

ACADEMY OF SCIENCE RELEASES LATEST CLIMATE CHANGE RESEARCH

Issue 1 – Academy Discovers “Hot Days” may be Related to Natural Climate Changes

Graham Williamson
March 2015 (Rev)

Academy of Science Uses Government Funds to Update Definition of ‘Climate Change’

[According to Andrew Holmes](#), President of the Australian Academy of Science, [the Academy’s earlier 2010 climate change publication](#) required updating to reflect the latest research, hence their latest climate change publication, [“The science of climate change: Questions and answers”, Australian Academy of Science, Canberra, 2015](#):

“It is an extensively revised update of a similarly titled Academy publication in 2010 that summarised the state of knowledge at that time.The views presented in the answers to the nine key questions were carefully reviewed by an Oversight Committee and 12 independent climate scientist....the Academy is especially grateful to the Department of the Environment, which provided the financial support for the preparation and publication of this document”

Ok, so what did the Academy’s 2010 report say that required updating?

Well firstly the definition of ‘climate change’ needed to be changed. [In 2010 the Academy defined ‘climate change thus](#):

“What is climate change?

Climate is a statistical description of weather conditions and their variations including both averages and extremes. Climate change is a change in the average pattern of weather over a long period of time. Greenhouse gases play an important role in determining climate and causing climate change.”

[But in 2015 the Academy stressed](#) that ‘climate change’ includes both natural climate variability as well as human induced changes.

“What is climate change?

The term ‘climate’, in its broadest sense, refers to a statistical description of weather and of the related conditions of oceans, land surfaces and ice sheets. This includes consideration of averages, variability and extremes. Climate change is an alteration in the pattern of climate over a long period of time, and may be due to a combination of natural and human induced causes.”

[The Academy further emphasises the point](#):

“Climate change may be due to natural processes, such as changes in the Sun’s radiation, volcanoes or internal variability in the climate system, or due to human influences such as changes in the composition of the atmosphere or land use.”

Given the Academy's definition [in their latest report](#) that 'climate change' may result from natural climate variability and is therefore not controllable by human intervention or reduction of human induced greenhouse gases, their following claim is most unremarkable:

"How are extreme events changing?"

Since the mid-20th century, climate change has resulted in increases in the frequency and intensity of very hot days and decreases in very cold days."

So the total resources of the Australian Academy of Science has now discovered, in 2015, that natural climate variation may be related to hot days and cold days, as has been the case for thousands of years!

Academy Refuses to State Which Consequences of 'Climate Change' are due to Humans

In answer to Question 7 of their report, "[What are the Impacts of Climate Change?](#)", [the Academy states](#), in their summary on page 5:

7 What are the impacts of climate change?

Climate change has impacts on ecosystems, coastal systems, fire regimes, food and water security, health, infrastructure and human security. Impacts on ecosystems and societies are already occurring around the world, including in Australia. The impacts will vary from one region to another and, in the short term, can be both positive and negative. In the future, the impacts of climate change will intensify and interact with other stresses. If greenhouse gas emissions continue to be high, it is likely that the human-induced component of climate change will exceed the capacity of some countries to adapt.

It is all very disturbing, "*climate change*" has "*impacts*" upon fires, food and water, health, and even "*human security*". According to the Academy though, these "*impacts*" are caused by "*climate change*", which includes the perfectly natural changes that have been happening for thousands of years. The Academy did point out however:

"If greenhouse gas emissions continue to be high, it is likely that the human-induced component of climate change will exceed the capacity of some countries to adapt."

The Academy raises such serious issues in the context of "*climate change*" which is human caused and therefore reversible by the UN if we give them enough money, then points out "*it is likely that the human-induced component of climate change will exceed the capacity of some countries to adapt.*"

How likely? Exactly what percentage is caused by the "*human-induced component?*" The Academy is supposed to supplying authoritative scientific answers, not guesswork.

[In the body of the Report](#), on p24, the question, *what are the impacts of climate change*, is answered in more detail:

"Climate changes have always affected societies and ecosystems

Climate change, whatever the cause, has profoundly affected human societies and the natural environment in the past. Throughout history there are examples of societal collapse associated with regional changes in climate, ranging from the decline of the Maya in Mexico (linked to drought) to the disappearance of the Viking community from Greenland in the fifteenth century (linked to decreasing temperatures). Some of these regional climate changes occurred rapidly, on timescales similar to current rates of global climate change."

Note that the Academy often refers to “*climate change*” (which includes natural variability), and only occasionally refers to “*human-induced climate change*”.

OK, so what has the collapse of the Mayan empire got to do with human caused climate change that can supposedly be mitigated by our politicians surrendering to the dictates of the UN and lowering human induced CO2 emissions? Is this a ‘breakthrough discovery’ that required funding by government? Clearly there is absolutely nothing here to justify the UN’s global climate change agenda.

But the Academy quickly alleges “***Impacts from human-induced climate change are already occurring***”:

“The clearest present-day impacts of climate change in Australia and elsewhere are seen in the natural environment, and are associated with warming temperatures and increases in the number, duration and severity of heatwaves. These impacts include changes in the growth and distribution of plants, animals and insects; poleward shifts in the distribution of marine species; and increases in coral bleaching on the Great Barrier Reef and Western Australian reefs. Some of these changes can directly affect human activities; for example, through the effects of changing distributions of fish and other marine organisms on commercial and recreational fisheries, and the impacts of coral bleaching on tourism. Some regional changes in Australian rainfall have been linked to human induced climate change. Southwest Western Australia has experienced a reduction in rainfall since the 1970s that has been attributed, at least in part, to enhanced greenhouse warming (Question 3). Societal adaptation to the resulting shortfalls in water supply is possible and already occurring (Box 7.1).”

The promising subtitle “*Impacts from human-induced climate change are already occurring*” leads one to conclude that at last Academy scientists are going to reveal some definite new discovery showing impacts of climate change that have been scientifically shown to be due to human caused emissions. But alas, right from the outset the Academy emphasises that the changes referred to are caused by “climate change”, which includes perfectly natural changes which are NOT controllable by scientists or politicians. The Academy could only offer the following vague and unscientific reference to possible human induced changes:

“Some regional changes in Australian rainfall have been linked to human induced climate change. Southwest Western Australia has experienced a reduction in rainfall since the 1970s that has been attributed, at least in part, to enhanced greenhouse warming”

What regional changes? Linked or caused by? Attributed in part? 20%? 50%? This new government funded report avoids scientific answers and provides more questions.

Undaunted though, like many politicians, the Academy continues to refuse to scientifically separate the consequences of natural climate change from those supposedly due to human caused reversible climate change:

Current changes are expected to continue and intensify in the future

The impacts of future climate change and related sea-level rise will be experienced in many areas, from the natural environment to food security and from human health to infrastructure.....

Health:

Heatwaves are among the highest-impact climate events in terms of human health in Australia..... Extreme events also have psychological impacts. Drought is known to cause depression and stress amongst farmers and pastoralists, and this impact may increase over southern Australia as a result of climate change..

Infrastructure:

Climate change can have impacts on infrastructure such as electricity and transport networks.....

The effects of climate change elsewhere will impact Australia

Human society is now globally interconnected, dependent on intricate supply chains and a finite resource base..... In this interconnected world, many risks to Australia from climate change, and potentially many opportunities, arise from impacts outside our national borders. For example: (1) sea-level rise and extreme events will threaten coastal zones, Pacific small island states, and large urban centres in Asian megadeltas; (2) global food production and trading patterns will change as present-day exporters see production fall, and as new exporters emerge; (3) climate change may exacerbate emerging humanitarian and security issues elsewhere in the world, leading to increased demands on Australia for aid, disaster relief and resettlement."

The Academy though, in their apparent eagerness to mislead or confuse rather than simply state the scientific facts, moved even further from science to political advocacy or outright fantasy with their answer to question 9, "**what does science say about options to address climate change?**" [According to the summary of their report](#), on p5:

9 What does science say about options to address climate change?

Societies, including Australia, face choices about how to respond to the consequences of future climate change. Available strategies include reducing emissions, capturing CO₂, adaptation and 'geoengineering'. These strategies, which can be combined to some extent, carry different levels of environmental risk and different societal consequences. The role of climate science is to inform decisions by providing the best possible knowledge of climate outcomes and the consequences of alternative courses of action.

The Academy emphasises that these are options to address "*climate change*", which of course, includes perfectly natural climatic variations. No doubt many would like to see the Academy's scientific evidence confirming that alleged human caused changes to temperature, rainfall, and sea level, may be controlled by reducing Australian emissions. **But the Academy has gone even further here, suggesting "*climate change*" or natural climatic changes, may also be changed by reducing emissions!**

Like so many politically funded scientific organisations, the Academy continues to turn obfuscation into a new scientific discipline by their obstinate determination to confuse natural climate change with supposed human induced climate change. So why do they consider this obfuscation necessary? If they have scientific evidence of the consequences of human induced climate change per se, then why not reveal it? Australians need to know. The world needs to know.

Are we expected to believe that it was beyond the scientific ability of Academy scientists to clearly distinguish natural climate changes from human-induced climate change in spite of all the certainty? Or, on the other hand, are Academy scientists, like so called sceptical scientists, simply confirming that significant effects of human caused climate change cannot be confirmed by science?

This latest Academy report just continues the confusion and obfuscation of past politicised reports. But even worse, it required even more public money to do so. Masquerading as a supposedly scientific report, any 'scientific' report that deliberately obfuscates, denigrates science and brings shame upon the scientific community. This report, like so many others, is consistent with the global political climate change agenda.