

THE WEATHER MAKERS RE-EXAMINED		BIAS										NEW RELEASE 400 page BOOK												
by Dr D W Allen		Baseless	Selection			Reporting				Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	See details at bottom of spreadsheet										
Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error				Allen Comments									
Bias is evident in unsupported extreme or dogmatic statements, in selecting suspect sources or material, presenting only one side, in failing to reflect uncertainty, and in misinterpreting or exaggerating findings		Score>	51	14	103	50	85	48	7	26	78	70	43	31	11	10	Some exaggerated or erroneous statements are also dogmatic and unsupported and thus allocated to several categories. While in some instances the source was erroneous, in most instances it is impossible to know the source of the error.							
Title - <i>The Weather Makers</i>		Page														Weather is not climate / nature makes weather								
<i>Climate change a threat to civilisation (R Purves)</i>		Foreword	1													Global cooling is the greater threat								
<i>a theory is only valid for as long as it has not been disproved</i>		2														1	Who could disprove that Tim will go to a special monkey heaven!							
<i>Pollutants - known as greenhouse gases</i>		3														1	Water vapour & CO2 pollutants?							
<i>By 1975, the first sophisticated computer models</i>		4		1														1	They were very primitive / still not sophisticated enough					
<i>The heart of Earth's thermostat is CO2</i>		5		1															Water is much more important					
<i>the gas lasts around a century in the atmosphere</i>		5		1		1															57% of it is naturally sequestered within a year			
<i>GHG reached levels not seen for millions of years</i>		6			1	1															CO2 reached 348ppm during the early Holocene			
<i>Replacing 4WD with a hybrid reduces GHG by 70%</i>		6		1														1	1	It can actually increase global GHG emissions				
<i>Vote for a politician who will sign Kyoto</i>		8		1																Signing Kyoto in 2007 made no difference to emissions				
SECTION 1 - GAIA'S TOOLS																								
<i>Drop of 0.1% in solar radiation reaching Earth can trigger an ice age</i>		14			1															1	Compare with next statement			
<i>smog can cut sunlight by 10% and heat the lower environment and ocean</i>		107			1															1	Smoke (which is what he is referring to) blocks sunlight, cooling the lower environment. This can cause an inversion and smog.			
<i>Earth's long-term climate stability could not have resulted from mere chance</i>		14		1														1		Was it intelligent design? By Gaia?				
<i>Complex CO2-based explanation for no more Snowball-Earth events</i>		16																1	1	Confusing and incompatible with known carbon cycle				
<i>"believes in Gaia" & "Gaian world view"</i>		17																1		Belief / faith is not science				
<i>Every extinction is an act of self-mutilation</i>		17																1		Even the smallpox virus?				
<i>A reductionist world view is responsible for climate change and [hence] the destruction of civilisation</i>		17		1																Who is the reductionist here?				
<i>Gaia would sort it out - and rid herself of us</i>		17		1																Man a parasite on the planet?				
<i>Limited mixing of atmosphere across equator</i>		20	1																Yet CO2 is similar in SH when >90% of emissions are in NH					
<i>By trapping heat near the planet's surface GHGs both warm our world and account for the 'upside down' troposphere</i>		23																1. GHGs trap heat in the upper troposphere & 2. the 'upside down' troposphere is produced by solar heating of Earth's surface						
<i>Most powerful GHG of all is water vapour</i>		24																CFCs are more powerful/potent						
<i>CO2 reaching 1% would bring Earth's surface temp to boiling point</i>		24		1	1																Without feedback, it would cause only about 5°C of warming			

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>For a visceral understanding of how GHG work, visit New York in August.</i>	24					1										Fails to mention UHI effect
<i>atmospheric CO2 will double to 600ppm this century</i>	26				1		1			1						On a trajectory for about 560ppm
<i>This doubling of CO2 could heat planet by 3 °C and as much as 6 °C</i>	26				1		1			1						IPCC says 1°C to 3.5°C
<i>Increasing CO2 in experiments made no difference to heat trapped</i>	27	1														
<i>Positive feedback loop (from moisture in atmosphere) forces Earth's temperature to ever higher levels</i>	28						1									Complicated by cloud formation
<i>Clouds: No single factor contributes more to our uncertainty of future climate predictions</i>	28	1														
<i>CO2 causes around 80% of all global warming</i>	28						1		1	1						Lee Kump says no such thing
<i>56% of CO2 from all fossil fuel burnt is still aloft</i>	28				1					1						The opposite is true - 57 % is sequestered within a year
<i>during cold times CO2 levels have dropped to around 160 ppm, and</i>	29				1					1						most ice core authorities state 180ppm
<i>until recently, they never exceeded 280ppm</i>	29									1						CO2 levels exceeded 300ppm during the MWP and 330ppm during the early Holocene
<i>in 2002 & 2003, CO2 levels rose by 2.54 ppm (cf 1.8ppm pa over the previous decade)</i>	29				1				1	1						There was no acceleration in 2002, 2003, or since
<i>Coal-fired power plants are so inefficient that 2/3 energy is wasted</i>	30			1		1										Modern power plants are 45-80% efficient
<i>Methane is the next most important GHG after CO2</i>	30	1														
<i>over 100yrs, it is 60 times more potent than CO2</i>	30				1					1						IPCC says methane is 21 times as potent
<i>25 times as potent a greenhouse gas as is CO2.</i>	258	1											1			Methane is about 25 times as potent over a 100-yr time frame
<i>will cause 15-17% of all global warming this century</i>	30			1	1		1									No reference given
<i>Life is carbon-based</i>	31	1														
<i>were it not for plants and algae we would soon suffocate in CO2</i>	31	1				1										Bacteria are also very important
<i>Mature forests are not good carbon sinks</i>	32	1														
<i>Cold sea water can hold more carbon than warm water</i>	33	1														
<i>the oceans are becoming more acid</i>	34			1						1						They are very slightly less alkaline
<i>so marine creatures are unable to mke carbonate shells</i>	35				1					1						Some are unaffected and some are better able
<i>Even slight variations . . could make Earth uninhabitable</i>	37				1					1						Alfred Wallace underestimated human resilience
<i>Attributes to Arrhenius a good understading of GHG</i>	40							1								His understanding was actually quite poor
<i>In 1938 Callendar knew the cause of global warming was the burning of coal</i>	41					1										It was then primarily solar warming
<i>Notes correlation of sunspots with Earth's temperature</i>	43	1														
<i>but no testable physical mechanism yet identified</i>	43					1										Unaware of Svensmark's work
<i>GHGs warm the troposphere most at the bottom</i>	44				1								1			Models predict max warming at 9km altitude
<i>the medieval Earth was 1-2 °C warmer than today</i>	44	1														
<i>but patchy and the Earth overall was 0.03°C cooler</i>	44			1	1											Strong evidence for a global MWP

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments	
<i>so the idea of a global Medieval Warm Period is bunk</i>	44		1				1									Hockey stick is bunk	
<i>American southwest was warmer than now 700 yrs ago</i>	131	1											1			This was during the MWP	
<i>Permian-Triassic extinction about 251 million years ago</i>	47	1														Accurate	
<i>245 million years ago (ma) the Permo-Triassic event</i>	200										1		1			Inaccurate	
<i>65ma CO2 caused an abrupt spike in temperature</i>	48		1				1			1						More likely that the temperature and extinction caused the CO2	
<i>the PETM extinction event 55ma was caused by a rapid rise in CO2</i>	53					1	1									The rise in temperature predated the rise in CO2 by 3,000 years	
<i>55Ma an eruption of methane warmed our planet</i>	188	1											1				
<i>the fastest warming 10-20 millennia ago was 1 °C per millennium</i>	59		1				1			1						It actually exceeded 1°C per decade!	
<i>'roller-coaster rides' with 'sharpness of saw teeth'</i>	61	1											1			Both statements can't be true	
<i>low temp & CO2 made it impossible to grow crops</i>	62	1														Many crops can't grow below 150ppm of CO2	
<i>the medieval 'black plague' caused the Little Ice Age</i>	67									1						Cooling preceded plague and caused rats and people to huddle	
"carbon causes climate change"	70		1							1	1					Profound!	
<i>Brown coal is the most polluting of all fuels</i>	72		1			1										Brown coal can be made less polluting	
<i>Recommends burning biomass</i>	297												1			Biomass is even dirtier than brown coal	
<i>1986 marks the year that humans reached Earth's carrying capacity</i>	78		1	1	1											Based on WWF Report - Population then 4.932 billion	
<i>Such profligate energy use is truly shocking</i>	79		1										1			What about his own frequent long haul flights!	
<i>Principal cause of global warming is an increase in CO2</i>	79		1				1									Accounts for 40% at most - see p 167	
SECTION 2 - ONE IN TEN THOUSAND																	
<i>Climate change lept when 'magic gates' opened in 1976 and 1998</i>	84					1				1							These were el Nino years at either end of a positive IPO
<i>Decline in Pacific Ocean salinity of 0.8% since 1976</i>	84								1	1							It has remained stable
<i>Parmesan & Yohe: a huge study published in Science</i>	87									1				1			Published in Nature & not 'huge'
<i>found a poleward shift of 6m per decade</i>	88					1	1										Of 168 bird species, 90 were stable or going equator-ward
<i>Confuses Parmesan and Yohe with paper by Root et al</i>	89														1		
<i>rainforest possums threatened by CO2 affecting nutrition</i>	92								1								This was based on seedlings grown in 790ppm of CO2
<i>Climate change at the poles is occurring at twice the rate elsewhere</i>	94		1							1							It may be faster but is not double, especially at the South Pole
<i>Peril at the Poles: Antarctica turning green</i>	95		1														Greenland turned white in LIA
<i>Krill are in decline due to loss of sea ice</i>	96						1			1							Due to harvesting of krill & increasing whale numbers
<i>Alaskan spruce dying & forest spreading into tundra</i>	98-99												1				Fewer trees or more trees in the Arctic?
<i>In 1974 too little snow on Amundsen Gulf for seals to make dens</i>	100												1				that was during a period of global cooling!
<i>Hudson Bay's polar bears are now 15% skinnier</i>	102					1											But much more plentiful
<i>Some time this century no summer ice will be seen in the Arctic</i>	103		1				1		1	1							Richard Betts (source) makes no such alarming statement
<i>The changes we are witnessing at the Poles are of the runaway type</i>	103									1	1						Arctic was warmer around 1940, ice cap stable since 2007
<i>no matter what humanity does it will be too late for reversal</i>	103		1				1		1								Betts said no such thing

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>In 2002, El Niño conditions killed 90% of corals, affected 60% of GBR</i>	109			1	1					1						No reference given
<i>spiralling CO2 emissions is killing the reef</i>	109			1												No basis
<i>↑ 1°C →82% bleached, 2°C →97% & 3°C →100%</i>	109				1											Australian Geographic article
<i>CO2 turns the oceans acidic & prevents coral from secreting skeleton</i>	111			1						1	1					Less alkaline (not acidic) - effect is minimal <1,000ppm CO2
<i>a few species of coral might refuge in places like Sydney Harbour</i>	113									1						Why so far south?
<i>our fragile planet passed through the magic gate</i>	114-5									1						Earth is hardly 'fragile'
<i>plunged the entire ecosystem of the mountaintop into crisis</i>	118									1						Toads / frogs are not the entire ecosystem
<i>Golden toad & 60% of frog species vanished</i>	118	1														
<i>the explanation of its demise was published in <u>Nature</u></i>	119				1											No reference given
<i>We had killed it with our prolific use of coal-power and oversize cars</i>	119			1							1					The real cause was the 1986–1987 El Niño event.
<i>not a single species is definitely known to have become extinct because of climate change</i>	114	1											1			compare with next statement
<i>gastric brooding frog - Australia's first victim of climate change</i>	120			1			1		1							unknown cause ?Chytrid fungus
<i>El-Niño-like conditions brought dramatic decline in East-coast rainfall</i>	121			1	1						1					normal cycles
<i>less winter rain in Pacific northwest → shallower ponds</i>	121										1					no significant change
<i>→ more ultraviolet light → increased susceptibility to chytrid fungus</i>	121								1	1						minor role if any
<i>NOAA models simulated Sahel drought based on GHG increasing SST</i>	125					1	1			1						11 of the 19 models failed to produce drought
<i>'single climatic variable' but also 'global dimming decreased SST'</i>	126			1									1			all man's fault!
<i>much of the American west has not been so dry for around 700 yrs</i>	131									1	1					normal rainfall cycle
<i>have to wait for decades or hundreds of years to see whether it is a natural cycle</i>	132										1					records from 762-2005 & 1895-2010 reveal nothing unusual
<i>the northwest remains in the grip of unprecedented drought.</i>	132			1							1					nothing unusual - see graph
<i>last 50yrs has seen a decline in the average amount of snow received</i>	132-3					1			1							but not over last 100 yrs
<i>5,000 yr ago the American southwest was a little warmer than today</i>	134	1														No reason given for this
<i>over just a few years the tropopause had risen several hundred metres</i>	135				1				1	1						had risen half a metre per decade since 1979
<i>By warming the troposphere we change the weather patterns globally and increase the likelihood of extreme weather events</i>	136			1						1						The layer-averaged warming is only 0.032°C/decade (since 1979) and there is no solid evidence that this has affected the weather or caused extreme weather events

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>As the troposphere has warmed over the past decade, the world has seen the most powerful El Niño ever recorded (1997-98)</i>	136			1												So why none more powerful since 1998?
<i>the first South Atlantic hurricane ever (2002)</i>	136													1		It was in 2004
<i>the most damaging storm to hit the Americas in 200 yr</i>	136					1										Mitch was the only top 10 hurricane since 'magic gate' of 1976 Honduran lives lost from flooding due largely to slash & burn
<i>hurricanes are becoming more frequent in North America</i>	137			1		1										fluctuate with AMO - more made landfall in 1887 than in 2005
<i>long time before sufficient data accumulates to detect trend</i>	138					1										speliotherms over 780 years reveal no trend
<i>increase in flood damage over recent decades has been profound</i>	138			1	1											speech by Tony Blair! Flooding was greater during LIA
<i>In 1960s 7 million people affected by flooding, now 150 mil</i>	138			1		1										due to population growth and movement
<i>1990s warmest decade in central England since records began in 1660s</i>	138	1				1										1660s was the depth of LIA
<i>European summer of 2003 was so hot that, statistically speaking, such an event should occur no more often than every 46,000 years</i>	139					1	1		1	1						the authors state that this very localised warming due to a Hadley Cell could have occurred in MWP, in 1540 or in 1757
<i>26,000 people died during June and July</i>	139					1				-1						at least 35,000 died - a rare understimation
<i>US heat-related deaths exceed all other weather-related causes</i>	139			1	1						1					winters 16% more lethal than summers
<i>GHG decreases temperature gradient from north to south</i>	139	1														valid theory and evidence
<i>between land and sea, and daytime temperature range</i>		1														should therefore also reduce extreme weather events
<i>Alice Springs experienced an increase of more than 3°C last century</i>	140			1	1					1						no increase since 1880s
<i>sea rose rapidly until stabilising about 8000 yr ago</i>	143					1										far more complex than that
<i>As recently as 2001, rising seas looked to be one of the least pressing problems</i>	145										1					The IPCC projections have been decreasing since 1990
<i>over 150 yrs oceans had risen 10-20 cm, which amounts to 1.5mm pa</i>	145										1			1		10-20/150= 0.067 - 0.13 (1.0) mm/yr (it rose >24cm)
<i>Over the 1990s the rate of sea level rise doubled to around 3mm/yr</i>	145									1						it remained fairly linear at about 2mm/yr
<i>little if any of the Arctic ice cap will be left at the end of this century</i>	144			1			1									No reduction since 2007
<i>positive feedback loop will hasten the melting of remaining continental ice</i>	145			1			1									This did not happen during the warmer 1940s
<i>in a few decades there will be no glaciers left in America's Glacier NP</i>	143			1			1			1						they have been advancing & retreating for millennia
<i>in 2004 Greenland's glaciers were melting 10 times faster than previously thought</i>	144			1	1					1	1					recently shown to be melting half as fast as previously thought
<i>Patagonian ice fields are contributing more water per unit area to global sea level rise (0.1 mm per year) than even the gigantic glaciers of Alaska</i>	147									1						Patagonia =3.8% (<0.017mm/yr sea level rise) cf.Alaska =24.4% of global glacial melt
<i>Greenland ice cap contains enough water to raise sea levels by 7m</i>	144									1						about 6.55m

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Dogmatic Extreme	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>temperatures cooling over highest parts of Greenland and Antarctica</i>	144	1													and ice is accumulating there
<i>information is also emerging for a sharp rise in temperature at depth</i>	146			1											National Geographic & what caused this? See next statement:
<i>takes 1,000yr or more for heat to reach the ocean depths</i>	146	1										1			So sharp rise there must be medieval warming
<i>Antarctica provides the most alarming news of melting ice</i>	147				1			1							Ice is accumulating over East Antarctica
<i>in Feb. 2002 the Larsen B ice-shelf broke up over a matter of weeks</i>	147				1										Both A & B broke up 5000 yr ago and became maximal in LIA
<i>glaciers feeding into the Amundsen increased their rate of discharge to around 250 km³/yr – enough to raise sea level by 0.25 mm pa</i>	148				1			1		1					"almost 60% more than is accumulated within their catchment basins" so net loss = 93km³/yr (250km ³ /yr would raise sea-level >0.6mm)
<i>increased precipitation at the Poles is expected to bring more snow</i>	149	1													
<i>the West Antarctic ice sheet may soon break up as did the Eurasian Arctic 15,000 - 12,000 yrs ago</i>	149				1										Eurasian Arctic & West Antarctica have 6 major differences
<i>the Whillans ice stream, long thought to be stable. Yet the study revealed that it could move at the extremely rapid rate – for ice, at least – of one metre per hour.</i>	149				1			1							moves every 6-18 hr a few tens of cm at rate of 1m/hr
<i>West Antarctic ice sheet has enough water to raise sea levels 6-7m</i>	149				1										3.3m - Bamber et al 2009
<i>scientists are now debating whether humans have already tripped the switch that will create an ice-free Earth. If so, we have already committed our planet and ourselves to a rise in the level of the sea of f around 67m . . . (after 2050) . . . and it will take millennia to melt</i>	150		1		1										it would take >100,000yrs for all the ice to melt & man adapted to twice that rise in a tenth of that time.
<i>some scientists predict a rise in sea levels of 3-6m over a century or two</i>	150		1					1							Overpeck, Cole et al
SECTION 3 - THE SCIENCE OF PREDICTION	151														
<i>models are underestimating climatic consequences of GHG build-up</i>	153		1							1					most models are overestimating them
<i>clouds can both trap heat and reflect sunlight . . they can . . . powerfully heat or cool</i>	155	1													models therefore do clouds poorly
<i>Jack Hollander's division of empirical evidence from speculation reveals a poor understanding of how computer models work</i>	156						1	1							The pot is calling the kettle black. Flannery thinks model 'projections' are 'climate change predictions'!
<i>WMO's 17,000 thermometers (in Stevenson's boxes) show incontrovertible warming rate of 0.17°C/decade</i>	158				1			1							far fewer, most non-compliant & often cherry-picked
<i>and are a more reliable gauge of change than satellites which indicate a much smaller rate of warming</i>	158		1		1										Surface thermometers are contaminated by UHI and cover oceans and remote areas poorly
<i>In 2004, it was found that satellites were measuring a warming troposphere and a cooling stratosphere, and the meaningless average was leading researchers astray.</i>	158				1					1					Satellite data was corrected for that in 1992. Still no warming. Correcting for orbital drift in 1998 gave 0.075°C/decade. Further corrections in 2005 gave 0.142°C/decade
<i>temperature decline of 1940s & 70s caused by aerosols</i>	159				1										compare this with the next statement

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>the amount of sunlight reaching Earth's surface has declined significantly over the last three decades</i>	161	1											1			since poorly understood aerosols have increased since 1970s, his argument on 'scrubbers' clearing aerosols falls over
<i>Hunter Valley lung cancer rates are 1/3 higher than in nearby Sydney</i>	159				1					1						Stats for incidence of lung cancer in Hunter-New England are 86.7 per 100,000 people, compared to 86.4 per 100,000 in NSW
<i>by the 1960s, lakes and forests were dying due to acid rain from SO2 emissions of coal-burning power stations</i>	159-60				1	1										most northern forests were flourishing on increased CO2 when 'acid rain' was first mooted in the 1980s
<i>prompted legislation to enforce the use of 'scrubbers' on coal-fired power plants</i>	160									1						scrubbers were being introduced in the 1970s before the alarm about 'acid rain' in the 1980s
<i>as the air cleared, temperatures resumed their upward creep</i>	160												1			on page 161 he admits the air didn't clear - it got worse
<i>Model predictions: the Poles & land will warm more rapidly, more rain, nights will warm more than days</i>	160	1				1										True but UHI also warms the land, and nights more than days
<i>Running GCM on 90,000 PCs gave an astonishing range of possibilities: +1.9 - 11.2°C</i>	161	1					1									an astonishing 6-fold range of uncertainty!
<i>CO₂ levels increased 100 ppm and Earth's temperature rose by 5°C.</i>	161			1		1										Rather, the temperature rise caused the CO2 to rise!
<i>This suggests that CO₂ is a powerful influence on global temperature.</i>	161								1			1				Is Tim that incredulous and ignorant?
<i>Yet an increase in CO2 three times as large is predicted to result in a temperature rise of only 3°C</i>	161											1				Tim also fails to understand logarithmic relationship
<i>this anomaly has serious implications for the survival of civilisation</i>	161			1								1				Tim's 'anomaly' is based on ignorance
<i>If 100ppm of CO₂ really can raise surface temperature 5°C</i>	162								1	1						Tim actually believes that!
<i>and if aerosols and contrails have counterbalanced this so that we have experienced only 0.63°C of warming</i>	162								1			1				i.e. 5°C - 0.63°C = 4.27°C of cooling from aerosols!
<i>their influence on climate must be enormously powerful . . only CO₂ is slightly more powerful</i>	162			1												Myhre (2009) showed that aerosols are 40% less powerful than the IPCC thought
<i>Earth's climate system so riddled with positive feedback that . . . lead to runaway change.</i>	163			1					1							Tim scarcely mentions any negative loops. There is no evidence for past runaway greenhouse
With all scenarios the Hadley Centre discovered that by 2050:	164								1							Flannery's figures based on ' high emissions ' (not all scenarios) and 2080 (not 2050)
<i>1. human influences on climate will have surpassed all natural influences</i>	164			1			1		1							Actual report states: "by the 2080s , most changes in average climate we describe as due to human activities are likely to greatly exceed the
<i>2. winter rainfall is expected to increase by up to 35 per cent</i>	164									1				1		Report: "up to 30% more precipitation"
<i>3. global rise of just 2°C would bring a temperature rise to all of Europe, Asia and the Americas of 4.5 degrees.</i>	164									1						the report said a rise of 3°C would cause that effect
<i>studies by scientists from Stanford and the University of California at Los Angeles</i>															1	from the University of California, Santa Cruz (not LA)
Regarding 2 reports on climate impacts for California:	165				1		1									only 1 found: their models failed to match many observations
<i>1. global warming would bring hotter summers and depleted snowpack</i>	165					1		1								they found an increase in very hot days but said nothing about snowpack
<i>2. threatening both water supplies and health</i>	165							1								they said nothing about water supplies

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
3. <i>heatwaves in Los Angeles would be 2-7 times as deadly</i>	165					1										they said only: "these changes could have major impacts on human health."
<i>Much of the CO₂ released just after WW1 is still warming our planet</i>	167			1			1					1				how much?
<i>In 2002 the surface temperature of the planet was 0.8°C above pre-industrial levels</i>	167					1										Preindustrial = LIA, 2008 was at least 0.5°C cooler than 2002 and 0.7°C cooler than 2007.
<i>Scientists say a 70% reduction in CO₂ emissions is required</i>	168				1											which scientists?
<i>current GHG may trigger positive feedback loops and destabilise the carbon cycle</i>	168											1				what does he mean by 'destabilise the carbon cycle'?
<i>may cross threshold of climate change, beyond which lies extreme danger</i>	168			1						1						pure alarmism
<i>between 600 and 1200ppm would cause somewhere in the range of 2 to 9°C increase</i>	169			1						1						based on linear relationship?
<i>Good policy means a carbon tax of US\$200/ tonne by 2050</i>	169				1					1						based on model of Mastrandrea and Schneider
<i>it is the rate not direction or overall scale of change that is important.</i>	169			1		1										both can be important. There were wild fluctuations during the Younger Dryas
<i>> 0.1C per decade increases the risk of significant ecosystem damage</i>	169				1											Hare UN report
<i>at stake - the fate of hundreds of thousands of species, and probably billions of people.</i>	170			1						1						
<i>snows of Kilimanjaro & PNG can't survive current levels of CO2 for more than a couple of decades</i>	172			1							1					No connection to CO2
<i>we can calculate the time to extinction of most mountain-dwelling species</i>	172						1									compare with next statement
<i>Few studies of the impacts of climate change on specific mountain regions have been completed</i>	174												1			so how can time to extinction be calculated?
<i>our planet has not been warmer than it is now for millions of years</i>	174			1	1						1					Eemian, Holocene max, Roman, MWP all warmer
<i>increase in global surface temperature of around 5°C over 7000 years.</i>	172	1				1										had nothing to do with CO2
<i>We know that our planet must heat by 1.1 degrees this century</i>	172			1			1									the future is certain, only the past is unpredictable
<i>large homes, 4WDs & refusal to ratify Kyoto cost nation's natural jewels</i>	177			1						1						Kyoto is destroying world's forests
<i>from gorillas to pandas there is only one way to save them</i>	177									1						a single cause and solution! Forget Dianne Fossey and forests
<i>in PNG at around 1400 m. no one lives - because of malaria</i>	177					1										main causes: steep slopes & low fertility
<i>In the near future, global warming will grant access to the malaria parasite & its vector to high mountain valleys</i>	177				1					1						The reference is to Africa, not PNG where high vallleys are 8°C cooler than at 1400m - AGW of 8°C in near future?!?
<i>As our globe warms a degree or two, the % of humans exposed to malaria parasites will rise from 45 to 60%</i>	288			1	1		1			1						Hare UN report - malaria a disease of poverty
<i>Just 14,000 yrs ago deciduous forests now around Montreal were only in northern Florida</i>	178					1										forests migrated even further north, then retreated to present position

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>The climate changes that prompted that migration, although far slower, were on a scale similar to those projected to occur this century</i>	178-9												1			describing changes at end of last ice age - compare with next statement
<i>massive 10°C drop in as little as a decade, rapid changes, see-sawing</i>	193-5	1											1			when the Gulf Stream stopped & could do so again
<i>how will species manage such long-distance movements?</i>	179					1										people are spreading them too much!
<i>temperatures in Australia may increase as much as 5°C in response to a global increase of 2°C</i>	179					1										By 2070 the SCIRO scenarios suggest warmings of 1-5°C (inland areas), 0-4°C (northern coastal), and 1-5°C (southern coastal)
<i>Tasmania's World Heritage forests dying due to drier, hotter conditions</i>	179				1					1						unspecified news broadcast, climate change poses least threat
<i>by 2050, 99 per cent of the succulent Karoo will have vanished</i>	180				1		1									UN Hare Report. The Karoo thorn imported from South Africa is a noxious weed in Qld
<i>the fabulous fynbos will lose over half of its extent by 2050</i>	180						1									These are "tough beauties that have learnt to thrive in nutrient poor soils, long dry summers, lots of wind and frequent fires."
<i>In the modern world such movements are impossible</i>	181									1						people are also developing new species and spreading them
<i>at least one out of every five living things on this planet is committed to extinction by the existing level of GHG</i>	183		1				1		1	1						extrapolation of study by Thomas et al which stated '18% of species sampled'
<i>If we carry on business as usual, in all likelihood three out of every five species will not be with us by 2100.</i>	183		1							1						Thomas stated: 'over 2°C, 1/3 of species will become extinct'. Bio-fuel production is now destroying forests and species
<i>The oceans become acid because its buffer, carbonate, is in limited supply</i>	186		1								1					the oceans are saturated in calcium and adding CO2 results in calcium carbonate precipitating out as sediment
<i>carbonate is leached out of marine creature's shells back into the ocean</i>	186		1							1	1					they don't dissolve, even if slightly acid, and some marine creatures actually increase shell production at high CO2 levels
<i>scientists are detecting a warming of the oceans at depth,</i>	188				1											No reference
A 2003 report predicted: 1. gradual warming until 2010														1		there was no gradual warming from 2003 to 2010
2. a dramatic shift with abrupt change in world's climate														1		El Nino of 2010 was not as great as that in 1998
3. persistent drought over critical regions	190					1								1		which areas? Record rainfalls in many regions
4. a plunge in average temperatures of more than 3°C for Europe	190													1		Europe had a warm summer and an average winter
5. 2°C increases for Australia, South America and Africa.	190													1		South America had a very cold winter, E. Australia cool & wet
6. Scandinavia incapable of supporting their population	191													1		the predicted starvation and war never happened
7. border protection to keep out homeless Scandinavians	191													1		Scandinavians are trying to keep out refugees from Middle East
8. by 2010-20, water supplies and energy reserves strained in Australia	191													1		Now much better than in 2003 - dams full, vast supplies of coal and gas
<i>frozen north contains enough ice to stop the gulf stream</i>	193					1							1			Maybe but it has to melt very fast
<i>it will take millennia for all that ice to melt</i>	150	1											1			That is far too slow
<i>From 1970, freshening of surface waters of NE Atlantic recorded: salinity graph describes a downward arc</i>	194					1				1						Increasing salinity since 1990
<i>I'd say that by 2080 Greenland may be 4°C warmer than today, which would melt enough ice . . . to shut the current down for some centuries</i>	195										1					Out on a limb and sure to be proved wrong - after he has long gone and been forgotten

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Dogmatic Extreme	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
Hadley Centre rates chance of disruption to Gulf Stream at 5% or less	195-6	1													Even Hadley Centre won't support Flannery's prediction
as soil warms decomposition accelerates & CO ₂ is released in prodigious volume	196					1		1	1						The paper states: ' <i>potentially large positive feedback coming from the release of carbon from soils as global temperatures increase. . . The uncertainty is large</i> '
plants of the Amazon effectively create their own rainfall	197				1										only about half of it
as CO2 levels increase, plants will keep their stomata closed longer	197	1			1										plants therefore lose less water
so transpiration will be reduced. so there will be less rain	197	1			1										so need less - no net difference in requirements
rainforest will collapse around 2040, complete this century	198		1			1									Amazon is being destroyed by slash & burn, partly for biofuels
Permian-Triassic extinction about 251 million years ago	47	1										1			compare with next statement
Permo-Triassic extinction (sic) . . . 245 million years ago	200									1			1		Permian-Triassic extinction was 251.2 ± 0.3 Ma
billions of tons of CO2 - so vast it led to an initial 6 °C rise	200		1							1	1				nonsense - volcanic ash → initial cooling [CO2 barely doubled]
triggered release of methane from the tundra and clathrates on sea floor	200			1						1	1				volcanic lava → release of methane from clathrates → 6°C
methane caused O2 to drop from 21% to 15% 260ma	201			1				1		1	1				this is 9m years before the volcanoes even began!
release of the clathrates is least likely to occur this century	201	1													so why even raise it?
in order to cool our homes, we end up cooking our planet	202		1		1				1						gives no practical suggestions for alternatives to AC
it'll be back to the stone age . . . civilisation will go'- Lovelock	203		1						1						man left the stone age only after the ice age ended
solutions: deriving water from hydrogen power plants, towing icebergs	205										1				Flannery has some nutty friends and acquaintances
the entire Earth will be affected by climate shifts and extreme weather events	206					1			1						thus saith the Lord!
other cities will join the list as water shortages increase around the world	206		1		1										failing to plan for increasing population is the cause, and climate change the excuse for not building dams
droughts & unusually hot summers caused world grain yields to fall	207									1					grain yields rose with 20thC global warming and continue to rise
whole forests of trees are already dying as a result of climate change	207			1	1				1						No reference given. No mention of increasing forests. Many forests disappearing for biofuel.
cities will likewise begin to die	207		1			1									prophet Flannery again
extreme cold or heat, water deprivation or flood	207										1				not quite sure which!
At highest end of scale (11°C of warming) impacts are unimaginable	208		1												and the bottom end of that model run (1.9°C) would be small
near-eternal dreary winter would descend on cities of Europe & USA	208								1						if Gulf Stream stops
Or perhaps extreme heat will destroy productivity of oceans and land	208-9		1								1				whichever is most frightening!
I think there is abundant evidence to support Lovelock's idea that climate change may well destroy our cities and end our civilisation	209		1						1						Civilisation arose during the Holocene Maximum and has flourished during subsequent warm periods
CC we are creating for 21stC similar to end of last ice age but 30x faster	209-10		1							1					the opposite is the case - it was over 30 times faster then

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>increasing levels of CO₂ will 'fertilise' the world's crop plants</i>	207	1														studies show improved crop yields 28% to 35% in greenhouses - but Flannery now sets out to demolish this
<i>Elizabeth Tansley and Stephen Long analysed the results</i>	207													1		It was Elizabeth Ainsworth, not Tansley
<i>rice showed an increased yield of only 6% from a doubling of CO₂ & wheat by 8%</i>	207					1			1	1						In these studies, the average increase in CO ₂ was just 49%, not double (100%). Stated rice and wheat yields were based on very limited studies (the average wheat yield was +15%)
<i>In future, crops will be stressed by higher temperature, more ozone at ground level & changes in soil moisture, all of which will decrease yields</i>	207						1		1		2					Study showed CO ₂ actually minimised stress from ozone and hot dry conditions & the average crop yield increased by 17%
<i>CO₂-rich world promises crop production lower than today</i>	207			1							1					Only Flannery can turn a positive into a negative
SECTION 4 - PEOPLE IN GREENHOUSES																
<i>the Montreal Protocol (CFCs) is compared to the Kyoto protocol (CO₂), arguing for a similar mechanism</i>	211-21					1							1			Over 20 differences between Montreal and Kyoto Protocols
<i>the most damning criticism of Kyoto is that it is a toothless tiger.</i>	224					1										more significant toothlessness: no penalties, excludes biggest emitters and will achieve almost nothing
<i>cuts of 70% by 2050 are required to keep CO₂ at double preindustrial level</i>	224						1									very rubbery
<i>these carbon credits, which do nothing to diminish climate change, are known as 'hot air'</i>	225	1														agree, but why did Kyoto arbitrarily set emissions at 1990 levels?
<i>Australia has a budget of 8% <u>greater</u> than it emitted back then (108%)</i>	225					1										an allowance of 8% means at least a 16% reduction on today's emissions, which have increased 28% since 1990
<i>Australia's stock traders are missing out on an estimated \$150 m/yr</i>	227	1														That's the tragic truth - and whose pockets does that come out of?
<i>Benefits of Kyoto/ETS: transparency & ease of administration, opportunities for new jobs & products it creates</i>	229				1					1						from <i>EcoGeneration</i> An ETS can be easily corrupted - anything but transparent
<i>US could comply and still see domestic energy bills decline by \$530 per household per annum</i>	233				1					1						Impossible findings by a pressure group report predating Kyoto by six months.
<i>the impact of Britain switching to renewables by 2050 would be to cut annual growth by only 0.1% pa</i>	233				1											July 2004 News Report of the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX), the dominant carbon trading exchange in the USA (since 2002)
<i>William Nordhaus argues that emission decreases to meet first round of Kyoto targets will be modest</i>	234				1	1										No reference. William Nordhaus is scathing in his critique of Kyoto. The costs are not modest.
<i>NCDC lists 17 weather events between 1998 & 2002 costing over \$1 billion apiece:</i>	235				1	1										The NCDC also inflated their temperature data for 20th century. Very few if any weather events are man-made.
<i>droughts, floods, fires, hailstorms, tornadoes, heatwaves & hurricanes</i>				1							1					Some of the worst hurricanes, floods and droughts in history occurred long before any anthropogenic warming.
<i>this suggests that the costs of doing nothing are so large that the failure to calculate it bankrupts the argument.</i>										1		1				His argument was bankrupt from the beginning
<i>Since the 1970s, insurance losses have risen at an annual rate of around 10%</i>		1				1										reasons include: increasing population, affluence, inflation, construction costs, increasing obsession with water views, 'sea change' & 'tree change'.
<i>Swiss Re considering denying coverage to companies not doing enough</i>	236											1				how the heck could they determine if a company was doing enough to reduce GHG?

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>Global warming' creates an illusion of a comfortable, warm future that is deeply appealing - essence of everything good</i>	237												1			Tim does his best to make 'global warming' frightening, but 'climate change' is even more frightening - and convenient!
<i>Children dredged from frozen ponds hours after slipping in have lived</i>						1				1						perhaps up to an hour but not hours
<i>because their bodies have evolved defences against freezing to death</i>	238											1				because their brains cool faster than adults' and are thereby preserved from anoxia
<i>SIDS has been attributed to the inadvertent overheating of babies</i>	238			1					1	1						no evidence linking SIDS to overheating - over-rugging has more to do with re-breathing used air than with temperature
<i>As early as 1977 the NY Times headline: Scientists Fear Heavy Use of Coal May Bring Adverse Shift in Climate</i>	240					1							1			Shift which way? They were fearing another ice age in the early 1970s!
<i>Palmer's views were the basis for a propaganda video 'The Greening of Planet Earth'</i>	240			1												a British court found Al Gore's propaganda docudrama, An Inconvenient Truth, contained nine major scientific errors!
<i>Cooney, an oil industry lobbyist, removed or adjusted descriptions of climate research that government scientists had approved</i>	241					1		1								Climategate's government scientists: "These will be artificially adjusted to look closer to the real temperatures . . . Apply a VERY ARTIFICIAL correction for decline."
<i>Warwick Parer, Minister for Minerals and Energy, owned \$2m coal shares</i>	242												1			Tim Flannery has vested interests in Geodynamics which received a \$90 million grant from the Rudd Government
<i>the Australian-based Lavoisier Group, set up in April 2000</i>	244													1		In March, not April
<i>among the many outrageous claims: IPCC is an elaborate conspiracy</i>	244							1		1						they do not state that, but many notable scientists do question its objectivity and validity
<i>the Institute of Public Affairs (a right-wing think tank)</i>	244					1										labelling
<i>Fred Singer, a member of Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church.</i>	244				1						1					ad hominem - guilt by association - and dead wrong!
<i>Another decade of such profits may cost us the Earth</i>	245			1						1						Only 4 years now until Armageddon becomes inevitable!
<i>The IPCC's pronouncements do not represent mainstream science or even good science</i>	245			1				1								IPCC not alarmist enough for Flannery
<i>If the IPCC says something, you had better believe it – and then allow for the likelihood that things are far worse than it says they are</i>	246			1						1						The IPCC is far too tame for Tim
<i>BP has moved 'beyond petroleum', making a 20% cut in CO₂ emissions</i>	246					1										What about the Gulf oil spill in 2010?
<i>Long before many were even aware of climate change, Mrs Thatcher was advocating a reduction in CO₂ emissions</i>	247					1										Thatcher was also politically and economically motivated use this to break the stranglehold of the coal miners' union
<i>each kg of carbon dug from the ground is an irretrievable step towards a hostile geological age in which civilisation will struggle to survive</i>	248			1												no comment needed!
<i>building them [CCS power plants] on a commercial scale will be expensive & take decades</i>	253	1														I agree with Flannery on carbon capture and storage, BUT he then suggests it for burning biomass
<i>burning biomass and sequestering the CO₂ generated [OK]</i>	297			1									1			sequestration is too dangerous for coal but not for biomass!
<i>these will have operating lifetimes in excess of sixty years</i>	255										1					cf. only 35-40 years for standard coal-fired power stations
<i>today the world is mostly deforested</i>	256										1					only 1/3 of Earth's ice-free land & 10.5% of the tropics is used for agriculture

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>There is real hope for change here, for a vast range of initiatives, from organic market gardening to sustainable rangelands management, are beginning to be seen at the grass-roots level worldwide.</i>	256					1										the greatest contribution to abating carbon emissions over the last half-century was the bioengineering of high-yield disease-resistant, drought-resistant, bug-resistant, herbicide-resistant crops; spraying weeds instead of tilling the soil; and the use of fertilisers – anathema to the purist <i>organic</i> movement.
<i>combined cycle plants, which burn gas . . . are extremely efficient</i>	260	1				1										so are CCPs that burn coal
<i>consequences of using hydrogen are as bad as driving a standard car</i>	262	1														the only advantage is that it keeps pollution out of cities - i.e at the power station
SECTION 5 - THE SOLUTION																
<i>many examples where emissions have been slashed by over 70 % while experiencing strong economic growth</i>	268			1	1					1						No reference for this statement about some British local councils
<i>big coal & big oil's scare campaign that it's all too hard and expensive</i>	268			1												What about Flannery's scare campaign?
<i>Intermittent power: the most mature and economically competitive is wind</i>	268			1												Not at all competitive with coal
<i>wind doesn't always blow, which means that it is unreliable</i>	269	1														wind turbines produce no power at all for much of the time
<i>average turbine generates at only 28 per cent of capacity</i>										1						The average is closer to 24% and Germany's is only 12.7%
<i>in the UK nuclear power works at around 76%, gas 60% & coal 50%</i>	269					1										They need extra capacity for peak loads and for when the wind dies and sun doesn't shine!
<i>they are cheaper to maintain than coal-fired power plants</i>						1										more subject to lightning strikes, less accessible and the blades need regular cleaning
<i>allegations that wind turbines kill birds, and are noisy and unsightly</i>	269	1														They kill bats also
<i>early wind towers had a latticework design, allowing birds to nest</i>	270					1										studies show even the new smooth sided ones kill dozens of birds and bats per turbine pa
<i>Cats kill far more birds in the US than do wind farms.</i>	270											1				cigarettes kill more people than do coal-fired power stations
<i>you can have a conversation at the base of tower without having to raise voice</i>						1										Wind farms can pose noise problems for up to 2km
<i>in terms of alleged unsightliness, beauty is in the eye of the beholder</i>						1										Real estate values plummet because not many share Tim's eyes
<i>none of these issues should be allowed to decide the fate of our planet</i>	270			1						1						end of argument!
<i>Solar hot water . . . best way to make large easy savings in most household power bills</i>						1										solar HW saves money only if heavily subsidised or power is very expensive
<i>photovoltaic solar - maintenance free, panels carry 25yr guarantee, and last up to 40yrs</i>	271					1				1						Photovoltaic panels need regular cleaning, glass cover has no guarantee, and output down to 80% at 25 yrs
<i>France supplies nearly 80% of its power from nuclear sources while Sweden provides half & the UK a quarter</i>	273	1				1										these countries have little or no coal
<i>The power they generate is at present competitive with wind</i>	273					1										only for wind with a very high capacity factor
RE Chernobyl nuclear meltdown in 1986:																
<i>1. Only 1% of Belarus is free from contamination & 25% of its farmland has been put permanently out of production</i>	274				1					1	1					UN Report in 2005 found that: outside the 30km exclusion zone radiation levels are now acceptable

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
2. nearly 1,000 children die each year from thyroid cancer	274									1	1					there had been only 4,000 cases and 9 deaths
3. 25% of the Belarus budget is spent on alleviating effects	274									1	1					such claims had been greatly exaggerated
Nuclear power provides 18% world's electricity, with no CO₂ emissions	273					1				1						15% in 2005; >50,000 tonnes of CO2 produced in construction, mining, transporting, enriching and disposal of waste
world uranium reserves are not large	275									1						enough to last 140 years
New reactor types include . . . pressurised water reactors	275										1					Three Mile Island generator that melted down in 1979 was a pressurised water reactor
one rock body in SA is estimated to contain enough heat to supply all of Australia's power needs for 75 years at a cost equivalent to that of brown coal. With trial power plants scheduled for construction in 2005, enormous potential of geothermal power is about to be tested.	277			1			1			1	1			1		Flannery has a vested interest in Geodynamics which optimistically estimates it could provide 24% of Australia's current use. After expending \$300 million dollars over a decade, the output is zero & shareholders haven't made a cent
In the hydrogen & nuclear economies the production of power is likely to be centralised, which . . .	278												1			Flannery enthuses about geothermal power being even more centralised at Innaminka, SA
. . . would mean the survival of the big power corporations	278			1									1			isn't Geodynamics potentially such a big power corporation?
people will generate most of their own power, transport and even water (by condensing it from the air).	278			1								1				romantic notion of self-sufficiency is more costly and inefficient
Brazil's vehicle fleet runs largely on ethanol from sugar cane	279					1										and the Amazon forest is being destroyed for biofuel
corn-derived ethanol in transportation provides little carbon savings	280	1														In 2006-07, US corn-based ethanol production grew by 30% pa and the price of US corn doubled
the crop would have to make up 20% of all productivity on land to power the world's cars, ships and aircraft	280			1						1						43% of all US crop land would be needed to supply just 10% of its automotive and diesel requirements by 2020
hybrid cars: a revolutionary new technology halves fuel consumption	280			1						1						hybrids use more fuel than claimed (13% more for Toyota Camry to 46% more for Suzuki Alto) & more than some diesels
the Prius cuts fuel use and CO ₂ emissions by 70 per cent	280									1		1				70% of what? Honda Jazz is nearly as efficient & half the price
Compressed air car (MiniCATO has a top speed around 120k/hr & can deliver ranges of around 300k at 50k/hr	281									1	1					Manufacturer claims 'a top speed of 110 kph & urban range of 180 km on compressed air alone'. It went only 7.2K on testing!
By combating climate change we can not only save the planet . .	282		1									1				from what - his imagined apocalypse?
. . . but open the way for a very different future as well	282			1												return to inefficient self-sufficiency instead of specialisation?
using wind and solar, sea cargo may by 2050, again travel carbon-free	282											1				and pigs might fly!
In 1992 air travel was the source of 2 % of CO ₂ emissions, the fastest growing source	282					1										it still contributes about 2% of CO2 emissions globally
Because most modern jets cruise near the troposphere	282											1				they cruise in the upper troposphere near the tropopause
The nitrous oxide emitted by aircraft . . .	282										1					the oxides of nitrogen emitted by aircraft are nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂), not nitrous oxide (N ₂ O)
contrails give rise to cirrus clouds - may have a significant impact on climate	283	1				1										cirrus clouds are probably warming and contrails cooling

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened		Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments
<i>If aircraft were to fly lower, cirrus cloud formation could be cut in half and CO₂ emissions could be lowered by 4%</i>	283								1		1					they would use a lot more fuel and CO ₂ emission increased by 4%
<i>contrails may be masking the impacts of warming caused by CO₂</i>	283	1											1			Tim contradicts himself and admits contrails are cooling
<i>Sometime this century the human influence on climate will overwhelm all natural factors</i>	284			1			1			1						a statement of faith
<i>the judiciary will be faced with apportioning guilt and responsibility</i>	284			1												on what basis? - see comments on cerebral palsy
<i>proof positive – as far as science can provide it – that the rain no longer falls because the richest and most powerful nations have been polluting atmosphere</i>	285			1			1									Flannery preempts scientific findings. Scientists will be well paid to provide such 'proof'!
<i>climate change could spawn a whole new industry of litigation</i>	285					1										the lawyers and climate 'experts' are already celebrating!
<i>It should not be too difficult to apportion blame for climate disasters as a result of the Global Climate Coalition's activities</i>	285-6			1								1				Presumption of guilt- incredible!
<i>Alaskan village Shishmaref is becoming uninhabitable due to increased temperatures</i>	286					1										9,000 years ago, Arctic temperatures averaged 1.7°C warmer than now for two millennia
<i>plans to relocate the whole town at a cost of over \$100,000 per resident.</i>	286					1										The Inuit have transitioned from nomadic lifestyle to fixed settlements very near the (already receding) shoreline
<i>It seems inevitable that these [Pacific Island] nations will be destroyed by climate change during the course of this century</i>	287			1												Sea level rise is not evenly distributed. Over a long period 86% of islands remained stable (43%) or increased in area (43%)
<i>Australia is to blame for this</i>				1							1					responsible for much less than 1mm of sea level rise to 2100
<i>only ratifying nations have an internationally recognised right to pollute</i>	289											1				Kyoto gives a legal right to pollute? What about nations not meeting targets?
<i>a protracted Dark Ages far more mordant than any that has gone before</i>	291			1						1						the Dark Ages were cold, not warm
<i>Australia may find itself on the brink of collapse as a result of declining rainfall</i>			1											1		only if we fail to plan - recent rains/floods put paid to predictions for Sydney and Brisbane
<i>As horrific as such an outcome is, if we delay action to combat the climate crisis, the [Orwellian] carbon dictatorship may become essential for our survival . . .</i>	294			1							1					anything to alarm the reader
<i>. . . will only be effective if we act now, before the crisis becomes full blown</i>	295			1			1									don't think twice about it!
<i>concerted action to rid atmospheric carbon emissions from their lives</i>	296											1				have to stop breathing to do that
<i>we could save around nine out of every ten species currently under threat</i>			1				1									no evidence provided that climate change threatens 90% of endangered species
<i>reduce, almost to zero, the possibility of any of the three great disasters</i>				1						1						he doesn't specify what the 3 are but doesn't need to because reducing CO ₂ will prevent all disasters
<i>act on climate change now: the delay of even a decade is far too much</i>	297			1			1									like every good charlatan, give a dreadful diagnosis and prognosis before pushing the magic remedy NOW before it is too late - before the temperature drops

Flannery Statements - mostly shortened	Important Facts	Extreme	Dogmatic	Suspect Source	Half-truth	No uncertainty	Misrepresentation	Misinterpretation	Exaggeration	Factual Error	Confusing / Silly	Contradictory	Failed Predictions	Mistakes	Allen Comments	
																1
<i>large energy corporations aggressively pushing for more coal-fired power plants . . .</i>			1												the government itself was the largest until it sold it off to unsuspecting buyers now understandably upset and pushing	
<i>. . . even in NSW . . . which is suffering the worst drought on record</i>	297		1								1				I suppose the drought is over because they stopped pushing!	
<i>If governments had forbidden further exploration for new coal reserves, and had purchased all existing stock,</i>											1				enough known reserves for another 120 years, & what stock?	
<i>it might become a powerful tool for protecting ourselves from the onset of the ice age</i>	298			1											Arthur C Clarke	
<i>ban the building or expansion of old-fashioned coal-fired power plants</i>			1												what will that achieve while China commissions a new one every week?	
<i>make big energy users like smelters feel the full impact of price signals</i>	298		1								1				drive them offshore, increasing emissions and costing jobs!	
<i>hitch ideological bandwagon to push for sustainability . . . the 'less is more' lobby, who believe that humans must reduce their overall consumption if sustainability is ever to be achieved</i>	301	1										1			Tim joins them in repeatedly attacking 'large' corporations and pushing self-sufficiency and 'sustainable' organic farming	
<i>ask about a green power option - can cost as little as a dollar per week</i>	303				1			1							10% green power costs that much. 100% green power adds \$8/wk to the average household power bill	
<i>switching to green power, reduce your household emissions to zero</i>	303							1	1						fossil fuels are used to manufacture and service renewable energy sources, for food, clothing & household items	
<i>I use hand tools rather than the electrical variety to make and fix things</i>	304									1					does he seriously suggest builders do likewise?	
<i>Hybrid fuel vehicles are twice as fuel-efficient as a standard, similar car</i>	305				1										some hybrids are twice as thirsty as similar sized diesels	
<i>if you can cut your emissions by 70%, so can the business you work for</i>	305					1				1					welcome to Flannery's hell at work - dim lighting and no AC	
<i>not only is our global climate approaching a tipping point</i>	306		1												Flannery keeps sharpening his dreaded 'tipping point'	
<i>If enough of us buy green power, solar panels, solar hot water systems and hybrid vehicles, the cost of these items will plummet</i>	306					1			1						increased demand usually increases cost, especially if products (eg. HWS) are resource-rich, and 'green power' is in short supply, especially on a still night!	
<i>soon the bulk of domestic power will be generated by renewable technologies</i>								1					1		Governments are pulling back on subsidies and rebates - renewable power is too expensive. Homes use most power when the sun isn't shining or the wind blowing	
<i>Asia might avoid the carbon catastrophe in which we [are] deeply mired</i>	306									1					What exactly is this catastrophe?	
<i>it will mean the difference between survival and destruction of our species</i>	307		1			1				1					a species that inhabits the entire globe from fiery Death Valley to freezing Antarctica and has ventured even into outer space.	
TOTAL		51	14 103	50	85	48	7	26	78	70	43	31	11	10		
Group Totals		51	117		183			181			74	11	10			
GRAND TOTAL OF PROBLEMS			576													

Flannery Statements
- mostly shortened

Allen Comments

Important Facts

Extreme

Dogmatic

Suspect Source

Half-truth

No uncertainty

Misrepresentation

Misinterpretation

Exaggeration

Factual Error

Confusing / Silly

Contradictory

Failed Predictions

Mistakes

The Weather Makers Re-examined by Wes Allen is extensively illustrated, referenced and indexed

Cost: \$39.60 (including postage in Australia)

Order From: www.irenicpublications.com.au

Published by **Irenic Publications**, 57 Duranbah Road, Duranbah, NSW 2487

Ph (International): 61 2 66777279

Fax: 61 2 66777113

Email: info@irenicpublications.com.au