

**Global Warming**  
**Summary of Faults in Analyses by the IPCC and other Alarmist Scientists**  
**by Des Moore BSc (Econ)**

- Analysis of global temperature changes shows no justifiable basis for claims of a direct link between increases in CO2 emissions and global temperature because:
  - >in three periods covering 58 years out of the last 130 temperatures have fallen or not increased despite increases in CO2 emissions over this period. This and other analyses of temperature data indicate there is no basis for claims that urgent action is needed to reduce emissions;
  - >the publication of ten year averages of temperatures conceals change points in such temperatures. The increase in Australian temps of 0.6 of a degree in the mid 1970s was due to *natural* causes. This means that 75% of the increase in our temps over the last 100 years (0.7-0.8) is natural not human;
  - >claims the temperature outlook has worsened since the last IPCC report in 2007 have no foundation;
  - >claims that recent temperatures are the hottest ever are wrong: temperatures over periods in the distant past were almost certainly higher despite no fossil fuel use then;
  - >a projection based solely on the published (inaccurate) temperature increase in the last 50 years would imply a non-dangerous temperature increase of only 1.0C over the next century, very much less than the IPCC prediction of 2-4 C for 2100;
  - >despite claims of “clearance” by official inquiries, the ClimateGate emails provide evidence of manipulations of temperature data by scientists who advised the IPCC.
- Possible future changes in global sea levels are widely disputed but a continuation of recent trends would produce an increase of only about 22 cms by 2100, at the lower end of the last IPCC report’s projected increase of 18-59 cm.
- Widely publicised meltings in the Arctic in 2007 occurred during a period of falling global temperatures and increased cloudlessness. These meltings, which have virtually no effect on sea levels, were subsequently reversed. Reports of recent threats of further meltings fail to recognise that there have been past periods (pre the intensive use of fossil fuels) when little or no ice was in the Arctic;
- The Government’s Green paper of 2008 claimed "concerns" exist about the "stability" of Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets. But the sea ice area in the Southern Hemisphere reached record levels in that year and claims of warming temperatures in the Antarctic were clearly unfounded scares;
- The official Dutch meteorological agency has stated there is “no evidence for accelerated sea-level rise”;
- There is no correlation between global temperatures and rainfall in Australia: the Green paper’s acknowledgement that the NE of Australia became wetter since the 1950s suggests no *global* temperature increase effect. Similar droughts to the recent one occurred in the past when emissions were much lower. Variations in Murray-

Darling basin annual show no connection with levels or variations in average temperatures. Garnaut's prediction that the MDB will cease to be a home to agriculture by 2100 is typical of his unsubstantiated assertions on climate;

- All IPCC reports acknowledge that the warming effects from increased concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> diminish progressively as concentration levels grow. But this established fact is not taken into account in IPCC conclusions that urgent action is needed to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. This suggests its conclusions are politically not scientifically motivated;
- IPCC models used to project temperature increases have a major fault in failing to take adequate account of cooling from evaporation. This causes models to produce much larger increases in surface temperatures than could actually occur;
- Considerable scientific analysis suggests variations in the sun's activity have some correlation to variations in temperatures: recent declines in activity suggest a possible cooling period ahead;
- Humans are able to adapt to differences in temperatures and already live good lives in places with widely different average temperatures;
- There is a long history of wrong doom and gloom predictions by scientists and the global warming scare is one of many identifiable false scares;
- Claims of scientific consensus are contradicted by numerous, qualified dissenters, including 31,000 scientists who signed a denial petition;
- Australia's highly respected Productivity Commission concluded some time ago that uncertainty pervades the science, geopolitics and economics of global warming and that action to substantially reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions could be "very costly";
- Treasury's modelling showing a low economic cost assumes some form of effective global agreement will be reached and carbon capture/storage will become "commercial". The first seems increasingly unrealistic and the second ill-defines commercial. If no global agreement occurs the cost of an emissions reduction policy (ERP) could be large;
- The case for an urgent ERP is undermined by uncertainty about the science and by the acknowledgement of only a miniscule "loss" of GDP in 2100 if no action is taken and temperatures increase as predicted by IPCC.
- There is no sound basis for Australia to "lead the way" in reducing emissions, particularly as there is now little or no prospect of an agreement amongst leading emitters let alone a global agreement.

September 2011