

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

Issue 5: As 'Global Warming' Ceases, IPCC Predicts 'Global Warming' Caused Wars & Conflict

Graham Williamson
August 2014 (2nd edit.)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines the IPCC AR5 report with respect to evidence that so called global warming or climate change is a cause of wars and conflict.

The following conclusions are based upon the content of the [AR5 WG2 Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability report](#) and the [AR5 WG2 Summary for Policymakers \(SPM\)](#).

- **According to the IPCC report there is NO evidence human caused climate change has caused war or conflict and therefore no confident predictions can be made in this regard;**
- **In an attempt to link wars to (natural) 'climate change' IPCC claims natural climate disasters may cause poverty etc and this in turn may lead to conflict;**
- **When the IPCC produced their SPM they completely omitted evidence from the main report which showed that 'climate change' had never been shown to cause conflict or wars;**
- **The AR5 report confirms again the IPCC tradition of exaggerating or politicising the facts in their SPM;**
- **The mainstream media continues to publish misinformation about 'climate change' and misrepresent the data contained in IPCC reports.**

Evidence cited in this paper has revealed again the determination of the mainstream media to sensationalise and misrepresent conclusions contained in the body of the IPCC report. Cited evidence reveals the mainstream media has a history of advocacy journalism, bias, cherry picking, incompetence, and a desire to simply rewrite press releases.

Climate Doomsayers Claim Wars to be Caused by 'Climate Change'

Although experts agree that the [world is not warming](#), [droughts are not increasing](#), and [humans are not dying](#), because of human caused climate change, the climate change doomsayers remain undeterred, even spreading fears that the global warming that has ceased will lead to world war! This, even though the [IPCC admits human caused climate change is NOT global, and is NOT local!](#) Climate change it seems, has bred a new industry of professional doomsayers and alarmists.

Astonishing headlines have recently appeared as the media climate doomsayers swung into action to warn the public that the main threat to peace now comes from the climate, not politicians or governments:

["Climate change is here now and it could lead to global conflict"](#), ["Climate change intensifies risk of conflict, migration: IPCC report"](#), ["Climate change will 'exacerbate existing problems': Defence"](#), ["Global warming to cause war, flood, hunger"](#), ["Climate affects international human conflict and violence"](#), ["Climate change is world's 'gravest security threat' – report"](#), and ["Australia's defence sector on increasing climate alert Australia's defence sector on increasing climate alert"](#).

[According to SBS News:](#)

*"IPCC chairman Rajendra K. Pachauri said the stability of human social structures could be at risk if no action was taken on the report's finding.....Speaking at a press conference in Japan on Monday, Dr Pachauri said climate change was found to lead to displacement and increased conflicts..... Michael Jarraud of the World Meteorological Organisation described the report as the '**most solid evidence**' available. 'We are at the point where you we have so much information, so much evidence, we can no longer plead ignorance,' he said."*

[Channel Nine News continued the alarmism:](#)

"Soaring carbon emissions will amplify the risk of conflict, hunger, floods and mass migration this century, the UN's expert panel says in a landmark report on the impact of climate change.....Climate change could drive turbulence and conflict, prompted by migration from newly uninhabitable areas and jockeying for water and food, it said. 'Climate change has a tendency to act as a threat multiplier whatever the current range of stressors is,' said Chris Field, co-chair of the conference.....US Secretary of State John Kerry said the document sounded an alarm that could not be ignored. 'Unless we act dramatically and quickly, science tells us our climate and our way of life are literally in jeopardy,' he said. 'Denial of the science is malpractice. There are those who say we can't afford to act. But waiting is truly unaffordable. The costs of inaction are catastrophic,' he added."

Professor Tony McMichael, in an article in The Age newspaper, went even further, claiming ["Australia's defence sector is on increasing climate alert"](#):

"Climate change and conflict are two of history's oldest bedfellows. The impacts of natural climate change on food yields, river flows and habitable land have long acted as triggers for conflict. Human-driven climate change is likely to do the same this century, but on a larger and more intense scale – unless extraordinary international emissions abatement occurs.....In today's more densely interconnected world, that task will broaden as human-driven climate change proceeds. There will be an expanded role for Australia's defence sector in regional peace-keeping, especially when geopolitical instabilities arise from the mix of climate change, population growth, other large-scale environmental changes (such as ocean acidification, land degradation and emptied aquifers) and widening wealth disparities."

Once again the media is using an IPCC report to promote fear and panic around the world. But what does the IPCC really say in their report?

IPCC Says No Evidence of Human Caused Climate Change Causing Conflicts and Wars

According to [Chapter 18](#) of the [AR5 WG2 Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability report](#):

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

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

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

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

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

“Some of the factors that increase the risk of violent conflict within states are sensitive to climate change (medium agreement, medium evidence). The evidence on the effect of climate change and variability on violence is contested [12.5.1]. Although there is little agreement about direct causality, low per capita incomes, economic contraction, and inconsistent state institutions are associated with the incidence of violence [12.5.1]. These factors can be sensitive to climate change and variability. Poorly designed adaptation and mitigation strategies can increase the risk of violent conflict [12.5.2]. Most of the research on the connections between climate change and armed conflict focuses on the connections between climate variability and intrastate conflicts in the modern era. For the most part, this research examines rainfall or temperature variability as proxies for the kinds of longer-term

chances that might occur due to climate change. Several studies examine the relationship between short-term warming and armed conflict (Burke et al., 2009; Buhaug 2010; Koubi et al., 2012; Theisen et al., 2012; O’Loughlin et al., 2012). Some of these find a weak relationship, some find no relationship, and collectively the research does not conclude that there is a strong positive relationship between warming and armed conflict (Theisen et al., 2013)..... There is high agreement that in the specific circumstances where other risk factors are extremely low (such as where per capita incomes are high, and states are effective and consistent), the impact of changes in climate on armed conflict is negligible (Bernauer et al., 2012; Koubi et al., 2012; Scheffran et al., 2012a; Theisen et al., 2013),,,,,, In response to the challenges of finding direct associations between changes in climate and violence, some research has examined the effects of changes in climate on factors that are known to increase the risk of civil war (Bergholt and Lujala,..... Confident statements about the effects of future changes in climate on armed conflict are not possible given the absence of generally supported theories and evidence about causality (see Box 12-5).”

The IPCC continue trying to confirm a link between ‘climate change’ and violence in [Chapter 19 of the AR5 WG2 report, entitled “Emergent Risks and Key Vulnerabilities”](#):

“Nevertheless, some individual studies have been unable to obtain evidence that violence has a statistically significant association with climate (Buhaug, 2010; Theisen et al. 2011). In detection and attribution of their impact on human conflict, there is low confidence that climate change has an effect (Section 18.4.6) and medium confidence that climate variability has an effect.....The effect of climate change on conflict and insecurity has the potential to become a key risk because factors such as poverty and economic shocks that are associated with a higher risk of violent conflict are themselves sensitive to climate change (medium confidence; Sections 12.5.1, 12.5.2, 13.2) and in numerous statistical studies the influence of climate variability on human conflict is large in magnitude (medium confidence).”

The language of the IPCC, “no evidence” and no “degree of confidence” could hardly be clearer. The best the IPCC could do, after admitting there is no evidence, is suggest ‘climate change’ “has the potential to become a key risk”.

So how do so many journalists get the facts so wrong? Are they just incompetent, or are they following a deliberate agenda and attempting to deceive the public?

IPCC Again Ramps up the Alarmism in the Politicised Summary for Policymakers (SPM)

The IPCC has a long and well established tradition of exaggerating, politicising, and sensationalising their claims in their SPM ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)). The [AR5 WG2 SPM](#) continues this tradition, continuing the alarm and conveniently failing to mention the fact that there is no evidence linking human caused climate change to conflicts and wars:

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

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

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

As the SPM explains in a footnote:

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

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

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

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

Although I asked both [Professor Hoegh-Guldberg](#) and [Dr Elvira Poloczanska](#) the following question on 4th July 2014, I have yet to receive any response.

*“The IPCC AR5 WG2 SPM recently claimed ‘**Climate change can indirectly increase risks of violent conflicts in the form of civil war and inter-group violence by amplifying well-documented drivers of these conflicts**’.*

Do you consider this a scientifically accurate statement, and an accurate summary of the AR5 report in regard to climate change and conflict?”

Their apparent refusal to endorse the SPM as being scientifically accurate is an answer in itself.

The Mainstream Media: Simple Incompetence or Deliberate Cherry Picking & Advocacy Journalism?

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

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

In the NIPCC analysis of the IPCC AR5 report entitled [Scientific Critique of IPCC's 2013 "Summary for Policymakers"](#), Isdo and colleagues point out "the IPCC has retreated from at least 11 alarmist claims promulgated in its previous reports":

"the IPCC has retreated from at least 11 alarmist claims promulgated in its previous reports or by scientists prominently associated with the IPCC. The SPM also contains at least 13 misleading or untrue statements, and 11 further statements that are phrased in such a way that they mislead readers or misrepresent important aspects of the science..... Eleven statements made in the 2013 SPM apparently retreat from more alarmist positions struck in earlier Assessment Reports or in related research literature. These repositionings are to be welcomed when they move the IPCC's commentary closer to scientific reality..... The IPCC concedes for the first time that a 15 year-long period of no significant warming occurred since 1998 despite a 7% rise in carbon dioxide (CO2). It also acknowledges that on a longer (more climatic) time scale the rate of global warming has decelerated since 1951, despite an accompanying 80 ppm or 26% increase in carbon dioxide (312 to 392 ppm)."

[The NIPCC concludes:](#)

"NIPCC scientists find no hard evidence for a dangerous human-caused warming. They find the null hypothesis – that observed changes in climate are due to natural causes only – cannot be rejected. NIPCC scientists remain open to new discoveries and further debate.

In 2013, any engaged policymaker or commentator has a responsibility to be fully familiar with the arguments and conclusions adduced by both of these teams of climate advisors. Towards this end, we present the primary conclusions of NIPCC's latest report as they are stated in its Summary for Policymakers:

- 1. We conclude neither the rate nor the magnitude of the reported late twentieth century surface warming (1979-2000) lay outside normal natural variability, nor was it in any way unusual compared to earlier episodes in Earth's climatic history. Furthermore, solar forcings of temperature change are likely more important than is currently recognized, and evidence is lacking that a 2/ C increase in temperature (of whatever cause) would be globally harmful.*
- 2. We conclude no unambiguous evidence exists for adverse changes to the global environment caused by human-related CO2 emissions. In particular, the cryosphere is not melting at an enhanced rate; sea-level rise is not accelerating; no systematic changes have been documented in evaporation or rainfall or in the magnitude or intensity of extreme meteorological events; and an increased release of methane into the atmosphere from permafrost or sub-seabed gas hydrates is unlikely.*
- 3. We conclude the current generation of global climate models are unable to make accurate projections of climate even 10 years ahead, let alone the 100 year period that has been adopted by policy planners. The output of such models should therefore not be used to guide public policy formulation until they have been validated and shown to have predictive value."*

As NIPCC rightly point out, "any engaged policymaker or commentator has a responsibility to be fully familiar with the arguments and conclusions adduced by both of these teams of climate advisors".

[But as Singer points out](#), citing an enlightening graph by John Christy, Roy Spencer and Howard Hayden, **as the gap between reality and IPCC computer projections has progressively increased, IPCC has gone in the reverse direction by progressively increasing both its level of 'certainty' and alarmism.**

But the mainstream media has avoided drawing attention to this IPCC change of direction. And the mainstream media also continues to avoid citing IPCC conclusions contained within their scientific report. So why do the media continually avoid the scientific facts?

We have seen, with the mainstream media's consistent 20 year determination not to reveal the truth about Agenda 21 ([5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)), that the media have their own agenda, an agenda not necessarily driven by truth and public interest. This advocacy journalism is also prevalent in regard to climate change ([10](#)).

We also know that belief in catastrophic human caused climate change is [commonly driven by political ideology, not science](#). And [as Richard Glover points out](#), those who are blinded by the thick rose covered glasses of political fanaticism are guaranteed not to be able recognise reality:

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

In the case of 'climate change' allegedly causing wars and conflict, the original claim in [Chapter 18](#) of the [AR5 WG2 Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability report](#) stated:

"There is no evidence of a climate change effect on inter-state conflict in the post-WW II period"

The politicised [AR5 WG2 SPM](#) though, failed to mention the fact that there is no evidence linking human caused climate change to conflicts and wars:

"Climate change can indirectly increase risks of violent conflicts in the form of civil war and inter-group violence by amplifying well-documented drivers of these conflicts"

But the ensuing media reports not only failed to mention the IPCC conclusion that *"There is no evidence of a climate change effect on inter-state conflict in the post-WW II period"*, but they even distorted the already corrupted conclusion contained in the SPM with headlines like:

["Climate change is here now and it could lead to global conflict"](#), ["Climate change intensifies risk of conflict, migration: IPCC report"](#), ["Global warming to cause war, flood, hunger"](#)

The fact that the media could change *"There is no evidence of a climate change effect on inter-state conflict in the post-WW II period"* to ["Global warming to cause war, flood, hunger"](#), indicates just how corrupt, biased, or incompetent our media has become.

But the media is well versed in misrepresenting IPCC reports and publishing misinformation about 'climate change'.

[According to Michael Parker](#), writing for [The Conversation](#), in an article entitled ***"Global warming 'unequivocal' and 'unprecedented' – IPCC"***:

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

However, this article by Michael Parker does not even cite the SPM correctly, as I pointed out in a complaint to [The Conversation](#) below.

Dr Mark Lonsdale: (email to Editorial Board Chair of The Conversation 13th July 2014)
Director,
CSIRO's Biodiversity Portfolio

Dear Dr Lonsdale,

As Chair of the editorial board for *The Conversation*, I would like to express my concern about misinformation about climate change being spread by *The Conversation*. I draw your attention to the below email directed to Andrew Jaspán, Misha Ketchel, and Michael Parker.

Do you approve of this type of misinformation or will a public apology and retraction be issued?

Regards

Graham Williamson

(email to Michael Parker and others dated 11th July 2014)

**Michael Parker
Environment and Energy Editor
The Conversation**

Dear Michael,

I refer to your article "[Global warming 'unequivocal' and 'unprecedented' – IPCC](#)".

Can you substantiate the following claim, which is not backed up by the AR5 WG1 report?

"the report concluded that the 30 years until 2012 were probably the warmest in 1,400 years"

If we turn to page 5 of the [AR5 WG1 SPM](#) we find the correct quote:

"In the Northern Hemisphere, 1983–2012 was likely the warmest 30-year period of the last 1400 years (medium confidence)." {2.4, 5.3}

For some reason you seem to have deleted "Northern Hemisphere" and omitted the fact, admitted by IPCC scientists, that this DOES NOT apply to Australia and the Southern Hemisphere. In fact, if you check Chapter 5 of the WG1 report you will find that IPCC scientists confirm that Southern Hemisphere data is not reliable.

Given the public interest in climate change, and the importance of scientific accuracy, I urge you to issue a public apology and retraction if you are unable to substantiate your claim. I think you will agree that far too much misinformation has been published regarding climate change and *The Conversation* should not be seen to adding to this problem.

Regards

Graham Williamson

Since **The Conversation** claims to provide what they refer to as "*In-depth analysis, research, news and ideas from leading academics and researchers*" which is "*Curated by professional editors*", it is vitally important that they abide by their promise of in depth and unbiased analysis. In view of this, I continue my correspondence with **The Conversation**, in full, below.

Below is Michael Parker's reply of 29th July to my above email, cc'd to Executive Director and Editor Andrew Jaspán, Managing Editor Misha Ketchell, and Editorial Board Chair Mark Lonsdale.

Graham,

Apologies for the delay in replying.

The piece you refer to from September was written by me from the IPCC report launch event in Stockholm. I am based at The Conversation's editorial offices in London and consequently write for a London/European/Northern hemisphere audience. I imagine that the words "northern hemisphere" probably seemed to me at the time superfluous information; of course when the article was republished on The Conversation's Australian-facing website it could be given a different reading by a different audience.

For the avoidance of any doubt, I've added text to make that distinction clear. Thanks for bringing it to my attention.

Regards,

Michael

My response to Michael Parker below, dated 31st July, and cc'd to Executive Director and Editor Andrew Jaspan, Managing Editor Misha Ketchell, and Editorial Board Chair Mark Lonsdale.

Hi Michael,

Thanks for your response and the amendment of your article.

Unfortunately however, the title of your article "**Global warming 'unequivocal and 'unprecedented' - IPCC**", remains very misleading since IPCC scientists admit in Chapter 10 of the AR5 WG1 report that global warming is most definitely NOT global. Although you seem to contradict IPCC scientists in this regard, you still claim the IPCC report as your source.

Furthermore, in Chapter 10 of the WG1 report, IPCC scientists point out that AGW cannot be quantified in local areas around the world. But they also stress that such local data is essential for the development of local policies. Do you disagree with the IPCC in this regard? Can you quantify the amount of anthropogenic warming in Sydney and Melbourne? Or do you agree that insufficient data is available for the development of local policies?

I was also very alarmed by your admission that the content of your article was based upon your location or your anticipated expectations of your audience, NOT the desire to accurately portray the contents of the AR5 report. Do you apply this same practice in your writing of other articles? Indeed, is this a common practice amongst authors writing for The Conversation? Perhaps Dr Lonsdale would like to comment on this.

It is heartening that you have made a first step in addressing the issues of climate change misinformation and misrepresentation of IPCC scientific reports. I urge you to continue the progress.

Regards

Graham Williamson

In my response above I express alarm that the content of the article was determined by Michael Parker's anticipated response of his audience rather than a desire to ensure the content of the IPCC report is represented accurately. I also pointed out that the title of the article, "*Global warming*

'unequivocal and 'unprecedented' - IPCC", could not be substantiated by evidence contained in the report.

Managing Editor Misha Ketchell responded to my above email on 31st July.

Hi Graham,

Thanks for getting in touch. Michael has clarified the northern hemisphere/southern hemisphere distinction and we're satisfied that the article as it now stands accurately reflects the IPCC report.

All the best.

Misha Ketchell

*Managing editor,
The Conversation
W: 03 9013 1787 | M: 0438 836 175
Level 3, 33 Lincoln Square South
Melbourne 3010*

My response to Misha Ketchell dated 31st July and cc'd to Mark Lonsdale.

Hi Misha,

Thanks for your email.

As I pointed out below, the title of Michael's article blatantly contradicts the IPCC report.

According to the IPCC WG1 Technical Summary, in the period from 1979-2010 when emissions were reportedly increasing most rapidly, the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans were defying model predictions and actually cooling when they should have been warming.

"Over the period 1979-2010 most observed regions exhibited warming (Figure 10.2d), but much of the eastern Pacific and Southern Oceans cooled. These regions of cooling are not seen in the simulated trends over this period in response to anthropogenic and natural forcing (Figure 10.2h), which show significantly more warming in much of these regions (Jones et al., 2013; Knutson et al., 2013). This cooling and reduced warming in observations over the Southern Hemisphere mid-latitudes over the 1979-2010 period can also be seen in the zonal mean trends (Figure 10.3d), which also shows that the models tend to warm too much in this region over this period."

Clearly the IPCC are pointing out here that global warming is most definitely NOT global, contradicting your article. Your article avoids mentioning this. Why?

Secondly, as I have also indicated below, IPCC acknowledge that anthropogenic warming cannot be quantified or confirmed in local areas around the world. This is backed up by CSIRO and BOM. In fact, no one can answer the simple question as to how much anthropogenic warming has occurred in Sydney and Melbourne. Not surprisingly, you also were unable to answer. But Michael's article avoids this issue, implying anthropogenic warming is occurring right around the world. This cannot be confirmed by IPCC, BOM, or CSIRO. Why the omission?

There is much work remaining to be done regarding accurate representation of IPCC reports, but you have made a great start.

Regards

Graham Williamson

While The Conversation should be commended for the small step it has taken in beginning to address the issue of climate change misinformation and misrepresentation of IPCC reports, it must be conceded that very much more work remains to be done, not just by The Conversation, but by the mainstream media generally.

Disappointingly, I have received no further correspondence from The Conversation.

The Australian media unfortunately has a history of incompetence and simply rewriting press releases as was recently dramatically demonstrated during their coverage of the proposed Council referendum. On 14th May 2013 the Commonwealth government announced proposed changes to Section 96 of the Constitution to be put to the people in a referendum. [Section 96 of the Constitution stated:](#)

“Financial assistance to States.

96. During a period of ten years after the establishment of the Commonwealth and thereafter until the Parliament otherwise provides, the Parliament may grant financial assistance to any State on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit.”

[The government announced the following proposed changes to Section 96:](#)

1. Section 96 (heading)

At the end of the heading add “and local government bodies”

2. Section 96

After “any State”, insert “, or to any local government body formed by a law of a State,”

If the proposed referendum were to be successful, the new Section 96 would have read:

Financial assistance to States and local government bodies

*96. During a period of ten years after the establishment of the Commonwealth and thereafter until the Parliament otherwise provides, the Parliament may grant financial assistance to any State, **or to any local government body formed by a law of a State**, on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit.*

But when the Minister for Regional Development and Local Government, Anthony Albanese released the official news release announcing the proposed changes, the vitally important words, “*on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit*”, had been curiously omitted. [The press release concerned was issued by Anthony Albanese on 16th May as follows:](#)

Release of Draft Constitutional Amendment to Recognise Local Government

“The Federal Government is today releasing for public comment the proposed words to give financial recognition to local government in our nation’s Constitution.....The 17 words proposed are as follows:

96 Financial assistance to States and local government bodies

*During a period of ten years after the establishment of the Commonwealth and thereafter until the Parliament otherwise provides, the Parliament may grant financial assistance to any State, **or to any local government body formed by a law of a State.**”*

It must be emphasized that [Section 96 of the Constitution](#) already contained the words omitted by [the official Anthony Albanese news release](#), “*on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit*”, and additionally, the **ONLY** changes proposed to be made to the Constitution are the **addition** of the following 17 words:

“and local government bodies or to any local government body formed by a law of a State”

Clearly, the critically important words “*on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit*” were omitted from the official press release. The addition of the full stop after “State” also makes this appear quite deliberate. Anthony Albanese repeated this ‘mistake’ by again omitting these words the next day in a further media release, “[Facts Not Fear Please, in Referendum Debate](#)”, which appeared in *The Australian* as “[Council Vote is Housekeeping](#)”. Amazingly, the same ‘mistake’ was repeated by Anthony Albanese again on 22nd May in a further article entitled “[Vote Yes for Local Government](#).”

In an astonishing display of unprofessional journalism, in the rush to simply unthinkingly rewrite government media releases, mainstream media organisations around the country repeated the omission made by Anthony Albanese in their parroted news stories ([The Australian](#), [The Herald Sun](#), [Channel Nine/MSN](#), [The Daily Telegraph](#), [Local Government News](#), [The Sydney Morning Herald](#), [The Northern Star](#), [Sky News](#), [AAP](#), [Perth Now](#), [Local Today](#), [Coffs Coast Advocate](#), [News.Com.Au](#), [EUPA](#), [Government News](#), [Queensland Times](#), [The Illawarra Mercury](#), [Noosa News](#), [Daily Liberal](#), [The Northern Daily Leader](#), [The Conversation](#), [World News International](#)).

The fact that these media reports misled the public and abandoned basic standards of journalistic accuracy, is confirmed by the following four facts.

1. Even a basic check of Section 96 of the Constitution, as above, would have revealed the omitted words very clearly.
2. A simple check of the actual [proposed draft amendment issued by the government](#) would also have revealed that the words “*on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit*” had not been deleted and therefore had been wrongly omitted from the Albanese press release.
3. These facts are confirmed again in the [Draft Explanatory Memorandum](#) released by the government.
4. Finally, even a basic check of parliamentary proceedings would have revealed the following admission of the deletion of the words in question.

http://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/BudgetReview201314/LocalGov

A Albanese (Minister for Regional Development and Local Government) and M Dreyfus (Attorney-General), [Release of draft constitutional amendment to recognise local government](#), joint media statement, 16 May 2013, accessed 16 May 2013. Note that the words ‘on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit.’ are part of Section 96 but do not appear in this press release. This is made clearer in the exposure-draft of the Constitution Alteration (Local Government) 2013 Bill a link to which is included in the joint media statement.

On the other hand, [The Age](#), the [Institute of Public Affairs \(IPA\)](#), and the [University of Sydney Law School](#) correctly included the phrase ‘*on such terms and conditions as the Parliament thinks fit*’ in their analysis of the proposed constitutional amendments. This was subsequently backed up by Julian Bajkowski in [Government News](#), who also included the mysterious missing words, although an earlier article by [Paul Hemsley](#) in the same publication simply copied the Albanese missing words version.

At the very least, in this instance the government made the mainstream media appear extremely incompetent. At worst though, the mainstream media was seen to effectively co-operate with the government in misleading or deceiving the public. With this eagerness to cooperate with government and rewrite press releases it is hardly surprising the mainstream media has completely failed in their duty to accurately disclose the truth about issues such as Agenda 21 or 'climate change'.