

# Global Warming (AGW): Separating Fact From Fiction & Recognising False Claims

## Issue 2: Droughts & AGW – IPCC Supports Climate Change ‘Sceptics’

Graham Williamson

November 2014 (2nd edit)

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines the latest IPCC AR5 report to assess the official IPCC view regarding trends in global droughts and developments in determining human attribution

We have already seen, [in the first paper of this series](#), how the IPCC is [abandoning previous alarmist health claims](#), and in this paper we document how the IPCC is attempting to set the record straight in regard to droughts, and reverse previous exaggerated or alarmist IPCC reports.

Based upon the cited data, including the latest IPCC AR5 report, this paper demonstrates the following:

- **IPCC was formed to blame humans for climatic variations.**
- **Globally droughts are NOT increasing & any previous ‘evidence’ that humans were causing droughts is now seen to be exaggerated, alarmist or totally false.**
- **Droughts are much less severe in modern times as atmospheric CO2 levels have risen.**
- **The current AR5 Summary for Policymakers does not draw attention to the conclusions described in the scientific report.**
- **The evidence clearly shows that the IPCC deceives the public by omission bias or cherry picking, and also by relegating evidence which contradicts their agenda to the ‘fine print’.**
- **Those supporting the alarmist agenda have even resorted to stifling dissent and preventing freedom of speech.**

But even though the evidence is quite clear, and the above facts reveal the IPCC is now supporting those that have long been derided as “sceptics”, many scientists, journalists, and politicians are continuing their alarmist agenda and are refusing to acknowledge they are completely out of step with the scientific evidence, out of step with the IPCC, and out of step with reality. Even when the evidence is presented directly to politicians, as evidenced herein, they remain unapologetic, undaunted, and still apparently determined to defy science, defy the IPCC, and pursue their bizarre ideological agenda.

The fact that many alarmists have apparently decided to contradict independent scientists, ‘sceptics’, and the IPCC, in pursuit of their agenda confirms:

- They regard science and truth as unimportant;
- the underlying undemocratic political agenda must continue at all costs;
- they are driven by desperation and perceived self-interest.

**Alarmists abandoned science, truth, and reality, a long time ago. Now, in their final humiliation as they desperately cling to their agenda, they have become abandoned by the IPCC too.**

## The IPCC: Alarmists Need an Alarmist Organisation

The [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) or IPCC is considered by many, especially those seeking to justify radical climate change political 'solutions', as the global authority on 'climate change' or 'global warming'. But since the IPCC [was formed specifically to assess](#) *"the scientific, technical and socioeconomic information relevant for the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change,"* the IPCC was not intended to focus upon natural climate variability or natural severe weather events. Given the charter of the IPCC was to focus upon any aspects of climate change that they considered human caused, it is hardly surprising they have built a longstanding reputation of exaggerated and alarmist predictions in order to sell their message ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#)). [According to Booker for instance:](#)

*"they will be amazed by the almost religious reverence accorded to that strange body, the [United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change \(IPCC\)](#), which by then will be recognised as having never really been a scientific body at all, but a political pressure group. It had been set up in the 1980s by a small band of politically persuasive scientists who had become fanatically committed to the belief that, because carbon dioxide levels were rising, global temperatures must inevitably follow; an assumption that the evidence would increasingly show was mistaken.....Looking at the Summary for Policymakers, however, we see how the scaremongers are still playing their same old game. On pages 12-14, for instance, they are still trying to whip up fears about extreme weather events, killer heatwaves, vanishing tropical islands, massive crop failures and so on, although little of this is justified by the report itself, and even less by the evidence of the real world, where these things are no more happening as predicted than the temperature rises predicted by their computer models."*

[As Ball summarises:](#)

*"The IPCC was created to predetermine a scientific result and amplify it through alarmism. This meant creating a controlled and directed political structure, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and a politically controlled scientific structure, the IPCC."*

But [as pointed out by Newman](#), the entire community were **"bullied"** into accepting the IPCC as being the one and only global authority on climate change:

*"For six or seven years we were bullied into accepting that the IPCC's assessment reports were the climate science bible. Its chairman, Rajendra Pachauri, told us the IPCC relied solely on peer-reviewed literature..... The IPCC was bound to be captured by the green movement. After all, it is a political body. It is not a panel of scientists but a panel of governments driven by the UN. Its sole purpose is to assess the risks of human-induced climate change."*

And [according to Newman](#), the IPCC succeeded by applying *"mass psychology through a compliant media"*:

*Since its first report in 1990, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change progressively has applied mass psychology through a compliant media to spread the delusion that wicked Western industrialists are causing irreparable damage to the climate.....Australia, too, has become hostage to climate change madness. It has been a major factor in the decimation of our manufacturing industry.....If the IPCC were your financial adviser, you would have sacked it long ago..... From the UN down, the climate change delusion is a gigantic money tree. It is a tyranny that, despite its pretensions, favours the rich and politically powerful at the expense of the poor and powerless."*

The fact that the entire UN climate agenda was politically or ideologically inspired has been clear [since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992 when Agenda 21 was born:](#)

*“Opening remarks offered by FCCC’s Environment Program Executive Director Maurice Strong who organized the first U.N. Earth Climate Summit (1992) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil expressed an underlying priority very candidly: ‘We may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrialized civilization to collapse. Isn’t it our responsibility to bring this about?’…… Former U.S. Senator Timothy Wirth (D-CO), then representing the Clinton-Gore administration as U.S. undersecretary of state for global issues, joined Maurice Strong in addressing the Climate Summit audience. He said: ‘We have got to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic policy and environmental policy’……Also speaking at the Rio conference, Deputy Assistant of State Richard Benedick, who then headed the policy divisions of the U.S. State Department, agreed that the Kyoto Protocol should be approved whether it had anything to do with climate change or not: ‘A global warming treaty must be implemented even if there is no scientific evidence to back the [enhanced] greenhouse effect’.”*

Especially given the fact that the IPCC and their findings are fully endorsed by organisations such as the **CSIRO** and the **Australian Academy of Science** ([6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#)), it is vitally important that these organisations disprove longstanding allegations of politicisation or corruption ([11](#), [12](#)).

In view of the revered status of the IPCC amongst those who support a more alarmist or political view of human caused global warming (AGW) this discussion will be based upon the IPCC’s latest conclusions regarding droughts, and the community response to these conclusions.

### **IPCC Admits Promoting False Alarmist Claims**

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

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

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

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

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

Australian scientists involved in writing [Chapter 2 of the AR5 Report](#) include **Lead Author** [Lisa V. Alexander](#), and contributing author, [Markus Donat](#).

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

## IPCC Says Global Droughts are **NOT** Increasing & Humans are **NOT** Causing Them

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Australians responsible for writing [Chapter 10 of the AR5 Report](#)** include Coordinating Lead Author [Nathaniel L. Bindoff](#) and Contributing authors [Catia M. Domingues](#), [Paul J. Durack](#), and [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#),

**But most alarming, and incriminating, is the admission by the IPCC in the AR5 [Technical Summary](#), that droughts during the “last millennium”, before the industrial revolution and rise of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, were much worse than today:**

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

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

**According to the IPCC in their AR5 Physical Science Report the evidence is very clear.**

- **Globally droughts are NOT increasing.**
- **There is no reliable evidence that humans are causing droughts.**
- **Droughts are much less severe in modern times as atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels have risen.**

But have climate ‘experts’, those supporting the IPCC, [such as CSIRO](#), or those supporting an alarmist perspective, welcomed and publicised these findings of the IPCC? Why are the CSIRO and the Australian Academy of Science so invisible when it comes to welcoming this good news? And have CSIRO and the Academy been seen to be leading the IPCC in addressing the reasons they got it so wrong?

Subsequently, in their [AR5 Synthesis Report](#), the IPCC stresses again that there is no clear evidence linking supposed human caused global warming to droughts.

*“There is low confidence in observed global- scale trends in droughts, due to lack of direct observations, dependencies of inferred trends on the choice of the definition for drought, and due to geographical inconsistencies in drought trends. There is also low confidence in the attribution of changes in drought over global land areas since the mid-20th century, due to the same observational uncertainties and difficulties in distinguishing decadal scale variability in drought from long-term trends.”*

### **IPCC Sanitizes & Politicises the ‘Science’ in Summary for Policymakers**

The full extent of the abovementioned IPCC errors and exaggerations have been censored, sanitised and downgraded in the [IPCC AR5 Working Group 1 Summary for Policymakers \(SPM\)](#). The SPM has long been known as an advocacy document intended to promote political change and as such has always relied more upon sensationalism rather than scientific facts. [According to Hendrickson](#):

*What the media report are the policymakers’ summaries, not the far lengthier reports prepared by scientists. The policymakers’ summaries are produced by a committee of 51 government appointees, many of whom are not scientists. .... Those who compose the summaries are given considerable latitude to modify the scientific reports. .... In other words, when there is a discrepancy between what the scientists say and what the authors of the policymakers’ summaries want to say, the latter prevails.”*

Not only is the SPM a political document, it may even be released [before the full report](#). As Professor Richard Lindzen testified before the [Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the US Senate](#):

*“almost all reading and coverage of the IPCC is restricted to the highly publicized Summaries for Policymakers which are written by representatives from governments, NGO’s and business; the full reports, written by participating scientists, are largely ignored..... The IPCC was created in essence to support the(Kyoto) negotiations, and without the negotiations, without the alarm, there would be no IPCC.”*

[Bell emphasises the political agenda of IPCC SPM’s](#):

*“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.”*

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

Returning to the matter of the politicisation of the SPM’s.

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 April in Berlin, governments approved the third of three reports comprising the fifth assessment report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The report from Working Group 1 (WGI) made clear that human impact on climate change is almost certain. WGII showed that impacts of climate change are evident and poised to worsen. WGIII focused on how to mitigate the emissions that cause global warming (1).”*

Wible concluded:

*“the SPM is intended to balance governmental and scientific input.....To promote discussion of whether and how to reform IPCC in advance of the 15th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in November 2015, Science invited several WGIII members to share their perspectives on what happened in Berlin and what it means for the IPCC and climate policy.”*

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 this ignores much more fundamental distortions of science in the SPM's ([13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#)).

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.

**Australians 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](#).**

**Australians 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 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. Given the history of the IPCC, it is incumbent upon all politicians and media outlets to obtain the most accurate and least politicised information by accessing the scientific report directly. And there is no excuse for interested parties not to do so.

### **Scientists Contradict IPCC & Claim Droughts are Increasing**

In Australia one of the best known alarmists and predictor of droughts is Professor Tim Flannery, [as noted by Professor Stewart Franks](#):

*"The first thing to note about Flannery's recent statements is that they do not include an admission that he got it wrong regarding future rainfall not filling the dams. He did unequivocally get it wrong....That Flannery appears to be defending his alarmism by pointing to others confusing weather for climate just provides another example (if one were needed) of his ignorance of the science of climate variability in eastern Australia. In fact, Flannery's error was to confuse climate variability for climate change.....Flannery in his opinion piece has also stated: "Some commentators jump on any cold spell or rainy period to claim climate change is not happening. This cherry-picking is irresponsible and misleading." It is also true that some commentators jumped on the recent drought to claim climate change was happening. This cherry-picking is indeed irresponsible and entirely misleading."*

[CSIRO have also long predicted increasing drought due to global warming \(17, 18, 19\)](#), and in spite of the latest IPCC AR5 report, CSIRO have not corrected their error and publicly endorsed the above findings of the IPCC. [According to CSIRO scientist Barrie Pittock](#), "droughts will become more intense." [Similarly, according to Will Steffen](#):

*"Climate change is influencing more than just droughts, as the recent CSIRO-Bureau of Meteorology State of the Climate 2012 report clearly outlines.....This emerging pattern of long-term drying across southern Australia, exacerbated by hot days and weeks and periodically interrupted by very intense rainfall and flooding, comes as no surprise to climate scientists. It is entirely consistent with what we expect from a changing climate....."*

In fact, CSIRO continues to directly contradict the IPCC with its alarmist human induced drought predictions ([20, 21](#)). [According to the Climate Institute in March 2014](#):

*"Today's [State of the Climate 2014](#) from the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) and the CSIRO joins the dots between carbon pollution, climate change, fire and drought.....The Government's self-identified 'primary advisers' on climate, BoM and CSIRO today clearly linked carbon emissions, climate change,*

*fire and drought in stark contrast to their own reluctance to do so,” said John Connor, CEO of The Climate Institute.”*

Astonishingly, as the IPCC abandons its former predictions of worsening human caused droughts, CSIRO seems to be moving in exactly the opposite direction, contradicting the evidence and contradicting the IPCC. **Is CSIRO genuinely unaware droughts were worse, as noted by IPCC, BEFORE global CO2 levels increased? Or are they deliberately concealing this evidence?**

### **Media also Aligns with Alarmist Politicians to Contradict IPCC**

The media of course, has been quick to jump on the alarmist bandwagon. [According to The Age:](#)

*“CLIMATE change has already claimed the lives of many thousands of people — and millions more are at risk — as severe weather events rage around the world and staple food crops are wiped out, meteorologists have told a world climate conference. More extremes of climate are bringing deadly floods, hurricanes, cyclones, droughts and ocean surges that are destroying vital food crops, leading to mass starvation in some countries..... He said there was no longer a question that humans had contributed to global warming; the question now was how they were going to feed the growing population as the effects of climate change ricocheted around the world.”*

Of course the claim that *“CLIMATE change has already claimed the lives of many thousands of people”* is just unsubstantiated nonsense if the term *“climate change”* is intended to mean *“human caused climate change”*, as has been made clear in [the first issue of this series](#). If, on the other hand, the term *“climate change”* is being deliberately used loosely, then it is a deliberate attempt to promote an agenda by deliberate deception and fear mongering.

[And the drought warnings from the ‘experts continued:](#)

*“Global warming is leading to such severe storms, droughts and heatwaves that nations should prepare for an unprecedented onslaught of deadly and costly weather disasters, an international panel of climate scientists says in a report issued Wednesday.”*

The media was quick to warn that global warming caused droughts would also engulf Europe ([22](#), [23](#)). In a series of startling and bizarre responses to the report from the IPCC that droughts are not increasing, and are not human caused, headlines around the world took the opposite view and screamed out dire warnings of catastrophic changes:

[“The Earth is collapsing, says IPCC Climate Change Report](#)

*The latest report on global warming by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change paints a bleak picture of the consequences of continued climate change. The prediction is, dangers of a heating Earth are immediate and the results could be catastrophic.....The report warns of intense droughts, flood, and heat waves in warmer worlds engendering food insecurity, disclaiming claims by [climate change skeptics](#) that rising carbon dioxide levels are good for crops.”*

Other headlines included, [“New IPCC report: 8 ways climate change will throw world INTO PERIL”](#), [“Climate change intensifies risk of conflict, migration: IPCC report”](#), [“Panel’s Warning on Climate Risk: Worst Is Yet to Come”](#), and [“IPCC report a reminder it is not too late if we act now.”](#)

[The ABC joined in](#), warning that the new IPCC report is an *“ominous one for Australian farmers”* since *“its modelling shows climate change making droughts and floods more common.”* Like other media



outlets, the ABC chose to avoid any mention of IPCC claims that their previous AR4 report was exaggerated and now they realise droughts are NOT increasing. A similar theme was expressed by [National Geographic which claimed:](#)

*“Farmers will need to take increasingly drastic and expensive measures to cope with droughts, frosts, and ever-changing growing seasons, says IPCC's new report.”*

Not to be outdone, [The Adelaide Advertiser](#) even warned that increasing droughts would lead to **“civil unrest”**:

*The UN has made disturbing predictions that water shortages will increasingly lead to civil unrest and famine around the planet as food production is hit by drought..... The Conservation Council of South Australia says the report again highlights the local threat of global warming and chief executive Craig Wilkins says that “we cannot afford to wait for the worst, we must take effective action to reduce the risks of climate change now”. “With every IPCC report, the confidence of leading climate scientists in their modelling increases, as well as the urgency of their warnings,” he said.*

Once again no concern was expressed about the IPCC exaggerating their previous report, and current IPCC claims that droughts are NOT increasing were avoided by [The Advertiser](#). Channel 4 News continued the dire warnings claiming '[We live in an era of man-made climate change' - IPCC:](#)

*“The world is in “an era of man-made climate change” and has already seen impacts of global warming on every continent and across the oceans..... Increasing numbers of people are set to be displaced by extreme weather events, and the impacts of rising temperatures could help increase the risk of violent conflicts by worsening problems such as poverty, the report said. Recent extremes such as heat waves, droughts, floods and wildfires show how vulnerable humans are to variations in climate, the study warned.”*

**Why did all these media reports seemingly unanimously agree to avoid mentioning the IPCC’s admission that they had exaggerated in their previous report and the fact that the IPCC now claim global droughts are NOT increasing? [Does the mainstream media have an agenda to conceal the truth](#), or is journalistic incompetence rife within the media?**

## **Politicians Refuse to Change Policy and Publicise Scientific Evidence which Contradicts [AGW Hysteria](#)**

Due to my concerns that the truth is not being publicised and political policies are not reflecting scientific evidence, as contained in IPCC reports and other scientific studies, on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2013, 5<sup>th</sup> December 2013, and 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2014, I put the following question to Greens Senator Richard Di Natale:

*Dear Richard,*

*I refer to the outdated and factually inaccurate climate change policy of your party. It is a policy which promotes alarmism and deception and urgently needs correcting. For instance, in spite of all the invented hysteria about humans causing droughts around the world, [according to IPCC in their latest Report](#):*

*“Owing to the low confidence in observed large-scale trends in dryness combined with difficulties in distinguishing decadal-scale variability in drought from long-term climate change, there is now low confidence in the attribution of changes in drought over global land since the mid-20th century to human influence.”*

*But have you sought to publicise this, include it in your policy, and move to correct the fearmongering about AGW and droughts?*

In spite of these 3 attempts to communicate with the Senator I have yet to receive any response. **The Senator did NOT welcome IPCC evidence that droughts are NOT increasing, and neither did he express any concern whatsoever about IPCC's admission that they had previously exaggerated the severity of droughts. Judging from Di Natale's refusal to respond, it seems scientific truth is of no interest to the Australian Greens.**

Due to my continuing concerns, on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2014 I also put the following question to various politicians:

To:

**Senator The Hon Lin Thorp, Senator The Hon Anne McEwen, Senator The Hon Carol Brown, Senator The Hon Ursula Stephens, Senator The Hon Stephen Conroy, Senator The Hon John Faulkner, Senator The Hon Penny Wong:**

*"When in government your party claimed humans are causing droughts ([27](#), [28](#), [29](#)). Now however, the IPCC, in [chapter 10](#) of the [IPCC, 2013: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis report](#), another of your claimed sources, has revealed there is "low confidence" that humans are in any way responsible for droughts. [According to the IPCC: \(see also \[final full report\]\(#\)\)](#)*

*'While the AR4 concluded that it is more likely than not that anthropogenic influence has contributed to an increased risk of drought in the second half of the 20th century, an updated assessment of the observational evidence indicates that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in hydrological droughts since the 1970s are no longer supported. Owing to the low confidence in observed large-scale trends in dryness combined with difficulties in distinguishing decadal-scale variability in drought from long-term climate change, there is now low confidence in the attribution of changes in drought over global land since the mid-20th century to human influence. {2.6, 10.6}'*

***This is good news indeed for all those who have been worrying that their emissions are causing droughts, but why have you refused to share this good news with the public? You create the impression that you prefer to conceal the truth. The evidence is clear. Your party has openly contradicted the science, even contradicted your own 'experts', and fraudulently exploited community fears and promoted unfounded alarmism.***

*The course for your party is perfectly clear. Maintain your present stance of exploiting community fears, concealing truth, and fraudulently misrepresenting science, and consequently continue your slide into political extremism and irrelevance; OR, tell the truth, apologise for the deception, and return to acceptable standards of political honesty and integrity."*

Once again, even 9 months later, I have received no response whatsoever. And neither have I been advised of any change in political policy as a result of this new evidence of which they are now aware. **Like Senator Di Natale, none of these politicians welcomed IPCC evidence that droughts are NOT increasing, and neither did any express any concern whatsoever about IPCC's admission that they had previously exaggerated the severity of droughts. Judging from their refusal to respond, it seems scientific truth is of no interest to either the ALP or the Australian Greens.**

In January 2014, curriculum expert [Dr Vaile Dawson](#) claimed something she referred to as ‘climate change’ should be thoroughly “*embedded*” into the school curriculum. On 5<sup>th</sup> February I wrote to Dr Dawson (cited in part):

*“And in spite of all the hysteria about humans causing droughts around the world, [according to IPCC in their latest Report](#):*

*“Owing to the low confidence in observed large-scale trends in dryness combined with difficulties in distinguishing decadal-scale variability in drought from long-term climate change, there is now low confidence in the attribution of changes in drought over global land since the mid-20th century to human influence.”*

***Is this being taught?***

**Dr Dawson’s only response to this was: “Am flat out with work commitments.”**

**Dr Dawson expressed no interest in ensuring our children were taught the scientific facts as I had indicated in my correspondence.**

The determination of certain scientists, politicians, and many in the mainstream media, to conceal or censor any evidence which contradicts AGW alarmism is abundantly clear. This blatant and contemptuous suppression of scientific evidence is alarming and has no place in a free society. While politicians specialise in spin and deception, our education system, the mainstream media, and our scientific institutions, certainly should not be driven by political propaganda or ‘politically censored science’.

## **Free Speech, Climate Change Deception, Politicisation of Science & Authoritarianism**

We have seen previously the terrible consequences of [politicisation of the CSIRO](#). [According to Professor Franks](#):

*“What dismays me the most is that the worst examples of speculative claims often come from the scientists themselves. Commentators from the Bureau of Meteorology and the CSIRO are among the worst for making statements that are simply incorrect.”*

[As noted by Professor Franks](#), the IPCC version of the ‘science’, actually has “*little to do with science*”, but rather “*is merely advocacy for a catastrophic future outlook*.”

So the goal then is NOT to convey truth, to convey the scientific facts, but rather to promote an agenda, even if that means concealing the truth and stifling dissent and freedom of speech. It is an agenda based upon deliberate deception and [denial of democracy](#).

But now we have the astonishing situation where alarmists are so openly rejecting reality that they are even contradicting their own ‘scientific’ source, the alarmist organisation (IPCC) they have been endorsing for 20 years. The IPCC, to their credit, have sought to correct previous exaggerated predictions (not in the SPM), but the alarmist community have become so openly obsessive and arrogantly agenda driven that scientific facts are of no interest to them. According to Attorney General [George Brandis](#):

*“he has nonetheless found himself ‘really shocked by the sheer authoritarianism of those who would have excluded from the debate the point of view of people who were climate-change deniers’. He describes as ‘deplorable’ the way climate change has become a gospel truth that you deny or mock*

at your peril, 'where one side [has] the orthodoxy on its side and delegitimises the views of those who disagree, rather than engaging with them intellectually and showing them why they are wrong'.....The moral straitjacketing of anyone who raises a critical peep about eco-orthodoxies is part of a growing 'new secular public morality', he says, 'which seeks to impose its views on others, even at the cost of political censorship'.....However, he's sussed enough to know that this is something new, that the left's turn against freedom of speech is a pretty recent thing.....Now it is the left, in the name of political correctness, in the name of this kind of new secular public morality, which seeks to impose its views on others, even at the cost of political censorship. And it is the right, traditionally more authoritarian than the left, which has become the custodian of classical liberalism."

The concerns of Brandis regarding free speech were [reinforced by Professor Judith Curry](#) who, [as noted by Steyn](#), has personally experienced the ostracisation of academic authoritarianism, all in the interests of 'climate change' of course:

*"Secular public morality,' indeed. Professor Judith Curry is chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at the Georgia Institute of Technology, co-editor of the Encyclopedia of Atmospheric Sciences, winner of the Henry G Houghton Research Award from the American Meteorological Society, etc, but someone who made the mistake of deviating from the one true path of the "eco-orthodoxies" and thus has been declared guilty of apostasy by the climate mullahs. See this Tweet from [Professor Curry](#): @BVerheggen @CColose @theAGU you mean like how Mann tries to intimidate me by calling me denier, anti-science, serial climate misinformer?"*

*The 'Mann' referred to is, of course, Michael E Mann, who is strangely inarticulate for one so expensively educated, but like his thuggish acolytes is particularly relentless in getting out the old social-media tire-iron for Judith Curry. It's [worked](#):*

*'With regards to climate science, IMO the key issue regarding academic freedom is this: no scientist should have to fall on their sword to follow the science where they see it leading or to challenge the consensus. I've fallen on my dagger (not the full sword), in that my challenge to the consensus has precluded any further professional recognition and a career as a university administrator. That said, I have tenure, and am senior enough to be able retire if things genuinely were to get awful for me. I am very very worried about younger scientists, and I hear from a number of them that have these concerns.'*

*That's the point. Ayatollah Mann launched his fatwa on Judith Curry pour encourager les autres, to make an example of her, to make it plain to any other would-be dissenters the price they will pay. In her [round-up of current free-speech issues](#), Professor Curry quotes both me and George Brandis:*

*'With regards to climate change, I agree with George Brandis who is shocked by the 'authoritarianism' with which some proponents of climate change exclude alternative viewpoints. While the skeptical climate blogosphere is alive and well in terms of discussing alternative viewpoints, this caters primarily to an older population. I am particularly pleased to see the apparent birth of resistance to climate change authoritarianism by younger people, as reflected by [the young Austrian rapper](#).'*"

Interestingly, as if to prove the point that opponents of climate change alarmism will be marginalised and silenced, the [reaction to the comments of Brandis was swift and widespread, as noted by Tim Black](#):

*"The response to that interview showed that when it comes to climate change, no dissent is allowed.....Over the weekend, it's fair to say that the Brandis interview became one of the leading*

news stories in Australia. It made the front-page of the Australian version of the [Guardian](#) (generating nearly 2,000 online comments), and featured heavily in the [Sydney Morning Herald](#), the [Australian](#), the [Age](#), the [Canberra Times](#), and many more. So prominent was the story that it even featured as a question on Q&A, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's answer to the BBC's Question Time, on which Brendan O'Neill happened to be a panellist....

Yet what's interesting is why the interview piqued the interest of Australian media, bloggers, and the Twitterati. It wasn't just that it featured one of Australia's most important political figures - Brandis says a lot of things without becoming a major news story. Nor was it simply that Brandis, as O'Neill noted, does something rare for a contemporary politician - openly talks about freedom of speech. Rather, what touched a nerve, as headlines like 'George Brandis: sidelining climate change deniers is "deplorable"' suggest, is the fact that Brandis was willing to defend the right of people to challenge and question today's environmentalist consensus. What's more Brandis did so as someone 'on the side of those who believed in anthropogenic global warming and who believed something ought to be done about it'. That is, just because he thinks that manmade climate change is a problem, he has been 'really shocked by the sheer authoritarianism of those who would have excluded from the debate the point of view of people who were climate-change deniers', a situation 'where one side [has] the orthodoxy on its side and delegitimises the views of those who disagree, rather than engaging with them intellectually and showing them why they are wrong'.

[Black continues his rundown](#) on the amazing reaction to the [comments of Brandis](#):

"Brandis's criticism of the free-speech denying tendency of climate-change advocates was the prompt for a response that reveals a lot about a certain section of Australian society's attitudes to free speech and science.

One of the most prominent arguments made in various forms since Brandis dared to suggest that climate change ought to be up for debate is that, well, the debate is closed, the science settled. No free speech is necessary because there is nothing more to say. As one letter writer put it in the [Canberra Times](#), 'The science is rock solid and conclusive'. If Brandis has his way, argued a professor of theology in the [Sydney Morning Herald](#), 'where will it end? Free speech for the tobacco industry to deny smoking causes cancer? There is a value in free speech to promote reasoned discussion and deliberation. And then there is obdurate and at times wilful ignorance.' And in the academic magazine [Conversation](#), one commentator simply said: 'I'm sorry George, but trying to debate anything with these people or someone who thinks that the universe is 7,000 years old when astronomical observations tell us it is more like 13.6 billion, or that evolution hasn't been occurring, is just a bit pointless.'

Again and again, the same point was made: when it comes to climate change, the time for questioning, the time for people to criticise and question, is over. 'We do not need to intellectualise on whether we should act to save the planet', wrote a correspondent to the [Canberra Times](#), 'we just need to get on with it... The [Australian] government is justifiably criticised for its failure to act in accord with the science and the views of world leaders.'

Accompanying the assertion that the science is settled, the debate is over, and now it's time for action, action, action, has been its correlative: so-called deniers of the truth should not be listened to. So [over at SBS](#), a part-public Australian broadcaster, one commentator even tried to suggest that it's because climate-change sceptics are wrong that they're being ignored. 'Brandis has confused the right to speak an idea with the non-existent right that the idea be given credibility. He says in the interview that the scientific community and its supporters simply attempt to delegitimise "the views of those who disagree, rather than engaging with them intellectually and showing them why they are

wrong"... That [the climate-change deniers'] case is not being made is not a function of suppression, it is the result of a lack of evidence. Deniers of climate science are not being excluded, they are being asked to step up. That they are failing to do so is nobody's fault but their own.' A philosopher, [writing on ABC's website](#), uses his interpretation of John Stuart Mill to make the same point: 'Senator [Penny] Wong is right to now say "the science is in". Increasingly there is community consensus and we may hope soon political consensus. This consensus is the effect of free speech as Mill theorised it; it is not a threat to free speech as Brandis so wrongly argues... "Heterodox" views ought not to be censored and they deserve careful consideration but they need to be true to gain legitimacy.'

In a [Brisbane Times commentary](#), another prominent theme emerges. Not only should 'climate-change deniers' be ignored - apparently their arguments are actually dangerous. '[The] science is settled and has been for years. We're killing ourselves and the planet with our civilisational addiction to burning fossil fuels for energy... [Deniers'] opinions aren't science and no matter how loudly they repeat them over and over and over again, they're not part of "the debate" either. They're just sound and fury signifying a corporate agenda which will eventually kill millions in search of profit.'

*Ironically, if there's sound and fury here, it's not coming from Brandis or those willing to challenge the environmentalist orthodoxy - it's coming from the orthodoxy itself. The outrage prompted by someone daring to suggest that debate over climate change might be a good thing, the shock that a politician might think that, yes, free and open political debate of an issue that could shape how society produces and consumes is important, the venom and ad hominem that have come the way of someone defending a principle - free speech - that anyone who cares about democracy ought to defend... it all goes to make Brandis's point about 'a new authoritarianism' emerging, an attempt 'to control the commanding heights of opinion', 'where rather than winning the argument [the new authoritarians] exclude their antagonists from the argument'.* As [Andrew Bolt put it in the Herald Sun](#), it amounts to something approaching a 'dictatorship of the mind'.

*Of course, free speech does not mean that all opinions are valid, as Disgusted of Australia contend. And it does not mean that all claims to truth, scientific or otherwise, are all to be treated as true. What it does mean, however, is that dissent, debate and argument need to be tolerated. These key elements of free speech are not threats to the truth (or even the scientific consensus); rather, they allow us to get at the truth. They allow us, as a society, to judge which views should be supported and which views rejected. That was Brandis's point. And with a few exceptions, it appears to have been missed."*

Although every informed person knows uncertainties of climate science abound and the science of climate change is most definitely 'not settled', [a fact confirmed by CSIRO scientist and IPCC author Kevin Hennessy](#), the desperation of climate change alarmists is such that they contradict themselves, and contradict reality, with the continuing pretence that the science is "settled". The Australian Greens, outspoken climate change alarmists, [have also reacted swiftly to the claims of Brandis](#):

*"The Greens have hit back, saying it's a feudal way of thinking to say that everyone's view of climate change is equally valid.*

*Will Ockenden spoke to acting leader of the Greens, Adam Bandt.*

*ADAM BANDT: This Abbott Government is using every trick in the book to hide the fact that they're not taking the action that the science calls for on climate change. And to suggest that somehow people in this country are being restricted from airing albeit very wrong views on climate change is completely misleading. I mean, if someone said 'two plus two equals five', would you insist on giving them as much airtime in the media as someone who said 'two plus two equals four'? That's in effect*

*what the country's highest law officer is arguing, and it's very worrying.*

*WILL OCKENDEN: He's saying in the publication that one side has the orthodoxy on its side, but delegitimises the views of those who disagree, rather than engaging with them intellectually and showing them why they are wrong.*

*In your example of 'two plus two equals five', isn't the free speech element an argument here saying 'yes you're wrong, but here's why', rather than just shouting them down?*

*ADAM BANDT: The science has been through one of the most rigorous peer-reviewed processes it can go through. And the answer that's coming out from people right across the political spectrum, if you take your ideological goggles off for a moment, is that unless we act soon, the Australian way of life is under enormous threat from global warming."*

Are they serious? We have seen the IPCC just announce they had previously exaggerated regarding droughts and when the Greens were advised about this they refused to respond or change their policy.

[The Bandt interview continues:](#)

*WILL OCKENDEN: Should people be able to, though, nonetheless be able to say that climate change doesn't exist?*

*ADAM BANDT: Well people are saying that, and they're saying it at the moment and they're wrong. The science community is now essentially speaking with one voice. To say someone without science training can somehow simply on a free speech basis say that they're all wrong is a very feudal way of thinking.*

**One voice? Without scientific training? Are they serious? The Greens are rejecting thousands of independent scientists, rejecting the IPCC, and rejecting reality too. Talk about green coloured glasses!**

[The Bandt interview continues:](#)

*WILL OCKENDEN: Senator Brandis does say that he does believe in human-induced climate change. Senator Brandis is quoted as saying "if you're going to defend freedom of speech, you have to defend the right of people to say things that you would devote your political life to opposing." Isn't that what he's doing here?*

*ADAM BANDT: Well if Senator Brandis really believed in free speech in this country and freedom of choice, he wouldn't be threatening to cut funding to artists who express their political views, as he did in the Sydney Biennale. He would be saying that individuals are able to marry the person they love, instead, this government is keeping discrimination in place. This isn't a government that's motivated by liberalism. It's not a government that's even motivated by conservatism, because they are failing to do what Ronald Reagan said was the fundamental duty of every conservative government, which is to protect a country's people. It's not liberalism, it's not conservatism, it's straight out feudalism. As we've seen with the resurrection of knights and dames, that fundamentally is what's driving Tony Abbott and George Brandis."*

**Bandt further confirms the point made above that those who support an alarmist view of climate science, and are intolerant of scientific debate, generally express extreme intolerance of debate in other areas too, such as multiculturalism, sharia law, homosexuality and gay marriage.**

## **Conclusion**

The evidence cited above is clear. The IPCC has a long history of being a political or alarmist organisation the mandate of which was to promote a specific agenda, the agenda of catastrophic human caused global warming. In spite of the expenditure of billions of dollars dedicated to this end, it has failed to find any evidence the planet is threatened by human caused global warming and as a result, in their latest series of AR5 reports the IPCC is moving away from the alarmist claims of previous reports. Now, the emphasis is shifting from mitigation or humans controlling climate, to adaptation, or acceptance that climate and sea level are not controllable by political or economic measures.

We have already seen how the [IPCC is abandoning previous alarmist health claims](#), and in this paper we document how the IPCC attempts to set the record straight in regard to droughts, and reverse previous exaggerated IPCC reports. While the IPCC deserves credit for moving away from its previous inaccurate reports, it still produces its politicised alarmist Summary for Policymakers in an attempt to enforce radical social, economic, and political changes. It is the clear responsibility however, of decision makers, and the media, to source more reliable data directly from the 'scientific' reports rather than unquestioningly adopt the IPCC ideological agenda. Astonishingly, even in spite of the 'mistake' ridden history of the IPCC, many public authorities still seem to prefer the politicised version rather than the scientific version.

Based upon the cited data, including the latest IPCC AR5 report, this paper demonstrates the following facts.

- **IPCC was formed to blame humans for climatic variations.**
- **Globally droughts are NOT increasing.**
- **There is no reliable evidence that humans are causing droughts.**
- **Droughts are much less severe in modern times as atmospheric CO2 levels have risen.**
- **IPCC previous AR4 report was exaggerated or alarmist in regard to droughts.**
- **The current AR5 Summary for Policymakers does not draw attention to the above conclusions contained in the scientific report.**
- **Those supporting the alarmist agenda have even resorted to stifling dissent and preventing freedom of speech.**

But even though the evidence is quite clear, and the above facts reveal the IPCC is now supporting those that have long been derided as "sceptics", many scientists, journalists, and politicians seem to be continuing their alarmist agenda and refusing to acknowledge they are completely out of step with the scientific evidence, out of step with their once much revered IPCC, and out of step with reality. Even when the evidence is presented directly to politicians, as



evidenced herein, they remain unapologetic, undaunted, and still apparently determined to pursue their bizarre ideological agenda even though they are now contradicted by the IPCC.

**The fact that many alarmists have apparently decided to contradict independent scientists, 'sceptics', and the IPCC, in pursuit of their agenda confirms:**

- **They regard science and truth as unimportant;**
- **the underlying political agenda must continue at all costs;**
- **they are driven by desperation and perceived self-interest.**

**Alarmists abandoned science, truth, and reality, a long time ago. Now, in their final humiliation as they desperately cling to their agenda, they have become abandoned by the IPCC too.**