

Federal GALLERY



JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF AUSTRALIA

MARCH 2020

In this issue: Are We Really In A New Climate Era?
Tough Background To Brexit
More Science, Less Politics For Bushfires
Failings Of The ABC
Dependence on Chinese Students
Farewell to John Abel, Ben Humphreys
and Tsebin Tchen

Editor: Robert Solomon

Are We Really in a New Climate Era?

Howard Thomas Brady

Dr Brady says that “politicians on both sides of the climate debate are making statements that are actually false. In good faith they think that certain propositions are correct”, so he needs to show otherwise. We have published Dr Brady before, in particular reviewing his book “Mirrors and Mazes: a guide through the climate debate” (2016). He has post-graduate degrees in Philosophy, Theology and Antarctic science. He also has a climate website listing various talks and YouTube presentations: <http://www.mirrorsandmazes.com.au>.

The Anthropocene

For many years the term ‘Anthropocene’ has been bandied around to suggest that we have entered a new geological epoch: a period moulded so much by man that it can be defined as a new era in Earth’s history. The starting date for this new ‘epoch’ is debated: the beginning of the Industrial Revolution (Crutzen); the invention of the steam engine (Lovelock); the first atmospheric nuclear tests in 1950 (an International Geological Congress, 2016); and so on. In 2019 James Lovelock even suggested the Anthropocene was ended and an era ‘The Novacene’ dominated by ‘super-intelligence’ had begun.

Today the term Anthropocene is most frequently used to suggest a new era of *man-made climate* brought on by the increase of greenhouse gases since the middle of the 19th century. It is alleged that an increase in greenhouse gases (mainly carbon dioxide) has led to events that characterise this Anthropocene: an unprecedented rate of warming; a rise in the frequency and severity of storms; an acceleration of sea level rise; an acceleration of ice loss from the ice sheets of Greenland and Antarctica.

Nevertheless, while it is clear that the rate of technological change has accelerated, this author argues that humans have falsely transposed such acceleration to nature. The title of James Gleick’s 1999 book highlights this misconception; -*Faster; the acceleration of just about everything*.

The conviction that humans were responsible for climate change was so ingrained by the 1980s that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was formed in 1988. That body’s charter was not to examine climate change in general, but to examine and quantify the human influence on climate and to coordinate international responses to human climate change. Modern climate change was seen to be so ‘Man-Earth’ related that the possible influence of ‘extra-terrestrial’ climate forces coming from the Sun and the Cosmos were considered to be irrelevant.

By overstating human influence on climate, the IPCC introduced a bias into climate science. Scientists were increasingly funded to find that human climate fingerprint; a focus that, for the last 30 years, has derailed climate science and left many scientists stranded in a scientific no-man’s land. While some global warming is real, there is strong scientific evidence of:

- no unprecedented increased rate of global warming
- no unprecedented rise in the severity and frequency of storms
- no unprecedented rise in the rate of sea level rise
- no unprecedented rise in the rate of ice loss from Greenland and Antarctica
- no unprecedented climate regime.

On Carbon dioxide levels

There is a common storyline painting the present rise in carbon dioxide levels as

catastrophic and leading to unprecedented temperatures. Yet, in the perspective of geological time, the present carbon dioxide levels, even though increased by human industry, **are at an historic low**. For millions of years plants and animals have happily lived and thrived in carbon dioxide levels between 1,500 and 2,000 parts per million; over four times the carbon dioxide levels of today. At those levels there was no catastrophic warming of the Earth. History tells us we have nothing to fear from the present rise in carbon dioxide levels.

On warming rates


The Earth has been warming since the 18th century and carbon dioxide levels have risen over 40 per cent since the middle of the 19th century. However, the rate of warming in various periods since the 1860s has been steady and independent of the rising levels of carbon dioxide. The Hadley Centre for climate research in Britain has released a graph showing that the warming rate was 0.163°C per decade in the 1860-80 period (CO₂ levels rising 2.2 parts per million per decade), then 0.15°C per decade in the period 1910-1940 (CO₂ levels rising around 5 parts per million per decade) and then 0.161°C per decade in the 1975-2009 period (CO₂ levels rising around 15 parts per million per decade).

So, the rate of warming was unchanged whether carbon dioxide levels were rising at 2 or 5 or 15 ppm per decade. This means that the rate of modern warming is not controlled by the rising rate of carbon dioxide levels. The **global warming prophets have perpetuated a myth**; namely that as CO₂ levels increase at a faster rate, so does temperature. Consequently, the alarmists labelled CO₂ as the evil protagonist behind modern global warming. As a consequence, billions of dollars have been spent to reduce carbon dioxide levels in the mistaken belief that such reductions will curtail modern warming.

For those still alleging that the rate of modern warming is unprecedented, scientific analyses of ice cores have shown that the rate of warming in West Antarctica was greater in the mid-18th and mid-19th centuries than in recent decades. So much for simplistic assumptions!

On storms

It is true that the destruction caused by modern storms is rising but that is simply due to greater population numbers and concentrations. The population on the Queensland Gold Coast from Southport to Tweed Heads was around 45,000 in 1945 and today is around 500,000! Obviously, there is more damage when storms affect a heavily populated coastline.



Frequency of tropical cyclones, Australia, 1970-2012 (Aust. Met. Bureau), carbon dioxide levels Mauna Loa Observatory.

The populist comments about increasing storm frequency and severity are bizarre; in fact, the opposite is true. Storm frequency and severity have been decreasing precisely as a result of global warming. There is now a lower equator-pole temperature gradient as the rate of warming in polar regions has been relatively more than the rate of warming in equatorial regions. The mixing of polar air in middle latitudes is less severe in warmer periods and more severe in cold periods.

The decline in the last 50 years of the frequency and severity of cyclones hitting the Queensland coast or of hurricanes striking the Florida coast is actually a **proof of global warming**. The populist logic needs to be reversed! The global warmists are wrong when alleging

that storm severity and frequency have increased. And those sceptics, saying that a drop in the frequency and severity of storms disproves global warming, are equally wrong. Both have been trapped by populist logic. The drop in the severity and frequency of hurricanes and cyclones has been due to global warming and more benign mid-latitude weather.

On sea level

The climate theory put forward by the IPCC maintains that sea level rise is accelerating even though current data shows no acceleration. The IPCC technical committees at meetings in 1990, 1994 and 2001 asserted that there was a steady rise of sea level during the 20th century but no acceleration. In 2016 NOAA released data from 200 tide gauges from the USA and Pacific and Atlantic islands showing no acceleration of sea level rise.

General sea level rise theory has had a rocky road since 2007 after an IPCC technical committee examined the records of a sea level satellite system launched in 1992. This committee assumed that the satellite sea level rise data were the most reliable, concluding that the rise was at a steady rate between 1900 and 1990, then accelerated to a rate of 30 cm per 100 years between 1990 and 2007.

However, in 2011 a report from Professor Houston (US Army Corp of Engineers) and Professor Dean (University of Florida) questioned the accuracy of the satellite data, saying they were 'too high'. And, in 2012, NASA admitted severe altimetry problems with the current satellite system, when it proposed a new satellite with a positional accuracy of 1mm at an orbital height 2500 km above Earth. It was NASA's view that such an accurate satellite was needed so that sea level satellites and other satellites could correctly position themselves.

Unfortunately, NASA has still not been funded to launch this reference satellite system (GRASP- Geodetic Reference Antenna in Space). Consequently, the current satellite readings on sea level rise are still higher than readings taken from tide gauges. The embedded errors in the present satellite sea level rise altimetry systems are still there.

Although the satellite data of sea level rise are higher than tide gauge data even the satellite measurements are not showing any clear acceleration of sea level rise. The analysis of the tide gauge data for the 20th century by the IPCC technical committees of 1990, 1995 and 2001 was basically correct. Sea level rise is real but there has been no acceleration of that rise in the last 120 years.

On ice loss in polar ice sheets

The media and scientific literature abound with articles describing accelerating ice loss from the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets. But, how can recent scientific articles, published in 'peer-reviewed' literature [a recent fad, implying control of bias and error] stridently announce to the scientific community and the world media accelerated ice loss to the ocean from the Antarctic and Greenland ice sheets when there is no corresponding acceleration of sea level rise shown by tide gauges, resulting from that 'extra ice' entering the ocean?

The tide gauges cannot be blind! So those articles alleging acceleration of sea level rise do not make sense. The lack of any evidence of sea level acceleration shows that these articles are either biased or based on data derived from flawed satellite ice mass measurements.

There is still an urgent need for the proposed NASA GRASP satellite. Without that reference antenna, the science of sea level rise or the science of ice mass changes

in polar regions will remain severely disadvantaged.

On the Arctic Ocean

There is another constant story line that was perpetuated by Al Gore, namely that an ice-free Arctic Ocean would be a sign of catastrophic climate change. An ice-free Arctic is no big deal. Swedish scientists such as Stranne, Jacobsen and Björk have uncovered evidence of an ice-free Arctic Ocean at various times between 14,700 and 6,000 years ago.

On glacial and ice sheet retreat

There is also panic about the present retreat of polar glaciers. The alarmists point to the recent dramatic retreat of glaciers such as the Jakobshavn in Greenland. Huge ice-blocks falling off glaciers are touted as proof of human-induced climate change.

But the real surprise came this year as Professor Axford and others unearthed evidence that a northern section of the Greenland Ice Sheet was at its warmest from 10,000 years to 6,000 years ago and Greenland was even smaller than today. This infers rapid retreat of those glaciers in the recent past. In addition, temperatures were warmer in the 1930s in SW Greenland than today.

The same situation exists in West Antarctica. Some scientists have pointed to the retreat of the Pine Island and Thwaites Glaciers in West Antarctica as evidence of catastrophic ice sheet collapse. However, research work by British scientists has shown that these two glaciers retreated further 8000 years ago. So how can one say that their present retreat is unprecedented or the 'canary in the coalmine' signalling rapid ice sheet collapse?

No unprecedented regime

Finally, the present warmists have no concept of climate change on this Earth. A **lack of historical perspective** totally distorts their view of the present. It was not

long ago that oak forests covered Norway and Sweden and the present bare mountain tops in Scotland were forested due to a warmer climate. The glacial retreat in Roman times was more extensive than that of today.

One wonders what dire warnings the catastrophists would have issued when they observed the Christian processions in Europe 400 years ago begging God to stop the Vernagt and Des Bois glaciers from advancing towards their villages.

This present climate madness and lack of historical perspective belongs to a pattern of human hysteria characterised by various movements in the past 60 years: acid rain; nuclear winter; mass starvation; peak oil and gas. Maybe such movements reflect the mad edge of our human psyche!

Conclusion

The author of this paper acknowledges that he is in the minority and that climate alarmists presently hold sway through the IPCC. These alarmist positions have been reinforced by the media, assisted by the weight of funds from many rich philanthropic foundations.

However, there must be some timeline to test the credibility of the present IPCC position. What timeline can be granted to the climate alarmists if their predictions of sea level rise in this 21st century have not eventuated? Five years? Ten years? Forty years? They can't be forgiven forever. And again, what timeline can be tolerated if unprecedented ice loss from the polar regions does not occur?

There will be a time when a scientific revolt will cause the alarmist positions of the IPCC to crumble overnight. We are not in a climate Armageddon. Perhaps the letters of the IPCC should stand for the *International Pessimists and Catastrophists Collective*.