Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to you to advise you of some evidence that needs to be studied. If you can study this evidence objectively, I think you will come to realise that Government Policy and spending has been developed and used based on false and incomplete information. No one has been able to address my “data challenge”. Can you?

It’s time to jettison the “CO2-induced climate change” model – and properly distinguish between environmental damage and destruction and things like active weather modification being in use. UK Military have been advised of this data (as have others).

If you ignore this data and evidence, you will come to the wrong conclusions and you will be choosing and/or helping to create a future based on scarcity rather than abundance – and your current activities are very likely consciously or inadvertently creating that future.

Yours Sincerely,

Andrew Johnson

http://www.checktheevidence.com/
http://www.drjudywood.com/

Did you know about this on 9/11/01? Check it out…
Dear Mr Johnson,

Climate Change

Thank you for your letter of 7 April about climate change. I have been asked to reply.

First, let me offer some background about the science behind climate change predictions.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was established by the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in 1988 to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis, scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant for the understanding of climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation. The IPCC is open to all Members of the UN and the WMO.

Since its establishment, the IPCC has produced a series of publications, which have become standard works of reference, and its reports and technical summaries are prepared wholly by scientists from all regions of the world. The IPCC does not carry out research, but bases its assessments mainly on peer reviewed and published scientific/technical literature.

The hundreds of IPCC Assessment Report Authors and Editors act throughout their deliberations as independent experts and do not 'represent' any organisation or government - they write their own reports and provide a strong consensus view of the very latest science.

The UK fully supports the work of the IPCC in authoritatively assessing all scientific and technical aspects of climate change and welcomed the release of the Fourth Assessment Report (AR4). This report leaves us in no doubt that human activity is the primary driver of the observed changes in climate. It
concludes there is a more than 90% chance that most of the observed warming since the mid-20th Century is due to human emissions of greenhouse gases.

Regarding, your query about the sudden right turn of Hurricane Erin in September 2001, this was due to a combination of oceanic and atmospheric circulation patterns, coupled with local sea surface temperatures. The point at which it turned East coincides geographically with the eastbound Gulf Stream, which forms the northern edge of the North Atlantic Subtropical Gyre circulation pattern.

Yours sincerely,

Hilary Cartwright-Taylor
Customer Contact Unit
Dear Hilary Cartwright-Taylor,

Thank you for your letter dated 5th May 2009 regarding climate change. Unfortunately, it does not address the evidence I notified you of on 7th April. I am pretty well aware of what the IPCC report says – and the incorrect conclusion(s) the panel has drawn. It is now clear we are all subjected to rulings based on incomplete and false information. Even though a number of Scientists took part in the IPCC report, they ignored significant data. Additionally, I have supplied a list of 100 Scientists who disagree with the idea of global warming being a function of CO\textsubscript{2} output of human activities. Also to say “90% chance that most observed warming in the mid-20th Century is due to human activity” has almost no meaning – because many scientists say there has been no appreciable warming anyway!

Sadly, most people get confused between “environmental destruction” and “global warming”. Indeed, your department’s name now says “climate change” and not “global warming” – so it seems there is even tacit acknowledgement that people can’t be sure about the warming.

So, now that it is settled that there is no evidence CO\textsubscript{2} is responsible for any significant warming, we have to look at other data – which is what I have included here. Please can you tell me what made this grid of trails over my house in 2005 (and I have seen other similar formations since). I have written to the CAA and they have no information about flights. (This picture is also contained in the enclosed booklet I made):

Now, don’t get me wrong, I know it’s your job and everything to promote the idea that by not burning fuel etc we will help the weather/climate situation - and of course, it is generally good that we don’t cause pollution - I am all for that. However, look again at the photo above. This is not ordinary aircraft trails – it is an undisclosed and unacknowledged form of pollution. People from all over the world have sent me information and photos – they share my concern that we are not being told the truth and
many have become very upset by the wall of official denial. So, the thing is, however hard you work in your job to try to help reduce pollution (by reducing CO₂ output in some way), this (above) will still be going on (and not every day – it seems to be about 4 or 5 days per week). Please observe this for yourself, rather than taking my word for it.

**Hurricane Erin on 9/11**

Thanks for your information about the Gulf Stream and the Gyre circulation – which I have known about for over 20 years. Again, as with your “90%” figure, there is little or no evidence that Hurricane movements are regularly and directly affected by Ocean Currents. If this was the case, movement prediction models would, of course be much simpler. Again, you need to inspect this data more closely. [http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/erin1.html](http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/erin1.html)

Also, from this page: [http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/erin9.html](http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/erin9.html)

You can learn the following:

1) Wind speed at JFK Airport constant (8 knots) for 24 hours
2) Barometric pressure measured at JFK airport constant from 2 am to 8pm (16 hours)
3) Hurricane Erin closest to NYC at 8am in the morning – just before events unfolded.

![Hurricane Erin Data Chart](http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/erin1.png)

Again, I understand about it being your job to basically gloss over things like the above, but from what I have been looking at, I will tell you this: if you ignore this data, and that in the booklet, you will be doing yourself a dis-service. What you are looking at is data – data which shows you that everything you’ve been told is either just wrong, or it is woefully incomplete.

I will also tell you that a few people are “catching on”, despite concerted efforts to ridicule, trash and otherwise shut down discussion of the data I have presented you with - and more which is readily available. Further information available on request or from [http://www.checktheevidence.com/](http://www.checktheevidence.com/) (A number of UK military bases and figures have been advised of this data also.)

Yours Most Sincerely,

Andrew Johnson
Dear Mr Johnson,

Climate Change

Thank you for your letter of 11 May about climate change.

I note what you say however I do not feel that there is anything I can add to my earlier reply. You may be able to find further information on our website at: www.decc.gov.uk

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Hilary Cartwright-Taylor
Customer Contact Unit