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Is the end of the world really nigh?

Dust storm as I drove across Sydney Harbour Bridge at 6:30 am on Wednesday 23 September 2009
There is no opinion, however absurd, which men will not readily embrace as soon as they can be brought to the conviction that it is generally adopted.

(Schopenhauer, *Die Kunst Recht zu Behalten*)
The Australian public fail the knowledge test on carbon....

53% believe climate change causes tsunamis
40% believe climate change causes earthquakes
37% believe climate change causes volcanic eruptions
93% think CO2 constitutes more than 1% of the atmosphere
47% think CO2 is ‘pollution’
37% think we should try to reduce carbon in the body
44% think food and drink would be safer if it had no carbon or CO2 in it
... And so does our Prime Minister

“You know what, consumers like to buy things with less carbon pollution in them, and business will respond to that price signal too.”

Julia Gillard in ‘The Australian’ 2 July 2011
But I want to start with facts that we can all agree upon:

(global warming ‘alarmists’ and ‘realists’ alike)
Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) is:

1. A tiny trace gas (385 parts per million: less than a twenty-fifth of 1% of the atmosphere)
2. Naturally occurring
3. Invisible to the human eye
4. Odourless
5. Non-toxic
6. Necessary for all plant life (photosynthesis)
7. Emitted by all animal life (breathing etc.)
So why is CO$_2$ called a “pollutant”? 

Remarkable answer:

Because it is a “greenhouse gas” - even though greenhouse gases thankfully make Planet Earth liveable (+14$^\circ$C current average global temperature, rather than -19$^\circ$C otherwise)
When we hear the words “carbon pollution” we are listening to an oxymoron.

**Carbon** is the most useful element on earth. In addition to diamonds, graphite, coal, oil and natural gas, carbon is the building block of every living plant and animal cell. In the atmosphere it is naturally present in trace amounts as carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄).
One of the “Big Polluters” keeping our lights on!

Bayswater Power Station (Hunter Valley, NSW) operating at maximum capacity

The visible white gas is *steam* from the cooling towers, with the tall chimneys emitting *invisible CO₂*
Greenhouse gases, in order of importance, comprise:

- Water vapour (H₂O) 97%
- Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) 2%
- Methane (CH₄), Nitrous Oxide (N₂O), etc. 1%

So fluffy rain clouds (H₂O), your exhaled breath (40,000 ppm CO₂, 8,000 ppm in submarines) and cow belches (CH₄) are all villainous “pollutants”!
Humankind currently contributes 3% of the Earth’s production of atmospheric CO₂.

The 97% balance of naturally-occurring CO₂ production is split between animals, vegetation and soils (53%) and the oceans (44%). Both the land-based biosphere and the ocean-based aquasphere also absorb huge amounts of CO₂.
Carbon Dioxide Cycle

Annual Carbon Cycle between the Oceans, Vegetation and Soils, Humankind and the Atmosphere

N.B. The oceans contain 50 times more CO$_2$ than the atmosphere.
Eyjafjallajokul Volcano Erupts in Iceland in 2010
Mt. Puyehue Erupts in Chile in 2011
CO$_2$ is a tiny trace gas in the Earth’s atmosphere.
Humanity makes a minuscule contribution to CO$_2$ – itself a tiny but vital and natural trace gas.
If only humankind could emit more CO$_2$!
Between 1950 and the early 1990s, world population X2.2, food production X2.7
1970-2000 saw a 15% per capita increase in food consumption

Benefits of Carbon Dioxide

Doubling current CO₂ levels would improve food crop yields as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop type</th>
<th>Yield increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legumes</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cereals</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuber crops</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doubling current CO₂ levels would improve food crop yields as listed above.
CO$_2$ is Plant Food

Here is what happens over one year with more CO$_2$

- 385 ppm (present ambient)
- 535 ppm
- 685 ppm
- 835 ppm
Cruelia starves the trees!
The warming effect of CO$_2$ declines logarithmically

The first 20ppm CO$_2$ in the atmosphere has a greater effect than the following 300ppm. The incremental effect of increasing CO$_2$ at the present 385ppm level is almost immeasurable.
Australia contributes 1.4% of global anthropogenic greenhouse emissions.
Australia’s ‘commitment’

The ‘base case’ bipartisan plan is to reduce Australia’s emissions by 5% by 2020.
This arbitrary commitment would therefore have had the following annual impact on the world’s greenhouse effect:

\[ 100\% \times 2\% \times 3\% \times 10\% \times 1.5\% \times 5\% = 0.0000045 \% \]

or about a 22 millionth!

(Equal to one human step in a trek around the Earth’s equator!)

Find a politician who admits to knowing this!
And yet the Greens tell us that Australia’s failure to cut CO₂ emissions will...

- destroy the Great Barrier Reef
- reduce agricultural production in the Murray-Darling Basin by 90% by 2100 due to drought
- inundate Australia’s coastal homes
- melt the Snowy Mountains ski fields
- ruin Kakadu National Park

They never explain how or why!

Senator Bob Brown, The Australian Greens
Brisbane 1893: 118 years ago!
So, to justify this huge national effort for effectively nil outcome, carbon dioxide must be the real villain of ‘catastrophic’ Global Warming:

Right?
Wrong!

600 Million Years of Temperature and CO₂ show no correlation. Over the last 150 million years, geological processes have taken 90% of the carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere. We are currently in a relatively cool period of the planet’s history.
Temperature, CO$_2$ and sea levels for the last 20,000 years

Relative stability during the most recent 7,000 years when human civilization has advanced most rapidly.
Stable temperature range since end of last ice age
Over the last 5,000 yrs there were three warm periods (green sections) where it was warmer than today and the Earth survived while human civilization flourished!
What is Earth’s normal temperature?

Historical Evidence – The Last 1,000 years

Medieval warm period? Yes. This drawing of a graph in the IPCC’s 1990 report shows it clearly.
‘Industrial Age’: 1850 - present

Globally averaged temperature variations between 1850 and 2000 show the emergence from the “Little Ice Age” in the early 1900’s, slight cooling in the 1940’s to the 1970’s, and then warming again since the 1970’s, followed by cooling since 1998.
Satellite Measurements:

1979 - 2011
No recent correlation between rising CO$_2$ and slightly cooling temperature
Exactly what “climate change”?

⇒ Global temperature has gently declined over the past decade.
⇒ Both polar ice caps are currently increasing.
⇒ Sea levels continue the same gentle minuscule rise.
⇒ Cyclones/hurricanes have decreased.
⇒ The Murray-Darling basin is awash.
⇒ The Great Barrier Reef is thriving.
⇒ Bountiful Snowy Mountains ski season, etc., etc...

So the rhetorical language has changed: what was once ‘global warming’ and then ‘climate change’, has become ‘carbon pollution’ (or just ‘pollution’), ‘price on carbon’, ‘energy security’ and ‘green jobs’ in the ‘green economy’.
Is global warming melting the ice caps and reducing sea ice? **NO!**

**Antarctic Sea Ice Trends**
.... going up!

**Antarctic Land Ice Trends**
.... going up over most of the continent!

Didn’t Al Gore say the Arctic Ice will be gone by 2012?

The graph of Arctic Ice cover of the last seven years, shows 2007 as the year with the least ice cover since satellites have been used (in 1979 they started).

In 2007 some people made a guess that the warming trend would continue. Al Gore and others have repeated that guess. Since then the arctic ice cover has increased.

- Anecdotal evidence shows there were periods when ice cover was less than in 2007, (e.g. ships in the 1930’s navigated the north west passage without the assistance of ice breakers or GPS tracking of ice floes), so there is nothing unusual about the levels of Arctic Ice we have today.
- Arctic polar bear population has increased from 5,000 50 years ago to 25,000 today.
Sydney Harbour will rise the length of your little finger (6cm) this 21st century, just as it did last century.

Sea level measurements at Fort Denison
Murray-Darling Basin Yearly Rainfall
1900 TO 2010
Are cyclones increasing?  No!

“During the past 6 years since Hurricane Katrina, global tropical cyclone frequency and energy have decreased dramatically, and are currently at near-historical record lows.”

Dr Ryan Maue 2011
Everything presented so far has been indisputable empirically observed data. Global warming advocates have no choice but to agree, even if they are reluctant to be open with us all on these matters.

The difference comes when computer modelling the future: “rubbish in, rubbish out”!

"People underestimate the power of models. Observational evidence is not very useful. Our approach is not entirely empirical."

John Mitchell, principal research scientist at the UK Met Office

No computer model has ever successfully predicted future global temperature. The inputs are too many, too complex and often unknown.
The IPCC’s failed computer models

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change set up in 1988 under UN auspices
- Does not carry out research or monitor climate
- Assimilates available information to inform governments of the world via computerized projections
- Global quasi-monopoly of official scientific advice
- Has mutated into a politically correct alarmist pressure group
- Notorious “hockey stick” quietly dropped from latest 2007 Report
- Joint winner with Al Gore of the Nobel Peace Prize!

“If the IPCC wasn’t there, why would anyone be worried about climate change?”

Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Science, February 5, 2010
The IPCC’s “Hockey Stick”

An exposed scientific fraud knowingly mis-used by Al Gore in his movie “An Inconvenient Truth”. What an ironic name!
Why did so many scientists get it wrong?

Climategate breaks on 20 November 2009

The emails have discredited most of the lead IPCC authors.

Recommended reading: “Climategate Analysis” by John Costella

The IPCC models predict monotonic warming, but they are already wrong!
Leading Global Warming Alarmists


**Australian Politicians** – All of the ALP (Julia Gillard, Kevin Rudd, Penny Wong, Peter Garrett, Greg Combet, etc. but not Martin Ferguson?), some Liberals (Malcolm Turnbull, etc.), all of the Greens (Bob Brown, Christine Milne, etc.). Independents? (Tony Windsor, Rob Oakeshott)

**Australian Professionals (generally)** – Government departments, academics, CSIRO, media (including ABC and Fairfax), ‘green’ industry corporates, financiers, lawyers and accountants, NGO’s, etc.

**Australian Government Appointees** – Tim Flannery (2007 Australian of the Year. Author of “The Weather Makers”. Australia’s Climate Change Commissioner). Ross Garnaut (Author of the Australian Government’s Climate Change Report); Ian Chubb (Chief Scientist)
## Leading Global Warming Sceptics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politicians</th>
<th>Former ALP ministers (Peter Walsh, Michael Costa, etc.), most Liberals (Tony Abbott, Nick Minchin, Cory Bernardi, Dennis Jensen, Andrew Robb, etc.), all Nationals (including Barnaby Joyce, Ron Boswell, John Williams, etc.), Independents? (Bob Katter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientists</td>
<td>Bob Carter, Ian Plimer, Bill Kininmoth, David Evans, Garth Paltridge, Jennifer Marohasy, Joanne Nova, David Archibald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbyists</td>
<td>Ray Evans (Lavoisier Group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viv Forbes (Carbon Sense Coalition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Max Rheese (Australian Climate Science Coalition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leon Ashby (Climate Sceptics Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists</td>
<td>Andrew Bolt, Miranda Devine, Terry McCrann, Christopher Pearson, Piers Akerman, Alan Jones, Janet Albrechtsen, The Australian newspaper, talkback radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishops and Aristocrats!</td>
<td>Cardinal George Pell, Lord Monckton, Lord Nigel Lawson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The “People’s Assembly” was scrapped for a “Multi-Party Climate Change Committee”

Eligibility required belief that “the science is settled” and that a “price on carbon” will “provide certainty” to business.

The only certain “price on carbon” is not to have one at all.
The Labor/Green/Independent Government’s Proposed “Carbon Tax” (sic.)

⇒ Multi-billion dollar per annum carbon tax: i.e. “great big new tax on everything”! Who are the 500 “big polluters”?
⇒ Creates massive distortions in our economy
⇒ Directly reduces international competitiveness
⇒ Produces grinding compliance costs and bureaucratic intervention to cushion adverse industry and household impacts for political expediency
⇒ Provides a bonanza for the financial and professional services, ‘green’ industries and government departments which will take commissions, fees, subsidies and taxes from the cash flow – bad luck for the productive sector, the taxpayer and the consumer!
Achilles has 4 heels

1. Instead of being ‘revenue neutral’ as promised, the carbon tax (sic.) costs the taxpayer $4 billion over the forward estimates.

2. Instead of coming out of the proceeds of the carbon tax (sic.) as promised, the $800m per annum climate change aid to developing countries is added to the taxpayer-funded foreign aid budget.

3. The $3.5 billion cost of closing down efficiently functioning brown coal power stations in Victoria and South Australia comes out of a taxpayer-funded ‘contingency fund’.
4. By 2020 the Treasury estimates that the majority of ‘emission reductions’ will be by Australian companies sending $ billions overseas to buy ‘carbon credits’ (scams?), thereby undermining the tax base from which the Government can afford its convoluted compensation schemes.
The Gillard/Brown Government’s Climate Change Commission

“The Commission is an independent body set up by the federal government to provide information on climate change and help inform the debate”

- ABC Spokeswoman 30 April, 2011

In fact, the taxpayer-funded Commission is a biased propaganda machine comprised entirely of climate change alarmists trying to stifle one side of the debate.

Now the Government apparently needs taxpayers to fund a $12 million advertising campaign to convince an increasingly dubious public.
“Business Certainty”?

“If the policy doesn’t reduce carbon then it is purely a tax. The other problem is that under this policy, at any time in the future the government of the day can change the cost of carbon so there is no certainty for us to make investment decisions.”

- Paul O’Malley
Chief Executive Officer
Bluescope Steel
Political plain speak on the carbon tax (sic.)

“The document obviously contemplates broad coverage of the economy but it also leaves open the discussion that we need to have about how that might be dealt with, whether or not we phase the scheme into different sectors of the economy but the important thing again is the PM acknowledged there are price impacts in the economy from a carbon price and also indicated, as you would expect from a Labor government, that we will assist those people who need the assistance the most, in particular obviously pensioners and low income households will be firmly in our mind and we will ensure that every dollar raised from the carbon price mechanism is committed to help households and to help industry make the transition to lower emissions in the future.”

- Greg Combet
  Minister for Climate Change

There. Hopefully that’s cleared things up!
20% Renewable Energy Target by 2020

- Currently 7%
- Most renewable energy is presently hydro (5% with little scope for increase) and ‘bagasse’ from sugarcane (1%)
- Wind and solar (1%) do not produce baseload power (therefore require ~85% baseload back-up)
- Baseload from geothermal ‘hot rocks’ difficult and isolated
- Baseload nuclear power (still ruled out politically in Australia-why?)
- Carbon Geo-Sequestration (expensive, non-uniform and unproven)

N.B. All of the above new technologies are much more expensive than coal- and gas-fired power. Therefore Australian electricity prices will continue to rocket upwards.
ORIGIN ENERGY CHIEF CITES GOVERNMENT POLICY

Electricity prices set to soar

Renewable energy targets could double the cost for consumers

ANNABEL HEPWORTH

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

The chief executive of one of Australia’s biggest energy retailers has warned that power prices set to increase dramatically.

Origin Energy’s Grant King said that complying with the mandatory renewable energy target (MRET) and network expansion would put up residential energy prices.

“Don’t get me wrong, or anybody else that’s policymakers, it’s not all doom and gloom,” Mr King told The Australian.

“This isn’t the inevitable and knock-on consequences of the policies that governments are implementing.

He continued to say that Federal Treasurer Joe Hockey and Energy Minister Martin Ferguson had also supported the MRET, warning to separate interview with this newspaper that power prices were likely to double in the next ten years.

“Are we going to start importing a ‘carbon intensive’ and added that energy consumers should look at where their money was being invested in renewable energy, water and other sustainable resources.

The ACCC said in a report that 30 per cent of Australia’s energy consumption by 2030 is derived from renewable sources.

Wind farms would cost between $550 and $1,050 per megawatt-hour, compared with $30 to $50 per megawatt-hour.

However, the intermittent nature of wind means that it would need to be backed up with large-scale investment in gas, solar or coal power stations.

Origin Energy chief executive Grant King has no plans to go public, from the highs of the electricity and renewable energy.
NSW Govt’s Desalination Plant & Wind Farm: Combination of two White Elephants!

Aerial view of the $2bn Kurnell Desalination Plant under construction while Sydney’s dams fill up

Site visit to $100m Capital Wind Farm near Lake George by Philip Wood on Sunday 11 April 2010
The financially embattled NSW Labor Government spent your money on scientifically illiterate scare mongering. The threat of a carbon dioxide tax cost the NSW taxpayer $10 billion in the sale of electricity generating assets.
Hilarious! – World Leaders meet to discuss controlling the climate

Copenhagen, December 2009

The hubris of a Greek tragedy
“Every great cause begins as a movement, becomes a business, and eventually degenerates into a racket.”

-Eric Hoffer

(The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements)

"It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself."

-Thomas Jefferson
The Spanish Experience in past 5 years
(similar climate and GDP to Australia)

- Household electricity costs up 30%, despite government subsidy
- Industry electricity costs up 100%
- Businesses and jobs therefore leaving Spain
- Unemployment 20% and rising
- Every ‘green job’ costs the taxpayer US$770,000
- 2.2 real jobs lost for every ‘green job’ created
- Lack of baseload power means electricity supply has become unreliable
- This is the Spanish example advocated by the Obama Administration!
- Spanish Government is now withholding subsidies because it can’t afford them.

Will 2020 be .... like the Little Ice Age?

Or, instead, the Mediaeval Warm Period?

- No-one knows!
- We need to prepare for either
- The IPCC’s (and Australian Government’s) plan hasn’t worked, won’t work and can’t work.
- So what should we do?
Let us...

...appreciate and trust Nature’s wondrous dynamic environment and cease our climate fear.

Instead, we will focus our creativity, energy and resources on the timeless challenge of adapting to natural changes in our climate and on eliminating real manmade pollution to express our inherent care for the Earth.
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