

CLIMATE CHANGE: FINAL POLITICAL HUMILIATION AS IPCC JOINS CSIRO & INDEPENDENT SCIENTISTS TO CONTRADICT GOVERNMENT

Graham Williamson

February 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines the extent to which the Australian government continues to contradict science and reality in their attempts to justify climate policy and a CO2 tax. If government policy is falsely based upon science, and deliberately misrepresents science and scientists, then legal action is warranted. Evidence cited in this paper reveals the following facts.

- Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery, the Australian Academy of Science, CSIRO, BOM, & IPCC chief Rajenda Pachauri, have all agreed with independent scientists and sceptics that the science of AGW is definitely NOT settled. The government however, in their determination to enforce their ideological agenda upon all Australians, has contradicted these experts, contradicted science, & contradicted reality, and introduced a CO2 tax.
- Our anti-Australian politicians, with the help of some scientists and economists, have falsely claimed they can control climate in other countries by taking money from ordinary Australians. They claim they are interested in social justice, equity, and climate change but yet they continually discriminate against those in real need to support their self-interested political agendas.
- To justify their actions the government not only ignores scientific evidence, but they also continually ignore the 98.5% of emissions not caused by Australia by utilising the unscientific, unjust, unethical, highly discriminatory, and bogus concept of per capita emissions. The concept of per capita CO2 emissions is an attempt to officially authorise and sanction deliberate immoral discrimination and debasement or demonising of individuals based upon a completely bogus assessment system.

The evidence indicates that Australians must get used to suffering under the government's plan to spread Australia's wealth and resources amongst socialist countries and despotic dictators as supporters of the concept of climate debt are eagerly moving forwards to quantify the guilt of all Australians. Even foreign Minister Bob Carr has stated his intention to support other countries, such as Palau, in taking legal action against Australia in the International Court of Justice to enforce the payment of climate change compensation.

The most frightening thing about all of this is that our politicians, and even some scientists, expect us to believe it and accept it because it is all based upon sound science. Well may they say, **'Trust us, we are from the government and sometimes we tell the truth.'**

In spite of the popularity of political apologies in recent times, calls for Trade Minister Craig Emerson to issue an official apology do not go anywhere near far enough. There should clearly be political sackings and legal action to restore confidence in politicians who have been misleading the public for far too long.

PART 1

How to Blame Australians for Climate 'Crimes' & Justify Wealth Removal & Redistribution When There is no Scientific Evidence

When Politicians Invent Scientific Problems a Political Solution is Needed

Prime Minister Julia Gillard said in May 2011, we must act now to “**save the planet**” with a CO2 tax, not after the next election (1). Although Julia Gillard promised (before the election) she would not introduce a CO2 tax, suddenly she claimed it is now or never (2) and we must act (1) “*not in a couple of generations' time, or even a couple of years' time, but now.*” Senator Bob Brown, Julia Gillard's coalition partner, confirmed the seriousness of the situation (3): “*There is no bailout option for the planet, like there is for Wall Street. If the world can take massive action to save Wall Street within weeks, it should take urgent action to save the planet.*”

But according to Anthony Albanese saving the planet is not enough, we should save money too (4) “**early action on climate change is what is required. By taking early action you will actually save money as well as save the planet.**” Not only do our politicians have the power to save the planet with a CO2 tax but it seems this planet saving action is on special this week! Believe it or not, Deputy Prime Minister Wayne Swan agreed, noting that **just** saving the planet may not be enough when money is involved (5):

“But we are proceeding with this because we do believe in the science of climate change, and we understand the economics of climate change, that we must do something about dangerous climate change, not just to save the planet and our environment but to keep a prosperous economy.”

Oh how we are indebted to them, saving the planet and saving our money at the same time! After all, who would possibly wish to save the planet if they had to withdraw their life savings and borrow money from international financiers in order to do so?

And yes, this is the same Wayne Swan who said less than 12 months previously (6): “**No, it's not possible that we're bringing in the carbon tax. That is an hysterically inaccurate claim being made by the coalition.**” Like Prime Minister Julia Gillard, it seems before the election he did not wish to save the planet..... or the economy. Surely life in Opposition could not be that bad!

The Australian government and their climate advisers have long claimed the debate is over and the science of human caused climate change is “**settled**” (7, 8, 9, 10, 11). According to the Climate Commission (12) “**climate science is settled**” and according to Julia Gillard (12) “**the science is in**”. Prime Minister Gillard underlined the importance of honesty and the scientific facts (12): “**We don't have time for false claims in this debate.....The science is in - climate change is real.**” The Prime Minister reiterated exactly why she is introducing a carbon dioxide tax (13): “**The answer to why is: I accept the science; I accept that our climate is changing; I accept that it is caused by human activity.**” But the Prime Minister went even further with her insinuation that the science of human caused climate change is supported by (14, 15, 16) “**every reputable climate scientist in the world.**”

The Prime Minister's comments were backed up by former climate change minister Penny Wong (17): “*On whether or not the **science is settled** the government has a very clear position: it is. The overwhelming consensus of the world's scientists with relevant qualifications—those who have advised governments around the world—is that climate change is real.*” And according to Climate Change Minister Greg Combet (18), “*the government respects the climate science. The Coalition*

doesn't, they're run by climate science deniers. If you accept the science as the government does then you have a public policy responsibility to deal with this problem."

Though it seems important for the politicians to convince the public the science is 'settled' and the destruction of the planet is imminent, what do government scientists, who allegedly provide the basis of government policy, have to say regarding these political claims?

Falling Temperatures Caused by Global Warming – Government contradicts IPCC, Science, & Reality

One of the difficulties for alarmists who desperately seek to justify a political solution for alleged human caused global warming is the fact that any mild warming which may have been occurring actually ceased around 16 years ago, even in spite of increasing CO2 emissions ([19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#), [23](#)). This has recently been confirmed by IPCC chief Rajenda Pachauri who has joined thousands of independent scientists and so called sceptics or deniers in confirming the recent cooling trend ([24](#), [25](#), [26](#)).

On the other hand, Robert Fawcett and David Jones of the government climate agency, the Bureau of Meteorology, have contradicted the global cooling claims of climate experts ([30](#)). Likewise, Federal Minister for Trade, Craig Emerson, still desperately clinging to the governments political unscientific view in an attempt justify government policy, has also contradicted the cooling claims made by Pachauri and others ([27](#), [28](#), [29](#), [30](#), [31](#)). According to Andrew Bolt ([30](#)):

"Emerson denied there was a pause in the warming. He was wrong. Emerson claimed the world was warming. In fact, there hasn't been statistically significant warming for between nearly 16 years and 23 years, depending on which measurement you use. Emerson should apologise, retract and publicly correct his claims. So far he has failed to do so, despite being [made aware](#) of his error. This is important, after all. Emerson is a member of a government which imposed on us a carbon tax and a \$10 billion "clean energy" fund on the assumption the world was warming dangerously."

[Calls for Emerson to issue an official apology](#) do not go anywhere near far enough. There should be political sackings and legal action to restore confidence in politicians who have been misleading the public for far too long. Surely our politicians are more deserving of restored confidence than our sportsmen. Since Sports Minister Kate Lundy emphasised how she intended to take action to reduce the freedom of sporting Australians in order to "[restore confidence in sport](#)", even after [politically hijacking the press conference](#), surely our politicians deserve no less.

But IPCC chief Pachauri has gone beyond the issue of recent global cooling, also blatantly contradicting the government's "*science is settled*" "*debate is closed*" attempts to shut the debate down ([26](#)):

"Dr Pachauri, the chairman of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, said that open discussion about controversial science and politically incorrect views was an essential part of tackling climate change....."People have to question these things and science only thrives on the basis of questioning," Dr Pachauri said. He said there was "no doubt about it" that it was good for controversial issues to be "thrashed out in the public arena". Dr Pachauri's views contrast with arguments in Australia that views outside the orthodox position of approved climate scientists should be left unreported."

Scientists in government institutions like the Bureau of Meteorology have long claimed that a period of ten years is needed to establish climate trends (forgetting for the moment their frequent references to severe weather events and claims that a certain year was *the hottest year on record* etc). According to Robert Fawcett and David Jones of the Bureau of Meteorology for instance, in their paper, "**Waiting for Global Cooling**" ([30](#)):

"Because of the year-to-year variations in globally-averaged annual mean temperatures, about ten years are required for an underlying trend to emerge from the "noise" of those year-to-year fluctuations."

However, now that most rational people agree (except the Australian government!) that the world has been cooling for 16 years, IPCC chief Pachauri says we now need to move the goal posts and extend this ten year period to 40 years ([26](#)):

"He said that it would be 30 to 40 years "at least" before it was possible to say that the long-term upward trend in global temperatures had been broken....."If you have five or 10 years when you don't have the same trend, that doesn't necessarily mean that you are deviating from the trend - you are still around the trend."

The global warming or climate change circus continues, with government 'experts' contradicting each other and the government contradicting their own experts and contradicting reality as well, Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery, also having a long history of trying in vain to get climate predictions correct ([32](#), [33](#), [34](#), [35](#)). Even in spite of these failed predictions however, at least Climate Change Commissioner Flannery has acknowledged the world has been cooling ([36](#), [37](#)):

"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."

It seems from the above that Climate Commissioner Flannery blatantly disagrees with government and agrees instead with IPCC chief Pachauri, independent scientists, and so called climate sceptics from around the world regarding global cooling, the unreliability of computer models and the unpredictability of climate.

It should be noted that Flannery made three vitally important points in the above interview.

- 1. The world is now cooling.**
- 2. There are many aspects of the world's climate that are not understood and are therefore unpredictable.**
- 3. IPCC scientists who make the global warming claims rely on computer modelling rather than real world scientific data and there may be a world of difference between the two.**

When Flannery subsequently tried to explain his above comments in a curiously politically biased article ([38](#)) he attempted to explain the first claim above and state the world is still actually warming although he did not refute the other two claims. In other words, the Climate Commissioner still admits the uncertainties and unpredictability of global climate, and he also admits the unreliability of computer modelling methods preferred by the IPCC, although somehow he still apparently claims

global warming projections are nevertheless accurate and are not compromised by these uncertainties and unreliable methods.

Even Flannery's Gaia guru James Lovelock has now recanted and criticised the exaggerated claims of climate alarmists (39, 40, 41). Not to be left behind in this trend of cooling climate alarmism Flannery himself also now seeks to emphasise that, far from us being in the "Critical Decade", actually climate change is "creeping up slowly" (42):

"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."

The shortcomings of politicised sanitised science have recently been considered in detail in a [study by Malcom Roberts](#).

We Do Not Know Whether it is Warming or Cooling but we do Know that Humans are Responsible

Flannery's concerns about the unpredictability of climate change have been reinforced by the **Australian Academy of Science (43)**.

*"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."

The Academy of Science it seems, is telling us that there are numerous **uncertainties** in climate science which will lead to various **surprises** but we can be certain that there is an **equal possibility**, like an each way bet, that these **surprises** may be in a plus direction or a negative direction and therefore we can be positive that **most** of the recent observed global warming is **very likely** caused by increasing greenhouse gas levels.

Clearly the Australian Academy of Science disagrees intensely with government claims of so called "settled science". But the Australian Academy of Science has further underlined the uncertainties of human caused climate change (44):

*"According to the bulk of scientific opinion, the world is getting warmer. **It is difficult, if not impossible, to prove the causes of this warming**, but many scientists are convinced that increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere are at least partly to blame."*

So, according to the science, it is "**difficult if not impossible**" to determine how much, if any, global warming is due to humans. But wait, the government has just passed the CO2 tax because, according to the Prime Minister, the **science is settled**. How can this possibly be? **How is it that the current ALP government is not only blatantly contradicting their own scientific advisors, but they have even passed legislation based upon a complete lie or misrepresentation of the scientific facts?** Or is the government claiming it is the scientists who are lying.

Meanwhile, CSIRO scientists were also struggling with the best ways of representing the many uncertainties of climate science in a scientifically acceptable way. According to Risbey and Kandlikar, in a study entitled ***“Expressions of likelihood and confidence in the IPCC uncertainty assessment process (45):***

“Every assessment of climate change is faced with the need to characterize and communicate uncertainties in the state of understanding.The first IPCC reports highlighted subjective judgements by categorizing results according to various linguistic expressions of confidence: ‘we are certain of . . . ’, ‘we calculate with confidence that . . . ’, ‘our judgement is that’.”

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 (46, 47,48):

“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.”*

Even though we are not sure how much the world (or Australia) is cooling, and even though we are not sure exactly what percentage (if any) of this cooling is caused by humans (ie Australians), and even though government climate experts tell us climate is unpredictable, we now know that the science of AGW is sufficiently settled to justify a political response in the form of an immediate wealth redistributing CO2 tax.

The Climate Commissioners, the Australian Academy of Science, IPCC chief Pauchari, CSIRO, and BOM, have all agreed with independent scientists and sceptics that the science of AGW is definitely NOT settled. Also without scientific substantiation are government claims that the planet is in danger of imminent destruction unless a CO2 tax is immediately introduced.

The government however, has contradicted scientists and introduced a CO2 tax without scientific justification.

Global Warming, Falling Sea Levels & the Threat of Floods - more settled science

Climate change alarmists, and government scientists from the CSIRO (49, 50) , advise us that there has been an alarming global increase in sea levels in the region of 1.7mm to 3.4mm annually, and they also assert that they can prove the exact percentage of this increase which has been caused by emissions from humans. They further assert that the only way to prevent catastrophic inundation is by implementing an immediate wealth redistributing tax on carbon dioxide.

Unlike the catastrophic 2-3mm predicted increase however (51), normal local tidal fluctuations in sea level can vary by 9 metres or more (52), while natural climate variations such as El Niño or La Nina, according to BOM (53), may cause an increase in local sea level in some areas by 20-30cm. The Australian government has also pointed out (54) 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.

Furthermore, according to CSIRO in **Climate Change: Science and Solutions for Australia (55):**

“Sea-level rise and fall is nothing new and earlier populations have experienced large fluctuations in sea level. Geological records indicate that sea level peaked at between 6 m and 9 m higher than today”

Other scientists agree that there has been no alarming increase in sea levels, let alone an alarming increase which has been shown to be caused by, and is reversible by, humans ([56](#), [57](#), [58](#), [59](#), [60](#), [61](#), [62](#), [63](#), [64](#), [65](#), [66](#), [67](#), [68](#), [69](#)).

Like falling temperatures, science tells us it is not possible to determine what percentage of this fall in sea levels (or declining increase) is due to emissions and is therefore reversible by a wealth redistributing CO2 tax. Once again however, the politicians are not listening to either the science or the people.

How to Use Science to Focus Upon Australia’s 1.5% of Emissions & Ignore the Other 98.5%

Even though scientists agree there are far too many uncertainties and the science of AGW is definitely NOT settled, the politicians need to convince ordinary Australians they are responsible for raising temperatures, raising sea levels, and causing severe weather around the world as only then can the politicians step in and save us all with their preferred political solutions. 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 their kind hearted concern? And how to blame Australians for global emissions and climate change when 98.5% of emissions are produced by other countries?

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. If total 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? We have already seen that science is not necessary, and according to the precautionary principle 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. But the eagerness of the ‘experts’ to abandon 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 ([70](#)):

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. Or are they pointing the finger at China and blaming China for most if not all of the various Australian climatic fluctuations they have been panicking about? Bearing in mind of course, the complete absence of "settled science".

But in the second point the Climate Commissioners point out the precise 'scientific' reason why they consider that is ordinary Australians who are disproportionately to blame for global climate change; it is because of so called per capita emissions. Alexander agrees (71), *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 (72):

"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 (71), 150% in the last decade, with the result that China now produces an astonishing 29% of total global emissions. But according to Alexander (71), 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. This eagerness to establish guilt and discriminate against ordinary Australians is clearly demonstrated by the government and also the Commonwealth Government's Climate Commissioners.

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. It is an abandonment of science. As has been pointed out by Codevilla (61):

"Because ordinary people will pervert reason with ideology, religion, or interest, science is "science" only in the "right" hands. Consensus among the right people is the only standard of truth. Facts and logic matter only insofar as proper authority acknowledges them.....By identifying science and reason with themselves, our rulers delegitimize opposition."

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?

The totally fictitious and meaningless nature of average per capita emissions is perfectly clear, though this was not explained by the Commissioners (62):

“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!”

Australia’s high per capita emissions are due to our low population combined with relatively high transport and industrial emissions, especially from aluminium and metal production (63, 64), or, according to the government’s [Fifth National Communication on Climate Change](#), our high per capita emissions are caused by *“the dominance of resource-based industries in our economy and its reliance on low-cost fossil fuels.”* **Therefore, when our typical low emission Indian citizen moves to Australia, irrespective of his lifestyle, he will become just as responsible for the emissions from Aluminium smelters as are other Aussies!**

But wait, it also depends upon what state of Australia our typical Indian citizen moves to! If he moves to Queensland he will produce more than double the emissions of those he would produce if he crossed the border into NSW ([Ben Cubby, Greenhouse gas emissions still on the rise, data shows](#))!

When it comes to climate change and the per capita approach endorsed by the Climate Commission it seems, Queenslanders, are more guilty than anyone in the world.

This we are asked to believe, is genuine climate science, endorsed by the Commonwealth government, the Climate Commissioners, the Commission’s science advisory panel, and the CSIRO!

The Climate Commissioners also apparently forgot to mention that emissions per square kilometre are much more important than emissions per capita (62).

But while the Commonwealth Government’s Climate Commissioners point out that (65) *“Australia has the highest emissions per person of any developed country”* and *“the average Australian produces emissions almost five times that of the average Chinese person and 16 times that of the average person from India,”* they also claim: *“Emissions generated in one country will contribute to the impacts of climate change in all countries”*. So according to the Climate Commission, Australians are to blame for climate change in cities and countries 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? And shouldn’t the NSW government be taking legal action against all Queenslanders because of their high per capita emissions (66) which must surely be impacting the NSW climate?

The Climate Commission, and Commissioners Flannery, Beale, and Hueston, urgently need to substantiate their above claims. 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?

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. Government scientists adopting a global political perspective also constantly seek to apply global averages to all local areas, however this strategy is also not based upon reality or clear science, it is based upon political convenience. It does nothing to help local authorities establish policies for their particular local area.

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 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 ([67](#), [68](#)). In other words, the concept of emissions per square kilometre is a much more important measure than fictitious per capita emissions ([69](#)). Of course the large area of Australia gives Australia one of the lowest rates of emissions per square kilometre in the world. Whereas Australia is ranked 11th in the world for per capita emissions ([70](#)), for emissions per square kilometre Australia is ranked 147th and yet our political masters tell us we must have the highest carbon dioxide tax in the world.

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.

Science and truth have been made expendable. What, or who, is next?

PART 2

Reaping the Rewards, Taking Money From Ordinary Australians, & Enforcing Undemocratic Global Wealth Redistribution

Climate Change as an Excuse for Politicians to Enforce Their Dreams of Socialisation

We have seen how politicians, with the help of some scientists, have falsely claimed they can control climate in other countries by taking money from ordinary Australians. But how will this work in practice?

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 are the Climate Commissioners and the government so reluctant to reveal this 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.

Our politicians claim they are interested in social justice, equity, and climate change but yet they continually redirect resources from those in real need to support their self-interested political agendas. But the common factor with all these accusers and bastions of science and social justice is that they point the finger of blame at their fellow Australians and seek to impose a 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? And what about evidence that Chinese emissions are impacting Australian climate?

It is not about climate change, it is about climate debt and undemocratic politically motivated wealth redistribution.

Climate Debt & the Desire of Politicians to Lower the Standard of Living of Australians

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 (71) *"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 (72), 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 (capitalist) countries to poor (socialist) countries (73):

"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 (74):

“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.”

Climate change politics is quite simply class war, it is anti-capitalist, anti-science, and anti-progress (75, 76). In the words of Archibald (77):

“The notion of global warming was concocted to provide a cloak of scientific respectability for a massive socialist redistribution of wealth. That is as plain as day..... The fake problem of carbon is distracting us from real problems, first of which is the fact that Australia’s oil self-sufficiency is declining rapidly. It is 40 per cent now. It will be down to 25 per cent by 2020. We now import oil from as far afield as Azerbaijan, Algeria and the Congo. We are forced to rely upon their kindness to keep our farms and factories running.”

But Australians must get used to suffering under the government’s plan to spread Australia’s wealth and resources amongst socialist countries and despotic dictators as supporters of the concept of climate debt are eagerly moving forwards to quantify the guilt of specific nations (78, 79, 80). Even foreign Minister Bob Carr has stated his intention to support other countries, such as Palau, in taking legal action against Australia in the International Court of Justice to enforce the payment of climate change compensation (81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86). According to McIntyre (82):

“the Gillard government is wanting us to be hauled before the International Court of Justice to shame her own country. This is quite insane and irresponsible and clearly not in Australia’s national interest.”

The [Australian Climate Justice Program](#) and environmental and animal rights lawyer Keely Boom (87, 88, 89, 90, 91) are at the forefront of legal proceedings against Australia (87). In a recent article entitled ***“See you in court: the rising tide of international climate litigation”*** Keely explains (92):

“It could be argued that Australia has breached the “no harm rule” on the basis that:

- 1) Australia has had an opportunity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions*
- 2) climate change damage was foreseeable, at least since 1992 when Australia signed the United Nations [Framework Convention on Climate Change](#) (UNFCCC)*
- 3) Australia has not taken proportionate measures to mitigate its emissions.”*

Australian tax payers are even funding research into scaring the Palauian government about the consequences of (human caused???) climate change courtesy of reports by CSIRO and BOM (93, 94), and now it seems, Bob Carr wishes to assist them to obtain compensation from all Australians!

Quantifying the Amount Australia Owes Other Countries for Pretend Climate Crimes

Of course, if the precise degree of supposed human caused climate change impacts in each country cannot be accurately substantiated and quantified, and the specific contribution from each contributor country accurately determined, then any claim of compensation or climate debt is completely fraudulent and immoral. However, for the purpose of the following discussion, let us assume so called climate debt has a solid scientific basis. All that remains to be done then, is to quantify the exact amount of debt owed. But it seems this has already been done. According to Polya (95):

“However it is possible to quantitate the Climate Debt incurred by profligate high polluters such as the US Alliance countries and the Climate Credit allowing low polluters to advance economically on a path to eventual zero emissions in circa 2050. Quantitative, country by country analysis of the Climate Debt of Climate Debtor countries versus the Climate Credit of Climate Creditor countries may prove to be a valuable litigation weapon in the fight of Island States for their very physical survival. This approach may indeed help avert “climate genocide” (Google “Climate Genocide”). The contribution of each country to elevated atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO2) can be calculated as Historical Climate Debt (1751-2006 CO2 pollution) minus Climate Credit (its fair share of the World’s terminal CO2 pollution budget of 600 Gt CO2 between 2010 and zero emissions in 2050). With CO2 pollution valued at \$100 per tone CO2, mostly European countries and Japan have Net Climate Debts ranging up to \$9.7 trillion (for the USA) whereas non-European countries typically have Net Climate Credits ranging up to \$6.5 trillion for India.”

Polya continues (95):

“In a 2008 letter to Australia PM Kevin Rudd (see [“Letter to PM Kevin Rudd by Dr James Hansen”](#), 2008:), NASA’s Dr James Hansen provided a breakdown of global responsibility for fossil fuel-derived CO2 pollution between 1751 that is summarized below as a percentage (%) of the Historical Climate Debt (1751-2006) of 346 Gt CO2.

- *Ships/air (4%): 4% of 346 Gt CO2 = 13.84 Gt. This has been allocated proportionately to the other groups.*
- *Thus India (2.5%) = (0.025 x 346 = 8.65) + (2.5 x 13.84/96 = 0.36) = 9.01 Gt CO2.*
- *Japan (3.9%) = 13.49 + 0.56 = 14.05 Gt CO2.*
- *UK (6.0%) = 20.76 + 0.87 = 21.63 Gt CO2.*
- *Germany (6.6%) = 22.84 + 0.95 = 23.79 Gt CO2.*
- *Russia (7.4%) = 25.60 + 1.07 = 26.67 Gt CO2.*
- *China (8.2%) = 28.37 + 1.18 = 29.55 Gt CO2.*
- *USA (27.5%) = 95.15 + 3.97 = 99.12 Gt CO2.*
- *Canada-Australia (3.1%) = 10.73 + 0.45 = 11.18 Gt CO2 -> Canada 5.59 Gt CO2 & Australia 5.59 Gt CO2.*
- *Rest of Europe (18.0%) = 62.28 + 2.60 = 64.88 Gt CO2.*
- *Rest of World (12.8%) = 44.29 + 1.85 = 46.14 Gt CO2.”*

According to Polya (95), 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**.

Polya concludes (95):

*“After the disastrous inaction of the Durban Climate Conference and the derisory First World offer of a \$100 billion climate fund for poor nations, it is apparent that the **greedy climate criminals (notably the US, Australia and Canada*)** and the other Climate Debtors will not repay their debt nor indeed stop polluting the atmosphere. One hopes that the Climate Creditor countries will insist on full*

reparations for a polluted planet. **Hopefully this analysis will be useful in International Court of Justice (ICJ) litigations and International Criminal Court (ICC) prosecutions against Climate Debtor countries by Climate Creditor countries***. I would urge everybody, and in particular citizens of threatened megadelta and Island States, to inform their leaders about this Climate Debt and Climate Credit analysis. The First World EU governments in the current EU financial crisis are insisting on financial debt repayment and fiscal responsibility by debtor countries. Climate Creditor countries should likewise insist on repayment of Climate Debt and a rapid global move to cessation of greenhouse gas pollution. **The Climate Debtors are stealing from the poor Climate Creditors and should be held to account by the Climate Creditors at the ICJ and the ICC.*"**

***Emphasis added**

Who Owes Whom for What? All about social justice & morality

Proponents of human caused climate change and the payment of a climate debt to developing countries often seek to justify their stance on a moral basis ([96](#), [97](#), [98](#), [99](#), [100](#)). All the rich (or capitalist) countries collectively caused the problem they claim, and all the poorer countries (that is non-capitalist, left wing or dictatorships) will be the main ones to suffer, creating a clear moral responsibility for debt on the part of the richer countries ([96](#), [97](#), [98](#), [99](#), [100](#)). But who exactly are the richer countries and the poorer countries and how is it decided who will suffer most from alleged human caused climate change? And how will human caused climatic consequences be separated from those due to natural climatic variability in each particular country?

Australia for instance, contributes only 1.5% of total global emissions while the annual increase in Chinese emissions is more than our TOTAL emissions ([101](#)). Additionally, it seems Australia is a creditor nation and is owed money from the big polluters by virtue of the fact that Australia is expected to be one of the countries which will be most severely impacted by the consequences of climate change ([102](#), [103](#), [104](#)). In the words of former Climate Change Minister Penny Wong ([104](#)), *"as one of the hottest and driest continents on earth, Australia will be among the hardest and fastest-hit by climate change if we don't act now."* Consequently, since the massive contribution to global emissions from China absolutely dwarfs Australia's inconsequential contribution surely China should owe Australia an enormous and rapidly increasing climate debt.

Somehow, even in spite of these facts, as though extreme left wing political morality is all that matters, there are some Australians (in conjunction with their like-minded overseas colleagues) who seem to feel all Australians owe a massive and ongoing climate debt to non-capitalist poorer countries, including China. But then again, China is a communist country, far to the left of Australia, so of course it is us who owes money to them, irrespective of climate debt and Australia's position as an extremely vulnerable nation ([97](#)).

According to skepticalscience.com, when it comes to the moral responsibility for alleged human caused climate change ([100](#)), *"the science says....those who contribute the least greenhouse gases will be most impacted by climate change"* (of course this claim is absolutely meaningless since nothing has been quantified and no damage identified, let alone any linking of the damage to a specific country – nevertheless, for the purposes of the discussion we will assume it is 'scientific') and this creates what they term a ([100](#)) *"moral hazard. If those who are emitting the most greenhouse gas are the least affected by direct global warming impacts, how shall we motivate them to change?"* As so often seems to be the case with supporters of climate alarmism, skepticalscience.com appear to be confusing different issues here. The first question of course is, does *"those who contribute the least greenhouse gases will be most impacted by climate change"*, refer to individuals (ie per capita) or nations? Supporters of climate alarmism seem to deliberately confuse this issue by referring to "national" emissions or "per capita" emissions, whichever suits their argument the best at the time.

If in this instance they are referring to per capita emissions then it follows that the poorer Australians, particularly indigenous Australians, those without cars, and those who do little or no travel, are owed a very significant climate debt by more extravagant members of the Australian community. Politicians for instance, would owe a huge climate debt to poorer Australians!

In the case of national responsibility, as mentioned above, China would owe a significant climate debt to Australia.

Which is correct?

Since [\(100\)](#) *“the science says...those who contribute the least greenhouse gases will be most impacted by climate change”*, and since, according to the experts ([102](#), [103](#), [104](#)), Australia is expected to be one of the most severely impacted countries in the world when it comes to the consequences of climate change, it clearly follows, according to the science, that Australia **“contributes the least”** to global greenhouse gases.

Regardless of any justification for the concept of total national emissions, which it could be argued simply amounts to a new form of officially sanctioned discrimination or racism, the fundamental basis of average per capita emissions is outrageously immoral, unjust, and discriminatory. It is an attempt to compare, penalise, and discriminate against individuals by applying some kind of fictitious assessment system. It is a new morality where a country's total CO2 level is averaged and fictitiously and unjustly applied to demonise and discriminate against individuals and their life style. In a country where per capita CO2 levels are high due to very cold climate or the prevalence of emissions intensive industry, individuals will be collectively blamed and penalised for these high emissions and compared to countries such as Africa. Countries like Africa will set the standards to which all Australians must aspire. And poorer Australians will be collectively blamed and penalised as politicians and others increase their wastefulness, extravagance and overseas trips.

Why should poorer Australians be blamed and penalised for the wastefulness of politicians? Yet this is the amazing new discriminatory morality being forced upon the people.

The concept of per capita CO2 emissions is an attempt to officially authorise and sanction deliberate immoral discrimination and debasement or demonising of individuals based upon a completely bogus assessment system, all for the purpose of social engineering and political self-interest. It is despicably discriminatory, unjust, exploitative and fraudulently based.

Nevertheless, according to Polya ([95](#)), countries to which Australia is climatically indebted include India, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, China, North Korea, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.

So Australia, with its paltry 1.5% of global emissions, is indebted to China because of damage done to that country by our emissions but yet it seems China's huge emissions have caused little or no damage to Australia. But who then, is responsible for Australia's climate change? Who do we blame?

America of course, since everyone knows only capitalist countries can cause climate change! The science says they say.

Conversely of course, if all of this is correct and based upon sound science, 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.

Those controlling the CO2 Tax/ETS must be so careful not to overcompensate lest countries around the world take class action for excessive cooling, floods, or dropping sea levels!

The most frightening thing about all of this is that our politicians, and many scientists, expect us to believe it.....and accept it. It is all based upon sound science they say.