

## Environmental Security Issues

*By Colin Brooks, Adelaide-based Geophysicist & Exploration Geologist, South Australia*

### ‘CLIMATE CHANGE’

**W**hat is meant by these words? Firstly - climate. The simplest definition from the Shorter Oxford dictionary is "Condition (of a region or country) in relation to prevailing atmospheric phenomena, as temperature humidity etc, especially as these affect animal or vegetable life."

Note the specific geographic limitation and the related effects on life.

Then "change" can be seen, necessarily, to be equally related to area and life, but change implies a timeframe view which is not constant. So, to consider climate change both area and timeframe need to be taken into account.

Some practical examples can illustrate this. Frans Manns of Artesian Geological Research in Toronto used data from about 1830 AD to 2006 AD to show that within coterminal U.S.A. one can see that temperatures vary quite widely from short term (five or ten year) averages and that over fifty or a hundred years in some U.S. towns and places the trend of annual mean temperatures can be seen to be rising, in some it was constant, but falling in others.

Examples that he gives include Berkeley, California, from 1890-2000 AD the mean rose from about 56°F to 57.5°F with a range of 54.5°F to 59°F. In New York the rise from 1820 AD to 2000 AD was from 50.5°F to 54.4°F with a range of 46.5°F to 57°F. Both examples may well illustrate the urban heat island effect as populations rose significantly, asphalt, buildings, heating, air conditioning and cars replaced grass, trees, wood fires and horses.

In Albany, New York, however, the mean fell from 48.5°F to 47.5°F from 1810 AD to 2000 AD with Annual Mean Temperatures ranging from 42°F to 51°F. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania and State University of Mississippi also, among others, showed falling trends.

In all he published 11 charts. These alone disprove any global hypothesis about climate change over this short time frame. These were all ground station weather bureau measurements, but Manns noted that since 1979 temperatures have been measured from satellites, which data show much smaller changes.

He also noted that as most weather stations are located at or near where people live, they are far from random or equally biased sample points, and, further, that climate is not weather.

While many scientists are aware of the chain of active volcanoes under the West Antarctic Peninsula, causing the ice sheets to melt, the general public has not been so informed, nor

that East Antarctica, a much larger area, has been cooling over the past few decades.

Recently both Russian and American submarines found two very active volcanoes causing ice to melt where there was clear water near the North Pole.

Before considering cause and effect, perhaps one should look at climate change both on earth and on our neighbouring planets, as far back in time as we can sensibly go.

When one does this, one sees glaciations alternating irregularly with warm, wet periods from at least 750 million years (Ma) ago to the present interglacial pause.

These comments show that quite old documented glaciations have been well known for many years to secondary and tertiary students.

Coming to younger geologic time, the Pleistocene Epoch of the Tertiary Period, extending from about 1.8 Ma almost to the Present had at least four major glacial cycles, of about 100,000 years each, covering much of Europe and North America.

Climate change, with its ups and downs, is clearly documented in the geological record, but has been falsely ascribed to a non-polluting minor gas by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

The IPCC's brief was to indicate man's effects, not to examine it in detail. Its ruling

clique, of 35 people, relies largely on computer models. Their work and conclusions have been sold in a non-philosophic manner to Western World politicians and media. Vast sums of money have been, and are being spent on trying to prove that carbon dioxide emitted by man is the significant cause that has to be limited.

Computer studies of this earth's climate changes, used to build models to predict future changes, have been shown to be worse than useless and here is why – many factors have to be considered in any such study. If there is a non-linear relationship between any two, the uncertainty of modelling just those two can be calculated, but the more interrelated factors that need to be built into a model, the more the uncertainty of any answer becomes. Quite quickly total uncertainty shows such an effort to be fruitless.

Ian Plimer's 2009 book, *Heaven + Earth* lists, on page 234, eleven cycles (galactic, Milankovitch, solar and tidal) known to drive the Earth's climate. There are other factors affecting climate both on local and global scales. Changes in the geometric relations of the Sun to the Earth are just one.

Non-linear relations between even these eleven are enough for one to see that the degree of uncertainty over decades of time is so high that any model (no matter how big and fast the computer system used) purporting to use this knowledge of a chaotic system for predicting even ten or

twenty years into the future is doomed to fail.

Therefore computer climate modelling, which may be quite useful for predicting short term (days) local weather, should not be considered relevant to the topic in hand.

Groups of people with detailed knowledge of relevant specific data are entering the debate, claiming that recent climate changes alone are driven by natural cycles, not by any human activity, and that the computer modelling served up as answering the questions is irrelevant nonsense. Recent history of the hockey stick (world temperature over time) curve and confusion between satellite-measured earth temperature and ground-based work confirm these opinions.

Professor Bob Carter's recent article in Quadrant Online adds to that. Here are some relevant snippets from Bob:

"The Climategate files have demonstrated the scientific malfeasance of an influential and internationally well networked segment of the climate research community. A small group of scientists and computer modellers - with the aid of an enormous supporting cast of environmental activists and organisations, self-interested business groups, and crusading journalists – have managed to turn the global warming issue (which in 1990 was an entirely sensible matter to have raised) into the scientific scam of the century, if not the biggest ever.

The IPCC is the official UN body that has presided over this fiasco. It is an organisation that was specifically set up to provide advice to national governments (including Australia's) for their use in setting climate policy. The IPCC's incompetence is manifest in its failure to detect the corrupt science that has for so long permeated the activities of the international jetsetters of the climate science power group. The organisation should be closed down (without tears), and the Copenhagen COP-15 meeting would be a good place to start this process happening."

"My concern with the science funding system, then, is not a personally bruised ego, but rather for them – the scientists in the early or middle stages of their careers, all of whom understand only too well (not least from the example made of me and many other "dissident" climate scientists) that to get funding for their research they have to conform to the scientific political correctnesses of the day. This is neither personally satisfying and nor, most certainly, does it stimulate the sort of unconventional creativity and lateral thinking on which many scientific breakthroughs are based."

"It's not just prestigious science institutions but also the world's formerly most excellent scientific publications that have had their reputations traduced by the Climategate scam. For instance, since the 1990s, *Science*, *Nature* and *New Scientist* have become renowned as propaganda outlets for the climate cognoscenti and their allies. For years now, these magazines have been

providing pompous editorial claptrap to go along with their flawed environmental research papers, like the following gem from *Nature* in 2002:

*“The public expects scientists ..... to have high standards. .... Trust in science .... (can) be diminished by people who exploit scientific uncertainty for political ends, such as casting doubt on the evidence for global warming or evolution. A few ‘sceptics’ appearing on TV can confuse a public that expects monolithic truth from science”.*”

"Why has our formerly excellent national science agency, the CSIRO, been allowed to become a consultancy arm for the government?

Why, amongst other shameless activities, has CSIRO been allowed to go around selling region-customized reports that are implied to provide climate predictions, but which in fact contain projections that are statistically no better than flipping a coin?

(CSIRO’s back is protected, of course, by the doubtless expensive lawyers who have insisted that the following disclaimer be inserted in all such reports:

*“This report relates to climate change scenarios based on computer modelling. Models involve simplifications of the real processes that are not fully understood. Accordingly, no responsibility will be accepted by CSIRO or the QLD government for the accuracy of forecasts or predictions*

*inferred from this report or for any person's interpretations, deductions, conclusions or actions in reliance on this report”.* (Would you buy a used car from these people?)

The IPCC reports are likely seriously flawed and should not provide rational bases for professional discussion of environmental security issues. Such fora need to be led by experienced multi-skilled discussion leaders with a grasp of many related fields.

To study environmental security issues it is essential to clear away the major fallacy of CO<sub>2</sub>'s dominant role in climate change before beginning any analysis of the causes of insecurity. This has to be the prelude to looking at environmental security in the age of climate change.

*Views expressed in this article are not necessarily those of SAGE International*



Climate change image:

<http://askehbl.files.wordpress.com/2009/06/climate-change1.jpg>

(Accessed: 16/02/2010)