

POLITICAL IDEOLOGY, NOT SCIENCE, THE REAL DRIVER OF CLIMATE CHANGE ALARMISM

Graham Williamson

June 2014

Climate Change Alarmism & Political Ideology

“People on the left instinctively believe in communal action, the role of government and the efficacy of international agencies such as the UN. They were always going to believe in climate change; it's the sort of problem that can best be solved using the tools they most enjoy using. The right tended to be sceptical about climate change from the start and for exactly the same reasons. It's the sort of problem that requires global, communal action, with governments setting rules. It is a problem that requires tools they instinctively dislike using.”

Richard Glover, *“Bone-headed beliefs bound to end in death by drowning”*. [Sydney Morning Herald, 4th June 2011.](#)

‘Climate Science’ Characterised by Personal Attacks and Intimidation

Climate change science is rather unique amongst scientific disciplines in that it has been commonly characterised by the eagerness of many of its proponents to resort to political tactics such as personal attacks, spin, exaggeration, and stifling of dissent. Indeed, so intense has been the need to shut down the climate change debate that any opponents, or so called ‘sceptics’, may be linked to ([1](#), [2](#)) [paedophilia and sexual abuse of children](#), as being [‘holocaust deniers’](#) who have [‘reptilian brains’](#), who should *“[have their opinions forcibly tattooed on their bodies](#)”*. In fact, extreme intolerance is so common, it would appear to be a defining hallmark of climate alarmists generally.

[According to Michael Rynn from the Parramatta Climate Action Network](#), who was commenting on an [article by Maurice Newman](#) criticising AGW and climate change alarmism:

“Mr Newman is a known climate science denial propaganda artist, and given his exalted status, is also likely to be a swindler and a charlatan. He would be the most unsuitable person in Australia to be advising a Prime Minister of Australia, unless of course that PM is Mr Tony Abbott. God help Australia. Tony Abbott is providing credibility to this climate science denial , big-coal terrorist front group”

Further, Muehlenberg ([3](#)) cites a paper presented by Kari Norgaard ([4](#)) at the [Planet Under Pressure Conference](#) in London in which she claimed those who do not believe in climate change must be ‘sick’ and therefore need ‘treatment’. Some even believe those who seek to debate human caused climate change or challenge the so called climate change consensus, are akin to being criminals and should be arrested and thrown in gaol ([5](#), [6](#)).

[As noted by William Happer](#), name calling and intimidation are well known tactics of climate alarmists:

Skeptics’ motives are publicly impugned; denigrating names are used routinely in media reports and the blogosphere; and we now see attempts to use the same tactics that Big Brother applied to the skeptical hero, Winston Smith, in Orwell’s 1984 . In 2009 a conference of “ecopsychologists” was held at the University of West England to discuss the obvious psychological problems resident in those who do not adhere to the global warming dogma. The premise of these psychologists was that

scientists and members of the general population who express objective doubt about the propagated view of global warming are suffering from a kind of mental illness. We know from the Soviet experience that a society can find it easy to consider dissidents to be mentally deranged and act accordingly.....The situation is even more lamentable for the general public, which is fed a constant stream of propaganda by specialists in environmental issues from the mainstream media and well-funded alarmist blogs. Not unlike functionaries of Orwell's Ministry of Truth in 1984, with its motto "Ignorance is Strength," many members of the environmental news media dutifully and uncritically promote the party line of the climate crusade."

While the psychology of ['herd mentality'](#) or ['groupthink'](#) does much to explain the perpetuating of climate change hysteria, this paper is concerned with the underlying intolerance and political drivers of this phenomenon.

Mainstream Media Driven by Politics & Ideology

It is clear from the above that the tools used by climate change alarmists to spread their belief system are very much political, certainly not scientific. [According to Nantz](#), climate change is a **"political ideology"**:

"But, climate change isn't a scientific theory so much as it is a political ideology. It's the "Green" opiate of the masses and serves as a cudgel in the hands of despots, bringing to heel the uninformed and weak minded. It's a very convenient untruth through which a despotic agenda may be laundered and sold to constituents as something good for the environment."

Since **"[Ideology not rationality drives climate change understanding](#)"**, it is hardly surprising that the mainstream media also reflect this ideological bias.

Recently, Wendy Bacon and the [Australian Centre of Independent Journalism \(ACIJ\)](#) conducted a [reportedly biased media survey of anti-government bias](#) in mainstream media coverage of climate change. Wendy Bacon, [a former Fairfax journalist, who describes herself as a supporter of the left wing political party The Greens](#), "[makes 157 references to Andrew Bolt in 222 pages](#)" of her second [Sceptical Climate report](#), creating a clear impression of a vendetta against Bolt and News Corp. In fact, Bacon clearly announces her bias stating "[I'm voting Green because I disagree with News Corp](#)," leading [Thomas to comment](#): "[She is also a self-confessed News Corp hater and Greens lover](#)". According to Bacon in her [Sceptical Climate Part 2 report](#), "[Bolt's campaign against climate science is linked to his opposition to publicly funded science and media which he tends to portray as elitist and dangerously left-wing.](#)"

But in her [first Sceptical Climate report](#) Bacon defends Fairfax publications against stinging allegations of bias and "[advocacy journalism](#)" made by the Australian in an article entitled "[Fairfax shows how not to run a serious newspaper](#)":

"READERS of Melbourne's The Age yesterday were provided with an amazingly stark, if unwitting, confession about how Fairfax seems to have ceased pretending to publish newspapers in favour of political pamphleteering.....No longer do you need to take our word for it, it is the national editor of The Age who tacitly admits Fairfax papers share with you only the information that supports their political positions"

The Bacon versus Bolt feud has been documented adequately elsewhere ([7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#)) and will not be considered in detail here. Suffice to say that **this whole controversy further illustrates just how irrelevant the scientific facts are when it comes to media coverage of the climate change debate.**

While the polarised mainstream media has become paralysed due to its domination by opposing political extremes of the climate change debate, the interests of ordinary Australians who do not share this fanatical extremism, have been generally abandoned by the mainstream media.

Climate Change: a left wing globalist socialist political ideology, not science

In reality, the UN version of climate change mitigation has always been about [global political control of wealth and wealth redistribution](#). That is, the introduction of climate change compensation payments, from the richer capitalist countries to the poorer countries, as a means of controlling global finances and global politics. At the Warsaw climate conference this aspect received more publicity with suggestions the world should now move on to the "[third era of climate change: loss and damage](#):"

"The annual U.N. climate change meetings are always all about money. This year's 19th Conference of the Parties (COP-19) of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Warsaw is no exception. The latest ploy by poor countries to guilt money out of rich governments is to claim that it's far too late to mitigate or adapt to climate change, it's now time to pay for the effects of climate change"

And not surprisingly, at the, [Planet Under Pressure Conference](#), a lead up conference for the [United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development \(Rio+20\)](#), scientists indicated people's freedom must be drastically reduced (4):

"The scientists behind the event recently put out a statement calling for humans to be packed into denser cities so that the rest of the planet can be surrendered to mother nature. And fellow attendee Yale University professor Karen Seto told MSNBC: 'We certainly don't want them (humans) strolling about the entire countryside. We want them to save land for nature by living closely [together]'."

Surrendering to full government control and progressive loss of freedom and democracy have always been an integral part of the *left's* version of the climate change debate, as [noted by Mcneil](#):

"Weinstein and the progressive left have every reason to want to shut down opposition speech on global warming. Free speech threatens their ability to shove socialism down the throats of Americans. That's what global warming/climate change is really all about with the leaders of the progressive left..... Notice every solution the left offers requires massive government involvement in the economy, massive taxation and loss of individual freedom..... This isn't about saving the world from a warming catastrophe, government and science have no idea how to actually affect the climate in any serious way. This is about Americans giving up their economic freedom to the state in exchange for protection from a fictitious evil..... If the public figures out this is a hoax, it threatens the future of socialism in America. In typical socialist fashion, the solution is to arrest those who disagree. This time instead of calling the arrested "enemies of the state" they'll be called "enemies of Earth."

Of course, [as Richard Glover has pointed out](#), the global "**communal**" enforcement action made possible by UN involvement in the climate change debate was always going to guarantee the enthusiastic support of those on the left of the political spectrum:

"People on the left instinctively believe in communal action, the role of government and the efficacy of international agencies such as the UN. They were always going to believe in climate change; it's the sort of problem that can best be solved using the tools they most enjoy using. The right tended to be sceptical about climate change from the start and for exactly the same reasons. It's the sort of problem that requires global, communal action, with governments setting rules. It is a problem that requires tools they instinctively dislike using. These initial responses to global warming, on both sides,

were understandable. But there's a point in any debate where what you want to believe comes up against what you know to be true; where ideology yields to reality."

[As Glover notes](#), some on the left of politics seem to welcome any new environmental tragedy to reinforce their belief system:

"There's a type of green zealot who appears to relish climate change. Every rise in sea levels is noted excitedly. Every cyclone is applauded and claimed as a noisy, deadly witness for their side. Suddenly, it's as if they have the planet's assistance in their lifelong campaign to bully everyone else into accepting their view of the perfect world. One without any human beings. Except for them. Living in a cave. Wearing an unwashed T-shirt that not only says "Support wildlife" but actually does."

Equally though, [as Glover continues](#), 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."

Further underlying the seriousness of the situation is the fact that the professional views of scientists themselves are also [heavily influenced by political bias](#). According to [Stenhouse and colleagues](#), the attitudes of meteorologists towards global warming are determined largely by their own personal political beliefs:

"Political ideology was the second strongest predictor of view certainty and causation, and was equivalent to perceived consensus as predictor of harm/benefit.....In other words, the notion that expertise is the single dominant factor shaping meteorologists' views of global warming appears to be simplistic to the point of being incorrect.....Political ideology was the factor next most strongly associated with meteorologists' views about global warming. This also goes against the idea of scientists' opinions being entirely based on objective analysis of the evidence, and concurs with previous studies that have shown scientists' opinions on topics to vary along with their political orientation (Nisbet, 2011; Rosenberg et al., 2009).....At least for the measure of expertise that we used, climate science expertise may be a less important influence on global warming views than political ideology or social consensus norms"

This troubling analysis explains the obvious bias or polarisation of scientists when it comes to climate change. However, the fact that some scientists have placed their personal political views ahead of any objective analysis of the scientific facts is most disturbing.

Former Greenpeace member [Patrick Moore describes climate change as](#) "a powerful convergence of interests among a very large number of elites" and a "nasty combination of extreme political ideology and a religious cult all rolled into one." But before considering the role of "elites" in climate change fanaticism it must be acknowledged that those on the right of the political spectrum have also had their own brand of climate change fanaticism.

The "free market" anti-government regulation philosophy of the right has always been diametrically opposed to the *climate control by never ending government interference* favoured by the left. Not to be outdone however, whereas the left could see their long held dream of total government control rapidly coming true, the right suddenly realised everyone could become rich by controlling the climate by the use of markets. In fact, climate change was even described as the [greatest market failure ever seen](#). Whether this is seen as driven by the right, or merely economists looking for jobs,

two opposing political solutions to climate change were seen to be close at hand. The first, total control of everyone in the world by endless regulations, at first enforced upon citizens nationally, and then globally. Second, new global markets and technologies would need to be developed and propagated globally by eliminating government regulation and interference. Under this system, the corporate world could only control the climate if they were not hindered by government interference.

Importantly, the left firmly believed governments could only control global temperatures and severe weather, and adjust sea level, if they had total global control of the people. On the other hand, the corporate world believed they could only control global temperatures and severe weather, and adjust sea level, if they were given total control of markets and governments!

In view of this profound dichotomy of political beliefs it might be thought that 'never the twain shall meet'. However, the elites had other ideas.

Elitists Join Forces to Counter their Common Enemy – the moderates, the mainstream, the ordinary people

As has been noted by [Wood, when it comes to the elites, birds of a feather do indeed stick together](#):

"The old saying, 'Birds of a feather, flock together' is appropriate for the perpetrators of globalism. Sociologically speaking, they are like any other people group with like interests: they naturally tend to form societies that will help them achieve their common interests"

Elitists, by definition, ascend to positions of power, whether in public office, private corporations, academia, or even non-government organisations. They speak the same language and deal in the same currency (power, control, domination). The internal cohesive forces or common interests binding elitists or authoritarians together are enormous and far outweigh petty differences attributable to nationality, culture, or party political affiliation. Though these qualities bond the elites together much more strongly than superficial political beliefs, the average person frequently fails to understand and collectively identify such persons and the threat they represent to freedom and democracy.

[According to Newman](#):

Like it or not, we are accustomed to being lectured to, or hectored, by intellectual elites. Our children are conditioned to believe their country's history is dark.....We are urged to celebrate diversity through multiculturalism but must repress feelings of outrage when recent arrivals show contempt for our way of life.....As in Animal Farm, on multiple fronts, these shortcomings are driven home by so-called progressive intellectuals who manipulate the language to denigrate the established order and to present the utopia they would impose on us.....One of the remaining obstacles to the full realisation of the intelligentsia's utopian dream is obedience."

But the elites, whether from the left of politics, or the right, are generally united in the desire for the total power and control which can [only be achieved by globalisation or globalism](#):

"the stampede to globalism is conducted by a small group of individuals with aspirations for global dominance.....In general, they are driven by lust for money and power. They have clearly made an end-run around the American people in order to achieve personal goals that, in many cases, are diametrically opposed to U.S. interests. If the American people fully understood the magnitude of the deception and power-grab, they would immediately and totally repudiate these individuals and their self-serving global schemes."

And in Australia it was [Alexander Downer who pointed out, in a speech to the National Press Club](#), that there is no longer any left and right and no middle ground, it is only possible to adopt 1 of 2 extreme positions.

1. Being a **globaphile** and being supportive of globalisation, or;
2. Being a **globaphobe** and opposing globalisation.

So the elite have developed their own global agenda which they intend to enforce upon the people whom they regard as stupid and ignorant. This contemptuous anti-democratic disregard for the people is a global phenomenon which has recently been summarised by Angelo Codevilla in his paper, [America's Ruling Class and the Perils of Revolution](#):

"No prominent Republican challenged the ruling class's continued claim of superior insight, nor its denigration of the American people as irritable children who must learn their place..... while most Americans pray to the God 'who created and doth sustain us,' our ruling class prays to itself as 'saviors of the planet' and improvers of humanity.....In fact, our ruling class grew and set itself apart from the rest of us by its connection with ever bigger government, and above all by a certain attitude.....our ruling class recruits and renews itself not through meritocracy but rather by taking into itself people whose most prominent feature is their commitment to fit in. The most successful neither write books and papers that stand up to criticism nor release their academic records. Thus does our ruling class stunt itself through negative selection. But the more it has dumbed itself down, the more it has defined itself by the presumption of intellectual superiority..... Its first tenet is that "we" are the best and brightest while the rest of Americans are retrograde, racist, and dysfunctional unless properly constrained. How did this replace the Founding generation's paradigm that 'all men are created equal'?..... the notion that the common people's words are, like grunts, mere signs of pain, pleasure, and frustration, is now axiomatic among our ruling class. They absorbed it osmotically, second -- or third hand, from their education and from companions..... the rulers want the ruled to shut up and obey"

Clearly this epidemic, which cuts across all political parties, is also running rampant in Australia ([12](#), [13](#), [14](#)). The enemies of the people can no longer be neatly confined to little partisan political boxes as tunnel vision self-interested elitism, which has found a fertile breeding ground in universities, has infected both the ALP and the Liberal Party. As has been observed by Strachan ([13](#)), **"There seems to be a growing attitude in government that the electorate is variously ignorant, easily deceived, a nuisance, or a body of potential troublemakers trying to interfere in the affairs of government. There is a growing attitude in government of "tell 'em anything, but get 'em globalised"**. As Strachan points out ([13](#)), the challenge for the politicians was how to appear to the people to be acting democratically while increasingly encaging their unsuspecting victims in a totalitarian state. This problem, he claims, was solved by the "Theory of Democratic Elitism". Strachan concludes ([13](#)):

"So in practice 'democratic elitism' led to plenty of elitism, and no democracy, which was precisely what it was intended to do.....The elitists see themselves as the social class chosen by 'history' to lead the world to the globalist utopia. In the interests of 'stability' the masses must be disarmed, subdued, mentally reconstructed...."

The eagerness of elitists to put their own self-interest above all others, and therefore readily betray and conspire against others, is highly significant. As is [noted by Giordano Bruno](#), the elites are usually not inhibited by conscience or concerns about morality which commonly deter most people from evil deeds:

“Inherent in every human being lurk the qualities that make us capable of indelible and enduring good, or astounding and catastrophic evil.....What I did not comprehend when I was younger was that not all men struggle against the dark corners of their own hearts. Some men revel in them. Some men embrace their failings, their hatred and their envy, their vicious desire for control over their environment and those in it, and they do it deliberately, completely aware of the imbalance and pain they are inflicting on others.....They stood at the edge of reason and truth, looked out into the nightmarish abyss at the back of their own psyches, and liked what they saw!..... This methodology, this philosophy of embracing one’s darker nature, is ever present in an organized group of people we have come to label ‘Global Elites’.”

Of course, the suggestion that a fair, just, and moral society could be built upon evil, betrayal, and treachery, indicates just how far the thought processes of some elites may deviate from reality. The core globalists, who are well aware that their plans are so repulsive they must be concealed, are a well organised team, as [noted by Wood](#):

“It is also important to understand that core globalists have full understanding of their goals, plans and actions. They are not dimwitted, ignorant, misinformed or naive. The global elite march in three essential columns: Corporate, Political and Academic. For the sake of clarity, these names will be used herein to refer to these three groups. In general, the goals for globalism are created by Corporate. Academic then provides studies and white papers that justify Corporate's goals. Political sells Academic's arguments to the public and if necessary, changes laws to accommodate and facilitate Corporate in getting what it wants. An important ancillary player in globalism is the media, which we will call Press in this report. Press is necessary to filter Corporate, Academic and Political's communications to the public. Press is not a fourth column, however, because it's purpose is merely reflective. However, we will see that Press is dominated by members of Corporate, Political and Academic who sit on the various boards of directors of major Press organizations.”

One may well ask, ‘what is it that motivates the elite’? According to Mises, in his classic economic text, [Human Action](#), it is the “*uneasiness*” of man and his desire to create “*conditions which suit him better*”, which brings about human action:

“We call contentment or satisfaction that state of a human being which does not and cannot result in any action. Acting man is eager to substitute a more satisfactory state of affairs for a less satisfactory. His mind imagines conditions which suit him better, and his action aims at bringing about this desired state. The incentive that impels a man to act is always some uneasiness. A man perfectly content with the state of his affairs would have no incentive to change things. He would have neither wishes nor desires; he would be perfectly happy.....The ultimate goal of human action is always the satisfaction of the acting man’s desire”

Clearly the elites are attempting to satisfy the internal uneasiness described by Mises, however, since this uneasiness is most unlikely to be satisfied by human domination and misery, their uneasiness seems destined to continue indefinitely at the expense of those they seek to dominate. As Giordano Bruno has pointed out, when they realise “*that they will never have enough control to satiate their desires*”, and they discover that “*such power over the environment is unreachable*”, they will then “*turn towards thoughts of complete destruction*”. Although this may seem completely beyond comprehension and belief to the average family man who simply wants to raise his family in peace and prosperity, in reality those pursuing destructive treacherous traitorous policies seem to abound everywhere in modern politics, economics, law, and academia.

When it comes to climate change, the [elites must achieve their goal of controlling the people](#):

“At a minimum, some of these e-mails reveal an undercurrent of elitism that many of us have always claimed existed in the IPCC. These scientists look upon us skeptics with scorn. It is well known that the IPCC machine is made up of bureaucrats and scientists who think they know how the world should be run. The language contained in a draft of the latest climate treaty (meant to replace the Kyoto treaty) involves global governance and the most authoritarian means by which people’s energy use will be restricted and monitored by the government. Even if this language does not survive in the treaty’s final form, it illustrates the kind of people we are dealing with. The IPCC folks jet around the world to all kinds of exotic locations for their UN-organized meetings where they eat the finest food. Their gigantic carbon footprints stomp around the planet as they deride poor Brazilian farmers who convert jungle into farmland simply to survive.”

It is clear that the climate change debate is a political debate, and a debate therefore which has a political solution.

Deliberately Confusing Science & Politics: the spin experts go to work

The first step in understanding the climate change debate, [as has been noted by Glover](#), is **“to acknowledge the way ideology informs attitudes to climate change on both sides.”** In other words, to understand the climate change debate we must first understand that those commonly driving climate change alarmism have political goals rather than scientific goals. Only then are we in a position to be able to fully understand the nature of the political goals they seek and the strategies they commonly utilise to achieve those goals. Since the true goals are political, an effective strategy must combine tokenistic environmental or emissions objectives with those political objectives which are the true drivers of the whole policy.

A climate change policy will only be ‘effective’ to the extent that the true political objectives are deceptively concealed amongst other tokenistic environmental objectives.

It is this concealing of the true political objectives amongst the publicised environmental objectives which is the key to understanding the whole process.

[As I have pointed out previously](#), rather than separate the various issues to give the people a clear choice, when government designed the climate change legislation they deliberately combined the various issues into a confusing undemocratic ‘package deal’:

“The government’s climate change CO2 tax package includes the following aspects.

- 1. **Accumulation of centralised power to enable unprecedented political control and taxation of everyone for the energy and resources they consume.** Government has not sought to clarify or place limits upon this power.*
- 2. **Deliberately exploiting the disconnect between science and political policy and frequently failing to differentiate between ‘climate change’ and ‘human caused climate change’ and therefore pretending that ‘climate change’ is controllable by humans.***
- 3. **The causative linking of human caused climate change to poverty and equity, a fundamental requirement for radical socialistic or extreme left ideologies.** Government has avoided a cause-based approach to poverty to identify and reverse causative factors throughout the global community. At the same time, government policies are intended to increase poverty within Australia.*

4. ***By taxing everybody for the energy they consume, which relates to their quality of life, enable massive ideological wealth redistribution and lower the standard of living to 3rd world level. Once again the government has placed no limits upon this process.***
5. ***At the same time turn pollution into a multi-billion dollar industry for international financiers.***
6. ***Simultaneously, to use the environment as an excuse to surrender sovereignty and invite the United Nations to increase its legal power to control Australia. Even accepting there is some basis for CO2 tax legislation, the need to transfer total power to a global body has never been established. According to the McKibben and Wilcox proposal for instance ([48](#), [49](#), [50](#)), it would be better for each country to take their own separate action (if such action is needed) and thereby avoid the drawbacks of centralised control and international trading of permits.***
7. ***Maintaining public ignorance and refusing to announce the full details of the long term agenda.***
8. ***Giving priority to the huge climate change bureaucracy and diverting funds away from those in genuine need to finance the climate change industry.***

While the government has sought to combine and confuse the above issues in a single package to facilitate the passage of the legislation through parliament, the merits and/or consequences of these various aspects need to be clearly separated. For instance, is surrendering sovereignty to the UN and reducing our standard of living by enforced wealth redistribution really the best means of addressing environmental issues?"

Recently, in an article entitled "[Science Can't Settle What Should be done About Climate Change](#)", Professor Mike Hulme has openly discussed some of the political objectives of climate change legislation. [Hulme](#) cites the following four 'political' questions to justify his view that politics must now take over from science when it comes to climate change.

- *"How do we value the future, or in economic terms, at what rate should we discount the future? Many of the arguments about urgent versus delayed interventions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions revolve around how much less we [value future public goods](#) and natural assets relative to their value today. This is a question that clear-thinking people will disagree about.*
- *In the governance of climate change what role do we allocate to markets? Many arguments about climate change, as about environmental management more generally, revolve around whether commodifying nature, by [pricing environmental "goods" and "services"](#), is part of the problem rather than part of the solution.*
- *How do we wish new technologies to be governed, from experimentation and development to deployment? This question might revolve around new or improved low-carbon energy technologies (such as fracking, nuclear power, or hydrogen fuel), the use of genetically modified crops as a means to adapt to changing climate, or proposed [climate engineering technologies](#). Again, these are not questions upon which science, least of all a scientific consensus, can adjudicate.*
- *What is the role of national governments as opposed to those played by multilateral treaties or international governing bodies? This requires citizens to reflect on forms of democracy and representation. They are no less important in relation to climate change than they are in relation to state security, immigration or financial regulation."*

[Hulme continues:](#)

“Any considered response to climate change will need to take a position, implicitly or explicitly, on one or more of these four questions.....And the percentage of climate science papers that accept humans are causing global warming has little to no bearing on public deliberations about these four questions. Because the questions about climate change that really matter will not be settled by scientific facts. They entail debates about values and about the forms of political organisation and representation that people believe are desirable.”

Hulme is correct of course, that climate change is associated with vitally important political issues. But given this association, which comes first, the political issues or climate change? Which drives which? Is climate change science creating these political issues, or is politics driving (and financing) climate change science, corrupting scientists, and politicising science? If the political agenda is the primary agenda then the suggestion made by Hulme that responsibility for climate policy should now be fully transferred *back* to politicians amounts to the ultimate surrender and abandonment of science and democracy.

In Hulme’s fourth ‘question’ he raises the vitally important issue of climate change policy and national democratic governments versus undemocratic global governance. The first point to be made here is that this issue has been very carefully and thoroughly removed from the political agenda by our politicians and the people have therefore been denied any democratic choice. In fact, those with a world view favouring globalisation and undemocratic domestic interference from global organisations such as the UN no doubt see climate change as a unique opportunity to subvert democracy and achieve their goals. And the determination of politicians to refuse the people a democratic choice in this regard only raises increasing suspicions that climate change is little more than a façade to conceal the power lust of those supporting an extreme undemocratic globalist ideology. **The refusal to offer the people a genuine democratic choice regarding foreign interference is a subversion of democracy and a crime against humanity.**

While Hulme points out that citizens should *“reflect on forms of democracy and representation,”* he fails to indicate how this is possible when governments deliberately combine and confuse these issues and deny the people a democratic choice. These matters should be separated and restored to the electoral agenda as a matter of urgency so the people can reflect democratically whether or not they wish to surrender to the dictates of the UN or other undemocratic global power mongers.

And it must be said, that many scientists have also participated in this death of democracy campaign by supporting the politicians in their campaign for a global solution. And scientists have even become openly involved with the push for global politicisation by [endorsing various global governance arrangements](#). If scientists have any regard for the integrity of science then they should [cease joining the politicians in their campaign for global governance](#).

In his second point Hulme raises the question of putting a price on nature or the use of markets to ‘solve’ environmental or climatic problems, popularly known as [environmental economics](#) or [ecological economics](#). Little needs to be said about the absurd proposition that a monetary or market value should be placed upon everything, including nature. [Money of course, has no intrinsic value](#), only a transient and artificial value assigned to it by participants in a market exchange. As pointed out by [Mitchell](#):

“we should never overemphasize money’s importance or put it above things that actually do have intrinsic value – things like our families, our physical and mental health, and our spiritual well-being.”

As [former CSIRO scientist Professor Julian Cribb points out](#):

“we are trading things that are real, eg. soil, water and our health, for things that are totally imaginary, eg. money. Money exists only in the human mind, it doesn't actually exist in the real world and we are losing things that we really need for our survival in the future: a protected atmosphere, forests, the oceans etc, Our economic system is driving us to destroy those things so we need to rethink it. I'm not saying we have to get rid of it, I'm just saying we have to rethink this thing called money so that we start reinvesting in the systems that protect us and preserve us as a species.”

The suggestion that a monetary or market value should be placed upon climate or our natural environment is a ridiculous, illogical, and an infantile perversion of modern politics and economics. A monetary value is supposed to represent replacement value. If we calculate the total value of Australia's environment and then sell it and destroy it, can we then buy it back?

We have seen that politics is driving climate change alarmism and we have seen how the politicians have concealed their true political objectives amongst tokenistic environmental objectives. So what is the solution?

Solutions: scientific or political?

As we have seen, the political tools which continue to drive the climate change debate include:

- Spin and deception
- Exaggeration and sensationalism
- Intimidation, stifling of dissent and extreme intolerance
- Justification by popularity or 'consensus'
- Frequent use of ad hominem attacks

These tools are clearly not the tools of science or scientists.

But in addition, to further cloud the climate change debate and prevent the people from making a clear evidenced based choice, the politicians have combined climate change with the following political issues to form a ***non-negotiable package deal***.

- Poverty
- Social equity
- Migration
- Wealth redistribution
- Globalisation, both political and legal
- Surrender of national sovereignty to one controlling global authority
- Political discrimination based upon fictitious average per-capita emissions

If climate change is ever going to have any credibility as a scientific issue then clearly these political issues must be considered separately, on their merits, and democratic approval sought for each separate issue. Since a number of these issues are global in nature, one essential step is to utilise national solutions to separate climate change science from the global political agenda. Indeed, Prime Minister Tony Abbott has recently been observed to canvass international support for national solutions, as opposed to UN global solutions, to climate change ([16](#), [17](#), [18](#)). According to Mark Kenny ([18](#)):

“Mr Abbott, however, has made his opposition to carbon pricing and to binding international agreement even clearer. He used a visit to Canada before arriving in New York to caucus with the like-minded conservative leader Stephen Harper to publicly reinforce their contempt for carbon

pricing. The two men expressed a newly articulated view against global limits, arguing individual countries should be free to determine their own action as long as there was no cost to economic growth. In his meeting with Mr Ban on Tuesday, Mr Abbott sidestepped accepting an invitation to attend a UN-sponsored international conference on climate policy later this year”

For those who wish to take the politics out of climate change, this is an absolutely essential first step. But beyond this, if the issue is to be taken as a serious scientific issue then it should not be seen to be driven by those whose main tools are spin, deception, self-interest, and public hysteria ([19](#)):

“The bottom line is that we live in an age of global climate hysteria. Just like similar religious frenzies in the Middle Ages, you have to live through until they abate through exhaustion or collapse under the weight of their own absurdities.....At some point the whole climate craziness will implode. Either when the models have so far diverged from temperature reality that they are literally unsustainable, or when the last-last climate gabfest breaks up with no binding global commitment to cut emissions.”

Since the evidence clearly shows that even scientists have allowed their views to be influenced by political ideology, it is clear, as noted by the [American Meteorological Society](#), that public commentary should be accompanied by a comprehensive declaration of interests, including political ideology:

“Second, the relationship between political ideology and global warming views suggests that those wishing to encourage engagement should find a way to address the political differences that are likely to exist between those with different views on climate change. One way to do this could be to recognize and affirm the value of all members’ political views prior to discussions of climate science”

The solutions are well known, we just need the will to apply them.