

THE CLIMATE COMMISSION ABANDONS SCIENCE AGAIN

A Response to [The Critical Decade: International Action on Climate Change](#)
by [Tim Flannery, Roger Beale and Gerry Hueston](#)

Graham Williamson

August 2012

Introduction

The Australian government has enforced upon Australians the highest carbon dioxide price in the world for no clear environmental or climatic benefit ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#)). And now, in a further attempt to try and justify their failed unscientific climate policy, Climate Commissioners Tim Flannery, Roger Beale, and Gerry Hueston have released their brand new report ([4](#)).

According to the Netherlands ([5](#)) [Trends in global CO₂ emissions 2012 Report](#), “The top 5 (global) emitters are China (share 29%), the United States (16%), the European Union (EU27) (11%), India (6%) and the Russian Federation (5%), followed by Japan (4%).” Australia is ranked 15th in the world, producing only 1.5% of global emissions. Scientifically of course, assuming that there is some obscure scientific basis to climate change, and assuming there is some obscure scientific basis for basing local climate policy on hypothetical global averages, we should be most concerned about the 98.5% of emissions which are NOT caused by Australia. This latest Flannery report explores the best ways of ignoring the 98.5% of emissions not caused by Australia and focussing instead on ways to make it seem like Australia’s 1.5% of global emissions are causing disastrous climate change in countries all around the world.

A very popular but unscientific way of doing this is to employ the fictitious concept of so called per capita emissions to try and disproportionately increase Australia’s guilt for human caused climate changes which have not been quantified or confirmed as real.

Although the Commonwealth government readily admits Australia only produces 1.5% of global emissions ([6](#)), according to Julia Gillard ([7](#)) “Australians are the biggest polluters per capita in the developed world, even more than the United States of America.” According to the government, the Climate Commission, and the CSIRO, selfish Australians are much to blame for any climate changes experienced in any other country because of the high per capita emissions they produce. And according to CSIRO, in their publication “[Climate Change: Science and Solutions for Australia](#)”, Australia’s emission reduction mitigation strategy or ‘carbon price’ is NOT based upon total emissions but in fact is based upon per capita emissions. Even the amount of so called *climate debt* resulting from per capita emissions has been calculated. According to Polya ([8](#)), the “**Net Per Capita Climate Debt (US\$ per person)**” of Australia is “**\$23,900 or \$24,265, if including the effect of its huge GHG Exports on its Climate Credits**” while the “**Net Climate Debt**” for Australia is **\$0.5 trillion**.

Repeatedly we are told climate change is a global problem that requires a global solution. In other words, we should tackle the main global sources of emissions, NOT the fictitious per capita emissions of Australians!

But where is the scientific evidence of the importance of fictitious per capita emissions?

Good question. There is none, there is only a political consensus and an abandonment of science, an abandonment of truth, an abandonment of common sense, and an abandonment of Australians by their own government.

Nevertheless, Climate Commissioners Flannery, Beale, and Hueston agree about the incredible and disproportionate guilt of Australians due to fictitious per capita emissions (4): *“the average Australian produces emissions almost five times that of the average Chinese person and 16 times that of the average person from India.”* Apparently this is meant to mean that Aussies are so selfish and guilty they are producing climate catastrophes around the world.

So although the world has been cooling, and although there is no evidence humans are causing this cooling, what we do know is that Australians are mostly to blame. More guilty than anyone in the world in fact.

This is the background for the shiny new Flannery report, so let’s look at it in a little more detail.

Cooling Interest & the Need for a Brand New Report – keeping the fire burning

Those who obtain satisfaction by spreading unfounded fear about impending human caused climate catastrophes have had a hard time of it recently. Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery has unsuccessfully tried so many times to make dire climate predictions (9, 10, 11, 12) but yet he must be admired as he never gives up. Statistically, he must get one right sooner or later.

Even in spite of these failed predictions however, at least Flannery does acknowledge the world has been cooling (13, 14):

“We’re dealing with an incomplete understanding of the way the earth system works... When we come to the last few years when we haven’t seen a continuation of that (warming) trend we don’t understand all of the factors that create earth’s climate... We just don’t understand the way the whole system works... See, these people work with models, computer modelling. So when the computer modelling and the real world data disagree you’ve got a very interesting problem... Sure for the last 10 years we’ve gone through a slight cooling trend.”

So Climate Commissioner Flannery agrees with independent scientists from around the world and so called climate sceptics regarding global cooling, the unreliability of computer models and the unpredictability of climate. Perhaps this has something to do with why his predictions always seem to be wrong.

Even Flannery’s Gaia guru James Lovelock has now recanted and criticised the exaggerated claims of climate alarmists (15, 16, 17). Not to be left behind in this trend of cooling climate alarmism Flannery himself now seeks to emphasise that climate change is *“creeping up slowly”* (18):

“Chief commissioner Professor Tim Flannery agreed, and said another challenge in the effort to drive action on climate change was the fact that its effects were creeping up slowly, rather than arriving with a bang. ‘This is a multi-decade challenge, and we’re not very good at holding people’s attention for that sort of lengthy period with this sort of thing,’ Professor Flannery said.”

It is this environment of cooling alarmism which is extremely disturbing to all dedicated alarmists and all those who are so urgently trying to justify the carbon dioxide tax/ETS. This new Flannery **“Critical Decade”** report has been produced at this critical time in an attempt to keep the global warming fire burning brightly and maintain the community panic. Given the importance of this latest Climate Commission report in stoking the fires of climate alarm the following claim does seem curiously understated and ambiguous (4):

“As you’ve read in this report and our other reports, we know beyond reasonable doubt that the world is warming and that greenhouse gas emissions are primarily caused by human activity.”

One minute it is cooling, the next it is warming, but what is causing this? No answers from the Climate Commission.

This latest Commission report clearly has a very important function during this troubling cooling time.

The Political Problem & How to Blame Australia & Australians: the lie of per capita emissions

The politicians need all the expensive Flannery reports they can get if they are to be successful in their bid to convince ordinary Australians they are responsible for raising temperatures, raising sea levels, and causing severe weather around the world. But even more difficult, how do politicians convince Australians that they really wish to control climate, not people. Scientists really need to earn their money here.

There is no doubt the dream of many politicians is to remove the power and independence from the people and enforce upon the people total political control. According to H. L. Mencken ([19](#)), *“the whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed (and hence clamorous to be led to safety) by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary.”*

The test to determine whether politicians are really caring public servants rather than control freaks is very simple: ask your politician to return power to the people with citizens initiated referenda, enforceable accountability for political promises, outlawing of sovereignty threatening international treaties, and significant penalties for poor political performance.

The problem for power hungry politicians is: how can they use the environment and climate change to disenfranchise Australians and enforce upon them dictatorial political controls while at the same time convincing them they are really doing it because of concern for them? And how to blame Australians for global emissions and climate change when 98.5% of emissions are produced by other countries?

This is where expensive Flannery reports are absolutely essential.

Scientifically of course, the only justifiable evidence based global emission policy is one which targets the main international sources of emissions. No other policy makes any scientific sense whatsoever. What is needed therefore, is a different way of looking at Australia's paltry contribution to global pollution, some way of making Australians appear much more guilty than they actually are.

Politically of course, the best emission policy is the one which has the best potential for enabling control or enslavement of the people. Targeting the main sources of pollution offers minimal opportunities for people control and therefore is virtually useless to politicians who dream of enslavement of the masses. Such politicians may understandably however, become quite excited about the potential of a per capita approach to emissions. If national emissions are averaged to produce a fictitious per capita figure it is possible to discriminate against richer capitalist countries, and ultimately even richer individuals who enjoy a higher standard of living can be targeted and blamed for climate catastrophes.

The problem for the politicians however, is that there is absolutely no scientific basis whatsoever for pursuing a per capita approach to emissions. But does an emission policy need to be based upon science? According to the precautionary principle we do not need science, we just need to create the illusion of scientific substantiation. All that is needed is some assistance from corrupt scientists in order to mislead and confuse people and make them think their lifestyle is causing climate change,

and then the people themselves will readily surrender and perhaps even welcome the political “enslavement” that is necessary to save the world.

The first task is to blame Australians, make them feel guilty. That is simply not possible if we adopt a scientific approach targeting the main global sources of emissions. The extent to which the ‘experts’ have abandoned science and truth is made abundantly clear by the following two points made by the Commonwealth Government’s Climate Commissioners, Tim Flannery, Roger Beale, and Gerry Hueston, writing in their latest 2012 report (4):

1. *“Emissions generated in one country will contribute to the impacts of climate change in all countries*
2. *Because of the nature of the economy, Australia has the highest emissions per person of any developed country. The average Australian produces emissions almost five times that of the average Chinese person and 16 times that of the average person from India.”*

We see from the first point that Australia’s emissions have the ability to alter temperatures and rainfall in other countries, although the Climate Commissioners stop short of providing any scientific evidence quantifying the effects of Australian emissions on temperatures in Siberia or rainfall in Saudi Arabia.

But in the second point the Climate Commissioners point out the precise ‘scientific’ reason why Australians are disproportionately to blame for global climate change; it is because of so called per capita emissions. Alexander agrees (20), *perennial high-polluting Australia has the dubious honour of having the highest per capita emissions”* in the world. And this is confirmed by Climate Change Minister Greg Combet (21):

“The fact is that Australia has the highest per capita emissions of all developed countries, about 27 tonnes per person. This compares to a world average of about 6 tonnes per person, and an average of about 14 tonnes per person in other developed countries. Developing countries consistently point to Australia's high per capita emissions to justify why we should take strong action on climate change.”

But what does this mean?

Alexander rightly draws attention to the massive increase in Chinese emissions (20), 150% in the last decade, with the result that China now produces an astonishing 29% of total global emissions. But according to Alexander (20), ethically *“Australia and the US are the villains – not China.....Ethically, the only crime China is guilty of is trying to emulate the economic growth and level of material comfort of countries like the US.”* But yet Chinese emissions are increasing more each year than Australia’s total emissions. Though China produces 29% of global emissions, and according to [Australia’s Fifth National Report on Climate Change](#) Australia produces only 1.5%, those pushing the unscientific political agenda would have us believe that it is Australians that are guilty of being the biggest villains when it comes to global emissions. Such claims are of course totally false, being based upon totally unscientific fictitious per capita figures.

But how are average per capita emissions calculated?

Fictitious average per capita emissions are calculated simply by averaging the total national emissions amongst the total population. In other words, if a country, like Australia, has energy dependent industries, high levels of agricultural emissions, or high energy demands for transportation, then these emissions will all be combined and averaged amongst the total population. In other words, ordinary Australians will be blamed for industrial and commercial

emissions and emissions from corporate or political high flyers. The more politicians fly to global talkfests, and the more agricultural and industrial products we produce, the more ordinary Aussies are guilty of altering the climate. This of course is completely untrue, immoral and fundamentally discriminatory.

This eagerness to establish guilt and discriminate against ordinary Australians is clearly demonstrated by the Commonwealth Government's Climate Commissioners, Tim Flannery, Roger Beale, and Gerry Hueston (4): *"the average Australian produces emissions almost five times that of the average Chinese person and 16 times that of the average person from India."*

So which *average* Australian actually produces these emissions? And what is an *average* Australian? And if corporate and political high flyers participate in more global talkfests does that mean ordinary Australians also produce more emissions and should be penalised more? And if industry produces more emissions, does that mean indigenous Australians are to blame? And if agricultural practices produce more emissions is that the fault of elderly Australians?

Clearly the whole debate about per capita emissions is complete unsubstantiated unscientific nonsense. It is a blatant attempt to discriminate against, and control, ordinary Australians.

This simple fact is made clear by [Australia's Fifth National Report on Climate Change](#):

"However, Australia's per capita greenhouse gas emissions are the highest of any OECD country and are among the highest in the world. This is due in part to the dominance of resource-based industries in our economy and its reliance on low-cost fossil fuels."

So although the Commonwealth Government's Climate Commissioners, Tim Flannery, Roger Beale, and Gerry Hueston claim (4) *"the average Australian produces emissions almost five times that of the average Chinese person and 16 times that of the average person from India,"* and Greg Combet claims (21) *"The fact is that Australia has the highest per capita emissions of all developed countries, about 27 tonnes per person"*, in reality, according to the Commonwealth government, ordinary everyday Aussies are being blamed because of *"the dominance of resource-based industries in our economy and its reliance on low-cost fossil fuels."* Of course the combination of an industrial economy and a low population density such as occurs in Australia combine to produce relatively high per capita emissions.

Average per capita emissions however, remain totally fictitious and meaningless.

It is indeed interesting to note that if an (undefined) average Indian person, who allegedly produces only 1/16th the emissions of the (undefined) average Australian, moves to Australia but adopts exactly the same life style in Australia as he/she did in India, then automatically he or she will suddenly be producing sixteen times more emissions!! This we are supposed to believe, is genuine climate science, endorsed by the Commonwealth government, the Climate Commissioners, and the CSIRO!

Additionally, the logic of lower per capita emissions dictates that Australia needs to double its population to significantly reduce its per capita emissions! Ridiculous though this logic is, this is the logic endorsed by the Commonwealth government, the Climate Commissioners, and the CSIRO. And they expect us to believe it is all based upon science!

Clearly, the practice of targeting people for per capita emissions as a mitigation strategy is unjust, unethical, highly discriminatory, and is based upon a lie. The concept of per capita emissions is nothing more than a political stunt where both scientists and the people are exploited for political purposes.

It is astonishing that so many politicians, academics, and scientists continue to promote average per capita emissions mitigation strategies as being scientific, fair, and justified. Although the government is targeting total national emissions and the major sources of emissions they go way beyond this, using per capita emissions to blame Australians and justify disproportionate, excessive, and scientifically unjustifiable mitigation strategies. The Australian government, in imposing the highest carbon dioxide tax in the world, has completely abandoned science and any sense of fairness or common sense in their eagerness to discriminate against and punish ordinary Australians. Clearly there is an extreme degree of desperation here, desperation to justify an unscientific political policy. In the complete absence of clear scientific evidence to the contrary, they are obsessed with people control, not climate control.

We have seen how ridiculous, unscientific and discriminatory the concept of per capita emissions is, but the full extent of this abandonment of science is made clearer by considering the concept of emissions per square kilometre.

Scientists know that soils and vegetation absorb carbon and are natural carbon sinks (22, 23). In other words, the concept of emissions per square kilometre is a much more important measure than fictitious per capita emissions (24). Of course the large area of Australia gives Australia one of the lowest rates of emissions per square kilometre in the world (25, 26). Whereas Australia is ranked 11th in the world for per capita emissions (27), for emissions per square kilometre Australia is ranked 147th (25) and yet our political masters tell us we must have the highest carbon dioxide tax in the world. Total emissions, per capita emissions, and emissions per square mile, of US states are compared here (27).

Given the established scientific importance of natural carbon sinks, the determination with which the Australian government, the Climate Commissioners, and the CSIRO, all seek to avoid highlighting the concept of emissions per square kilometre is most illuminating. Their unanimous preference for fictitious unscientific per capita emissions reveals the importance with which they regard truth and science. Australian politicians, with support from some scientists, are hell bent on ignoring the scientific facts, concealing the truth, and working against the interests of Australia and Australians.

Local Science, Global Politics, Social Justice, Equity & Climate: who owes who for what?

Local policies clearly must be based upon local information, NOT global averages.

Normal local tidal fluctuations in sea level however can vary 9 metres or more (28), while natural climate variations such as El Niño or La Nina, according to BOM (29), may cause an increase in local sea level in some areas by 20-30cm. This compares with the allegedly human caused global average increase in sea level of less than 2mm annually (31), a figure which is considered by many to be alarming, if not catastrophic. The Australian government has also pointed out (30) that natural La Nina and El Nino events may cause such dramatic local climatic variations that it is difficult to detect clear evidence confirming so called human caused climate change.

CSIRO and BOM also agree about the unreliability of local data and the impossibility of confirming human causation. According to Kevin Hennessy of the CSIRO and Scott Power of the Bureau of Meteorology (32, 33, 34):

“Trends in climate are evident over the Pacific as a whole, including the PCCSP region, however the extent to which these trends are attributable to natural variability and to human activities is not yet well understood.”” “little research has been conducted to quantify the relative importance of human-induced change and natural variability as causes of the observed trends in the PCCSP region.”

So whatever the situation globally, the science is very clear that local variations are even less predictable and, if it is not possible to identify and quantify human causation globally, it is even less possible at the local level.

But this does not help local authorities establish policies for their particular local area. Government scientists who adopt a global political perspective constantly seek to apply global averages to all local areas, however this strategy is not based upon reality or clear science, it is based upon political convenience. Flannery, Beale, and Hueston's (4) abovementioned claim that there is a definite causative link between greenhouse gas emissions in one country and climate variation in all other countries clearly contradicts the above quoted research from CSIRO and BOM (32, 33, 34).

Flannery, Beale, and Hueston urgently need to substantiate their claim. If indeed there is evidence that emissions from Sydneysiders impact the climate of New York, or NSW emissions cause less snow in Greenland, or Australian emissions cause increased sea levels in the U.K., then why not reveal the evidence for all to see? Of course this goes to the heart of the concept of so called '**climate debt**', social justice, and the global allocation of blame for climate change. Flannery and colleagues clearly seek to apportion global blame for so called climate change but yet they provide absolutely no evidence to justify their particular system of climate justice.

The fictitious concept of so called **climate debt** is based upon a new type of politically promoted discrimination. It is discrimination on the basis of emissions. Climate debt is the alleged debt of western industrialised nations to poorer countries arising from (35) "*their disproportionate contribution to the causes and consequences of climate change and their excessive historical and current per person emissions – denying developing countries their fair share of atmospheric space.*"

As is noted by Bullard (36), climate debt is a deliberate attempt to reduce the prosperity and standard of living in wealthier countries:

"The notion of climate debt goes to the heart of climate change politics. It raises the central question of historical responsibility and who owes whom for what. And it turns traditional rich-poor relations upside down."

At the heart of climate change politics therefore, is the political desire to reverse "*traditional rich poor relations*" or, in other words, make the rich capitalist nations poor and make the poor countries rich. What appears to be a Marxist's dream, is of course justified by so called climate change, it is '*climate justice*', justice which dictates the transfer of billions of dollars from rich countries to poor countries (37):

"The concept of climate justice seeks to restore equity in two ways. Firstly, that richer countries should repay their climate debt by undertaking severe cuts in emissions, reserving "atmospheric space" for the growing emissions of poorer countries. Secondly, that they should provide financial compensation for the costs of low carbon transition and adaptation to the damaging effects of climate change.....The 2009 Copenhagen Accord made a start on scaling up financial support. It promised that Annex 1 countries will provide fast start finance "approaching \$30 billion" for the period 2010-2012, rising to \$100 billion per annum by 2020.

The Cancun conference made no progress towards satisfying demands that rich countries provide climate finance in the range of 0.5%-1% of their GDP, equating to \$200-\$400 billion per annum. It did however issue strong instructions to "speed up" support for NAPA projects."

Climate change, and so called climate debt, have clearly been moulded by politicians into a powerful discriminatory tool for unprecedented extreme global social and political change and economic disruption (38):

"The concept of climate debt rests on the fact that no solution to climate change is possible unless

it also guarantees justice and social equality..... the wasteful, energy-intensive development of the rich countries has deprived the poor countries of their share of 'atmospheric space'. For over-using the Earth's capacity to absorb greenhouse gases, the rich world is in debt to the poor world."

While we have many politicians and scientists talking about social justice, equity and climate change, and pointing the finger of blame towards countries like Australia, the common factor with all these accusers and bastions of science and social justice is that they all seek to impose the penalty BEFORE any guilt has been confirmed and quantified. If Flannery, Beale, Hueston, and their scientific and political colleagues have evidence to substantiate the degree to which Australians are responsible for drought in Africa, or increased sea levels in Tuvalu then why is this evidence so secretive? In the interests of science and social justice why do they consistently refuse to reveal it?

Conversely of course, if Flannery and his Climate Commission colleagues are correct, the door will be open to massive law suits as a result of mitigation techniques such as the carbon dioxide tax. For instance, will Saudi Arabia be able to claim compensation because Australia's world leading carbon tax has caused too much rain? Or perhaps Australia could be held legally responsible for excessive snow and floods around the world.

And these people expect to be taken seriously!

Mob Mentality & Group Think

How is it possible that so many otherwise sensible people could believe that ordinary Australians can control global climate and sea level with a CO2 tax/ETS? And how could any sane person believe that it is just and proper to blame and penalise Australians for causing climate change in distant countries in the total absence of any evidence to confirm and quantify any such climatic changes? And why would they believe that the only possible solution to environmental problems is to surrender to the UN?

There are many reasons no doubt, but undoubtedly many thought this campaign of deception and selling out to the UN was in the best interests of Australia. Gullible politicians were probably dazzled and blinded by the cure all promises of globalisation. As Alexander Downer pointed out, politics is no longer about left versus right, it is about whether you disapprove of globalisation (ie love Australia) and are a globaphobe, or you love globalisation and are therefore a globaphile ([39](#), [40](#), [41](#), [42](#)). According to Downer ([1](#)), "*The triumph of globophobia would be a death note for Australia...Let me put this clearly - globalisation is an irreversible trend.*" Globophobia of course, means putting Australia and Australians first. But according to Downer this would be a death note for Australia. Australia can only advance it seems, if we put Australia last and the globe first.

No room for democracy here it seems, the decision has already been made. But it was a decision made by UN servants not public servants. We must work to support the 'globe', not Australia. Of course, those subjected to this bizarre UN promoted global view then become susceptible to the groupthink which commonly afflicts feel good philosophies and global talkfests ([43](#), [44](#), [45](#), [46](#), [47](#), [48](#), [49](#), [50](#)). Groupthink is irrational consensus thinking which aggressively rejects alternatives ([44](#), [46](#)). It is the same type of mentality which has resulted in large numbers of people accepting the bizarre belief that climate, rain, and severe weather, may be controlled with a CO2 tax ([51](#)).

The latest Flannery report is just another unscientific report which will continue to fan the flames of irrational groupthink.

Conclusion

In order to properly assess the latest Climate Commission report, [The Critical Decade: International Action on Climate Change](#), it is first necessary to decide the purpose of the report and its intended target audience. In the Preface Flannery Beale, and Hueston state:

“The Climate Commission brings together internationally renowned climate scientists, as well as policy and business leaders to provide an independent and reliable source of information about climate change to the Australian public.”

Intending to target the Australian public, it is clear that this is another politically inspired report intended to justify and support government climate policy. With its dependence upon spin and motherhood statements and its biased avoidance of contrary scientific evidence this latest Commission report certainly does not qualify as a scientific document. Central to the purpose of the report is the subject of human causation of climate change but this is dealt with in typically vague and unscientific terms with recycled statements such as: *“As you’ve read in this report and our other reports, we know beyond reasonable doubt that the world is warming and that greenhouse gas emissions are primarily caused by human activity.”* While greenhouse gas emissions may be primarily caused by human activity the Climate Commissioners apparently decided it was best to avoid any clear analyses of the scientific cause of any current cooling/warming which may be occurring.

While the cause of any climate change which may be currently occurring is carefully avoided or disguised with scientific obfuscations, the other aspect which is central to the purpose of the report, namely identifying and quantifying responsibility for any changes that may be occurring, is also treated in an equally vague, unscientific, and obfuscatory manner. This of course is hardly surprising if in fact the subject of human causation cannot be clearly established in the first place. Yet, assuming humans are causing a catastrophic degree of climate change, it is absolutely vital that responsibility for these changes is based upon clear and irrefutable evidence and remedial actions are seen to be just and beyond reproach.

While the Climate Commissioners acknowledge that 98.5% of global emissions are not caused by Australia they nevertheless proceed on a spurious and scientifically twisted pathway in what appears to be a politically desperate attempt to cast disproportionate blame upon Australians for any global climatic variations. The Commissioners even resort to the use of fictitious and scientifically meaningless average per capita emissions in their apparent eagerness to find some way of disproportionately blaming Australians for global climate fluctuations and severe weather events. Of course, in keeping with the unscientific spin intensive political tone of their report, these half-hearted attempts to blame Australians for global climate problems are left completely devoid of any scientific substantiation by Commissioners Flannery, Beale, and Hueston. If they sought to justify and somehow legitimise Australia’s world leading carbon dioxide tax then they completely failed.

Further, when scientists in government employ find need to resort to such fictitious unscientific concepts then serious questions must be asked.

It is indeed disappointing, given the resources of the Climate Commission, that Commissioners Flannery, Beale, and Hueston, were not able to supply some clear cut scientific evidence of human causation at both the local and global level, and clear cut evidence of the proportionate responsibility of the various countries. That they continue to endorse a ‘treatment’ in spite of this lack of evidence clearly represents a complete abandonment of science and any sense of social justice.

[The Critical Decade: International Action on Climate Change](#) is yet another anti-Australian report

which seeks to support the United Nations global political climate agenda and further justify the undemocratic interference of undemocratic UN created initiatives in Australian domestic politics. Flannery and colleagues, in their apparent eagerness to support the UN global political agenda by blaming Australians for climate change around the world, continue to promote scientifically meaningless fictitious concepts such as average per capita emissions.

The public will not learn the truth from this latest report, but they may well learn who the Australian government wishes to blame for climatic variations and severe weather events around the world. But if we are so guilty of changing global climate wouldn't we effect our own country first rather than countries thousands of miles away? Or do our emissions only impact distant non-capitalist countries and dictatorships who want our climate change compensation payments?