

John Nicol's sent the following email to Bob Baldwin MP on 11th March, 2015.

Dr Nichol is a physicist. He worked in Electromagnetic Theory for his PhD at University of Queensland and James Cook University (originally a college of UQ) then into the spectroscopy of gases, aimed mainly at Spectral Line Broadening. This is an important part of the analysis of the effects of atmospheric carbon dioxide. He spent thirty years in high and very high resolution gas and mixed gas spectroscopy, measuring line spectra using interferometric techniques and highly stabilised scanning, ring dye lasers, including work in the spectroscopy laboratory at Griffith University.

Dear Mr Baldwin,

I understand that you have provided terms of reference for a "forum" to study the very substantial claims of bias by our Bureau of meteorology in dealing with historical temperature data in Australia's records.

I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the membership of the forum which appears to consist only of mathematicians who will be addressed solely by staff from the Bureau of meteorology itself.

Surely this is a scientific matter rather than a mathematical one yet your choice of membership appears to include no one who has a significant background in atmospheric physics, physics or meteorology.

One would have expected there to be at least four of the six members to have had such a suitable experience in atmospheric science or at least science in general. One obvious omission would be someone of the calibre of the retired director of the Bureau, Mr William Kinninmonth.

As a physicist, it is deeply disturbing to read the claims made by other scientists concerning the serious modification of this historic data, with no scientific justification beyond "what is done elsewhere" - possibly also unjustified, but undoubtedly under very different circumstances from what has occurred at the many different stations in Australia, including the addition of new stations to a long, historic sequence and the apparently unjustified removal of others.

The failing to provide a balanced forum of "experts" is further emphasized by the absence of an invitation for other qualified persons not now associated with the Bureau of Meteorology. Such a forum, as now constructed, can hardly be considered independent, or even fully competent to undertake what ought to be an investigation which is at arm's length from the Bureau, whose work is under the spotlight and needs to be reviewed, and also seen to be reviewed, totally independently of those responsible for the apparent "so-called "Homogenization " of the data. The word "homogenize" immediately implies the use of techniques to make the data "look the same" no matter from where it comes.

The charges against the bureau have been substantial and would indicate that this process has been used to reduce past temperatures, and to enhance present day temperatures with the obvious result that the process of apparent Global Warming, as indicated by the data, has been artificially increased.

This process of homogenization has obviously taken many years to be performed and many hours of deliberation and data manipulation to complete. It is therefore requested also that any forum which is

charged with considering the value and authenticity of what has been carried out, should be given at least one week to discuss and consider the implications of what has been done.

I look forward to your consideration of this request and trust that it is still possible to make the necessary changes to the composition of, presentations to and processes of deliberations by, this proposed forum.

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider these terms of reference to provide a much more balanced approach.

Yours sincerely,

John L Nicol
Forest Lake, Qld 4078
0409 761 503
jonicol18@bigpond.com