

ACADEMY OF SCIENCE RELEASES LATEST CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH

Issue 2 – Academy Contradicts & Cherry Picks Findings of the IPCC

Graham Williamson
February 2015

Academy Acknowledges Authority of IPCC but Contradicts IPCC in Regard to 'Hiatus' & Failure of Computer Models

According to Andrew Holmes, President of the Australian Academy of Science, [the Academy's earlier 2010 climate change publication](#) required updating to reflect the latest research, hence their latest government funded climate change publication, ["The science of climate change: Questions and answers", Australian Academy of Science, Canberra, 2015](#). At the outset, The Academy emphasises their regard for the authority of the IPCC:

"The Academy recognises the role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) as the mechanism for the international scientific assessment of climate change science, impacts and response strategies. However, it believes that it is important that Australian climate scientists explain the science, including its uncertainties and implications, to the Australian community in simpler terms than can be found in most of the IPCC reports.....Since 2010, the IPCC has prepared a new international assessment with the active involvement of many Australian researchers, including several members of the Academy Working Group."

Ok, so the Academy regards the public as being too stupid to understand IPCC reports, hence the need for the Academy to use public funds to simplify the results of such reports, especially in an Australian context. [One significant breakthrough in the IPCC's latest report](#) is the agreement of the IPCC with sceptic claims regarding the unreliability of climate models, particularly in regard to predicting the current 'hiatus' or cessation of global warming. So what does the Academy say about the 'hiatus' in their [latest 2015 report](#)?

Notably, [the Academy completely avoids the term 'hiatus'](#), which is preferred by the IPCC. According to the Academy in their latest report:

"Has climate warming recently stopped?"

According to most estimates, the rate of average surface warming has slowed since 2001, despite ongoing rises in greenhouse gases. This slowdown is consistent with known climate variability. Indeed, decades of little or no temperature trend can be seen throughout the last century, superimposed on the long-term warming trend. Two main factors have contributed to the most recent period of slowed surface warming. First, decadal variability in the ocean-atmosphere system has redistributed heat in the ocean, especially in the eastern and central Pacific. This has caused warming at depth and cooling of surface waters and the lower atmosphere in this region. Second, several temporary global cooling influences have come into play including unusually weak solar activity (Box 3.1, see page 15), increased aerosol production, and volcanic activity. None of these influences is likely to continue over the long term. Moreover, despite the slowdown in warming at the surface, there have been continuing increases in heat extremes and in the heat content of the oceans,

as well as rising sea levels, shrinking Arctic sea-ice, and ongoing melt of ice sheets and glaciers. Some models predict that, when the current slowdown ends, renewed warming will be rapid.”

Although the Academy, like other politically funded organisations, completely failed to predict the current cessation of warming, they now claim *“This slowdown is consistent with known climate variability”*, pretending of course that they had always expected such a slowdown, but apparently forgot to mention it before. As has been [noted by Tony Thomas](#):

“What’s the Academy line on the 18-year atmospheric warming halt (which it pretends is only a 13-year ‘slowing’)? It merits a three-paragraph box on Page 10 in the 31 pages of text. The box is titled, ‘Has climate warming recently stopped?’ This is at least at least more honest than the Academy’s 2010 ‘discussion’, in which it set up and knocked down a straw-man argument about whether the planet is ‘cooling’.....Paragraph One on the hiatus says: ‘This slowdown is consistent with known climate variability. Indeed, decades of little or no temperature trend can be seen throughout the last century, superimposed on the long-term warming trend.’

This is cute, very cute. It pretends the halt was somehow foreseen or expected, when the 2001 and 2007 IPCC reports (and every warmist authority in the world) was predicting temperature doom and disaster from this decade on. The statement also alludes to the 30-year warming halt from 1940-70, which the warmist community cannot explain. Perhaps another 30-year halt is under way?

But the Academy’s apparent eagerness to whitewash the ‘hiatus’ issue also involves overlooking the failure of climate models, long noted by independent or sceptical scientists. This brings the Academy into direct conflict with the IPCC who [have acknowledged this failure of models to predict the hiatus in their recent report](#).

In [Chapter 10 of the IPCC AR5 Working Group 1 Physical Science Basis report](#) the IPCC confirms the inconvenient truth that increasing CO2 emissions are NOT associated with progressively increasing temperatures as they have repeatedly predicted:

“The observed recent warming hiatus, defined as the reduction in GMST trend during 1998–2012 as compared to the trend during 1951–2012, is attributable in roughly equal measure to a cooling contribution from internal variability and a reduced trend in external forcing (expert judgement, medium confidence).”

And in [Chapter 9, box 9.2, of the IPCC AR5 WG1 report](#), IPCC scientists state:

“The discrepancy between simulated and observed GMST trends during 1998–2012 could be explained in part by a tendency for some CMIP5 models to simulate stronger warming in response to increases in greenhouse gas (GHG) concentration than is consistent with observations (Section 10.3.1.1.3, Figure 10.4)..... Almost all CMIP5 historical simulations do not reproduce the observed recent warming hiatus. There is medium confidence that the GMST trend difference between models and observations during 1998–2012 is to a substantial degree caused by internal variability, with possible contributions from forcing error and some CMIP5 models overestimating the response to increasing GHG and other anthropogenic forcing.”

And finally, [according to the IPCC AR5 WG1 Technical Summary](#):

“The observed GMST has shown a much smaller increasing linear trend over the past 15 years than over the past 30 to 60 years (Box TS.3, Figure 1a, c). Depending on the observational data set, the GMST trend over 1998–2012 is estimated to be around one third to one half of the trend over 1951–2012.This difference between simulated and observed trends could be caused by some combination of (a) internal climate variability, (b) missing or incorrect RF, and (c) model response error.....

During the 15-year period beginning in 1998, the ensemble of HadCRUT4 GMST trends lies below almost all model-simulated trends (Box TS.3, Figure 1a), whereas during the 15-year period ending in 1998, it lies above 93 out of 114 modelled trends..... the hiatus is in part a consequence of internal variability that is predictable on the multi-year time scale..... The discrepancy between simulated and observed GMST trends during 1998–2012 could be explained in part by a tendency for some CMIP5 models to simulate stronger warming in response to increases in greenhouse-gas concentration than is consistent with observations..... In summary, the observed recent warming hiatus, defined as the reduction in GMST trend during 1998–2012 as compared to the trend during 1951–2012, is attributable in roughly equal measure to a cooling contribution from internal variability and a reduced trend in external forcing (expert judgement, medium confidence)..... Almost all CMIP5 historical simulations do not reproduce the observed recent warming hiatus. There is medium confidence that the GMST trend difference between models and observations during 1998–2012 is to a substantial degree caused by internal variability, with possible contributions from forcing error and some CMIP5 models overestimating the response to increasing GHG forcing.”

In other words, the official verdict from IPCC scientists is that the predictions of climate models, upon which they have been so eager to base the future of global politics and the expenditure of trillions of dollars, are wrong. Alarmingly, the IPCC admit that they, and their models, forgot to allow for natural climate variability.

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors:** [Lisa V. Alexander](#), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [John Church](#), and **Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#). Australian scientists involved in writing Chapter 10 include **Coordinating Lead Author** [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), and **Contributing Authors**, [Catia M. Domingues](#), [Paul J. Durack](#), and [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#). Australian scientists involved in writing Chapter 9 include **Lead Author** [Christian Jakob](#), **Contributing Authors**, [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [Jennifer Catto](#), [Paul J. Durack](#), [Sandy Harrison](#), and **Review Editor**, [Andy Pitman](#).

In using government funds to update their 2010 report, is this really the best the Australian Academy of Science can do? Their latest report, [“The science of climate change: Questions and answers”, Australian Academy of Science, Canberra, 2015](#), contradicts, and cherry picks, the IPCC scientific report which the Academy claims to support. [As has been confirmed by Garth Paltridge](#), the latest Academy report is characterised by *“subconscious blindness to overstatement and the cherry-picking of data.”*

If the Academy has dramatic new evidence of the dangers of human caused climate change then why not reveal it instead of resorting to cherry picking and contradicting the IPCC? Why should the Academy expect the public to fund still more of the same old recycled political AGW claims.

Academy Acknowledges Authority of IPCC but Contradicts IPCC in Regard to Droughts

[The IPCC are very clear in their latest report when it comes to droughts](#). In [Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis](#), Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC clearly admit, in the [Technical Summary](#), that their previous AR4 report was wrong:

“The most recent and most comprehensive analyses of river runoff do not support the IPCC Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) conclusion that global runoff has increased during the 20th century. New results also indicate that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s are no longer supported.”

In [Chapter 2 of the IPCC AR5 Report](#) the IPCC confirm again that they had previously exaggerated:

“Based on updated studies, AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in drought since the 1970s were probably overstated..... Based on evidence since AR4, SREX concluded that there were not enough direct observations of dryness to suggest high confidence in observed trends globally, although there was medium confidence that since the 1950s some regions of the world have experienced more intense and longer droughts.”

So the IPCC have confirmed allegations of so called ‘sceptics’, at least in regard to droughts, that they have been responsible for promoting untrue, exaggerated, or alarmist claims. OK, so what is the official view of the IPCC now in regard to droughts?

According to the IPCC in their AR5 [Technical Summary](#):

“There is low confidence in a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall), owing to lack of direct observations, dependencies of inferred trends on the index choice and geographical inconsistencies in the trends. However, this masks important regional changes and, for example, the frequency and intensity of drought have likely increased in the Mediterranean and West Africa and likely decreased in central North America and northwest Australia since 1950. “

And in [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) the IPCC state:

“Confidence is low for a global-scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall) since the middle of the 20th century, owing to lack of direct observations, methodological uncertainties and geographical inconsistencies in the trends.”

The IPCC summarise in [Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report](#):

“In summary, assessment of new observational evidence, in conjunction with updated simulations of natural and forced climate variability indicates that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s should be tempered. There is not enough evidence to support medium or high confidence of attribution of increasing trends to anthropogenic forcings as a result of observational uncertainties and variable results from region to region (Section 2.6.2.3). Combined with difficulties described above in distinguishing decadal scale variability in drought from long-term climate change we conclude consistent with SREX that there is low confidence in detection and attribution of changes in drought over global land areas since the mid-20th century.”

But most alarming, and incriminating, is the admission by the IPCC in the AR5 [Technical Summary](#), that droughts during the “last millennium”, before the industrial revolution and rise of atmospheric CO2, were much worse than today:

“There is high confidence for droughts during the last millennium of greater magnitude and longer duration than those observed since the beginning of the 20th century in many regions. There is medium confidence that more megadroughts occurred in monsoon Asia and wetter conditions prevailed in arid Central Asia and the South American monsoon region during the Little Ice Age (1450–1850) compared to the Medieval Climate Anomaly (950–1250).”

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors:** [Lisa V. Alexander](#), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [John Church](#), and **Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#). Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors:** [Lisa V. Alexander](#), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [John Church](#), and **Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#). Australian scientists involved in writing [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) include **Lead Author**

[Lisa V. Alexander](#), and contributing author, [Markus Donat](#). **Australian scientists responsible for writing Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report** include Coordinating Lead Author [Nathaniel L. Bindoff](#) and Contributing authors [Catia M. Domingues](#), [Paul J. Durack](#), and [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#),

When it comes to droughts, earlier ‘scientific’ reports were frequently alarmist and based upon a political agenda rather than the scientific facts.

In an article entitled “[No snow, more drought, climate report warns](#)” in August 2011, Oliver Chan cites a report by climate experts from the CSIRO and the [University of Melbourne](#) presented at the [Four Degrees or More climate change conference in Melbourne](#). According to Chan, scientists attending the conference claimed “*Australia's climate could shift dramatically with **five times as many droughts** in southern Australia and no snow cover, according to a new report on the consequences of severe climate change.*” But according to Chan, Professor Sherwood urged caution regarding the reliability of projections based upon climate models, which he claimed should be taken with a “**grain of salt**”:

*“Steven Sherwood, an atmospheric physicist and co-director of the Climate Change Research Centre at the University of New South Wales in Sydney, said that while the report, ‘follows a fairly standard methodology’ in summarising the predictions of climate models, the estimates ‘**must be taken with a grain of salt**’ because of the variability between the 23 models. ‘They don’t all predict the same outcome, so a large range can sometimes appear – but this probably represents the best we can do at the moment,’ he said. Sherwood continued, ‘Of course there is no guarantee that the actual outcome will even be within this range, all the models could be off. But if the models are wrong, it is just as likely to be in the direction of underestimating change rather than overestimating it. ‘Either way, it’s better to be safe than sorry and we need to reduce greenhouse emissions now while we still can before it’s too late.’”*

Interestingly, Professor Sherwood is a co-author of the Academy’s latest report, [The science of climate change: Questions and answers](#)”, [Australian Academy of Science, Canberra, 2015](#), which tells a very different story regarding droughts as compared to that presented by IPCC scientists:

*“.....past floods and droughts in many regions have likely been larger than those recorded since the early 20th century. This high variability poses great challenges for recording and analysing changes in climate extremes not just in Australia, but the world over. Nevertheless, some changes in Australia’s climate extremes stand out from that background variability.....
While there is no clear trend in drought occurrence globally, indications are that droughts have increased in some regions (such as southwest Australia) and decreased in others (such as northwest Australia) since the middle of the 20th century.”*

The Academy stated they wished to ‘simplify’ the results reported by IPCC scientists, results such as the following [IPCC conclusions regarding droughts](#):

- **Globally droughts are NOT increasing.**
- **There is no reliable evidence that humans are causing droughts.**
- **Droughts are much less severe in modern times as atmospheric CO2 levels have risen.**
- **As long claimed by sceptics, previous claims about increasing human caused droughts are now known to be incorrect or exaggerated.**

These IPCC conclusions could hardly be clearer, but yet The Australian Academy of Science report is characterised by its vagueness and its avoidance of the scientific facts. It has deceptively cherry-

picked IPCC data concerning droughts, completely omitting IPCC evidence showing there is no reliable data showing humans are causing droughts.

The question is, why has the Academy used government funds to cherry pick and misrepresent IPCC data, and conceal the scientific truth regarding supposed human caused droughts? And why has the government approved public funds to mislead the public about droughts? Why did the government decide NOT to publicise the above IPCC conclusions concerning droughts, but instead produce a 'new' report which conceals these facts?

Around the world billions of dollars have been spent trying to prove humans are causing dangerous climate change. Not only have they failed to do so, but as the latest IPCC report illustrates, the evidence is actually getting less! The latest Academy report convincingly illustrates why all government funding in support of the global AGW agenda should cease immediately.