

[Redacted]

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 22 June 2011 10:50 AM  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** FW: [Fwd: Infantile professor pronounces debate "infantile"]

[Redacted]

[Redacted] [Redacted]  
[Redacted] [Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
[Redacted]

=====  
=

IMPORTANT NOTE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended addressee or an authorised recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately.

=====  
=

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 8 June 2011 2:54 PM  
**To:** [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: [Fwd: Infantile professor pronounces debate "infantile"]

Thanks [Redacted] and [Redacted]. I have not checked the list of emails, but we need to check emails to all members of the Climate Institute. Are these on the list you sent or do we need to contact all staff in the Institute?

Cheers

[Redacted]

=====

[Redacted]

=====  
=

IMPORTANT NOTE: This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain confidential or legally privileged information. If you are not the intended addressee or an authorised recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error please notify the sender immediately.

=====

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Wednesday, 8 June 2011 2:40 PM  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: FW: [Fwd: Infantile professor pronounces debate "infantile"]

Hi [REDACTED]  
FYI  
[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: Friday, June 04, 2010 7:16 PM  
To: [REDACTED]  
Subject: [Fwd: Infantile professor pronounces debate "infantile"]

...and here's another one, directed at me -- [REDACTED].

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Infantile professor pronounces debate "infantile"  
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 2010 15:01:55 +1000  
From: [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

infantile"

The Age - formerly a decent newspaper - never fails to take an opportunity to parrot PR for Team AGW.

Last week they gave a free shot  
<<http://www.theage.com.au/environment/climate-debate-almost-infantile-20100524-w81e.html>>to

Climate debate 'almost infantile'

(The Age, ADAM MORTON, May 25, 2010)

A SCIENCE adviser to the federal government has described the debate in the media over the basics of climate change science as "almost infantile", equating it to an argument about the existence of gravity.

It takes a tax-payer funded Pro-fessor to equate AGW to gravity. It must have taken years of education to be able to issue pronouncements like this eh? If Australian taxpayers were hoping to get a bit more than just bluster and name-calling from certain public servants, they're bound to be asking for their money back soon.

Not to put too fine a point on it, but the existence of gravity is proven each day you don't get flung off the planet when you get out of bed. We can measure gravity to /twelve /significant digits/\*/, but our value for climate sensitivity to carbon dioxide varies from 0 to 10.

Pick a number. We can't even get /one /significant digit fixed.

Quantifying gravity involves dropping a rock with a clock and a ruler.

Quantifying carbon's effect on climate change involves understanding cloud-formation, ice sheet changes, evaporation, humidity levels in air

8000 m above Singapore, and ocean currents at the bottom of the endless abyss that we can't even measure.

Speaking at a Melbourne summit on the green economy, Professor Will Steffen criticised the media for treating climate change science as a political issue in which two sides should be given a voice.

Is it political? Heck No. It's /not /about managing our economy, assessing risks, choosing between different courses of action. err. it's pure science. ██████████ has modeled our future, there's no need to involve the economists-consumers-engineers-investors-medical-experts-or those pesky kids we're supposedly saving-the-planet-for. Managing the country is pure science now; free speech and democracy-babble, who needs it!

This censorship of speech, and appeal to authority is the antithesis of science, and ██████████ simplifies things ad absurdum. In Australia, he appears to have been appointed Carbon-King-of-Bluster. Find me a sentence where he substantiates a claim with something that amounts to more than/ ".it's true because I say so"./

It's a no-brainer. If you go over the last couple of decades you see tens of thousands of papers in the peer-reviewed literature, and you have less than 10 that challenge the fundamentals - and they have been disproved," Professor Steffen said after an address at the Australian Davos Connection's Future Summit.

"Tens of Thousands" of papers eh? So why doesn't he dig out a few and help his colleague ██████████ who is at least honest enough to engage in a debate <<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/06/round-five-ignore-the-main-point-repeat-th-e-irrelevant/>>

and try to answer the question: /Can you name any paper that supports the claim that positive feedback occurs and will double or triple the direct effect of carbon dioxide? /Without that amplification the big scare campaign is all over (and so is much of the funding that feeds the associated junkets, conferences, grants, Institutes, and certain "science advisers" to the government ).

And which 10 papers exactly have been disproved? [REDACTED] can't name them, won't try, and helpfully leaves things vague as a one-size-fits-all whitewash. Pure bluster. Adam Morton dutifully prints all that without checking, as if it's a pronouncement from the Mount and one of the ten commandments.

Don't give me the excuse that he's written giant documents with thousands of references, so the evidence is there "somewhere". It only takes a few minutes to name and explain one paper. Waving vaguely at tomes is part of the shell game. If he wants rational discourse, this is where it starts, with /details/.

Right now, this almost infantile debate about whether 'is it real or isn't it real?', it's like saying, 'Is the Earth round or is it flat?'

Actually, the only one trying to debate whether "it's" real or the world is flat is him. No one else wants to reduce public conversation to meaningless descriptors as much as he does. What "it" is he talking about? Does he mean "climate change"? He'd sure like us to debate /that/, because he'd be on safe preschool-climate-science terms where he could win: /Yes Esmeralda, the climate does change!/ But the rest of us keep asking him to debate the real issue instead of his fake-o-strawman-substitute.

[Climate change] is a hugely important question and yet we are not having a rational discourse in the media in Australia on this question. That is my biggest frustration.

This is quite funny really. (I laughed). So [REDACTED] is frustrated that the discourse is /irrational/? This is the man who uses his academic authority to mock opponents (that he won't debate) with strawman arguments that are irrelevant. He claims he wants rational discourse, but works hard to stifle any discussion that doesn't agree with him. He actively contributes to the nightmare of government spin and irrationality.

Asked about the scepticism of Opposition Leader Tony Abbott, he said scientists respected leaders from both sides of politics who showed respect for scientific expertise.

"Respect for expertise" is code for argument from authority:/ Trust me I'm an expert./ It's the cop-out.

\*Real scientists don't have any respect for the fawning servants of bureaucracy or fame. We admire those who can reason, and not those who pour confusion on conversations with confounding pomposities. The ingrates who take our money but call us names, while they dodge debates and hail vainglorious victories over points we never raised: these we mock.\*

Thanks to Ainslie for the tip-off.

\*Thanks to BobC for pointing out that we can measure gravity to 12 significant digits (not 4).

The short killer summary: The Skeptics Handbook <<http://joannenova.com.au/global-warming/>>. The most deadly point: The Missing Hot Spot <<http://joannenova.com.au/2008/10/26/the-missing-hotspot/>>.

<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/06/infantile-professor-pronounces-debate-infantile-comment-page-2/#comment-54963>

--  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]