

**ACADEMY OF SCIENCE RELEASES LATEST CLIMATE CHANGE
RESEARCH**

**Issue 4 – Academy Overlooks Scientific Uncertainties to Advocate
Global Political Agenda**

**Graham Williamson
March 2015**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The [Australian Academy of Science 2015 report](#) is intended to assist in the lead-up to the UN's global political climate deal in December. It is essential therefore, that this report succeeds in its objective, described by [Academy President Andrew Holmes as](#) being to provide, *“authoritative answers to the key questions we are all asking about the science of climate change.”* [According to Holmes](#), the report *“has been endorsed by the Academy as a balanced, objective and authoritative summary of the current state of knowledge of the science of climate change.”*

The 3 previous papers, outlined below, have examined some shortcomings of the new ‘authoritative’ answers supplied by the Academy in the Academy’s 2015 government funded report, [“The science of climate change: Questions and answers”](#).

Issue1

[Academy Discovers “Hot Days” may be Related to Natural Climate Changes](#)

In the context of discussing those aspects of so called ‘climate change’ which are allegedly human caused and are therefore allegedly reversible by the UN’s global political agenda, the Academy redefines the term ‘climate change’ to include natural climate variability. Rather than seek to separate those aspects of climate that are allegedly controllable by humans from natural irreversible changes, the Academy chose to do exactly the opposite. They have sought to mislead and confuse, not clarify.

Issue2

[Academy Contradicts & Cherry Picks Findings of the IPCC](#)

Although the Academy stresses that they accept the scientific authority of the IPCC, in writing their latest 2015 report the Academy has chosen to deviate so much from the [IPCC AR5 scientific report](#), that it can only be described as “cherry picking” or contradicting the IPCC. Vital aspects of the IPCC report, such as the following, were completely omitted by the Academy:

- the failure of models to predict the ‘hiatus’,
- the IPCC admission that there is no reliable evidence humans are causing droughts,
- previous IPCC drought claims are now known to be alarmist,

Once again, the Academy has shown an eagerness to mislead and confuse, certainly not clarify. Deliberate cherry picking or omission bias is a deliberate attempt to deceive.

Issue3

[Scientific Uncertainties of ‘Climate Change’ Lead to Certain Global Political ‘Solutions’](#)

Although the ‘uncertainties’ of climate science, particularly in regard to AGW, continue to increase, the calls for global political action actually grow louder. Instead of responding to these uncertainties by calling for more scrutiny of the science, the Academy has joined in the political process, boldly stating the certainty that uncertainties will remain, but yet action is needed. The Academy even points out that climate change projections may not apply to any single location on earth. In spite of this, the UN is pushing ahead with plans to use AGW as an excuse to control the economy of the world, thanks largely to the work of various politically active scientists. The Academy report however, by obfuscation, by omission bias, and by acknowledging continuing uncertainties, has further clouded the issues and drawn attention to the scientific futility of any UN climate deal in Paris.

In this final paper, the means employed by the Academy to mislead the public about human caused climate change are further examined. In particular, the preferred use of politicised

IPCC summary documents rather than scientific literature is considered. Although various examples of politicisation of IPCC summary documents are demonstrated, the Academy continues to cite such politicised documents and defend the IPCC as a scientific organisation. The strange *scientific method* practiced by the Academy, and also government organisations like CSIRO, goes like this:

1. **First, Australian scientists assist in writing the IPCC scientific report.**
2. **After completion of the scientific report, it is submitted to scientists and government officials to produce a summarised politicised, and frequently, sensationalised, report.**
3. **Scientists who prepared the initial scientific report, prefer to cite, or publicise, only the politicised and summarised report.**

This strange process seems unique to climate science, and clearly represents an abandonment of science.

It is concluded that the Academy has completely failed in its stated objective of supplying *“authoritative answers to the key questions we are all asking about the science of climate change.”* The Academy did not just fail to provide clear answers, they confirmed the continuing uncertainties and ambiguities surrounding human caused climate change. They revealed again the cherry picking or omission bias, and obfuscation, which are commonly the hallmark of politicised climate change documents. It would seem that the Academy regards this as the best they could do in the lead-up to Paris.

Many no doubt regard the main purpose of this Academy report as being political. An attempt to supply answers that will provide scientific justification for the proposed binding UN political climate deal in Paris, and consequent UN political interference in the lives of all Australians. According to the Academy *“The role of climate science is to inform decisions by providing the best possible knowledge of climate outcomes and the consequences of alternative courses of action.”*

One such course of action is to surrender to the climate demands of the UN. The Academy has completely failed to reveal the consequences of such a decision.

The alternative course of action is for Australia to reject UN interference and utilise a democratically based Australian strategy. The Academy has completely failed to reveal the consequences of such a decision.

The Academy has blown the chance to scientifically justify any climate deal in Paris. In keeping with the Academy’s contribution, Australia should cancel participation in Paris and allocate the funds to adaptation, and those in real need.

Academy Supports IPCC, IPCC Supports Academy, & Both Support Politicisation of Science

Given the vital importance of separating the effects of human caused climate change from effects due to natural climate variability, it is alarming indeed that [the Academy chose to continue the confusion and obfuscation surrounding these terms in their latest report](#). [The Academy also declined the opportunity to tell the complete truth](#), according to the IPCC, about droughts, unreliability of models, and the so called 'hiatus'. And yet, [in spite of noting the uncertainties, and admitting global warming projections may not apply to any single location on earth](#), the Academy strangely concluded that the scientific 'evidence' is such that political action is warranted to control human caused climate change.

Given this background, it is worthwhile taking a closer look at the methods used by the Academy, and frequently also by other government funded or politicised scientific organisations, to deceive or mislead the public ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#) [4](#)). These methods have in common, an abandonment of science, as once respected scientific organisations give precedence to a position of political advocacy ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)).

As is perfectly clear, the Academy relies heavily upon IPCC reports for its own statements concerning climate change ([5](#), [6](#)). Interestingly however, the Academy seems to very much prefer citing the politicised summaries and conclusions of the IPCC, rather than the more detailed IPCC scientific reports. [The Academy's latest report is no exception](#), carefully avoiding inconvenient scientific facts.

The United Nations though, which is desperately using sensationalised AGW claims to stitch together a global political deal in Paris at the end of the year, [describes the Academy's contribution](#), based as it is on politicised UN IPCC reports, as affirming "*the overwhelming scientific consensus that human activity is having an impact on the planet's climate.*" **This type of recycled circular reasoning is absolutely pervasive in the field of human caused climate change.** However, it is indeed interesting to note the high regard with which the [UN apparently regards the Academy's recycling of UN climate change reports](#):

"In an effort to better explain climate change to the community and to take account both of new research and public questions about climate change, the Australian Academy of Science has updated its climate change booklet which it originally published in 2010.

The booklet is designed to explain the often inaccessible scientific concepts associated with climate change in a form easily understandable to people without a background in science. Since the previous edition of the booklet in 2010, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has prepared a new international assessment with the close input of many Australian researchers, some of whom are also authors of this booklet.

The booklet affirms the overwhelming scientific consensus that human activity is having an impact on the planet's climate, with carbon dioxide emissions from the burning of fossil fuels being the most significant contributing factor. In a business-as-usual scenario, global temperatures are expected to rise by an average of 4.5 degrees by 2100."

[But then the UN comes to the point](#), the reason why there seems to be a constant stream of recycled alarming sensationalised warnings about something loosely referred to as 'climate change':

"World leaders will gather for the 2015 UN Climate Change Conference in Paris in December, the 21st such conference since the signing of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The organising committee will seek an agreement to a binding international agreement to reduce

*greenhouse gas emissions..... **The Australian Academy of Science has called on Australian political parties to follow the example and agree to an approach to addressing climate change.***

Human caused climate change, as it is commonly presented to the world, is all about politics, global politics, It is NOT about science. The test for this is extremely simple, [just separate the global politics from the science.](#)

Previous presidents of the Australian Academy of Science have made this quite clear, an article by Kurt Lambeck, entitled "[On the Edge of Global Calamity](#)", appearing in **The Australian** on 7/07/07. Similarly, [according to Suzanne Cory](#), "*The world can be more certain than ever that human-induced climate change is a real and serious threat to our planet.*" Since the Academy also emphasises the uncertainties of climate science, it is clear that these statements are based upon something other than science. Either they are more appropriately considered 'science fiction' or else they are political statements. Politics of course, is based upon 'spin' and deceit, not truth. Bearing this in mind, it is most disturbing to note, as [Roger Beckmann](#) and Marguerite Tarzia point out, climate change 'science' is unique in that [it is increasingly viewed through a "political lens"](#).

The implications of this are most serious indeed. [Politics is about influencing and controlling people](#), especially by using 'spin' and deceit'. Why is climate science considered so unique that it must be taken over by those who specialise in spin and deceit rather than scientific truth? [As Richard Lindzen points out in regard to the IPCC](#), which is [at the heart of the politicisation of climate science](#):

"The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."

Philip Lloyd agrees, confirming the fact that the IPCC Summary for Policymakers (SPM) is a politicised document that distorts or corrupts the science, [as cited by Happs](#):

"I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."

Recently, in correspondence with current Academy of Science President Andrew Holmes, Dr John Happs asked:

"Q.5 If a registered company produced an end of year report in the way IPCC personnel have distorted portions of the technical reports to produce their "Summaries for Policymakers" do you think they would be facing de-listing and prosecution?"

Andrew Holmes responded:

"This is not a valid analogy of the IPCC process for producing its Summaries for Policymakers. The scientist Lead Authors produce draft summaries based on the underlying chapters. These are then subject to peer and government review and revised by the expert Lead Authors. The revised drafts are then reviewed, in session, by IPCC Member governments with the full involvement of the Lead Authors and their own scientific experts."

Dr Happs responds by correcting Holmes and citing the actual IPCC instructions to contributing authors. Dr Happs, and other cited scientists, indicate various instances where the meaning in the scientific report is fundamentally changed or even reversed in the politicised SPM. One such example given by Dr Happs relates to the capacity of humans to cause climate change. Happs cites the IPCC scientific report, then the SPM:

"SECTION 8.6

*"Finally we come to the most difficult question of all: 'When will the detection and unambiguous attribution of human induced climate change occur?' when the detection and attribution of human induced climate change is likely to occur. The answer to this question must be subjective, particularly in the light of the very large signal and noise uncertainties discussed in this Chapter, it is not surprising that the best answer to this question is **'We do not know.'**" (My emphasis)*

IPCC SUMMARY DISTORTS THE SCIENCE BY SAYING:

"Viewed as a whole, these results indicate that the observed trend in global warming mean temperature over the past 100 years is larger than our current best estimates of natural climate variations over the last 600 years, unlikely to be entirely natural in origin."

The IPCC's 1995 Scientific Report draft included the following three statements:

- 1. "None of the (scientific) studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed (climate) changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases." (Source, IPCC, 1995.)*
- 2. "No study to date has positively attributed all or part (of observed climate change) to anthropogenic causes." (Source, IPCC, 1995.)*
- 3. "Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced." (Source, IPCC, 1995.)*

All three of the above statements by IPCC scientists were later replaced with:

"The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate." It is clear that the "Summary for Policymakers" is actually a "Summary By Policymakers" and it is approved by the policymakers themselves. It does not have to coincide with the views of the scientists who produced the technical reports. In fact it is clear that the "Summary for Policymakers" is more a political statement and this was acknowledged by Dr Phil Jones in an email (redacted) sent to Dr Chris Folland at the Met Office Hadley"

Dr Happs continues by asking Andrew Holmes:

Q.3 Do you believe that the broader scientific community should trust the IPCC process and findings?

Holmes responded thus:

"Yes. The IPCC process and findings have been widely accepted by governments around the world after careful scientific review and advice by their various national scientific expert bodies."

This response by Academy President Andrew Holmes is most interesting. Although Dr Happs specifically asked whether IPCC findings and processes should be trusted by **scientists**, Holmes responded, yes, they are accepted by **governments**.

It is clear that one of the methods employed by the IPCC to politicise the science and deceive the public is to issue a summary publication in which fundamental meanings are changed, vital findings are omitted completely, or selective emphasis is applied to further a predetermined political agenda. In general, sensationalism is highlighted in the summaries, while uncertainties or findings that do not support the agenda, are omitted or underemphasised.

[According to Larry Bell](#), the political agenda being promoted by the IPCC in their SPM's involve redistribution of wealth, not rainfall:

“IPCC Summary for Policymakers reports offer prescriptions for distribution of wealth and resource redistribution, including regionalized (smaller) economies to reduce transportation demand, reorienting lifestyles away from consumption, resource-sharing through co-ownership, and encouraging citizens to pursue free time over wealth.”

The issue of politicisation of the SPM’s is completely separate from the reported [corruption of scientific procedures involved in preparation of the various IPCC scientific reports](#), which has been [covered elsewhere](#).

Let us examine some examples in the IPCC’s latest reports.

Academy Supports IPCC Politicisation of Science & Deception in the SPM

Although the IPCC practice of politicising and corrupting the science in the SPM is a longstanding practice, the following discussion considers some more recent example taken from the IPCC AR5 report. The interesting fact here, is that organisations like the Australian Academy of Science and [CSIRO](#) seem by their silence, to condone this IPCC corruption of the science. While prominent international climate scientists have long expressed concern about IPCC methods and have recommended improvements, the AAS, CSIRO, and BOM, have not been seen to be part of this move to rectify scientific weaknesses within the IPCC. Furthermore, when IPCC publications are released, AAS, CSIRO, and BOM, seem to prefer to cite the politicised SPM rather than the scientific report.

The following information is obtained from 3 sources, from which more details may be obtained ([7](#), [8](#), [9](#)).

1. [SPM Conceals Facts About Droughts](#)

Recently, Brian Wible, [senior editor of Science](#), in a series of 3 papers in *Science*, has drawn attention to concerns about the politicisation of science by the IPCC ([Science 4 July 2014: 345.6192.34-a](#)). In [Getting serious about categorizing countries](#) (*Science 4 July 2014: 34-36*), Victor and colleagues further point out that “*IPCC is a government controlled process*”:

“But IPCC is a government-controlled process. Its line-by-line approval of the SPM yields the lowest common denominator of what is scientifically accurate and not too toxic for governments. A small number of countries can block findings that a large number of scientists working over many years with extensive review have agreed are robust. Disentangling IPCC from politics is impossible, especially where IPCC engages social science research that has policy-relevant conclusions. Yet IPCC as a scientific body can sharpen its messages by focusing more attention on the author-approved technical and policy summary documents.”

Although *Science* is to be applauded for drawing attention to the critically important issue of IPCC politicisation of science, they have not gone anywhere near far enough. The series of papers in *Science* relate to [governments deleting country sensitive data relating to increased emissions](#), from the SPM. But although this illustrates the capacity of politicians to overrule scientists, it ignores much more fundamental distortions of science in the SPM’s ([10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#)).

It can be clearly seen that the IPCC employ two fundamental mechanisms to politicise or corrupt the conclusions contained, not only in the SPM, but also in their even more brief and ‘media friendly’ “[Headline statements from the Summary for Policymakers](#)”. The first of these is to corrupt the content of the SPM and [Headlines document](#) by utilising omission bias or cherry picking to ensure vital data contained in the scientific report is omitted. The second mechanism utilised by the IPCC is to selectively emphasise the data in the SPM so that data which does not support the underlying

agenda is relegated to the 'fine print'.

In the case of droughts the IPCC have employed both these mechanisms to corrupt or politicise the SPM. Firstly, the IPCC has resorted to cherry picking or omission bias by omitting evidence that *"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."* **This critical fact was deleted from both the SPM and Headlines document.**

Secondly, evidence that globally droughts are NOT increasing, evidence that humans are causing droughts is diminishing and unreliable, and evidence that the AR4 report was exaggerated or alarmist in regard to droughts, was **relegated to the 'fine print' in the SPM, and was completely deleted from the highlighted conclusions and the Headlines document.** The media of course, are quick to respond to these alarmist IPCC documents by [jumping on the alarmist bandwagon](#).

Australian scientists responsible for writing the [IPCC AR5 Working Group 1 Summary for Policymakers \(SPM\)](#) include **Drafting Authors [Lisa V. Alexander](#) (also lead author for the [Technical Summary](#)), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#) (also lead author for both [Chapt 10](#) and the [Technical Summary](#)), [John Church](#) (also lead author for the [Technical Summary](#)), and **Draft Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#).**

Australian scientists responsible for writing the [AR5 Synthesis Report SPM](#) include [John A. Church](#), [Mark Howden](#), and [Scott B. Power](#), while [Jean Palutikof](#) was a review editor.

The Academy, as a scientific organisation, should be seen to be constantly challenging, testing, and strengthening the scientific methods utilised by the IPCC. The reverse is true, the Academy, by their persistent silence, have approved the IPCC's politicisation of the SPM in regard to droughts. The Academy has also refused to publicise the good news revealed by the IPCC that humans are not causing droughts.

2. [SPM Conceals 'Hiatus' & Lack of Warming](#)

The content of the final version of the IPCC AR5 SPM has resulted in global turmoil in the world of climate alarmists as governments and scientists sought to put their own particular spin on the final report ([14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#)). Headlines such as *"[Row over IPCC report as nations 'try to hide lack of climate change'](#)"* and *"[IPCC report summary censored by governments around the world](#)"* suddenly appeared as the political drivers of global climate change alarmism clearly exposed their underlying political agenda and contempt for science.

The longstanding IPCC tradition of politicising and sensationalising the SPM is clearly being continued in regard to the 'hiatus' and the reliability of climate models. As noted by [Judith Curry](#) and also [Isdo and colleagues](#), the Draft version of the Summary for Policymakers correctly stated as follows, although this was removed from the Final version:

"Models do not generally reproduce the observed reduction in surface warming trend over the last 10–15 years."

[According to Isdo and colleagues](#):

"Though this statement was removed from the final, published version of the SPM, it remains patently true, as does the fact that IPCC's climate models have failed to project the lack of warming over the last 15 (now 17) years."

In the [final of the Working Group 1 Summary for Policymakers](#) the IPCC not only avoided using the term 'hiatus', they also omitted mentioning the total failure of the climate models, which they referred to in the [AR5 Technical Summary](#) and which they had previously claimed were so reliable:

"In addition to robust multi-decadal warming, global mean surface temperature exhibits substantial decadal and interannual variability (see Figure SPM.1). Due to natural variability, trends based on short records are very sensitive to the beginning and end dates and do not in general reflect long-term climate trends. As one example, the rate of warming over the past 15 years (1998–2012; 0.05 [–0.05 to 0.15] °C per decade), which begins with a strong El Niño, is smaller than the rate calculated since 1951 (1951–2012; 0.12 [0.08 to 0.14] °C per decade)^s. {2.4}"

As the IPCC Scientific report continued to agree with the criticisms of global warming science long publicised by sceptics, and confirm the cessation of global warming and the failure of climate models, the [Summary for Policymakers](#) moved in the opposite direction and ramped up the alarm, even claiming "climate models have improved since AR4":

"Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and since the 1950s, many of the observed changes are unprecedented over decades to millennia. The atmosphere and ocean have warmed, the amounts of snow and ice have diminished, sea level has risen, and the concentrations of greenhouse gases have increased (see Figures SPM.1, SPM.2, SPM.3 and SPM.4)..... Each of the last three decades has been successively warmer at the Earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850 (see Figure SPM.1). In the Northern Hemisphere, 1983–2012 was likely the warmest 30-year period of the last 1400 years (medium confidence)..... Climate models have improved since the AR4. Models reproduce observed continental-scale surface temperature patterns and trends over many decades, including the more rapid warming since the mid-20th century and the cooling immediately following large volcanic eruptions (very high confidence)..... Observational and model studies of temperature change, climate feedbacks and changes in the Earth's energy budget together provide confidence in the magnitude of global warming in response to past and future forcing..... Human influence has been detected in warming of the atmosphere and the ocean, in changes in the global water cycle, in reductions in snow and ice, in global mean sea level rise, and in changes in some climate extremes (see Figure SPM.6 and Table SPM.1). This evidence for human influence has grown since AR4. It is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century."

So according to IPCC scientists, the climate models which have been shown to be so unreliable in the AR5 report, were even worse in the AR4 report, although the unreliability of the AR4 models was not made clear by the IPCC at that time.

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 SPM include **Drafting Authors** [Lisa V. Alexander](#) (also lead author for the Technical Summary), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#) (also lead author for both Chapt 10 and the Technical Summary), [John Church](#) (also lead author for the Technical Summary), and **Draft Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#).

The Academy, as a scientific organisation, should be seen to be constantly challenging, testing, and strengthening the scientific methods utilised by the IPCC. The reverse is true, the Academy, by their silence, have approved the IPCC's politicisation of the SPM in regard to the hiatus and reliability of models.

3.SPM Conceals Truth About Conflicts

According to [Chapter 18](#) of the [AR5 WG2 Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability report](#), there is no evidence human caused climate change has caused war or conflicts:

“There is emerging literature on the impact of climate change on poverty, working conditions, violent conflict, migration and economic growth from various parts of the world, but evidence for detection or attribution to climate change remains limited. [18.4] There is no evidence of a climate change effect on inter-state conflict in the post-WW II period.....For these reasons, neither the detection of an effect of climate change on civil conflict nor an assessment of the magnitude of such an effect can currently be made with a degree of confidence..... Several studies have examined links between climate variability and small-scale communal violence (Adano et al., 2012; Butler and Gates, 2012; Hendrix and Salehyan, 2012; Raleigh and Kniveton, 2012; Theisen, 2012). As with larger-scale civil conflict, this work has focused on climate variability rather than on climate change, so neither the detection of the effect of climate change nor an assessment of its magnitude can currently be made with a degree of confidence.”

Australian scientists involved in preparing Chapter 18 include **Contributing Authors** [Ove Hoegh-Guldberg](#), [Lesley Hughes](#), [Elvira Poloczanska](#), and **Review Editor** [Neville Smith](#).

It should also be noted that these most unalarming IPCC conclusions resulted even in spite of the fact that the IPCC deliberately sought to “[establish a link](#)”:

“Finally, efforts have been made to establish a link between high temperatures and violent crime (Anderson, 1987; Field, 1992; Anderson, 2001; Rotton and Cohn, 2001; Butke and Sheridan, 2010; Breetzke and Cohn, 2012; Gamble and Hess, 2012). However, the findings remain controversial with other studies identifying non-climate factors as explaining variations in the rate of violent crime (Kawachi et al., 1999; Fajnzylber et al., 2002; Neumayer, 2003; Cole and Gramajo, 2009). Again, the focus in this work has been on weather rather than climate and, in light of this and the equivocal nature of the results, neither the detection of a climate change effect nor an assessment of its magnitude can currently be made with a degree of confidence. The impact of future climate change on human displacement and migration has been identified as an emerging risk (19.4.2.1). The social, economic, and environmental factors underlying migration are complex and varied (see e.g. Black et al., 2011) and it has not been possible to detect the effect of observed climate change nor assess its magnitude with any degree of confidence (see also 12.4.1.1).”

The IPCC even sought to establish vague indirect links in an attempt to blame “*climate change*” for violence, conflicts, and wars, as they point out in [Chapter 12 of the AR5 WG2 report](#):

“Some of the factors that increase the risk of violent conflict within states are sensitive to climate change (medium agreement, medium evidence). The evidence on the effect of climate change and variability on violence is contested [12.5.1]. Although there is little agreement about direct causality, low per capita incomes, economic contraction, and inconsistent state institutions are associated with the incidence of violence [12.5.1]. These factors can be sensitive to climate change and variability. Poorly designed adaptation and mitigation strategies can increase the risk of violent conflict [12.5.2]. Most of the research on the connections between climate change and armed conflict focuses on the connections between climate variability and intrastate conflicts in the modern era. For the most part, this research examines rainfall or temperature variability as proxies for the kinds of longer-term changes that might occur due to climate change. Several studies examine the relationship between short-term warming and armed conflict (Burke et al., 2009; Buhaug 2010; Koubi et al., 2012; Theisen et al., 2012; O’Loughlin et al., 2012). Some of these find a weak relationship, some find no

relationship, and collectively the research does not conclude that there is a strong positive relationship between warming and armed conflict (Theisen et al., 2013)..... There is high agreement that in the specific circumstances where other risk factors are extremely low (such as where per capita incomes are high, and states are effective and consistent), the impact of changes in climate on armed conflict is negligible (Bernauer et al., 2012; Koubi et al., 2012; Scheffran et al., 2012a; Theisen et al., 2013)..... In response to the challenges of finding direct associations between changes in climate and violence, some research has examined the effects of changes in climate on factors that are known to increase the risk of civil war (Bergholt and Lujala,..... Confident statements about the effects of future changes in climate on armed conflict are not possible given the absence of generally supported theories and evidence about causality (see Box 12-5)."

Australian scientists involved in writing Chapter 12 include Lead Author [Jon Barnett](#), and Contributing Author, Stuart Kent.

The [AR5 WG2 SPM](#) though, continues the tradition of politicisation by conveniently failing to mention the fact that there is no evidence linking human caused climate change to conflicts and wars:

"Climate change can indirectly increase risks of violent conflicts in the form of civil war and inter-group violence by amplifying well-documented drivers of these conflicts such as poverty and economic shocks (medium confidence). Multiple lines of evidence relate climate variability to these forms of conflict"

Clearly the IPCC have again decided to contradict the body of their own report in their politicised SPM. But the SPM further adds to the confusion by failing to clearly distinguish between human caused climate change on the one hand, and natural climate variability and severe weather events on the other. According to the [AR5 WG2 SPM](#):

*"Climate change refers to a change in the state of the climate that can be identified (e.g., by using statistical tests) by changes in the mean and/or the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer. Climate change may be due to natural internal processes or external forcings such as modulations of the solar cycles, volcanic eruptions, and persistent anthropogenic changes in the composition of the atmosphere or in land use.....**WGII AR5 generally links responses of natural and human systems to observed climate change, regardless of its cause"***

As the SPM explains in a footnote:

"The term attribution is used differently in WGI and WGII. Attribution in WGII considers the links between impacts on natural and human systems and observed climate change, regardless of its cause. By comparison, attribution in WGI quantifies the links between observed climate change and human activity, as well as other external climate drivers."

So the IPCC, with all their purported concern about scientific accuracy, chooses to completely redefine the term "climate change" as it suits them, even using fundamentally different definitions in different volumes of the AR5 report. **Unlike the WG1 report, In the WG2 report the IPCC specifically includes all natural climate variability under the term 'climate change'.**

Given the fact that the human controllability (and causation) of climate change is absolutely fundamental to all IPCC mitigation strategies, deliberate moves to vary the definition of 'climate change' creates a strong perception of deliberate obfuscation, if not outright deception.

Interestingly, [Professor Hoegh-Guldberg](#), and [Dr Elvira Poloczanska](#), were contributing authors to [Chapter 18](#) of the [AR5 WG2 Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability report](#) and both were also drafting authors for the [AR5 WG2 SPM](#). BOM Deputy Director [Dr Neville Smith](#), was also a review editor for [Chapter 18](#).

The Academy, as a scientific organisation, should be seen to be constantly challenging, testing, and strengthening the scientific methods utilised by the IPCC. The reverse is true, the Academy, by their silence, have approved the IPCC's politicisation of the SPM in regard to conflicts and wars.

Academy Climate Change Agenda about Global Politics, not Science

The IPCC AR5 scientific report is characterised by the frequency with which its conclusions agree with the conclusions of so called sceptics and contradict previous alarmist IPCC claims. [As noted by Curry](#):

"Some nightmare scenarios are robustly defused. Past IPCC reports have warned that there might be as many as 50 million "climate refugees" around the world, who will flee drought, rising tides and spreading deserts. This report is set to dismiss that idea."

The charter of the IPCC, their strident unscientific advocacy, and their political procedures, [have long been known](#). So although the latest SPM does not accurately reflect the scientific report this was always to be expected. As the fallacy of doomsday climatic predictions are increasingly exposed the fact that [the entire agenda is being politically or ideologically driven](#) is being increasingly admitted. According to EU Climate Commissioner Connie Hedegaard, ["climate change is right even if science was wrong"](#):

"Regardless of whether or not scientists are wrong on global warming, the European Union is pursuing the correct energy policies even if they lead to higher prices, Europe's climate commissioner has said. However, EU and other policymakers are worried that the IPCC's forthcoming admission, expected on Sep 27, that previous forecasts are wrong will damage the legitimacy of climate change policies, such as levies and fuel taxes on consumers to fund renewable energy. Leaked IPCC reports, reviewing forecasts made in 2007, have called into question how much climate change has taken place by concluding that, even with a doubling of carbon emissions from 1990 levels, the global temperature has risen little or more slowly than predicted over the last 10-20 years.....'Let's say that science, some decades from now, said 'we were wrong, it was not about climate', would it not in any case have been good to do many of things you have to do in order to combat climate change?'"

The bottom line though, 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"

[The Climate Institute](#) also stressed the "international accountability" of Australia, and the political nature of the climate change agenda, [noting that](#) "The low carbon world is being shaped by a complex web of international politics and policy." There is no mention anywhere of the importance of democracy or democratic sustainability.

It is this political campaign that the Academy is promoting and endorsing.

Given the well-known politicisation of the SPM, it is abundantly clear that decision makers, journalists, and other interested parties have a clear responsibility to source their data directly from the scientific report. But it is indeed alarming when scientists themselves seek to cite the SPM and avoid the scientific report ([21](#), [22](#)), the well-known [Skeptical Science](#) web site for instance, even asking "[Why is the IPCC AR5 so much more confident in human-caused global warming?](#)" This [Skeptical Science report](#), like politicians and those seeking to put a political 'spin' on the science, repeatedly cites the politicised SPM and avoids the failure of climate models confirmed in the IPCC Scientific report.

According to Academy of Science member and IPCC lead author [Andy Pitman](#), in an article entitled "[Is global warming in a hiatus](#)":

"The slowing in the rate of warming over the last 15 years is not in the least surprising. We have seen a combination of the solar minimum, anthropogenic aerosol emissions and [back-to-back La Niñas](#)..... One way that this makes sense is if climate scientists have underestimated how dominant CO₂ and other greenhouse gases are in warming the climate. In other words, CO₂ and other greenhouse gases are countering the cooling effects of natural variability by much more than we anticipated..... If you see the slowing of warming over the last 15 years as a hint that climate scientists [might have been wrong](#) and that global warming is less of a problem than predicted, you are very likely being lulled into a false sense of security"

Pitman seems to have carefully avoided the conclusions of the IPCC in the scientific report revealing that the models had been shown to be unreliable since they had failed to predict the hiatus.

And just as many scientists have avoided the science contained in the AR5 scientific report and opted to cite the politicised SPM instead, so too journalists and the mainstream media hungrily sought sensationalised headlines derived from the politicised SPM ([23](#), [24](#), [25](#), [26](#)). [According to Michael Parker](#), in an article entitled "***Global warming 'unequivocal' and 'unprecedented' – IPCC***":

"In the strongest language yet deployed in the fight against increasing temperatures, the report concluded that the 30 years until 2012 were probably the warmest in 1,400 years, driven by "unprecedented" levels of greenhouse gases – these are now at levels not seen for 80,000 years"

However, this article by Michael Parker does not even cite the SPM correctly, [as I pointed out in a complaint](#) to [The Conversation](#). As a result of that complaint, to their credit, [The Conversation did amend the article to correct the misinformation](#), however they did not go far enough.

Considering the consistent resort to cherry picking or omission bias by the Australian Academy of Science, a Royal Commission is urgently required.