

Submission by Dr. D.N.Parkes

Senate Inquiry into Academic Freedom 2008

August 13 2008

In March of this year I wrote to the so-called Climate Institute, expressing my concern at its intention to distribute 'educational material' on Global Warming (aka Climate Change) to Australian schools and Universities [I assume].

Why should this concern me?

Because the Climate Institute is a biased and poorly qualified organisation to undertake such a mission. The Climate Institute makes no attempt at all to present a balanced approach and never supports its opinions with documentation that would be acceptable to even the most basic science forums.

The Committee will be aware of the 2008 decision of the High Court in UK upon a challenge against the distribution of material to UK schools that was biased towards the views expressed by Mr. Al Gore in his film, now widely discredited by independent scientists. The Climate Institute fully supports the views expressed by Mr. Gore and his followers. Among these persons associated with the Climate Institute is a former CSIRO scientist, Dr. Pearman. He is now a fund raiser and advertiser (as noted on Power Point presentations at a recent Royal Society of NSW lecture in Mittagong NSW) for the Climate Institute. He is a devotee, with alarming enthusiasm, of 'Global Warming' caused by anthropogenic activity through the burning of fossil fuels. It is my view, having heard Dr. Pearman lecture at the Royal Society of NSW on April 5 2008 and having asked him a question, at that meeting, on the capability of his paradigm to identify 'cooling' as effectively as he claims it has identified 'warming' and when this might occur, was met by a facetious reply along the lines, 'in 20,000 years or next year'. This response is on the record.

This is NOT acceptable science for our young students and as Dr. Pearman is an important front-person for the so-called Climate Institute, I must assume that such views would be part of the intended distribution to our students.

Global warming (forget the recent attempts to hide under 'climate change' and 'carbon pollution') caused principally by anthropogenic activity in the burning of fossil fuels is now contested by many scientists, including increasing numbers of former IPCC scientists.

The following letter to the UN presents information and references that the Climate Institute is most unlikely to provide for our students:

www.lowefo.com/pdf/Letter_UN_Sec_Gen_Ban_Ki-moon.pdf

I am one of the 13 international signatures to this letter to the UN, on July 14 2008, including 3 former IPCC expert reviewers and a Nobel Peace Prize winner (shared) 1988. In April of this year a letter was sent to Dr. Pachauri, Chair of the IPCC, that letter is also included and was very widely referenced. The UN independently posted

the letter: in its concerns over food supply.

I am retired a Professor of Human Ecology with initial honours degrees in Geography (including climatology) and Economics, an MA and PhD in urban system modelling with special reference to timing systems in complex space. The consequences of Climate related political decisions, such as the ongoing ETS, will possibly cause serious disruption to human ecosystems especially in view of the period of cooling, possibly severe, that is likely to occur during the next 20-30 years IF solar activity in the cycles ahead continue as presently observed. Policies for a warming planet, based on ever more widely questioned General Circulation Models are NOT the only possible basis for strategies to manage the planet. If the Climate Institute has its way, they will be the ONLY policies presented to our students.

I urge the Committee to seek further information from the Climate Institute and its proposal to distribute educational material without also providing the alternative science. Their carefully chosen title of 'Climate Institute' implies unbiased science – the reality is that this Institute does no fundamental research but does generate a very great deal of political climate chatter and it is dangerous: not for its views per se, but for its rejection of the scientific method and its inability therefore to provide a balanced perspective.

Such an institution does not encourage academic freedom and indeed I would say its very existence into the future depends on its ability to disable academic freedom.

Our students should not be exposed to such bias.

The Climate Institute never replied to my letter, on matters of climate, of March 2008.

D.N.Parkes