

MORE HOT AIR ABOUT CLIMATE AS UN POLITICAL AGENDA DRAWS CLOSER IN PARIS

Graham Williamson
March 2015

According to the news headlines, "[Hotter, harder times are forecast for the farm as climate changes food production](#)," and, [Australia is drying out thanks to our emissions](#)." Especially since this last headline is from New Scientist magazine, how accurate are these claims? Are they just sensationalised alarmist claims aimed at generating sales at the expense of truth? Or are they factually based? Especially since the Academy of Science has recently joined in the political bandwagon on the road to the UN climate deal in Paris this year ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)), are these claims just intended to further the political agenda in Paris?

[The combined resources of BOM and CSIRO](#) have recently produced a detailed report about so called 'climate change' ([5](#)), including that particular type of climate change that politicians are so interested in, and have done so much grovelling about. That is, that type of climate change which is allegedly caused by humans, and is therefore allegedly reversible by political humans exercising control over other humans. Some interesting points in the BOM/CSIRO report are:

- *"Australian average rainfall has been increasing since the 1970s, mainly due to an increase in wet season rain in northern Australia (Section 4.2.2). During the cooler months, rainfall has declined in the south-east and southwest of the continent (Section 4.2.2).*
- *Australia has experienced three major dry periods over the last century or more, including the "Federation drought" (1895-1903), the "World War II drought" (1939-1945), and the so-called "Millennium drought" (1996-2010).On the other hand, many other parts of the continent, particularly in the tropics, show a decrease in drought frequency and intensity at various timescales since the early 20th century..... Assessment of changes in the behaviour of droughts over time is complex, with the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report finding that results varied greatly between studies, depending on the drought indicator used"*

In fact, BOM and CSIRO scientists are contradicting [IPCC scientists who noted in their 5th report that](#):

- **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.**

In another startling example of cherry picking or omission bias, CSIRO and BOM seem to have forgotten to mention these facts, even though they are taken directly from the IPCC scientific report which was partly prepared by BOM and CSIRO scientists.

The most important aspect of the BOM/CSIRO report of course, relates to the causation of any climatic changes and their reversibility by politicians exerting global control through the UN. According to BOM/CSIRO ([5](#)):

"ATTRIBUTION

The latest report of the IPCC WGI (2013) concluded that "warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and since the 1950s, many of the observed changes are unprecedented over decades to millennia. The atmosphere and ocean have warmed, the amounts of snow and ice have diminished,

sea level has risen, and the concentrations of greenhouse gases have increased". Figure 3.4.1 (from IPCC, 2013) shows the observed global temperature record from 1850. Observed global mean temperature has risen by around 0.85 °C from 1880 to 2012, at a rate of around 0.12 °C per decade since 1951 (IPCC, 2013). Increasing greenhouse gases have been the dominant cause of these observed changes to the climate system, along with smaller contributions from natural and other human influences.

For the Second and Third IPCC WGI Assessment Reports (IPCC, 1995, IPCC, 2001), robust attribution was mostly limited to global climate change metrics. The Second Assessment Report in 1995 concluded, "The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on climate". For the Third Assessment report, optimal fingerprints of climate change (or four-dimensional spatiotemporal climate indicators) provided "new and stronger evidence that most of the warming observed in the last 50 years is attributable to human activities". This evidence strengthened in the two subsequent IPCC Reports. The Fifth IPCC Assessment Report (IPCC, 2013) concluded that it is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century."

Importantly, CSIRO base their claims of human causation of climate change on IPCC reports, even going back to the 1st and 2nd IPCC reports in 1992 and 1995. According to CSIRO and BOM, the 2nd IPCC report in 1995 confirms the influence of humans upon climate (5):

"The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on climate"

This quote however, is taken from the politicised IPCC Summary for Policymakers or SPM (6). It is NOT taken from the body of the scientific report which was written by Australian and international scientists (6). Interestingly, in the [Technical Summary](#) to the IPCC report the assessment is rather more cautious (12):

"In the light of new evidence and taking into account the remaining uncertainties, most of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations."

Since the SPM is produced for political purposes (4, 7, 8, 9, 11), it is instructive to examine what IPCC scientists actually said in Chapter 8 of the IPCC scientific report in 1995 (6):

"8.6 When Will an Anthropogenic Effect on Climate be Identified?"

Finally, we come to the difficult question of when the detection and attribution of human-induced climate change is likely to occur. The answer to this question must be subjective, particularly in the light of the large signal and noise uncertainties discussed in this chapter. Some scientists maintain that these uncertainties currently preclude any answer to the question posed above. Other scientists would and have claimed, on the basis of the statistical results presented in Section 8.4, that confident detection of a significant anthropogenic climate change has already occurred.....

The body of statistical evidence in Chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points towards a discernible human influence on global climate. Our ability to quantify the magnitude of this effect is currently limited by uncertainties in key factors, including the magnitude and patterns of longer-term natural variability and the time evolving patterns of forcing by (and response to) greenhouse gases and aerosols."

In the summary to Chapter 8, IPCC scientists point out (see p411 -412, 6)

"Although these global mean results suggest that there is some anthropogenic component in the observed temperature record, they cannot be considered as compelling evidence of a clear cause-and-effect link between anthropogenic forcing and changes in the Earth's surface temperature....."

Viewed as a whole, these results indicate that the observed trend in global mean temperature over the past 100 years is unlikely to be entirely natural in origin."

BOM and CSIRO, in their report (5), have for their own reasons, which have nothing to do with science or truth, chosen to repeatedly selectively quote the IPCC reports. They have deceptively chosen to omit scientific evidence which would contradict the political agenda which has been built upon an alarmist view of climate change. **It is odd indeed, that scientists, and scientific organisations like BOM and CSIRO, prefer to repeatedly cite only the politicised summary of the work of scientists and avoid citing the scientists directly.**

This pattern of scientists cherry picking IPCC reports and preferring only to cite the work of their scientific colleagues AFTER it has been politicised in IPCC summary reports has continued with more recent IPCC reports (7, 8, 9, 10, 11).

As [Professor Eckard has recently pointed out](#):

"If you can disentangle climate change from the politics, we'd be so much better off."

While the professor did not outline his plans for separating politics from science, and restoring the independence of science and scientists, an obvious first step is for scientists is to desist from promoting politicised versions of 'science' in preference to true empirical science.

Given this background, and claims by CSIRO and BOM that the certainty of significant human caused climate change has increased with recent IPCC reports, it is interesting to examine the recent [Appetite for Change report](#) compiled by various scientists in conjunction with the University of Melbourne. In their introduction to the report entitled "[Climate change to leave bad taste in our mouth: new report](#)", Melbourne University describes the report by "*leading climate scientists David Karoly and Richard Eckard at the University of Melbourne*":

"Appetite for Change, a report prepared by leading climate scientists David Karoly and Richard Eckard at the University of Melbourne, reveals the impact that shifting rainfall patterns, extreme weather, warming oceans, and climate-related diseases will have on the production, quality and cost of Australia's food in the future..... 'It's definitely a wake up call when you hear that the toast and raspberry jam you have for breakfast, for example, might not be as readily available in 50 years time,' said Associate Professor Richard Eckard from the University of Melbourne..... 'It makes you appreciate that global warming is not a distant phenomenon but a very real occurrence that is already affecting the things we enjoy in our everyday lives, including the most common of foods we eat for breakfast, lunch and dinner, ' he said.

Professor David Karoly, co-author of the report, said that out of all the impacts global warming is having on Australian farms, increases in heat-waves and bushfires pose the biggest threat to Australia's agricultural regions.

'Global warming is increasing the frequency and intensity of heatwaves and bushfires affecting farms across southern and eastern Australia, and this will get much worse in the future if we don't act. 'It's a daunting thought when you consider that Australian farms produce 93% of the food we eat,' he said."

In the Foreword to the report Richard Eckhart underlines the seriousness of the current situation:

"Australian agriculture is at a turning point. We are halfway through what scientists refer to as the 'critical decade' to act on climate change."

OK, according to Eckhart, we need to act on 'climate change', which of course includes natural climatic variations. Eckhart continues:

"And with less than a 1-degree global average rise in temperatures, climate change is already impacting a suite of Australian-grown commodities and will continue to impact farmers if stronger global efforts to reduce carbon pollution are not forthcoming."

Now it seems that 'climate change' (ie not AGW) will continue to 'impact' farmers unless something Eckhart refers to as 'carbon pollution', is not reduced. But it becomes even more confusing:

"Australian farmers have always faced a highly variable climate, but now climate change adds significant additional complexity to their management."

Here Eckhart differentiates 'climate change', from what he describes as a 'highly variable climate'. Eckhart then claims Australian farmers are threatened by increasing droughts, though he does not mention whether these droughts can be prevented by lowering 'carbon pollution':

"According to the CSIRO, production from cropping and livestock is projected to decline by 2030 over much of southern Australia due to increased drought and the fact that the availability of nutrients will limit productivity in most Australian landscapes. Heat and drought are likely to reduce the quality of grain, grape, vegetable, fruit, and other crops. A 20% reduction in rainfall could reduce pasture productivity by 15%, and livestock weight gain by 12%, which would substantially reduce farm income. There is likely to be a southward movement of pests and diseases as the southern regions warm"

Interestingly, Eckhart declines to mention the latest research by IPCC scientists (cited above) concerning droughts and the fact they are NOT caused by humans. Perhaps this is why he avoided mentioning 'carbon pollution' with respect to droughts. Eckhart finally concludes with a call to action, not a call for more empirical science and less politicised science:

"I urge you to read this report and make your voice heard by calling for greater action to reduce greenhouse emissions for the sake of our food and farmers. This Saturday 28th March, I will participate in Earth Hour to make a stand for the future of Australian agriculture. By taking part in Earth Hour we can all build momentum towards action on climate change to help ensure future generations can enjoy the healthy, fresh food that we were lucky enough to grow up with."

Apparently if we all turn our lights off for one hour it will *"build momentum towards action on climate change"* so that we *"can enjoy the healthy, fresh food that we were lucky enough to grow up with."* Eckhart does not explain how turning our lights off will create *"action on climate change"*, though I suspect he means UN political action in Paris, as it is difficult to see how turning our lights off will produce scientific action.

Eckhart's Foreword to the [Appetite for Change report](#) is confusing indeed. It masquerades as a scientific report based upon the allegedly human caused nature of something loosely referred to as 'climate change', and its reversibility by other humans exerting global controls upon all the countries of the world. If this report is the best modern science can do then we all have a huge problem.

In the preface to the report, Anna Rose writes about '*solving*' what she refers to as '*climate change*':

“In 2015 Earth Hour is very proud to have partnered with the University of Melbourne to highlight the need to solve climate change for the sake of our fresh food and farming communities..... No-one can do everything to solve climate change, but everyone can do something. On Earth Hour, and in every hour, we can all play our part in demonstrating our #AppetiteForChange”

This seems exciting indeed. ‘Climate change’ is a problem which can be solved by human effort. While the report starts off so optimistically as far as the controllability of climate change is concerned, it quickly changes tone as Professor David Karoly *“outlines the impact that global warming is having”* in the following regions within Australia:

- **Zone 1**
Changes in mean rainfall are uncertain, with possible increases in the intensity of infrequent heavy rain events.
- **Zone 2**
The south-west has experienced some of the biggest climate changes observed anywhere in Australia, warming about 1°C over the past 100 years with winter rainfall declining substantially since about 1960. This decline has been directly linked to human caused climate change (Delworth and Zeng, 2014)
- **Zone 3 & 4**
Rainfall will continue to vary greatly from year to year though long-term annual changes are uncertain
- **Zone 5 & 6**
There will continue to be large variations in rainfall from year to year but long-term changes in rainfall are uncertain. However, the intensity of heavy rain events is expected to increase, particularly in the warm season.
- **Zone 7 & 8**
There will continue to be large variations in rainfall from year to year but long term changes are uncertain. The intensity of heavy rain events is expected to increase.
- **Zone 9 & 10**
This region across much of southern NSW, Victoria and Tasmania experiences a cold winter and warm to hot summer, with rainfall throughout the year but more in the cool seasons. It has pronounced year-to-year variability of rainfall ranging from droughts to very wet years..... Rainfall is expected to decline in the cool season although the magnitude is uncertain, with no clear change in summer rainfall.

Like other reports which adopt the perspective of the alarmist political climate change agenda, the only thing certain about this report is the UNcertainty.

Karoly claims a ‘link’ to human causation only in Zone 2, although he did not explain why human causation only allegedly affects this one zone. But then as Karoly and colleagues point out in their report titled, [“Inter-hemispheric temperature variability over the past millennium”](#), global warming is not global after all, though he did not mention this in the ***Appetite for Change*** report:

“Our analysis of inter-hemispheric temperature variability in an ensemble of climate model simulations for the past millennium suggests that models tend to overemphasize Northern Hemisphere–Southern Hemisphere synchronicity by underestimating the role of internal ocean–atmosphere dynamics, particularly in the ocean-dominated Southern Hemisphere. Our results imply that climate system predictability on decadal to century timescales may be lower than expected based on assessments of external climate forcing and Northern Hemisphere temperature variations alone.”

In spite of continuing recycled circular claims that humans are causing significant climate change which can only be solved by giving the UN the power to control all the countries in the world, including those which produce no significant emissions, the [Appetite for Change report](#) is just another bitter disappointment in a long line of disappointments. After spending billions of dollars on research, where is the “increasing evidence” we so often hear about? Where is the science showing only the UN can save us from climatic Armageddon?

Is this report really the best the University of Melbourne and contributing scientists can produce?

Anna Rose has every right to be bitterly disappointed that this report once again offers nothing to instil confidence regarding the ‘solvability’ of what is termed ‘climate change’. It much more closely resembles a political campaign document with an emphasis on spin and an appeal for emotional groupthink and mass action, hardly the tools of scientists.