

ACADEMY OF SCIENCE RELEASES LATEST CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH

Issue 3 – Scientific Uncertainties of ‘Climate Change’ Lead to Certain Global Political ‘Solutions’

Graham Williamson

February 2015

Academy Points out, that Little is as Certain, as the Uncertainties of Climate Science

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](#). Of course, the main area of concern when it comes to climate science, are the numerous uncertainties and unknowns involved. While these numerous uncertainties continue to plague climate science, global strategies intended to control or mitigate climate changes decades into the future are clearly based more solidly upon politics rather than science. Given these facts it is anticipated that the new Academy report will significantly reduce these uncertainties and provide long missing scientific justification for the current global climate change mitigation agenda. It is instructive to see the progress the Academy has made since their 2010 report.

In regard to the uncertainties of climate science, [in 2010 the Academy stated](#):

“How do we deal with the uncertainty in the science?”

Although climate forecasts are uncertain and will remain so, the broad conclusions of climate change science as outlined above are based upon many lines of evidence which together give a high degree of confidence. Partly because of scientific uncertainty but also because many aspects of human life are involved, decisions about action on climate change will need to involve extensive consideration of issues beyond science, including ethics, economics, and risk management.”

So in 2010 the Academy is very much having ‘two bob each way’. Climate forecasts the Academy says, are ‘uncertain’, and these uncertainties, according to the Academy, will not be resolved in the future. In spite of these uncertainties however, the Academy has been able to reach what it refers to ‘broad conclusions’ with a ‘high degree of confidence’. The Academy quickly points out though, that ‘actions on climate change’ cannot be justified by science alone.

In conclusion, [the 2010 report stated the scientific ‘facts’ very clearly](#):

*“It is **very likely** that **most** of the recent observed global warming is caused by increasing greenhouse gas levels”*

*“**many** aspects of climate change will likely remain difficult to foresee despite continuing modelling advances, leaving open the possibility of climate change **surprises**”*

*“some aspects of climate science are still quite **uncertain** ”.....*

“Uncertainty about future climate change works in both directions: there is a chance that climate change will be less severe than current best estimates, but there is also a roughly equal chance that it will be worse.”

According to the Academy in 2010 it seems, even if current fears about future ‘climate change’ turn out to be wildly exaggerated, and not posing any significant increased risk, we can be certain that *“It is **very likely** that **most of the recent observed global warming**”* has been caused by humans. The only possible *solution* therefore, is for all countries, especially capitalist countries, to transfer global political power, and global economic power, to the UN, so they can ‘fix’ the climate.

Now, 5 years later, while still acknowledging continuing uncertainties and inability to predict future climate accurately, the [Academy has concluded](#) on p5 of their report, that *“global warming”* is now *“real”*. But [like the IPCC](#), the Academy, after another 5 years research, is quick to point out that they still have little idea of what is going on in the real world in local areas such as Sydney or Brisbane. The Academy, [like the IPCC](#), lives in the world of fictitious global averages which dictate that if the northern hemisphere climate changes, we must change our local climate policies. According to the Academy:

“What are the uncertainties and their implications?”

There is near-unanimous agreement among climate scientists that human-caused global warming is real. However, future climate change and its effects are hard to predict accurately or in detail, especially at regional and local levels. Many factors prevent more accurate predictions, and some uncertainty is likely to remain for considerable time. Uncertainty in climate science is no greater than in other areas where policy decisions are routinely taken to minimise risk. Also, the uncertainty means that the magnitude of future climate change could be either greater or less than present-day best estimates.”

And on p28 of their latest 2015 report, the [Academy again underlines the uncertainties](#):

“A number of factors prevent more accurate predictions of climate change, and many of these will persist.....Although information from past climate changes largely corroborates model calculations, this is also uncertain due to inaccuracies in the data and potentially important factors about which we have incomplete information.....It is very difficult to tell in detail how climate change will affect individual locations,...Despite these uncertainties, there is near-unanimous agreement among climate scientists that human-caused global warming is real....Uncertainty works in both directions: future climate change could be greater or less than present-day best projections”

Here again we see the Academy admitting, after 5 years additional research, that climate change is now regarded as a global phenomenon that [does not apply to any single location in the world](#). The situation with climate models though, seems much clearer.

On p14 of the Academy’s new report they state:

“Models can successfully reproduce the observed warming over the last 150 years when both natural and human influences are included, but not when natural influences act alone.”

As noted above however, on p28 they state:

“Although information from past climate changes largely corroborates model calculations, this is also uncertain due to inaccuracies in the data and potentially important factors about which we have incomplete information”

Report co-author Professor Steven Sherwood, does not reveal in the report, whether he still considers model results should be taken with a “*grain of salt*”, [as he stated in 2011](#). Nevertheless, in spite of all these uncertainties, The Academy boldly predicts:

“Current changes are expected to continue and intensify in the future”

Based upon the science, the Academy predicts “current changes” will “intensify”, though the Academy is not sure whether the changes will be more or less intense than predicted, and whether in fact these changes will occur at any single location on earth.

Uncertainties and Unsettled Science used by Politicians for Global Political Transformation

[According to Tony Thomas](#), the [Academy’s latest report](#) was produced to “*help massage public opinion towards action at the Paris climate conference next December.*” The [Paris Conference](#), the UN’s attempt to stitch together a binding global agreement, is going ahead regardless of increasing uncertainties, and in the absence of scientific evidence. The UN requires capitalist countries [to commit to the transfer of \\$100 billion annually](#) to socialist countries and dictatorships by 2020.

Numerous ‘experts’ have sought to justify the transfer of political power and public funds to the UN by claiming this is the only way of ‘saving the planet’ from climate change, [Anthony Albanese even claiming that saving the planet is not enough](#), we should save money too:

“early action on climate change is what is required. By taking early action you will actually save money as well as save the planet.”

The bottom line though, and the reason why the UN does **not** want individual countries to pursue democratic national solutions to environmental problems, is best explained by the Executive Secretary of the [United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change \(UNFCCC\)](#), [Christiana Figueres](#). According to Figueres the UN climate change program will provide a “[centralized transformation](#)” which will change the lives of everyone in the world. Rather than an attempt to ‘save the planet’, Figueres describes the upcoming Paris climate conference as an opportunity to “[transform the economy of the world](#)”:

“This is probably the most difficult task we have ever given ourselves, which is to intentionally transform the economic development model, for the first time in human history. This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the industrial revolution.”

Figueres further emphasised that the UN is about “*global governance*” and climate change is [no more than a “playground” in which the UN can exercise their global governance power](#):

“I am very convinced that society as a whole, global society, is moving to the point where we are going to need more and more global governance muscle.....Climate change is only the first of the major, major planetary challenges that we are being given, almost as a playground.....to go into that playground and exercise our global governance capacity”

Rather than endorse democratic national solutions, [Figueres has appealed to the people to drive the agenda, regardless of their government](#). The end game then is control, complete control of the world. The movers and shakers behind the global climate change agenda are not the least bit interested in democratic national strategies. [According to Jasper](#):

"The goal is as plain as day. In her new book, Environmental Overkill, former Washington Governor Dixy Lee Ray notes: 'The objective, clearly enunciated by the leaders of UNCED [the Earth Summit], is to bring about change in the present system of nations. The future is to be world government, with central planning by the UN.... If force is needed, it will be provided by a UN green-helmeted police force'."

Given these well known facts the question must be asked: **why is the Australian Academy of Science using public funds in an attempt to justify the global political machinations of the UN?**

Climate Change About Political Ideology, Not Science

The answer to this question lies in the fact that "[Ideology not rationality drives climate change understanding](#)". Global political control by the UN is particularly attractive to those on the left of politics. As Richard Glover explains in an article entitled, "[Bone-headed beliefs bound to end in death by drowning](#)":

"People on the left instinctively believe in communal action, the role of government and the efficacy of international agencies such as the UN. They were always going to believe in climate change; it's the sort of problem that can best be solved using the tools they most enjoy using. The right tended to be sceptical about climate change from the start and for exactly the same reasons. It's the sort of problem that requires global, communal action, with governments setting rules. It is a problem that requires tools they instinctively dislike using."

[As Glover points out](#), some on the left of politics seem to welcome any new environmental tragedy to reinforce their global belief system:

"There's a type of green zealot who appears to relish climate change. Every rise in sea levels is noted excitedly. Every cyclone is applauded and claimed as a noisy, deadly witness for their side. Suddenly, it's as if they have the planet's assistance in their lifelong campaign to bully everyone else into accepting their view of the perfect world. One without any human beings. Except for them. Living in a cave. Wearing an unwashed T-shirt that not only says "Support wildlife" but actually does."

Surrendering to full government control and progressive loss of freedom and democracy have always been an integral part of the *left's* version of the climate change debate, as [noted by Mcneil](#):

"Weinstein and the progressive left have every reason to want to shut down opposition speech on global warming. Free speech threatens their ability to shove socialism down the throats of Americans. That's what global warming/climate change is really all about with the leaders of the progressive left..... Notice every solution the left offers requires massive government involvement in the economy, massive taxation and loss of individual freedom..... This isn't about saving the world from a warming catastrophe, government and science have no idea how to actually affect the climate in any serious way. This is about Americans giving up their economic freedom to the state in exchange for protection from a fictitious evil..... If the public figures out this is a hoax, it threatens the future of socialism in America. In typical socialist fashion, the solution is to arrest those who disagree. This time instead of calling the arrested "enemies of the state" they'll be called "enemies of Earth."

[But Tucker went further, describing climate change as](#) "the ultimate public goods 'problem' and the last and best hope for those lustful to rule the world by force":

"I'm convinced that fear over climate change (the ultimate public goods "problem") is the last and best hope for those lustful to rule the world by force. Some people just want to run the world, and

this entire nightmare scenario that posits that our high standard of living is causing the world to heat up and burn is the latest and greatest excuse. And that remains true whether or not everything they claim to be true is all true or all nonsense..... If you want tolerance and humility, and a willingness to defer to the evidence and gradual process of scientific discovery, you will find it among those who have no desire to manage the world from the top down.”

But alarmingly, [as Glover points out](#), those who are blinded by the thick rose covered glasses of political fanaticism are guaranteed not to be able recognise reality:

“Facts that don't fit one's world view can be difficult to see. Consider the way the left spent decades ignoring the horrors of Soviet communism, horrors that were obvious to anyone who cared to look from at least the early 1930s. The facts didn't fit in with the way they wanted to see the world, so they spent decades in denial, looking the other way.”

Most disturbingly, scientists are also part of this political divide, the professional views of scientists being shown to be [heavily influenced by political bias](#). According to [Stenhouse and colleagues](#), the attitudes of meteorologists towards global warming are determined largely by their own personal political beliefs:

“Political ideology was the second strongest predictor of view certainty and causation, and was equivalent to perceived consensus as predictor of harm/benefit.....In other words, the notion that expertise is the single dominant factor shaping meteorologists' views of global warming appears to be simplistic to the point of being incorrect.....Political ideology was the factor next most strongly associated with meteorologists' views about global warming. This also goes against the idea of scientists' opinions being entirely based on objective analysis of the evidence, and concurs with previous studies that have shown scientists' opinions on topics to vary along with their political orientation (Nisbet, 2011; Rosenberg et al., 2009).....At least for the measure of expertise that we used, climate science expertise may be a less important influence on global warming views than political ideology or social consensus norms”

This troubling analysis explains the obvious bias or polarisation of scientists when it comes to climate change. While there are various reasons why some scientists continue to promote misleading politicised information about climate change, government funding and political bias clearly represent significant challenges to the independence and integrity of organisations like the Australian Academy of Science.

Australian Academy of Science Blows the Chance to Eliminate the Uncertainties of AGW & Justify the Paris UN Conference

As climate alarmist's predictions continue to fail, computer models continue to get it wrong, and as [the uncertainties therefore continue to increase](#), so the politicised claims to justify the upcoming UN deal in Paris become louder and [more distant from reality and truth](#). **In their latest report, The Academy had a clear opportunity to cut through the politics and the sensationalism, clearly state the scientific facts, and eliminate the uncertainties. For whatever reason, they apparently decided not to do so.**

It is impossible to believe that [their latest report](#) is the best the combined resources of the Academy could come up with to provide what [Academy President Andrew Holmes described as](#) **“authoritative answers to the key questions we are all asking about the science of climate change.”** According to the Academy's answers, current climate projections may not apply to any location on earth, and

additionally, they are confident the uncertainties will continue. But we must take 'action' it seems, to support the global climate change agenda.

But while the Australian Academy of Science, even in the face of growing uncertainties, pretends to answer questions about climate change in the lead up to the Paris conference, Professor Richard Lindzen asks one question the Academy seems determined to avoid: "[Climate Science: Is it Currently Designed to Answer Questions?](#)" [According to Lindzen](#):

"When an issue becomes a vital part of a political agenda, as is the case with climate, then the politically desired position becomes a goal rather than a consequence of scientific research....Perhaps the most impressive exploitation of climate science for political purposes has been the creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by two UN agencies, UNEP (United Nations Environmental Program) and WMO (World Meteorological Organization), and the agreement of all major countries at the 1992 Rio Conference to accept the IPCC as authoritative".....

Nevertheless, the partnership continues: the Academy continues to provide answers as the scientific uncertainties increase, and the UN continues to offer global political and economic 'solutions' based upon the uncertain answers of the scientists. But will these same scientists accept responsibility for the consequences of the UN's plan?