

## A response to: Setting Australia's post-2020 target for greenhouse gas emissions

David R. L. Davies, PhD, April 2015

### **Preface:**

Since silence is commonly interpreted as assent I begin with a few comments on the issues summary since I strongly disagree with its implied assumptions. These may have been plausible a decade ago but objective analysis of the issue has changed radically in that time frame.

*"The Government's focus is on taking direct action, ..."*

This is a commendable approach if it is restricted to improved energy efficiency and soil fertility and not driven by misguided ideas about atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. Humans are now using most of the planet's arable land. The new frontier for this century is increased productivity through soil improvement.

*"... Australia has warmed by 0.9°C since 1910, with most of the warming since 1950."*

This is a debatable statement. The warming in the early half of the century was comparable within the error bounds of the measurements. Australia's highest recorded temperature (51.7°C) was at Bourke in 1909.

*"Climate change is a global problem that requires a global solution."*

There is no climate problem that we have any control over other than minimising negative impacts using well established protective measures as appropriate to a particular local context. The climate has always varied and will change regardless of our actions. Sensible non-politicised analysis may help us cope better with its impacts.

*"A strong and effective global agreement, that addresses carbon leakage and delivers environmental benefit, is in Australia's national interest."*

Increased CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere over recent decades has increased global vegetation levels and crop production by 10% to 20%. This is in our national interest. A global agreement that attacks our national sovereignty is not in our interests.\*

*"... how it contributes to achieving the UNFCCC's objective of stabilising emissions at a level that would avoid dangerous climate change."*

There is no rational risk of dangerous climate change. Even the IPCC technical reports have backed away from the initial extreme claims though their political reports have become increasingly strident.

*"Australia's target must provide certainty to business and the Australian community to facilitate decision making and investment."*

This is a primary consideration and would not be possible if we gave the UN the power to micro-manage our economy and lifestyles.

*"The target will represent Australia's fair share of the global effort needed to respond to climate change."*

The effort needed is zero hence so is our share. Any effort made will have no measurable impact.

*"Australia's post-2020 target will be consistent with continued strong economic growth, jobs growth and development in Australia."*

Continued economic growth requires an economy free from a global carbon taxation system that is out of our control and so arbitrary that it can be gamed endlessly. We have a very poor grasp of the carbon cycle that it is based on.

We used gold as a basis for currency because its supply and assay could be accounted accurately. Carbon dioxide is its antithesis.

### **Addressing the highlighted issues:**

- *What should Australia's post-2020 target be and how should it be expressed? In responding to this question you could consider the base year (e.g. 1990/2000/2005), the end year (e.g. 2025/2030), the type of target and why the suggested target is preferred.*

Australia should set no such targets but if we, as a small country, are bullied by the UN into making some commitment it should be set high enough that it does not inhibit our economic growth. Of utmost importance

should be an understanding that we can opt out when the fundamental errors of the carbon scare are widely recognised.

Carbon dioxide has no measurable impact on climate. The link is purely theoretical. The theory used by the IPCC is flawed with the most obvious problems being:

1: The IPCC modellers start with the tiny impact of CO<sub>2</sub> and build from there. Mathematically this is not a valid approach. Earth, the water planet, has a water based thermostat based primarily on air circulation, cloud formation and thunderstorms. The impact of CO<sub>2</sub> is a very small perturbation of the action of that thermostat. Perturbation theory requires an accurate and detailed model of the central system before the impact of such a small perturbation can be evaluated. No such model exists and it is currently beyond our ability since we don't have the data to base one on.

2: The IPCC models have failed to describe actual measured temperatures. The temperature plateau of the last seventeen years or so is the most obvious failure, failing at the 95% level of certainty, but they have also failed to track past changes.

Simple models based on long-term ocean cycles accurately account for natural variations and show that we have just passed a peak. They project a downward temperature trend for this century reversing the small trend of the past century of less than 1°C.

The practical impact of rising ocean temperatures over the last century has been minimal and would have gone unnoticed without the climate scare campaign. In contrast, inter-annual fluctuations are in the order of 5 to 10°C. This summer was the coolest I can remember in Canberra. Even my dog noticed and in mid-summer was urging me to turn on the heater by lying in front of it – winter behaviour.

3: The IPCC models assume that the net impact of clouds is warming. Any observant person who has spent time outdoors will be aware that the daytime shade of clouds has a far greater cooling effect than the slight warming effect they have at night.

4: The IPCC models fail to account for thunderstorms. These are powerful phase-change heat pumps that cool the surface by evaporative cooling and dump the energy in the upper troposphere where it is radiated to space. With each storm, on average, transporting atomic bomb scale energies and approximately seven million storms per year this amounts to around 10<sup>22</sup> Joules/year<sup>1</sup> which matches the 'missing heat' that IPCC modellers say is hiding in the deep oceans – along with the forty or more other excuses put forward for its apparent disappearance.

5: The IPCC analysis of the carbon cycle omits 97% of the biosphere's carbon based life – all the ocean biota (90% of total) and the 80% of the terrestrial biota that is in soil ecosystems. The measurement uncertainties in each of the remaining CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes are greater than our industrial contributions so they are lost in the noise.

By the IPCC's own figures the atmosphere replaces a quarter of its CO<sub>2</sub> each year yet they still claim that the residence time is centuries. This is a glaring logical inconsistency.

• *What would the impact of that target be on Australia? In responding to this question you could, for example, consider the impact on our economy, jobs, business and on the environment.*

With the use of fossil fuels free from arbitrary constraints Australia can continue to prosper if we make the effort. The damage that constraints would have on our economy, jobs and business is obvious. Increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels are clearly beneficial to the environment.

• *Which further policies complementary to the Australian Government's direct action approach should be considered to achieve Australia's post-2020 target and why?*

The availability of water is a key constraint on improving our soil fertility and expanding agricultural productivity. Australian farmers Ken Yeomans (Keyline Farming) and Peter Andrews (Natural Sequence Farming) have made outstanding contributions to the art of water management. We should encourage further use of their techniques. Improved water retention means deeper and healthier soil ecosystems and a greater potential to take advantage of increased atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels.

#### **\* Impacts on national sovereignty:**

Sitting behind the push for carbon targets are the intrusive UN bureaucracy and regulations needed to enforce compliance and that will inevitably increase as the carbon market deficiencies become more

apparent. The UN's Agenda 21 and Global Governance programmes intend to replace national sovereignty with a massive centralised bureaucracy:

*"The supra-national sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national auto-determination practiced in past centuries."* David Rockefeller, Club of Rome, Bilderberg Conference, 1991

At least he excludes from his intellectual elite the bankers who are still trying to launder trillions of dollars of bad debt.

*"De facto, this means an expropriation of the countries with natural resources. This leads to a very different development from that which has been triggered by development policy."* Ottmar Edenhofer, IPPC, Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 14 November 2010

The expropriation of Australia's natural resources is not in our interest and, given the anti-fossil fuel obsession of the UNFCCC, is not in the interest of any country.

*"This is probably the most difficult task we have ever given ourselves, which is to intentionally transform the economic development model for the first time in human history"* Christiana Figueres, UNFCCC, UNRIC, 3 February 2015

This campaign is clearly not about climate. And who does she mean by 'we'?

Australia's sovereignty, control of our economy, taxation with representation, and foreign aid must remain in Australian hands and not in the hands of the openly anti-democratic UNFCCC and associated organisations. **Any commitment that undermines it should be put to a referendum.**

It is quite bizarre, given the potential economic significance, that we have had no public debate on this issue. With issues of this significance we need an open, ongoing and objective public debate where all views are considered.

The Australian public would be surprised to find that there has been no meaningful debate within the scientific community either. The oft-quoted 97% consensus comes from a methodologically flawed assessment of the views of those scientists funded by the anti-carbon campaign.

The brief of the IPCC was to develop a case against fossil fuels. The case for the prosecution has been put. Now it's time for the case for the defence to be publicly presented on behalf of the powerless of the world who have a desperate need for cheap and reliable energy along with the health, comforts, and economic opportunities that it brings.

The very least that the Australian government must do in the Paris meeting is to ensure an opt-out clause. If, as the ocean cycles indicate, we are entering a cooling phase similar in scale to the Little Ice Age then all responsible governments will want to opt out and focus on providing their citizens with reliable and affordable energy. Unimpeded, Australia can help provide these energy supplies.

<sup>1</sup> Calculation of thunderstorm energy

Typical energy per storm =  $1 \times 10^{15}$  Joules (source [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thunder\\_storms#Energy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thunder_storms#Energy))

Storms per year = 6,657,600 storms/y (source <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-12991483>)

Energy per year =  $1 \times 10^{15} \times 6,657,600 = 6.7 \times 10^{21}$  Joules/y

Ocean heat content change =  $6.3 \times 10^{21}$  Joules/y (ROAS4 OHC, average over 2000-2004 rise)