



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 12, 2019

Out of Power Nationally, Politician Finally Tells Truth on “Global Warming”

https://media.blubrry.com/1462062/mcdn.podbean.com/mf/web/rbfeuw/Out_of_Power_Nationally_Politician.mp3

Podcast: Play in new window | [Download](#) ()

Subscribe: [Android](#) | [RSS](#) | [More](#)

“We’re all as honest as we can afford to be,” noted late comedian Lenny Bruce. One man who can now afford to be far more honest is politician Barnaby Joyce. Once a two-time deputy prime minister of Australia, Joyce is now a “backbencher” only representing rural New South Wales. As such, he has finally told everyone what he really thinks about the man-made climate-change agenda:



It’s “barking” madness.

American Thinker’s Thomas Lifson [explains](#) how Joyce became an “honest man,” writing, “Like the United States, Australia is subject to agitation for CO2 emissions reduction in the name of ‘saving the planet.’ As deputy P.M. serving in coalition under the leadership of warmist true believer Malcolm Turnbull, Joyce could not speak his mind for fear of those interests.”

“But Australia has a new liberal (conservative) government following federal elections last May 19, with the margin of victory attributed by most observers to the opposition by Scott Morrison, the new leader of the Liberals, to closing a major coal mine,” Lifson continues.

Consequently, “Joyce is now a backbencher and can finally tell the truth about the global warming scare,” [writes](#) the *Herald Sun’s* Andrew Bolt (story paywalled).

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Regardless of how it took becoming a backbencher to find backbone, Joyce’s comments are so to the point and powerful that they warrant reprint in toto. As he [wrote](#) on Facebook:

“The very idea that we can stop climate change is barking mad. Climate change is inevitable, as geology has always shown.” These are the views of New Zealand lecturer of geology, David Shelley. A person vastly more competent than me and the flotilla of others telling the kids the world is going to end from global warming.

The central theme of David Shelley’s analysis is that sea levels are rising and have been for thousands of years and will fall during the next ice age which is expected about now, give or take a thousand years.

When the ice age does arrive temperatures will drop around ten degrees. A warmer planet will be a disconsolate chronicle and many, maybe most, will die from starvation as is the usual experience of man or beast in previous ice ages.



The weather is going to brutally win the population problem and the parliament of Australia has no power against it. One may suggest that warmer weather is the better problem of the two.

One of the few graces of being on the backbench is you can be honest with what your views really are. I believe this is one of the greatest policy phantoms, the misguided and quite ludicrous proposition that Australia can have any affect [sic] on the climate. If we could we should be the first to make it rain and, more importantly, stop the recurrence of an ice age anytime in the coming millennium.

Politics takes politics to the absurd. We have to absolutely affirm that our domestic settings can deal with a proposition which is stated quite clearly by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that: "In climate research and modelling, we should recognise that we are dealing with a coupled nonlinear chaotic system, and therefore that the long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible."

You don't get the feeling when you listen to the political propaganda or the supporting lobbyists that there is any doubt about their capacity to "fix the climate problem" I do get the feeling that you will be tried for heresy if you dare question the zeitgeist so you basically have to lie about your honest assessment of what the hell we are doing to our economy, standard of living, our basic rights and the real future of our children.

Today, more than in the past, the political debate is set within a predetermined paradigm. Participants can not agree [sic] outside these preset boundaries. Maybe it is over cynical but I believe the promotion of the primacy of the state over the individual is very well served by the apparent necessity of climate policy.

Private property rights are removed, by the implementation of vegetation laws, because of "climate action". The state will limit your access to electricity because of "climate action". You will drive an electric car because of "climate action". You will divest the nation of its largest export because of "climate action". Rather than state there is no prospect whatsoever that any action of ours, and most likely of anyone else, will have any affect [sic] whatsoever on the trajectory climate is on.

We have instead the congenial narrative that we are all trying to make the world get cooler, but one path or the other path is the better alternative of cooling policies. We will do this by shutting down all our power stations, replacing them with windmills and rejiggering our nation away from our largest exports of mining and agricultural resources to carbon neutral tourism and the knowledge economy. Australia will be the catalyst to a global epiphany and the totalitarian Chinese regime will follow our lead because of our righteousness followed by India and the United States.

No, I don't think that will happen. I hate to say it but I doubt the majority of people on the planet, give a toss about the Paris Agreement. I would be amazed if one percent of the planet could competently explain it.

I will make one prediction; after this is published it will be promptly followed by the remnants of the traditional media in furious pursuit of my heresy. Questions will be asked by the fourth estate and high octane derision will issue forth from the climate change actionistas.

No doubt I will be accused of not knowing what I am talking about, and when it comes to predicting the weather more than a fortnight or so out, that is true. But of those who ask the questions, will any of them truly understand what on earth are they are talking about?



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on July 12, 2019

Joyce is correct about an impending ice age, all due to natural climatic cycles, as I've [warned](#) for [years](#). He's also right in saying that this, not "global warming," is the truly deadly scenario. Of course, were ignorant and power-mad politicians not distracting us with warmist nonsense, we might actually start preparing for this eventuality (insofar as we can). We're focusing, childishly, on an imaginary boogeyman beneath the bed — while a very real monster looms on the horizon.

More points to ponder:

- If a stock broker had a 25-year history of consistently incorrect advice, would you take investment tips from him? Now consider that alarmists' climate models have been wrong in their warming predictions for approximately that amount of time.
- According to [one analysis](#), reducing the temperature three-tenths of one degree by the century's end — meaning, postponing "global warming" less than four years — would cost \$100 trillion. No, that's not a typo.
- Since no one can tell us what earth's ideal average temperature is, how can we know that a given type of climate change (whether caused by man or nature) is bad? Maybe it will bring us closer to the ideal temperature.
- As Professor Walter E. Williams' [2008 article](#) "Environmentalists Wild Predictions" makes obvious, the scariest thing about the green doomsayers' warnings is that, despite being accurate one less time than the [boy who cried wolf](#), people still take them seriously. (By the way, perhaps the wildest of these claims was a [warning](#) that civilization would end by the year 2000.)

Ironically, the truth here is the opposite of the default assumption: Given that an ice age likely looms, efforts to lower future temperature should be viewed as a crime against humanity.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.