

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 31 May 2015 12:20 p.m.
To: Climate Contribution
Subject: Submission 10948

Dear MFE,

I spend much time each week studying various aspects of climate change. My exploration of the subject started in earnest when semi retiring to New Zealand. Until retiring, like the vast majority of people, I lacked the time to read and think seriously about the climate. An extremely busy lifestyle meant that the whole subject escaped my serious attention.

Like most people my knowledge of the subject was at one time limited to brief presentations and articles in the media. Unfortunately most of these articles in the mass media still continue to be largely written or presented by people whose background does not contain any practical training or training in the sciences. I believe that this has made them very vulnerable to intimidation from older employers/editors whose ideologies were formed in the seventies and who also tended to lack any practical or scientific experience in their university life. Their ideas would have been greatly influenced by the Paul Ehrlich / Maurice Strong gang. This gang presented something of a way of thought that gave people a banner to cling to, a moral crusade. Those crusaders' employees criticise the crusade at their peril. The crusade was the solution which avoided the awful turmoil of having to continually go on thinking about anything....that makes a non curious brain hurt too much! The crusade said that humans were guilty of abusing the planet and along the way such themes as Peak Oil and Global Warming became solid facts and we had somehow to make amends and punish ourselves. Not very new as throughout history we have always tried to please some imaginary deities and appease them with some sacrifice or other. Seems to be wired in.

Now today hardly a nature documentary from the BBC does not have some reference in it to man's influence on the climate blaming him for endangering different animals and plants. Those who disagree lose their jobs or pay lip service and keep quiet about their doubts as to the validity of the crusade. Retirement brings freedom to journalists and academics to publish their doubts but those running the journals are still having to earn a living and are watching their backs.

So out there in the mass media there is an appearance that everyone agrees that CO2 is a bad thing/a pollutant and in politics hardly any politician will dare speak out against this belief. In reality several polls have revealed that climate change comes bottom of the list of worries people have. However politicians continue to pussy foot around the issue and not expose the fragility of much of the science of climate followed by the AGW crusaders. Possibly their grasp of the basics of scientific thinking is not competent enough to get across the idea that the effect of CO2 on climate warming is still an unproven theory that goes against the second law of thermodynamics and common sense in physics. Theories have to be proven before they become scientific facts and this century rising CO2 levels have not increased 'global' temperatures. So the theory remains unproven at the moment and climate models based on it would seem unreliable.

I realise that in politics it is difficult for a small nation to stand against the whims of the UN and those egos which are bruised at the bruisers peril. Nevertheless I hope that in some gentle way avoiding any heavy repercussions someone at the Paris meeting will be able to lead the world away from acting prematurely on this theory. Please concentrate on genuine pollutants of our atmosphere and the real threats to human health and wellbeing posed by some ideologies.

Thank you for working to keep New Zealand a beautiful place but keep your minds open to the possibility that we might all be looking in the wrong direction over climate change.....
what was the panic in the seventies.....global cooling?!!

Best wishes to you all

George Luck

Sent from my iPad