

A statement from Jennifer Marohasy

On the label “climate change sceptic”: I do not accept it as an accurate description of my position. I accept the basic physics of the greenhouse effect and that carbon dioxide is an infrared-active gas. My work has focused on the integrity of the observational record that is used to quantify how much warming has occurred, how unusual recent extremes are relative to the longer instrumental record, and whether homogenisation and digitisation processes have introduced systematic biases. That is a narrower and more technical concern than a general rejection of climate science. I have published on rainfall forecasting using historical patterns and machine-learning methods (including papers in the international peer-reviewed climate science journals *Advances in Atmospheric Sciences* and *Atmospheric Research*), and I have argued that discarding or overwriting pre-1910 and early post-1910 observations weaken our ability to understand natural variability.

On qualifications: Yes, I am a biologist by training. I hold a PhD and have worked for years on the analysis of long observational series—temperature, rainfall, and related environmental data. Formal meteorological credentials are not required to examine whether digitised records match the original handwritten observation books held in the National Archives, or to identify copy-paste blocks, missing extremes, or one-way adjustment patterns. Those are questions of data provenance and statistical consistency. I have spent time at the National Archives (Chester Hill) examining original meteorological observation books, including the Bourke January 1909 ledger.

On the claim that my 2017 work has been dismissed as “junk science”: That characterisation is a matter of opinion from climate science managers with a vested interest. My 2017 paper (in *GeoResJ*) that you reference has never been retracted and is increasingly cited within the mainstream climate science literature. It would appear more generally that my work with John Abbot published between 2012 and 2017 was a decade ahead of its time, with the techniques we pioneered now beginning to be used more broadly within mainstream climate science, though not by the Australian Bureau of Meteorology.

There has been opportunity for Gavin Schmidt and others to publish a proper rebuttal to our *GeoResJ* paper in the peer-reviewed literature, instead they restrict their criticisms to sniping on Twitter. For sure, our paper has stood the test of time, and I am very proud of the contribution we have made to understanding the application of new AI techniques including machine-learning for understanding the longer temperature record back 2,000 years, and the opportunity to use these natural embedded cycles to potentially forecast the next 100 years.

The underlying points I and others have raised concern concrete discrepancies between original paper records and the digital files used for official series. A recent independent forensic audit by Tom Berger and Geoff Sherrington, reported by Graham Lloyd, identified multiple categories of problems in the “raw” Climate Data Online files: months copied across years (for example, Sydney Observatory August values), statistically improbable flatlines of identical readings, broken-seam patterns, and long runs of missing data. The Bureau has acknowledged a small number of post-1910 duplications (fewer than 200 daily values out of more than 7 million) and described their effect as negligible. The audit’s authors argue the patterns indicate broader integrity issues that have not been systematically addressed by comparing digital files against the surviving original books. These are testable claims about specific records, not general assertions.

On the Bureau’s temperature records: I have documented, and continue to document, cases in which values present in the original observation books are absent from the digitised series used for national statistics. The clearest example remains Bourke Post Office on 3 January 1909: 125 °F (51.7 °C) written in the ledger, underlined, and confirmed in the monthly abstract, after a Stevenson screen had been installed in August 1908. A nearby station (Brewarrina) recorded 123 °F the same day. The value was set aside in Blair Trewin’s 1997 *Australian Meteorological Magazine* paper and does not appear in Climate Data Online.

January 1896 extremes at Bourke, long treated as the hottest month in local history, are likewise excluded from the official annual series. The Bureau’s practice of starting the ACORN-SAT record in 1910, combined with homogenisation adjustments that can reverse or amplify trends at individual stations, means the official narrative of progressive warming rests on a truncated and remodelled subset of the available observations.

Independent reviews of the homogenisation methods exist; they do not constitute an audit of the raw digital files against the original paper ledgers, nor do they restore the missing extremes.

The practical consequence is that Australians are presented with a temperature history that under-represents early temperature extremes. Also, the remodelled/homogenised ACORN-SAT series erases the obvious cooling trend to at least 1960 in maximum temperatures at locations with long records. This matters for understanding natural variability, for evaluating the skill of forecasting methods that use long historical series, and for public understanding of how unusual recent events are not.

I have made the original-ledger evidence for Bourke and Brewarrina available at my blog, and the Berger–Sherrington findings on copy-paste and related anomalies are now public. Those materials can be checked.

I am happy to supply further specific references, archival citations, or station-level comparisons if that would assist your research.

I would also welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues on ABC TV with Bureau of Meteorology staff, specifically Blair Trewin has been responsible for the construction of the ACORN-SAT series and the scratching of several early temperature extremes. Blair Trewin did this work in accordance with expectations of more senior scientists, beginning with the scratching of the 3 January 1909 meteorological observation as part of his PhD thesis.

Yours sincerely,

Jennifer Marohasy BSc PhD

<https://jennifermarohasy.com/2026/10/australias-historical-temperatures-update-following-tom-berger-forensic-audit/>

<https://jennifermarohasy.substack.com/>

<https://www.facebook.com/JenniferMarohasyOfficialPage/>

25 Oct 2026

Given the lack of understanding of how things generally operate at the BOM etcetera, and the importance of the early historical record, I have written some more.

I would like the attached to be added to the submission from me, and the same is here: <https://jennifermarohasy.substack.com/p/why-the-record-high-temperature-from>