

*While the Association does not necessarily agree or disagree with everything on this page, we do respect the right of everyone to have their say.*

## The Dogma of Climate Change.

*(Dogma = a principle or set of principles laid down by an authority as incontrovertibly true.)*

If “Anthropogenic Climate Change” is an ecological thing, based on scientific research, why does opinion on the topic nearly always follow political lines. Why do those who tend towards the left of the political debate lead the march for the unabashed belief in the concept while those on the right question it. If, as those on the left declare there is unquestionable scientific proof that mankind is poisoning mother earth with his/her horrific generation of that disastrous CO2 gas, why do those on the right oppose the idea? Surely if a thing was scientifically proven beyond all reasonable doubt, the vast majority of people on both sides of the political fence would believe it – but they don’t.



Makes you wonder whether “Climate Change’ is actually nothing more than just an expensive political game.



Both sides trot out irrefutable facts to prove their point and both sides then trot out irrefutable facts to disprove the others irrefutable facts. It's our opinion that the left seems to play the man more than does the right, while the right plays the ball more so than does the left. If the right puts forward an argument, the left immediately and brutally attacks the messenger in an attempt to disprove the message whereas the right will mostly argue facts ignoring the opposition's personnel.

The media play a big part in the discussion, the left leaning media, like our ABC and Fairfax, trumpet Climate Change as though it's a given and never put forth an opposing argument, whereas the right leaning media, most commercial TV channels and the Sydney Telegraph associated press argue the opposite.

Both sides religiously believe in their opinion, but common sense tells us, one of them has to be wrong, we're either on the road to impending doom or we're not.

Why the different points of view?

Patrick T. Brown, an Assistant Professor in the Department of Meteorology and Climate Science at San Jose State University, California has an idea, he says:



“Research into scientific questions is nearly always influenced by political attitudes. The Left rather self-servingly, say ‘our side is logical and correct, so what exactly makes the people who disagree with us so biased and ideologically motivated?’ Meanwhile those on the Right incorrectly assume that the Left's position is therefore informed by dispassionate logic. Rather than thinking about the political divide on global warming as the result of dogma versus logic, a better explanation is that people tend to embrace conclusions, scientific or otherwise, that support themes, ideologies, and narratives that are pre-existing components of their worldview. It just so happens that the themes, ideologies, and narratives associated with human-caused global warming and its proposed solutions align well with the political predispositions of the Left and create tension with those of the Right.

The definitional distinction between the political Right and the political Left originated during the French Revolution and relates most fundamentally to the desirability and perceived validity of social hierarchies. Those on the Right see hierarchies as natural, meritocratic, and justified, while those on the Left see hierarchies primarily as a product of chance and exploitation. A secondary distinction, at least contemporarily in the West, is that those on the Right tend to emphasize individualism at the expense of collectivism and those on the Left prefer the reverse.

There are several aspects of the contemporary global warming narrative that align well with an anti-hierarchy, collectivist worldview. This makes the issue gratifying to the sensibilities of the Left and offensive to the sensibilities of the Right.

The most fundamental of these themes is the degree to which humanity itself can be placed at the top of the hierarchy of life on the planet. Those on the Right are more likely to privilege the interests of humanity over the interests of other species or the “interests” of the planet as a whole (to the degree that there is such a thing). On the other hand, those on the Left are more likely to



emphasize a kind of pan-species egalitarianism and care for our shared environment, even if that means implementing policies that run counter to humans' short-term interests.

Within humanity, there are at least two additional ways in which narratives about hierarchies influence thinking on global warming. One of these concerns attitudes towards developed versus developing countries. Firstly, the blame for global warming falls disproportionately on developed countries (in terms of historical greenhouse gas emissions) and proposed solutions therefore often call on developed countries to bear the brunt of the cost of reducing emissions going forward. (Additionally, it is argued that developed countries have the luxury of being able to afford increases in the cost of energy.) Overall, the solutions proposed for global warming imply that wealthy countries owe a debt to the rest of humanity that should be paid due at once.

Those on the Right are more likely to see the wealth of developed countries as rightfully earned by their own industriousness, while those on the Left are more likely to view the disproportionate wealth as fundamentally unjust and likely caused by exploitation. The idea that wealthy countries must therefore be penalized and made to subsidize poor countries is one that aligns well with the Left's views about rebalancing unfairness. An accentuating factor is the Right's tendency to favour national autonomy and therefore to oppose global governance and especially international redistribution.

Hierarchy narratives also help to determine political positions on the wealth of corporations and individuals. On the Right, oil and gas companies (as well as electric utilities that utilize fossil fuels) are held to be a product of innovation and a source of wealth creation; the smartest and most deserving people and organizations found the most efficient ways to transform idle fossil fuel resources into the power that runs society and, consequently, have greatly enhanced human wellbeing. For conservatives, it is therefore fundamentally unjust to blame those corporations and individuals that have done so much for human progress. The counter-narrative from the Left is that greedy corporations and individuals exploited natural resources for their own gain at the expense of the planet and the general public. They therefore support policies that blame and punish the fossil fuel industry in the name of cosmic justice and atonement.



Global warming is a tragedy of the commons, in which logical agents act in ways that run counter to the long-term interests of the group. These types of "collective-action problems" usually call for top-down government intervention at the expense of individual action and responsibility. Furthermore, the long-term nature of global warming demands acquiescence to collective action across generations. This natural alignment of the global warming problem with collectivist themes makes the issue much more palatable to the Left than the Right.

In addition to these fundamental ideological issues, there are a number of circumstantial characteristics that contribute to polarization regarding global warming.

For instance, in the US, Al Gore was one of the political figures most responsible for bringing global warming into the national consciousness. Once a former vice president and presidential





nominee became a flag-bearer for the environmentalist movement, it only increased the perception that this is a partisan issue.

There is also the longstanding claim by those on the Right that the global warming issue is a Trojan Horse intended to bring about all manner of unrelated changes desired by the Left.

So, it should really not be particularly mysterious that opinions on global warming tend to divide along political lines. It is not because one side cleaves to dispassionate logic while the other remains obstinately wedded to political dogmatism. It is simply that the problem and its proposed solutions align more comfortably with the dogma of one side than the other. That does not mean, however, that the Left is equally out-of-step with the science of global warming as the Right. It really is the case that the Right is more likely to deny the most well-established aspects of the science.

If sceptical conservatives are to be convinced, the Left must learn to reframe the issue in a way that is more palatable to their worldview.

No matter which side of the fence you sit, [THIS](#) is worth watching as is [THIS](#).

But [THIS](#) and [THIS](#) and [THIS](#) are also interesting.

And Andrew Bolt has something to say too - see [HERE](#)



**You know it's hot in Australis when:**  
You learn that a seat belt buckle makes a good branding iron

## Our subs – again!

Robert Gottliebsen  
News Pty Limited

Very rarely in journalism do you come across a potential disaster that could jeopardise the nation for a generation.

I have access to information that has made me realise that the proposed submarine project is not a normal mistake that can be managed — it's a national disaster.



I invite the three most senior members of the cabinet, Scott Morrison, Josh Frydenberg and Mathias Cormann (I know and respect all three), to read what I have discovered and then use non-defence people to check me out. I do not believe my whistle-blower is wrong because he or she is acting in the national interest, particularly in the light of the recent events at NATO and in Turkey.

But to convey the sheer magnitude of this disaster I have to take you back to the Turnbull government's decision to go with the French submarine plan. Former PM Tony Abbott had a nodding agreement with the Japanese Prime Minister to buy the Japanese submarine. However, down the line staff in the Japanese submarine operation did not want to do such a deal and so undermined the efforts of those at the top. The Japanese ceased to be a contender. The Germans became hot favourites and offered Australia an industrial network to support their vessel.





But the French brilliantly presented a most exciting and tantalising concept — Australia would join them to develop a new submarine and together we would be regional leaders in submarine development. The negotiation was brilliantly masterminded by the French. They concluded legendary and tough head of the French Naval Group industrial operation Herve Guillou was the wrong person to push the deal through the Australian defence establishment. So, Marie-Pierre de Bailliencourt was made his deputy and was given the job of selling the deal to Australians. She did the job superbly.



When the deal was concluded, Guillou took control and de Bailliencourt went elsewhere.

I have now discovered that the deal the French and Guillou put on the table was very different to that proposed by de Bailliencourt.

Defence officials may dispute this but, in essence, under the new deal the French do most of the designing and if we don't like it we pay for the alteration. This was graphically illustrated when we wanted different lighting to that proposed by the French. Different lighting could be arranged by the French, but Australia would pay. The idea of an exciting joint development has been trashed.

But it gets much worse.

Our defence systems are linked to or are at least compatible to the US. The US defence and security people have never trusted the French since US defence secrets were leaked to Russia during the reign of de Gaulle. That distrust grew in the decades that followed and intensified when the base design of the Australian submarine was leaked before the deal. The Americans demanded that it only supply its combat system to the project if the US had a separate deal with Australia.

And so, the submarine development is two deals — one for the basic design between Australia and France and one for the combat system between Australia and the US. And the French will have restricted access to the combat system in the submarine they are designing. It might have worked had the original French proposal of a true partnership been carried out, but it is a hopeless arrangement when it is basically a French project. And remember, this is a high-risk new technology submarine, so with two “warring” suppliers there will be an endless blame game.

Australia might have hoped that, over time, the US distrust of France would fade. Last week's NATO clash between presidents Donald Trump and Emmanuel Macron showed the distrust is getting worse, not better. And the US is very sensitive to its technology, which was illustrated when Turkey bought anti-missile systems from Russia. The US immediately cancelled its Joint Strike Fighter deal with Turkey.

The Australian government announced in 2016 that it would be paying \$50bn, inflation protected, for the submarines. By 2018 that had blown out to \$90bn. At that time, with help, I estimated that the final costs over the life of the submarines, including maintenance etc, would be about \$220bn.



I expected that defence chiefs would deny such an incredibly high estimate. Two years later they have now confirmed my estimate, which makes me suspect the real costs are much higher. Given the looming chaos I have described, we could be looking at \$400bn- \$500bn, although that is speculation.

In the original deal the first submarine would be operational in 2034, but the contract is already six months late and I am told the real delay is about 18 months to two years. Given what is ahead, I think 2040 is an optimistic estimate for the first operational submarine.

In the next 15 or 20 years there will be incredible developments in warfare and technology. Already we may have missed the lithium battery the French offered the Dutch. Frydenberg is right to be proud of his budget surplus. But he is sitting on a \$220bn disaster.

Frydenberg, Morrison and Cormann can escape the contract with what in comparison to \$220bn is a token break-free .

And there are better options.

Hot water comes out of both taps

## Arson, mischief and recklessness: 87 per cent of our bush-fires are man-made

*The Sydney Morning Herald*

There are, on average, 62,000 fires in Australia every year. Only a very small number strike far from populated areas and satellite studies tell us that lightning is responsible for only 13 per cent. Not so the current fires threatening to engulf Queensland and NSW. There were no lightning strikes on most of the days when the fires first started in September. Although there have been since, these fires – joining up to create a new form of mega-fire – are almost all man-made.





A 2015 satellite analysis of 113,000 fires from 1997-2009 confirmed what we had known for some time – 40 per cent of fires are deliberately lit, another 47 per cent accidental. This generally matches previous data published a decade earlier that about half of all fires were suspected or deliberate arson, and 37 per cent accidental. Combined, they reach the same conclusion: 87 per cent are man-made.

The cycles of the seasons are changing beyond that which can be explained by known forces, both ancient and modern. Every lethal wildfire since 1857 has happened at the height of summer. Until now! The size of these fires has never been seen in Australia's history this side of summer, and certainly not starting as early as September.

Seasonal changes, in part due to climate change on top of natural oscillations causing the drought and westerly winds, have some origins in man-made emissions. More directly, however, the source of ignition is human. It's not lost on police, emergency services and firefighters at the front line that most of these fires were lit deliberately, or accidentally through recklessness, nor that they are unprecedented in their timing and ferocity. Since September, it has been a constant pattern that a few days after the fires roar through we have the first police reports that arson or recklessness was involved.

The mix of people lighting fires always follow the same age and gender profiles: whether accidental or deliberate, half are children, a minority elderly, and the most dangerous are those aged between 30 and 60. Ninety per cent are male. The psychosexual pyromaniac has long been relegated to dusty tomes from 1904 to the 1950s. At least among those caught, the profile emerges of an odd, unintelligent person from a chaotic family, marginalised at the fringes of society and deeply involved in many types of crime, not only fire.





It seems about 10,000 arsonists lurk from the top of Queensland to the southern-most tip of Victoria, but not all are active and some light fires during winter. The most dangerous light fires on the hottest days, generally closer to communities and during other blazes, suggesting more malicious motives. Only a tiny minority will gaze with wonder at the destruction they have wrought, deeply fascinated and empowered. Others get caught up with the excitement of chaos and behave like impulsive idiots.

As for children, they are not always malicious. Children and youths follow the age-crime curve where delinquency peaks in their late teens. Fire is just one of many misbehaviours. The great majority grow out of it. Four overlapping subgroups include: accidental fire-play getting out of control; victims of child abuse – including sexual abuse – and neglect; children with autism and developmental disorders; and conduct disorder from a younger age, which can be genuinely dangerous.

Whereas the first three groups can be helped and stopped, the last is more problematic. These children are more likely to continue lighting fires for a lifetime, emerging as psychopaths in adulthood. This tends to match the finding that only 10 per cent of convicted arsonists will go on to light fires again after prison. They are the recidivists, more fascinated by fire, more prone to giving in to dangerous urges when in crisis, more impulsive, less empathic – the hallmarks of a psychopath.



Some research suggests only a very small percentage of arsonists are ever caught, which has several implications. One is that we have a biased profile of who they really are. Whereas the children and the dopey get caught, the more cunning would be less represented in our samples. More ominous, many more than 10,000 arsonists might be active.

One of the few prospective studies of almost 3000 fire lighters in South Australia alone found as many as 14 per cent of people in a community sample lit fires. This level is much higher than actual convictions would suggest. Further to this, community sampling suggests females represent 20 per cent of those fire lighters, even though convictions of females are only half this figure. If this trend continues into adulthood, it suggests we have a biased view of the typical arsonist to begin with. Those we haven't caught yet are still hiding, but we know enough to recognise them and, one day, maybe stop them.

In the thick of a deadly crisis, it beggars belief that some people would seek to make it worse. But we should be careful who we demonise. Not all children mean to do harm. Careful handling of them will reduce, not exacerbate, their problems and allow caregivers to refer them before the first match is struck. Emergency services and communities on the front line will shine a light on the very best of humanity; others will disgrace themselves through idiocy or malice. Amid the chaos of confronting fires, the psychopath forever looms – not only the criminals who light fires in the forests and grasslands but perhaps also, figuratively, the people who profit from planetary destruction and ignore the urgent warnings of 23 emergency commissioners to prepare.



When the flames abate, we can have a sensible national dialogue about the prevention of wildfires, handling arson, and maybe even climate change.

The temperature drops below 32 degrees C and you feel chilly.

## Looking, Looking!

**Nigel Blake,**

Greg Purdy is trying to find a contact address for Nigel Blake former RADTECHG who left the RAAF from Richmond around 1980. I have some of his personal possessions that I have been "minding" for him all these years and I would like to send them to him before I get too old to remember who Nigel was. I would be very happy for him to contact me if he responds to any notice you may be able to put in the next magazine.

If you can help, let us know and we'll pass on the info to Greg.

You learn it only takes two fingers to steer a car.

## Pregnancy Problems in the US Navy

Thanks for your magazine - it's always a great read, however, when reading [one of the articles](#), I noted a worrying statement.

Please note that I am not politically aligned here, just a concerned individual who doesn't like seeing the truth subtly misrepresented for political gain.

While the article on pregnancy in the navy was of interest, I was concerned to see the source. The Daily Caller, in conjunction with another right wing group, Judicial Watch.

The Daily Caller is a decidedly right-wing publication started by one of the far-right commenters on Fox News, Tucker Carlson. The evidence of this is plentiful - here are some of the many sites that point this out.

And no, these are not politically aligned sites.

<https://www.mediamatters.org/networks-and-outlets/daily-caller>

[https://archives.cjr.org/feature/the\\_great\\_right\\_hype.php](https://archives.cjr.org/feature/the_great_right_hype.php)





<https://www.politifact.com/personalities/daily-caller/statements/byruling/false/>

[https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/The\\_Daily\\_Caller](https://rationalwiki.org/wiki/The_Daily_Caller)

This made sense when I saw some of the clear anti-women-in-service smears and Obama-bashing included without any citations (e.g. "The Obama administration understated the pregnancy problem throughout its eight years and even suppressed some data about the impact...") - where is there any evidence that they did this? And claiming that 75-100 page reports being summarised (ie. and executive summary) somehow indicates important data was removed seems a bit ... stretching the truth?

I'm not saying that anything there is not true (although bias is heavy), however, on the balance of evidence - the source, the track record of political bias by the source, and the total lack of quotes or citations supporting the claims - there is no evidence presented that in fact the Obama administration did any such thing as "understate the pregnancy problem" or that the "brief two or three-page summaries" excluded anything (or even that they don't continue to do this now under the current administration). Further, statements like "...some women get pregnant simply to avoid deployment. We all know that happens. Women do it to avoid deployment," Eden told The DCNF" - is an example of anecdotal journalism to push a pretty anti-female, anti-women in service, conservative viewpoint. How many women DELIBERATELY get pregnant to avoid deployment? 1:1000? I have never met a woman in my 20 years service who deliberately got pregnant to avoid being deployed. I knew of ONE who was actually quite upset at finding out she was pregnant and MISSING a deployment, although also happy because she and her husband had been trying for 3 years to get pregnant when it finally happened.

The statement is inflammatory and unbalanced. How many MEN, as a percentage, fake illness, or self harm, to avoid deployment? Are the percentages of PROVEN deployment-dodging similar? I'd suspect "Most likely" is the answer.

Again, thanks for your publication. I'm just interested in keeping political opinions (unless supported by actual, non-cherry picked evidence) out of our stories.

Cheers,

Terry Hill  
ex-SIGSOP/T (1/89 SIGSOP RADS)

You develop a fear of car door handles



## Sick Parade

### Pete DeJonge

Pete hasn't been travelling too well lately, he's been getting the occasional wobbles and finding it hard to stay upright, though anyone who remembers Pete from uniform days would think that was normal, but unfortunately not this time.

A couple of times he was forced to spend a few nights in Greenslopes Hospital in Brisbane where a million tests were done on his thoroughly abused body and where he spent most of the day chatting up the lovely nurses. Eventually the consensus report revealed his worn out, poor old heart was operating on only 20% of its capability and his systolic blood pressure (the one that is normally 100+) was down to as low as 60 – not good.



Pete's on tablets to try and rectify the problem and we all hope they do, they will recall him for a further bunch of tests in the New Year and hopefully there's a heap of improvement.

We'll keep you posted.

Perhaps he could do with a little Waukesha beside the bed to keep things humming.