

4.33 Broad comments on the Climate Commission's 2013 report entitled *The Critical Decade*

Please refer to the accompanying sub-section containing the cover page, inside cover, table of contents, preface, key findings, introduction and first two chapters of the Climate Commission's 2013 report entitled *The Critical Decade*. It is available at: <http://www.climatecouncil.org.au/uploads/b7e53b20a7d6573e1ab269d36bb9b07c.pdf>

The first two chapters purport to present climate science.

The Climate Commission's 2013 report entitled *The Critical Decade* relies on conjecture, unfounded opinions and contradictions of empirical evidence to fabricate claims that carbon dioxide from human activity caused, causes and will cause catastrophic global climate change. The report presents no empirical evidence and logical scientific reasoning necessary to establish causation. Yet Exhibit 33, the Joint Expert report, cites and relies upon this report.

It is difficult to see how an honest and competent scientist would rely on such material.

Please refer to comments on the Climate Commission's '*Angry Summer*' in the accompanying supporting evidence in Sub-section 4.4 entitled *Empirical evidence on climate relevant to this complaint*.

The Climate Commission report's Figure 4 likens greenhouse gases in earth's atmosphere to a bed's doona. In reality in earth's open atmosphere, all gases act in a way opposite to that of a doona. Whereas doonas and blankets reduce conductive and convective heat losses from the body, all gases in the open atmosphere—including gases absorbing long wave radiation—accelerate the removal of heat from earth's surface through conduction and convection.

This illustrates the fundamentally unscientific and deceptive nature of the Climate Commission's work. At the time of its formation, the then Minister for Climate Change Greg Combet explained its purpose as one of communication. Scientific facts have never seemed significant to the Commission, which contradicted empirical evidence and fundamental scientific principles.

Climate Commissioner Will Steffen is a chemical engineer yet has been the person responsible for the Commission's publications and has personally implied carbon dioxide is akin to a doona or blanket. **This reinforces the need to ensure only registered professional engineers provide advice on engineering matters in Queensland.**

The Climate Commission relies on a claimed "strong consensus". That claim is false and demonstrates the Commission is unscientific. Firstly, there is no consensus. Secondly, and more significantly, those who claim or imply that a consensus determines science do not understand science. The determinant of science is empirical evidence.

Experience shows that those who have the empirical evidence present it and those who do not use a variety of other methods instead. The Climate Commission's reports and/or Commissioners have used the following:

- Output from erroneous, unvalidated computerised numerical models that the UN IPCC admits are erroneous and based largely on factors with very low levels of understanding and that omit or downplay

- significant natural drivers of climate variability known to control climate;
- False and misleading claims of consensus,
 - Appeals to authority,
 - Invocations to peer-review despite the scientific literature lacking empirical evidence for its position that carbon dioxide from human activity causes dangerous warming and climate change,
 - Portrayal of natural weather events and inherent natural variation as process change,
 - Broad and generalised yet unsubstantiated claims contradicting empirical evidence,
 - Implied fearful projections contradicting science,
 - Emotive statements that distract from the lack of empirical evidence,
 - Smears of those who disagree with his views.
 - Invocations of morality.

Although these appear scientific to some journalists and members of parliament and to many members of the public, this is not science or engineering.

The report presents many clearly false statements and/or implicitly false statements that contradict empirical scientific evidence. It appears to be relying on presenting or implying inherent natural variation in climate as climate change. It relies on clever subtle use of emotionally charged topics, situations and claimed consequences. It relies on cherry picking data and presenting it out of context. Its use of analogies reverses nature's reality. It misrepresents the well-known net effect of water vapour as a coolant and temperature modulator to claim that increased carbon dioxide levels increase the atmosphere's water vapour content that in turn warms the earth.

In misrepresenting the consequences of natural trends on earth as human drivers of trends, it reverses known relationships and reverses cause-and-effect. It makes self-contradicting statements and it claims impossible effects. It cites and relies on the demonstrably corrupt UN IPCC yet neglects to mention that the UN IPCC has no evidence of human causation of global climate variability.

It admits the atmosphere is not warming yet claims it is. It falsely claims ocean temperatures are rising unusually when they are not rising at all and appear to be cooling slightly.

It omits the most accurate and reliable measurements of tropospheric temperature, being satellites and the second most reliable being weather balloon radiosondes and misrepresents the ground-based measurements.

It presents no causal-relationships or empirical evidence as proof of causation yet falsely claims causation.

It omits known scientific climate relationships that disprove its core climate claims.

Some of its claims on so-called extreme weather events contradict claims in the UN IPCC's 2013 report. Regardless, the empirical evidence confirms that there is no process change (ie, exceptional variation) in such natural weather events.

It neglects to mention that future projections are based on computerised numerical models that are inherently flawed and biased and that have proven erroneous in their projections.

The Climate Commission's misrepresentations are discussed briefly on pages 16 and 17 of the accompanying report entitled *False claims reveal hidden opportunities* in sub-section 4.17 and in the *CSIROh!* Appendix 10 available here: <http://bit.ly/1snwKVB> or here: <http://www.climate.conscious.com.au/CSIROh!.html>

Professor Hoegh-Guldberg was a member of the Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel.

Six of the Climate Commissioners and the Commission's 'Science' Advisory Panel are contributors to the UN IPCC including David Karoly, arguably the most influential UN IPCC academic. The Commission relies heavily on the UN IPCC's claims.

At best, the booklet is speculative. At worst, it's deceptively misleading and dishonest. It is certainly not scientific.

That A/Prof Meinshausen and Dr. Taylor endorse and rely on the Climate Commission's glossy booklet is astounding.