, Australia only has about a tenth or even less of the population of the United States. Here is an analysis of the Waxman-Markey climate bill and it shows that temperature, even if the bill were fully implemented. And I can tell you they haven't even got it through a senate yet and so the chances of it being implemented at all are small. But if it were fully, virtually no difference to temperature, virtually no difference to the rise in sea level. It makes no difference but it does so at the cost of



MEDIA MONITORS

being the largest tax increase in the history of the world.

And so how much less of an impact is Australia going to have even if it goes as far as the United States is proposing to go? The fact is that mitigating climate change by trying not to burn carbon dioxide is many orders of magnitude, more expensive and less cost effective than focused adaptation and you merely adapt to climate change whichever direction it happens to go in and to whatever degree it happens to go, as and if necessary. And as we foresee it won't in fact be necessary.

So, now what about the political cost of all this? Very, very nearly we got a treaty at Copenhagen that would have shut down democracy worldwide. They were going to establish a world government and I'm not making this up.

I'm not some kind of world government conspiracy theorist, as Kevin Rudd says I am. He said I had no evidence whatsoever for my contention that they were proposing to establish a world government. So I obtained a copy of the September 15, 2009 draft of the world government treaty, which the Australian negotiators - as well as other negotiators around the world - had been working on for several months by the time I got this particular draft of it, and that is what it says.



MEDIA MONITORS

The scheme is written in the usual bureaucratise: The scheme for the new institutional arrangement under the convention will be based on three basic pillars; government - and that's the first time I have seen the word government appear in any world treaty and I've written a few and I've negotiated a few and, indeed, I've interpreted several. I've never seen the word government used in this context ever before.

And also a facilitative mechanism, that is for the first time again in any such international treaty: the power centrally to enforce the will of the new world government by enforcement and policing mechanisms and, thirdly, a financial mechanism. That means the right of that government over the heads of those whom you elect to impose taxes directly upon you.

That is what this treaty draft proposed. So when Mr Rudd says I do not have evidence, read it and weep, Kev baby.

[Applause]

The Government - it says it again, Article 38 of Annexe 1, in case you're wondering where - will be ruled by the COP - that's the conference of the parties to the states, sorry to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. It's all mouthfuls this - with the support of a new subsidiary body on



MEDIA MONITORS

adaptation and of an executive board - and so on and so on and so on.

A huge army of new bureaucracies to enforce the will of those whom you do not elect on those whom you do. And this is what they were going to be given the power to do, to take control over all formerly free markets and set the market rules to control or to rig the market.

Now, it is a well-settled, well-established, well-proven rule of economics that if you have anything other than a free market, if you have a rigged market, the only people who can be sure of making money out of a rigged market - and they will make a lot at your expense - will be those who rig the market.

And they were going to allow all markets to be rigged by the new world government. Those are just some of the taxes which, thank goodness, you have been spared because this treaty draft failed even to make it to Copenhagen itself. There was such an international outcry when I first revealed this treaty in Canada and then in the United States, so many of you - and then on Alan Jones's splendid show here in Australia - so many and let's have a round of applause for Alan Jones, come on.

[Applause]



MEDIA MONITORS

So many of you got in touch with your pollies that it was quite clear that it was not going to happen. They couldn't get this world government through. They thought they could. What they did is they hid it on a website of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It was tacked on behind what was called Note by the Secretariat of the state parties. And the note was a two page note and beneath it - a friend of mine found it because he thought the file looked suspiciously large for a two page note. He found 168 page treaty draft.

Now, why did they put it there at all? Because they wanted to say, once they'd got it through at Copenhagen, well it's no good saying that you hadn't seen it, it's been on our website for months. That's how they were going to do it. Completely dishonest, completely unprincipled and not one of your politicians revealed the existence of this treaty until I did, and that...

[Applause]

...and that is a very real concern because who's looking out for you, if your own elected politicians don't?

And while we're on the subject of elections, here are the democratic provisions that were enshrined in the world government treaty.

[Laughter]



MEDIA MONITORS

I need not I think dwell on the content of this slide because there aren't any. The word democracy, ballot, vote, election does not occur once in any of the 186 pages of the treaty. This was to have been a dictatorship just like the EU writ large. We have this now, we no longer have democracy in Britain, you still have it here in Australia. Make sure you keep it.

Now here are just the 10 people that Kevin Rudd took with him to Copenhagen. [Laughter] I mean look at them. Penelope Wong, the Minister for Climate Change and Water. What a strange title. Louise Helen Hand, Ambassador for Climate Change. We have a press secretary. And all of these people were necessary to take to Copenhagen and all of these, that's another 20 of them, there's the 30, and we'll keep going shall we? These were the people that your Prime Minister took, at your expense, to Copenhagen. Can you imagine the carbon footprint of what happened?

And here we are, I'm sorry you can't quite see the exact numbers, you can on that side maybe. But there we are we're up to, we're still going here, there we are 114 freeloaders. [Laughter] Now how many of you...

[Applause]



MEDIA MONITORS

Do you think that that enormous delegation was a proper and appropriate and proportionate use of your taxpayers' money?

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No.

LORD MONCKTON: Good. I don't either.

So we now come on to the final central scientific point that we have to make here, and that is how much warming will we actually get if, as we will if we don't bother about all these ets's and emissions reductions if we just go on with business as usual burning carbon dioxide, burning fossil fuels into carbon dioxide as freely as we like, how much warming will we get?

Well now let's begin with this interesting remark from one of the Climategate emailers. There has been no global warming for a decade, we cannot explain why, it is a travesty that we can't.

[Laughter]

Well this is Kevin Trenberth who shares his Christian name with your Prime Minister, so I'll say again, 'Kev baby, I can explain', and we're going to.

Now the IPCC in 1990 said there was no discernible human effect on global temperature at all. It said the same again five times over, here are two of them in 1995. But then the bureaucracy realised if you put



out a second report saying that humans weren't actually influencing climate taxpayers like me would say well hang on, why are we paying for these nincompoops if there's no problem? And so they decided they'd better get it rewritten. So did they refer it back to the scientists and say 'look chaps this is a very inconvenient result. If we all want to go on travelling to exotic locations around the world every three months at taxpayers' expense we've got to make out that there's more of a problem than this.

So what they did was they got one man, Ben Santer of Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, one man to rewrite the entire report, to take out all five of the references to there being no human influence. And this is what he said instead. The body of evidence now points to a discernible human influence on global climate.

Just like that. That's how it was done. And people tell me there's a consensus, and so there is; one man, one vote, once.

[Laughter]

By 2001 they were getting even more confident they could get away with this scam and they decided that with more than 66 per cent probability most of the warming of the last 50 years was caused by us. They upped the ante and said that in the 2007 report it's now more than a 90 per cent probability



MEDIA MONITORS

that this one man had it right all along when the rest of the world's scientists had it wrong.

Now I thought 90 per cent probability, that isn't even one of the normal statistical intervals, you'd be normally looking for 95 or even 99 per cent, but not 90, that doesn't compute. So I thought I'd make some enquiries and find out what scientific process they went through, and in fact this also was not written by the scientists, it was written by the political representatives of government, none of whom have any scientific qualifications whatsoever. And they reached this conclusion by a show of hands. That is how it was done. That is what passes for science in the IPCC. That is what the media filming this presentation have been telling you you have to believe in. They're trying to tell you the debate is over, the debate is over because there's been a show of hands by political representative. That's how they do their science.

And let's look at the other - just another example of how they bend science. I could give you dozens of examples of this, but I'm going to give you just the one. There is the temperature record for the last 150 years, that's the grey lines jiggling up and down there. And these grey lines you can see there's no set pattern, but then what the UN did was they added four separate trend lines chosen at very very careful start points all ending in the present so that they could say that the more recently you look at this graph the steeper the slope.



MEDIA MONITORS

The implication, which is stated in three places along with this graph in full colour in the UN's 2007 fourth assessment report, they say that shows that we are accelerating the rate of warming, it's all our fault because of CO2 emissions.

But that is an entirely bogus statistical technique, and I'm going to show you why. I've taken the same data set but just the right hand end of it starting in 1993 top left, '97 top right, 2001 bottom left, 2007 bottom right and I have once again done the trend lines for you, it's the same data in each case but I've done the trend lines, and look now we're heading for a new ice age.

Right. Hands up all those who think that the UN's graph there is right. Not one, not even the media.

[Laughter]

Oh there is one, there is one there. There's always one.

[Laughter]

Sir you are a brave man but an uneducated one.

[Laughter].

How many of you think that I have got it right?



MEDIA MONITORS

I told you not to believe a word I said [laughter] because actually of course if I'm using the same data and the same technique and achieving precisely the opposite result to the IPCC then it is the technique itself that is bogus. And I merely show you this exercise to illustrate how bogus the technique is. I could have done it in different ways, I could have for instance taken the line from 1905 to the present and showed you that that was twice as steep as the line from 1945 to the present on the same data.

So there we are. The global warming we've seen over the last 300 years is slowing down I could have said, but that too would have been a bogus application of this bogus technique. And it is an outrage that a public body like the UN's climate panel, funded by taxpayers, should be allowed to produce what is nothing other than flagrant propaganda.

Now here's the truth. If you see the steep arrow there, that's the warming, that's nearly all the warming that's taken place in the last 50 years, the one that they say is caused by us. Now can we see any other part of that graph where there might have been a similar rate of warming? Well there's one for a start, and that was in a period long before we could have had any significant influence on the climate. And by the way there's another.

So what we're seeing, that's the true position, take away all engineer Patchari's railway lines, and by



MEDIA MONITORS

the way what on earth are they doing having as the chairman of their climate panel not only a crook now facing criminal charges, but also a railroad engineer?

[Laughter]

You might as well appoint a classical architect like me because at least I know some climate science.

Now so there is what the truth is. We've seen cyclical rates of warming in a general upward trend which, after all, has been going on for 300 years so where would you expect the warmest years of that period to be? Yes at the right hand end in our own time. But the only period for which - let's just have a look also whether that temperature record is any good.

This is the Darwin temperature station, it's the one that's been reporting longest in Australia. The actual raw data shows a slight decline in temperatures over the last 100 years, but somebody's tampered with the data to adjust for what's called the urban heat island effect, there's now an airport at the Darwin measuring station and that naturally means you have to kind of bring down the temperatures, but they haven't, they've increased them. And they have shown an entirely spurious warming of two Celsius degrees in the Darwin temperature station alone.



MEDIA MONITORS

And there are stations all round the world where this kind of tampering has gone one, and so until the satellite era 30 years ago we simply can't tell whether or not there has been really any warming in the earth's climate over the last 100 years.

So let's look now at the satellite era which began roughly in 1983.

And we're going to try and work out what caused this particular warming. We can't tell what caused the other two, it's too far back, we don't have the data. But in our own time, in the satellite era, we probably can.

Here's a clue. For a hundred years, calorimeters mounted on the surface on the earth at Japan, have been measuring the amount of sunlight actually striking the earth's surface. And then they've plotted that against the temperature change in the region of the Sea of Japan, and what do you get? You get a very good correlation.

Now, correlation doesn't necessarily imply causation, but in this case, it's arguable that it does, because as you know, if you go outside this room and there are clouds above you, it will be cooler than if there aren't.

So, what might be happening, then, is we might be getting a change in cloud cover, that has a big effect on temperature down here.



MEDIA MONITORS

And sure enough, a paper by a satellite nerd says cloud forcing of three watts per square metre, in just the la... those 19 years. Compared with 1.6 watts per square metre of all the anthropogenic forcings from 1750 until 2005, a 255 year period.

So, there is a natural reason for that warming. And if you then do a little calculation, and I'll be testing you on this later, but I'm not going to explain it in too much detail now, but you will be tested later on this, you can work out just how much warming you would get from a doubling of CO₂ concentration. The answer, less than half a degree celcius.

But the UN says 3.26. They use modelling but what I use is straightforward measurement. And measurement always trumps models. If I asked you to tell me how long my nice bright red tie, chosen carefully so it strobos the television cameras, how long that tie is, there are two ways you could go about it.

You could ring up all the tie manufacturers, work out the average lengths of their tie, plot that against the number of ties they sell, and work out a probably length of my tie. That would be modelling.

Or, you could say; take off your tie, cobber. Take measure. And just measure it. Now, which do you think would be the simplest and most reliable method?



MEDIA MONITORS

Yup! Measurement always trumps models. We've used measurement, and it looks as though the UN has exaggerated seven and a half times over.

And look how we can check this. We can check it if we want, by setting up ship mounted, and surface mounted, calorimeters and thermometers together, in rural areas only, and on the oceans, and in - everywhere all around the world, and within 10 years we would have a complete answer to that question, and very cheaply too.

Models can't work. You can prove some things. There, we can prove the Pythagoras theorem, just by looking at that diagram it's self-evidently true, or you can use Monckton's proof, which is a little less obvious but still true.

[Laughter]

2009. That's my particular proof of Pythagoras' theorem. Enjoy. Admire. Congratulate. And then we look at the problem with the climate, which is that it is not something which is capable of proving things in, it's very difficult.

It's a mathematically chaotic object. And the paper that established chaos theory, and invented chaos theory, is this one, by Edward Lorenz, the father of numerical forecasting in the United States, in 1963. And he says; in view of the inevitable inaccuracy and incompleteness of weather observations,



MEDIA MONITORS

precise, very long range weather forecasting would seem to be non-existent, you can't do it.

Climate forecasting is merely weather forecasting done over a longer period. So it can't be done, and there's a mathematical proof in that paper that it can't be done and why it can't be done.

But the UN tries to do it anyway. Here's why chaotic equations are so difficult to handle. That is a simple chaotic equation. The atmosphere has thousands of variables, this just has one. And I've given its values, specified there, to 16 decimal places. And you might think that simple equation would draw a simple picture, because you can make equations draw pictures.

You might think it might draw a nice simple picture like this Knights of Malta Cross(*), I being a Knight of Malta(*), but watch the screen very carefully. That simple equation, with that particular very, very carefully specified value of the initial values of the complex number C , produces that picture. And that picture is not drawn by me, I didn't get my paint pots out, that picture is drawn by that equation. And that gives you some idea of the complexities that arise in what is called a chaotic equation.

Now, the equation that defines the climate is many millions of times more complicated than the equation that defines this object. And that is



MEDIA MONITORS

precisely why, unless you know the initial conditions, at any one moment, to a precision that is forever unattainable, you cannot predict the climate more than a few weeks ahead.

And this is why Syun-Ichi Akasofu, a very eminent scientist, says you can't find any computer that will prove the greenhouse theory at all. And he says, also, that the amount of warming you can expect from doubling CO₂ is an input to these climate models and not an output from them. This is the example of the argument of [indistinct], the circular argument, you tell the computer the answer you want it to spit out, and it spits it out and you feed it back in again.

Well, the other inference we can look at is the sun. There is the increase in solar activity from the zero activity for 70 years of the [indisinct] minimum. Then it began to recover and then you went to the grand maximum. That was the most active period in the sun's history for 11,400 years. There may have been a couple of periods more than that, but that's a record. So, from record low over 11,400 years, to record high in just 300 years.

And then we have, once again, you see this correlation between the solar activity in red, and the temperature in blue. So the sun might have something to do with it. It certainly isn't CO₂ because, look, we've only increased it by a tiny fraction in the whole of the last 250 years. It's just not - it's nothing more than a bit part player in the



MEDIA MONITORS

climate. And, indeed, its concentration is rising at a lower rate than the UN predicted, so that we will only have add half as much of it to the atmosphere by 2100 as the UN predict. That too is a problem.

Likewise, the sea is supposed to be warming up, because if we're causing global warming then 90 per cent of that warming must end up in the sea, everybody agrees that. But here's what's actually happening. The first time we've been able to measure sea temperatures all over the world to a depth up to 2000 metres, reliably, using the 3319 argo bathythermograph buoys that are deployed throughout the earth's oceans, and they show a clear cooling trend, a cooling trend recently analysed to have, in fact, taken place for the last 68 years, there's certainly been no warming in that time.

That is fatal to the notion of what's called high climate sensitivity, the big warming effect of CO₂ UN imagines, it can't happen.

Here's another very subtle but very major error. And if we look at this diagram, wait a minute, we'll find it, there we are, this is by Kevin Trenberth, and Trenberth is one of the Climategate emailers, what he is trying to suggest is that there are 390 watts per square metre of radiant energy at the earth's surface.

Well, if there are, then you have to divide all of the UN's temperature forecasts by three, as this entirely



MEDIA MONITORS

clear slide amply demonstrates, as I think you'll agree.

Then we have the missing hotspot. Now, this is one of the most interesting discrepancies between what the UN and its wretched models tell us, and what real world measurement tell us. So here we're going to use, once again, the tape measure to measure the tie, rather than the computer modelling.

Here is what the models show. This is another of the Climategate emailers who drew this picture, and included it in the IPCC report, which he largely controlled in 2007.

And you'll see that man-made greenhouse forcing, its latitude left to right and altitude up and down, in the topics, at altitude, there should be a near tripling of the surface warming rate, and even if you combine that forcing with the other four natural and anthropogenic ones there, that's the one that's supposed to predominate.

Now, he had to draw this picture because if that picture isn't true, then you can't get a big warming effect from CO₂. And, indeed, once he'd published that in the UN's document, all the models began copying it.

This is called inter-comparison, or as you and I would call it, fudging. And they all come to the



MEDIA MONITORS

same conclusion, this hotspot should be there, if it's us that's causing the warming, but not otherwise.

Now, we're going to look, watch the screen carefully, now we're going to see what the actual data show.

And I think you will see a rather startling absence of the predicted hotspot, it isn't there, and if it isn't there, then global warming caused by us isn't there either, it is as simple as that.

Here's another check we can do. We can look at the pre-existing atmosphere, which causes 100 watts per square metre of radiant energy to stay down here, that otherwise would escape into space if we didn't have an atmosphere with any greenhouse gases like water vapour, the main one, or CO₂ the next one, in it.

But that only produces around 18 to 20 Celsius of warming. So you get a very, very low warming effect for each extra watt per square metre of CO₂ you add to the atmosphere. That, again, broadly puts us in the same ballpark as that original calculation we did with reference to the clouds.

And here's the clincher. This is a very interesting measurement by Professor Richard Linson who is - knows more about the atmosphere than anyone else alive. Now what he says is that if global mean surface temperature increases, will radiation



MEDIA MONITORS

increasing from earth to space (a) increase, (b) remain unchanged and (c) diminish. We're going to take a vote, just like the IPCC.

Now all of you eminent scientists are going to vote with me. All those who think it will increase, hands up. All those who think it will stay the same, hands up. All those who think it will diminish, hands up. Not many hands up. All those who haven't put their hands up, hands up.

[Laughter]

Right. There is an honest audience, or at least one that has learnt caution when Monckton asked it to put its hand up. Quite right, because in fact this is what the models predict will happen. Eleven of the UN's simple models, which you can force with changes in sea surface temperature and see what will happen to outgoing radiation, in every case what they're predicting is you warm up the planet and instead of more radiation going out into space, which is what all the laws of thermodynamics would normally require, they say so much greenhouse gas gets in the way, that you get less radiation going out into space. They're all told to say that.

Now I want you to look at the centre blue panel there, because now I'm going to show you - once again we're going to be boring and we're going to measure it. We're going to use the earth radiation



MEDIA MONITORS

budget experiment satellite and we measure it. So watch the birdie.

And there is the true picture, an enormous increase in the amount of outgoing radiation, if you increase the temperature at the sea surface.

Now what does this mean? It means that the radiation isn't staying down here to cause global warming. It's as brilliantly simple as that. Now this paper has been heavily challenged by, guess who? The Climategate conspirators. It's always the same little group that attacked every result that it finds uncongenial. But the author of this paper has assured me he still reckons he's right and he is just in the process of producing another paper updating it and establishing exactly why he is right.

So here are all those reasons why the UN has clearly got it wrong and it looks as though the original calculation we did with reference to the clouds is probably right. We're looking at seven-fold exaggeration. And so, Houston, the UN has a problem and frankly the only solution to that problem is to shut the climate panel down.

[Applause]

Well now Kevin Rudd has said this is a moral issue for our generation. Now whenever you hear a politician saying we have to save the planet, or anything else, for the sake of our children and our



MEDIA MONITORS

children's children, reach for your hat and run,
because he's after your money.

[Laughter]

There he is. He is watching. Big Brother is watching you and he wants your money, he wants your money. But he says it's a moral issue. He says we've got to do this because we've got to save the planet. Well he's quite right. It is a moral issue. To bend and distort and destroy and fabricate and then try to hide data as the Climategate conspirators who run the IPCC's process did, that is a moral issue.

To take the graph of global surface temperatures over the last 150 years and impose upon it railroad engineer Pachowrie's(*) railroad lines, trying to show, by a bogus technique, that the rate of warming is accelerating, when it is not, that is a moral issue. To make various other changes to the observed data, or the inferred data such as the attempt by the IPCC to abolish the medieval warm period, when 780 scientists from 462 institutions in 42 countries, over the last 20 years, have contributed to papers saying it was there, it was real, it was global and it was warmer than the present, that is a moral issue.

To claim consensus when you haven't got consensus, that is a moral issue. But above all, to leave people to starve in third world countries, because you don't get the science right - and if you



don't get the science right you, therefore, get the policy wrong, that is a moral issue.

But this is Australia. Australia is the world's friend. To whom do the Pacific nations turn when they need help? Australia. To whom did we turn, not in one but in two world wars, when we in Britain needed help, most recently against the Hitler threat? Australia. To whom did Korea turn when she needed help against invasion from the north? Australia. To whom did Vietnam turn, when she feared invasion from the north? Australia. To whom did we turn again, when Saddam Hussein threatened not only Kuwait, but also the world's oil fields? Australia.

Every time any one in the world needs help, there is one friend, one nation on which they can always unhesitatingly rely. Australia.

So I say to you this. Look into the eyes, the hopeful - hopeless eyes of these starving children in Africa and love them enough and love your great and generous country enough, to say to those who would destroy your economy, in the name of chimera that is global warming, enough is enough.

Thank you.

[Applause]



MEDIA MONITORS

CONVENOR:

Right ladies and gentleman. We only have 10 minutes for questions. Now Lord Monckton doesn't wish to sort of get away easily, so if - are there questions that can't be answered in the time, I'm sure we can set up some way to channel them through, so there's not an evasion here.

So, right, you sir?

QUESTION:

I found recently at dinner parties, barbecues, social gatherings, that this issue is a rising issue. Very marginal. I get lost for words sometimes on how I can make one statement, best response, to my friends and colleagues, to give them something to ponder. They are people that - well they believe in climate change.

I want to tell it to school teachers, science teachers and a lot of people will find it very difficult to believe that I don't agree with climate change, so have you got one strong point that I can give these people some [indistinct].

LORD MONCKTON:

Well, of course, you have dozens of strong points in the excellent presentation you've just seen.

[Laughter]

But I think one that seems to work pretty well is simply to say that even if the UN is right, even if you shut down the whole world economy for 41 years, one Celsius degree of global warming will be



MEDIA MONITORS

forestalled and that's on the UN's own figures. That is all. Once they understand that, then you get them to understand that adapting as, and if necessary, is better than trying to stop the emissions taking place in the first place. Why destroy your economy, when it's not going to make the slightest difference to the climate. That's the central point.

[Applause]

QUESTION:

How confident and optimistic are you that this whole mess is going to be turned around, the mess in politics, the mess in science, is going to be turned around and fixed up?

LORD MONCKTON:

Right. The mess in politics, for those of you lucky enough to have democracy, is something you can do something about. If you like your existing government, you can vote for it again. If you don't like your existing government, you can vote it out. We, in the United Kingdom, can't vote our government out, because our government is the unelected commissars of the new miserable, grey dictatorship of the European Union.

[Laughter]

And now for the science, for the science part of your answer, one of the great things about the truth is that the truth is untouchable. You can lie and lie and lie again, but the truth remains the truth. The art, therefore, is to minimise the damage caused by



MEDIA MONITORS

the lies in other directions, so that the truth eventually can come through.

And I should say, looking at the sheer size of the audiences who have been kind enough to come and listen to these presentations all over Australia, that the truth is much more widely understood than your pollies yet understand, and they are going to have to learn that very fast - or find themselves flung out of office.

There.

QUESTION:

In the early 1900s, the western media told the citizens of the world they were going to freeze to death. By 1925 they'd reversed that stand and said we would cook to death. In 1955 they'd reversed the stand and said they were going to be frozen to death. And just as I was giving up UGG Boots [indistinct] thirty years, they told me I'm now going to be cooked to death. Can your - can you give us views on why the media over more than 100 years have been so persistently wrong in the reporting [indistinct]?

LORD MONCKTON:

Yes, I can. First of all, journalists are dumb. [Laughter] I know this because I was a journalist once, and I decided I'd better stop. Secondly, which sells more newspapers: world to end shock? Or climate continuing changeable. That's it.

So there.

Oh, there was one here first, yes.

QUESTION: Do you believe that the post Copenhagen so-called global government is going to be cheaper and more efficient than the European solution?

LORD MONCKTON: Well I'm glad to say that so far we've more or less managed to stop the global government. They're - all they've set up is a high level panel, a sort of stub which would start accreting money to itself, and hope to acquire power. But with luck - and with those countries like you that still remain democratic - you can now make sure that no more money and no more power go to this hideous world government monster.

All I should say to you on this is just say no, and do not pay.

QUESTION: [Inaudible question]

LORD MONCKTON: Right. They compiled that draft from proxy data where they gave 390 times as much weight to bristlecone pine proxies as they did to other proxies that didn't give them the hockey stick shape. They shouldn't have used bristlecone pines anyway because they are known to be affected not only in their tree ring width by temperature increases, but also by rainfall, and also by CO2 fertilisation - which totally screws up the record, which is why the UN had said, don't use these proxies. But they used them anyway.



MEDIA MONITORS

They also used a proxy called the Tilianda Proxy(*) which is known to be dubious, and if you take the Tilianda and the bristlecone pine proxies out, the hockey stick no longer works, and you get instead the medieval warm period just as they showed it in the 1990 report - alive and well.

They also used data for the northern hemisphere only, which allowed them to exaggerate by 50 per cent the warming of the twentieth century - 50 per cent. And they also used a model in processing that data which, whatever data you put in, including random red noise, which is a special kind of randomised data, would always draw hockey stick shapes regardless of the data you fed into it.

When any two or three of these fudgies and fiddles and distortions, and frankly criminal distortions of the data were taken out, the hockey stick shape disappears; and the medieval warm period reappears.

That graph is the most discredited artefact in the dismal history of bogus science.

[Applause]

QUESTION: You mentioned in your talk that the Japanese record showed diminution of cloud cover.

LORD MONCKTON: No, that wasn't the Japanese records that showed that. The Japanese records merely showed a very



MEDIA MONITORS

good correlation between changes in radiant energy at the earth surface, probably caused by cloud cover, and changes in temperature.

QUESTION:

So perhaps there is a drying rather than a warming, is that a...

LORD MONCKTON:

No, there was a drying - or at least there was a reduction in cloud cover - over that particular period of 19 years. Some of that cloud cover has now restored itself. These things wax and wane for reasons we don't yet understand, and I can't pretend to explain. Henrik Svensmark in Denmark says it may be to do with variations in the solar wind, causing variations in the amount of cosmic rays that come in and help to nucleate clouds.

There's all sorts of reasons that have been offered. None yet has kind of won universal acceptance.

But cloud cover seems to come and go. And it seems to be the main reason why you get these uppy-downny fluctuations, or stochastic fluctuations in the temperature data set. And it is by allowing for those fluctuations, and then working out what the underlying trend from CO₂ is, that you realise the underlying trend of general drifting upwards in warming from CO₂ is so very much smaller than what the UN thinks it is.

Thank you.



MEDIA MONITORS

QUESTION: [Indistinct] all the major national organisations are in it, and they're all wrong. Where does the [indistinct]?

LORD MONCKTON: I think the first thing that we have to do is stop funding science as taxpayers. That's been a mistake. There is only one paying customer for science these days, and that's the state. Ninety nine of all science - ninety-nine per cent of all science is bought and paid for by the state via the taxpayer, whether the taxpayer likes it or not.

That induces a kind of culture of dependency much the same as somebody living on the dole. The science - the scientists are all like this, and they therefore begin to pander to what the state wants. And indeed, Garth Paltridge who wanted to speak out recently against global warming, and did so, was rung up by the university's funding council of Australia - that may not be its right name, but it's that body - and they rang up and they said, if you say anything like that in public ever again, we will cut off all tenure, all funding, and all grants to you from now, and forever.

That's the kind of threats that are being made by bureaucrats who want to peddle this agenda because they can see it's going to make them very rich.

So we've got to get science out of the hands of bureaucrats, out of the hands of the state, and back



MEDIA MONITORS

into the hands of - aristocrats who do it on their own because they're...

[Laughter]

... thank you.

QUESTION:

And just [indistinct] on your closing remarks there regarding all of the [indistinct], it's [indistinct] said that you've never seen a rich man go hungry. And that's very true. And then the people who need the food can't afford to buy it. those in Australia and other countries, we can't afford to grow it and give it away. Somewhere there needs to be a balance. Where do you draw a solution to your problem where we can get rid of the food we will grow and get it to payers who need it and [indistinct]?

LORD MONCKTON:

Yep. Well I'll tell you the first thing that I would do - and that is to abolish the European Union.

[Laughter]

And I'll tell you - that's not a silly point actually. Because the European Union abandoned Commonwealth preference. And once we no longer preserved Commonwealth preference, other Commonwealth countries didn't either. One of the greatest mechanisms the world has ever seen for getting food from countries like Australia that grow it in huge quantities to countries in the Commonwealth - the black Commonwealth in



MEDIA MONITORS

particular where food was desperately needed - was Commonwealth preference.

It is a bitter regret to me that the European Union interfered with that process, and Edward Heath's stupidity in not preserving Commonwealth preference.

[Applause]

So like her majesty the Queen, I see a terrific role for the Commonwealth - and in particular for great and splendid nations like Australia.

I now have to dash for my plane. But I do want to leave you with one final thought. It has been a serious and real pleasure for me to be in your great and great hearted and splendid country. So I end just with three words: God bless Australia.

[Applause]

Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER:

Now just one final thing - just - I don't know how we're going to get this to you in the home country, but this is a special thank you from the New South Wales Farmers Association. I don't know how closely this is related to Ian Plimer's country at Broken Hill, but anyway.



LORD MONCKTON: There it is.

MALE SPEAKER: Thank you, anyway.

LORD MONCKTON: Thank you all.

[Applause]

MALE SPEAKER: And thank you to John Smeed and co, too.

LORD MONCKTON: Thanks very much. Bless you.

* * **END** * *

TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY MEDIA MONITORS
target-monitor-analyse

CLIENT SERVICE CENTRE
1300 880 082

AGENCY REPORT For private research and not to be disseminated. Every effort made to ensure accuracy for the benefit of our clients but no legal responsibility is taken for errors or omissions. (*) - Indicates unknown spelling or phonetic spelling. Metro TV demographics are supplied by OzTAM, Radio and Non-Metro TV demographics are supplied by Nielsen Media Research.

ABs = Managers, administrators, professions. GBs = Grocery buyers.
