

Preservation of Freedom & Democracy in Australia

Volume 1

The Case Against the Climate Alarmism Dictatorship and the Carbon Dioxide Tax Panic

By Graham Williamson
grahamhw@iprimus.com.au
April, 2011

'The new religion of global warming is a great story, and a phenomenal best seller. It contains a grain of truth and a mountain of nonsense. And that nonsense could be very damaging indeed. We appear to have entered a new age of unreason, which threatens to be as economically harmful as it is profoundly disquieting. It is from this, above all, that we really do need to save the planet'.

Nigel Lawson, p. 106, 'An Appeal to Reason: A Cool Look at Global Warming', 2008.
Cited by Robert Carter (47)

[Introduction](#)

[Scientific Facts or Political Alarmism?](#)

[Pay Your Carbon Dioxide Tax and Watch the Oceans Drop and the Icebergs Form](#)

[The Underlying Science – Dissenters from the Alarmist Political & Media Campaign](#)

[Globalism, Interdependence, and Allegiance to The United Nations – The Agenda Combat Forgot](#)

[Carbon Dioxide Tax for Climate Change or UN Global Wealth Redistribution?](#)

[Does the Government Really Care So Much About the Environment?](#)

[Enslaved by a Litany of Lies or Liberated by One Truth – Future Directions](#)

[References](#)

Introduction

The Australian government it seems, is doing so many stupid things. But are they really so stupid? Or is it all intentional? Is it part of their plan, a plan which is so distant from the worst nightmare of ordinary Australians that they simply could not believe it?

At the outset I would like to stress most emphatically that the carbon dioxide tax issue goes way beyond superficial concerns about climate change and the degree of financial compensation. The Gillard government is challenging the very foundations of our democracy by seeking to prevent any democratic choice and even silence any opposing voices by an orchestrated and extreme campaign of vilification and intimidation. On so many fronts the Gillard government is obsessively pursuing the type of deliberately divisive extreme policies which would excite those who dream of a global dictatorship where Australians have absolutely no choice other than to submit to the extreme whims of a green “global army”. The current government is busily attacking our freedoms, our democracy, our social cohesiveness and border control, and undermining our sovereignty and economy. While pretending to Australians that the carbon dioxide tax is intended to reverse climate change, the Minister for Climate Change, Greg Combet, has

committed Australia to the United Nations plan to introduce a carbon dioxide tax which the United Nations admits is primarily intended to enable the financing of a world government, not change the climate.

Those who seek to enslave and further their own shameful agenda rely upon the people not being able to see the full extent of their inner ugliness and dishonesty, at least until they have total control. Can you see it? Have a closer look after you read this article.

Scientific Facts or Political Alarmism?

There are many at the forefront of the environmental and global warming movement today who appear to spend their lives jet setting around the world spreading their low emission, low carbon message of panic and impending doom regarding catastrophic changes to global temperatures and sea levels. According to the message they forcefully convey, not only is the global temperature increasing alarmingly, with all its alleged consequences of increased droughts, increased floods, increased cyclones, increased sea levels and reduced polar ice, but further, all these events are caused by man's influence upon climate by increased atmospheric carbon dioxide levels arising primarily from man's affluence and hunger for electricity, hydrocarbon fuels and energy. They apparently believe that if we all switch off our lights, air conditioners and heaters, cease using our appliances, and walk or ride bicycles instead of using cars, then these changes will be reversed and the climate returned to normal. They seem to believe they have the power to reduce global temperatures, reduce floods and droughts, reduce sea levels and increase polar ice simply by introducing a carbon tax or carbon trading scheme, perhaps even going so far as to suggest all this has been proved by scientists. But the astute reader will no doubt be readily able to distinguish between a political campaign and a scientific campaign. Self serving political campaigns use the media to promote emotion, fear, panic, and perhaps hysteria, and are high on rhetoric, insults, vilification and intimidation of opponents, but correspondingly low on facts and truth. Extremists prefer to silence or eliminate the opposition rather than have a true debate.

It is absolutely absurd to suggest that science has proved that a carbon dioxide tax can lower sea levels and increase polar ice but yet, amazingly, this it seems, is what we are expected to believe. This government insults the intelligence of the Australian community at every step, expecting us to believe any far fetched tale.

What is not so often mentioned is the fact that political climate change alarmists frequently not only believe in alleged climate change, but they also believe that the best and perhaps the only solution is to give *them* the political power to fine individuals and companies billions of dollars. One gets the distinct impression that if this transfer of money and power were not involved, or if it was controlled by a totally independent body of ordinary citizens, all of a sudden there would be a dramatic reduction in the number of ardent environmentalists and those believing in climate change.

Billions of dollars have already been spent and enormous resources consumed by an enormous global army of workers and bureaucrats whose job it is to try to spread fear and panic and convince the world of the catastrophe which is about to befall us and thereby justify legislation to force a carbon dioxide tax or similar monetary penalty upon the citizens of the world. According to these beliefs, only by imposing a monetary penalty or "fine" can global temperatures and sea levels be reduced. I deliberately use the term "fine" as this term is normally used to describe monetary punishment for an action or wrongdoing whereas the term "tax" is not normally intended to penalise and modify behaviour. In the case of the carbon dioxide fine, it is clearly being justified by blame about damage to the climate and seeks to bring about corrective action. It is most noteworthy that both the United Nations and the Australian government describe it as a carbon dioxide "tax" and not a carbon dioxide "fine". If it is a *tax* rather than a *fine* then clearly it is not intended to penalise and change behaviour, it is intended instead to raise government revenue.

It is interesting to note the enormously expanded bureaucracy which already exists to promote and police the global warming sustainability agenda. As productive jobs and farms are diminished, more and more people are employed to ensure the rest of us comply with the requirements of the United Nations sustainability and climate change agenda. Governments often refer to the explosion of "green jobs" as a result of the green agenda and there is absolutely no doubt a veritable "green army" of workers will be required to ensure ordinary productive citizens do not violate the stringent sustainability requirements of the United Nations. This is already happening though much of the legislation does not yet even exist.

At the outset let me make it abundantly clear that the onus of proof in this whole debate is completely on the climate change alarmists for it is they who are attempting to radically change accepted wisdom and force their radical doomsday views upon the entire global population.

While this article will examine various aspects of the carbon dioxide tax and the driving forces behind it, later articles will consider in more detail the part played by the United Nations and issues relating to national sovereignty.

Pay Your Carbon Dioxide Tax and Watch Ocean Levels Drop and the Icebergs Form

Assuming the scientific facts relating to anthropogenic global warming have already been established, how effective will the carbon dioxide tax be as a means of lowering global temperatures? There are two aspects to this question. Firstly there is the impact of unilateral imposition of a carbon tax with Australia going it alone without the support of the major polluting countries of the world. Secondly there is the question regarding the environmental impact if every country in the world were to introduce a carbon dioxide tax. Let us consider the latter first.

The discussion below makes the monstrous assumption that the carbon dioxide tax will be 100% effective in achieving its purpose of modifying human behaviour and lowering emissions. The carbon dioxide tax in reality of course, will have an entirely unpredictable effect on human behaviour and emissions. Clouding the issue even further are the various “compensation packages” being considered by the government, the aim of which is to counteract any effect on human behaviour and emissions.

Tim Flannery, the Climate Change Commissioner for the Australian government, whose job it is to act as a “salesman” for the tax, has already answered questions relating to the scientific effectiveness of the carbon tax as a means of modifying climate ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#)):

“If the world as a whole cut all emissions tomorrow the average temperature of the planet is not going to drop in several hundred years, perhaps as much as 1000 years because the system is overburdened with CO2 that has to be absorbed”

Flannery also conceded that any drop in temperature which did occur would be very slight, even after 1000 years.

Since global temperature increases in the next 100 years have been predicted by alarmists to range from 3-4 degrees Celsius or perhaps as much as 6 degrees ([4](#), [5](#), [6](#)), it is clear that even those who support the carbon dioxide tax acknowledge that this tax will have absolutely no effect on reversing this projected temperature increase, especially given the short time span involved. In the case of projected sea level increases, which are predicted by alarmists to increase globally this century by 80cm to as much as 2 metres ([6](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#)), the impact of the carbon dioxide tax may be more than 900 years too late to save inundated islands and coastal areas.

Since global sea level has been claimed to have risen by 10cm in total or 1.25mm annually in the 80 years from 1920-2000 ([11](#)) while current projections forecast an increase of up to 2 metres this century, it is abundantly clear that the alarmists predict an enormous sudden increase in global sea level in the remainder of this century. This represents an increase this century 20 times greater than the total increase that occurred in the previous 80 years.

Fundamental to the arguments of the climate change alarmists are the time frames as depicted above with catastrophic environmental changes expected this century. This is absolutely fundamental to their often stated urgency, alarm, and panic and the need for a carbon dioxide tax before the next election. Predicted changes this century include increased poverty and starvation due to reduced crop production ([12](#)) and displacement of 100 million people due to a rise in sea levels of up to 2 metres ([9](#), [10](#)).

If these predictions are correct then obviously we need **immediate** answers.

To assess the possible effectiveness of a carbon trading or carbon tax system as a means of controlling climate, Professor John Christy gave the following evidence to US Congress ([15](#) , 16)

“I am John Christy, Alabama’s State Climatologist, Distinguished Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Alabama in Huntsville, and participant in many national and international climate science panels, including being one of several Lead Authors of the IPCC.”

“I want to bring a bit of hard-core metrics to the objectives described for the Hearing today. I have testified several times before House and Senate Hearings on climate issues, but also have testified in Federal Court on specific consequences of proposed legislative actions.”

“I calculated, using IPCC climate models, that even if the entire country adopts these rules, the net

impact would be at most one hundredth of a degree by 2100 (Fig. 1). The Federal Court accepted this analysis. And, even if the entire world did the same, the effect would be less than four hundredths of a degree by 2100, an amount so tiny we cannot even measure it with instruments, let alone notice it in anyway.”

In spite of the urgency to introduce a carbon dioxide tax it seems, the climate alarmists are endorsing a policy which they themselves admit could not be expected to have any effect on climate until 1000 years time, much too late to save countless millions of people. And so far they have provided no scientific evidence whatsoever that a globally imposed carbon dioxide tax could reverse the projected sea level rise this century.

But it seems that climate change alarmists have frequently been caught making false and exaggerated claims to spread their message of fear and panic ([7](#), [13](#), [71](#)) with a British Court even finding Al Gore resorted to “*nine untruths*” in his documentary *An Inconvenient Truth* ([14](#)). The judge concluded that it was a “*political film*” rather than a factually based scientific film. It seems it was more a work of science fiction rather than fact, though Al Gore declined to point this out to his followers.

Since there is absolutely no scientific evidence that a globally imposed carbon dioxide tax will reverse the projected temperature and sea level increases this century it is clear that suggestions that Australia needs to resort to urgent unilateral action to impose a carbon tax are not only completely devoid of scientific or environmental justification, but further, they are completely lacking in any semblance of common sense. These claims have absolutely nothing to do with science and climate change and everything to do with politics and control of global wealth. In as much as such claims are justified environmentally they are fundamentally dishonest and misleading and they remain so until scientific evidence reveals that a unilateral carbon tax will lower temperatures and sea levels and increase polar ice.

The fact that a unilateral carbon dioxide tax will be environmentally useless, perhaps even significantly environmentally detrimental, and will destroy Australia’s economy, have been well documented ([17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#)).

Proponents of the carbon dioxide tax have produced no evidence whatsoever, even if it is implemented globally, that it will prevent or reduce the environmental disasters they are predicting this century. So why are they so obsessed with a strategy which even they admit is doomed to failure and will not save any of the lives they say are threatened by climate change this century? Why not endorse policies which will save lives?

The Underlying Science – Dissenters from the Alarmist Political & Media Campaign

The global climate change alarmist agenda has originated from the United Nations and is characterised by the fact that it is essentially a political or media campaign. For this reason the goals of the campaign appear to revolve around the conspicuous mobilising and monopolising of public opinion rather than the passive dissemination of scientific facts and influencing of key decision makers. Given the obvious preference for sensationalism and alarmism by many climate change advocates it is hardly surprising that there are numerous reputable scientists around the world who prefer to oppose the views of the climate change alarmists without resort to alarm and hysteria. For these scientists of course, media sensationalism is not the tool of their trade. Genuine scientists have no need for cheap sensationalism and alarmism for these are the tools of the politician or the scoundrel. Those who promote their beliefs most loudly and most aggressively clearly display a preoccupation with enforced subservience rather than truth. Society demonstrates quite clearly that such persons frequently go to any length in their efforts to prevent the truth from being heard. There are however, many scientists who have raised their concerns regarding fundamental scientific fabrications, distortions, or exaggerations and the tendency of climate change alarmists to stifle or prevent opposing views being publicised.

Below I have listed just a few of these world renowned scientists and will follow with a summary of their concerns about the scientific standard of the current climate change debate

[Richard Lindzen](#)

Richard S. Lindzen is the Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Sciences at Massachusetts Institute of Technology ([25](#), [26](#), [27](#), [28](#))

[Garth Paltridge](#)

Garth William Paltridge, is a retired Australian atmospheric physicist. He is presently a Visiting Fellow at the Australian National University and Emeritus Professor and Honorary Research Fellow at the Institute of Antarctic and Southern Oceans Studies (IASOS), University of Tasmania ([29](#), [30](#), [31](#), [32](#), [33](#)).

[William M. Gray](#)

William M. "Bill" Gray is Emeritus Professor of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University (CSU), and head of the Tropical Meteorology Project at CSU's Department of Atmospheric Sciences. He is a pioneer in the science of forecasting hurricanes and one of the world's leading experts on tropical storms ([34](#), [35](#), [36](#)).

[William Kininmonth](#)

William Robert Kininmonth is a retired Australian meteorologist noted for his views as an opponent of anthropogenic global warming theory and for his frequent writings on the topic of climate change ([37](#), [38](#), [39](#), [40](#), [41](#)).

[John Christy](#)

John R. Christy is a climate scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville whose chief interests are satellite remote sensing of global climate and global climate change ([15](#), [42](#), [43](#)).

[Robert Carter](#)

Robert M. "Bob" Carter is an adjunct research professor in the Marine Geophysical Laboratory at James Cook University, Queensland and the University of Adelaide South Australia, Australia. He is a geologist specializing in palaeontology, stratigraphy, marine geology, and environmental science. Carter is a former Director of Australia's Secretariat for the Ocean Drilling Program and a Co-Chief Scientist for drilling leg 181. He is an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Society of New Zealand ([16](#), [44](#), [45](#), [46](#), [47](#)).

The scientific case discrediting the claims of the climate change alarmists can be found here ([23](#), [24](#)):

The above scientists provide scientific evidence that:

1. Global temperature increases are very small and not as great as claimed by climate alarmists. In fact the accepted global temperature increase of a fraction of 1 degree over the past century is so small it is well within the normal margin of error and normal natural climatic variations. Due to inaccuracies, measuring limitations and bias, such as the urban heat transfer effect, the possible temperature error may be more than 1 degree, that is, more than the entire claimed increase of the last century. Climate alarmists who claim a global temperature increase of 0.7-1.00 degree over the past century seem to avoid publicising details relating to the possible margin of error within their figures. Scientific evidence also reveals that in the past decade there is global cooling even though CO2 levels have increased, a fact which clearly shows the temperature is being controlled by other factors, not CO2. Scientists cite evidence that this is the second time in the past 100 years that increasing CO2 levels have correlated with *decreasing* temperatures.
2. Historically, global temperature does not necessarily follow CO2 levels, as noted above, because there are so many other factors involved, thus invalidating the alarmists claimed use of the carbon dioxide fine as a climate control measure. Any temperature increase can be explained by natural mechanisms and cannot be proven to be due to CO2 production by humans. Reductions in CO2 emissions cannot be reliably predicted to bring about a significant global cooling effect in the foreseeable future.
3. As noted above, according to the climate change alarmists, up to 100 million people may be displaced before the end of this century as global sea level rises up to 2 metres higher than it is presently. Firstly, it should be pointed out again that the predictions of the climate alarmists regarding dramatic global sea level rise are based upon speculative computer models rather than scientific evidence. Secondly, the concept of average global sea level is itself rather meaningless since it is the changes in local sea level which dictate policy and determine consequences of any sea level increase. Local sea level is constantly changing around the world due to both local and global factors. Global sea level has been reported to have increased by around 1.8mm per year through the 20th century, hardly cause for alarm. The setting up of accurate tide gauges by the Australian government in 1993 has also produced disappointing results for the alarmists. Sea level increases, according to the scientific evidence, are most unalarming.
4. Fundamental to the alarmists's case is the extreme urgency involved due to the enormous changes they predict will occur this century. As noted above, in actual fact changes in global temperature and sea level are most unalarming. Infinitely greater fluctuations occur daily throughout the world and if we could focus on predicting these changes we may be able to save many lives.
5. The climate change alarmists rely heavily on projections derived from virtual reality computer models rather than scientific evidence. Computer models and projections derived from them have been observed to have been manipulated, exaggerated and falsified.

The abovementioned scientists point out that future projections of temperature increases are fundamentally flawed because of the huge number of unpredictable variables involved and there is absolutely no scientific justification for the current politically motivated alarmism or urgent campaign to introduce a carbon dioxide tax or similar political

mechanism. This alarmist campaign to introduce a carbon tax is generally considered a political campaign which has no basis in science.

The Australian government's Climate Change Commissioner, whose job it is to sell the tax, has also drawn attention to the scientific shortcomings of the global warming case ([48](#))

"We're dealing with an incomplete understanding of the way the earth system works... When we come to the last few years when we haven't seen a continuation of that (warming) trend we don't understand all of the factors that create earth's climate... We just don't understand the way the whole system works... See, these people work with models, computer modelling. So when the computer modelling and the real world data disagree you've got a very interesting problem... Sure for the last 10 years we've gone through a slight cooling trend."

Flannery has not only acknowledged the scientific shortcomings of the global warming case and the fact that the warming has now ceased and the world is cooling, but further, he has also pointed out that even if every country in the world lowered their CO2 emissions there would not be any effect on climate for perhaps 1000 years ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#)):

"If the world as a whole cut all emissions tomorrow the average temperature of the planet is not going to drop in several hundred years, perhaps as much as 1000 years because the system is overburdened with CO2 that has to be absorbed..."

The views of the government's Climate Change Commissioner are therefore completely at odds with the government's campaign of climate alarmism which requires the immediate introduction of a carbon dioxide tax. According to Flannery, the scientific evidence is not clear, the world is now cooling anyhow, and a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions could not be expected to make any difference to climate for 1000 years in any case.

Interestingly, in December 2007, 103 scientists and climate experts wrote to the Secretary General of the United Nations to voice their concerns regarding the false or misleading claims made by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (cited by Carter - [47](#)):

"Recent observations of phenomena such as glacial retreats, sea-level rise and the migration of temperature-sensitive species are not evidence for abnormal climate change, for none of these changes has been shown to lie outside the bounds of known natural variability."

"The average rate of warming of 0.1-0.20 C/decade recorded by satellites during the late 20th century falls within known natural rates of warming and cooling over the last 10,000 years."

"Leading scientists, including some senior IPCC representatives, acknowledge that today's computer models cannot predict climate. Consistent with this, and despite computer projections of temperature rises, there has been no net global warming since 1998. That the current temperature plateau follows a late 20th century period of warming is consistent with the continuation today of natural multi-decadal or millennial climate cycling."

As Carter points out ([47](#)): *"The IPCC is the United Nations body whose second chairman, John Houghton, wrote in 1994 that 'unless we announce disasters, no one will listen'."*

Professor Bob Carter has recently summarised the issue with his **"Ten Little Facts About Global Warming"** ([46](#)). Number 2 on his list of facts states ([46](#)):

“We need to link much more closely with the climate emergency”

“There is no ‘climate emergency’; the term is a deliberate lie. Global average temperature at the end of the 20th century fell well within the bounds of natural climate variation, and was in no way unusually warm, or cold, in geological terms.”

“Earth’s temperature is currently cooling slightly.”

There is absolutely no scientific climatic justification for a carbon dioxide fine globally, and even less justification unilaterally. Evidence shows that the carbon dioxide fine can only be politically justified by extremists as a “tax” intended to redistribute wealth but which will have absolutely no effect on climate.

Globalism, Interdependence, and Allegiance to The United Nations – The Agenda Combet Forgot

Generally speaking it is the unpatriotic globalists who are the greatest deliberate drivers of climate alarmism and the exploitation of sustainability and the environment. To them the environment is nothing more than the means by which they pursue their dream of surrendering and eroding national sovereignty leading to complete global domination. Allegiance to the United Nations is frequently a prerequisite for deliberate drivers of climate alarmism. I refer here of course to those who knowingly deliberately propagate climate alarmism as distinct from those who unknowingly are swept up by the hysteria and their ignorance exploited by those who know the truth.

Closet United Nations globalists are generally conspicuous by their divisive domestic policies, their tendency to export jobs and farms to other countries, their refusal to introduce domestic policies to preserve sovereignty, and their preference for policies that undermine the economy and social cohesiveness of their own country. They will do virtually anything to blur national boundaries and erode border control. They shun democracy and seek to intimidate and silence any who oppose their agenda. Usually their preferred strategy is to lower all to the lowest common denominator. They often preach tolerance but practice extreme intolerance. They obediently and subserviently pursue the United Nation’s aims of global interdependence as they deindustrialise and sacrifice the independence of their own countries. Instead of strong independent countries they dream of producing a condition of complete global interdependence which will have all the fragility of precariously placed dominoes.

They are particularly fearful of the public learning their true agenda, especially at election time. Clearly this anxiety about electoral scrutiny is related to the degree to which they regard their own agenda as repulsive and unacceptable to the electorate. They clearly fear the punishment they may receive if the truth were to become known!

The UN and their supporters in each country are always looking for global issues which can be used as an excuse for a global power grab and the removal of wealth from affluent nations. Previously it was the nuclear threat but now it is the environment and sustainability. Currently the UN is exploiting environmental concerns, in concert with governments around the world, to breakdown the independence of nations, redistribute global wealth, take control of sovereign land and private property, and accumulate ever increasing control of countries around the world. They are achieving these ends in Australia and globally with their Agenda 21 sustainability program ([49](#), [50](#), [51](#), [52](#), [53](#), [54](#), [55](#)) and this program is also being implemented by Local Agenda 21 initiatives through sustainability officers in local councils ([56](#), [57](#), [58](#)).

The alarming implications of Agenda 21 have been noted by many ([51](#)):

“Agenda 21 embraces virtually every aspect of human life; it is being implemented aggressively in the United States. Congress has never examined the totality of the Agenda. Instead, Congress is fed only bits and pieces in the context of ‘protecting the environment.’ The ultimate objective of Agenda 21 is to establish ‘international norms’ of personal behaviour that are dictated by a handful of the world’s enlightened elite who believe they know best how people ought to live.”

The carbon dioxide tax is just one of the tools used by the UN to further their global agenda. The United Nations, and their representatives in member countries, seek to transfer the wealth, resources, and jobs from the richer countries to the poorer countries. They believe the richer countries consume too much energy and resources to support their standard of living and this must be reversed. According to this philosophy the costs of energy in affluent nations must be raised to ridiculous levels to force a significant reduction of energy consumption and standard of living in affluent nations. Countries must be lowered to the lowest common denominator as funds from affluent nations are used to support brutal dictatorships which have such a significant influence within the United Nations.

According to Robert Mugabe from Zimbabwe, at the 65th Session of the United Nations ([59](#)):

“We are meeting today to reaffirm our commitment to the United Nations and, in particular, to its comprehensive agenda for the promotion of peace and security, sustainable development and human rights.”.....”We are also alarmed that powerful states, which daily preach peace and good governance continue to trample with impunity upon the sovereignty of poor and weak nations.”.....” It is clear that climate change is now one of the most pressing global issues of our time. Copenhagen failed to produce a successor to the Kyoto Protocol, an outcome that many of us had hoped for. Yet that conference was significant in its own way. It demonstrated the futility of attempts by the rich and powerful to impose their views and policies on the poor and weak. What we need, Mr President, is not an imposition of solutions based on self-interest, but a consensus on the reduction of harmful emissions and a climate change regime that balances adaptation and mitigation backed by the transfer of technology and resources.”

The carbon tax is just one part of this UN process to “transfer resources” to such countries and in so doing to lower all to the lowest common denominator, all in the name of saving the environment. Greg Combet and the Australian government have signed up for this program to exploit environmental concerns to justify this transfer of Australian resources to poorer countries and in so doing lower Australia’s standard of living to the lowest common denominator.

I have repeatedly raised these issues with Greg Combet but to date he has completely ignored all my correspondence. Perhaps he has no answers, or perhaps he is ashamed of the true answers and he does not wish to be accused of telling lies like the Prime Minister. Perhaps a smart decision.

Carbon Dioxide Tax for Climate Change or UN Global Wealth Redistribution?

We have seen above that the carbon dioxide tax cannot be scientifically justified as a means of changing or controlling climate and we have seen that the carbon dioxide tax is just one part of the global agenda of the UN. So why is there such a panic to introduce the carbon dioxide tax? So what is the true agenda of carbon dioxide tax fanatics?

To answer these questions we need look no further than the fact that climate alarmists describe it as a “tax”, and not a “fine” which is intended to penalise and change behaviour. A tax of course is simply a revenue raising tool.

The United Nations initially proposed the carbon dioxide tax strategy NOT from an attempt to rectify global warming but rather it was one of various taxes they considered in pursuit of their goals to reduce the wealth of affluent nations and redistribute this wealth globally. The fact that the tax could be justified on climatic and environmental grounds was incidental but it also made the carbon tax a very attractive option compared to other wealth redistribution taxes they considered. According to the Secretary General of the United Nations in 2004 ([60](#)):

*“To the extent that emissions impose environmental damage wherever they occur, the corrective tax should be the same. However, this needs to be moderated to take account of the unequal distribution of world income — **the very reason for our current interest in the (carbon)tax.** Considerations of global justice point to poor countries bearing less of the cost burden, and may justify the tax being levied only on high-income or middle-income countries.”*

The United Nations stresses here that the carbon dioxide tax is proposed because of “*the unequal distribution of world income*” and not because of climate change.

In respect of choosing the carbon dioxide tax to raise revenue instead of other taxes the United Nations points out ([61](#)):

“If global taxation is considered desirable, the Conference and the Summit are likely to find more promise in a carbon tax—a tax on the consumption of fossil fuels, at rates that reflect the contribution of these fuels to CO₂ emissions. This tax could serve two important goals: limiting the rise in global temperatures associated with burning these fuels, and raising revenue.”

The United Nations further emphasises that as they move towards a world government they will need to implement

effective global taxes (60):

“One interesting point of departure is to consider the taxes and transfers that might be instituted by a world government”..... “If such a global government were to act in the interests of world citizens as a whole, then global welfare maximization is likely to imply substantial positive taxes on almost everyone in richer countries and substantial transfers to the majority of people in low-income countries”..... “Any foreseeable global tax will be introduced, not by a unitary world government, but as the result of concerted action by nation states”... “We have both global institutions and national governments, and it is the latter which have to agree to the taxes being levied and which are accountable to their electorates. It could indeed be the case that the global tax is treated as simply a glorified domestic tax, with the revenue being forwarded by national governments to a global spending body”... “national governments retain not only control over the administration of the tax process but also discretion over the tax rates. In this case, participating governments would agree on their national tax liability but retain the freedom to decide how the revenue is to be raised.”

The United Nations further points out that countries should be taxed according to how wealthy they are (60):

“Does this mean that the global tax should be levied at the same rate on all countries? To the extent that emissions impose environmental damage wherever they occur, the corrective tax should be the same. However, this needs to be moderated to take account of the unequal distribution of world income — the very reason for our current interest in the tax. Considerations of global justice point to poor countries bearing less of the cost burden, and may justify the tax being levied only on high-income or middle-income countries.”..... “A global tax on carbon use at a rate equivalent to a tax on gasoline of 4.8 cents per United States gallon (approximately €0.01 per litre) levied only on high-income countries could indeed raise some US\$ 60 billion a year. Such a rate of global tax would represent a very small addition to those applied by many national governments, and is an order of magnitude smaller than the increases considered in proposals to halt global warming.”

The United Nations also points out that if the carbon tax is going to continue to generate sufficient revenue then it should not be set at such a high level that it reduces CO2 emissions to zero as this would be counter productive (60):

“The carbon-use tax can make a major contribution to raising revenue at a much lower rate than that suggested as needed to halt global warming. Taking this argument to the limit, we may note that a carbon tax that reduced emissions to zero would be an environmental success but a revenue failure.”..... “The energy tax considered here has a rate of one tenth or one twentieth of those typically considered in the literature on global warming. The taxes are not, therefore, guaranteed to have the major behavioural impact, discouraging pollution and speculation, which has been sought. This conclusion has both negative and positive aspects. On the minus side, it means that the double dividend — of increased revenue plus improved functioning of the economy — may fall short on the second dimension. But it is revenue that is our concern here. The second aspect is positive, which is that the much more modest tax rates envisaged here are more acceptable and less likely to have disruptive economic consequences.”

The UN summarises (61):

“With the rapid advance of global interdependence, problems of poverty and underdevelopment have become global problems for which the world must exercise global responsibility. We have outlined an ambitious agenda to raise the financial resources needed. Undertaking this agenda will require public education and political courage.”

The “*advance of interdependence*” to which the UN refers here clearly refers to the loss of national sovereignty and independence which is occurring throughout the world. The fact that “*political courage*” will be needed is obviously an admission by the UN that the proposed changes must be introduced against or in spite of the will of the people.

These facts have been confirmed again more recently by Edenhoffer of the UN (62):

“Basically it’s a big mistake to discuss climate policy separately from the major themes of globalization. The climate summit in Cancun at the end of the month is not a climate conference, but one of the largest economic conferences since the Second World War”..... “First of all, developed countries have basically expropriated the atmosphere of the world community. But one must say clearly that we redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy. Obviously, the owners of coal and oil will not be enthusiastic about this. One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with the environmental policy anymore, with problems such as deforestation or the ozone hole.”

So while the UN clearly admits that the carbon tax has always been primarily a global wealth redistribution tool

aimed at penalising more affluent nations, this is not communicated to Australians by politicians who prefer to conceal the truth and exploit the situation for their own purposes, even though they eagerly signed the UN agreement.

Still the Gillard government, including Greg Combet who signed the UN agreement at Cancun, pretends that the carbon dioxide tax is about pollution and the environment even though the UN has said quite clearly that the tax must not be set high enough to prevent emissions!

The United Nations has emphasised the potentially lucrative nature of carbon trading ([63](#)):

“When a cap is set on emissions, the right to emit (the emission allowance) becomes a valuable asset. Auctioning of emission allowances may therefore represent a significant source of financing. The revenue potential depends on the volume of the carbon market, the percentage auctioned and the carbon price.”....” The carbon market has grown considerably in recent years. According to the World Bank (2010), the total amount transacted in this market more than doubled from USD 63.0 billion in 2007 to USD 144 billion in 2009.”....” An international agreement on earmarking a percentage of ETS auction revenue for international financing could potentially generate a substantial financial flow.”

The United Nations concludes ([63](#)):

“Revenue generated through public carbon market mechanisms could be regarded as new climate finance, and could contribute towards the USD 100 billion target set out in the Copenhagen Accord. However, in order for these mechanisms to work, be practical, and generate substantial revenues, there is a need for a tight carbon market – and that in turn requires ambitious mitigation commitments. Only then will the right to emit become a valuable asset. In a tight climate regime, emission allowances will be scarce, offset levels substantial, and the carbon price high. In such a regime these sources could generate substantial, additional, and reliable revenues for climate actions in developing countries.”

The United Nations High Level Advisory Group on Climate Change set up following the Cancun agreement, on which Bob McMullan was the Australian representative, further confirmed the potentially lucrative nature of the carbon tax and acknowledged the problem of national sovereignty ([64](#)):

“The Advisory Group emphasized the importance of a carbon price in the range of US\$20-US\$25 per ton of CO₂ equivalent in 2020 as a key element of reaching the US\$100 billion per year. The higher the carbon price, the steeper the rise in available revenues and the stronger the mutual reinforcement of abatement potentials and different measures.

Actual estimates of 2020 revenue potential for new public instruments are sensitive to many assumptions, particularly the carbon price and the share allocated to international climate finance. Based on a carbon price of US\$20-US\$25 per ton of CO₂ equivalent, auctions of emission allowances and domestic carbon taxes in developed countries with up to 10 per cent of total revenues allocated for international climate action could potentially mobilize around US\$30 billion annually. Without underestimating the difficulties to be resolved, particularly in terms of national sovereignty and incidence on developing countries, approximately US\$10 billion annually could be raised from carbon pricing international transportation, assuming no net incidence on developing countries and earmarking between 25 and 50 per cent of total revenues. Up to US\$10 billion could be mobilized from other instruments, such as the redeployment of fossil fuel subsidies in developed countries or some form of financial transaction tax, though diverging views will make it difficult to implement this universally. International private investment flows are essential for the transition to a low-carbon and climate-resilient future. A carbon price of US\$20-US\$25 could generate around US\$100 billion to US\$200 billion of gross private capital flows.”

It should be noted that, according to the United Nations Advisory Group of which Bob McMullan was the Australian government representative, the annual transfer to the UN Green Climate Fund of “10 per cent of total(carbon tax) revenues” “going to international climate action” has the “potential to generate around US\$30 billion annually.” This is in spite of what they call “the difficulties” of “national sovereignty.”

Interestingly, Julie Bishop raised this matter in Parliament and asked the Prime Minister for an explanation ([65](#)):

JULIE BISHOP: “My question is to the Prime Minister. I refer the Prime Minister to her unequivocal statement on Sunday, reiterated by Labor backbenchers today:
‘Every cent raised from pricing carbon will go to assisting households ...’

How can the Prime Minister be trusted when the government entered into an agreement in December last year that requires the government to give a reported 10 per cent of any carbon tax raised to a United Nations climate change fund?”

The Prime Minister responded very evasively as though she wished to conceal the truth:

Ms GILLARD—“The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has asked me how money raised from carbon pricing will be used. I refer her to what I said at the press conference last Thursday. When I announced the carbon pricing mechanism I said:

‘Every cent raised from pricing carbon will go to assisting households, helping businesses manage the transition and funding climate change programs. And the government will always support those who are in need of assistance with cost of living pressures.’

That is where the money will go. When I was on the Today show on Sunday I said:

‘... I do want to be clear. Every cent raised from pricing carbon will go to assisting households, to helping businesses transition, and to programs to tackle climate change. But the highest priority will be assisting households.....’

On the question of foreign aid, what I can say to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is that the government will make its own decisions. You will get yours from One Nation.”

So according to the United Nations, 10% of carbon tax revenue will go to the Green Climate Fund for the purposes of “international climate action”, and according to Julia Gillard an unspecified amount will be utilised for “funding climate change programs.”

The Prime Minister apparently decided it was desirable to avoid any clear answer to Julie Bishop’s question and displayed a determination to refuse to state precisely what proportion of the proceeds would go to what she described as the funding of “climate change programs”. Julia Gillard concluded in this respect that when it comes to “foreign aid” the “government will make its own decisions.” Apparently she believes Australian taxpayers have no right to know where their money goes even though her government has already pledged its support of the United Nations campaign to transfer funds from Australian taxpayers to brutal dictatorships and third world countries.

I have detailed above the agreement entered into by Greg Combet to send up to 10% of the annual proceeds of the carbon tax to the United Nations Green Climate Fund. This is not a secret so why would Julia Gillard be so afraid to tell the truth about this? Why does she apparently feel that the truth would bring such discredit or shame upon the government? Doesn’t she have pride in her policies?

The Liberal Party subsequently expressed their concern about Julia Gillard's refusal to answer the question ([66](#)):

"The Prime Minister today failed to answer a question about the proportion of her carbon tax revenue that will be set aside for the United Nations Green Climate Fund, as agreed by the Australian Government at the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Change Conference and reconfirmed at the 2010 Cancun Conference.

*In contrast ALP backbenchers have been primed to mislead the public to say that all the carbon tax money will be spent on Australian families. For example Deborah O'Neil, the Member for Robertson, stated this morning that "... **the main message is that every cent that is raised by a carbon price is going to go back into assisting households with their household bills and that's what really matters to the people in my electorate.**"*

*In reality, the fact is that in the **Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing** released on 5 November 2010, but written earlier in the year with the assistance of then Parliamentary Secretary for International Development Assistance - Bob McMullen MP - on behalf of the Australian Government (page 4), it was recommended that: **"Based on a carbon price of US\$20-US\$25 per ton of CO2 equivalent, auctions of emission allowances and domestic carbon taxes in developed countries with up to 10 per cent of total revenues allocated for international climate action could potentially mobilize around US\$30 billion annually."** (pages 5-6)*

The High-Level Advisory Group was co-chaired by the Prime Ministers of Norway Jens Stoltenberg, United Kingdom Gordon Brown (originally) and Ethiopia Meles Zenawi.

It is important to note that this proposal would only partially meet the target set by the Copenhagen Conference of \$100 billion per annum.

The question remains. How much of the carbon tax revenue will be contributed to the UN Fund?"

The United Nations admits ([67](#), [68](#), [69](#)), and the Australian government has agreed ([55](#)), as a result of the Cancun agreement, that in 2011 a Green Climate Fund will be established to accept funds from developed countries such as Australia, funds which will total \$30 billion in 2011-2012 rising to \$100 billion by 2020.

As noted above, The United Nations has however admitted the adverse effects of carbon tax mechanisms upon national sovereignty ([64](#)):

"The political acceptability of earmarking part of the auction revenue is uncertain as this will interfere with national sovereignty. Compared with ordinary budget contributions, some countries might not consider domestic ETS auctioning to be a politically easier option for contributing to international financing. For other countries, revenue raised through climate related policies will naturally have an affinity for climate related uses. Nevertheless, once an agreement on earmarking is reached, the decision could be made for several years, and the revenue would not be subject to domestic annual budget procedures. In contrast to annual appropriations, the decision to set aside funds under an ETS would be taken once and for all until the ETS legislation is changed. The decision in itself may be no easier than the annual appropriations, but it would have much greater longevity."

As the present government plots to transfer funds from Australian taxpayers to third world countries, and as it plots to permit people smugglers to break down security and border control, and as it continues to export jobs and farms, it seems equally determined to avoid policies which would strengthen our unity and sovereignty. Divide and conquer seems to be the overwhelming policy as the government seems intent to work against the interests of ordinary Australians.

Does the Government Really Care So Much About the Environment?

The government would have us believe, in spite of their jet setting emission producing lifestyle, that their environmental concerns are such that they lay awake at night waiting for news of the coastal inundation of Australia from rising sea levels, having long since disposed of their luxurious coastal properties. And their extreme anxiety about the imminent catastrophic results of increasing CO2 levels has resulted in the unique sight of politicians pedalling to Parliament House to park their bicycles? And such is their anxiety about sustainability, emissions and the environment that all politicians, from the Prime Minister to backbenchers, have unanimously endorsed the exclusive use of locally produced agricultural products to prevent the enormous emissions resulting from the use of overseas produce? Perhaps the environmental leaders in the government have even gone further in their obsessive campaign to promote the ideal "low footprint lifestyle" characterised by "local consumption and production" by promoting backyard food growing throughout Australia.

Why don't our politicians lead by example in this bold new world of environmental consciousness?

From the point of view of the environment and sustainability the issues below are of absolutely fundamental importance and if the government is sincere with its claimed concern about sustainability then they will have very clear policies regarding these matters.

1. If the government is at all serious about CO2 emissions they will immediately introduce an immediate cap on emissions from high flying politicians.
2. The UN has recently stated (70) that the ideal green option in a truly green world is to have “*low footprint lifestyles*” where “*production and consumption are primarily local*”. This, according to the UN, is the goal we should be aiming to achieve. Yet, through policies of free trade, reduced tariffs, deindustrialisation, and the exporting of farms and manufacturing, the government is doing exactly the opposite. **Government policies, according to this UN analysis, are leading us further and further away from a green world.** It has been estimated that a typical basket of food from an Australian supermarket must now travel an incredible 70,000 kilometres to reach the Australian consumer and as a result of these policies this distance will continue to increase. Why does the government endorse these emission causing resource wasting policies?

If the government is at all serious about the environment and sustainability it will immediately reverse these policies and return to an independent “green” Australia where these items are produced locally. **Why is the government moving further and further away from a “green world” as defined by the UN?**

From an environmental or sustainability point of view it is absolutely ridiculous to try and justify, as many seem to be paid to do, the ever increasing distance our foods need to travel. This is clearly deliberate unsustainability or environmental vandalism. While there is no justification on environmental grounds, if the primary purpose is to ensure a global interdependence which guarantees that our food supply system will have all the fragility of precariously placed dominoes then obviously the current system promoted by our government is an outstanding success. Let us be abundantly clear though that this policy reveals an extremely contemptuous disregard of the environment by our government.

If they are at all serious about sustainability and the environment they will reverse these policies immediately. If on the other hand their concern about the environment is just a façade by which they seek to manipulate and control the people then of course they will continue to pursue policies which are consistent with erosion of national sovereignty and independence leading to global control.

Enslaved by a Litany of Lies or Liberated by One Truth – Future Directions

How does Australia find itself in the present ridiculous situation where government policy, and the sell out of the Australian people, is based upon a science fiction story that riding push bikes and turning off appliances can control world climate, reduce sea levels, and increase polar ice? And even though the government’s own Climate Change Commissioner or “salesman” has discredited the government’s scientific case, still the government sticks to its agenda, an agenda based upon a blatant scientific lie and a blatant political lie. How can this be? And how can the Australian government eagerly sign up to the United Nations global wealth and resource distribution program and yet conceal this from the Australian public? And how can the Australian government persist with its policies of breaking down Australia’s border control, promoting divisiveness, refusing to introduce policies to preserve our sovereignty, and exporting jobs and farms, and yet have Australians believe they put Australia first, not last? And why the extreme urgency and panic when experts agree the world is now cooling? They clearly regard loss of life from everyday weather fluctuations much less seriously than slight temperature variations 1000 years from now. But then perhaps they feel it is OK if Australians lose their lives due to weather fluctuations.

Also disturbing is the behaviour of the current government and its contemptuous attitude to democracy and free speech. As they cuddle up to extremist independents or political groups they openly resort to extreme hostility, intolerance, vilification and name calling of anyone who dares to oppose them. They seem absolutely desperate to FORCE everyone to comply with their wishes. One wonders what will come next if we fail to succumb to the vilification and intimidation. If a government behaves like extremists, promotes extremist divisive policies, and is affiliated with extremists, then it is extremist and should be treated as such.

According to Professor Lindzen (25):

“In view of the above, one may reasonably ask why there is the current alarm, and, in particular, why the astounding upsurge in alarmism of the past 4 years. When an issue like global warming is around for over twenty years, numerous agendas are developed to exploit the issue. The interests of the environmental movement in acquiring more power, influence, and donations are reasonably clear. So too are the interests of bureaucrats for whom control of CO2 is a dream-come-true. After all, CO2 is a

product of breathing itself. Politicians can see the possibility of taxation that will be cheerfully accepted because it is necessary for 'saving' the earth..... With all this at stake, one can readily suspect that there might be a sense of urgency provoked by the possibility that warming may have ceased and that the case for such warming as was seen being due in significant measure to man, disintegrating. For those committed to the more venal agendas, the need to act soon, before the public appreciates the situation, is real indeed. However, for more serious leaders, the need to courageously resist hysteria is clear. Wasting resources on symbolically fighting ever present climate change is no substitute for prudence. Nor is the assumption that the earth's climate reached a point of perfection in the middle of the twentieth century a sign of intelligence."

Lindzen's analysis has been confirmed by Professor Carter (45):

"Run that past me again, Professors Garnaut and Flannery – your advice to government still remains that human carbon dioxide emissions are causing dangerous global warming? Do you understand the meaning of the phrases "empirical science" and "hypothesis testing"? Do you understand that the correct null hypothesis is that gentle warmings, such as that which occurred between 1979 and 1998, and equivalent coolings, are to be viewed as due to natural causes unless and until evidence indicates otherwise. Gentlemen, where is that evidence, and why is it not presented in the voluminous reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) that you and the government so often refer to? Despite this lack of evidence for dangerous, or potentially dangerous, warming, and despite the lack of efficacy of cutting carbon dioxide emissions as a means of preventing the trivial warming that is likely to occur (cutting all of Australia's emissions would theoretically prevent, perhaps, around one-thousandth of a degree of warming), the political course in Canberra is now set on carbon tax autopilot, and the plane is flying squarely into the eye of a storm that is labelled 'let's spin a regressive new tax as a virtuous environmental measure'.".....

....." Minister Combet is also prone to saying: "We are committed to tackling climate change". No, Minister, you are not. Instead, you are playing with ghosts in trying to "stop" a chimerical dangerous global warming, and that for entirely political reasons. Meanwhile, you are offering nothing by way of policy initiatives to deal with the actual and very real hazards that are associated with NATURAL climate events and change in Australia. Relating to the El Nino-La Nina weather cycle, no part of Australia has escaped climatic hazard in the last two years. Events like the Victorian bushfires, the Queensland floods and landfalling tropical cyclones in northern Australia are of concern to every citizen, indeed some have been killed by these events and many others have sustained crippling personal or business costs. Despite which, Mr Combet and PM Gillard and their expert climate advisers appear to have no interest in dealing with these only-too-real natural climate problems in a commonsense and cost-effective way, which is by preparing better for them in advance, and adapting better to them as and when they occur. Instead they are busy constructing a tornado of political spin about imaginary global warming."

Professor Carter continues (45):

"Never has an important national policy issue been so surrounded with public dishonesty and deliberate ambiguity of language as is the issue of dangerous, human-caused global warming."

But do allegations of fraud and dishonesty go far enough? According to Tracinski the culprits behind the fraud should be brought to justice (72):

"For more than a decade, we've been told that there is a scientific "consensus" that humans are causing global warming, that "the debate is over" and all "legitimate" scientists acknowledge the truth of global warming. Now we know what this "consensus" really means. What it means is: the fix is in. This is an enormous case of organized scientific fraud, but it is not just scientific fraud. It is also a criminal act. Suborned by billions of taxpayer dollars devoted to climate research, dozens of prominent scientists have established a criminal racket in which they seek government money-Phil Jones has raked in a total of £13.7 million in grants from the British government-which they then use to falsify data and defraud the taxpayers. It's the most insidious kind of fraud: a fraud in which the culprits are lauded as public heroes. Judging from this cache of e-mails, they even manage to tell themselves that their manipulation of the data is intended to protect a bigger truth and prevent it from being "confused" by inconvenient facts and uncontrolled criticism. The damage here goes far beyond the loss of a few billions of taxpayer dollars on bogus scientific research. The real cost of this fraud is the trillions of dollars of wealth that will be destroyed if a fraudulent theory is used to justify legislation that starves the global economy of its cheapest and most abundant sources of energy. This is the scandal of the century. It needs to be thoroughly investigated-and the culprits need to be brought to justice."

Australians are being enslaved by a monstrous litany of preposterous lies by those who seek to monopolise power and reduce Australia's standard of living to the lowest common denominator. They are, in effect, working for the UN, not the Australian people. The test for this is simple – an iron clad written guarantee that ALL money raised from the carbon dioxide tax will stay in Australia – PERMANENTLY. If the current government were forced to abide by such

a policy we may suddenly see many Federal politicians suddenly losing interest in emissions!

There are 3 fundamental reasons why they have been so successful in pushing their preposterous agenda and it is necessary to understand these reasons to best formulate an effective response.

Firstly, they are super salesmen and they have utilised a thoroughly orchestrated campaign using simply understood and emotive concepts. With truth on their side, one would have thought it would be very easy for mainstream Australia to counteract the globalists propaganda campaign. However, mainstream Australia are not so organised and hungry for power which leads me to the other reasons for the success of the globalists.

By definition, those who are driving the current global agenda tend to be very assertive and forceful and have no respect for opposing points of view. The average Australian on the other hand is not power hungry and has no interest in forcing his or her views upon others.

To counteract the campaign of the globalists and those seeking to subvert democracy I believe it is necessary to have an opposing well orchestrated campaign or agenda and to communicate this opposing agenda forcefully and effectively. If we simply adopt a negative campaign of flag waving and opposing their agenda I believe it will not be effective. To oppose the current sustainability campaign gives the appearance one is completely disinterested in the environment. We need an alternative "fair dinkum" environmental campaign which is not linked to legislated revenue raising, subservience to the UN and global wealth redistribution, or the exporting of farms and importing of agricultural products.

We need to make a very clear public distinction between phony environmentalists who exploit the environment for political power and wealth redistribution and sincere environmentalists who genuinely support Australia.

The real debate is not about global warming and compensation packages for the carbon dioxide tax but rather, is the C02 tax the best way of financing a world government? Following on from this, the next question is: what is the best way of duping the taxpayers and making them feel comfortable and preoccupied while concealing the true agenda until it is too late for them to object? The difficulty for the government is to enthusiastically embrace the global initiatives of the UN when attending UN meetings but when returning to Australia tell Australians the government is warm and caring and they will do anything to help Australians and look after the environment.

Do they have a history of misleading Australians? Are they experienced at this?

Never before has mainstream Australia had so much ammunition on which to base their campaign. It just needs to be organised and put into action.

References

1. Andrew Bolt, **Julia Gillard's tax to make no difference to climate**; *Herald Sun*, 26/3/2011. <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/pms-tax-to-make-no-difference/story-e6frfhqf-1226028353937>
2. Mitchell Nadin, Stuart Rintou, **No fast result in cuts: Flannery**; *The Australian*, 26/3/2011. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/no-fast-result-in-cuts-flannery/story-e6frg6xf-1226028366173>
3. Barbara Hollingsworth, **Spend Trillions Now, and World Temperatures Might Fall in 1000 Years**; *Washington Examiner*, 26/3/2011. <http://washingtonexaminer.com/blogs/beltway-confidential/2011/03/spend-trillions-now-and-world-temperatures-might-fall-1000-years>):
4. Climate Change in Australia, Chapter 4 – **Global Climate Change Projections**, *CSIRO*, Enquiries, Bag 10, Clayton South VIC 3169 http://climatechangeinaustralia.com.au/documents/resources/TR_Web_Ch4.pdf
5. **Future Temperature Changes**, *US Environmental Protection Agency*, <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/science/futuretc.html>
6. **Projections of Climate Change**, *Union of Concerned Scientists*, National Headquarters 2 Brattle Square, Cambridge, MA 02138-3780 http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/science_and_impacts/science/projections-of-climate-change.html

7. Emma Alberici, **Britain Bans Exaggerated Climate Change Ads**; 23/3/2010. <http://www.gpyr.com.au/blog/britain-bans-exaggerated-climate-change-ads>
8. Climate Change in Australia, Chapter 5 – **Sea Level Rise**, CSIRO, Enquiries, Bag 10, Clayton South VIC 3169 http://climatechangeinaustralia.com.au/documents/resources/TR_Web_Ch5iv.pdf
9. Rob Young and Orrin Pilkey; **Get ready for seven-foot sea level rise as climate change melts ice sheets**, *The Guardian*, 15/1/2010. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/jan/15/sea-level-climate-change>
10. Pfeiffer et al, **Kinematic Constraints on Glacier Contributions to 21st-Century Sea-Level Rise** ; *Science*, 5 September 2008: 1340-1343. <http://climateprogress.org/2008/09/05/stunning-new-sea-level-rise-research-part-1-most-likely-08-to-20-meters-by-2100/>
11. Climate Change in Australia, CSIRO, Enquiries, Bag 10, Clayton South VIC 3169 http://climatechangeinaustralia.com.au/documents/resources/Summary_brochure.pdf
12. John Vidal, **Poor face more hunger as climate change leads to crop failure, says Oxfam**; *The Guardian*, 5/7/2009. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/jul/05/crops-farmers-climate-change-oxfam>
13. Mark Henderson, **Exaggerated claims undermine drive to cut emissions, scientists warn**; *The Times*, 30/10/2009. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/science/earth-environment/article6896152.ece>
14. Lewis Smith, **BRITISH COURT RULES AL GORE FILM EXAGGERATED CLIMATE CLAIMS**; **12/10/2007**. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,301067,00.html> See also <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2007/oct/11/climatechange>
15. John R. Christy, **Global Temperature Impact of vehicle reductions of CO2**, House Ways and Means Committee, US Congress, 25 February 2009. <http://waysandmeans.house.gov/media/pdf/111/ctest.pdf>
16. Robert M Carter; **Climate: The Counter Consensus**, Stacey International, London, 2010
17. Greg Sheridan, **It's Madness to sacrifice Ourselves for Nothing**; *The Australian*, 9/4/2011 <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/commentary/its-madness-to-sacrifice-ourselves-for-nothing/story-e6frgd0x-1226036215554>
18. Terry McCrann, **Carbon tax is pointless unless rest of world imposes it**; *The Herald Sun*, 15/2/2011. <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/business/terry-mccranns-column/carbon-tax-is-pointless-unless-rest-of-world-imposes-it/story-e6frfig6-1226005951214>
19. Henry Ergas, **Unilateral action creates costs without benefits**; *The Australian*, 28/2/2011. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/unilateral-action-creates-costs-without-benefits/story-fn59niix-1226013133637>
20. Henry Ergas, **Treasury should know better about an ETS**; *The Australian*, 8/4/2011. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/commentary/treasury-should-know-better-about-an-ets/story-e6frgd0x-1226035611467>
21. **The Impact of Global Warming Control Policies on Australian Industry: Executive Summary**, London Economics, London, January 1992, pp1-4. <http://www.uow.edu.au/~sharonb/STS300/equity/greenhouse/ausarticles/ausarticle4.html>
22. **Carbon tax is economic self-harm: Abbott**; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 17/9/2010. <http://news.smh.com.au/breaking-news-national/carbon-tax-is-economic-selfharm-abbott-20100917-15f0g.html>
23. S. Fred Singer, ed., *Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate: Summary for Policymakers of the Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change*, Chicago, IL: The Heartland Institute, 2008. http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/22835.pdf
24. Craig Idso, S. Fred Singer et al, **Climate Change Reconsidered**, 2009 *Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC)*, The Heartland Institute 2009. <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/2009report.html>
25. Richard Lindzen, **Resisting Climate Hysteria: A Case Against Precipitous Climate Action**, 26/7/2009. <http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2009/07/resisting-climate-hysteria>
26. Richard Lindzen, **Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus**; Spring 1992, Cato Institute • 1000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. • Washington D.C. 20001-5403 <http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv15n2/reg15n2g.html>
27. Richard Lindzen, **The Climate Science Isn't Settled**; *The Wall Street Journal*, 30/11/2009. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html>
28. Richard Lindzen, **Climate Science in Denial**; *The Wall Street Journal*, 22/4/2010. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704448304575196802317362416.html>
29. Garth Paltridge, **Climate Change Sceptic**; *PESA News*, Dec-Jan, 2009-2010. http://www.pesa.com.au/publications/pesa_news/dec_jan_0910/images/pn103_32-34.pdf
30. Garth Paltridge, Letter to *The Australian*; 30/5/2008. <http://www.lavoisier.com.au/articles/climate-policy/science-and-policy/paltridge2008-13.php>
31. Garth Paltridge, http://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php?title=Garth_Paltridge

32. Garth Paltridge, **Overselling Climate Doom**; ABC, 5/3/2010. <http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/33156.html>
33. Garth Paltridge, **The Over-Blown Science of Global Warming**; 17/8/2009 <http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=9303>
34. William M Gray, **Get Off Warning Bandwagon**, *BBC*, 16/11/2000. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/sci_tech/2000/climate_change/1023334.stm
35. William M Gray, **Battle of the climate scientists and the 'Hijacking of the American Meteorological Society'**; *The Examiner*, 6/2/2009. <http://www.examiner.com/weather-in-denver/battle-of-the-climate-scientists-and-the-hijacking-of-the-american-meteorological-society>
36. Tony Hake, **Battle of the Climate Scientists – Gray versus Hansen Part 3**; *The Examiner*, 12/2/2009. <http://www.examiner.com/weather-in-denver/battle-of-the-climate-scientists-gray-versus-hansen-part-3>
37. William Kininmonth, **FACTS ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE**; http://www.engineersaustralia.org.au/shadomx/apps/fms/fmsdownload.cfm?file_uid=A1A170C5-0EAF-8612-39EF-1C1C640CFC44&siteName=ieaust
38. **The Global Warming Sceptics**, *The Age*, 27/11/2004. <http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2004/11/26/1101219743320.html>
39. William Kininmonth, **ETS Forum – The Models are Wrong**; 8/8/2009. <http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2009/08/william-kininmonth>
40. William Kininmonth, **Cold Facts Dispel Theories on Warming**; *The Australian*, 29/4 2009. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/cold-facts-dispel-theories-on-warming/story-e6frg6zo-1225704690711>
41. William Kininmonth, **Open letter to Tony Abbott from William Kininmonth**; *Australian Conservative*, May, 2010. <http://australianconservative.com/2010/05/open-letter-to-tony-abbott-from-william-kininmonth/>
42. Lee Roop, **Christy: attention brought by climate change views almost a drug**; *Huntsville Times*, 11/11/2009. http://blog.al.com/breaking/2009/11/global_warming_skeptic_tells_g.html
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/11/11/christy-attention-brought-by-climate-change-views-almost-a-drug/>
43. Jon Birger, **What if global-warming fears are overblown?**; *CNN Money*, 14/5/2009. <http://money.cnn.com/2009/05/14/magazines/fortune/globalwarming.fortune/index.htm>
44. Bob Carter, **Facts Debunk Global Warming Alarmism**; *The Australian*, 20/1/2009. <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/facts-debunk-global-warming-alarmism/story-e6frg746-1111118607086>
45. Bob Carter, **Carbon Dioxide Tax – The Peoples Revolt Part 1; Shhssh.....Don't Talk About the Science - Part 2**, *Quadrant Online*, 28/2/2011. <http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/02/carbon-dioxide-tax-the-people-s-revolt> <http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/02/gillard-ignores-the-science>
46. Bob Carter, **Bob Carter's Ten Little Facts About Global Warming**; *Quadrant*, 14/3/2011. <http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2011/03/bob-carter>
47. Robert M. Carter, **Knock, Knock: Where is the Evidence for Dangerous Human-Caused Global Warming?**; *Economic Analysis and Policy*, Vol 38, Sept, 2008. <http://www.auscsc.org.au/images/PDF/knockknock.pdf>
48. Andrew Bolt, **Climategate news spreads**; *Herald Sun*, 24/11/2009. http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/the_global_warming_conspiracy_news_spreads/
49. United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs, Division for Sustainable Development, Core publications; *Agenda 21*. <http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/> ;
50. Agenda 21 Implementation, *Progress report, compiled from the national reports to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development five years after Agenda 21 was adopted in Rio de Janeiro*, *Eco-Logic*, May/June 1998. <http://sovereignty.net/p/sd/agenda21rpt.htm> ;
51. **Institutional Aspects of Sustainable Development (Agenda 21) in Australia**, United Nations. <http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natinfo/countr/austral/inst.htm>
52. Diane Ross, **Agenda for the 21st Century Invades Australia**; *Freedom Advocates*, 7/1/2008. http://www.freedomadvocates.org/articles/sustainable_development/agenda_for_the_21st_century_invades_australia_20080107270/ ;
53. **National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development**; *Prepared by the Ecologically Sustainable Development Steering Committee, Endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments, December, 1992*. <http://www.environment.gov.au/about/esd/publications/strategy/intro.html> ;
54. **Climate Change: Shaping a Strong Global Outcome**; Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. http://www.dfat.gov.au/un/climate_change.html ;
55. **Agenda 21: Sustainable Development; Department of the Environment and Heritage**, January 2004. <http://www.environment.gov.au/about/international/uncsd/publications/pubs/agenda21.pdf>
56. **Local Agenda 21: Education for Sustainability in Local Government**, <http://www.aries.mq.edu.au/handbook/files/6-WhatIsLocalAg.pdf> ; See also Neil H, Sansom G, Porter J and Wensing E (2002) *Australian Local*

- Sustainability Initiative: An Achievement Recognition Matrix* Environment Australia.
57. **Sustainability, Local Agenda 21 and WSSD**; Australian Local Government Association, 8 Geils Court, Deakin ACT 2600 :: Tel +61 (02) 6122 9400 <http://www.alga.asn.au/policy/environment/sustainability/> ;
 58. **Urban Environmental Management, Local Agenda 21**; The Global Development Research Centre, <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/la21/la21.html>
 59. **Statement by R. Mugabe to the 65th Session of the United Nations**; http://www.un.org/en/ga/65/meetings/generaldebate/Portals/1/statements/634209412147500000ZW_en.pdf
 60. **Innovative sources of financing for development**, 59th Session of the United Nations; 17/8/2004. http://www.unescap.org/tid/mtg/egmrti_ref272.pdf
 61. Ernest Zedillo, **Report of the High-Level Panel on Financing for Development**; *United Nations*, 22/6/2001. <http://www.un.org/reports/financing/recommendations.htm>
 62. Raven Clabough , **UN Official Admits Cap and Trade is Wealth Redistribution**; *The New American*, 19/11/2010. <http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/world-mainmenu-26/europe-mainmenu-35/5253-un-official-admits-cap-and-trade-is-wealth-redistribution>
 63. Work Stream 1: **Carbon Market Public Revenues**: United Nations. http://www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/climatechange/shared/Documents/AGF_reports/Work_Stream_1_Carbon%20Market%20Public%20Revenues.pdf
 64. Meles Zenawi and Jens Stoltenberg, **Report of the Secretary General's High-Level Advisory Group on Climate Change Financing**; United Nations, 5/11/2010. http://www.un.org/wcm/webdav/site/climatechange/shared/Documents/AGF_reports/AGF%20Report.pdf
 65. **Hansard, House of Representatives**, 1/3/2011. <http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard/reps/dailys/dr010311.pdf>
 66. **PM failed to answer question on UN Green Climate Fund**; Liberal Party of Australia. <http://www.liberal.org.au/Latest-News/2011/03/02/UN-Green-Climate-Fund.aspx>
 67. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; **Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session, held in Cancun from 29 November to 10 December 2010**. <http://unfccc.int/files/na/application/pdf/07a01-1.pdf>
 68. **The Cancun Agreements, Fast Start Finance up to 2012**. <http://cancun.unfccc.int/financial-technology-and-capacity-building-support/fast-start-finance-up-to-2012/#c281>
 69. **The Cancun Agreements, Long Term Funding Arrangements**. <http://cancun.unfccc.int/financial-technology-and-capacity-building-support/new-long-term-funding-arrangements/#c294>
 70. **Third International Expert Meeting on Sustainable Consumption and Production** , Stockholm, 26-29 June, 2007. <http://esa.un.org/marrakechprocess/pdf/NGO%20CONTEXT%2019%20Aug%2007.pdf>
(please copy to your browser)
 71. Vicky Pope, **Scientists must rein in misleading climate change claims**; *The Guardian*, 11/2/2009. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/feb/11/climate-change-science-pope>
 72. Robert Tracinski, **Climate Gate: The Fix is in**; 24/11/2009 http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/11/24/the_fix_is_in_99280.html