

Submission

Global Warming – Done and dusted? No!

People who argue anthropogenic carbon emissions are to blame for global warming might appear to be in the majority, but are they right?

The science is NOT done and dusted. 30,000 scientists reject the notion of human induced climate change. I'm not an advocate of conspiracy theories, but why one side of science is ignored and all the media focus given to the alarmist position, borders on the incredulous.

As for the IPCC report, how many people have actually read it? The IPCC Report while containing both pro and con papers, virtually ignores the evidence against the notion of human induced climate change and pushes the idea of catastrophic global warming due to human activity – based not on hard evidence (there is none), but imperfect computer modelling.

To all those who say the science is 'done and dusted' please note: according to US Senator James Inhofe, a comprehensive survey of peer-reviewed scientific literature from 2004-2007 revealed "less than half of all published scientists endorse global warming theory."

Senator Inhofe, a ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, says the notion of a "consensus" is carefully manufactured for political, financial and ideological purposes. Its proponents never explain fully what "consensus" they are referring to. Is it a "consensus" that future computer models will turn out correct? Is it a "consensus" that the Earth has warmed? Proving that parts of the Earth have warmed does not prove that humans are responsible.

Senator Inhofe says that of 539 total papers on climate change, only 38 (7%) gave an explicit endorsement of the consensus. 'If one considers 'implicit' endorsement (accepting the consensus without explicit statement), the figure rises to 45%. However, while only 32 papers (6%) reject the consensus outright, the largest category (48%) are neutral papers, refusing to either accept or reject the hypothesis. This is not consensus."

According to 30,000 scientists, anthropogenic emissions do not contribute in any meaningful way to global warming.

30 odd years ago, scientists said the Earth was cooling. *Newsweek* warned on April 2 1975, "The drop in food output could begin quite soon, perhaps in 10 years. The resulting famines could be catastrophic." Now today, scientists are saying the exact opposite. What is going on here? Either most of the scientists back then were complete dills, or this generation of scientists are. In ten years time, history will prove that scientists were right the first time around that the Earth is in fact cooling.

What the Rudd Government, fails to realise is the scientific community divided over the issue of human induced global warming. And while it may appear to the casual observer that scientists promoting climate fears are in the majority, the evidence continues to reveal that global warming is an illusion. The emerging silent majority of scientists who do not accept the 'status quo', receive much smaller shares of university research funds, foundation funds and government grants and they are not plugged into the well-heeled environmental special interest lobby.

Before the Rudd Government imposes its unnecessary and counter-productive carbon tax, it should revisit its decision. I challenge the government to reject the fallacious conclusions made by computer modelling and not to vote for any anti-progressive environmental tax such as the ETS/CPRS.

The UN global warming conference held recently in Poznan, Poland faced a serious challenge from over 650 dissenting scientists from around the globe who are criticizing the climate claims made by the UN IPCC and former Vice President Al Gore. A newly updated U.S. Senate Minority Report features the dissenting voices of over 650 international scientists, many current and former UN IPCC scientists, who have now turned against the UN. The report has added about 250 scientists (and growing) in 2008 to the [over 400 scientists who spoke out in 2007](#). The over 650 dissenting scientists are more than [12 times the number of UN scientists](#) (52) who authored the media hyped IPCC 2007 Summary for Policymakers.

The U.S. Senate report is the latest evidence of the growing groundswell of scientific opposition rising to challenge the UN and Gore. Scientific meetings are now being dominated by a growing number of sceptical scientists. The prestigious International Geological Congress, dubbed the geologists' equivalent of the Olympic Games, was held in Norway in August 2008 and prominently featured the voices and views of scientists sceptical of man-made global warming fears. [See Full report [Here](#): & See: [Sceptical scientists overwhelm conference: '2/3 of presenters and question-askers were hostile to, even dismissive of, the UN IPCC'](#)]

Hearsay verses evidence

If climate change alarmists had to defend their case in court, it would be thrown out as it is based on hearsay evidence. That's to say, because it is based on pure conjecture – not hard evidence. Computer modeling is not hard evidence.

Take for example a man who is on trial for shooting another man. The prosecution argues that the victim was shoot with a .45 bullet. The defendant, in our example, owns a .45 caliber gun, and as many people have been saying he was in the vicinity at the time of the shooting, this `proves' he shot the victim. This is hearsay - not evidence.

No hard evidence exists. No one saw the defendant point the gun at the victim and fire. And while the defendant admits to having a .45 caliber gun and being in the vicinity at the time of the shooting, this does not prove his guilt.

However, forensic tests show that the rifling on the defendant's gun was different to that on the bullet taken from the victim's body. Furthermore, tests reveal the gun has not been fired for some considerable time. Also, an eyewitness of the shooting said the assailant was tall with thinning black hair while the defendant was of medium height with wavy blonde hair. Therefore the hard evidence supports the conclusion that the defendant did not commit the crime.

The case for anthropogenic global warming rests almost entirely on hearsay - and not evidence. There is virtually no evidence to support the claim that carbon emissions caused by human activity are the real culprits behind climate change.

Open division

Rank-and-file scientists are now openly rebelling. American meteorologist James Spann, has said he does "not know of a single TV meteorologist who buys into the man-made global warming hype." A panel of meteorologists expressed unanimous climate scepticism, and one panellist estimated that 95% of his profession rejects global warming fears.

In addition, a September 26, 2007 report from the international group Institute of Physics' finds no "consensus" on global warming. The Institute has urged world leaders "to remain alert to the latest scientific thought on climate change."

The Maldives is in no immanent danger despite the rather modest rise in sea levels. As for the claim that 11 of the 12 years from 1995 rank among the 12 warmest years since 1850, only prove that people have not done their homework. Professor Don Easterbrook's research published by the Center for Globalisation in California, has found that the Earth's annual temperature has decreased since 2001. The planet has entered a COOLING cycle and will stay in this phase for at least another 20 years.

`Carbon Pollution' is an oxymoron

The Federal Government's Carbon Pollution Reduction sees carbon as a `pollutant'. Carbon (CO₂) is not a pollutant. It's naturally occurring, necessary for all plant life (photosynthesis), emitted by all animal life, invisible, odourless and non-toxic.

We are told it is a pollutant because it is a `greenhouse gas'. However, without CO₂ in the atmosphere, the Earth would be unliveable. CO₂ makes the planet liveable (+14 degrees global temperature). Without it the temperature would average -19 degrees otherwise.

Water vapour makes up 97% of greenhouses gases, carbon only 2%, and Methane 1%.

Humanity currently contributes 3% of the Earth's annual emissions of CO₂ into the atmosphere. The other 97% comes from vegetation and soils (53%) and the oceans (44%).

The Government plans to reduce Australia's emissions by 5% by 2020. To put this into some perspective, it means the Rudd Scheme will have an effect of about 2.2 millionths! That's equal to one footstep in a walk around the equator!

Historically, concentration of carbon levels have been higher - long before industrialisation. It's at historically low levels now - even allowing for anthropogenic carbon emissions. If it gets any lower, the Earth faces the prospect of another ice age which will have a far more negative impact on the planet (massive crop failures) than even a rise in temperature of 3 degrees.

What the Government should do

Does Australia really need an ETS? I don't believe it does, but if the government thinks it must rush into this issue and leaving aside the fact that the Earth is cooling, then if the steps are taken below, would reduce our "carbon footprint" without the necessity of bringing in an ETS or CPRS.

The Rudd Government, if it serious about the environment and wanting to reduce our carbon footprint, instead of splashing cash around with its Stimulus package, which is of dubious benefit, why not use this money to subsidize every home in Australia to install solar panels and a water tank? This would not only greatly reduce carbon emissions, but also have the added benefits of stimulating local manufacturing, conserving our rapidly dwindling water supplies, and creating thousands of local jobs.

Also if all cars were made to go electric, hydrogen cell or hybrid by the year 2020, this would mean Australia could reach its reduction targets without the necessity of bringing an crippling ETS/CPRS.

Immigration

Also by bringing in 300,000 migrants each year must mean higher power and petrol consumption, as well as placing a severe strain on housing and accommodation. Australia would go along way

in meeting its cuts to greenhouse emissions by reducing the migrant intake. We are running out of water and accommodation and our public transport system is at full capacity. Having so many migrants each year must place a great strain on the Treasury. An intake between 30-40,000 per year should be the target for the next 10 years.

Nuclear power

It is totally hypocritical for the government to trot out its green credentials but in the same breath rules out nuclear as a source of base load power. Wind farms are grossly expensive and inefficient, and not the way to go. If the Government is serious about going green then it should immediately adopt a 20 year plan to phase out coal fired power stations and replace them with nuclear ones. Nuclear power stations are safe, and reliable and should be regarded as a stopgap measure until other reliable base power generation resources became available. We don't have to be saddled with them forever.

Unfairness of an ETS/CPRS

Most State Governments have built up their states on the back on coal-fired power. Our taxes paid for the development of the mainly coal-fired power grid. It was the government's idea to utilise cheap and abundant coal. Now instead of replacing the coal-fired power stations with greener alternatives, it is going to punish us, the people for using the power supply that they built!

We are now going to have to pay a carbon tax in one form or another. This is not fair or just. If the government, and you, think that the Earth is under some dire threat from human induced global warming, then for goodness sake, get serious, and put nuclear back on the agenda instead of pussy footing around.

Why are business people not in up in arms about this tax? It's an unnecessary business cost!

Sites

May I refer the committee to the following sites?

<http://www.auscsc.org.au/>

<http://www.climatesceptics.com.au/>

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/commentaries_essays/romms_fairy_tales.html

www.heartland.org/full24849

www.mannkal.org/environment.php

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/>

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/monckton_man_made.pdf

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2008/10/18/ice-reality-check-scientists-counter-latest-arctic-record-warmth-claims-as-pseudoscience/>

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/feb_co2_report.pdf

http://rohrbacher.house.gov/UploadedFiles/Rohrabacher_Global_Warming_SO_18march2009.pdf

http://science.widener.edu/svb/ftir/ir_co2.html

For Global warming research go to www.petitionproject.org This will open Global Warming Petition Project. Click Summary of Peer Review Research then click again on the same title in left hand side box. For the other good article - Google *Cold Facts on Global Warming* then click on the first item that appears.

Conclusion

The Earth is not facing a rise in temperature of between 3 to 6 degrees, but the real possibility of a mini ice age, and if this happens, having large amounts of atmospheric carbon will be highly beneficial.

Australia contributes 1.5% of global anthropogenic emissions. The Rudd Government's Emissions Trading Scheme (ETS) plans to reduce Australia's emissions by 5% by 2020. To put this into some perspective, it means the Rudd Scheme will have an effect of about 2.2 millionths! (Equal to one footstep in a walk around the equator!) So why bother?

An Emissions Trading Scheme will not be good for the economy or the cost of living. Jobs will be exported off shore to nations, which have no commitment to the Kyoto Protocol. Cost of living will rise significantly as electricity and petrol prices will rise over time as the government tapers off its level of support. The Australian economy will bog down in a green quagmire.

Anthropogenic emissions do not pose any sort of threat to the planet nor does it contribute to global warming according to 30,000 scientists.

Before the Rudd Government rushes off and impose this unnecessary and totally ridiculous tax, it ought to do its homework and reject the fallacious conclusions made by computer modelling. There is no point in trying to fix something that's not broke. In a few years time, rising power costs may result in many businesses going bust, but also place some older Australians at risk (elderly deaths peak in hot summer months) as they switch off air conditioners on hot days (One policy paper proposes a tax of \$170 per day for use of air-conditioners).

It's time a halt was called to the introduction of the ETS/CPTS. There is no reason to act in haste. Life on Earth has been around for quiet some time and will continue to adapt and thrive as it always has done. There is no point in trying to fix something that's not broke.

Yours Sincerely,
Alan Barron