

# Council For The National Interest

PO Box 653, Belmont WA 6984  
0418 742 701  
0430 147 049  
admin@cniwa.com.au  
www.cniwa.com.au  
ABN 43 775 878 315



## AUTUMN NEWSLETTER April 2016

Since our Spring Newsletter, October 2015, our strong focus has been on policy development and direct political lobbying. The Central Branch Policy Discussion Group has met regularly and engaged in robust debate on a whole range of issues. The result is that we are finalising a raft of policy suggestions to be promoted in this 2016 federal election year.

Some key issues include the need to repeal Section 18c of the Racial Discrimination Act. This section deals with causing offence and is a key contributor to the gradual breakdown of our western culture.

Much of the debate, within the Group, has illuminated the direct political lobbying and has included the following:

**Climate Change** – a strong case was put to the Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister and the Minister for the Environment to NOT commit to Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) reduction targets nor to a contribution to the UN Climate Fund at the UNFCCC talks in Paris December 2015. This was supported by CNI Fact Sheet – Carbon Dioxide attached. All to no avail. Our case was simply rejected without valid reason or ignored. Worse the Prime Minister committed Australia to \$1 billion to the UN Climate Fund over five years with \$200 million to be paid this year.

We then lobbied the “cross bench Senators” urging them to reject any legislation or regulations necessary to achieve the Government's CO<sub>2</sub> reduction pledge and the Climate Fund pledge. There is something seriously deficient in our democracy when the Prime Minister or other Minister can make such major commitments without the approval of Parliament or a mandate from the electorate.

We have taken this up directly with the Auditor General and await a response. We have also challenged the Auditor General to show why it is justifiable for the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM) to homogenise historic temperature records to achieve a different result, favourable to the climate change philosophy of the BOM. Similar behaviour whereby some of Western Australia's historic temperature records have been excised is also being questioned.

There is a hint of a change in the “official” climate change philosophy, Dr Larry Marshall, Chief Executive of CSIRO, has announced that there has been enough modeling of climate change – it has all proven inaccurate – so he will focus on adaptation and mitigation. This is in accord with CNI policy since at least 2008.

We wrote and complimented Dr Marshall and also Professor Michael Asten of Monash University as he quickly, publicly supported Dr Marshall's decision.

**Safe Schools Coalition Australia (SSCA)** – We have undertaken a strong direct campaign against this so called anti bullying program in schools. Much has been written and spoken in the media since we launched our attack. The program, launched by Roz Ward, La Trobe University in Melbourne, is a Marxist based revolution aimed at changing society's culture and norms. Worse, it targets Year 7 and 8 children in government schools, ostensibly as an anti-bullying program. Worse still it recommends to school students pornographic web content, sex shops, adult on line communities and sex clubs. It is focused on GLBTI issues and teaches role playing “gender” as fluid in contradiction of the scientific fact that gender is male, female or neuter (rare cases where because of malformation or late development it is not possible to determine gender at birth). The SSCA also teaches children ways to hide, from their parents, their internet browsing, as they explore these deviant, sadomasochistic sites.

The SSCA is funded by the federal Government having been introduced by the Rudd Labor Government initially for a four year term. The Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull has responded to parent and political outrage and asked for the SSCA to be reviewed. The snap review has resulted in the removal of some websites from the program and has restricted the program to high schools.

Children as young as 11 years old in government high schools will still be exposed to social manipulation under the guise of an anti bullying program. It is only a matter of time until a social activist government imposes a mandatory application on all schools and ultimately will attempt to force private schools to adhere to such a divisive program.

A conservative government supporting the political views of the majority of its supporters would have withdrawn funding and killed the program. Schools already have programs promoting respect of every individual student regardless of their appearance, background, ethnicity or disability with varying degrees of success. The forthcoming election may stoke the resentment of an inept Turnbull response to this issue.

### **Cultural Marxism.**

The Western world is in the throes of self destruction and cultural marxism is most probably the best descriptor of the process. Marxists have been allowed the privilege of marching through institutions such as our universities with the overwhelming success by leftist manipulators.

Academics are regularly berated for speaking out against the established ideology and the usual reaction is to accuse the dissenter of hatred or racism with threats of dismissal or withdrawal of funding.

The recent example in Perth whereby 6000 students and alumni of UWA forced the rejection of the \$4 million funding of the Lomborg Academy. The intellectual challenge to oppose the author of "The Skeptical Environmentalist" on home ground proved beyond the capacity of academia. A good counterargument was not going to be sufficient to appease the green environmentalist marxists, anyone who rated climate change as number 31 on a list of the world's most important challenges was not to be tolerated on hallowed ground. The possibility that Lomborg could win any argument would undermine academic brainwashing of the student body.

Consensus in science is another marxist revisionist idea however this oxymoron is now gospel at all levels of government including the United Nations. Unfortunately the religion of climate hysteria is such a huge industry that millions of people now rely on perpetuating the belief of Anthropogenic Global Warming so that no self serving politician would dare to question its validity. This is especially so since the 2015 Paris accords have all the nations of the world signing up for an agreement that may, or may not, be actually implemented. In the case of Australia just throw a miserly \$200 million at the UN Climate Fund to appease the greenies and move onto the next most important issue of the day, getting re-elected.

Universities used to be places of higher learning, priding themselves on attracting the intellectual elite however the new culture within academia is bowing to political correctness whereby students are now taught WHAT to think, not HOW to think. Evolution is taught in universities worldwide and any academic dare to challenge the supposition or raise creationism would be treading on brave ground. Darwin's theory of evolution is mathematically improbable to one chance in 10 to the power of 150. A living organism cannot arise by chance from non living matter, abiogenesis is absolutely impossible.

However scientific consensus (that seems to be common to all facets of science in the 21<sup>st</sup> century) claims that the evidence for evolution is overwhelming. Just to add fuel to the fire the "big bang theory" is contrived by cosmologists who, with scientists, have additional theories such as "hyperspace" to make the theory work. (refer Dr John F. Ashton, Evolution Impossible, RMIT Uni Melbourne)

Debating cultural issues is strictly forbidden with left wing agitators freely allowed to physically and verbally abuse any opposition as displayed in recent anti Islam protests and any retaliatory response is categorised as right wing extremism. The display of a banner at an AFL football ground brought forth the usual hater, bigot, fascist, racist ranting and raving. The only legitimate complaint the AFL have is using the venue for guerilla marketing (remember the Messages on Hold signs at AFL matches?) but they cannot complain about social issue advertising as the AFL have already hypocritically promoted homosexual and multicultural banners. Commentators from the AFL player group have special ranking notably if an overflowing mop-hair head defines your ethnic background and righteous suitability.

Our political leaders are also highly practiced at using the same techniques of berating opposition in the usual marxist language led by Premier Colin Barnett and his cohorts exemplified by his treatment of Geert Wilders. There are a significant number of Australians who believe the Dutch party leader, with his 25% voter support, has a message of importance for all Australians regardless of political allegiance.

Moral issues are on dangerous grounds for political discussion unless there is total acceptance of the marxist determination of such issues. Abortion, euthanasia, feminism, equality, marriage, gender, homosexuality, sexualisation of the young, divorce, family breakdown, domestic violence, pornography, pedophilia, immigration, prostitution, sex slavery, poverty are social issues requiring intelligent discussion and debate. The march of western culture based upon Christianity has halted on the promotion of subjective notions of seems right, feels right then must be right. Morality has moved from objective truth to human beings defining the meaning of harm to themselves or others.

Without the anchor of Christianity our society is adrift in a world of conflicting desires, battered by inherent weaknesses of depravity and evil with dignity and good.

The future of Australian and western culture is in the balance as the forces of cultural marxism lead society on a pathway towards historical, archaeological and biblical outcomes.

### **Australia's Economic Wellbeing:**

The list of issues needing political leadership is extensive and the following are only a couple on an exhaustive list, nor are they of the highest priority, however they need intelligent discussion and resolution.

Under the climate debate we have the “sustainability” industry in bed with renewables such as wind and solar power, regardless of the economic benefits, driving our energy supply industry into higher costs and the potential to exacerbate the decline of Australian manufacturing due high energy cost. The decline in Australian manufacturing is not just an energy issue but it is a complementary factor. Can we continue as an innovative ideas country if employment opportunities in manufacturing are constantly exported to low cost countries?

Food security is a motivating force for Chinese investment but what about Australia's food security?

Water allocation to environmental flows and the development of water trading by non water users has caused decline in output from one of the country's most productive area in the Goulburn valley.

As a tribute to recently deceased Professor Bob Carter this book review by Vaclav Klaus on “Climate: The Counter Consensus” is a worthy inclusion:

The Australian professor deserves thanks and praise for repudiating the heretic-hunting climate orthodoxy: The Spectator, October 2010; by

Vaclav Klaus President of the Czech Republic

Let me declare from the outset that I consider global warming dogma (and its widespread acceptance) to be one of the most costly and undemocratic mistakes in generations, and try, therefore, to contribute to its demolition.

As someone who spent most of his life under a repressive and highly inefficient regime, I can hopefully afford to say that the previous most costly and undemocratic ‘experiment’ was Communism. That too started quite innocently, and its supporters — probably — also believed that they fought for a noble cause.

When I listen to the views and arguments of the global warming alarmists, and there are many of them in Australia (I guess your country scores very highly on the worldwide ‘warmists per capita’ scale), they sound very similar to the arguments of the former politicians, journalists and public intellectuals in Communist Czechoslovakia.

Of course, the polemic about global warming has a very respectable scientific dimension. But in its substance and consequences, the debate is not part of the scientific discourse about factors influencing swings in global temperature. It is part of the public policy debate about man and society, about our political, economic and social systems, about our freedom or its possible loss. This difference should be made explicit.

In his book Climate: The Counter Consensus, Bob Carter, the well-known Australian paleoclimatologist and professor at the James Cook University, clarifies this point when he says: ‘The global warming issue long ago ceased being a scientific problem.’

It is evident that science plays no part in the current public policy debate, neither in Kyoto, nor in Copenhagen, nor at the United Nations General Assembly or the EU summits.

There is just the pretence of science and the wishful thinking that there exists an undeniable scientific consensus. Recent developments — the Royal Society’s highly sceptical report and the resignation of a prominent climate scientist from the American Physical Society (the top body of US physicists) — further demonstrate there is no such consensus, if ‘scientific consensus’ has any meaning at all.

We are maybe closer to Bob Carter's 'counter consensus'. There are respectable, if highly controversial, scientific hypotheses on this topic. As I have already said, there are many global warming alarmists in Australia (and your former prime minister is one of them), but there are also many serious scientists who do not live in ivory towers and are ready to speak up.

I have to mention especially Professor Ian Plimer and his book *Heaven and Earth: Global Warming — the Missing Science* (for which it was my pleasure to write a cover note).

The names Archibald, Kininmonth, Evans and Sternhell also come to mind.

But above all others stands Bob Carter.

I like Carter's emphasis on the crucial difference between global warming (which is part of normal scientific discourse) and 'dangerous anthropogenic global warming' (which is ideological propaganda).

He is also right when talking about the difficulty in defining who is and who is not a climatologist, and turning our attention to the fact that there is no 'climate science', because 'scientists who study climate change come from a wide range of disciplines'. His decision to group them into three main categories — meteorologists, geologists and the computer modelling group — is also revealing.

Importantly, he notes that the group with the fewest warmists is the geological scientists, because they are able to compare 'modern climate change with climate history', which is something the meteorologists and the computer modelling experts — quite intentionally — do not do.

Carter is a respected climatologist. At the same time he is able to write about science in a way that is easily understandable to most of us. He is at his best in Chapter 1, 'The geological context of natural climate change', in which he discusses 'the geological record of climate change'. This is the topic of his greatest comparative expertise, and he is able to successfully challenge both the meteorological group and especially the computer modelling group of the climate change 'experts'. His main (elementary, non-trivial and crucial) message is that climate was variable as far back as before the Industrial Revolution, and that climate was not made unstable by human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

He sees a problem with the standard interpretation of 20th-century warming (Chapter 2) because of the limited meteorological record, and cannot see why 'the short period of mild warming that started around 1979 and terminated in 1998 so excites the IPCC and other climate alarmists'. He is convinced (as am I) that the current warming will be 'like the Medieval Warm Period followed by cooling which may indeed have already started'. I also agree with him that 'endlessly analysing short trend lines ... has nothing to do with science and everything to do with politics'.

Chapter 3 discusses the climate sensitivity of CO<sub>2</sub>, highlighting two key points: that man's carbon dioxide contribution is small in the context of the planetary carbon system, and that the relationship between adding carbon dioxide to the atmosphere and temperature is not linear. Each incremental amount of extra carbon dioxide exerts a lesser heating effect.

As a result, any additional possible warming in the future will be very slight.

As someone who devoted a decade of his life to econometric computer modelling, I appreciate the chapter dedicated to climatologists' computer models. Carter is right that the outcomes of these models are not predictions but projections, because they are based on the aprioristic assumptions of the builders who attend to the so-called 'calibration' of these models.

That is their only way to 'show', for example, that 'although human emissions weren't large before 1940, the models assume that the temperature rise since 1850 is due to human carbon dioxide'.

My country, the Czech Republic, is situated in the heart of Europe, without any coastline. Unlike Australians, we are no experts on the oceans. That's another reason for our very careful reading of Chapter 4, 'Ocean Matters', and for considering the argument that 'the ocean has a much greater heat capacity than the atmosphere'. However, the whole debate has concentrated on the relationship between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and the atmosphere.

I could continue with interesting quotations for a long time. *Climate: The Counter Consensus* is an important book which convincingly refutes Al Gore's declaration that 'the time for debate is over'. It is not, thanks to people like Bob Carter. (Vaclav Klaus)