

6 June 2012

The Productivity Commission

Re: Draft Report – Barriers to Effective Climate Change Adaption

In effect, the whole report is based on one single factor, namely: *climate change which is caused by human-induced increased atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases*. This factor is used in isolation and out of context and ignores the other far greater contributors to climate change. I know that the Government has accepted this as a fact. But it is wrong and immoral, as well as a waste of public money, to proceed if there is any doubt about the truth of this assumption. It is time that someone had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say that more work needs to be done before another cent of public money is spent.

Proponents of anthropogenic global warming (AGW)/climate change are spreading fear around the world and people are being pressured to give up their freedom in order to 'save' their grandchildren and the world from AGW doom. I need to be clear that I am **not** against conservation or protecting the environment, and I agree we need to be responsible for preserving this earth to the best of our abilities. But this must be done based on truth and common sense, and not on lies and deception. So, what is the truth?

First, climate change is a fact. It has always changed and it is changing now. The key issues are what causes these changes, and can we do anything about them?

I have provided some verifiable data for those who wish to go a bit deeper into the subject and genuinely want to know the truth. But until someone can provide a satisfactory answer to the first point, which provides a 'prima facie' case that man-made carbon dioxide (CO₂) is **not** the major cause of climate change, nothing will be gained by wasting time on the other points.

Point 1. People who are open to the truth do not need to be scientists, but to simply apply common sense. Prior to the beginning of the industrial revolution when man started burning coal & oil and producing CO₂, and the world population was less than 1/6th of today's, there were four periods of global warming and cooling in the preceding 2,000 years (Roman Warm period; Dark Ages Cold Period; Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age). So clearly there are more climate change factors at play than CO₂! Why are all the other factors being ignored, and carbon alone blamed for the problem? If it is possible to provide a true scientific explanation for these occurrences, then the following factors also need to be considered.

Point 2. There is evidence that the major determinant of climate is the activity of the sun, and the maximum impact man can have is 3 percent - the actual figure is less than 2 percent. Also, the maximum impact the proposed carbon trading scheme could achieve is 3 percent - in other words, 3 per cent of 3 percent would result in an impact factor of 0.0009 on the climate at best - a change the man on the street would not be able to recognize! And at what horrendous cost!

Most reports on 'climate change' contain expressions of uncertainty. For example, *"If no action is taken to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions the earth is forecast to experience a warming of 2.2°C to 5.0°C by 2070. If significant efforts are undertaken to reduce these emissions it MAY be possible to limit global warming to 1.0°C to 2.5°C by 2070"*¹ (my emphasis). (These estimates vary also with the "experts" producing them). So, at great cost, it MAY be possible to limit the temperature rise by about HALF, which may be only 1°C!

Point 3. The Climate Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in the UK, the chief source of data used by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), was exposed in November 2009 for destroying raw temperature data that conflicted with global warming theory. And the IPCC's claim to unanimity is achieved by simply deleting from their report those who disagree. And yet the IPCC report is still being used as factual in the DGAP and other documents.²

Point 4. Greenhouse gases comprise only 1% of the earth's atmosphere and of these gases, water vapour (which we can do nothing about) makes up over 95%. The CO₂ element equates to 0.038 % of all atmospheric gases as at 2008. Mankind currently contributes less than 3% of the earth's annual emissions of CO₂. The 97% balance of emissions is split between vegetation and soils (53%) and oceans (44%). There is constant interchange between the oceans and atmosphere. Atmospheric CO₂ levels increase or decrease in accordance with ocean temperature, weather patterns, cloud cover, volcanic activity and sun activity. On top of this, in the total CO₂ budget, for the 3% portion attributable to mankind (which is 0.0000114 % of total atmospheric CO₂), the IPCC predict a reduction of about 3% of this amount would be achieved through the drastic measures proposed to reduce AGW: this impact would be practically indiscernible - and at what great cost!?

Point 5. The impact of all atmospheric CO₂ on the greenhouse effect is itself miniscule and the human contribution even more so. CO₂ is not responsible for global warming. Statistics show that CO₂ levels rise *after* a period of warming, not before! A scientific study has found no relationship whatsoever between atmospheric CO₂ levels and global temperatures over long geological periods.³

Point 6. On top of the negligible amount, rather than it being the enemy, CO₂ is essential to plant and animal life and therefore to our life. In fact, better and faster yields are obtained from crops with increasing CO₂ levels, with flow on benefits for feeding the poor in the Third World. It is not a pollutant - rather, the more CO₂ the better! History tells us that warm periods are a time of prosperity, whereas cold periods are a time of famine and plagues.

Point 7. Factors which impact on climate change include the sun's activity, volcanic activity. El Nino and La Nina, cloud cover, and greenhouse gases. Of these, the major factor is sun spot activity, accounting for about 97% of the cause of climate change. So why have these factors been omitted from the AGW predictions and CO₂ chosen as the culprit?!

Point 8. Al Gore, the AGW guru (making many dollars from the AGW industry), says the science is settled and there is no need for further discussion. This statement itself is unscientific - science is only settled until a piece of verifiable data arises which contradicts the present theory. The IPCC claims that scientific opinion is unanimous.

Of course, if all detractors from the report are omitted, then you do have 'unanimity' - all contrary views were dismissed! In the USA alone 31,487 scientists have signed a petition declaring that the theory of catastrophic global warming is not supported by scientific evidence, and that CO₂ is a beneficial gas and not a pollutant.⁴ Dr. G. LeBlanc Smith, principal research scientist in geosciences and sedimentology at CSIRO said, *"I have yet to see credible proof of CO₂ driving climate change, yet(sic) alone manmade CO₂ driving it. The atmospheric hot-spot (in the troposphere) is missing and the ice core data refute this... I contend that those professional scientists and advisors that are knowingly complicit in climate change science fraud and all that is derived from it, will continue to be exposed by the science itself... There is no atmospheric hot-spot from "greenhouse CO₂" despite over 20 years of serious looking for it. Occam's razor would point to the sun as the driver of climate change of significance. Human generated CO₂ is arguably around 3% of the total CO₂ budget, and in light of the above, we are effectively irrelevant to the natural climate change continuum"*⁵.

Point 9. IPCC computer models predict a calamitous rise in global warming of between 2° and 11.5° F by 2100. Yet not one of the twenty three computer models, costing billions, failed to predict that the earth's temperature would begin dropping from 1998. These climate models ignore the input from the sun, volcanoes, clouds, far more pervasive greenhouse gases than CO₂, El Nino and La Nina. They ignore data contradictory to their theory (Medieval Warm Period, Little Ice Age, etc) and use falsified data (East Anglia University data which is used as the basis for the IPCC report^{6,7}). Today's climate forecasts can not accurately predict the weather more than about one week in advance - how can they predict it for 2100?

Point 10. The carbon tax and allied measures will have massive social, economic and political costs for us. But living standards in Third World countries will rise little, if at all. In the meantime, China and India proceed to increase their CO₂ contribution, suck up the carbon penalty dollars from the West and laugh all the way to the bank! In exchange for these massive costs and penalties, the scientists supporting the Kyoto Protocol predict that the result will be a reduction of just *one-third of 1° F* by the year 2100! Clearly, significant reduction in global temperature is not the real goal! So what is?

Point 11. If just a fraction of the annual money associated with the costs of the proposed lowering of carbon was invested in clean water, sanitation, medical care and food production, it would produce an enormous improvement in the quality of life of billions in the Third World. Surely this is a much better and more certain outcome than the great cost of AGW/climate change penalties based on lies and unproven assertions?

Many more similar factors could be cited; some of the data may be contradicted; but if just one of the above facts is correct, then no drastic action should proceed until the truth is determined. Please do not believe me or those who are masquerading as experts and shouting down all opposition to their unsubstantiated views - it behoves us all to seek out the truth for ourselves, and then have the courage to speak it out. To put it plainly – until the truth of the causes of climate change are established along with the part contributed by human activity, nothing should be done to investigate barriers to effective climate change adaption.

Ian Sarah

Notes:

1. Eurobodall Shire Council, *Draft Greenhouse Action Plan*, Section 2, page 5.
2. Brian Sussman, *Climategate* (Washington, DC:WND Books)
3. Jan Veizer, Yves Godderis. and Louis M. Francois, "Evidence for Decoupling of Atmospheric CO₂ and Global Climate During the Phanerozoic Eon", *Nature* 408, no. 6813 (December 7, 2000): 698-701, www.nature.com/nature/journal/v408/n6813/abs/40869a0.html.
4. Global Warming Petition Project, www.petitionproject.org/.
5. Yid with Lid. "Blame the Sun for Global Warming." The Lid, December 13, 2009. <http://yidwithlid.blogspot.com/2009/12/blame-sun-for-global-warming.html>,
6. Email from Phil Jones to Michael Mann, sent February 2, 2003, "East Anglia Confirmed Emails from the Climate Research Unit -1107454306. txt," www.eastangliaemails.com/emails.php?eid==490&filename=1107454306.txt/. See also Muir Russell, Geoffrey Boulton, Peter Clarke, David Eyton, and James Norton, *The Independent Climate Change E-Mails Review*, July 2010, www.cce-review.org/pdf/FINALREPORT.pdf.
7. "'Consensus' Exposed: The CRU Controversy," Minority Staff, United States Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works (Washington. D.C.: Government Printing Office, February 25, 2010), 1, http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.ViewStore_id=7db3fbd8-f1b4-4fdf-bd15-12b7dfla0b63/.