

This is the text of a letter from Professor Robert Carter in reply to Dr David Tranter's letter.

I thank Dr Tranter for encouraging people to inspect my website and attend my forthcoming talk in Mittagong on Feb. 19. I fully agree with the implication of his letter that public policy on global warming should be set on the basis of a firm understanding of available scientific knowledge.

Where I disagree with Dr Tranter is in his belief that the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and various national science academies represent the best source of dispassionate science advice on the issue. Rather, and regrettably, these bodies are strongly political, as is the advice that they render.

For example, the Royal Society in London issues its climate statements through its Council. The membership of the society has not been polled to determine its views on the global warming issue (which, of course, will be many and varied, as befits active scientists). Most of the members of the Royal Society Council have no more knowledge or understanding of climate science than any other variegated group of scientists, and, properly, their prime concern is with the governance and perpetuation of the Society and with safeguarding its funding sources. The same comments apply with equal force to virtually all of the other national science academies, worldwide, that have expressed an "official" view on global warming.

And in any case, you do not need an advanced science degree, nor advice from a science "authority", to understand the simple commonsensical facts that are relevant to the dangerous human-caused global warming issue.

As I shall show in my talk this week, these facts include (i) that the earth is currently cooling; (ii) that warming due to human carbon dioxide emissions has not yet been measured, and will never be of dangerous magnitude; (iii) that natural climate change poses our gravest environmental hazard, within which cooling trends or events are potentially the most harmful; and, therefore (iv) that introducing carbon dioxide taxation legislation, as the federal government intends to do, is an expensive exercise in futility, for it aims to reduce warming at a time when cooling is underway, and anyway is unlikely to cause any measurable change in future climate at all.

Yours etc.

Professor Bob Carter  
James Cook University

