

**Submission to  
the Environment and Communications Reference Committee Inquiry**

**Recent trends in and preparedness for extreme weather events**

This submission seeks to show that the assumptions that this inquiry makes about trends in extreme events both now and in the future are without merit. In the context of the terms of reference these comments address items (a), (b) and perhaps item (h).

**1- Addressing the premise of more extreme events**

On a global scale there's the question of whether there have been more extreme events recently or whether "weather paranoia" has taken root.

In the USA, NOAA has produced a series of graphs, for various extreme events, of the percentage of land-area of the 48 states affected by the event types (see <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/extremes/cei/graph/6/01-12>). This showed that 2012 had the greatest percentage area impacted by extremes in maximum and minimum temperature but gave no information about the duration of such events or the meteorological causes

A more detailed and fully explained analysis rated 2012 the 54<sup>th</sup> year out of 103 years for extreme weather, making it the 46<sup>th</sup> most extreme (for full explanation of the method see <https://notalotofpeopleknowthat.wordpress.com/2013/01/20/how-extreme-was-us-weather-in-2012/>). The relative graph from this alternative evaluation is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1 – Alternative ranking system for extreme weather in the USA.

It looks to me very much like different yardsticks for "extreme weather" produce dramatically different results, which in turn means very different trends.

Australia has certainly had extreme events in the past, including a heatwave in 1896 that saw hundreds die and special trains operating to move people from central NSW to the nearer the coast for some relief.

"Extreme heat in 1896: Panic stricken people fled the outback on special trains as hundreds die"

<http://joannenova.com.au/2012/11/extreme-heat-in-1896-panic-stricken-people-fled-the-outback-on-special-trains-as-hundreds-die/>

Also see how the recent heatwave was not unusual at

<http://joannenova.com.au/2013/01/australia-was-hot-and-is-hot-so-what-this-is-not-an-unusual-heat-wave/>

And if you want information about Brisbane floods there's copious reports about the big flood of 1974, which itself was nothing special in the context of Brisbane's flood history.

And if you want to see how Victoria's recent bushfires are nothing unusual, look for reports of the 1939 bush fires when the state was burnt from near Corryong to Melbourne's outskirts.

This Victorian bushfire occurred in January 1939 and flooding in Brisbane occurred in March 1939 (see <http://trove.nla.gov.au/ndp/del/article/17568970>), so it seems that extreme events in quick succession are nothing unusual either.

**Conclusion – In the matter of item (a) of the terms of reference, the manner in which extreme events are judged can have a huge impact on the perceived trend of such events. Australia has seen plenty such events in the past and sometimes within a relatively short space of time.**

## 2 - Addressing the premise of human involvement in extreme events

The IPCC, CSIRO and others would have you believe that extreme events are made worse by manmade warming. The problem with that argument is that over the last 16 years, when various "extreme events" have occurred in Australia, there's been no statistically significant increase in global average temperature. This is not my "opinion" but has been stated by Phil Jones, head of the UK's CRU, and by climate alarmist James Hansen who has previously said that sceptics should be tried before the courts.

German magazine Der Spiegel has just reported on the absence of warming and a translation of its sober report, headlined (translated) "Climate change: scientists baffled by the stop in global warming", can be found at <http://tinyurl.com/atj73gv>.

Figure 2 is a graph of the decadal temperature trends, based on HadCRUT3 data, starting from the date shown in the X-axis, until October 2012. The right hand side shows extreme variance because the period to October 2012 is quite short.




Figure 2 – decadal temperature trends from each month in the X-axis to October 2012.

When the graph line is above 0 on the Y-axis the trend is upwards (i.e. warming) and when below 0 the trend is downwards (i.e. cooling). The trend from early 1997 to October 2012 was zero, indicating no warming. Start the trend any time from January 2000 to about November 2005, and end it in October 2012 the trend is one of cooling trend.

It is claimed by the IPCC, CSIRO and the Climate Commission that anthropogenic emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are causing significant and dangerous warming. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have certainly continued over the last 16 years but no warming. Doesn't that strike you as odd?

Cyclones (aka hurricanes) are driven by the temperature differential between latitudes. If the Earth did warm the amount of warming at any location is largely dependent on its latitude. Any extra heat in the tropics will be lost through convection, but at the poles the warming would be more significant and there's a sliding scale between the two. The net result would be a reduction in the temperature differential across the latitudes and therefore cyclones would be *less likely* than they are without that warming.

If human activity hasn't influenced weather events through rising temperature then how else might it do so?

Some try to blame heatwaves on human activity but Bureau of Meteorology reports about heat waves almost inevitably they describe how the heat waves were caused by quasi-stationary pressure cells, usually High's, causing winds that poured hot air to a specific location.

The European heat wave of 2003 had a similar cause – warm air from North Africa being dragged into southern Europe by winds, and that's according to the sensible analysis in chapter 3 of the IPCC's 2007 report.

The only extreme event that is influenced by human activity is bushfire, but I dare say the truth about that won't make people happy.

My early years were spent on a farm in central Victoria. Forty years ago people used to be diligent about removing potential fire fuel late in spring and even making deliberate firebreaks around property. Local councils did their part by mowing the grass at the sides of roads to increase the width of firebreak provided by that road and to reduce the risk of discarded cigarette butts causing fires. Forestry practices were aligned to this and effort was made to reduce fire risk on the one hand and on the other ensure good access for fire fighting if that became necessary.

In recent years these sensible precautions seem to have been abandoned. I lay the blame on various Green policies for the environment. It's ironic that policies designed to protect the environment actually increase the risk of fires that will destroy that environment.

**Conclusion – In relation to item (b) of the terms of reference, any premise of a human influence in heat waves is flawed because there's no been no discernible human influence on temperature for the last 16 years. It is nonsensical to blame human activity for the presence of quasi-stationary pressure cells that often create heat waves. The only "extreme events" that I can link to human activity are bushfires because the risk of such fires has increased through environmental policies set by humans.**

### **3 - Addressing the premise of that the IPCC and CSIRO claims about a significant human influence on climate are credible**

I know two people who have asked the CSIRO for a copy of the definitive peer-reviewed paper that shows incontrovertible evidence that anthropogenic emissions of CO2 cause significant warming, but it's been a request made in vain. I suggest that you ask this of either the CSIRO or Bureau of Meteorology and see what kind of answer you are given.

The CSIRO and BoM (and the Australian Climate Commission) usually refer people to the IPCC 4AR of 2007, but that's not a credible authority.

The IPCC's charter says

"The role of the IPCC is to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation." (see <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/ipcc-principles/ipcc-principles.pdf>)

Or put more simply it is to report on the magnitude of manmade climate change and what can be done to reduce its impact, *the existence of manmade climate change being assumed from the outset.*

The role of the IPCC is therefore to find material to support that assumption and to use UN processes to obtain support for its ideas.

The IPCC's is not a global authority on all plausible causes of climate variation; there is no agency charged with that task. To take the word of an organization with a very specific focus, and whose existence would be threatened if it couldn't find a way to claim there was a human influence, is simply risible.

More on this subject can be found at <http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2013/01/the-ipcc-s-fatal-founding-flaw>.

The IPCC's claims are based on the output of climate models but table 2.11 (chapter 2, page 201) of the 200 report lists 16 climate forces related to heat transfer by radiation and states that 12 of them are poorly understood. It stands to reason that if the forces are poorly understood they can't be modelled with any accuracy.

Also in that report, chapter 8 discussed climate models and on about 15 occasions it expressed reservations about the accuracy of the modelling of various forces.

Despite the discussion of issues in chapter 2 and 8, chapter 9, the pivotal chapter in the entire report, declared that models showed a human influence and when run with future scenarios the models predicted warming. Models in previous reports failed to predict the recent absence of warming, which is hardly surprising given that the models were even worse than the 2007 models, but what faith can we have in models at all when none have

been verified and the IPCC uses the averaged results from 'an ensemble of models' to support its claims?

I have also questioned the IPCC's credibility and integrity on several matters, some of which are:

On the key claims of its 2007 report, some of which expands on my comments above, "*Prejudiced Authors, Prejudiced findings*"

[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/McLean\\_IPCC\\_bias.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/McLean_IPCC_bias.pdf)

On the number of people that the IPCC implies were involved with the 2007 report, "*The IPCC can't count*"

[http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC\\_numbers.pdf](http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf)

On the plagiarising of a magazine article and pretending it was peer-reviewed science, "*Glaciergate highlights IPCC flaws*"

[http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/glacier\\_gate.pdf](http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/glacier_gate.pdf)

Finally on the question of IPCC credibility it has to be said that one of the most dishonest actions by the IPCC is to express opinions through the use of expressions of probability (e.g. 'extremely likely'). Mathematics is the basis for calculating probabilities, not an opinion, especially when that opinion is probably only that of the author of that that section of the IPCC report.

(To me it's embarrassing to see academics Professor Neville Nicholls and Dr Andrew Glikson making submissions to this inquiry and using the same phony dressing up of opinions. Perhaps you'd care to ask them to justify their expressions by showing the mathematics behind them.)

**Conclusion – The IPCC is not a credible body when it comes to climate matters. Its focus is just one issue, not the entire spectrum, so it is woefully biased in that direction, on top of which it has shown inconsistency and a lack of integrity on more than one matter. The CSIRO merely parrots the IPCC and likewise has been unable to produce any incontrovertible evidence. Neither organisation has any credibility on the matters that form the basis of item (b) of the terms of reference.**