

LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE AND INTEGRITY

THE DECLINE OF THE CSIRO AND THE AGENDAS BEHIND THAT DECLINE

Graham Williamson

sanhedin@gmail.com

APRIL, 2012

SYNOPSIS

It is readily seen, from a deep and extensive study of the scientific and political literature, that the scientific impartiality, reliability, and integrity of Australia's prime national research body – the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) has been seriously compromised - particularly with respect to climate science and the notion of anthropogenic global warming (AGW). Clear testimony from numerous members of the scientific community, both national and international, shows that the CSIRO is the victim of ongoing political and management interference, and has therefore become, in effect, an activist organization that responds to political agendas. Management shows no particular interest in either recognizing or rectifying this situation. Morale at all levels of this once proud organization is now at an all-time low.

An in-depth survey of CSIRO publications shows outright bias in a direction which favours current Federal Government policy. Evidence of removal or censoring of conflicting evidence, or evidence which may conflict with political policy, is so consistent and extensive that CSIRO climate publications more closely resemble political activist pamphlets, rather than rounded and independently assessed scientific publications.

There is only one way out of this sad and serious dilemma. Both Government and the CSIRO must be seen to recognize that current policy is entirely wrong. It betrays the sense and sensibility of Australian citizens and their trust in the nation's primary scientific research body, and in the Federal Government. Only outright and complete de-politicisation of the science can open the path to renewal of integrity and restoration of morale at the CSIRO. By these means the rewards will be for genuine scientific initiative, and not for those who simply comply with political agendas at the expense of scientific truth.

Contents

Foreword	2
Introduction	3
PART 1	3
Is the CSIRO Raison D'être Primarily Scientific or Political?	
Who pays the bills and 'pulls the strings'?	
The muzzling of Dr Clive Spash	4
The dismissal of Dr Trevor McDougall	5
PART 2	8
Are CSIRO Print and Website Publications Balanced in Regard to Climate Science or is There Evidence of Bias?	
The 'Alarmist' or 'Political' Point of View Regarding Climate Science	8
The Dissenting or 'Apolitical' Point of View	9
CSIRO Publications Under the Microscope: Biased or balanced?	10
General Comments on Cited Publications	21
PART 3	24
The CSIRO and the IPCC: has the CSIRO been seen to be the driving force supporting IPCC reforms & strengthening IPCC scientific procedures?	
IPCC Problems Identified by Scientists	24
The Role of the CSIRO: Has the CSIRO been complicit in IPCC misrepresentations of science or the driving force behind IPCC reforms to constantly improve IPCC processes?	31
Standard of Evidence that is Acceptable to the CSIRO	33
So has the CSIRO been acting as a political organisation or a scientific organisation?	34
PART 4	35
The Future: Identifying Problems and Finding Real Solutions	
The Politicisation of Science	36
Political Ideological Dreams Made Possible by Science	38
De-Politicising Climate Change and Climate Science	45
Moving Forward with a Sustainable Environment and Climate Program	46
Concluding Remarks	47
Bibliography	48

Foreword

In 1916, the then Labor Federal Government established The Advisory Council of Science and Industry as the first step towards a national laboratory. In 1926, this group was reformed as Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) which had the aim of carrying out research to assist primary and secondary industries in Australia – farming, mining and manufacture.

In 1949, CSIR was renamed The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) and its research was expanded to include (*inter alia*) **atmospheric physics**. Over the following 6 decades the organisation's activities have further expanded into studies related to other aspects of the **environment** and **conservation**.

The CSIRO has a proud history of scientific breakthroughs in diverse fields including biological control of rabbits, development of atomic absorption spectroscopy, plastic (polymer) banknotes and advanced radio astronomy. Its reputation among the scientific community internationally has traditionally been highly positive.

Although funded by Government, a basic principle of operation of The CSIRO, as with any scientific organization, is that the scientists employed to study in a particular area have the freedom to objectively report their findings without fear of censorship or political influence.

However, since the emergence of the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) hypothesis in the 1980's, those CSIRO scientists involved in research related to climate change have, seemingly, been constrained in what aspects they are allowed to research and what findings they are allowed to report. It would appear that findings which support the AGW hypothesis are preferred by the administration. It has been suggested that this preference is dictated by pressure from officials connected with The Government of the day and who desire the CSIRO to release only those findings which support government policy.

The result has been a disturbing loss of professional and public confidence in the CSIRO's objectivity when contributing to the climate change debate. In recent times we have seen CSIRO scientists dismissed for expressing unpopular views, overseas colleagues protesting to the CSIRO on behalf of the dismissed staff, other scientists quitting because they have been denied publication of their papers, former senior staff 'spilling the beans' regarding internal prejudice, and even cartoons in the media ridiculing CSIRO bias emerging from reliance on Government funding.

This paper explores the evidence available to support the assertion that the CSIRO, at least in its 'official' contribution to climate science, has been, and continues to be, biased, unreliable and deceitful. The reasons why this decline in integrity has occurred are forensically analysed and hidden agendas are startlingly exposed. Finally, directions are set towards saving us from the 'Trojan Horse' of climate change alarmism.

The author of this paper is not a qualified scientist but his opinions and claims are supported by an extensive literature search and comprehensive references – many emanating from scientists who, themselves, specialise in climate research. The paper deserves to become essential reading for people interested in the future of Australia and Australians.

Jim Hawes, B.Sc. M.Ed. Science teacher and author

Introduction

Australians are being told by government that they are amongst the largest per capita polluters in the world and **that** this is causing an imminent climatic Armageddon characterised by catastrophic increases in temperature and sea levels, combined with increasing droughts, floods, and severe weather events. Australians are to blame we are told, by virtue of their standard of living, for causing all manner of climatic catastrophes all around the world. The government 'solution' to this 'problem' threatens to destroy the Australian economy and significantly reduce the standard of living and life style of Australians for generations to come. The life style and standard of living Australians are used to must be dramatically reduced, according to government, if we are to save the world. In order to achieve this there must be enforced behavioural change, firstly by penalising Australians for CO2 emissions, and secondly, by increasing energy costs to such an extent that such basics as fuel, gas, and electricity, become luxury items which can only be afforded by the rich. All these proposals have originated from the United Nations (UN) and will be enforced with the assistance of the UN by virtue of the fact that the Australian government has sought to give the UN more control over Australia through [Part 1, Section 3a](#) of the recently passed [Clean Energy Act](#).

All of these changes, including the decision to give the UN more power to interfere in Australian affairs, have been justified by *claims of scientific certainty*. According to the Australian government all these policies are firmly based upon scientific advice from organisations like the CSIRO. But since CSIRO is funded by government, is this advice reliable and independent? Indeed, CSIRO scientists themselves have long complained of political interference at the CSIRO.

It is the task of this paper to explore such allegations and examine whether or not CSIRO has been acting as an independent scientific organisation and has been supplying soundly based unbiased scientific information, particularly in regard to climate science. We must be absolutely certain our scientific institutions have not surrendered to political intimidation and become political advocacy organizations. Safeguards should also be introduced to ensure this can never happen. Scientists working within these scientific institutions deserve all the protections we can give them to ensure their true independence and freedom from any kind of political pressure.

We must openly acknowledge the conflict of interest between science and politics and respond accordingly. Scientists are in the business of discovering truth whereas politicians are dedicated to maintaining popularity, power and control, by political spin and the concealment of truth.

It is incumbent upon us to give our scientists the protections they so richly deserve. Our children and grandchildren rely upon us to make the correct decisions today.

PART 1

Is the CSIRO *Raison D'être* Primarily Scientific or Political?

Who pays the bills and who 'pulls the strings'?

The CSIRO has been plagued by complaints about political or management interference for the past decade, particularly in regard to climate science (1-18). These complaints, which of course originate from scientists themselves, reveal a picture of a continuing environment of politically inspired management interference in science. Further, the fact that this internal dissension has been continuing for so long clearly indicates a political and managerial unwillingness to rectify this

4 | Loss of Independence & Integrity: Decline of the CSIRO

situation. Even as long ago as 2006 Jenny Macklin (MHR) described the situation as a (3) *“national disgrace”* and called for an enquiry:

“These scientists have been gagged for talking about one of the most important issues facing the world, and that is climate change.” “We want to make sure that our scientists can speak freely, can make sure that our politicians, our government departments and the public really do understand the critical importance of the science of climate change, and we cannot afford to have these scientists gagged”.
“What Labor wants to do is get to the bottom of this.”

This culture of interference and censorship has continued more recently with the resignation of Dr Clive Spash when his peer reviewed paper was refused publication (11-14), apparently because it disagreed with government climate policy, and the sacking of Dr Trevor McDougall (29-33).

The Muzzling of Dr Clive Spash

The Clive Spash controversy revolved around a CSIRO report he produced entitled (168) *“The Brave New World of Carbon Trading”* which argued that the government’s proposed emissions trading scheme was (12) *“fundamentally flawed”*. Yet, Dr Spash was on the same side of the climate change debate as the government, far from being sceptical, he agreed with the need for urgent action, he merely disagreed with government about the best solution to the problem (12). Dr Spash, in his report (cited in part), lists various reasons why the government’s emission trading scheme would be ineffective (168):

“A contention of this paper is that the serious problems posed by human induced climatic change soon become lost amongst concerns for designing complex exchange mechanisms to handle the large scale transfer and management of financial assets.....In practice the carbon budget is surrounded by unknowns, ignorance and social indeterminacy*.....“Where individuals are solely motivated by ‘warm glow’ giving they will have no concern for the actual consequences of their expenditure (Andreoni, 1989). Indeed firms selling such credits may play on the ‘feel good factor’ of warm glow by selling credits as assuaging guilt rather than abating greenhouse gases (GHGs).....“While carbon trading and offset schemes seem set to spread, they so far appear ineffective in terms of actually reducing GHGs. Despite this apparent failure, Emission Trading Schemes (ETS) remain politically popular amongst the industrialised polluters.*..... Perhaps the most worrying aspect of the ETS debate is the way in which an economic model bearing little relationship to political reality is being used to justify the creation of complicated new financial instruments and a major new commodity market.* In 2008 the financial sector was in a global crisis having manipulated bad debts and mismanaged its own finances to the point of requiring international banks to seek government bailouts. Yet ETS proposals place a new multi-billion dollar market in the hands of the same people and organisations.....The billions of dollars now being generated in trading carbon and offsets has created a powerful institutional structure which has many vested interests whose opportunities for making money rely on maintaining GHG emissions, not reducing them.* The transaction costs inherent in these markets are actually being seen as a source of economic growth rather than a deadweight loss to society. Once created, how politicians will cut the market by 80 per cent—even within the 40 years they are allowing themselves—is hard to imagine. After all, the reason for emissions trading is that corporations and the technostucture proved too powerful for the political process to establish a tax or direct regulation in the first place.”**

**Emphasis added*

The difficulties and impracticalities of an ETS system have been clearly outlined by Dr Spash. He points out that an ETS will become a self-perpetuating industry in itself. Although nothing will be produced, nothing will change hands, and there will be no way of assessing ‘value for money’, a trading juggernaut will be produced which will see the major players having a clear vested interest in maintaining a level of highly profitable pollution. For his contribution to the climate change debate, and his refusal to amend his paper so that it agreed with CSIRO (pro-government) guidelines, Dr Spash was apparently advised by CSIRO boss Megan Clark that he would be (14) *“punished”*.

5 | Loss of Independence & Integrity: Decline of the CSIRO

Dr Spash is on the public record as claiming his paper was withdrawn by CSIRO because it was (12-13) **“politically sensitive”**. According to Colvin (12), the Spash dispute *“ended with the CSIRO saying Professor Spash couldn't publish his paper, even though it had been peer reviewed and cleared for publication in an international journal.”* Further, according to Dr Spash (12):

“I think they've certainly got themselves into a total mess both with their public policy statements and also their charter signed with the Minister. It seems impossible for the CSIRO to conduct research engaging on public policy issues and yet maintain a statement which prevents them from doing that.....The paper I was told was politically sensitive. Presumably this relates to the fact that the emissions trading scheme was going through the Senate and when I first started the paper and it was first submitted in February 2009 the issue looked like it wasn't going to be problematic. By the time the Senate had rejected the emissions trading scheme for the first round, suddenly everything became much more politically sensitive. I think the main point is that I'm arguing in general terms about emissions trading schemes and their problems which cannot be redesigned. Most economists are arguing that you can redesign emissions trading schemes.”

According to Berkovic (13), **“Clive Spash also accused the agency of hindering public debate and trampling on his civil liberties by preventing the research being published.”** But not only was Dr Spash denied publication by CSIRO on the grounds his paper was ‘politically sensitive’, but further, the CSIRO even sought to prevent him publishing it as a private citizen (19). According to Dr Spash (19):

“The CSIRO is currently maintaining they have the right to ban the written version of this paper from publication by myself as a representative of the organisation and by myself as a private citizen.”

Rather than contribute to genuine scientific debate it seems, at least when it comes to politically sensitive issues, CSIRO focus is now dedicated to controlling what is published, even by private citizens. CSIRO has clearly gone from a genuine scientific organisation to a censorship or propaganda organisation which has assumed the task of ensuring only pro-government material is released, even if that information is factually incorrect, deceptive, or misleading. Evidence from the scientific community indicates that scientific truth has now become subjugated by politics and replaced by political deception.

The Dismissal of Dr Trevor McDougall

In November 2011 the CSIRO dismissed world leading ocean scientist Dr Trevor McDougall (29-33) because his research direction could not be *“aligned”* with the direction required by management.

Dr Andrew Johnson of the CSIRO states, in regard to the sacking of Dr McDougall (28):

“the particular component of oceanographic work that the individual that you referred to previously worked on was not consistent with the direction we want to take the work.....But, within the context of the CSIRO's strategies and priorities, we have made a particular decision to decrease our effort in that work, and particularly in the area that that scientist was focusing on in the last three years, which has been around the thermodynamic properties of seawater.....Certainly the way in which the ocean stores and transports heat is a critical part of understanding the global energy budget and has a critical link to the world's climate system. So the macro issue is an important one.”

So we learn from this that Dr McDougall was involved in an area of research which is critical to understanding the earth's climate and we also know that CSIRO management did not want research to progress in this direction, hence the sacking of Dr McDougall. The point is taken up by Senator Milne (28):

“that review says very strongly that the CSIRO should boost its support for oceanographic work. I note that in your response you say that the reason that he was let go was that your mandate is to address major challenges

6 | Loss of Independence & Integrity: Decline of the CSIRO

facing Australia and our region and to meet the nation's contemporary challenges. And, in that context, he could be let go. Now you just admitted a moment ago that the oceans, this oceanographic work, the world's ocean circulation, is utterly critical. You also talk about balance. You just said a minute ago that there was just him and two research scientists. So to thin is one or none, is it not, in this context? I think we are now getting somewhere as to why he was dumped from CSIRO. It comes back to management's aspirations as opposed to the scientists' work in the field and goes to the accusation in the letter that you received from scientists of CSIRO's division, this marine and atmospheric research division, being top-heavy with an overly redundant and duplicate management bureaucracy that hinders rather than supports achievements of the organization's scientific aspirations."

Senator Milne summarises (19):

"I want to say here that it is time the community understood that the CSIRO is not free to publish, that it has got a managerial ethos which puts absolute pressure on its scientists to self-censor if they want to get on, if they want to maintain research grants, if they want to have promotion."

The CSIRO's continuing policy of rewarding compliance with managerial restrictions rather than scientific achievement is understandably destroying morale within the organisation and deterring talented young scientists (30, 32-33). According to Dr Angus McEwan (30), the CSIRO decision to sack Dr McDougall "will undermine the basic building blocks of a future generation of science. He is an exceptional scientist, and CSIRO has indeed lost a science leader who was respected as a generous mentor." CSIRO Staff Association president Michael Borgas agreed saying the McDougall sacking sent a message that science (32) "is not a secure career in this country. It suggested successful scientists were not valued or rewarded, and success has become an occupational hazard at CSIRO".

The declining reputation of the CSIRO in the scientific community has been noted by Dr Art Raiche (30):

"Art Raiche said the national science agency was jokingly known among young science graduates as 'an employer of last resort'.....'Scientists no longer have ownership of CSIRO, or have much input into the direction of the organisation. It is now run by managers, but not managers acting in an advisory capacity to senior scientists. Managers are making the decisions, and these are people who are fearful of independent thought and generally risk-averse."

But as if the demise of the CSIRO as a respected scientific organisation **within Australia** is not bad enough, the McDougall sacking has resulted in **international humiliation for Australia with 161 scientists from around the world lodging a letter of protest with CSIRO** (30, 32, 34-35).

The matter has been summarised by Reisner (35):

"On Christmas Eve 2011 The Canberra Times' Rosslyn Beeby broke the story that "oceanographer Trevor McDougall, has been made redundant by the CSIRO's Division of Marine and Atmospheric Research. It drew a stinging letter of rebuke from top international scientists". The letter accused CSIRO of "relinquishing its responsibility" to global climate science and is "taking definitive steps towards mediocrity" by abandoning "high-impact research". It was sent to top CSIRO administration, members of the CSIRO board, the Australian Academy of Science -- Dr McDougall being a Fellow of the Academy -- and Australia's Chief Scientist. "

As was pointed out by Reisner (35), McDougall's work was critical to understanding the role of the oceans in climate and the formulation of reliable climate models.

According to the letter of complaint from the team of international scientists (34):

"This letter is prompted by the 30 November 2011 dismissal of Dr. Trevor McDougall FAA from CSIRO. Dr.McDougall is a fellow of the Australian Academy of Science, winner of various prestigious

7 | Loss of Independence & Integrity: Decline of the CSIRO

*international oceanography awards (including the Prince Albert I Medal in 2011 awarded by the International Association for the Physical Sciences of the Oceans), and former CSIRO Fellow.....Please accept this letter as an expression of our concern over the recent path taken by management of CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research (CMAR) regarding its scientific research priorities. As members of the international ocean and climate science community, we perceive that recent actions by CMAR, an international leader in ocean and climate science, are negating its basic mission. If continued, CSIRO will lose its prominence in national and international research in oceanography and climate.....Dismissing Dr. McDougall has severely damaged the reputation of CSIRO in the national and international oceanographic and climate community. It is our understanding that Dr. McDougall's dismissal was based on his work being declared redundant to CSIRO. Specifically, Dr. McDougall's research is deemed to be too fundamental for CMAR's mission.....Dr. McDougall's research has in particular improved ocean and climate models that are keys to operational oceanographic forecasting as well as long term climate projections, both of which are high priority research and operational areas at CMAR.....By eschewing fundamentals, CSIRO is exhibiting signs of an organization whose vision leans towards what certain managers deem to yield immediate pay off, rather than by following what core scientists at the organization determine to be important and high impact avenues of pursuit. Maintenance of a short term vision will severely compromise the relevance and impact of CSIRO's marine research.....However, without long vision basic or fundamental research, such as that exemplified by the research output of Dr. McDougall, CMAR is in effect relinquishing its responsibility as a scientific organization to provide a sound, rational, and authoritative Australian voice for ocean and climate science. **Dr. McDougall's dismissal is an example of what we perceive to be an unwise and short sighted management culture that distances itself from the core science that is the main product of the organization. The dismissal may have long-term adverse effects on the ability of CSIRO to recruit and retain the best and brightest young and mid-career scientists. We are thus dismayed by this action, and believe it to be a dramatic example of a management culture gone profoundly wrong. We are in turn sincerely concerned that senior management is threatening the viability of CSIRO's claim to be supporting and nurturing sound and visionary leadership in ocean and climate science*.....**We are thus very puzzled why CSIRO has dismissed Dr. McDougall, one of the world's leading ocean scientists conducting high impact science in support of understanding the ocean and its role in climate and climate change. There is no doubt that Dr. McDougall ranks very high indeed among world-class people."*

**Emphasis added*

Given claims by Dr Art Raiche that political interference at the CSIRO has been a fact of life for more than two decades, it is clear urgent action is needed ([7](#)):

"The organisation employed me for 35 years -the last 15 of which I had the rank of Chief Research Scientist – I worked on computer modelling by the way – the CSIRO that I joined in 1971 was a very lean, world class organisation and it was run by scientists for the benefit of Australia..... Here's an important thing – CSIRO was called a QANGO – that's a bureaucratic term meaning Quasi Autonomous Non-Governmental Organisation – financed by government but set to act independently of government. That meant that my day, our research and publications were judged on the quality of their science and how useful it was, and not whether or not it agreed with government policy..... But, we came under increasing pressure at the end of the 1980s and it was pretty terrible. We had to become more business like. The doors were opened to management consultants..... We scientists were given very strict guidelines – and I have to tell you this – very strict - we got lots of memos on not publishing any public discussion, not publishing anything or public discussion of any research that could be seen as critical of government policy. Those who did not do it could be subject to dismissal. The days of CSIRO as a QANGO were over. We had now become a government enterprise."

Not only is the reputation of CSIRO suffering, but furthermore, it is deterring those with scientific flair who do not wish to be shackled by political or managerial restrictions ([32](#), [36-38](#)). As has been noted by Australia's Chief Scientist, Professor Ian Chubb, it is ([32](#)) *"time for Australia to show the rest of the world we do value our scientists as highly regarded citizens and contributors to our future"*.

In a most disturbing analysis of the decline of Australian science entitled **"Making Science Redundant"**, Beeby argues ([36](#)):

"So, what next for Dr McDougall? He's serious international talent, his work is highly relevant to predicting extreme weather events and it's likely he'll be able to take his pick of offers from elsewhere. But what message

does his redundancy send to young people thinking seriously about a science career? It says innovation isn't rewarded in Australia, even if you win prestigious awards and earn the admiration of the top people in your profession. It also suggests smart science is something that's valued overseas, but not here. So get your degree and get out of the country as quick as you can.....Earlier this year, Dr McDougall became the first Australian to win one of the world's most prestigious ocean sciences awards, the Prince Albert I Medal.....He was also one of Australia's Nobel Peace Prize winners in 2007.....So even winning a slice of one of the biggest global awards in town is no guarantee of secure employment. Why would any bright young kid look seriously at science as a career? Why teach science when you can't truthfully say to classroom that a brilliant, rewarding career awaits those who'll step up to the challenge?..... Yes, we need good science teachers but we also need to value and respect our scientists. And maybe we need better science managers, who are prepared to fight to retain top talent."

It seems, in the absence of any commitment to effective change, that the CSIRO administration is determined to continue their policy of censorship and surrendering to political interference that resulted in the resignation of Dr Spash and the dismissal of Dr McDougall.

It is no longer time for words, it is time for action. Ordinary Australians, Australian scientists, CSIRO scientists, politicians, and now international scientists, have all expressed concern about the demise of the CSIRO due to political or management interference in science.

Clearly there should be more transparency and accountability here in the national interest. The fact that now CSIRO management decisions are attracting condemnation from scientists around the world is a national disgrace. The CSIRO surely deserves nothing less than the benefits of a full Royal Commission to restore its ailing reputation. And this should be extended to cover political or management interference in science generally.

We have seen, that according to scientists themselves, CSIRO scientists are required to surrender to the dictates of politicians and bureaucrats and we have seen that scientists are prevented from publishing material, no matter how scientifically sound, which may disagree with government policy. Given this background and testimony from the scientific community, let us now turn our attention to the web site and publications of the CSIRO to see whether in fact there is evidence of scientific bias in CSIRO climate publications, and if so, the direction of any bias.

PART 2

Are CSIRO Print and Website Publications Balanced in Regard to Climate Science or is There Evidence of Bias?

The 'Alarmist' or 'Political' Point of View Regarding Climate Science

In order to establish bias we first need to delineate the different sides of the climate change debate. Often claims are made that there is a so called 'consensus' view point regarding climate change and anthropogenic global warming. This view is often referred to as the 'alarmist' view point since this view predicts catastrophic global consequences if immediate global political mitigation techniques are not introduced. Since the alarmist point of view is often characterised by an agenda linking climate change to ideological objectives, this viewpoint may also be quite appropriately termed the '*political*' point of view, and this will be the terminology adopted hereafter. The essential aspects of the political viewpoint are listed below (42-50).

9 | Loss of Independence & Integrity: Decline of the CSIRO

1. Preference for the use of climate data from computer models rather than real life empirical data.
2. Insistence that global temperatures are continuing to increase alarmingly.
3. Insistence that global sea levels are increasing alarmingly.
4. Insistence that floods, droughts and other severe weather events are increasing.
5. That assertions 2, 3 and 4 above are predominantly caused by humans as a result of CO2 production.
6. Urgent political intervention with a mitigating strategy (ie constraining or lowering CO2 levels) is essential to avoid an irreversible climatic catastrophe.
7. Mitigating strategies must be perceived to be capable of significantly impacting equity and social justice on a global scale.
8. Mitigating strategies are best determined and administered by a central, global authority such as the UN – there must be a linking of global politics, climate, equity, and social justice.

The political view point is supported by The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), scientists allied with the IPCC, scientists working in government funded scientific organisations such as the CSIRO and The Bureau of Meteorology (BOM). It is also commonly supported by a majority of politicians and governments. (42-50, [63-64](#)).

The Dissenting or 'Apolitical' Point of View

Dissenting scientists believe there is **no alarming** increase in temperatures or sea level. Further, they believe evidence of any human impact upon climate is very weak and evidence humans are having a **catastrophic** influence upon climate is totally absent. The essential aspects of the dissenting view point are as follows (51-62).

1. Preference for real life empirical data rather than data from unproven computer models.
2. Evidence reveals global temperature is increasing slightly, certainly not alarmingly. Models exaggerate temperature increase, primarily because of assumed “*feedbacks*” which do not reflect reality.
3. For the last 15 years, real life measurements reveal levelling or mild dropping of average global temperatures , even though CO2 levels are increasing.
4. Global sea level is increasing very slowly, not alarmingly; local sea level is more important than a fictitious global average.
5. There is no convincing scientific evidence of a link between global warming, increasing sea level, floods, droughts, severe weather events and human activities. Natural variability is still the main regulator of climate.
6. There is no scientific evidence of any impending human caused climatic catastrophe.
7. There is no scientific evidence that the proposed ‘treatment’ or mitigation techniques are capable of significantly lowering global temperature and sea level, regulating rainfall, and moderating severe weather events as claimed.

The dissenting view point is supported by the Nongovernmental International panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) and many independent scientists around the world (51-62, [65](#)).

Given these fundamentally opposing scientific view points, the following discussion will examine five CSIRO/BOM climate change publications ([39-41](#), [64](#), [72](#)) for the presence of scientific bias. These five publications were chosen because of their visibility and accessibility and because they typically represent the public stance of the CSIRO in regard to climate science. In keeping with a proper scientific assessment of the theory of AGW, these publications must, if scientifically balanced and unbiased, highlight any dissenting scientific evidence which may disprove their theory. Any deliberate policy not to do so is not just bias, it is deliberate cherry picking and deception and an abandonment of proper scientific procedure.

CSIRO Publications Under the Microscope: Biased or balanced?

The following analysis will examine the five CSIRO publications cited below ([39-41](#), [64](#), [72](#)) for the presence of bias and to ensure they provide a balanced scientific presentation.

1. **Understanding Climate Change – CSIRO ([39](#)): Does this publication consider dissenting evidence and reflect the views of dissenting scientists? Is it a balanced scientific presentation?**

The CSIRO publication, *“Understanding Climate Change”* completely excludes any consideration of contradictory scientific evidence and claims of human causation are so vague as to be scientifically meaningless. Some of the main points of this publication are cited below in italics, with associated comments in red.

- *“There is greater than 90 per cent likelihood that most of the global warming seen since the mid 20th-century is due to increases in greenhouse gas emissions”.*

91% likelihood that 51% (ie “most”) of the global warming is human caused.....this is a typically vague and scientifically meaningless claim which can be traced back to the discredited IPCC. These IPCC claims are intended to express the uncertainties of climate science in a way which confers more certainty. Such claims are recycled endlessly by those who support the political or alarmist viewpoint.

- *“Sea level is projected to rise further by the end of this century. In Australia, there has been a 0.9 °C warming since 1950. The global average sea level rose by close to 20 centimetres between 1870 and 2007. Sea levels rose at an average of 1.7 millimetres per year during the 20th century, and 3.4 millimetres per year from 1993 to 2007.”*

Note that conflicting scientific evidence is not even mentioned. And what percentage of these alleged changes are human caused and therefore potentially reversible by government mitigation techniques (ie. CO2 tax)? This crucial fact is so often omitted.

- *“Since 1950, eastern and south-western Australia have become significantly drier. The interaction of short-term and long-term variations can either reduce or worsen the impacts, making it more difficult to pinpoint the causes of local temperature changes or specific weather events. Australia is likely to become warmer, with uncertain rainfall changes in the north, and less rainfall and more droughts in the south..... **The area affected by droughts is likely to increase** and tropical cyclones are likely to become more intense. A 10 year delay in mitigative action, achieving peak emissions by 2025, would raise peak warming to about 2.5 °C. A further 10 year delay would mean a warming of about 3 °C.”*

These claims regarding reduced rainfall and increasing drought are also out of date and inaccurate. The prediction that the drought affected area of Australia will increase is so blatantly wrong it should be changed to *“the area of Australia affected by floods will increase.”*

- *“The Bureau of Meteorology has found in 2009, serious to severe rainfall deficiencies occurred in a narrow band extending along the coast from southern New South Wales through Gippsland to south-central Victoria. In addition, very long-term rainfall deficiencies persisted across parts of southern and eastern Australia. **Lower rainfall and reduced runoff in the southeast of Australia associated with the current drought is in part due to natural variability as well as to human-induced climate change. The relative contribution of each of these mechanisms remains uncertain. Climate model projections for the coming decades indicate an increasing risk of below average rainfall for southern and eastern mainland Australia,** higher temperatures and evaporation, and below average runoff. In particular there is a significant projected increase in frequency of extremely hot years and extremely dry years.”*

Since no mention is made of floods and extremely wet years and increasing run off and dam filling rains, these claims are either grossly inaccurate or deliberately biased. Uncertainties highlighted here are no basis for projections.

Concluding Comment

Clearly there is no evidence whatsoever that *“Understanding Climate Change”* has attempted to adopt a scientifically balanced perspective by considering all the available scientific views. Contrary views are in fact completely excluded. With its central theme of promoting uncertainties as scientific facts, this document more closely resembles a green activist booklet, certainly not a scientific document.

2. State of the Climate 2012 – CSIRO (40): Does this publication consider dissenting evidence and reflect the views of dissenting scientists? Is it a balanced scientific presentation?

The CSIRO publication, *“State of the Climate 2012”* also excludes any consideration of contradictory scientific evidence. Some of the main points of this publication are cited below with associated comments in red.

- *“Global-average surface temperatures were the warmest on record in 2010 (slightly higher than 2005 and 1998). 2011 was the world’s 11th warmest year and the warmest year on record during a La Nina event. The world’s 13 warmest years on record have all occurred in the past 15 years.”*

Strange, when it comes to short term cooling and increasing rain, even for as long as a decade, the experts keep claiming this has nothing to do with climate and does not contradict their AGW theory in any way. According to the CSIRO (69): *“Data over the past decade provide little insight into long-term trends; the period is simply too short.”* So according to the CSIRO, these yearly changes are of absolutely no consequence when it comes to establishing long term climatic trends. So why does the CSIRO continue to publicise potentially alarming data when they admit the data is irrelevant as a guide to climatic trends?

- *“State of the Climate 2012 also highlights the increase in global sea level and notes sea-level rise around Australia since 1993 is greater than, or equal to, the global average. Our observations show that sea-surface temperatures around Australia have increased faster than the global average.”*

The fact that scientists have provided scientific data ([20-23](#), [25](#), [27](#), [60](#), [163-164](#), [171-172](#)) which contradicts or disproves CSIRO claims regarding the rate of sea level change is completely ignored by CSIRO and excluded from this report. As noted below, the CSIRO claims that ([41](#)) *“Sea-level rise and fall is nothing new and earlier populations have experienced large fluctuations in sea level.”* So why is CSIRO now spreading so much alarm and how can we be definite that past reasons for sea level rise are now completely absent? Carter et al summarise the opposing viewpoint which is completely excluded from the CSIRO report ([164](#)): *“CSIRO/BOM advance no evidence that the well established changes in sea-level that occurred during the last 100 years, as measured by tide gauges and discussed above, were controlled by the carbon dioxide level of the atmosphere, rather than being controlled by natural factors.”* Although CSIRO claims ([40](#)) *“one of the best indicators of changes in the climate system is the amount of heat stored in the oceans”*, it is astonishing that CSIRO does not even mention the most accurate data available from the ARGO buoys ([57-58](#), [164](#)). Furthermore, given the admission by CSIRO that ocean heat content is of fundamental importance it is astonishing that they excluded from this report the fact that the IPCC confirmed in their **Fourth Assessment Report** the unreliability of computer models when compared to real life measurements ([169](#)): *“uncertainties remain. For example, there are apparent discrepancies between estimates of ocean heat content variability from models and observations.”* Perhaps CSIRO is guided more by the politicised **Summary for Policy Makers** which confirms ocean warming with no mention of conflicting real life data ([170](#)): *“Discernible human influences now extend to other aspects of climate, including ocean warming, continental-average temperatures, temperature extremes and wind patterns.”* So according to the IPCC it seems, humans are causing ocean warming even if warming is not confirmed by real life data.

- ***“El Nino and La Nina events during the past century have continued to produce the hot droughts and cooler wet periods for which Australia is well known. 2010 and 2011, for example, were the coolest years recorded since 2001 due to two consecutive La Nina events. Consecutive La Nina events in the past two years, however, have kept average maximum temperatures below the long-term average – by 0.24 °C in 2010 and 2011. Very few extreme hot maxima were recorded during these two years, A very strong La Nina event in 2010, followed by another La Nina event in 2011, brought the highest two year Australian-average rainfall total on record. Many rainfall records were broken during this period.”***

Though CSIRO claimed above *“Global-average surface temperatures were the warmest on record in 2010”*, they now point out that in Australia 2010 was the coolest year since 2001. Since El Nino and La Nina are natural (ie not human caused) climatic events ([173- 176](#)), the CSIRO are here admitting that the ***“hot droughts”*** and ***“cooler wet periods”*** of the past century have been caused by nature and not by humans. According to the World Meteorological Society ([173](#)): *“The world’s climate has always been influenced by the interaction between the Earth’s atmosphere and the oceans and phenomena like El Niño and La Niña are a natural part of it, historically documented for centuries.”* The Bureau of Meteorology has pointed out not only that ([175](#)) ***“nothing can be done to stop”*** natural climate variations such as El Niño or La Nina, but further, according to BOM ([175](#)), these natural phenomena may increase sea level in some areas by 20-30cm. The Australian government has further pointed out ([176](#)) that natural La Nina and El Nino events may cause such dramatic climatic variations that it is difficult to detect clear evidence confirming (human caused?) climate change. It seems the bottom line according to the CSIRO is that our prevailing weather or climate conditions are determined mainly by natural climate variability, as always, rather than human activities, however this contradicts their claim below.

- *"It is very likely (at least a 90 per cent likelihood) that most of the observed global warming since the mid-20th century is due to increases in greenhouse gases from human activities. Human activities also have influenced ocean warming, sea-level rise, and temperature extremes."*

It is "very likely" that "most"; what does this mean? There is a 90% chance that 51% (ie "most") "of the observed global warming since the mid-20th century is due to increases in greenhouse gases from human activities." And when it comes to sea levels the scientific claim is they have been "influenced" by human activities. Is this the best the proponents of the AGW theory can provide? And we are expected to destroy the economy and waste billions of dollars based upon this evidence? Does this same standard of evidence (ie 90% of 51%) apply in other areas of science, or is this guesswork reserved for climate science alone? It should also be noted here that the CSIRO claims humans have influenced temperature "extremes" even though scientists generally dismiss short-term changes as weather which is not due to humans.

- *"It is very unlikely (less than ten per cent likelihood) that 20th century warming can be explained by natural variability alone."*

Was 5% due to nature, now 10%.....

- *"Long-term global climate trends are occurring alongside natural weather variations. For example, recent Australian heavy rainfall and flooding can be explained largely by strong La Ninas."*

In other words, nature has more effect than humans.

- *"Climate models suggest long-term drying over southern areas during winter and over southern and eastern areas during spring. This will be superimposed on large natural variability, so wet years are likely to become less frequent and dry years more frequent. **Droughts are expected to become more frequent in southern Australia; however, periods of heavy rainfall are still likely to occur.**"*

The **assumption** here seems to be that these changes will be caused by humans even though the CSIRO have clearly stated above that it is the natural climatic factors, not human factors, which have been causing the "**hot droughts**" over the past century. Previously the CSIRO claimed (39) "*the area affected by droughts is likely to increase*" but now they can have it both ways with their new predictions that "*droughts are expected to become more frequent*" but "*periods of heavy rainfall are still likely to occur.*" But are we talking about science or clairvoyance here? Exactly when and where will the heavy rains occur? And when and where will the droughts increase? And exactly how much of all this is caused by, and reversible by, humans? Where does the guessworking end and the scientific facts begin?

Concluding Comment

Once again there is no evidence that the CSIRO, with their "**State of the Climate 2012**" publication, have attempted to adopt a scientifically balanced perspective by considering all the available scientific views. Contrary views, such as those of Carter et al are in fact completely excluded (164):

"our analysis finds no evidence that dangerous global warming is occurring; nor that human carbon dioxide emissions will cause such warming in future; nor that recent Australian climate-related events lay outside normal climate variability; nor that reducing carbon dioxide emissions will have any discernible impact on future climate."

With their prediction that droughts can be expected to be accompanied by heavy rain, it seems the CSIRO has everything covered and cannot be wrong. The AGW theory is proving to be very flexible and adaptable, being able to be stretched to fit any new circumstances. The AGW theory it seems, is a theory of infinite elasticity.

3. Climate Change: Science and Solutions for Australia – CSIRO (41): Does this publication consider dissenting evidence and reflect the views of dissenting scientists? Is it a balanced scientific presentation?

- ***“The Earth in the distant past has been both warmer and cooler than today. The Cretaceous Period (120 to 65 million years ago) was 5° to 7°C warmer than today and CO2 concentrations were much higher.”***

But are the reason/s for those changes absent now in this era of supposed human caused changes?

- *“There is evidence that the observed changes to the climate system are consistent with changes expected due to increasing greenhouse gases. It is very likely that most of the warming over the last 60 years is due to increases in greenhouse gas emissions due to human activity.”*

The same guesswork and recycled politicised IPCC claims being promoted as scientific evidence while contradictory evidence is completely omitted.

- ***“This trend is continuing: the second half of 2009 was the warmest on record for Australia and 2010 was one of the hottest years in the instrumental climate record.”***

Although the CSIRO claims “2010 was one of the hottest years in the instrumental climate record”, in the above publication, ‘**State of the Climate 2012**’, they point out that 2010 was the **coolest** year since 2001. Strange, when it comes to cooling and increasing rain, short term changes, even as long as a decade, the experts keep claiming this has nothing to do with climate and does not contradict their AGW theory in any way. According to the CSIRO (69): *“Data over the past decade provide little insight into long-term trends; the period is simply too short.”* We continually hear claims that 2009 was the hottest year on record, but what does this matter if short term changes are irrelevant? The message from the CSIRO seems to be that short term changes of a decade or less are irrelevant unless they can be used to support the AGW case.

“It is difficult to characterise long-term changes in Australian rainfall amidst this background of large, natural, year-to-year and decade-to-decade variability. For instance, while much of southern Queensland and northern New South Wales experienced (on average) severe and prolonged dry periods in recent decades, the longer term trend is not sufficiently clear to be able to distinguish whether these recent dry periods are different from the large decade-to-decade variability that is a natural feature of climate in these regions. Indeed, record- and drought-breaking rain during 2010 across Queensland and NSW is consistent with long-term natural variability.”

Nature causes the rain, man causes the heat and drying? Is this guesswork again, or are we talking hard scientific facts here?

- ***“The combination of observations and climate models are currently the best tools available to differentiate the natural and human-induced effects on the climate system because experimentation with real climate systems is not practically possible. Experiments using climate models typically include increasing greenhouse gases, changing solar radiation, changing atmospheric aerosols due to***

volcanoes and industrial pollution, and changing stratospheric ozone. These models, harnessing the strength of modern computing power, have been shown to be skilful enough in their representation of the real climate system to provide meaningful insights into the causes of recent climate change."

According to Professor Steven Sherwood, in summarising the predictions of climate models, the estimates (66) "**must be taken with a grain of salt**" because of the variability between the models. "They don't all predict the same outcome, so a large range can sometimes appear - but this probably represents the best we can do at the moment,"....."**Of course there is no guarantee that the actual outcome will even be within this range, all the models could be off. But if the models are wrong, it is just as likely to be in the direction of underestimating change rather than overestimating it. Either way, it's better to be safe than sorry and we need to reduce greenhouse emissions now while we still can before it's too late.**" Models it seems, are very unreliable, their predictions possibly being completely out of touch with reality. But, according to science we have nothing better, so why not take an each way bet? Once again it is clear that when it comes to climate science, particularly politicised climate science, a much lower standard of evidence is required than is acceptable in other branches of science. **But why has the CSIRO gone to such extraordinary lengths to lower the acceptable standard of evidence when it comes to climate science?**

- "Studies have linked most of the warming in global temperatures in the past 100 to 120 years, especially in the last 50 years, to increasing greenhouse gases and the enhanced greenhouse effect. It is extremely unlikely that the observed global-scale warming is due to natural variability. Simulations of the last 100 years of climate that include both human and natural influences on climate successfully reproduce observed patterns of global temperature change, whereas simulations that do not include human factors fail to reproduce the observed patterns. This contrast indicates that recent changes in temperature cannot be explained adequately by natural causes alone. Consistency between warming over land and warming over oceans during the 20th century provides further evidence that temperature changes are real rather than an artefact of recording practices. This is because land and sea temperatures are recorded very differently and are influenced by quite different factors, yet they reveal the same patterns of warming. **It generally is easier to attribute changes in temperature over large regions, such as the globe or a hemisphere, to greenhouse gas increases than it is to attribute regional temperature changes.** This is because natural variability from year to year in individual regions is larger than it is over the globe as a whole, thereby making it more difficult to separate the effect of longer term changes from natural variability. **Nonetheless, studies have shown that changes in Australian regional temperatures are most likely due to greenhouse gas increases and not due to natural processes alone.**"

We have seen above what Professor Sherwood had to say about climate models. According to former CSIRO scientist Dr Art Raiche (7): "but now CSIRO. We can understand them very easily you see, because their climate researchers live in a state of altered reality; the second life; the state of computer models. In this world it doesn't seem to matter when measured data contradicts their model results..... The CSIRO.....They live in "Model World". They defend their projections because these are based on computer models of the earth's system, not on an extrapolation of observed regional trends."

- "Scientists have a much more difficult task attributing Australian rainfall changes to human induced climate change because it is difficult to separate naturally occurring drought from long-term declines in rainfall. The issue of largest interest has been the causes of the recent, long-term drought in the south-west and south-east of the continent. Drought conditions persisted in the south-east from around 1996 to 2010 (see Figure 1.2). Research has shown that some aspects of this drought are consistent with global warming, **but it has not been possible to unequivocally attribute this dry period to the enhanced greenhouse effect.** The drought in the south-west of WA has been particularly prolonged, such that it is often characterised as a long-term decline in rainfall, or an increase in aridity,

rather than drought. The reduction in rain has been linked with shifts in prevailing weather patterns (e.g. storms and cold fronts) and a general reduction in rainfall associated with those systems. Some of these changes have been shown to be consistent with human influences (greenhouse gas increases and decreases in stratospheric ozone) in combination with natural climate variability. Similarly, increased atmospheric pressure in the region, particularly in the subtropical ridge (a zone of high pressure or descending dry air across the southern half of the continent, associated with clear skies and low rainfall), has also been shown to be associated with the decline in rainfall across southern Australia, as well as being consistent with human-induced climate change.”

According to the CSIRO, “Scientists have a much more difficult task attributing Australian rainfall changes to human induced climate change” – Perhaps they should not try so hard!

- **“Sea-level rise and fall is nothing new and earlier populations have experienced large fluctuations in sea level. Geological records indicate that sea level peaked at between 6 m and 9 m higher than today during the last interglacial period, about 125 000 years ago. Sea level was more than 120 m below today’s levels at the peak of the last ice age (about 20 000 years ago). Rates of sea level rise coming out of the last ice age averaged about 1 m per century for many thousands of years, with maximum rates of 2–4 m a century. Sea level stabilised around 3000 years ago and archaeological data indicate a period of small rates of change in global averaged sea level for the 2000 years before about 1800. Sea level began to rise again in the late 19th century.”**

According to the CSIRO, “Sea-level rise and fall is nothing new and earlier populations have experienced large fluctuations in sea level.” So why is CSIRO now spreading so much alarm about human causation and how can we be definite that past reasons for sea level rise are now completely absent?

- **“The net effect of all these processes is a set of feedbacks that have an overall reinforcing effect. A doubling in CO₂ from pre-industrial levels (280 ppm) to around 550 ppm without feedbacks would result in a global warming of about 1°C. Factoring in the effects of water vapour and other ‘fast’ feedbacks, however, means that a CO₂ doubling will amplify the long-term average warming to about 3°C. This important number, called the ‘fast climate sensitivity’, is somewhat uncertain and could vary between 2° and 4.5°C according to IPCC estimates based on a range of climate models. The conclusion that water vapour and related feedbacks have an overall amplifying effect is critical. It can be substantiated entirely independently from climate models using ice-core records of climate fluctuations over the last 850 000 years. These show that small fluctuations in the Earth’s orbit around the Sun led to large changes in global temperature through the same set of feedbacks that operates to amplify the climate change from human emissions of CO₂ and other GHGs. These records yield a value of about 3°C for fast climate sensitivity to a doubling of CO₂, similar to the estimates from various climate models. Climate models indicate that it is also very likely that warming and other climate changes will continue and accelerate through the coming century if emissions of greenhouse gases continue to increase. Our growing understanding of the feedbacks that can both dampen and reinforce climate change suggest that, in aggregate, these feedbacks reinforce the warming trend. Ultimately, there is always a difficult-to-quantify risk of crossing an important threshold and triggering serious, unexpected change that is potentially irreversible for a long time.”**

The exaggerated use of feedbacks to support the AGW agenda has been noted and discredited by opposing scientists ([1](#), [58-59](#), [67-68](#)), however this evidence is excluded from this CSIRO publication.

- **“Climate change impacts will increasingly be experienced first through extreme events rather than gradual changes in mean temperature or rainfall. Consideration of current vulnerability to extreme events helps to establish the context for assessing changes in vulnerability due to future changes in extremes. Extreme weather and climatic events that we experience today are most likely a combination of climate variability combined with an underlying change in climate associated with anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions (see Chapter 1). The evidence for a human contribution**

through increases in greenhouse gases varies regionally and for different climate variables, and **it is very difficult to attribute specific causes to individual extreme weather events**. However, there are statistical methods for assessing whether an extreme event may have been made more likely because of increases in greenhouse gases. **Regardless of the cause**, it is important to understand the impacts of existing extreme weather and climate events and use these as a window into future climate change in an enhanced greenhouse world. **A good case study of how we can look at the impacts of current extreme events and assess their importance in the future is the Victorian bushfires event in early February 2009**, which killed 173 people and more than 1 million animals, destroyed more than 2000 homes, burnt about 430 000 hectares, and cost about \$4.4 billion. Conditions leading into that fire were extreme, with high temperatures, low humidity, high winds, and very dry fuel as a result of years of drought, all of which combined to produce an extreme forest fire danger index (FFDI). When the daily FFDI is greater than 50, the risk rating is 'Extreme' and a 'Total Fire Ban' is usually declared. The bushfires of February 2009 had a FFDI that greatly exceeded 100 in many locations and, as a consequence, an additional fire rating 'Catastrophic' has since been added to the rating system."

So, according to the CSIRO, "Climate change impacts will increasingly be experienced first through extreme events rather than gradual changes" even though they also claim "it is very difficult to attribute specific causes to individual extreme weather events." So although the cause cannot be established, we nevertheless know the cause is climate change, maybe even human caused climate change? So why mention the Victorian bush fires? Is the CSIRO attempting to insinuate the Victorian bushfires were caused by human caused climate change and therefore would be preventable with a CO2 tax? If not, why mention them? The Victorian bush fires were an absolute tragedy which should not be exploited for some kind of agenda.

- **"Water security, or reliability of water supply, in southern and eastern Australia is expected to decline in future as a result of reduced rainfall and higher rates of evaporation.** There is likely to be less water available for irrigation, domestic use, and industry, and lower environmental flows. For example, median stream flow in the Melbourne catchments is estimated to decline by 10% by 2030 and median stream flow in south-western Australia is estimated to decline by 25% by 2030."

These predictions are already humiliatingly out of date – the AGW theory needs yet another adjustment.

- **"The position of Australia relative to other countries in terms of emissions per person is shown in Figure 9.1 and in terms of energy sources in Table 9.1. This is the starting point for changes in mitigation strategies for Australia compared with the rest of the world.** For electricity production, Australia has over three times the greenhouse gas emissions per capita than the OECD average, while for transport Australia's per capita emissions are some 30% higher. Consequently, a significant portion of the future reductions in greenhouse gas abatement will need to come from these sectors. In broad terms, the modelling shows that, after taking into account the retirement of existing coal plants and some adoption of efficient vehicles and low-emission fuels, around one-third of the nation's energy greenhouse emissions savings could be expected to come from energy efficiency plus demand reduction, one-third from renewables, and one-third from carbon capture and storage."

According to CSIRO it is the per capita emissions which provide the basis for Australia's "mitigation strategies". From the point of view of the planet however, it is undeniably the total national and global emissions that matter, certainly not per capita emissions. But national emissions are of little interest to those who wish to control and discriminate against individuals. Discrimination on the basis of per capita emissions is an attempt to compare, penalise, and demonise specific individuals by applying some kind of fictitious assessment system. It is a new morality where a country's total CO2 level is averaged and fictitiously and unjustly applied to discriminate against individuals and their life style and lower everyone to the lowest common denominator. Within Australia, the averaging of emissions across the

population will penalise the lower socio-economic groups most severely as they pay the price for the high energy users. **Where is the scientific and moral justification for penalising and demonising individual Australians in such a discriminatory fashion? Where is the science showing that reducing the energy consumption of pensioners and indigenous people is more important for tackling climate than reducing the national emissions of China or America?**

- *“Demand reduction can be achieved in many ways, such as the use of ‘smart agents’ and ‘intelligent grids’. Here, sensors monitor and report information about energy use that can be used to manage supply and demand to a central controller. For example, systems that sense whether rooms are occupied – and that can regulate lighting, heating, and cooling accordingly – can reduce overall demand for power.”*

So the CSIRO supports direct central control of energy use by remotely taking control of consumer’s electrical appliances and turning off air conditioners etc [\(70-71\)](#).

- *“Hydro power has limited large-scale expansion opportunities in Australia due to **public aversion** to the large-scale impacts on river systems, limited accessible sites, and **declining rainfall in the south**.”*

Public aversion and declining rainfall – in the midst of widespread floods? Where is the scientific evidence? And what about public aversion against the CO2 tax, or doesn’t that matter?

Concluding Comment

Once again there is no evidence that the CSIRO, with their “**Climate Change: Science and Solutions for Australia**” publication, have attempted to adopt a scientifically balanced perspective by specifically considering all the available scientific views. Contrary views are once again excluded. **In the absence of any scientific justification for discriminating against people on the basis of per capita emissions, this publication clearly endorses the current political agenda, as distinct from the scientific facts.**

4. **Drought: Exceptional Circumstances – CSIRO [\(64\)](#): Does this publication consider dissenting evidence and reflect the views of dissenting scientists? Is it a balanced scientific presentation?**

- *“About 50 per cent of the rainfall decrease in south western Australia since the late 1960s **is likely** to be due to increases in greenhouse gases. The autumn rainfall decline in south eastern Australia since the late 1950s **may be partly** due to increases in greenhouse gases. Given the **likely increase in the area of the globe affected by droughts in future**, this assessment examines how climate change may affect the concept of a one in 20-25 year event into the future for Australia. The strongest warming has occurred in the Queensland region, where rainfall has also declined markedly in both the far southwest and the southeast of Australia, the recent hydrological drought is significantly characterised by a near absence of very wet years, giving rise to drying soil profiles and low dam inflows. **Over Australia, a warmer and drier climate is expected.** Median estimates for 2030 indicate a warming of about 1°C, relative to 1990, with less warming near the coast and more warming inland, a 3 to 5% decrease in rainfall, with slightly larger decreases in central and south western areas and little change in the far north, and a 2 to 4% increase in potential evaporation (Figure 7).”*

As is made clear from the above **State of the Climate 2012** CSIRO report, these drought predictions forgot to allow for the flooding rains caused by natural climatic factors.

- *“Given that Australia is likely to become warmer, and drier in the south, it is likely there will be changes in the nature and frequency of exceptionally hot years, low rainfall years and low soil moisture years. A 10 per cent decrease in mean annual rainfall across most of Australia is a possible scenario by 2030 (see Section 3). This decrease roughly doubles the risk of exceptionally low rainfall in five of the study regions, and almost triples the risk for the Vic&Tas and SW WA regions. A 20 per cent mean rainfall decrease triples the risk of exceptionally low rainfall in the same five regions and increases by more than six-fold the risk for the Vic & Tas and SWWA regions.”*

As is made clear from the above **State of the Climate 2012** CSIRO report, these drought predictions forgot to allow for the flooding rains caused by natural climatic factors.

- *“There are four main sources of uncertainty in climate change science: (1) the projected increase in greenhouse gases; (2) the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and their atmospheric concentrations; (3) the global warming for a given change in concentrations; and (4) regional climate change. Since **nearly all models show decreased rainfall in the south**, with mixed results in the north, the model selection did not bias the rainfall projections. Using all 13 models represented a conservative approach.”*

Seems they forgot to mention the unreliability of models, the unpredictability of natural climate variability which may cause flooding rains even though the models suggest worsening drought, regional inconsistencies, and finally, the difficulties of attributing changes to humans.

Concluding Comment

Once again there is no evidence that the CSIRO, with their **“Drought: Exceptional Circumstances”** publication, have attempted to adopt a scientifically balanced perspective by considering all the available scientific views. Contrary views are once again excluded. The CSIRO again downplayed or ignored the effects of natural climate variation.

5. Climate change in Australian dairy regions– CSIRO (72): Does this publication consider dissenting evidence and reflect the views of dissenting scientists? Is it a balanced scientific presentation?

- *“Warming of the climate system over the past century is unequivocal and is now evident from a variety of observations. In Australia, temperatures have increased markedly since 1950, rainfall has increased in the northwest and decreased in the south and east, and **the last 5 to 10 years mark one of the most severe droughts in Australia’s history, partly because droughts have become hotter. Inflows to many Australian dams have declined significantly over the past decade.**”*

As is clear from the above **State of the Climate 2012** report, (since El Nino and La Nina are natural, ie not human caused), the **“hot droughts”** of the past century have been caused by nature and not by humans. Just to update the CSIRO, not only has rainfall increased, but so too have dam inflows. Another adjustment to the AGW theory may be needed.

- *“**Most** of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is **very likely** due to the observed increase in greenhouse gas concentrations due to human activities. In*

Australia, the mean warming and associated changes in extreme daily temperatures since the middle of the 20th century are **likely to be mostly** due to human-induced increases in greenhouse gases. The rainfall decrease in south-western Australia since the mid- 1970s is **likely to be partly due** to anthropogenic increases in greenhouse gases. **It is not yet possible to attribute rainfall decreases in eastern Australia, and rainfall increases in north-western Australia, to human activities."**

More guesswork and recycled politicised IPCC claims. More attempts to try and make the uncertainties appear acceptable and scientific.

- "Climate change projections for Australia were updated in October 2007. The regional projections are relative to the period 1980-1999, i.e. 20 years centred on 1990. The projections for 2030 give an estimate of the average climate around 2030 under future emission scenarios, taking into account the consistency among models. Individual years will, of course, show some variation from this average. In the dairy regions, **warmer and drier conditions are simulated, with increased evaporation and less runoff."**

Out of date – see above.

- "To represent the uncertainty due to differences between climate model results, probability distributions have been fitted to the range of results for temperature and rainfall. This allows presentation of a best estimate based on the 50th percentile (the mid-point of spread of model results), and a range of uncertainty based on 10th and 90th percentiles (lowest 10% and highest 10% of the spread of model results). It also allows the calculation of the probability of a change in climate being greater than a given threshold, based on the spread of model results. **The full range of uncertainty associated with projecting future global and regional climate change cannot be easily quantified. Changes outside the ranges given here cannot be excluded."**

This point confirmed by Professor Sherwood who states, as noted above, that model results should be taken with a (66) "**grain of salt.**" Not only do we have the intrinsic uncertainty of the climate system, but now the models are so variable we need to add "**probability distributions**" in an attempt to allow for model variation and uncertainty.

- "**Simulated changes in rainfall vary substantially between models. The majority of models indicate a decrease in rainfall over the coming decades.** Where at least two-thirds of spread of model results show a decrease in rainfall then decreasing rainfall is considered likely. Decreases are likely in southern areas in the annual average and in winter, in southern and eastern areas in spring, and along the west coast in autumn (Figure 14). Otherwise the models do not give a likely direction of rainfall change, although model ranges show a tendency to decrease in most cases. **In no region or season do models suggest a likely increase in rainfall."**

So the CSIRO admits, before the floods, "**In no region or season do models suggest a likely increase in rainfall.**" The wisdom of Sherwood's above advice is confirmed it seems.

- "Risk management is an iterative process, where scoping and risk identification usually takes place before more detailed assessments are carried out. **Care must be exercised when using projections in any risk assessment, particularly when selecting climate variables,** determining temporal and/or spatial resolution, and dealing with uncertainty. Detailed risk assessments generally require purpose-built climate projections, including time series, or probabilistic representations of future climate. Various tools have been developed which represent different methods for enhancing the delivery of climate information to stakeholders. Examples are given in Chapter 6 of the report by CSIRO and BoM (2007). **Nevertheless, significant challenges remain for communicating climate risk in ways that can be effectively used in risk management. The projections described above have been designed for raising awareness rather than for application in risk assessments."**

What is the point here? Is the CSIRO trying to point out that their climate projections are too shaky, wobbly, and airy fairy to be used for “*risk assessment*” and they are therefore only suitable for “*raising awareness*”? Is the CSIRO trying to point out that any old ‘airy fairy’ predictions are suitable for *raising awareness*? If so, point taken.

Concluding Comment

Once again there is no evidence that the CSIRO, with their “**Climate change in Australian Dairy Regions**” publication, have attempted to adopt a scientifically balanced perspective by considering all the available scientific views. Contrary views are once again excluded. The CSIRO again forgot to allow for natural climate variation. In underlining the complete inability of models to predict the recent flooding rains, the CSIRO have obviously completely destroyed the reliability and credibility of climate models. It is no wonder the CSIRO has drawn attention to the different levels of evidence required for “*raising awareness*” as distinct from calculating “*risk assessment*”. One detects here a very real awareness within CSIRO that their model projections are so shaky that something much more valid is needed when it comes to risk assessment. Indeed, the recent floods have confirmed their fears about the shakiness of their own models! But why is such flimsy evidence so suitable for “*raising awareness*”?

General Comments on Cited Publications

The above five CSIRO publications are highly visible and accessible and are used by CSIRO to promote their views on climate science and AGW and they therefore have a requirement for accuracy, balance, and freedom from bias. We have seen in our analysis that they fail on all 3 counts. The picture they paint is one of contradictions, imbalance, inaccuracy, and extreme selectiveness of sources with conflicting evidence totally excluded. Indeed, so complete is the exclusion of contrary points of view that the perception is created that CSIRO is an activist organisation which is supporting and campaigning for one side of the AGW debate while simultaneously trying to conceal the other side of the debate. Given the allegations of political and management gagging of CSIRO made by scientists and documented in **Part 1** of this report, it must be admitted that these results, though of course disappointing and extremely concerning, are not too surprising.

What is more surprising are the many areas where the CSIRO have made contradictory statements, repeatedly contradicting their own claims. Models are reliable, no they are not and they are not good enough for “*risk assessment*”; drought areas will be increasing, heavy rain will be increasing; 2010 was the warmest year, 2010 was the coolest year since 2001; droughts are caused by humans, droughts are caused by natural climate fluctuations; short term periods less than 1 decade are of no significance as indicators of climatic changes, but even 1 hot year supports the CSIRO theory of AGW; sea level is increasing alarmingly due to humans, but sea level has always been subjected to large variations even before any human emissions existed. These types of contradictions give the impression that the CSIRO theory of AGW is a ‘hotch potch’ theory which has been made on the run and has been endlessly stretched to fit changing circumstances.

It is interesting to note that although CSIRO has confirmed that Australia’s mitigation strategy is based upon per capita emissions and NOT national or global emissions ([41](#)), this defies the fundamental alleged planetary purpose of such strategies. According to CSIRO scientist Dr Stafford Smith, the interconnectedness of nations requires we adopt a global approach which is based upon the contribution of specific nations ([188](#), [191](#)).

Another surprising claim is the warning by CSIRO that their “**projections**” are simply not good enough for “**risk assessment**” since they are only intended to “**raise awareness**”. A number of points follow on from this.

1. CSIRO believes little or no evidence is necessary to “**raise awareness**”
2. CSIRO considers one of their primary tasks is to raise awareness by use of evidence which is insufficiently sound or accurate to provide a basis for “**risk assessment**”.
3. CSIRO is fully aware their projections have such a flimsy basis they would not stand up in court.

This latter point underlines the different standard of evidence required by scientists, lawyers, and politicians. Stone et al ([177](#)) point out, not surprisingly, that the level of evidence required by scientists, and by courts of law is higher than is commonly required by politicians: “*To date, courts have not accepted evidence from numerical models, but given the nature of the problem, it is hard to see how any reasonable attribution evidence could inform a liability case without using numerical models in some form....*” Given the CSIRO’s assessment that their model projections are too unreliable for the courts it would seem their standard of evidence could best be described as “political”. Of course this is also borne out by the popularity of so called consensus *science* when it comes to climate change, consensus being a political term rather than a scientific term.

One of the most conspicuous problems of CSIRO climate publications concerns the determination with which they have sought to redefine and disguise fundamental uncertainties and unknowns so they become more scientifically and politically acceptable. The fact that climate science has become so dedicated to accepting and disguising uncertainties rather than removing or eliminating them separates this branch of science from other branches of science. According to Risbey and Kandlikar ([198](#)):

“Every assessment of climate change is faced with the need to characterize and communicate uncertainties in the state of understanding.....The new formalisms are beginning to incorporate deeper forms of uncertainty, opening the door for more pluralistic conceptions of uncertainty in future assessments.”

The use of climate models continues to be controversial and the CSIRO have added to the confusion and controversy with their various claims. However, since those on the political or alarmist side of the debate continue to base their case for revolutionary political and economic change, and the spending of billions of dollars, upon the projections of computer models, it is prudent indeed to consider the words of the experts concerning the reliability of such models.

According to Professor Freeman Dyson, cited by Dr Raiche ([7](#)):

“Climate models do a very poor job of describing the clouds, the dust, the chemistry, the biology in the fields, the farms, the forests, they do not begin to describe the real world in which we live – one that is muddy and messy and full of things that we do not yet understand..... it’s much easier for scientists to sit in an air conditioned building and run computer models than to put on winter clothes and actually measure what’s going on outside in the swamps and clouds.”

These doubts about the reliability of models have been reinforced by the CSIRO/BOM report, ***Climate Change in Australia*** ([73](#)):

“Projections of global and regional climate change contain a large number of uncertainties. Predictability is limited by factors such as human behaviour and the uncertainties inherent in complex systems, such as chaotic behaviour and rapid changes in state. Uncertainty over future human behaviour affects emission scenarios, including future mitigation policies discussed in Section 4.1. Chaotic behaviour affects climate variability and

change on a range of scales, from everyday variability (well understood) to long-term rapid shifts in climate (less common and not well understood but observable in palaeo-climate proxy records). Such behaviour is a long-term property of climate (and all complex systems) and may potentially increase under global warming."

Further, according to the **Australian Government's Climate Change Health Risk Assessment in 2002**, prepared jointly by experts from the ANU, CSIRO and BOM ([127](#)):

"Climate models are most uncertain in how they represent feedback effects, particularly those dealing with changes to cloud regimes, biological effects, and ocean-atmosphere interactions. The coarse spatial resolution of climate models also remains a limitation on their ability to simulate the details of regional climate change, particularly in mountainous coastal areas. Future climate change will also be influenced by other factors, largely unpredictable, such as changes in solar radiation, volcanic eruptions and natural variations within the climate system itself. Rapid climate change (abrupt and non-linear changes in physical systems that could be irreversible) in response to the enhanced greenhouse effect is possible, but its likelihood cannot be defined (IPCC 2001c)."

When considering the limitations of models it is wise to remember proper scientific procedure, as we are reminded by Happer who cites the words of Richard Feynman ([128](#)):

"In general we look for a new law by the following process. First we guess it. Then we compute the consequences of the guess to see what would be implied if this law that we guessed is right. Then we compare the result of the computation to nature, with experiment or experience; compare it directly with observation, to see if it works. If it disagrees with experiment it is wrong."

Happer's citation of Feynman was appropriately paraphrased by Cohen ([129](#)):

"We guess the process, we compute the consequences of our guess, we compare our computations to direct observations of nature. If they disagree, we are wrong."

Happer concludes ([128](#)):

"The most important component of climate science is careful, long-term observations of climate-related phenomena, from space, from land, and in the oceans. If observations do not support code predictions—like more extreme weather, or rapidly rising global temperatures—Feynman has told us what conclusions to draw about the theory."

Perhaps Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery had the words of Feynman in mind when he commented ([130-131](#))

"We're dealing with an incomplete understanding of the way the earth system works... When we come to the last few years when we haven't seen a continuation of that (warming) trend we don't understand all of the factors that create earth's climate...We just don't understand the way the whole system works... See, these people work with models, computer modelling. So when the computer modelling and the real world data disagree you've got a very interesting problem... Sure for the last 10 years we've gone through a slight cooling trend."

It is abundantly clear from experts from both sides of the debate that models are much too unreliable to form the basis for future economic or political policies.

The main points of our survey of CSIRO climate change publications can be summarised:

1. The cited climate publications are totally biased and present only one side of the debate.
2. Conflicting evidence and dissenting scientists are excluded from these publications.

3. Cited climate publications are so consistently biased and selective in one direction that they resemble political advocacy or activist documents.
4. CSIRO climate data is itself contradictory and inconsistent.
5. When new evidence emerges that contradicts the theory of AGW, CSIRO seems to prefer to adjust the theory to fit the new circumstances rather than question the basis of the theory.
6. CSIRO climate science depends heavily upon accepting and disguising uncertainties and lowering the level of acceptable evidence so that uncertainties appear scientific.
7. CSIRO admit their climate projections are much too flimsy to form the basis of “risk assessments” and should only be used to “raise awareness”.
8. Following on from this it seems, according to CSIRO only very limited ‘evidence’ is necessary when the object is simply to “raise awareness”.

We have seen that the scientific community has expressed concern about political or management gagging of CSIRO scientists over a long period of time, and we have seen the biased and unbalanced nature of typical CSIRO climate change publications and their highly selective use of “evidence”. It is also clear that the bias in surveyed CSIRO climate change publications always seems to be in the one direction, namely, in support of alarmism and government policy.

Another marker of bias we have yet to consider is the way in which CSIRO handles criticism or scientific disputes regarding their sources. Since the CSIRO depends heavily upon the IPCC, an organisation which CSIRO scientists are heavily involved in, it is pertinent to consider recent controversies regarding the IPCC and check to see the ways these controversies have been dealt with by the CSIRO.

PART 3

The CSIRO and the IPCC: has the CSIRO been seen to be the driving force supporting IPCC reforms & strengthening IPCC scientific procedures?

IPCC Problems Identified by Scientists

CSIRO scientists are heavily involved in production of IPCC reports and depend heavily upon such reports in their own publications (72-77). CSIRO scientists who have contributed to IPCC reports are listed below (74).

Past & Present CSIRO Scientists Who have Contributed to IPCC Processes			
Nathan Bindoff	Kathy McInnes	Mark Howden	Richard Braithwaite
Wenju Cai	Ramasamy Suppiah	Nick Abel	Rosemary Buxton
Pep Canadell	Ian Watterson	Rob Allan	Steve Charles
John Church	Penny Whetton	Mike Austin	Francis Chiew
Mark Collier	Bryson Bates	Greg Ayers	Tom Denmead
Martin Dix	Donna Green	Peter Baines	Nada Derek
David Etheridge	Kevin Hennessy	Bryson Bates	Martin Dix
Paul Fraser	Alistair Hobday	Tom Beer	Ian Enting
Mike Raupach	Roger Jones	Simon Bentley	David Etheridge
Steve Rintoul	Kathy McInnes	Reinout Boers	Jenny Evans
Leon Rotstayn	Barrie Pittock	Willem Bouma	Roger Farrow
Sue Faragher	Margaret Friedel	Roger Gifford	Dean Graetz

Roger Francey	Ian Galbally	Stuart Godfrey	Chris Mitchell
Jorgen Frederiksen	John Garratt	Hal Gordon	Andrew Moore
John Gras	Glen Kile	Trevor McDougall	Siobhan O'Farrell
Graeme Harris	Miko Kirschbaum	Richard Matear	John Parslow
Roger Hughes	Paul Kriedemann	Angus McEwan	Graeme Pearman
Barrie Hunt	Tony Koslow	John McGregor	Leon Rotstayn
Roger Jones	John Landsberg	Ross McMurtrie	Brian Ryan
Martine Platt	Ian Poiner	John Raison	Keith Ryan
Jack Katzfey	Jason Lutze	Mick Meyer	Ian Smith
Ian Plumb	Lakshman Randeniya	Peter Rayner	Mark Stafford Smith
Paul Steele	Ron Thresher	Brian Walker	Ian Watterson
Robert Sutherst	Brian Tucker	Kevin Walsh	Richard Williams
Josef Syktus	Peter Vohralik	Ying Ping Wang	Susan Wijffels

Given the close link between the CSIRO and the IPCC, and the fact that the CSIRO readily endorses and depends upon IPCC reports, it is of great concern when the integrity and reliability of the IPCC is questioned. But the integrity and professionalism of the IPCC is being increasingly questioned by scientists from around the world ([51-52](#), 78-103, [139](#), [152](#)), including former lead authors of the IPCC who have witnessed the workings of the IPCC from the inside. These are led by world famous climate experts such as Professor Richard Lindzen and Professor John Christy, both of whom, being former lead authors of the IPCC, have 'blown the whistle' on that organisation and its unscientific methodology.

According to Professor John Christy for instance ([104](#)):

"I have served as a Lead Author of both the IPCC and CCSP reports and will demonstrate with published data that these reports are not always "factual" but written (a) to give the impression of certainty where large uncertainty is the reality or (b) to actually suppress results which run counter to the more alarming conclusions. And, more importantly, the "consensus" exercise is a false scientific process because the authors tend to write about their own publications.....the great majority of the IPCC authors were, on the one hand, not climate scientists and were, on the other hand, pre-approved by their governments in a political process. This should lead to considerable caution when interpreting their statements – the reports had as their final editors those who were appointed by the political process. Thus, scientific results deemed inconsistent with personal views of the authors were far less likely to be considered in the reports.....A fundamental notion contained in the IPCC and CCSP reports, and stated in the EPA quote above, is that climate models are capable of producing "facts" when in fact they cannot. They are models – which means they are the sum of the assumptions and prejudices of the organizations building the models (and do rather poorly when measured against the real world as shown later.) Here is a simple fact: There is no instrument that can measure Earth's temperature change which can unambiguously determine what part of the temperature change might be due to humans and what part might be due to nature.... Claims as to how much of the change is due to humans are found only in model assumptions and simulations ... not in direct observation. Therefore, it is faith in model simulations (and their assumptions) that drives the notion that major variations in the climate are due to greenhouse gases."

And according to Professor Richard Lindzen, IPCC reports are politicised and unscientific, misrepresent scientists, and are not subject to proper peer review ([105-106](#)):

"Senator Inhofe was absolutely right. All that's coming out Friday is a summary for policymakers that is not prepared by scientists. Rob is wrong. It's not 2,500 people offering their consensus, I participated in that. Each person who is an author writes one or two pages in conjunction with someone else. They travel around the world several times a year for several years to write it and the summary for policymakers has the input of about 13 of the scientists, but ultimately, it is written by representatives of governments, of environmental organizations like the Union of Concerned Scientists, and industrial organizations, each seeking their own benefit."

As is noted by Solomon, Lindzen also drew attention to the dictatorial atmosphere in which IPCC scientists worked ([136](#)):

"The summaries' distortion of the IPCC chapters compounds another distortion that occurred in the very writing of the scientific chapters themselves. Dr. Lindzen's description of the conditions under which the climate scientists worked conjures up a scene worthy of a totalitarian state: 'throughout the drafting sessions, IPCC 'coordinators' would go around insisting that criticism of models be toned down, and that 'motherhood' statements be inserted to the effect that models might still be correct despite the cited faults. Refusals were occasionally met with ad hominem attacks. I personally witnessed co-authors forced to assert their 'green' credentials in defense of their statements'."

According to Lindzen ([124](#)), chapter 12 of the **Scientific Assessment of Climate Change**, a volume of the **IPCC Third Assessment Report**, provided the following **draft statement** of the **Summary for Policymakers**:

"From the body of evidence since IPCC (1996), we conclude that there has been a discernible human influence on global climate. Studies are beginning to separate the contributions to observed climate change attributable to individual external influences, both anthropogenic and natural. This work suggests that anthropogenic greenhouse gases are a substantial contributor to the observed warming, especially over the past thirty years. However, the accuracy of these estimates continues to be limited by uncertainties in estimates of internal variability, natural and anthropogenic forcing, and the climate response to external forcing."

As Lindzen points out ([124](#)), the qualifications and uncertainties emphasised in this draft statement make it somewhat credible, though there is plenty of room for improvement. However, the final version of this statement in the Summary for Policymakers is considerably more inaccurate and deceptive ([124](#)):

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

Lindzen concludes ([124](#)): **"in point of fact, the impact of man remains indiscernible simply because the signal is too small compared to the natural noise."**

Lindzen describes concerns about global warming as "hysteria" ([121](#)):

"Perhaps the most impressive exploitation of climate science for political purposes has been the creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) by two UN agencies, UNEP (United Nations Environmental Program) and WMO (World Meteorological Organization), and the agreement of all major countries at the 1992 Rio Conference to accept the IPCC as authoritative..... This paper has attempted to show how changes in the structure of scientific activity over the past half century have led to extreme vulnerability to political manipulation. In the case of climate change, these vulnerabilities have been exploited to a remarkable extent..... As concerns the specific dangers pertaining to the climate change issue, we are already seeing that the tentative policy moves associated with 'climate mitigation' are contributing to deforestation, food riots, potential trade wars, inflation, energy speculation and overt corruption.... Although society is undoubtedly aware of the imperfections of science, it has rarely encountered a situation such as the current global warming hysteria where institutional science has so thoroughly committed itself to policies which call for massive sacrifices in well being world wide."

Lindzen summarises ([106](#)): **"There's little doubt that the IPCC process has become politicized to the point of uselessness."**

Similarly, according to Hayward and colleagues ([107](#)):

"The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) new Summary for Policymakers (SPM) of its Synthesis Report (SR) should be taken with several chunks of salt.¹ The summary itself is a political document that downplays assessments of uncertainty from the scientific reports written by the main body of the IPCC,

which themselves are far more subjective than the IPCC would have one believe. Equally important, both the IPCC's Summaries and main reports omit much contrary evidence. In several cases, the SR disagrees with the reports on which it is based, and it fails to take account of cautionary publications in the scientific literature that were available early enough to have been incorporated into the SR. Climate change and climate policy are key issues for future human welfare, but that concern should translate into sober analysis and actions that are likely to do more good than harm. The people of the world should not let themselves be steamrolled by a report that reflects the IPCC's interest in promoting climate change fears, rather than in conveying the weight of the scientific evidence."

The confessions of Professor Christopher Landsea in his resignation letter to the IPCC are particularly illuminating and underline IPCC scientific corruption and misrepresentations ([108](#)):

"After some prolonged deliberation, I have decided to withdraw from participating in the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns..... It is beyond me why my colleagues would utilize the media to push an unsupported agenda that recent hurricane activity has been due to global warming. Given Dr. Trenberth's role as the IPCC's Lead Author responsible for preparing the text on hurricanes, his public statements so far outside of current scientific understanding led me to concern that it would be very difficult for the IPCC process to proceed objectively with regards to the assessment on hurricane activity..... The IPCC leadership saw nothing to be concerned with in Dr. Trenberth's unfounded pronouncements to the media, despite his supposedly impartial important role that he must undertake as a Lead Author on the upcoming AR4..... a scientist with an important role in the IPCC who represented himself as a Lead Author for the IPCC [Dr. Trenberth] has used that position to promulgate to the media and general public his own opinion that the busy 2004 hurricane season was caused by global warming, which is in direct opposition to research written in the field and is counter to conclusions in the TAR..... Because of Dr. Trenberth's pronouncements, the IPCC process on our assessment of these crucial extreme events in our climate system has been subverted and compromised, its neutrality lost..... I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by preconceived agendas and being scientifically unsound. As the IPCC leadership has seen no wrong in Dr. Trenberth's actions and have retained him as a Lead Author for the AR4, I have decided to no longer participate in the IPCC AR4."

But Australian scientists, including former CSIRO scientists, have also drawn attention to the shoddy unscientific practices of the IPCC and IPCC's version of climate 'science' ([1](#), [7](#), 53, [55](#), [57-58](#), 109-117). According to Dr John Reid for instance ([1](#)):

"The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not. If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. The IPCC claims to have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid."

Dr David Evans, formerly of the Australian Greenhouse Office, emphasises the disturbing political agenda behind global warming ([111](#)):

"The debate about global warming has reached ridiculous proportions and is full of micro-thin half-truths and misunderstandings. I am a scientist who was on the carbon gravy train, understands the evidence, was once an alarmist, but am now a skeptic. Watching this issue unfold has been amusing but, lately, worrying. This issue is tearing society apart, making fools and liars out of our politicians. The whole idea that carbon dioxide is the main cause of the recent global warming is based on a guess that was proved false by empirical evidence during the 1990s. But the gravy train was too big, with too many jobs, industries, trading profits, political careers, and the possibility of world government and total control riding on the outcome. So rather than admit they were wrong, the governments, and their tame climate scientists, now cheat and lie outrageously to maintain the fiction that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant."

These Australian scientists are joined by an exceedingly long line of international scientists whose concerns about the unscientific practices of the IPCC has compelled them to also expose the deceit inherent in this organisation. Let us see what just a few of these scientists have to say:

Dr Robert Balling: *"The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected." (This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers).*

Dr. Lucka Bogataj: *"Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don't cause global temperatures to rise.... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed."*

Dr John Christy: *"Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."*

Dr Robert Davis: *"Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers."*

Dr Willem de Lange: *"In 1996, the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3,000 "scientists" who agreed that there was a discernable human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."*

Dr Vincent Gray: *"The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."*

Dr Kenneth Green: *"We can expect the climate crisis industry to grow increasingly shrill, and increasingly hostile toward anyone who questions their authority."*

Dr Georg Kaser: *"This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing,"*

Dr Aynsley Kellow: *"I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."*

Dr Madhav Khandekar: *"I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."*

Dr Hans Labohm: *"The alarmist passages in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."*

Dr. Andrew Lacis: *"There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department."*

Dr Richard Lindzen: *"The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."*

Dr Philip Lloyd: *"I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."*

Dr Martin Manning: *"Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."*

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: *"The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."*

Dr Roger Pielke: *"All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."*

Dr Jan Pretel: *"It's nonsense to drastically reduce emissions ... predicting about the distant future-100 years can't be predicted due to uncertainties."*

Dr Paul Reiter: *"As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."*

Dr Murray Salby: *"I have an involuntary gag reflex whenever someone says the 'science is settled. Anyone who thinks the science is settled on this topic is in fantasia."*

Dr Tom Segalstad: *"The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."*

Dr Fred Singer: *"Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"*

Dr Roy Spencer: *"The IPCC is not a scientific organization and was formed to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. Claims of human-cause global warming are only a means to that goal."*

Dr Richard Tol: *"The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices."*

Because of the international avalanche of criticism directed at the IPCC, and the Climategate email scandal ([122-123,138](#)), the IPCC engaged the **Inter Academy Council** (IAC) to review IPCC procedures. The above criticisms by scientists from around the world were reinforced by the IAC review of the IPCC ([19-20](#)). Some of the main criticisms of the IPCC by the IAC include the following ([20](#)).

1. Unclear means of choosing IPCC authors which may result in authors being chosen on political grounds rather than in accord with scientific qualifications.
2. IPCC policy results in inclusion of non peer-reviewed data in their reports but the use of such possibly flawed data is not necessarily identified as non-peer reviewed in the reports. In other words, IPCC policy enables the disguising of suspect data sources within their reports. See Himalayan glaciers fiasco.
3. IPCC reports favour confirmation bias and suppression or inadequate consideration of opposing points of view. Lead authors are permitted to censor or exclude opposing viewpoints. See Himalayan glaciers fiasco.
4. IPCC processes authorise political editing of scientific reports to maximise their acceptability to governments in the final Summary for Policymakers. As a result of this process the Summary for Policymakers tends to be a more sensationalised and less scientific document. For instance, **in the 1995 report, scientists state 5 times there is no evidence of humans causing global warming (Is there new evidence since then?) Yet the summary of the 1995**

report reads *“The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate”*.

5. Unspecified authorship criteria and political interference of Synthesis Reports.
6. IPCC processes do not deal adequately with the inherent uncertainties of climate science. This includes statements of certainty when there is little supportive evidence and the use of vague difficult to refute statements to imply a level of certainty. Downplaying or ignoring uncertainties has led to many errors in IPCC reports. Furthermore, the origin of such mistakes is often not traceable due to the fact the IPCC does not require accountability in this respect.
7. IPCC Chairman should be suitably qualified in climate or allied science, unlike present Chair Rajendra K. Pachauri who has a background in railway and mechanical engineering.
8. The IPCC does not exclude anyone with a conflict of interest as they have no conflict of interest policy.
9. IPCC leaders make non-scientific public statements which could be construed as flagrant political statements.
10. IPCC is very slow and reluctant to publicly acknowledge errors.

But all this is not too surprising given the fact that the climate change debate is more about politics than science ([124](#)):

“The public discourse on global warming has little in common with the standards of scientific discourse. Rather, it is part of political discourse, where comments are made to secure the political base and frighten the opposition, not illuminate issues. In political discourse, information is to be “spun” to reinforce preexisting beliefs and to discourage opposition. The chief example of the latter is the claim of universal scientific agreement. This claim was part of the media treatment of global cooling (in the 1970s) and has been part of the treatment of global warming since 1988 (well before most climate change institutes were created). The consensus preceded the research. The fact that media discourse on climate change is political rather than scientific should come as no surprise. However, even scientific literature and institutions have become politicized.....Unfortunately, a significant part of the scientific community appears committed to the notion that alarm may be warranted. Alarm is felt to be essential to the maintenance of funding. The argument is no longer over whether the models are correct (they are not), but rather whether their results are at all possible. It is impossible to prove that something is impossible. The global warming issue parts company with normative science at an early stage. A good indicator of this disconnect is widespread and rigorous scientific agreement that the Kyoto Protocol would have no discernible impact on climate. This clearly is of no importance to the thousands of negotiators, diplomats, regulators, general-purpose bureaucrats, and advocates whose livelihood is tied to climate alarmism.”

In spite of the IAC review, in spite of Climategate, and in spite of criticisms from scientists around the world, the IPCC continues to stubbornly refuse to implement significant reforms and correct inadequacies and corruption of its scientific procedures. As a result of his review of the IPCC, and the IPCC’s failure to implement effective reforms, Prof Ross McKittrick made the following recommendations ([118](#)):

Recommendation 1: An objective and transparent Lead Author selection procedure.

Recommendation 2: A transparent Contributing Author recruitment process.

Recommendation 3: Appointment of an Editorial Advisory Board and identification of potentially controversial sections.

Recommendation 4: Explicit assignment of both section authorship and reviewer positions.

Recommendation 5: Adoption of an iterative process to achieve a final text under the joint supervision of authors, reviewers and editors.

Recommendation 6: Adoption of a procedure for seeking technical input when necessary from outside the list of authors and reviewers during the assessment process.

Recommendation 7: Due diligence regarding key supporting papers and full disclosure of all data and methods used to produce original IPCC Figures and Tables.

Recommendation 8: Immediate online publication of the full report upon finalization, prior to production of summary.

Recommendation 9: Production of Summary by Ad Hoc group appointed by the Panel based on recommendations from the Editorial Advisory Board.

Recommendation 10: Release of all drafts, review comments, responses and author correspondence records within 3 months of online publication of the full report.

Recommendation 11: That the nations involved in the IPCC Panel begin these reforms at once, and if such a process cannot be initiated then those national governments that seek objective and sound advice on climate change issues should withdraw from the IPCC and begin the process of creating a new assessment body free of the deficiencies identified herein.

However, given the well known political agenda of the UN ([194](#)), these reforms may not go anywhere near far enough. The fact that the IPCC tends to ignore criticisms and oppose positive reforms is abundantly clear. Any genuine scientific organisation should be actively seeking to identify and address weaknesses but the opposite is true in the case of the IPCC. The conflict of interest between the political and environmental aspirations of the UN creates insurmountable problems which dictate that the best course of action may be to completely dissolve the IPCC and return the control of environmental policy to sovereign nations.

We have seen the bias of CSIRO climate change publications, their selective use of scientific 'evidence' and their exclusion of any opposing evidence. Have they drawn attention to the abovementioned shortcomings of the IPCC? Have they been seen to be leading the way forward to constantly improve and refine IPCC processes? Or, on the other hand, have they turned a blind eye to the shortcomings of the IPCC, pretended there is no problem, and resisted change. Has the CSIRO been complicit in the distortions and misrepresentations of climate science by the IPCC?

The Role of the CSIRO: Has the CSIRO been complicit in IPCC misrepresentations of science or the driving force behind IPCC reforms to constantly improve IPCC processes?

Given the fact that the IPCC has been discredited by scientists around the world, including former lead authors of the IPCC, and these scientists have been backed up by the IAC review of the IPCC, where does the CSIRO stand? As has been noted by Carter in respect of the alarming IPCC/CSIRO sea level predictions ([119](#)):

"The CSIRO and the Bureau of Meteorology, at official level, have consistently supported the IPCC sea-level projections as valid and accurate, as indeed has the government-appointed Coasts and Climate Change Council. To make matters worse, the IPCC sea-level predictions are for an entirely notional statistic, global average sea-level. Astonishingly, the predictions have been adopted uncritically as the basis for local planning."

Carter continues ([119](#)):

"As long ago as 1996 a former president of the US National Academy of Sciences, Frederick Seitz, commented on its second assessment report on global warming that "I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report".

Subsequently, successive scandals have engulfed the IPCC, and destroyed the credibility of its claimed "gold standard" of science summary and peer-review.

These scandals are well described in several easily accessible publications, and include such things as statistical chicanery related to the global temperature "hockey stick" (a faulty analysis of ancient tree ring measurements

used to reconstruct global temperatures), a biased and dysfunctional peer-review process, the Climategate affair (leaked emails from Britain's Climatic Research Unit that contained abundant evidence of scientific malfeasance by leading IPCC scientists), the Glaciergate affair (inaccurate anecdotal evidence about Himalayan glacier melt in an IPCC report) and the infiltration of IPCC advisory panels and authors by environmental activists and partisan researchers.

*Public reaction to these scandals has included calls for the IPCC be disbanded or that its chairman, Rajendra Pachauri resign, with former German chancellor Helmut Schmidt even recommending an IPCC audit be undertaken because "some of their researchers have shown themselves to be fraudsters (betrueger)". **In such circumstances, that Australian governments still use IPCC advice about sea-level change as their guide for coastal planning is hard to understand, when site-specific measurements of actual Australian change are readily available."***

Carter asks the following critical question ([119](#)):

"Why do Australian governments still draw their advice about sea-level change from the IPCC, a discredited international political agency that is now known to flout conventional scientific and peer-review procedures in favour of promulgating environmental activism?"

One of the main reasons of course is that Australian scientific organisations such as the CSIRO still endorse the IPCC. According to CSIRO Group Executive, Dr Andrew Johnson (pers commun, 21/7/2011):

"CSIRO stands by the work of its scientists that appears in the IPCC reports. CSIRO has contributed extensively to the IPCC. More than 100 Australian experts, authors, contributors and reviewers have been involved in the IPCC process since 2001, including 35 CSIRO scientists. They were among more than 3000 scientists who contributed to the understanding of climate change impacts and adaptation, risk, and opportunities for mitigation collated by the IPCC in its Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) in 2007."

Clearly, according to Johnson, the CSIRO continues to fully endorse the IPCC, and therefore continues to fully endorse the shoddy scientific practices of the IPCC which have been criticised by the IAC review and also by scientists from around the world. It is no wonder the CSIRO has NOT been seen to be actively pursuing reforms to strengthen the scientific processes of the IPCC.

We have seen that, according to the Australian and International scientific community, the CSIRO has become increasingly politicised over the past 1-2 decades, a process which has been occurring simultaneously in The National Academy of Science in the USA and the Royal Society in Britain ([120](#)). As a **scientific organisation** the role of the CSIRO is to constantly test, refine, and improve scientific procedures, and to do so in a scientific and unbiased manner. Scientific theories should be constantly challenged and either disproved or strengthened. As a **political organisation** on the other hand, it is the task of the CSIRO to adopt a deliberately biased position and publicise and give priority to any evidence which can be used to promote government policy. Simultaneously of course, CSIRO would be required to ignore, suppress or discredit any evidence which may undermine or contradict government policy. As has recently been noted by Lindzen ([56](#), [120](#)) in respect of the Royal Society, such scientific organisations are endorsing policy even **before the science is settled**, thus abrogating their role as scientific institutions and assuming a new role of political advocacy organisations. According to Lindzen ([56](#)):

"If the government wants carbon control, that is the answer that the Academies will provide. Nothing could better epitomize the notion of science in the service of politics – something that, unfortunately, has characterized so-called climate science.

Has the CSIRO also been adopting a biased position in support of government policy, and has the CSIRO also been seen to be endorsing policy **before** the science is settled?

Sadly, it seems the CSIRO is also dancing to the tune of their puppet masters in Canberra and in the UN. During her address to the National Press Club in 2009, CSIRO CEO Dr Megan Clark made it quite clear that the CSIRO is no longer a scientific organisation with her political statements that Australia needs to put a price on carbon (75):

“our approach to science must change.....particularly in a world where water, carbon and biodiversity will have prices and a markets.....Living in a world where carbon has a value and irrigation water is restricted means new choices and trade-offs.....As we adjust to a world where carbon has a value.”

And in 2011, Dr Clark endorsed government climate policy again with her claim that Australia must (47, 125) “put a price on carbon”. The CSIRO of course, defended Dr Clark (A. Johnson, pers commun, 21/7/2011):

*“You refer to comments made by Chief Executive Dr Megan Clark during the Greenhouse 2011 conference as evidence of CSIRO as a political organisation. Those comments were made in the context of the journalist’s questioning and clearly were phrased to indicate that placing a price on carbon is one option amongst several others “Clearly we need a price on carbon and policy response but we also need sustainable technologies that will take us into a low carbon future and also our change in behaviours.” Some commentators have interpreted this comment as advocating a carbon tax: this was not the intent and the comment repeated previous public statements that placing a value on carbon, like water, is a valid market mechanism. To be clear, if Dr Clark had advocated for a tax on carbon then she would have been in breach of our public comment policy. Stating that placing a value (price) on carbon by some (unspecified) mechanism as part of the policy mix is consistent with our public comment policy that “**staff may discuss options for policy development based upon scientific work, and explore scenarios stemming from such options, while avoiding direct comment upon government or opposition policy**”. Indeed we regularly make public comment on policy options, including carbon and water, for example in our submissions to parliamentary inquiries.”*

But Dr Clark’s claim that (47, 125) “we need a price on carbon and policy response but we also need sustainable technologies that will take us into a low carbon future”, is almost identical to the words of Prime Minister Julia Gillard (126), “this decision, to put a price on carbon, is a major reform to build a clean energy future.” Interestingly, both Julia Gillard and Megan Clark preferred to adopt the more politically acceptable term, “**price on carbon**” rather than a “**price on carbon dioxide**”.

The bottom line is however, unless Clark’s call for a “price on carbon” has a sound scientific basis then it is unquestionably deliberate political advocacy.

The government’s call for a “price on carbon” is based upon the discredited, contradictory and unscientific AGW claims of the IPCC as noted above (40). The standard of evidence used by the IPCC, and accepted and endorsed by the CSIRO, is of fundamental importance.

Standard of Evidence that is Acceptable to the CSIRO

The government’s CO2 tax/ETS policy is based upon their claims that humans are causing an alarming or catastrophic increase in temperatures, sea levels, droughts, and floods as a result of increased CO2 emissions. According to the government, they can control all these adverse climatic events by lowering CO2 emissions by “*putting a price on carbon*”. Are these claims scientific or political? Since this government policy threatens to destroy the Australian economy and change the lives of all Australians it must surely be based upon conclusive scientific evidence. No, it is based upon IPCC distortions, guesswork, and politicisation of the final IPCC report, as noted above. Let us briefly examine the ‘scientific’ basis of Megan Clark’s advocacy of a *price on carbon*.

Firstly, a price on carbon is claimed to be necessary because humans are causing a catastrophic degree of global warming. According to the CSIRO (40): “***It is very likely (at least 90 per cent likelihood) that most of the observed global warming since the mid-20th century is due to increases***

in greenhouse gases from human activities. Human activities also have influenced ocean warming, sea-level rise, and temperature extremes."

Forgetting for the moment that this claim originated from a politicised IPCC report where uncertainties were presented as being scientific, this standard of 'scientific evidence' which the CSIRO finds acceptable to justify a carbon price is the probability that *there is a 90% chance that 51% (ie "most") "of the observed global warming since the mid-20th century is due to increases in greenhouse gases from human activities."* Of course this also overlooks the fact that CSIRO model projections are also so unreliable it has been recommended they be taken with a "**grain of salt**". **So does the CSIRO consider this same standard of evidence is acceptable in other branches of science such as medical science, or nuclear science? Or has the CSIRO made a special effort to lower the acceptable standard of evidence in politically sensitive areas such as climate science?**

Clearly, the 'science' of human causation is very much uncertain and unsettled. But there are various other reasons why Megan Clark's advocacy of a price on carbon is political rather than scientific.

- CSIRO admits natural climate variability is responsible for major droughts and wet periods thereby making an AGW signal impossible to quantify and confirm. Again, the science is most definitely NOT settled.
- There is no convincing scientific evidence of effectiveness, that is the ability of a CO2 tax to lower global temperature and sea level and regulate rainfall has not been scientifically demonstrated.
- In regional areas, scientific evidence is even more lacking. According to Kevin Hennessy of the CSIRO and Scott Power of the Bureau of Meteorology ([178-180](#)): "*Trends in climate are evident over the Pacific as a whole, including the PCCSP region, however the extent to which these trends are attributable to natural variability and to human activities is not yet well understood.*" "*little research has been conducted to quantify the relative importance of human-induced change and natural variability as causes of the observed trends in the PCCSP region.*" **So Megan Clark is endorsing a price on carbon in the absence of any evidence of effectiveness and even before natural variability can be differentiated from human caused changes.**
- According to CSIRO ([41](#)), government mitigation strategies for Australia (ie price on carbon) are NOT based upon total national emissions but rather are based upon per capita emissions. But where is the scientific evidence that a per capita emission strategy will have more effect upon climate than lowering total national emissions? CSIRO has yet to produce any scientific evidence of this.

Suggestions that Megan Clark's advocacy of a carbon price is based upon sound scientific evidence rather than political policy are clearly unsustainable unless and until the science confirming human causation and reversibility is settled. Since the science is a very long way from being settled, Clark's endorsement of a carbon price is clearly based upon something other than science.

So has the CSIRO been acting as a political organisation or a scientific organisation?

CSIRO scientists continue to complain of political interference. CSIRO climate change publications appearing on their web site are extremely biased in a direction which is supportive of government policy. And the CSIRO has continued to support the shoddy unscientific practices of the IPCC while simultaneously maintaining a deafening silence about reforms to strengthen the scientific processes of that organisation.

As a scientific organisation the CSIRO has a duty to constantly re-examine and challenge the science behind climate change. It has failed. The CSIRO has a clear duty to lead the way forward by constantly refining and improving IPCC procedures. It has failed. When distinguished lead authors of the IPCC observe serious scientific problems with the IPCC, the CSIRO has a duty to initiate their own investigation. It has failed. And when scientific reviews of the IPCC find fundamental problems, the CSIRO should be seen to be pushing for and implementing scientific reforms. It has failed. CSIRO policy and public statements should be confined to science not politics or political policies. It has failed.

In summary, evidence clearly indicates, especially when it comes to climate change, CSIRO has been acting very much as a political organisation for the following reasons.

1. **CSIRO climate change publications reveal an extreme degree of bias in a direction which is supportive of government policy.**
2. **CSIRO climate science is based upon political techniques such as ‘consensus’ and disguising of uncertainties. CSIRO climate science depends upon lowering the standard of acceptable evidence to a level which would not be acceptable in other areas of science.**
3. **CSIRO fully and uncritically endorses the scientifically discredited IPCC and the politicisation of IPCC final reports.**
4. **The CSIRO is not seen to be actively initiating or supporting reforms to identify weaknesses and implement changes to improve the scientific processes of the IPCC.**
5. **The CSIRO maintains a deafening silence regarding scientific criticisms of both the IPCC and AGW theory.**
6. **CSIRO endorses a political discriminatory per capita approach to emissions rather than a scientific approach targeting the main global sources of emissions.**
7. **The CSIRO has been seen to be openly making or endorsing claims that support political policy even before the science is settled, therefore clearly acting as an advocacy organisation.**

One may well ask:

Are the internal problems within the CSIRO regarding climate science due to ignorance of the scientific facts or, on the other hand, are these problems due to politicisation, deliberate dishonesty, and loss of integrity?

PART 4

The Future: Identifying Problems and Finding Real Solutions

The Politicisation of Science

The whole climate change issue has dramatically highlighted the incompatibility of science and politics. Scientists are dedicated to the pursuit of truth and the constant challenging of theories by testing and direct observation. Politicians on the other hand, are dedicated to political power, control, popularity or ‘consensus’, and self-interest, and the tools of their trade are spin and deception. Given these facts, and the fact that [\(132\)](#) “*politics is the process by which coercive power*

is legitimately applied’, the destructive effects of politics upon science and scientists in regard to climate science is hardly surprising. The current political climate change agenda is not just tearing science apart, it is dividing the entire Australian community like never before. According to David Archibald (55):

“You might expect in a normal world that a proposal to double Australia’s power costs and halve the economic life of our coal reserves might have some rigorous scientific examination associated with it. But there has been none.....All the institutions which should be guarding us against the climate change rent seekers and carpetbaggers have abrogated their responsibility. The worst, and by this I mean the CSIRO, are actively conniving against the interests of the Australian people.”

The claim that CSIRO are “*conniving against the interests of the Australian people*” is of course merely a manifestation of the degree to which the CSIRO has become politicised. As is pointed out by former CSIRO atmospheric physicist, Dr John Reid, those pushing the climate alarmism agenda will not accept any opposition or conflicting evidence (1):

“Back in the early 1990s when I was still working for the CSIRO and the early versions of the AGW theory started to gain currency, I was rather bemused by the passions which were aroused in my colleagues and the gullibility with which predictions of future climate disaster were accepted..... My scepticism about AGW arises from the fact that as a physicist who has worked in closely related areas, I know how poor the underlying science is. In effect the scientific method has been abandoned in this field.....The quasi-religious nature of AGW is evidenced by the rancour which is generated when people like me express scepticism about the theory. Scepticism is an essential part of science which has, until recently, been a “small-l liberal” pursuit in which the opinions of doubters were respected. Now we sceptics are called “deniers” and, by implication, lumped in with neo-Nazis who question the Holocaust. The accusation that we are somehow in the sway of the oil companies and similar big business interests is commonplace and indeed is the chief argument of non-scientist supporters of the AGW theory.”

Reid continues (1):

*“The implication is that climate prediction, as it is carried out by those organisations which come under the aegis of the IPCC, is not science. It is a superstition similar to astrology or homeopathy. The IPCC is promoting the AGW proposition as if it were an established scientific theory, when it is not. If the IPCC were a pharmaceutical company it could face fraud charges for doing this. This is a good analogy. **The IPCC claims to have diagnosed a planetary disorder, global warming, and has proposed a remedy, the limitation of man-made carbon dioxide production. They have produced no convincing scientific evidence that either the diagnosis or the cure is valid.....**People are entitled to entertain whatever apocalyptic view of the future they choose, but such ideas have nothing to do with science. Climate prediction is not science, it is pseudo-science, and sooner or later more real scientists are going to wake up to this fact.”*

When the science fails, those supporting the political alarmist agenda frequently defend their position by claiming it is all about risk and taking extreme political action now just in case there is some truth in current alarmist claims (ie. The Precautionary Principle). This argument completely ignores the political, social, and economic costs of the proposed reforms and seeks to justify any future extreme political reform, just in case there is an element of truth in it. As has been noted by Reid (1):

“A whole new regimen for emission capping and trading is about to come into existence. A necessary condition for the reduction of atmospheric carbon dioxide is that major carbon-dioxide-producing nations co-operate in limiting emissions. I believe that is highly unlikely to happen, because international diplomacy is insufficiently evolved for such a goal to be achieved. Given the highly emotive, quasi-religious attitude of many Westerners to this issue there is likely to be a good deal of resentment generated should some countries fail to live up to their obligations. Wars have been fought about less.....Not only will carbon trading lead to problems between nation-states, but internally different lobbies already clamour for specialist treatment. Carbon trading is proposed as a free-market operation, so avoiding heavy-handed government regulation. But some sort of

authority will be needed to monitor the details of how much carbon is being sequestered or released in each situation. Carbon credits will be available for planting trees, say, but what happens when saplings are eaten by wallabies or mature forests are consumed by bushfires? Monitoring and accreditation structures of Byzantine complexity will need to come into existence.....This country and the world at large have many real political, demographic and environmental issues to contend with. We do not need to create problems where none exist. The present hysteria diverts money and attention away from problems which do need to be solved. In my view, terrorism, the proliferation of nuclear weapons and pandemic disease are far bigger threats to my family's comfort and security than are global warming and putative 'tipping points'."

The fact is that extreme environmental politics is (133), "anti-science", "pessimistic", and "regressive", further underlines the fundamental incompatibility of politics and science.

The effects of politics upon science are further highlighted by the bias now infiltrating once respected scientific institutions and scientific journals. Recently for instance, an editorial in the journal 'Nature', emphasised different publication procedures for submitted manuscripts according to whether they agree or disagree with climate change (134-135). According to the *Nature* editorial (135), **"results confirming climate change are welcome, even when released before peer review."**

Nigel Calder, former editor of the journal "New Scientist" summarises the *Nature* editorial thus (134):

"What the new editorial means, in my opinion, is that the politicisation of science has now penetrated right through to the workaday rituals of publication. On no account must you publicise your new work prematurely, unless you do it to bash the climate sceptics or the Republican Party or supporters of Special Relativity or anyone else the editors happen to dislike today. In that case they'll forgive you."

But the tools used to politicise science are not limited to publication bias, censoring, and selective use of scientific evidence (121, 124, 134-137). Indeed, a wide range of mechanisms have been utilised to promote one side of the debate and silence dissenters. These tactics include (121, 124, 134-137); withdrawal of funding, infiltrating scientific organisations and editorial boards with green activists, establishing organisations to masquerade as authoritative scientific organisations, and even *ad hominem* attacks targeting any who dare disagree with the "consensus". Additionally, claims of a "consensus" are used to intimidate and reinforce the proposition that the science is settled and the debate is over, as has been noted by German physicists Dr Gerlich and Mr Tscheuschner (141):

"A theoretical physicist must complain about a lack of transparency here, and he also has to complain about the style of the scientific discussion, where advocates of the greenhouse thesis claim that the discussion is closed, and others are discrediting justified arguments as a discussion of 'questions of yesterday and the day before yesterday'. In exact sciences, in particular in theoretical physics, the discussion is never closed and is to be continued ad infinitum, even if there are proofs of theorems available."

In a disturbing assessment of modern science, computer scientist and author Christopher Warren points out that science has become "prostituted" to such an extent there are now 3 forms of science (137):

"When governments (who finance scientific research institutions), businesses and other groups use legal or economic pressure to influence the findings of scientific research or the way it is disseminated, reported or interpreted, then it is rightly said that science is no longer independent or objective. It is no longer 'science' but pseudo-science and sometimes outright quackery.....if you wanted to research something the government didn't approve of, you simply didn't get funds and had to choose a politically-acceptable area — and I saw how researchers were willing to twist the data in order to get the desired results published...and therefore continued funding.....There may be said to be at least three kinds of modern 'Science':

1. **Independent, objective science** that has no goal other than the discovery of actual facts that are verifiable;

2. **Politically-controlled 'science'** that is pressed to fulfil certain political objectives at the expense of true science; and
3. **Corporation-controlled 'science'** whose objective is to realise certain economic goals at the expense of scientific truth, environment and health."

Scientists are now increasingly joining politicians in their world of spin and deception. Politicians who recognise the repugnance of their true agenda are compelled to go to extraordinary lengths to deceive the public if they wish to avoid complete political annihilation. And many scientists have apparently become willing partners in this political process of deception so politicians can avoid the democratic consequences that would normally follow the introduction of unpopular policies.

The struggle between the ruling class and the people continues *ad-infinitum*. While true democracy inserts checks and balances to prevent the ruling elites from gaining the totalitarian controls of which they have long dreamt, the élite have many tools in their arsenal to remove democratic safeguards and gradually undermine and subvert democracy. One of these is to hoodwink the public with false, exaggerated or misleading statements from respectable members of the community such as scientists.

To what depths is it necessary to sink to support this process of deliberate deception and political spin? And why is it so important for politicians to go to such extraordinary lengths to conceal their true agenda? Why are they so convinced that publicising their true long-term agenda would not guarantee electoral success?

Political Ideological Dreams Made Possible by Science

Democracy, truth, and political checks and balances are nothing but eternal frustrations for those who seek total power. This may result in a **one-way** process of deliberate erosion of democratic rights. According to Maddison et al ([143](#)):

"It is widely accepted that a well-functioning democracy is not limited to elections every three or four years but involves a continuing process of consultation between government and the citizenry.....Debate is fundamental to the development of good public policy and a well-functioning democracy. Governments that are open to policy debate enhance their own legitimacy and strengthen the democratic credentials of the nation."

But if the state of democracy in Australia is determined by the government's openness to debate then democracy in Australia is already dead and buried. In Australia at present, government is seen to be enforcing numerous radical reforms with no genuine debate and irrespective of the wishes of the people. Opponents of government policy are even targeted with ruthless vilification campaigns. When it comes to political issues such as climate change, so intense are the attacks on democracy and science from those who seem desperate to shut the debate down that even respected scientists may be demonised, vilified, and ostracised ([26](#), [144-145](#)). But why would anyone consider it necessary to go to such lengths to conceal their true agenda. Could the true agenda be so repulsive?

According to Lindzen ([121](#)), *"climate science has been targeted by a major political movement, environmentalism.....engendering fear as well as **an agenda for societal reform and control.**"* The underlying social and political agenda was also highlighted by former Canadian Environment Minister, Christine Stewart, who indicated that a genuine scientific basis for climate change is not necessary ([146](#)): **"no matter if the science is all phony, there are collateral environmental benefits.... climate change [provides] the greatest chance to bring about justice and equality in the world."** So science can be used to justify the required political reforms even if it is *phony* science.

Unfortunately however, this “*justice and equality*” will not be voluntary or democratic, but rather will be enforced by a combination of national and global legislation under the guise of saving the world from human caused climate change. It will be “justice and equality” based upon unprecedented global deception and the abandonment of democracy and informed choice. Australian scientist Dr David Evans agrees the true motivating force driving this political climate change agenda is the desire to totally control global energy use of all countries and individuals by enforcing radical social, political, and economic reforms ([143](#)):

*“To regulate CO2 emissions effectively and fairly you must regulate nearly all energy use, and thus most of the economy, in every nation of the world. The regulating class promotes the dual beliefs that the “problem” of global warming is very scary and that it is caused by human emissions of CO2. **The only solution they offer just happens to be complete regulation of the whole world’s economy by ... the regulating class, of course.** “Enlightened” self-interest doesn’t come any bigger than this....The push towards a global bureaucracy, using climate change as an excuse, is a clear and present danger to sovereign nations, to the competition between nations for productive citizens, and to freedom everywhere. The attempted stealthy globalization of bureaucracy is a crime by a new regulating class that demands the privilege of taxing and paying itself whatever it thinks is worth, while the rewards for the rest of society are instead set by competition in the marketplace.....**The real issue here is a grab for absolute power by those who already govern. They have grown tired of democracy and would like to do away with it, without ever giving the game away by actually saying so.** This is the age-old divide between the totalitarians and libertarians. Coalitions like the current regulating class have always been instinctively totalitarian, desirous of interfering in every tiny detail of our lives—for our own good of course, and prodigiously at our expense. They are now even telling us what kind of light-bulbs we can use. With the rise of democracy, it looked like the regulating class would be subject to the will of the people. The US Constitution explicitly defines the obligations of government to the people, and not of people to the government. **However, liberty, democracy, and the free market are now again at grave risk, and “global warming” is the Trojan Horse the regulating class is hoping to ride to victory over the people.**”*

As Evans points out, a global bureaucracy poses grave dangers for democracy and all citizens of the world who are not in the ruling class ([143](#)):

*“If a bureaucracy is global, there is nowhere to run to from high taxes, persecution, exploitation, selective enforcement of regulations, and so on. It would bring an end to the competition that keeps sovereign nations in check and makes them treat their productive citizens decently. Furthermore, any global system is prone to tyranny taking over forever, because if it is global there is no possibility of outside help or refuge for those under its yoke—so the tyranny is harder to dislodge.what’s at stake is **freedom from the demands of a hostile ruling class, as well as more disposable income, more choice, less red tape, and a better quality of life.** The new regulating class—bureaucrats, academics, greenies—look down on others as stupid and morally inferior, they don’t like people who make real stuff, and they don’t like the private sector or the marketplace....”*

Political commentator, Bill Muehlenberg, confirms the concerns of Evans, likening radical environmentalism upon which the climate change agenda is based to a new religion ([154](#)):

“Radical environmentalism has become a pseudo-religion, and this has wide-ranging consequences.....When the radical activists get their way and get into power, we all can suffer in very practical ways. Those who fall victim to the green totalitarianism pay a very big price indeed.....The green jackboots are out, stomping on anyone who will not comply with the tenets of the new green religion – even 83-year-old grandmothers. This is but one example of how radical green ideology is resulting in a new tyranny and the smothering of human freedom. Environmental concern is always a good thing, if not taken to extremes and turned into a humanistic religion. But sadly we are now seeing that happen all over the Western world. As Nisbet warned three decades ago, this will only result in ugly coercive utopianism – all in the name of saving the planet of course.”

As has been noted above, the climate change ‘religion’ demands compliance and seeks to remove any right to object or disbelieve. Muehlenberg ([154](#)) cites a paper presented by Kari Norgaard ([155](#)) 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’. There is nothing new about the

desire of climate change zealots to enforce their ideas upon others however. Environmental lawyer Polly Higgins ([156-157](#)) is promoting a new law of ‘ecocide’ ([158-159](#)) as an “***an international crime against peace - alongside genocide and crimes against humanity***” which will be punishable in the International Criminal Court. **Part of this new law is intended to outlaw the denial of climate change so that so called climate deniers could be arrested** ([158, 159](#)).

Scientists at the [Planet Under Pressure Conference](#) have also indicated that people’s freedom must be drastically reduced ([155](#)):

“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]’.”

According to Australian government Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery ([162, 164](#)) we need to become like a huge global ant colony where independence is replaced with interdependence and individuals become less competent and depend more upon other team members for survival. Flannery does not make clear however, whether he sees himself as one of the ‘worker’ ants or one of the ‘soldiers’ or ‘rulers’. Flannery notes that attempts to produce an effective global government have so far not been successful even though the “*era of nations is slowly fading*” ([163](#)):

“What I see at least as we move into the 21st century is that the era of nations is slowly fading, because nations are no longer capable of dealing with some of the most critical questions we face. We’ve failed really to produce a top down government. The UN process hasn’t worked, I think it’s fair enough to say, although it’s still valuable, but hasn’t worked as a sort of proxy global government.”

But many in the scientific community are becoming very outspoken about their desire for a revolution or “*constitutional moment*” in global governance ([181-182](#)). Denney summarises ([181](#)):

*“On March 16th, 2012, Science Magazine published policy prescriptions from an international group of professors entitled, ‘Navigating the Anthropocene: Improving Earth System Governance.’ The article concerns the future of environmental action, calling for a ‘**constitutional moment**’ in international environmental governance, similar to the watershed changes in global governance that followed the Second World War.....The authors propose seven “building blocks” of reform that should be considered at the upcoming climate negotiations at [Rio+20](#) in June.....Both the second and the fifth building blocks represent a significant departure from the traditional United Nations convention that member-states’ national sovereignty should not become subject to majority voting.”*

But exactly what is a ‘*constitutional moment*’ and why do scientists, who normally are so precise with details, fail to spell out exactly what they are seeking and how it will be achieved? According to Csaba and Marton ([183](#)):

“A clear example for constitutional moments is the French Revolution, where it entailed ‘revolutionary’ constitutional process as opposed to the one in Hungary in 1989 at the time of the Transition, where ‘revolution by negotiation’ took place in the redefinition of the ‘legal element’ of the constitutional framework took place. Another such constitutional moment in the case of Hungary is considered to have happened in 2004, at the time of the accession to the EU, which was however – according to some – not adequately used and the extent of anticipated benefits was lesser in terms of the constitutional renewal of the country. Constitutional moments are significant in terms of the examination of the nation concept, because in constitutional moments the national self-definition usually changes as a reflection to the events leading to these constitutional moments.”

So a *constitutional moment* usually brings about a significant change in national identity and national sovereignty by undemocratic means. A *constitutional moment* typically occurs during times of

turmoil or distractions ([187](#)) which create an opportunity for those who wish to avoid being exposed by the protections of democracy and media exposure. As has been noted by Besselink ([186](#)), *“revolution is the ultimate constitutional moment. These revolutionary constitutions tend to have a blueprint character, wishing to invent the design for a future which is different from the past.”*

A constitutional moment is a suspension of democracy when democracy is no longer convenient and is regarded as a frustration for those seeking to enforce their beliefs upon others. According to James Lovelock, humans are too stupid to prevent climate change and democracy needs to be suspended ([192](#)):

“One of the main obstructions to meaningful action is ‘modern democracy’. Even the best democracies agree that when a major war approaches, democracy must be put on hold for the time being. I have a feeling that climate change may be an issue as severe as a war. It may be necessary to put democracy on hold for a while.”

Clive Hamilton agrees that when it comes to climate change, people need to be ([193](#)) *“jolted out of their complacency by militancy, even if that means a period of rancour, turmoil and danger”* because *“only radical social and economic transformation will give us a chance of avoiding dramatic and irreversible changes to the global climate.”*

But in spite of his earlier calls for a suspension of democracy, James Lovelock has now recanted and criticised the exaggerated claims of climate alarmists ([195-197](#)). If he had had his way however, and democracy had been suspended, it may well be too late now to reverse the damage done to our democracy and our freedoms. In spite of this obvious lesson, many are still dedicated to removing our democracy and preventing any freedom of choice.

Whereas once scientists were involved exclusively with matters of science, now it seems an increasing number of scientists are involved with politics, particularly global politics ([194](#)), surrendering of national sovereignty, and the move towards global government ([194](#)). Trouble is, these proposals are deliberately undemocratic as the full details seem to be universally omitted from electoral policies and those behind these changes seem to make no attempt to clearly spell out their intentions for protecting democracy and the rights of the individual. Like the carbon dioxide tax, the full details behind these fundamentally important issues have not been part of the ALP or Liberal party's official electoral platform and we are given no democratic choice. And neither are Australians given in any choice in regard to UN policy, which after all, is the driving force behind the climate change agenda. In other words, the entire climate change agenda is based very much upon deception.

If they have their way it seems, scientists and politicians will use supposed climate change and the environment to bring about the surrendering of democracy and national sovereignty. Those behind this push are seemingly completely disinterested in discussing democratic solutions which preserve national sovereignty.

At the heart of global politics is the United Nations ([194](#)), and many are suggesting that the upcoming [Rio+20 Conference](#) in June 2012 should result in slow incremental change being replaced with more rapid revolutionary global change ([184-185](#)). Since the focus of the just completed [Planet Under Pressure Conference](#) was ([185](#)) *“how to create a ‘constitutional moment’”*, it seems that those who regard democracy and sovereignty as eternal frustrations are looking to the Rio+ 20 Conference to put this into practice and provide a watershed moment in global governance. The apparent popularity of both these conferences with those who prefer undemocratic solutions to national and international problems makes one wonder whether genuine democratic solutions (for real problems) will receive any consideration at all.

But the ‘need’ for a *constitutional moment* was also confirmed by CSIRO scientist Dr Mark Stafford Smith (188-189) who co-chaired the [Planet Under Pressure Conference](#). Bearing in mind the fact that considering ways of creating a *constitutional moment* was a focus of the conference (185), it is indeed interesting to note that according to Dr Stafford Smith, the CSIRO was very well represented (190):

“Well, CSIRO have quite a contingent there. I think there’s 40 or so people planning to head along, and I think involved in running at least two or three sessions, as well as giving almost in all cases, I think giving Papers. So there’s some exciting possibilities there. I think CSIRO has plenty to offer at this time when global research is trying to think about how to be a bit more strategic applied, which of course is our mandate, so I think we have lessons to offer to people around the world about that. We also have lessons to offer, I think, in this whole area of engaging with decision makers, again whether they’re in policy, or in industry, or in other sectors of society. Again, we have long experience in trying to do that, so I think we’ll be running a significant booth there, which we’ll try and get some of these messages across, and I hope CSIRO will come across in the conference as a significant player around the world in all of these issues.”

Although CSIRO was apparently heavily involved in discussing ways of creating a *constitutional moment* in London, most Australians were no doubt completely unaware of the details of the CSIRO contribution, as well as their final goals and the total costs of the CSIRO contribution. But refusing to inform the wider community of the full details of the long term agenda is part of the deception.

Political support for climate change pervades all levels of politics, from local to global. But to many, climate change appears to be a political obsession for which democracy should be readily sacrificed. Democracy it seems, is a continuing frustration for those who are anxious to force the world to accept their political solutions for supposed climate change. Climate change is a new obsession, a new industry and a new ‘ism’. Climate change no doubt offers extremists and totalitarians exciting opportunities for the type of dictatorial political control of which they have long dreamt. Climate change has been described as “*class war*” (147):

“Climate change is class war, extended to future generations. Capitalist economic production says, our accrual of wealth is more important than your desire to live a free life, or to live free of exploitation. Climate change is the historical output of capitalist economic relations”

The social equity considerations of climate change will be justified by the fictitious concept of so called ‘*climate debt*’ which is based upon a new type of politically promoted discrimination. It is discrimination on the basis of emissions. Climate debt is the alleged debt of western industrialised nations to poorer countries arising from (161) “*their disproportionate contribution to the causes and consequences of climate change and their excessive historical and current per person emissions – denying developing countries their fair share of atmospheric space.*” As is noted by Bullard (148), climate debt is a deliberate attempt to reduce the prosperity and standard of living in wealthier countries:

“The notion of climate debt goes to the heart of climate change politics. It raises the central question of historical responsibility and who owes whom for what. And it turns traditional rich-poor relations upside down.”

At the heart of climate change politics therefore, is the socialistic desire to reverse “*traditional rich poor relations*” or, in other words, make the rich capitalist nations poor and make the poor countries rich. What appears to be a Marxist’s dream, is of course justified by so called climate change, it is ‘*climate justice*’, justice which dictates the transfer of billions of dollars from rich countries to poor countries (149):

“The concept of climate justice seeks to restore equity in two ways. Firstly, that richer countries should repay their climate debt by undertaking severe cuts in emissions, reserving “atmospheric space” for the growing

emissions of poorer countries. Secondly, that they should provide financial compensation for the costs of low carbon transition and adaptation to the damaging effects of climate change.....The 2009 Copenhagen Accord made a start on scaling up financial support. It promised that Annex 1 countries will provide fast start finance "approaching \$30 billion" for the period 2010-2012, rising to \$100 billion per annum by 2020. The Cancun conference made no progress towards satisfying demands that rich countries provide climate finance in the range of 0.5%-1% of their GDP, equating to \$200-\$400 billion per annum. It did however issue strong instructions to "speed up" support for NAPA projects."

Of course the consequences of this massive unprecedented global redistribution of wealth will be profound. According to Passant ([160](#)), the CO2 tax and ETS are simply an **"attack on our living standards"** which will have the most affect upon those least able to pay ([160](#)):

"The carbon tax is short term carrot and long term stick. The politics of "a great big new tax" drove Gillard to introduce a tax for which most people and businesses affected will be compensated. Some in fact will be overcompensated, at least in the first years of the scheme. That compensation will prove illusory over time. The package is designed to soften us up for a future attack on our living standards.....That is the long term goal – a mechanism for increasing prices that slowly but methodically imposes the burden of pollution for profit on the backs of ordinary working Australians....Workers were right to distrust the carbon tax before they saw the details. They will be right to distrust it now the details are out."

While the CO2 tax is being sold as a kind of panacea to cure all adverse climatic changes and severe weather events, in the complete absence of scientific evidence of course, its real but somewhat less publicised **"long term goal"** is to enable massive wealth redistribution and political control and dramatically reduce the standard of living of all Australians. Climate change, and so called climate debt, have clearly been moulded by politicians into a powerful discriminatory tool for unprecedented extreme global social and political change and economic disruption ([150](#)):

"The concept of climate debt rests on the fact that no solution to climate change is possible unless it also guarantees justice and social equality..... the wasteful, energy-intensive development of the rich countries has deprived the poor countries of their share of 'atmospheric space'. For over-using the Earth's capacity to absorb greenhouse gases, the rich world is in debt to the poor world."

According to Ben Courtice, writing in **Green Left Weekly** ([151](#)), the payment of the climate debt by rich countries like Australia means **"destroying the unjust imperialist economic system that keeps the poor world poor and the rich world rich. These demands are the only conceivable fair and workable way for the world as a whole to address climate change."**

So although the developed world, including Australia, has been convicted and sentenced without even having a trial, and even it must be said, without the very fundamental basis of climate debt or human caused climate change having been proven, the only solution it seems is to **"destroy the unjust imperialist economic system that keeps the poor world poor and the rich world rich."**

In other words, the current economic system in Australia must be destroyed in order to address a problem which has not been proven to exist (ie human caused climate change).

The bottom line when it comes to climate debt, and the reason it is so popular with socialists and those with covert political agendas, is because it is such a pervasive and subversive tool which may be used to surreptitiously undermine and destroy Western economies and transfer wealth to poorer countries ([148](#)):

".....climate debt is a powerful idea that links issues, constituencies and strategies, with the added attraction of using simple language as a Trojan horse for complex and potentially subversive ideas.....Climate debt is also a measure of the complete folly of capitalism – whether it's free market or state-run – as a model for

*managing human society and the earth's ecosystems. Ultimately, the only way that the debt can be repaid is by ensuring that the historic relations of inequality are broken once and for all and that no "new" debt will accumulate. This requires system change, both in the North and in the South. **That's why climate debt is such a subversive idea.***"

But while funds are increasingly being diverted away from those who are suffering from poverty or severe weather events in the real world, those involved in the climate change industry are absorbing ever increasing amounts of national budgets with no definite result ([153](#)).

"The most telling point is that after spending \$30 billion on pure science research no one is able to point to a single piece of empirical evidence that man-made carbon dioxide has a significant effect on the global climate..... The stealthy mass entry of bankers and traders into the background of the scientific "debate" poses grave threats to the scientific process. The promise of "trillions of dollars" on commodity markets—with all of that potential money hinging on finding that human emissions of carbon dioxide have a significant role in the climate—surely acts like blanket of mud over open dispassionate analysis..... In this scientific debate, one side is gagged while the other side has a government-funded media campaign."

It is this global political agenda ([194](#)) which is behind the exploitation of science and scientists. And it is this global political agenda which some scientists are seeking to assist the politicians to enforce upon the people under the guise of controlling climate and saving the planet. But the politicians, with the support of some scientists, are asking the public to accept a completely open ended commitment based upon deliberate deception, with no defined limits, no defined goals or escape clause, and no defined protections for democracy and national sovereignty.

1. Since the cost (political, social, and economic), and effectiveness (ability to lower temperature, sea level, and reduce severe weather) is totally unknown the government is seeking a complete blank cheque.
2. While \$23/tonne is the starting carbon price, the government has set no maximum price and no escape clause should the tax/ETS fail to lower sea level etc.
3. Through [Part 1, Section 3a of the Clean Energy Act](#), the Australian government has sought to give the UN the power to undemocratically interfere in Australian affairs, but the government has refused to limit the extent of UN powers over Australia or spell out the long term aims of surrendering sovereignty to the UN. The government has failed to implement any legislation to ensure the preservation of democracy and sovereignty in Australia.
4. It is expected that the ETS will result in a huge transfer of wealth from Australia to poorer countries so that Australia will become a third world country with a dramatically reduced standard of living. The government has refused to put any limit on this process or spell out the details of their expectations in the long term.
5. The political ability to completely control the energy use of all citizens transfers enormous powers to government but the government has refused to place any limits on this transfer or introduce protective mechanisms to prevent excess government control.
6. The whole agenda is fundamentally undemocratic being dependent upon deliberate deception and a determination to refuse to spell out the full details of the long term agenda to the public at large.

These facts underline the critical importance of separating the various issues from politics.

De-Politicising Climate Change and Climate Science

Both the clear politicisation of climate science and the political climate change agenda which is driving this politicisation have been documented above. The importance of science and climate change and the environment are such that there should be no question of any conflict of interest whatsoever in those responsible for shaping and implementing environment or climate policy. Indeed, to position those who stand to benefit, either politically or economically from climate change policy, in the position of formulating or implementing policy would be inviting a catastrophic peril that could affect not only the environment, but the entire human race. But those who are simply using concerns about the environment or climate to further their own self-interested covert agenda will be conspicuous by their eagerness to combine climate policy with other sociological, ideological, or economic issues to form a 'package deal'. For instance, climate or environmental concerns are frequently combined with political or ideological concerns about poverty, social justice, globalisation, and egalitarianism or class war. Similarly, the environment and climate are often exploited by those who simply wish to promote an anti-Australian globalist agenda or simply a grab for more political power and the ability to increasingly control the life style of people. And those whose political agenda involves de-industrialisation and the destruction of capitalist societies desperately need a mask to disguise their true goals. They rely upon deception, ignorance, and control of the media for their success.

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 ([165](#), [166](#), [167](#)), 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? **The separation of climate and the environment from global politics and UN interference in Australia would no doubt cause many with devious environmental motives to suddenly lose interest in the environment.**

And why pretend a CO2 tax/ETS is a cure all for international poverty which in fact has many different causes? There is no doubt that it would be best to tackle all these causes directly. And if sustainability and the environment are our true goals, then why not move to localisation rather than globalisation? The current globalisation policy of increasing the resource consumption and emissions per commodity consumed *ad infinitum* is nothing more than deliberate environmental vandalism and deliberate unsustainability. We must choose between a genuinely environmentally sustainable scientifically justified localisation policy on the one hand, or an environmentally unsustainable and scientifically unsupportable globalisation policy of so called *free trade*.

All these issues must be clearly separated if we are to have an environment and climate policy based upon genuine science.

Moving Forward with a Sustainable Environment and Climate Program

The following list is proposed as the basis of a truly sustainable environmental program.

1. A genuine risk based approach to pollution is adopted which targets first the most toxic and damaging pollutants, and targets first and foremost the most significant national and global sources of these pollutants. Exclusive demonisation of carbon dioxide and methane emissions is abandoned and the concept of per capita emissions is rejected as being both discriminatory and scientifically unjustifiable.
2. A policy of localisation is adopted which means all commodities, as far as possible, must be sourced and/or produced locally in the interest of reducing resource wastage and unnecessary emissions, including hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and sulphur dioxide. The current policy of increasing pollution and resource wastage per commodity consumed to promote globalisation is rejected as completely unsustainable. The unnecessary transportation of commodities must be dramatically reduced if there is to be any serious commitment to sustainability.
3. Poverty and social injustices should be addressed by identifying the unique causative factors which predominate in each instance, and by mitigating these factors.
4. Nationally and globally, it is recognised that sustainable societies are those that adopt fundamental values of honesty, integrity, family bonds, social cohesion, and respect, and are protected from the tyranny and excesses of political power by democratic and media safeguards. For these reasons covert intrusion of government (or foreign agencies such as the UN into affairs of sovereign nations) must be resisted and reforms should be introduced to increase democratic safeguards and political accountability, locally, nationally, and globally. Democratic freedoms and open honest debate are a fundamental prerequisite for any discussion of sustainability.

5. Recognising the importance of science and scientists, effective safeguards must be put in place to ensure scientific freedom and independence and protection from political interference.

Of course, the above directions are not exhaustive. They are a beginning.

Concluding Remarks

It is clear there is overwhelming evidence that the political climate change agenda has dragged many scientists down into the world of political spin and deception. In fact, the CSIRO have been seen to be complicit in continually repackaging, recycling, supporting and perpetuating the politicised corrupted and exaggerated claims of the discredited IPCC. Further, the CSIRO has continued to support these corrupted politicised IPCC claims even after the IPCC has been discredited by scientists from around the world, by the IAC review, and by the release of climategate emails. The CSIRO has shown no public concern about the unscientific practices of the IPCC or the implementation of reforms to strengthen the scientific procedures of the IPCC. The CSIRO has even been seen to be reinforcing the IPCC's campaign to lower the standard of acceptable evidence by disguising AGW uncertainties to make them more acceptable.

The determination with which the CSIRO has endorsed the government's call to put a "*price on carbon*" is most disturbing since this advocacy is clearly not scientifically sustainable unless and until the science confirming human causation and reversibility is settled. But the CSIRO admit the science is not settled and natural climate variability cannot be reliably differentiated from human caused climatic changes. **Although there is no clear scientific evidence of an imminent human caused climatic catastrophe and no scientific evidence that current mitigation techniques have the ability to control climate and sea level, CSIRO have nevertheless proceeded to endorse a 'treatment' of unknown efficacy and cost for a problem which is yet to be proven real.**

Why, at enormous social and political cost to the entire Australian community, is the CSIRO promoting a policy as scientific which has NOT been shown to be based upon science? Has the CSIRO become a political organization which will go to any lengths, and at any cost, to promote political policy? **And why is the CSIRO so involved in discussing ways of creating a so called 'constitutional moment' in global governance?**

The importance of science is such that immediate action should be taken to prevent political interference and remove any sources of deliberate deception or misrepresentation of science.

The systemic weaknesses that enabled this situation to develop must be identified and reversed. The personal weaknesses that enabled this situation to continue must be addressed at a systemic and personal level. There must be more transparency and accountability and complete independence from political interference in science. The importance of the CSIRO is such that they deserve nothing less than a broad ranging Royal Commission to assist in restoring their ailing reputation.

Clearly those scientists who have made personal or professional sacrifices to stand up for truth and prevent corruption of science are well placed to lead the way forward. It is to them we are indebted and it is to them we turn for a new direction. A new direction toward scientific truth and integrity and the de-politicisation of science.

Acknowledgements

This publication relies upon an extensive bibliography of authors, scientists and truth seekers to whom I am indebted. Without their commitment to truth this publication would not have been possible.

I am also indebted to my wife Anne for her support and understanding, and my brother David for his encouragement, assistance, and commitment to truth.

And finally I would like to thank Jim Hawes and Michelle Tesoriero for their support and never ending commitment to exposing the pseudoscience underpinning climate change alarmism. To Jim, who freely gave his time and expertise to edit the manuscript and write the foreword, I express my sincere appreciation. While I have been guided by the above in preparation of the manuscript, responsibility for the final content remains with me.

Graham
21st April 2012

Williamson

Bibliography

1. John Reid, **Climate Modelling Nonsense**, *Quadrant Online*, 2008;
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2009/10/climate-modelling-nonsense>
2. Stephen Pincock, **Australian Climate Researchers Gagged?**, *The Scientist*, 14/2/2006;
<http://classic.the-scientist.com/news/display/23121/>
3. **ALP Wants Enquiry into CSIRO Gag Claims**, *The Age*, 13/2/2006;
<http://www.theage.com.au/news/National/Scientists-gagged-from-climate-debate/2006/02/13/1139679483824.html>
4. Nicola Berkovic, **CSIRO Gagging Climate Debate**, *The Australian*, 5/11/2009;
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/csiro-gagging-climate-debate/story-e6frg8gf-1225794500655>
5. Nassim Khadem, **Scientists Free to Talk, says CSIRO**, *The Age*, 14/2/2006;
<http://www.theage.com.au/news/national/scientists-free-to-talk-says-csiro/2006/02/13/1139679536438.html>
6. Peter Pockley, **Gagging Row Rattles CSIRO Executives**, *Australasian Science*, April 2006;
<http://www.control.com.au/bi2006/273Browse13.pdf>
7. **Transcript of address delivered by Dr Art Raiche PHD on August 16, 2011**,
<http://galileomovement.com.au/blog/?s=Art+Raiche>
8. Andrew Bolt, **The Real Hot Topic is CSIRO's Prediction on Global Warming**, *The Herald Sun*, 19/3/2010; <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/the-real-hot-topic-is-csiros-prediction-on-global-warming/story-e6frfhqf-1225842538869>
9. Andrew Bolt, **The Rise of the Sceptics, Fall of the CSIRO**, *The Herald Sun*, 29/5/2010;
http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/the_rise_of_the_sceptics_fall_of_the_csiro

10. Nicola Berkovic, **CSIRO Moves to Put Gag on Scientists**, *The Australian*, 9/11/2009; <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/csiro-moves-to-put-gag-on-scientists/story-e6frg6nf-1225795565498>
11. Crystal Ja, **Gagged CSIRO Scientist Resigns**, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 3/12/2009; <http://news.smh.com.au/breaking-news-national/gagged-csiro-scientist-resigns-20091203-k7ir.html>
12. Mark Colvin, **Dumped CSIRO Professor Calls for Senate Enquiry**, *ABC PM*, 24/2/2010; <http://www.abc.net.au/pm/content/2010/s2829301.htm>
13. Nicola Berkovic, **Climate Expert Clive Spash 'Heavied' by CSIRO Management**, *The Australian*, 3/11/2009; <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/climate-expert-clive-spash-heavied-by-csiro-management/story-e6frg8gf-1225793717744>
14. Clive Spash **Resigns from CSIRO after Climate Report 'Censorship'**, 3/12/2009; <http://www.news.com.au/breaking-news/clive-spash-resigns-from-csiro-after-climate-report-censorship/story-e6frfku0-1225806539742>
15. David Pannell, **CSIRO and the Clive Spash Controversy**, *Pannell Discussions*, 23/11/ 2009; <http://cyllene.uwa.edu.au/~dpannell/pd/pd0162.htm>
16. **Rudd Government Accused of Censoring CSIRO Scientist Dr Clive Spash**, *The Herald Sun*, 25/11/2009; <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/rudd-government-accused-of-censoreding-csiro-scientist-dr-clive-spash/story-e6frf7jo-1225803868573>
17. Geoff Davies, **Suppression of Science Sacrifices the Future**, *Australasian Science*, April, 2006; <http://www.control.com.au/bi2006/273conscience.pdf>
18. Christine Milne, **Public Interest Research Under Threat: Greens**, *Media Release*, 2/3/2006; <http://greensmps.org.au/taxonomy/term/125/all?page=14>
19. **Censorship of the CSIRO**, *Senate Debates*, 25/11/2009; <http://www.openaustralia.org/senate/?id=2009-11-25.102.2&s=CSIRO#g104.1>
20. Imre Salusinszky, **Blocked Sea Level Research Probed**, *The Australian*, 5/12/2011; <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/blocked-sea-level-research-probed/story-fn59niix-1226213593352>
21. **Allegations of NSW Government Cover Ups**, *Channel 7 News*, 1/12/2011; <http://au.news.yahoo.com/video/nsw/watch/27443801/>
22. Miranda Devine, **Tide Rises Against Climate Lies**, *Daily Telegraph*, 3/12/2011; http://blogs.news.com.au/dailytelegraph/mirandadevine/index.php/dailytelegraph/comments/tide_rises_against_climate_lies/
23. Malcolm Holland, **The Code of Climate Silence – More Interference by NSW Labor Bureaucrats**, *Daily Telegraph*, 3/12/2011; <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/national/the-code-of-climate-silence-more-interference-by-nsw-labor-bureaucrats/story-e6freuzr-1226212734074>
24. **Holding Back Tide of Alternate Views**, *Daily Telegraph*, 3/12/2011; <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/opinion/holding-back-tide-of-alternate-views/story-e6frezz0-1226212673769>
25. Malcolm Holland, **The Code of Climate Silence – More Interference by NSW Labor Bureaucrats**, *Daily Telegraph*, 3/12/2011; <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/sydney-nsw/climate-change-science-being-stifled-by-nsw-labor-bureaucrats/story-e6freuzi-1226211748047>

26. Miranda Devine, **Stars Party on as We Burn**, *Sunday Herald Sun*, 4/12/2011 <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/stars-party-as-we-burn/story-e6frfhqf-1226213210427>
27. David Oldfield, **Sea Level Facts Being Covered Up?**, 2UE, 2/11/2011; <http://www.2ue.com.au/blogs/2ue-blog/sea-level-facts-being-covered-up/20111202-1o9ui.html>
28. **Senate Estimates Committee**, Australian Parliament, 15/02/2012; <http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au/parlInfo/search/display/display.w3p;db=COMMITTEES;id=committees%2Festimate%2F16bb4111-084d-4c58-8cae96ecba7e7e6e%2F0002;query=id%3A%22committees%2Festimate%2F16bb4111-084d-4c58-8cae-96ecba7e7e6e%2F0000%22>
29. **Dr Trevor McDougall: Ocean Mixing and Climate**, CSIRO; <http://www.csiro.au/Organisation-Structure/Divisions/Marine--Atmospheric-Research/TrevorMcDougall.aspx>
30. **CSIRO Management Culture Condemned**, *Canberra Times*, 05/01/2012; <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/act-news/csiro-management-culture-condemned-20120105-1uctw.html>
31. **Experts Praised Scientist Before Dumping**, *Canberra Times*, 12/02/2012; <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/national/experts-praised-scientist-before-dumping-20120212-1t9i4.html>
32. **Scientist's Services No Longer Required**, *Canberra Times*, 23/12/2011; <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/act-news/scientists-services-no-longer-required-20111223-1uvnq.html>
33. Rosslyn Beeby, **CSIRO, Top Scientist Could Not 'Align' Their Interests**, *Canberra Times*, 16/02/2012; <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/national/csiro-top-scientist-could-not-align-their-interests-20120215-1t7cm.html>
34. **Letter to leaders of CSIRO and the Australian Academy of Science from 161 international scientists**, 21/12/2011.
35. Alex Reisner, **The Wonderful World of CSIRO**, *Australasian Science*, March, 2012; <http://www.australasianscience.com.au/article/issue-januaryfebruary-2012/wonderful-world-csiro.html>
36. Rosslyn Beeby, **Making Science Redundant** (edit), *Canberra Times*, 29/12/2011; <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/opinion/editorial/making-science-redundant-20111229-1uhwd.html>
37. **Science Managers**, *Canberra Times*, 03/01/2012; <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/national/letters/science-managers-20120103-1tia1.html>
38. **Privatisation Gone Mad Cuts the Heart Out of the CSIRO**, *Canberra Times*, 02/01/2012; <http://www.canberratimes.com.au/national/letters/privatisation-gone-mad-cuts-the-heart-out-of-csiro-20120102-1ti8w.html>
39. **Understanding Climate Change**, CSIRO, 7/12/2009; <http://www.csiro.au/Outcomes/Climate/Understanding.aspx>
40. **State of the Climate 2012**, CSIRO; http://www.csiro.au/en/Outcomes/Climate/Understanding/~/_media/8E59FBA4F8A94FE4B84F01E271226316.pdf

41. Andrew Ash et al, **Climate Change: Science and Solutions for Australia**, CSIRO, 2011;
<http://www.csiro.au/Outcomes/Climate/Climate-Change-Book.aspx>; See also full version
<http://www.csiro.au/Outcomes/Climate/Climate-Change-Book.aspx#a3>
42. **IPCC Climate Change Assessment Reports**;
http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_and_data_reports.shtml
43. **Global Action – Facts and Fiction**, Department of Climate Change;
<http://www.climatechange.gov.au/government/international/global-action-facts-and-fiction.aspx>
44. **Facts About Global Warming**, *Climate Change Australia*; <http://www.climatechange.com.au/facts-about-global-warming/>
45. **The Critical Decade;Key Messages**, *Climate Commission*: <http://climatecommission.gov.au/the-critical-decade-key-messages/>
46. **The Critical Decade;Key Messages**, *Climate Commission*: http://climatecommission.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/The-Critical-Decade_Key-messages_RB-v2.pdf
47. **The Critical Decade**, *Climate Change Action*, <http://climatechangeaction.org.au/climate-change-facts/experts/the-critical-decade/>
48. Will Steffen, **The Critical Decade; Surviving the Anthropocene**, *Blue Skies Lecture*, *Climate Commission*, 28/5/2011;
http://www.climatescience.org.au/downloads/steffen_2011_BLUE_SKIES_LECTURE.pdf
49. Chris Weaver, **Professor David Karoly - The 'Critical Decade' for Climate Change**, Melbourne University; <http://alumni.news.unimelb.edu.au/professor-david-karoly-critical-decade-climate-change>
50. Kevin Trenberth et al, **Check With Climate Scientists for Views on Climate**, *Wall Street Journal*, 1/02/2012;
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204740904577193270727472662.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_MIDDLEThirdBucket#articleTabs%3Darticle
51. Craig Idso, S. Fred Singer et al, **Climate Change Reconsidered**, *2009 Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC)*, The Heartland Institute 2009.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/2009report.html>
52. Craig Idso, S. Fred Singer, Robert Carter et al, **Climate Change Reconsidered: 2011 Interim Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change**,
<http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2011/pdf/2011NIPCCinterimreport.pdf>
53. Robert M Carter; **Climate: The Counter Consensus**, Stacey International, London, 2010
54. Richard Lindzen, **The Climate Science Isn't Settled**; *The Wall Street Journal*, 30/11/2009.
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html>
55. David Archibald, **Failure to Warm**, 2007;
<http://www.davidarchibald.info/papers/Failure%20To%20Warm.pdf>
56. Richard Lindzen, **Reconsidering the Climate Change Act: How to approach the science**, *Seminar at the House of Commons Committee Rooms*, London, 22/02/2012;
http://i.telegraph.co.uk/multimedia/archive/02148/RSL-HouseOfCommons_2148505a.pdf
57. David Evans, **The Skeptics Case**, *The Global Warming Policy Foundation*, 26/2/2012;
<http://thegwpf.org/best-of-blogs/5063-david-evans-the-skeptics-case.html>
58. David Evans, **Four Fatal Pieces of Evidence**; <http://joannenova.com.au/2011/09/dr-david-evans-four-fatal-pieces-of-evidence/>

59. Joanne Nova, **Australian Temperature Records Shoddy, Inaccurate, Unreliable**; <http://joannenova.com.au/2012/03/australian-temperature-records-shoddy-inaccurate-unreliable-surprise/>
60. JP. J. Watson (2011) **Is There Evidence Yet of Acceleration in Mean Sea Level Rise around Mainland Australia?**. *Journal of Coastal Research*: Volume 27, Issue 2: pp. 368 – 377.; <http://www.icronline.org/doi/full/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-10-00141.1> ; <http://dx.doi.org/10.2112/JCOASTRES-D-10-00141.1> ; <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V14/N15/C1.php>
61. Richard Lindzen, Claude Allegre, et al, **No Need to Panic About Global Warming**, *Wall Street Journal*, 26/01/2012; <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html>;
62. John R. Christy, **House Science, Space and Technology Committee, Examining the Process concerning Climate Change Assessments**, *US Congress*, 31/03/2011; http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/ChristyJR_written_110331_all.pdf
63. Michael McCarthy, **The Century of Drought**, *The Independent*, 4/10/2006; <http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/the-century-of-drought-418623.html>
64. K. Hennessy et al, **Drought: Exceptional Circumstances**, *CSIRO/BOM*, July 2008; http://www.daff.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0007/721285/csiro-bom-report-future-droughts.pdf
65. Stewart Franks, **Climate and Floods: Flannery is no expert, but neither are the experts**, 6/3/2012; <http://theconversation.edu.au/climate-and-floods-flannery-is-no-expert-but-neither-are-the-experts-5709>
66. Oliver Chan, **No Snow, More Drought, Climate Report Warns**, *Cosmos Magazine*, 10/8/2011; <http://www.cosmosmagazine.com/news/4604/no-snow-more-drought-climate-report-warns>
67. R. Lindzen, Y.S. Choi, **On the observational determination of climate sensitivity and its implications**, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Atmospheric Sciences*, 22/5/2011; http://www.masterresource.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/Lindzen_Choi_APJAS_final.pdf
68. David Whitehouse, **Global Warming Forecasts Exaggerated**, *Global Warming Policy Foundation*, 25/11/2011; <http://thegwpf.org/the-observatory/4422-global-warming-forecasts-exaggerated.html>
69. **Climate Questions: Has Global Warming Stopped**; <http://www.csiro.au/Outcomes/Climate/Has-Global-Warming-Stopped/In-detail.aspx>
70. Linda Simalis, **Peak Power to Turn off Your Household**, *The Sunday Telegraph*, 14/8/2011; <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/peak-power-to-turn-off-your-household/story-fn6e0s1g-1226114335148>
71. Linda Simalis, **Power Cuts by Remote**, *Sunday Herald Sun*, 14/8/2011; <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/more-news/power-cuts-by-remote/story-fn7x8me2-1226114458769>
72. Kevin Hennessy , **Climate change in Australian dairy regions**, *CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research*, October, 2007; <http://dairyingfortomorrow.com.au/uploads/documents/file/CSIRO%20report%20on%20climate%20change%20for%20Dairy%20Australia%202007.pdf>
73. **Climate Change in Australia**, Chapter 4, *CSIRO and Australian Bureau of Meteorology*, 2007; http://www.climatechangeinaustralia.gov.au/documents/resources/TR_Web_Ch4.pdf http://www.climatechangeinaustralia.gov.au/technical_report.php

74. **Climate Scientists Share in Peace Prize**, CSIRO, 2007; <http://www.csiro.au/Organisation-Structure/Divisions/Marine--Atmospheric-Research/NobelPeacePrizeWinners.aspx>
75. Megan Clarke, **Address to the National Press Club**, Canberra, 30/9/2009; http://www.csiro.au/Portals/About-CSIRO/Who-we-are/Executive/~/_media/CSIROau/Corporate%20Units/Executive%20Team%20ET/NationalPressClubClarkSpeechTranscript_ETF_PDF%20Standard.pdf
76. **Stronger Evidence for Human Induced Climate Change**, CSIRO, 2/2/2007; <http://www.csiro.au/en/Organisation-Structure/Divisions/Marine--Atmospheric-Research/Stronger-evidence-for-human-induced-climate-change.aspx>
77. Chris Mitchell, **CSIRO's Response to Second Volume of IPCC Report**, CSIRO, 6/4/2007; <http://www.csiro.au/Portals/Multimedia/CSIROpod/2nd-IPCC-Report.aspx>
78. Malcolm Roberts, **The Eco Fraud Part 1**, August 2010; http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf
79. David Rose, **Glacier Scientist: I knew data hadn't been verified**, *Daily Mail*, 24/1/2010; <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1245636/Glacier-scientists-says-knew-data-verified.html#ixzz0dUoPiTkG>
80. Richard Lindzen, **Resisting Climate Hysteria**, *Quadrant*, 26/7/2009; <http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2009/07/resisting-climate-hysteria>
81. Richard Lindzen, **Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus**, *CATO Institute*, Vol 15, No 2 1992; <http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv15n2/reg15n2g.html>
82. Richard Lindzen, **The Climate Science Isn't Settled**, *Wall Street Journal*, 30/11/2009; <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html>
83. John R. Christy, **Written statement to the Subcommittee on Energy and Power Committee on Energy and Commerce**, US Congress, 8 March 2011; <http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/Media/file/Hearings/Energy/030811/Christy.pdf>
84. Nicola Scafetta, **Testing an Astronomically Based Decadal-Scale Empirical Harmonic Climate Model vs the IPCC (2007) General Circulation Climate Models**, *Journal of Atmospheric and Solar-Terrestrial Physics* (2011), 2011.12.005; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/astronomical_harmonics.pdf
85. John Christy, **No Consensus on IPCC's Level of Ignorance**, *BBC News*, 13/11/2007; <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7081331.stm>
86. John R. Christy, **House Science, Space and Technology Committee Examining the Process concerning Climate Change Assessments**, 31 March 2011; http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/ChristyJR_written_110331_all.pdf
87. Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts, **Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception?** *Science and Public Policy Institute* (SPPI), 27/8/2010; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf
88. **Scientific Untruths About Global Warming: The political and academic financial corruption of science**, Galileo Movement; http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php?zoom_highlight=IPCC#B
89. Rebecca Terrell, Ed Hiserodt, **IPCC Researchers Admit Global Warming Fraud**, *New American*, 23/11/2009; <http://www.thenewamerican.com/tech-mainmenu-30/environment/2377-ipcc-researchers-admit-global-warming-fraud>

90. Malcolm Roberts, **Exposing Corruption of Climate Science: Misrepresentations, distortions, omissions, evasions, myths and lies**; <http://www.conscious.com.au/galileodocuments/corruption.pdf>
91. Joseph D'Aleo, **Ten Major Failures of Consensus Science**, *Science and Public Policy Institute*, 15/03 2011; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/10_major_consensus_failures.pdf
92. James Stafford, **The IPCC May Have Outlived its Usefulness: An interview with Judith Curry**, *Global Warming Policy Foundation*; <http://thegwpf.org/the-climate-record/5084-the-ipcc-may-have-outlived-its-usefulness-an-interview-with-judith-curry.html>
93. **IPCC Corner**, *Global Warming Policy Foundation*, <http://thegwpf.org/ipcc-corner.html>
94. Marc Morano, **More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Global Warming Claims**, *Science and Public Policy Institute*, 4/01/2012; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/1000_scientists_dissent.pdf
95. **UN Climate Propaganda Exposed**, *The Washington Times*, 17/6/2011; <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/17/un-climate-propaganda-exposed/>
96. Lorne Gunter, **The IPCC Loses its Last Credibility**, *National Post*, 16/6/2011; <http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2011/06/17/lorne-gunter-the-ipcc-loses-its-last-credibility/>
97. Graham Lloyd, **Greenpeaces's Key Role in UN Climate Study**, *The Australian*, 18/6/2011; <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/greenpeaces-key-role-in-un-climate-study/story-fn59niix-1226077352408>
98. http://www.tech-know.eu/uploads/Understanding_the_Atmosphere_Effect.pdf Joseph E. Postma, **Understanding the Thermodynamic Atmosphere Effect**, March 2011. See also <http://climaterealists.com/index.php?tid=816>
99. Christopher Booker, **Amazongate: New Evidence of the IPCC's Failures**, *The Telegraph* (UK), 30/1/2010; <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html>
100. Alan Moran, **Climate Change Requiem**, *The Drum*, ABC TV, 8/4/2010; <http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/33488.html>
101. Marc Morano, **Manufactured 'Science': Another IPCC Scientist Reveals How UN Scientists talked about 'trying to make IPCC report so dramatic that US would just have to sign Kyoto Protocol'**; <http://www.climatedepot.com/a/5064/Manufactured-Science-Another-IPCC-Scientist-Reveals-How-UN-Scientists-talked-about-trying-to-make-IPCC-report-so-dramatic-that-US-would-just-have-to-sign-Kyoto-Protocol>
102. John Christy, **No Consensus on IPCC's Level of Ignorance**, *BBC News*, 13/11/2007; <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7081331.stm>
103. Frederick Seitz, **A major deception on 'global warming'**, *Wall Street Journal*, New York; Jun 12, 1996; http://stephenschneider.stanford.edu/Publications/PDF_Papers/WSJ_June12.pdf
104. John R. Christy, **Response to Federal Register/** Vol. 74, No. 78, April 24 2009 / Proposed Rules, EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0171; http://icecap.us/images/uploads/EPA_ChristyJR_Response_2.pdf
105. Richard Lindzen, **MIT Climate Scientist Calls Fears of Global Warming 'Silly' - Equates Concerns to 'Little Kids' Attempting to "Scare Each Other**, *MIT Meteorologist Richard Lindzen's appearance on CNN's Larry King Live* on January 31, 2007 ;

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=PressRoom.Blogs&ContentRecord_id=7E60E3FA-802A-23AD-4291-E3975CBB96CB

106. Richard Lindzen, **IPCC Report Criticized by One of Its Lead Authors**, *Heartlander*, 1/6/2001; <http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2001/06/01/ipcc-report-criticized-one-its-lead-authors>
107. Steven Hayward et al, **Politics Posing as Science: A Preliminary Assessment of the IPCC's Latest Climate Change Report**, *American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research*, December 2007; http://www.aei.org/files/2007/12/03/20071203_EPOno4_g.pdf
108. **IPCC Chris Landsea resignation letter**; http://www.tsagust.org/Landsea_Letter.htm; http://cstpr.colorado.edu/prometheus/archives/science_policy_general/000318chris_landsea_leaves.html; <http://cstpr.colorado.edu/prometheus/archives/ipcc-correspondence.pdf>
109. B. Carter et al, **Climate Report just Rehashed IPCC Propaganda**, 30/5/2011; <http://www.australianclimatemadness.com/2011/05/climate-commission-report-just-rehashed-ipcc-propaganda/>
110. David Evans, **Is the Western Climate Establishment Corrupt?** 28/2/2011; <http://ionova.s3.amazonaws.com/corruption/climate-corruption.pdf>
111. David Evans, **Carbon Modeler Says it's a Scam**, 23/3/2011; <http://joannenova.com.au/2011/03/david-evans-carbon-modeler-says-its-a-scam/>
112. Malcolm Roberts, **Timeline of Shady IPCC Practices**; <http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/additional%20material/Timeline%20of%20shady%20UN%20IPCC%20practices.pdf>
113. John McLean, **Why the IPCC Should be Disbanded**, November 2007; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf
114. Bob Carter, **Facts Debunk Global Warming Alarmism**, *The Australian*, 20/1/2009; <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/facts-debunk-global-warming-alarmism/story-e6frg746-1111118607086>
115. Robert Carter, **Knock Knock: Where is the Evidence for Dangerous Human-Caused Global Warming?** *ECONOMIC ANALYSIS & POLICY*, VOL. 38 NO. 2, SEPTEMBER 2008; <http://www.auscsc.org.au/images/PDF/knockknock.pdf>
116. Bob Carter, **An Inconvenient Fallacy**, *The Age*, 27/6/2011; <http://www.theage.com.au/opinion/politics/an-inconvenient-fallacy-20110626-1glmu.html>
117. Ian Plimer, **The Changing Climate**, *PESA News*, Oct/Nov 2009; http://www.pesa.com.au/publications/pesa_news/oct_nov_09/images/pn102_66-67.pdf
118. Ross McKittrick, **What is Wrong with the IPCC?** *Global Warming Policy Foundation*, 2011; http://thegwpf.org/images/stories/gwpf-reports/mckittrick-ipcc_reforms.pdf
119. Bob Carter, **Scientific Research Drowning in a Sea of Alarmism**, *The Australian*, 7/2/2012; <http://ipa.org.au/news/2593/scientific-research-drowning-in-a-sea-of-alarmism->
120. Andrew Montford, **Nullius in Verba, The Royal Society and Climate Change**, *Global Warming Policy Foundation*, 2012; http://thegwpf.org/images/stories/gwpf-reports/montford-royal_society.pdf
121. Richard Lindzen, **Climate Science: Is it Currently Designed to Answer Questions**, 2009; <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0809/0809.3762.pdf>
122. John Costella, **The Climategate Emails**, *Lavoisier Group*, March 2010; <http://www.lavoisier.com.au/articles/greenhouse-science/climate-change/climategate-emails.pdf>

123. Rob Waugh, **Climategate Scientists DID Collude with Government Officials to Hide Research that Didn't Fit Their Apocalyptic Global Warming**, *Daily Mail*, 28/11/2011;
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2066240/Second-leak-climate-emails-Political-giants-weigh-bias-scientists-bowing-financial-pressure-sponsors.html>
124. Richard Lindzen, **An Exchange on Climate Science and Alarm**, 2/3/2008; http://www-eaps.mit.edu/faculty/lindzen/L_R-Exchange.pdf
125. Simon, **Head of Hopelessly Politicised CSIRO Backs Carbon Price**, 4/4/2011;
<http://www.australianclimatemadness.com/2011/04/head-of-hopelessly-politicised-csiro-backs-carbon-price/>
126. Julia Gillard, **Address to The National Press Club**, 14th July, 2011;
<http://australianpolitics.com/2011/07/14/gillard-carbon-tax-speech-national-press-club.html>
127. A. McMichael et al, **Human Health and Climate Change in Oceania: A risk assessment 2002**, Australian Government 2003;
[http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/content/2D4037B384BC05F6CA256F1900042840/\\$File/env_climate56.pdf](http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/content/2D4037B384BC05F6CA256F1900042840/$File/env_climate56.pdf) ;
[http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/content/2D4037B384BC05F6CA256F1900042840/\\$File/env_climate.pdf](http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/content/2D4037B384BC05F6CA256F1900042840/$File/env_climate.pdf)
128. William Happer, **Global Warming Models are Wrong Again**, *Wall Street Journal*, 27/3/2012;
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html>
129. Lorraine Yapps Cohen, **Will Happer on Global Warming**, *The Examiner*, 27/3/2012;
<http://www.examiner.com/conservative-in-san-diego/will-happer-on-global-warming>
130. Tony Jones, **Tim Flannery Discusses Hacked Climate Emails**, *Lateline, ABC*, 23/11/2009;
<http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2008/s2751390.htm>
131. Andrew Bolt, **Climategate News Spreads**, *The Sun Herald*, 24/11/2009;
http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/the_global_warming_conspiracy_news_spreads/
132. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics>
133. **The Global Politicisation of Science**, <http://dizzythinks.net/2007/03/global-politicisation-of-science.html>
134. Nigel Calder, **Nature Muddies the Water**, 27/10/2011;
<http://calderup.wordpress.com/tag/politicisation-of-science/> See also *Nature* vol. 478, p. 428
135. **Scientific Climate** (edit), *Nature* vol. 478, p. 428, 27/10/2011;
<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v478/n7370/full/478428a.html>
136. **The Original Denier: into the cold**, *National Post*, 22/12/2006;
<http://www.canada.com/nationalpost/news/story.html?id=bc93abca-79cd-4a7b-b7a8-357d4e98f3f3>
137. Christopher Warren, **Science Inc.: The Politicisation and Corporatisation of Science**, *American Daily Herald*, 12/1/2012; <http://www.americandailyherald.com/pundits/christopher-c-m-warren/item/science-inc-the-politicisation-and-corporatisation-of-science-3>
138. Chris Berg and Sinclair Davidson, **Climategate: What we've learned so far**, *IPA Review*, December 2009; http://ipa.org.au/library/publication/1261529427_document_berg_davidson_climategate.pdf
139. http://ipa.org.au/library/publication/1261529427_document_berg_davidson_climategate.pdf
140. Brice Bosnich, **A letter to Paul Nurse**, <http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2012/2/12/a-letter-to-paul-nurse.html>; See also [http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2012/2/12/a-letter-to-paul-nurse.html](#)

http://climaterealist.com/index.php?id=9116&utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+ClimaterealistNewsBlog+%28ClimateRealists+News+Blog%29

141. G. Gerlich, R.D. Tscheuschner, **Falsification of the Atmospheric Co2 Greenhouse Effects Within the Frame of Physics**, *Internat J Modern Physics*, 23,275,2009;
http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0707/0707.1161v4.pdf
142. David Evans, **Climate Coup; The Politics**, 19/3/2012;
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/climate_coup.pdf
143. Sarah Maddison, Richard Denniss, Clive Hamilton, **Silencing Dissent**, Discussion paper 65, *Australia Institute*, June 2004; http://www.tai.org.au/documents/dp_fulltext/DP65.pdf
144. Bob Carter, **Closing Out Dissent**, 1/8/2010;
<http://anhonestclimatedebate.wordpress.com/2010/08/14/closing-out-dissent/>; see also
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2010/08/closing-out-dissent>
145. Joe Newby, **Global Warming Activists Launch Campaign to Silence Dissent Among Weathermen**, *Spokane Conservative Examiner*, 30/1/2012; <http://www.examiner.com/conservative-in-spokane/global-warming-activists-launch-campaign-to-silence-dissent-among-weathermen>
146. Christine Stewart, *Calgary Herald*, December 14, 1998;
http://www.appinsys.com/globalwarming/gw_about.htm ; See also
http://www.appinsys.com/globalwarming/GW_History.htm
147. **Friedman Fantasizes About Green Capitalism**, *Climate and Capitalism*, 15/11/2009;
<http://climateandcapitalism.com/2009/11/15/friedman-fantasizes-about-green-capitalism/>
148. Nicola Bullard, **Climate Debt as a Subversive Political Strategy**, *Climate and Capitalism*, 1/5/2010;
<http://climateandcapitalism.com/2010/05/01/climate-debt-as-a-subversive-political-strategy/>
149. **Climate Change and Poverty Guide**, <http://uk.oneworld.net/guides/climatechange>
150. Simon Butler, **Climate Debt: Why we're not all in this together**, *Green Left Weekly*, 9/5/2010;
<http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/44060>
151. Ben Courtice, **Summit Calls for Climate Debt Payment**, *Green Left Weekly*, 9/5/2010;
<http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/44006>
152. **Open Letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by 100 prominent scientists**, Dec. 13, 2007; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/UN_open_letter.pdf
153. Joanne Nova, **Climate Money**, *SPPI*, 21/7/2009;
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_money.pdf
154. Bill Muehlenberg, **More Mean Green Madness**;
<http://www.billmuehlenberg.com/2012/04/07/more-mean-green-madness/>
155. **If You Don't Believe in Climate Change You Must be Sick: Oregon professor likens scepticism to racism**, *Daily Mail*, 31/3/2012; <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2123260/If-dont-believe-climate-change-sick-Oregon-professor-likens-skepticism-racism.html>; Paper presented by Kari Norgaard at the Planet Under Pressure Conference, March 26-29, 2012.
156. <http://www.pollyhiggins.com/Welcome.html>
157. <http://treeshaverightstoo.com/>
158. Juliet Jowett, **British Campaigner Urges UN to Accept, 'Ecocide' as International Crime**, *The Guardian*, 9/4/2010; <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/apr/09/ecocide-crime-genocide-un-environmental-damage>

159. Keelan Balderson, **Prosecute Climate Deniers for Ecocide**, 8/12/2010;
<http://wideshut.co.uk/prosecute-climate-deniers-for-ecocide/>
160. John Passant, **Carbon Tax: Short Term Carrot, Long Term Stick**, *Socialist Alternative*, 11/7/2011;
http://www.sa.org.au/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=6974:carbon-tax-short-term-carrot-long-term-stick&%20Itemid=398
161. Patrick Bond, **Climate Debt Owed to the People of Africa**, *Links Journal*, 5/5/2010;
<http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?id=24177>; paper was presented at the Economic Justice Network post-Copenhagen Climate Justice Conference, May 5, 2010.
162. Christian Bennett and Damian Carrington, **Tim Flannery: "We will form a global community with a set of shared beliefs"** (video), *The Guardian*, 4/4/2011;
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/video/2011/apr/04/tim-flannery-global-shared-beliefs-video?INTCMP=SRCH>
163. Bob Carter et al, **What's Wrong With the Science?** 5/4/2012;
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/04/what-s-wrong-with-the-science>
164. Bob Carter et al, **What's Wrong With the Science?** 5/4/2012;
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/Analysis%20March%202012.pdf>
165. Warwick J. McKibbin, **Submission to the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties: Enquiry Into the Kyoto Protocol**, 8/8/200; <http://www.aph.gov.au/house/committee/jsct/kyoto/sub23.pdf>
166. Warwick J. McKibbin, Peter J. Wilcoxon, **Designing a Realistic Climate Change Policy that includes Developing Countries**, *Resource Management in Asia-Pacific*, Working Paper 23, May 1999;
http://rspas.anu.edu.au/papers/rmap/Wpapers/rmap_wp23.pdf
167. Warwick J. McKibbin, Peter J. Wilcoxon, **Designing a Realistic Climate Change Policy that includes Developing Countries**, Paper prepared for the United Nations University Symposium on "Global Environment and Economic Theory" to be held on October 24 and 25, 1999, in Tokyo;
<http://www.msgpl.com.au/download/developing.pdf>
168. Clive Spash, **The Brave New World of Carbon Trading**, December, 2009;
http://www.clivespash.org/MPRA_paper_19114.pdf
169. **IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007, Working Group 1, The Physical Science Basis, Executive Summary**; http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/ch9s9-es.html
170. **IPCC Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007, Working Group 1, The Physical Science Basis, Understanding and Attributing Climate Change**;
http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/spmsspm-understanding-and.html
171. John Daly, **Testing the Waters**, <http://www.john-daly.com/ges/msl-rept.htm>
172. Alberto Boretti, **Is there any support in the long term tide gauge data to the claims that parts of Sydney will be swamped by rising sea levels?**, *Coastal Engineering* (in press)
173. **La Nina and Current Extreme Weather: Questions and Answers**, *World Meteorological Organisation*;
<http://www.wmo.int/pages/mediacentre/factsheet/LaNinaQA.html>
174. **State of the Environment Report: Natural Climate Fluctuations**, *North West Territories*, September 2011; http://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/live/pages/wpPages/soe_natural_fluctuations.aspx
175. **South Pacific Sea Level and Climate Monitoring Project: El Nino and La Nina Important Ocean Phenomena**, *Bureau of Meteorology*;
http://www.bom.gov.au/pacificsealevel/pdf/Elnino_and_La_Nina.pdf

176. **State of the Environment 2011**, Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population, and Communities;
<http://www.environment.gov.au/soe/2011/report/atmosphere/2-1-current-state-climate.html>
177. Daithi A. Stone et al, **The Detection and Attribution of Human Influence on Climate**, *Ann Rev Environ & Resources*, 34, 1, 2009;
<http://www.annualreviews.org/eprint/Rm9hwcfrWQZgwHAVfrQC/full/10.1146/annurev.envIRON.040308.101032>
178. Kevin Hennessy, Scott Power, *Australian Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO, 2011. Climate Change in the Pacific: Scientific Assessment and New Research. Volume 1: Regional Overview. Volume 2: Country Reports*; http://www.cawcr.gov.au/projects/PCCSP/Nov/Vol1_CoversForewordContents.pdf
179. Kevin Hennessy, Scott Power, *Australian Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO, 2011. Climate Change in the Pacific: Scientific Assessment and New Research. Volume 1: Regional Overview. Volume 2: Country Reports, Chapter 8: Conclusions and Further Research*;
http://www.cawcr.gov.au/projects/PCCSP/Nov/Vol1_Ch8.pdf
180. Kevin Hennessy, Scott Power, *Australian Bureau of Meteorology and CSIRO, 2011. Climate Change in the Pacific: Scientific Assessment and New Research. Volume 1: Regional Overview. Volume 2: Country Reports, Chapter 3: Observed Climate Variability and Trends*;
http://www.cawcr.gov.au/projects/PCCSP/Nov/Vol1_Ch3.pdf
181. Michael Denny, **Academics Call for Constitutional Moment in Environmental Governance**, 16/3/2012;
<http://www.environmentalgovernance.org/featured/2012/03/academics-call-for-constitutional-moment-in-environmental-governance/>
182. F. Biermann et al, **Navigating the Anthropocene: Improving Earth System Governance**, *Science*, 335, 1306, 2012; <http://www.sciencemag.org/content/335/6074/1306.summary>
183. Pakozdi Csaba, Sulyok Marton, **The Birth of a New Nation**, *Miskolc Journal of International Law*, 8, 43, 2011; http://www.uni-miskolc.hu/~wwwdrint/20112pakozdi_sulyok1.htm
184. F. Biermann et al, **Transforming Governance and Institutions for Global Sustainability: key insights from the earth system governance project**, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 4, 51, 2012; <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343512000152>
185. F. Biermann, S. Bernstein, **How Rio+20 Can Herald a Constitutional Moment**, *The Guardian*, 15/3/2012; <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/mar/15/rio20-constitutional-moment>
186. F.M. Besselink, **The Notion and Nature of a Constitution for the European Union**, June 2007;
<http://www.enelsyn.gr/papers/w4/Paper%20by%20Prof.%20Leonard%20F.M.%20Besselink.pdf>
187. Timothy Garton Ash, **Only a New Duet of Parliament and People, can Bring the Change we Need**, *The Guardian*, 8/7/2009; <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/jul/08/constitutional-reform-parliament-uk>
188. Julian Drape, **UN Needs a Sustainability Council**, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 29/3/2012;
<http://news.smh.com.au/breaking-news-national/un-needs-a-sustainability-council-csiro-20120329-1w0ra.html>
189. Mark Stafford Smith, **Welcome to the Anthropocene**, *ANU Rio+20 policy forum*, Nov 2011;
http://publicpolicy.anu.edu.au/public_policy_community/workshops/rio20_towards_sustainable_development/S2P2_Stafford_Smith.pdf
190. Glen Paul, **The Planet's Under Pressure**, Mark Stafford Smith interview, 7/3/2012;
<http://www.csiro.au/Portals/Multimedia/CSIROpod/Planet-under-pressure.aspx>

191. Lidia Brito, Mark Stafford Smith, **State of the Planet Declaration**, Planet Under Pressure Conference, March 2012; http://www.planetunderpressure2012.net/pdf/state_of_planet_declaration.pdf
192. Leo Hickman, **James Lovelock: Humans are too Stupid to Prevent Climate Change**, *The Guardian*, 29/2/2010; <http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2010/mar/29/james-lovelock-climate-change>
193. Clive Hamilton, **Environmentalism: The Way Forward**, 9/4/2011; http://www.clivehamilton.net.au/cms/media/documents/articles/environmentalism_the_way_forward.pdf
194. William Jasper, **The United Nations Exposed**, John Birch Society, 7/4/2001; <http://www.wearechange.ie/the-united-nations-exposed-part-1-foundations/>; see also http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/un_exposed/un_exposed.htm
195. **Lovelock's Conversion Challenges Climate Alarmists**, *The Australian*, 27/4/2012; <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/lovelocks-conversion-challenges-climate-alarmists/story-fn558imw-1226339184189>
196. Lydia Warren, **"I Made a Mistake": Gaia Theory Scientist James Lovelock Admits he was Alarmist About the Impact of Climate Change**, *Daily Mail*, 27/4/2012; <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2134092/Gaia-scientist-James-Lovelock-I-alarmist-climate-change.html?ITO=1490>
197. Gemma Jones, **Climate Change Alarmist Warnings all Hot Air, says British Scientist James Lovelock**, *The Daily Telegraph*, 25/4/2012; <http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/sydney-nsw/climate-change-alarmist-warnings-all-hot-air-says-british-scientist-james-lovelock/story-e6freuzi-1226337509756>
198. J. Risbey, Milind Kandlikar, **Expressions of Likelihood and Confidence in the IPCC Uncertainty Assessment Process**, *Climate Change*, 85, 19, 2007; http://www.marine.csiro.au/~ris009/pubfiles/cc_expr_like_conf.pdf