

RESPONSE TO CLIMATE COMMISSION REPORT – “Off the charts: Extreme Australian summer heat”

Graham Williamson

January 2013

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines the latest Climate Commission report entitled, “[Off the charts: Extreme Australian summer heat](#)”, and its evidential basis. The Commission report is assessed against its stated purpose, which is to highlight the connection between what is termed ‘**climate change**’, and the 2012-13 Australian heat wave and resultant bush fires. Vital features of the report include the following.

- The Climate Commission, with David Karoly and co-authors, begins its task of highlighting the connection between what is referred to as ‘**climate change**’, and the 2012-23 summer heat wave by citing various statistical data indicating very high or claimed record summer temperatures.
- However, the report provides no evidence directly linking these temperatures to what they call ‘**climate change**’, although it must be noted that **the Climate Commission’s definition of ‘climate change’ ambiguously includes both natural climate variability and any human induced changes.**
- Although the report does contain isolated references to the subject of alleged human causation, the claims are very vague and on one occasion, involve the repetition of a recycled discredited IPCC claim.
- **Overwhelmingly, the report prefers to discuss ‘climate change’ rather than [AGW](#) or ‘human caused climate change’. This apparent decision to downplay the fundamental matter of human attribution is extremely significant and is the dominant theme throughout the report. It is clear that this report was intended by the Commission NOT to distinguish between natural climate change and AGW or human caused climate change.**
- **Any impression that the report focuses on human caused climate change and its connection to the summer heat wave is entirely undeserved and is merely a façade unsupported by evidence.**
- **This report adds further weight to the view that there is no scientific basis for AGW and associated mitigative political policies.** This is even in spite of the fact that billions of dollars have so far been wasted on identifying and quantifying an AGW signal.

The report, which relies upon obfuscation, and ambiguous use of the term ‘**climate change**’, **completely fails to link Australia’s high temperatures to human caused climate change.** The vague use of language, ambiguous expressions, or [weasel words](#), creates the perception that this report is about political spin and manipulation, not communication. **Such tactics can be expected to become more popular as the truth about the unscientific nature of [AGW](#) continues to be exposed.**

The Australian government, the scientific community, and all Australians, should be extremely concerned about any alarming reports which use language to mislead or deceive, or fail to clearly define, the term ‘climate change’.

Background – Concern About the Southern Heat, But Not the Northern Freeze?

As CSIRO have aptly pointed out in [Climate Change: Science and Solutions for Australia](#) – “*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.*” And in their publication [State of the Climate 2012](#), CSIRO stress that **natural climate variability caused by “El Nino and La Nina events” “have continued to produce the hot droughts and cooler wet periods for which Australia is well known”**, over the past century. Now however, with the advent of global politics, global economics, and consensus science, ‘climate change’ is nothing more than a [market failure](#).

The latest Climate Commission ‘report’, entitled ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)) “[Off the charts: Extreme Australian summer heat](#)”, has been released to coincide with Australia’s 2012-2013 summer heat wave and resultant bush fires. Politicians, and their advisors and ideological activists, seemingly endorse anything which justifies their particular climate change agenda. It seems the ashes had not stopped smouldering before the latest bush fire tragedy was exploited by political or ideological opportunists and sensational media reports blaming climate change ([5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#)). Of course, given the fact that some prominent mainstream media publications have been shown by Professor Wendy Bacon and the [ACIJ](#) in their report entitled “[A Sceptical Climate, Media coverage of climate change in Australia 2011](#)” to be [significantly biased in favour of government policy](#), it is hardly surprising that once again there would be a rush to endorse the government position. The fact that the earlier CSIRO report, [Climate Change Impacts on Fire Weather in South East Australia](#), predicted no increased fire risk for Hobart, underlines yet again the foolishness of relying upon computer predictions given the current tragedy in that locality ([14](#), [15](#)). Floods, fires, rain, drought, and heat waves, do not readily and obediently align themselves with computer predictions.

Given the [global anti-Australian priorities of our politicians](#) and supportive politicised scientists, their determination to put their long term global agenda ahead of the immediate needs of Australians, particularly the suffering of the many Australians affected by the fires and the boosting of fire fighting resources, is hardly surprising. According to Phillips ([11](#)):

“Every year, the media reports heroic efforts by residents and firefighters during the summer but there is a deafening silence about how governments—state and federal alike—have contributed to the worsening dangers during the bushfire season, threatening the safety and lives of ordinary people, as well as emergency service personnel.

Federal and state authorities, which provide miniscule amounts of direct funding and heavily rely on volunteers to staff rural fire services, have consistently rejected calls for additional full-time fire fighters, coordinated national action, properly resourced evacuation facilities and other rudimentary fire safety measures. Demands for increased resources following Victoria’s disastrous 2009 Black Saturday fires have been largely ignored.

According to “A Fire Safe Community” report in January 2012, Tasmania has one of the lowest numbers of full-time fire fighters per capita in Australia, and the worst response time to fire calls. In Victoria, \$66 million was stripped from the firefighting budget last year, including \$40 million from the Country Fire Authority. The NSW government is cutting \$70 million from its services over the next four years, and the Queensland government has slashed firefighters’ jobs.

Prime Minister Julia Gillard feigned concern over the plight of fire victims when she visited Tasmania today, claiming that her government was “standing with them in every way.” But when asked by the media on Saturday if the government would provide financial assistance to victims, she had attempted to dodge the question, declaring that the main focus was “fighting the fires.”

At today’s media conference in Hobart, Gillard offered nothing apart from the standard federal relief package for natural disaster victims, which was announced on Sunday. Those affected can apply for

\$1,000 per adult and \$400 per child—a pittance compared to the losses suffered, particularly by those who have lost their homes and livelihoods”

Even though the 2009 Victorian Royal Commission into bush fires ([16](#), [17](#)) stressed the importance of ongoing Commonwealth funding and resources to counter the bush fire threat, this year, 2013, following the widespread fires, the Federal government will cease funding bush fire research ([18](#)). Funding for global warming ([AGW](#)) will of course continue, and no doubt continue to increase.

Those on the alarmist side of the global warming debate seem to link alleged human caused warming around the world to the current Australian bush fires ([5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#), [22](#)), even in spite of the simultaneous record cold temperatures being apparently caused by global warming in the northern hemisphere ([23](#), [24](#), [25](#), [26](#), [27](#), [28](#), [29](#), [30](#), [31](#), [32](#), [33](#), [34](#)), and reports of global cooling ([35](#), [36](#), [37](#), [38](#), [39](#), [40](#)). According to Alexander ([37](#)):

“The link between extreme weather and global warming has as much scientific basis as the pagan rite of human sacrifice to ensure a good harvest.

Yes, the supposed connection between unusual weather events and global warming is often taken as self-evident.....The fact is that anomalous weather events, such as hurricanes, heat waves, floods, droughts and killer tornadoes, show no long-term trend whatsoever over more than a century of reliable data. Weather extremes have occurred from time immemorial, long before industrialization boosted the CO2 level in the atmosphere.....Extremes are a natural part of our climate, which constantly changes and is rarely stable for extended periods. In fact, weather extremes are the “old normal,” not a “new normal,” as UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon proclaimed in Qatar.”

Whether global cooling is causing the fires, and if so, what percentage of this cooling is caused by, and is reversible by, humans, remains to be determined.

Although those on the alarmist side of the current global warming debate have been enthusiastically, processing the statistics and reporting broken temperature records during the current heat wave, there is a tendency to reject data which does not support their global warming agenda. According to Miranda Devine in her report, [Aussies have weathered nature’s extremes before](#):

“CLIMATE alarmists have waited a while for a good heatwave to press their case that human activities are causing unprecedented catastrophic global warming. This summer the weather delivered.

Right on cue, after a record string of hot days across Australia, the ABC, The Guardian (UK) , the Climate Commission, the CSIRO and the UN’s IPCC (coincidentally meeting in bushfire-racked Tasmania) all trotted out scary climate statements.

The Bureau of Meteorology even added an extra colour to its heat scale, even though previous charts have included temperatures over 50C, and there have been hotter days in the past.

Yes there have. There really, really have.

Take the 50.7C at Oodnadatta Airport in South Australia on January 2, 1960, or the 50.3C the next day.Whatever is the extent of global warming and any human contribution to climate change, exaggerating the 2013 heatwave is just another green lie which will blow up in all our faces.

NSW hit a high of 48.3 degrees on Saturday at Bourke, according to the Bureau of Meteorology, and Sydney hit 42.3 degrees last Tuesday.

But we haven’t come close to the highest state temperature on record, (BoM records have been kept since 1910) which was 49.7 degrees in Menindee on January 10, 1939.

Or even to the 48.9 recorded at Brewarrina on December 9, 1912.”

When it comes to global warming fanaticism it appears, deaths from extreme cold, or previous record high temperatures, are of little or no significance.

Sadly, it seems there still remain many in the Australian political and scientific communities who expect Australians to continue to believe in politically inspired fictitious human caused global warming. What is most disturbing, apart from the issues of integrity this involves, is the misuse of public funds and the determination to divert millions of dollars from supporting the needs of ordinary Australians to their global ideological agenda, including fictitious AGW.

The price we all continue to pay for this is astronomical.

Diverting public funds from helping real people today to instead support people who do not yet exist, and for the purposes of driving a self-interested extreme political agenda, is immoral and some may say, criminal, especially when human lives are involved. But the green ideological agenda has long been considered more important than preventing bush fires and their consequences.

As has been emphasised by the CSIRO, it is the 'fuel' in the form of dead leaves and bark which greatly intensifies bush fires and renders ignition much easier (41):

"Much of Australia's vegetation has evolved with fire and curiously, like the vegetation in other harsh dry environments, it has developed characteristics that promote the spread of fire:

- *Eucalypt litter is coarse and decays slowly, ensuring that after several years there will be an abundant build-up to carry the next fire.*
- *The bark of many species is flammable and loosely attached to the trees, making ideal firebrands to carry fire across natural barriers.*
- *The green leaves contain highly flammable oils and resins that act as a catalyst to promote combustion before the leaves are fully dry.*

All the potentials are there and sooner or later, in some part of Australia, weather patterns will occur so that strong, hot, dry winds will blow from the centre of the continent after the fuel has been preconditioned by drought.

All that is needed is a spark to produce a conflagration that simply cannot be stopped until the weather moderates.....The bushland areas and particularly those around Sydney, New South Wales, have thickened and accumulated more fuel.....As a result, the infrequent fires that now occur under extreme weather burn much more intensely and have a significant impact on the built environment.....If we want to reduce fire intensity and make fire suppression safer and easier we need to accept that it is the dry undergrowth and dead leaf, bark and twig litter that provides the fuel for bushfires, and use prescribed fire to reduce fuel loads.....We need to support the fire service and the land management agencies when there is no emergency and accept the minor inconvenience of smoke in the air when fire is prescribed for hazard reduction, forest regeneration or biodiversity management."

Given these facts it is hardly surprising that controlled burn offs to reduce fuel load is one of the main preventative tools of fire fighters and a strategy which has been endorsed by numerous enquiries, including the Victorian Royal Commission (16, 17, 18, 19). However, the political [ecocentric green or gaian agenda](#) dictates that [plants and the environment are more important than humans](#) and therefore burn offs have been politically obstructed (20):

"Over much of the bushland in Victoria there has been no effort to reduce fuel levels by any means for the past twenty-five years as a result of pressure from urban green groups, academics and gutless leadership from the government."

Similarly, in the Brisbane floods it was said to be the political green agenda, combined with predictions of drought and global warming, which prevented early release of dam water and exacerbated the flood ([21](#), [22](#), [23](#), [24](#)).

Deliberate political obstruction of property rights and burn offs are the result of [ecocentric plants come first human rights destroying global agreements](#) such as [Agenda 21](#) which are implemented by [state governments and local councils](#) using [native vegetation laws](#) ([16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#)) and [biobanking schemes](#). The serious consequences of this undemocratic erosion of human rights has recently been highlighted by Miranda Devine in an article entitled "[Lets Tell the Burning Truth About Bush Fires and the ALP-Greens Coalition](#)":

"WHENEVER a major bushfire catastrophe occurs in Australia, the victims are essentially told to shut up.

It happened after Victoria's Black Saturday fires in 2009. It happened after the Canberra bushfires, 10 years ago on Friday. And it's happening now in Tasmania.....

Now is the time for people who understand the bush to tell the rest of Australia what fools we are.

'Fuel reduction burns make it possible to fight and control a fire; what happened here was uncontrollable,' Dunalley farmer Leigh Arnold told The Australian.

Greenies who oppose such burnoffs, 'care more about birds and wildlife than they do about people and farms,' he said.

'But what's the point of that now when the hills and trees they told me I couldn't burn off, because there were protected eagles and swift parrots there, are now all burned and the fire it created was so hot we had dead swans dropping out of the sky?'

No, the only permissible comment on a bushfire catastrophe is to say it was caused by 'climate change' - that convenient get-out-of-jail free card for greenies, governments and the obstructive bureaucracies they jointly create.....

No matter what legalistic and linguistic ploys are now used to rewrite history, green hostility to proper bushfire management is on the record, from the light-green NIMBYs who object to smoke, to green lobbyists who infiltrate government decision-making, taxpayer-funded green activists who embed themselves in government agencies, the bureaucratic green tape which makes the job of volunteer firefighters so difficult, the green NGOs who strongarm politicians, right up to the political arm of green ideology, The Greens....

It's not enough but it's a welcome change from the dark days of 2003, eight months before the Canberra inferno, when former RFS Commissioner Phil Koperberg told a NSW parliamentary inquiry that widespread hazard reduction was 'an exercise in futility'.

Fast forward to last month and blame for that fire has finally been laid where it belongs, at the feet of Koperberg's RFS and the green-influenced National Parks and Wildlife Service.

[Brinadabella farmer Wayne West](#), whose property was wiped out in the fires, [sued the two agencies. Last month in the ACT Supreme Court](#), Chief Justice Terrence Higgins found them negligent.

The episode demonstrated how green pressure on decision-makers filters down into a cascade of subtle bureaucratic obstructions which disempower firefighters on the ground and disregard their expertise.

The result in 2003 was that a small fire at McIntyre's Hut in the Brindabella ranges was allowed to rage out of control through the national park to emerge 10 days later, and burn lethally through Canberra's suburbs.

Unfortunately for West and his insurance company, the government agencies are protected by statute and don't have to pay compensation.

But West won a moral victory. We all are in his debt because he fought for the truth and refused to shut up.

Unlike the enlightened and the greens, in what is termed the ([19](#)) "feral age of fire" (ie European colonisation), it seems those who have suffered personally from fires may simply fail to understand

(19) *“the fundamental importance of fire in Australia’s evolutionary and cultural history.”* According to Campbell, as cited by Johnston & Bowman (19), *“rather than demonising fire with the language of warfare, disaster, destruction and terror, we should have explicit programs that are about learning to live with fire.”* It seems the emphasis is on more funds for living with fires rather than preventing them (19).

Given this background of overriding political agendas, climate change, and bush fires, let us examine The latest Climate Commission ‘report’, [“Off the charts: Extreme Australian summer heat”](#).

As the Northern Hemisphere Freezes from Global Warming, The Climate Commission Produces their New Report: [Off the charts: Extreme Australian summer heat](#)

The purpose of this new *Off the Chart* report by Climate Commissioners, David Karoly, Will Steffen, and Matthew England, is not clear. The [Off the Chart report](#), and the Commission, describe it as a document which (4) *“provides a summary of the influence of **climate change** on Australia’s temperature and extreme heat events.”* According to ABC News (42), *“The scientific advisor to the Climate Commission, Professor David Karoly, has written the report for the Climate Commission to answer questions about the link between heatwaves and **climate change**.”* While the report cites various statistical data in support of its claim of high summer temperatures, it fails to link these temperatures to what is referred to as ‘**climate change**’. This is not surprising however, since the report avoids defining what is meant by this term. Whether the term ‘*climate change*’ is intended to mean ‘*human caused climate change*’ is not made clear and is curiously left open to the interpretation of the reader, even though this term is used 12 times in the *Off the Chart* report.

However, it must be admitted that failure to distinguish ‘*climate change*’ from ‘*human caused climate change*’ could be seen as a deliberate attempt to confuse, mislead and conceal the truth, especially given the loose, [‘sloppy’ unscientific use of the term ‘climate change’](#) often utilised in political or alarmist literature. For instance the **Australian Clean Energy Act** in [Part 1 Section 3](#) states the object of the Act is to enforce the United Nations [Climate Change Convention](#) and the [Kyoto Protocol](#) and *“to support the development of an effective global response to climate change.”* In [Section 4 of the Act](#), the **Simplified Outline of the Act** is defined thus:

“This Act sets up a mechanism to deal with climate change by encouraging the use of clean energy.”

In [Section 5 of the Clean Energy Act](#) the term *“international climate change agreement”* is defined as *“the Climate Change Convention”*. But in [Article 1 of the UN Climate Change Convention](#) the term ‘*climate change*’ is defined thus:

“‘Climate change’ means a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.”

Of course this is a deliberate corruption of the literal meaning of the term by an organisation that has its own global agenda. The terms ‘climate’ and ‘change’ make no reference whatsoever to humans, to causation, or to greenhouse gases, so it is hardly surprising that the [standard dictionary definition](#) of this term has absolutely no implications as far as alleged human caused climate change is concerned. The fact that organisations like [Melbourne Water](#) are also seeking to corrupt the English language and redefine the term ‘*climate change*’ in support of the [UNFCCC](#) definition is indeed disturbing.

The Commonwealth government however, in their publication, "[Climate Change Impacts & Risk Management](#)", emphasises that the term 'climate change' embraces ALL climatic changes and does NOT mean climate change caused by humans as suggested by the UNFCC:

Climate change means, "*Any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity.*"

This agrees with Ross Garnaut in the [Garnaut Climate Change Review](#), who adopts the [IPCC definition](#) (which contradicts the [UNFCC definition](#)) and points out that 'climate change' includes ALL climatic changes, not just alleged human caused changes.

Most importantly for consideration of the Commission's 'Off the Charts' report, if we are guided by [the Climate Commission's definition of 'climate change'](#), we will need to adopt the standard literal (*ie not human caused*) meaning:

"Climate change' refers to the way long-term [weather patterns](#) have been changing over many decades. One of the ways the Earth's climate is changing is through increases in global temperatures, or 'global warming'."

Given the above facts it is clear that the *Off the Charts* Climate Commission Report by Karoly, England and Steffen, was produced to consider climate change in general, and avoid any specific consideration of [AGW](#) or human caused climate change. Both the Commission, and Karoly, clearly state the report is about "climate change", not human caused climate change.

Given the fact that the purpose of the report has nothing to do with human caused climate change per se, it is clear that it makes no scientific contribution to the AGW debate or about any human contribution to the current heat wave. In fact, as the report points out, "*This document provides a summary of the influence of climate change on Australia's temperature and extreme heat events.*" **The fact that natural climate change (ie. not human caused) may be linked to high temperatures is hardly surprising and hardly warrants a special report to establish this connection.** Nevertheless, bearing in mind the fact that the report was intended to focus upon 'climate change' rather than human caused climate change, let us take a brief look at the report.

Notwithstanding the above facts, the following three vague references in the report refer to the possible part allegedly played by human causation. Two of these seek to link greenhouse gas emissions to future severe weather events.

"Understanding the link between heat extremes and climate change is important because efforts today to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will influence the severity of these types of events in the future. Having a good understanding of climate change risks can ensure that we take appropriate action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to put measures in place to prepare for, and respond to, more extreme weather."

This was restated by the Commission as a "**key message**":

"Good community understanding of climate change risks is critical to ensure we take appropriate action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to put measures in place to prepare for, and respond to, extreme weather."

The Commission continues to vaguely link greenhouse gas emissions and severe weather:

“The increase in extreme weather in Australia illustrates an important way that greenhouse gases are forcing a shift in climate that is very costly. This highlights the need for urgent action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.”

The prediction that normal climate change or severe weather events can be controlled in the future by reducing emissions is completely unsubstantiated and unquantified. How much reduction in emissions? Which severe weather events? How much will the severity be reduced? When, how long in the future? Does the report refer to Australia’s emissions, China’s emissions, or global emissions? The report provides the questions, but gives no answers. But in the key message above it seems that our *“understanding of climate change risks is critical”* for us to *prepare and respond to* (ie. not to prevent), severe weather events. This seems quite reasonable, if we can define ‘climate change risks’, but what does it have to do with [AGW](#)?

In the third instance the report repeats an endlessly recycled and discredited IPCC claim that was developed by ignoring or understating the scientific uncertainties of human attribution:

“The increase in temperature observed around the world is directly connected to the increase in greenhouse gases from human activities (IPCC, 2011).”

This analysis is based upon the unscientific political belief that local climate policy should be determined by applying global averages to all local areas. In other words, **Australia’s environmental and climate policies should NOT be determined by what is happening in Australia, as has been done in the past, but rather should be based upon what is happening in the rest of the world.** Since this strategy is based upon global politics, and the desire to blame humans, rather than reality or clear science, it is hardly surprising that the IPCC has been thoroughly discredited and the above claim contradicted by thousands of so called sceptical scientists from around the world. Serious doubts about the impact of humans upon climate have also been expressed by CSIRO, BOM, the Australian government, and the Australian Academy of Science. The Australian government for instance, in their [2011 State of the Environment Report](#), has pointed out that natural La Nina and El Nino events may cause such dramatic local climatic variations that it is difficult to detect any clear evidence confirming so called human caused climate change.

This has been reinforced by Kevin Hennessy of the CSIRO and Scott Power of the Bureau of Meteorology ([43](#), [44](#), [45](#)):

“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.”

And the Australian Academy of Science have also expressed their doubts ([46](#)):

*“It is **very likely** that **most** of the recent observed global warming is caused by increasing greenhouse gas levels” “**many** aspects of climate change will likely remain difficult to foresee despite continuing modelling advances, leaving open the possibility of climate change **surprises**” “**some aspects** of climate science are still quite **uncertain** ” “Uncertainty about future climate change works in both directions: there is a chance that climate change will be less severe than current best estimates, but there is also a roughly equal chance that it will be worse.”*

Climate Commissioner Tim Flannery has also expressed his doubts about climate science and the unreliability of computer predictions ([47](#), [48](#),[49](#)):

"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."

Perhaps the reliability of computer models has been best summarised by Professor Sherwood who points out that model predictions (50) "**must be taken with a grain of salt**" and the best 'scientific' justification for mitigative action to reduce emissions is therefore that "**it's better to be safe than sorry**":

"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."

But when it comes to the science of human caused global warming, special efforts are made 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 (51):

"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."

But not only do Professors Karoly, England, and Steffen seem to disagree with their colleagues above and avoid mentioning these uncertainties in their latest report, they also avoid mentioning the record cold in the northern hemisphere which has already taken many lives (23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56). Given the fact that this extreme cold and loss of life dwarfs what is happening in the southern hemisphere and is therefore presently the dominant global weather extreme, why is this completely ignored by the *Off the Charts* report? Is there deliberate bias here and no concern about the most dangerous weather pattern? Are deaths from extreme cold unimportant? It must be assumed that Karoly's *Off the Charts* report is founded upon the concern of the professors for the future of humanity so why do they show no concern whatsoever for the plight of our northern neighbours?

The report does however express concern about the health consequences of what it describes as Australian "*heat waves*", however no evidence is provided linking [AGW](#) to direct health consequences. One possible reason for this is that a previous [attempt by the Commission to link AGW to specific health consequences has been discredited](#). Those seeking to justify climate alarmism and global political controls often blame human suffering caused by severe weather events upon so called '*climate change*'. Such reports commonly avoid clearly blaming [AGW](#) or human caused climate change, preferring instead a loose, ['unscientific use of the term 'climate change'](#).

Reports such as "[Future under threat: climate change and children's health](#)" by Farrant, Armstrong, and Albrecht, further demonstrate this tendency to blame '*climate change*' for various alarming health consequences while avoiding even a basic definition of their terminology. If they are referring to [AGW](#) or human caused climate change, like so many other similar alarming reports they fail to

indicate the methodology which has been utilised to distinguish the consequences of alleged [AGW](#) from those due to natural variation or severe weather events ([57](#), [58](#), [59](#), [60](#)).

The Australian government, the Climate Commission, the scientific community, and all Australians, should be extremely concerned about alarming reports which misuse, obfuscate, or fail to define, the term ‘*climate change*’, especially when such reports propagate health fears about children. **Any attempts to deliberately propagate false health information or spread health fears based upon false or unsubstantiated information, should attract extremely severe penalties.**

The *Off the Charts* Climate Commission report has again highlighted the [misuse or vague use of language](#) to mislead, deceive, or manipulate the public. According to [Robert Todd Carroll](#):

“Some people are often intentionally unclear. They use language to conceal the truth, to mislead, confuse, or deceive us. They do not use language to communicate ideas or feelings; they use it to control thought and behaviour. Manipulation, not communication, is their goal.”

Given these facts serious questions must be asked about the vague use of the term ‘climate change’, not just in this report, but also in the wider debate about sustainability and climate change. The issues involved are far too important to be controlled by those whose values endorse deliberate misuse of language to avoid democracy by deceiving and manipulating the public. This matter has been dealt with in some detail by Ben Grono in [“The Corruption of Language”](#):

*“The way that the language of contemporary politics is misused to deceive us and obscure reality mirrors Orwell’s imagined future in which truth and honesty are absent from political discourse..... In *Politics and the English Language*, Orwell was most critical of vague and incompetent political language that concealed reality by tending away from concrete meaning.⁷ This language - weasel words, stale metaphors, managerial buzz words, pretentious diction and other meaningless phrases - continues to proliferate in contemporary political discourse. Seeking a shield against attack, public figures instinctively use ambiguous expressions, described as weasel words, to complicate meaning..... Our growing awareness of the natural environment on which we depend has spurred the creation of the most recent set of buzz words and meaningless terms. The most notorious of these words—often labelled as astro-turfing—are the adjectives ‘sustainable’ and ‘green’, which can (and are) applied to any idea or policy in search of support..... Orwell’s concern for the corruption of language is justified, and so too is concern for the now contested notion of truth itself. Contemporary political discourse is constantly manipulated and attempts must be made to revive language and meaning in debate. The clear and precise language Orwell argued for is needed in any society where power is shared. Effective communication, the relationship of trust between the governors and the governed, and the ability to recognise dishonesty and incompetence are all reliant on expressive language.”*

Language may be used to destroy democracy or the ability of the public to make an informed choice. The use of spin, distortions, and deliberate deceit is creating an undemocratic dream world, controlled by deceit, completely detached from reality. It is a fictitious dream world where everyone becomes rich from controlling the climate.

Sooner or later we will all pay the real price as reality returns.

Conclusion

Intending to target the Australian public, it is clear that the *Off the Charts* report is another politically inspired report intended to justify and support political climate policy. With its dependence upon spin and motherhood statements and its biased avoidance of contrary scientific evidence this latest

Commission report certainly does not qualify as a scientific document. Although the report masquerades as being about human causation of temperature extremes (ie reversibility), in fact the Climate Commission specifically states the report is about '*climate change*', which they define as "***the way long-term weather patterns have been changing over many decades.***" In other words, according to the Commission, the report was not written to consider the influence of human caused climate change.

Although the report does contain isolated references to the subject of possible human causation, the claims are vague and on one occasion, involve the repetition of a recycled discredited IPCC claim. Overwhelmingly, the report prefers to discuss '*climate change*' rather than **AGW** or '**human caused climate change**'. This apparent decision to downplay the fundamental matter of human attribution is extremely significant and is such a dominant theme throughout the report that the message it conveys must be acted upon. This report adds further weight to the view that there is no scientific basis for AGW and associated mitigative political policies. This is even in spite of the fact that billions of dollars have so far been wasted on identifying and quantifying an AGW signal. This waste must stop and funds reallocated to those in real need.

Those who have a vested interest in [Creating Climate Wealth in Australia](#) also have a vested interest in continuing the pretence that climate can be controlled by humans, or more specifically, controlled by money. For this reason, as the truth about the unscientific nature of AGW continues to be exposed, we can expect increasing resort to vague, misleading, or '[sloppy](#)' [unscientific use of the term 'climate change'](#). **Fewer alarmists will dare to make specific claims about the consequences of human caused climate change without the protection of obfuscation, misleading, or undefined terms.**