

Excuses and myths commonly used to 'justify' belief in human cause

Instead of providing empirical evidence, advocates of unfounded climate alarm dodge discussing empirical evidence and invoke some or all of the following as 'justifications' that are really diversions from science. Mr. Hunt has relied on many of these that appear scientific yet none are. All betray science:

- Broad and generalised yet unsubstantiated claims contradicting empirical evidence yet sounding 'scientific',
- False and misleading claims of 'consensus',
- Appeals to authority such as CSIRO, BOM, UN IPCC, NASA-GISS
- Implying peer-review despite the scientific literature lacking empirical evidence of cause that is essential for *true scientific* peer-review,
- Citing and relying on manipulated data taken out of context,
- Portraying natural weather events and inherent natural variation as process change,
- Implied or explicit fearful projections contradicting science,
- Emotive statements that distract from the lack of empirical evidence,
- Output, directly or implicitly from erroneous, un-validated 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—including the sun—of climate variability and known to control climate,
- Use of UN IPCC schematics that depend for validity on the implied assumption of the existence of unusually high temperatures that are not occurring,
- Hiding behind the UN's damaging Precautionary Principle,
- Presentation of the UN IPCC's qualitative and politically driven allocation of levels of uncertainty that contradict empirical evidence and known facts and that are not statistically valid yet imply validity and that misrepresent science and climate, and are allocated politically by bureaucrats not scientists,
- Smearing directly or subtly those questioning alarming climate claims,
- Invocations of morality such as claiming to protect our children's future or to protect emotive icons such as the Great Barrier Reef or Bondi Beach, ...

Although these appear scientific to some journalists, cabinet ministers, Members of Parliament and to many members of the public, this is not science. That some universities, some academics and many ABC journalists allow and defend such behaviour is of concern and it undermines science.

These misrepresentations of climate and science distract from real and serious humanitarian and environmental challenges and globally harm people and our precious natural environment.

Stating his belief and then claiming that he respects everyone's (diverse) beliefs on climate shows that Mr. Hunt does not respect science. That reflects an apparent lack of respect for those who present empirical evidence and present facts documenting misrepresentation of climate science. In behaving in this way Mr. Hunt is invoking the hallmarks of religion, superstitions, phobias or politics.

Tuesday, 12 April 2016