

CATASTROPHIC ANTHROPOGENIC GLOBAL
WARMING.
CONSENSUS OR FRAUD?

Dr John Happs

INTRODUCTION:

The often heated public exchanges about atmospheric carbon dioxide levels and climate change between individuals, the media and the scientific community initially saw the proponents of catastrophic anthropogenic global warming (CAGW) on the front foot and in the majority.

We have heard public figures such as Professor Paul Nurse (geneticist), Professor Martin Rees (astronomer), Professor Brian Cox (astronomer), Professor Nicholas Stern (economist), Professor John Beddington (population biologist) and a host of crusading celebrities, such as Prince Charles making forceful comments in strong support of the notion of CAGW. Climate science is complex and poorly understood and it is inappropriate for prominent and influential individuals, whose expertise lies in other areas, to loudly proclaim their warmist and sometimes abrasive views in public.

For instance, economist Sir Nicholas Stern made the comment:

"Those who say that climate change doesn't exist are being understood as the flat-earthers that they are, as the people who deny the link between smoking and cancer, as the people who denied the link between HIV and AIDS." (1)

The term "*climate change denier*" has been widely used in a derogatory way about those who challenge the notion of CAGW yet the term is quite inappropriate, if not silly. We are still waiting to meet just one scientist who actually denies that the climate is changing.

The climate is never static. Numerous, abrupt, short-lived warming and cooling episodes, much more intense than recent warming/cooling, have occurred over the last few million years (Groote 1992) (2) Adams et al. (1999) (3)

The Greenland Ice Core Project (GRIP) has provided evidence of rapid temperature fluctuations which have occurred during the last 110,000 years and of a scale much greater than any shifts that have taken place during the past 10,000 years. (4) It is evident that the climate has always changed, it is changing as we write this and it will continue to change in the future.

Only a few years ago most in the scientific community still appeared to accept the unproven notion of CAGW, pointing to the authority of the

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and august bodies such as the Royal Society and the American Physical Society. On the other hand there were others (few at first) that were always skeptical of the IPCC statements knowing that there were many factors which influenced the Earth's climate, a system which is non-linear, chaotic and poorly understood. As Mayewski and Bender (1995) remind us:

"The processes influencing climate, the mechanisms through which they act, and the responses they generate are, in general, as complex and poorly understood as they are important." (5)

The notion of CAGW has been linked with current historic low levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide and the relatively small inputs of carbon dioxide produced by human activity. Belief in CAGW is still held by some, despite the fact that proxy data clearly tell us: (6)

1. Carbon dioxide levels have never been shown to drive global temperature over 500 million years of geologic time;
2. When carbon dioxide levels were ten times higher than current levels, the Earth was in the depths of an ice age;
3. Data from the Vostok ice cores show that change in temperature always precedes changes in carbon dioxide levels by about a thousand years;
4. Current carbon dioxide levels are amongst the lowest they have been over the last 500 million years;
5. We are living in a mild interglacial period and, based on past interglacial history, we should expect further natural warming.

It has been shown (Petit et al.1999) that the current Holocene interglacial peak temperature is lower than any of the previous 5 interglacials. (7) Additionally, Sime et al. (2009) have shown that the current interglacial peak temperature is cooler by about 6°C when compared to previous interglacials. (8)

What we also know with certainty is that carbon dioxide is a minor greenhouse gas. The logarithmic warming impact of the relatively small quantities released into the atmosphere via human activity would need to be greatly amplified by processes not yet identified or proven in order for catastrophic global warming to follow.

The logarithmic warming effect of increasing levels of carbon dioxide was explained by Dr William Happer, Professor of Physics at Princeton University, to the Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming, U.S. House of Representatives:

“Well over half of the greenhouse warming is due to water vapor and clouds. There is little argument in the scientific community that a direct effect of doubling the CO₂ concentration will be a small increase of the earth’s temperature -- on the order of one degree Kelvin. Additional increments of CO₂ will cause relatively less direct warming because we already have so much CO₂ in the atmosphere that it has blocked most of the infrared radiation that it can.”

He explained further:

“To get the frightening global warming scenarios that are bandied about, the added CO₂ must substantially increase water’s contribution to warming. The jargon is “positive feedback” from water vapor and clouds. With each passing year, experimental observations further undermine the claim of a large positive feedback from water. In fact, observations suggest that the feedback is close to zero and may even be negative.” (9)

As the above information filtered through to the wider scientific community, questions were raised about the IPCC’s “science and process.” There is no doubt that during the 1990’s many, if not a majority, in the scientific community fully supported the IPCC, trusting that it was being funded to initiate an impartial meta-analysis of the published research (the IPCC is not a research body) which looked at factors contributing to climate change. Unfortunately, it appears, this was not the case and that trust now appears to have been misplaced. Scientific opinion has changed accordingly and substantially. Support for the IPCC appears to be evaporating.

Scientists were initially alerted to possible bias when the IPCC set out its brief:

“To assess the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant for the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change.” (10)

With a charter such as this, many in the scientific community might have been justified in thinking that the many other complex factors

which influence climate change might not be given the attention required by the IPCC. Those doubters in the scientific community were soon to have their suspicions further aroused.

The IPCC website states:

“The IPCC is an intergovernmental body. It is open to all member countries of the United Nations (UN) and WMO. Currently 194 countries are members of the IPCC. Governments participate in the review process and the plenary sessions, where main decisions about the IPCC work programme are taken and reports are accepted, adopted and approved.” (11)

The above statement appears well-intended and promised rigour but anyone who is familiar with the climate literature and then reads the IPCC scientific reports and the IPCC *Summaries For Policymakers* (12) might suspect that all is not as it seems. Anyone who is familiar with the climate literature and then reads the emails leaked from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia and comments from IPCC contributors will most likely have their suspicions confirmed.

The science which does not support the notion of CAGW is extensive and well documented in the peer-reviewed, published literature. Readers can select from the more than 800 documents which are readily available online. (13)

Rather than again reviewing or summarising any of these papers we consider it more appropriate to examine some of the claims that are routinely made about those scientists who question the IPCC methodology. We will then look at ways in which the IPCC appears to have acted in questionable ways. We will address 10 key questions.

1. Is there only a minority of scientists who are skeptical about catastrophic anthropogenic global warming (CAGW)?

In the latest edition of the *The Skeptic* (Vol. 31, No 1, March 2011), David Brookman reviewed the book *Merchants of Doubt* by Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway. The front cover has the wording:

*“How a **Handful** of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming.”* (my emphasis)

Kevin Rudd, in his address to the Lowy Institute (reported in *The Australian* 6th November 2009) said:

*"They (climate change skeptics) are a **minority**."* (my emphasis)

and

*"Climate change deniers are **small in number**."* (my emphasis)

Nicholas Stern said of the deniers:

*"Well, they're **marginal** now."* (my emphasis) (14)

What are the facts about AGW skeptics? Are they indeed small in number today and have they really been marginalised?

To answer these questions we suggest readers firstly consult the following document:

"More than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming." (15)

This list of 1,000 means that just one source logs about 20 times the number of UN scientists (52) that authored the IPCC 2007 *Summary for Policymakers*. The public and scientific community are now becoming aware of these numbers.

McLean comments that the IPCC has tried to give the impression that its Fourth Assessment Report (FAR) was thoroughly and diligently reviewed and that conclusions reached were endorsed by a very high percentage of reviewers. In fact, reviewers comments reveal little support for the oft-heard view that humans are very likely (90% to 95%) responsible for climate change. (16)

Additionally, if readers look up the following petitions, they will get an even clearer picture about current numbers of scientists skeptical of CAGW:

The Heidelberg Appeal (17); The Oregon Petition (18); The Manhattan Declaration (19); Open Letter to UN Secretary General (20); The Petition by German Scientists to the Chancellor (21); The Leipzig Declaration (22); Statement from Atmospheric Scientists (23); Letter to the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S.

Senate. (24) Memorandum submitted by the Institute of Physics (25)
It is clear that tens of thousands of scientists (a distinct majority) now reject the notion of CAGW. Other groups have also made similar statements. For instance, the American Association of Petroleum Geologists has made its position clear:

“The earth’s climate is constantly changing owing to natural variability in earth processes. Natural climate variability over recent geological time is greater than reasonable estimates of potential human-induced greenhouse gas changes. Because no tool is available to test the supposition of human-induced climate change and the range of natural variability is so great, there is no discernible human influence on global climate at this time.” (26)

We know exactly what the Russian Academy of Science thinks about CAGW from its engagement with Sir David King, former Chief Scientific Adviser to the British Government. King had been a noted global warming alarmist (he is not a geoscientist) making public comments such as:

“Antarctica is likely to be the world’s only habitable continent by the end of this century if global warming remains unchecked.”

and

“Global warming is worse than terrorism.”

and

“If all the ice on Greenland were to melt, sea level would rise by seven metres. Is that likely to happen? Well I was saying six years ago unlikely [but] I’m afraid that that’s having to be revised.” (27)

President Putin asked some of Russia's leading climate scientists (and some experts from other countries) to talk with King at a meeting hosted by the Russian Academy of Sciences. When they met, King wanted to select scientists who would speak in favour of CAGW and sideline those who would not (such as Professor Paul Reiter and Professor Nils-Axel Morner). The Russians wouldn't comply with King's request.

Rupert Wyndham takes up the story:

“Sir David King, not realizing he had been ambushed, launched into his usual exaggerated, alarmist presentation (he actually knows remarkably little about the science of climate, and makes an ass of himself every time he opens his mouth on the subject). The six sceptics heard him politely until one of them, who told me the story, could contain himself no longer. When Sir David said that the snows of Kilimanjaro were melting because of “global warming”, my informant pointed out that, in the 30 years since satellite monitoring of the summit had begun, temperature had at no instant risen above -1.6°C , and had averaged -7°C (Molg et al., 2003); that the region around the mountain had cooled throughout the period (Cullen, 2006); that the recession of the glacier had begun in the 1880s, long before any anthropogenic influence (Robinson, Robinson & Soon, 2007); and that the reason for the long-established recession of the Furtwangler glacier at the summit was ablation caused by the desiccation of the atmosphere owing to the regional cooling. It had nothing to do with global warming.” (28)

Sir David and the British Delegation left the meeting in a fit of pique and Dr. Andrei Ilarionov noted that the supporters of the “consensus” position had based their argument on known scientific falsehoods.

The tens of thousands of scientists rejecting the notion of CAGW represents a distinct majority. We acknowledge that consensus should never be used as an argument in science. Rather we refer to relative numbers essentially to illustrate how scientific opinion and consensus have changed in recent years.

We now want to consider feedback from a significant number of scientists (and economists) who have, in good faith, been involved with the IPCC as contributors/authors/reviewers. They have provided us with valuable commentary and insight into the IPCC process. After all, if the IPCC process itself is flawed then so might be its findings.

Dr Robert Balling: “The IPCC notes that “No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected.” (This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers).

Dr. Lucka Bogataj: “Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don’t cause global temperatures to rise.... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed.”

Dr John Christy: "Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."

Dr Rosa Compagnucci: "Humans have only contributed a few tenths of a degree to warming on Earth. Solar activity is a key driver of climate."

Dr Richard Courtney: "The empirical evidence strongly indicates that the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis is wrong."

Dr Judith Curry: "I'm not going to just spout off and endorse the IPCC because I don't have confidence in the process."

Dr Robert Davis: "Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the (IPCC) *Summary for Policymakers*."

Dr Willem de Lange: "In 1996, the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3,000 "scientists" who agreed that there was a discernible human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."

Dr Chris de Freitas: "Government decision-makers should have heard by now that the basis for the longstanding claim that carbon dioxide is a major driver of global climate is being questioned; along with it the hitherto assumed need for costly measures to restrict carbon dioxide emissions. If they have not heard, it is because of the din of global warming hysteria that relies on the logical fallacy of 'argument from ignorance' and predictions of computer models."

Dr Oliver Frauenfeld: "Much more progress is necessary regarding our current understanding of climate and our abilities to model it."

Dr Peter Dietze: "Using a flawed eddy diffusion model, the IPCC has grossly underestimated the future oceanic carbon dioxide uptake."

Dr John Everett: "It is time for a reality check. The oceans and coastal zones have been far warmer and colder than is projected in the present scenarios of climate change. I have reviewed the IPCC and

more recent scientific literature and believe that there is not a problem with increased acidification, even up to the unlikely levels in the most-used IPCC scenarios."

Dr Eigil Friis-Christensen: "The IPCC refused to consider the sun's effect on the Earth's climate as a topic worthy of investigation. The IPCC conceived its task only as investigating potential human causes of climate change."

Dr Lee Gerhard: "I never fully accepted or denied the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) concept until the furore started after NASA's James Hansen's wild claims in the late 1980's. I went to the [scientific] literature to study the basis of the claim, starting at first principles. My studies then led me to believe that the claims were false."

Dr Indur Goklany: "Climate change is unlikely to be the world's most important environmental problem of the 21st century. There is no signal in the mortality data to indicate increases in the overall frequencies or severities of extreme weather events, despite large increases in the population at risk."

Dr Vincent Gray: "The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."

Dr Mike Hulme: "Claims such as '2,500 of the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that human activities are having a significant influence on the climate' are disingenuous ... The actual number of scientists who backed that claim was "only a few dozen."

Dr Kiminori Itoh: "There are many factors which cause climate change. Considering only greenhouse gases is nonsense and harmful."

Dr Yuri Izrael: "There is no proven link between human activity and global warming. I think the panic over global warming is totally unjustified. There is no serious threat to the climate."

Dr Steven Japar: "Temperature measurements show that the climate model-predicted mid-troposphere hot zone is non-existent. This is more than sufficient to invalidate global climate models and projections made with them."

Dr Georg Kaser: "This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing,"

Dr Aynsley Kellow: "I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."

Dr Madhav Khandekar: "I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."

Dr Hans Labohm: "The alarmist passages in the (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."

Dr. Andrew Lacis: "There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department."

Dr Chris Landsea: "I cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound."

Dr Richard Lindzen: "The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."

Dr Harry Lins: "Surface temperature changes over the past century have been episodic and modest and there has been no net global warming for over a decade now. The case for alarm regarding climate change is grossly overstated."

Dr Philip Lloyd: "I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."

Dr Martin Manning: "Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."

Dr Stephen McIntyre: "The many references in the popular media to a "consensus of thousands of scientists" are both a great exaggeration and also misleading."

Dr Patrick Michaels: "The rates of warming, on multiple time scales have now invalidated the suite of IPCC climate models. No, the science is not settled."

Dr Nils-Axel Morner: "If you go around the globe, you find no sea level rise anywhere."

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: "The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."

Dr Roger Pielke: "All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."

Dr Paul Reiter: "As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."

Dr Tom Segalstad: "The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."

Dr Fred Singer: "Isn't it remarkable that the Policymakers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites--probably because the data show a (slight) cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction to the calculations from climate models?"

Dr Hajo Smit: "There is clear cut solar-climate coupling and a very strong natural variability of climate on all historical time scales. Currently I hardly believe anymore that there is any relevant relationship between human CO2 emissions and climate change."

Dr Richard Tol: “The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices.”

Dr Tom Tripp: “There is so much of a natural variability in weather it makes it difficult to come to a scientifically valid conclusion that global warming is man made.”

Dr Gerd-Rainer Weber: “Most of the extremist views about climate change have little or no scientific basis.”

Dr David Wojick: “The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates.”

Dr Miklos Zagoni: “I am positively convinced that the anthropogenic global warming theory is wrong.”

Dr. Eduardo Zorita: “Editors, reviewers and authors of alternative studies, analysis, interpretations, even based on the same data we have at our disposal, have been bullied and subtly blackmailed. By writing these lines... a few of my future studies will not see the light of publication.”

Again, this is hardly a case of one or two scientists being critical of the IPCC.

2. Are scientists, skeptical of CAGW, well published?

In a clearly biased interview of Bob Ward by Robyn Williams (29) Ward was asked the question:

“So what about the quality of the climate sceptics' publications?”

Ward, a public relations worker at the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment (UK) provided the facile answer:

“You can usually see that they don't actually have much of an academic publication record.”

He continued, either to deliberately obfuscate or comment out of sheer ignorance:

"A lot of these people who claim to be sceptical about climate change don't bother with journals."

Had Williams bothered to do just a little homework he would have found that Ward was wrong and, of the scientists who reject the notion of CAGW, many have excellent publication records. Again, readers might want to check out the list of more than 800 peer-reviewed published papers which do not support the notion of CAGW. (See 13).

Of course Ward's perspective and William's acceptance of it wouldn't surprise Professor Bob Carter who notes:

"Most of the public statements that promote the dangerous human warming scare are made from a position of ignorance - by political leaders, press commentators and celebrities who share the characteristics of lack of scientific training and lack of an ability to differentiate between sound science and computer-based scare mongering." (30)

3 . Are the IPCC claims correct when they say they use only peer-reviewed literature in their reports?

The non-scientist Chairman of the IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri has always been dismissive of any scientist or journalist critical of the IPCC process. Here is one defensive line he uses regularly and frequently waves like a crucifix before vampires:

"The IPCC studies only peer-review science. Let someone publish the data in a decent credible publication. I am sure the IPCC would then accept it, otherwise we can just throw it into the dustbin." Rajendra Pachauri, November 2007.

He also said:

"People can have confidence in the IPCC's conclusions...Given that it is all on the basis of peer-reviewed literature." Rajendra Pachauri, June 2008.

and:

"This is based on peer-reviewed literature. That's the manner in which the IPCC functions. We don't pick up a newspaper article and, based on that, come up with our findings." Rajendra Pachauri, June 2008.

(31)

Similar statements have been echoed by others who actually believed Pachauri:

"Without a strong, peer-reviewed science base (provided by the IPCC) ... the case for action on climate change would not be as unequivocal as it is today." Ban Ki-Moon, United Nations Secretary General, August 2008. (32)

"The IPCC relies entirely on peer reviewed literature in carrying out its assessment." US Environmental Protection Agency, December 2009. (33)

"The IPCC bases its work on papers that have been published in the peer-reviewed scientific literature." The Economist, December 2009. (34)

But are Pachauri's (and other) statements correct?

A team of 43 auditors from 12 countries has recently scrutinised the IPCC's 2007 report which comprises 44 chapters in its almost 3,000 pages. (35).

There are 18,531 cited references and each chapter was audited 3 times with references being sorted into articles that were published in peer-reviewed academic journals and non-peer-reviewed articles.

It became clear that, of the 18,531 references cited in the IPCC report, 5,587 (nearly one third) of these were not peer-reviewed. They included press releases, newspaper and magazine articles, discussion papers, student theses, working papers, and literature published by environmental groups.

Some chapters were particularly scant with regard to peer-reviewed literature. Chapter 5, from Working Group 3's report, for instance, has only 61 of its 260 references being peer-reviewed, i.e. about three-quarters of the material cited in that particular chapter was not peer-reviewed.

We find the IPCC Chairman being economical with the truth.

4 . Are there thousands of scientists, associated with the IPCC, who support the claim of a significant human influence on climate?

Advertising from the IPCC for the 4th Assessment report itself was along the lines:

2,500+ scientific expert reviewers;

800+ contributing authors;

450+ lead authors from

130+ countries

6 years work

1 report (36)

Kevin Rudd was always quick to say that 4,000 scientists supported the notion of a significant human influence on climate:

“This is the conclusion of 4,000 scientists appointed by governments from virtually every country in the world...” (37)

Dr John McLean has many years experience investigating and analysing climate data and other climate-related issues. He makes the comment:

“How many times have you heard or read words to the effect that 4,000 scientists from the IPCC supported the claims about a significant human influence on climate? It's utterly wrong.”

and:

“Fifty-three authors and five reviewers are all that can be said to explicitly support the claim of a significant human influence on climate. The figure of 4,000 is a myth.” (38)

He continued:

“The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) gives the impression that its Fourth Assessment Report (4AR) was thoroughly and diligently reviewed and the statements contained in the report were endorsed by a very high percentage of reviewers. This analysis of the reviewers' comments for Working Group I (WG I) shows that the reality is rather different and that there is surprisingly little explicit support for the key notion, that humans are very likely (90% to 95%) responsible for climate change.” (39)

This then was the 2007 IPCC 4th Assessment report and, as we have seen, a number of those reviewers disagreed vehemently with the IPCC's findings.

5. Are these (relatively few) members of the IPCC our top climate scientists?

Dr John Christy, Professor of Atmospheric Science and Director of the Earth System Science Centre at the University of Alabama says:

"It is well known that many, if not most, of its (IPCC) members are not scientists at all. Its President, for example, is an economist." (40)

Dr William Schlesinger, biogeochemist and President of the Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, acknowledges that 80 percent of the IPCC membership had absolutely no dealing with the climate as part of their academic studies. (41)

In the 1995 report, key changes were made after the scientists had met and accepted what they thought would be the final peer-reviewed version. Trusting scientists thought there would be no change to any scientific report after it had been accepted by the panel of scientific contributors.

However, after the participating scientists had accepted the final report *"The Science of Climate Change"* more than 15 sections in Chapter 8 of the report which set out the scientific evidence for and against a human influence over climate were changed or deleted.

The contributing scientists and reviewers were never asked if they agreed with the *Summaries For Policy Makers* (SPM's) so any suggestion that the SPM's represent the views of thousands of scientists appears to be deliberately misleading.

Dr Richard Lindzen, Professor of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology observes:

"Rarely has such meager science provoked such an outpouring of popularization by individuals who do not understand the subject in the first place." (42)

6. Is the following behaviour “scientific” and acceptable?

Example (a)

The 1990 IPCC First Assessment Report (FAR) in WG1 stated:

*“A global warming of larger size has almost certainly occurred at least once since the end of the last glaciation without any appreciable increase in greenhouse gas. Because we do not understand the reasons for these past warming events, **it is not yet possible to attribute a specific proportion of the recent, smaller warming to an increase in greenhouse gases.**”* (my emphasis) (43)

The SPM contained no such uncertainties.

Example (b)

The IPCC's 1995 Scientific Report draft included the following three statements:

1. *“None of the (scientific) studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed (climate) changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases.”* (Source, IPCC, 1995.)
2. *“No study to date has positively attributed all or part (of observed climate change) to anthropogenic causes.”* (Source, IPCC, 1995.)
3. *“Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced.”* (Source, IPCC, 1995.)

Yet, in the IPCC's expert-approved Chapter 8 draft, all three of the above statements by IPCC scientists were replaced with:

“The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate.” (44)

Example (c)

Dr Patrick Michaels was Research Professor at the University of Virginia for over 30 years and a reviewer for the IPCC. He recounts how, as a reviewer for the 2007 FAR, he looked over the draft which

clearly documented how Siberia and East Russia had previously been between 2°C and 7°C warmer than any post-industrial period.

MacDonald et al. (2000) collated tree records from tundra areas, dating these by radiocarbon analysis. They reported:

“Over most of Russia, forest advanced to or near the current Arctic coastline between 9,000 and 7,000 yrs BP and retreated to its present position between 4,000 and 3,000 yrs BP.” (45)

This information was removed from the second draft.

Dr Robert Balling states: *“The IPCC notes that “No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected.”*

This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers. (46)

Example (d)

Dr Willem de Lange, an expert in Oceanography, coastal processes and climatic hazards, was listed by the IPCC as one of approximately 3,000 “scientists” who agreed that there was a discernible human influence on climate. In fact he **did not agree** (pers. comm.). Nor did he agree with the IPCC projections of sea level rise and threats to Pacific Islands. He indicated how research clearly shows that coral atolls and associated islands are likely to increase in elevation as sea level rises. Hence, the assumptions were invalid, and he was convinced that the IPCC projections were unrealistic and that they severely exaggerated the problem.

The IPCC ignored his comments. (47)

Professor Frederick Seitz considers the 1996 IPCC report as:

“Not what it appears to be – it is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists listed on the title page.”

He went on to say:

“In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never

witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report.” (48)

and

“Many of the contributing scientists object to what is left in the Summaries For Policymakers after the non-scientists have influenced it but their names remain as contributing scientists.”

Seitz asked for his name to be removed from the report but the IPCC refused saying that he had contributed to the report, so they had to give him credit. Seitz insisted they remove his name and he threatened legal action if they did not comply. Eventually, they did.

Example (e)

Research scientist at the Hurricane Research Division of Atlantic Oceanographic & Meteorological Laboratory at NOAA, Dr Chris Landsea has made clear that the IPCC has systematically ignored the science, presented by its own experts, on hurricane intensity. Rather, the IPCC have promoted dramatic scenarios which are not backed up by research findings. Dr Landsea asks the question:

“Where is the science, the refereed publications, that substantiate these pronouncements? ...As far as I know, there are none.” (49)

Example (f)

Dr Kevin Trenberth, a lead author for the IPCC, announced at a press conference at Harvard University that there was a clear relationship between global warming and the increased intensity of hurricane activity. Trenberth has no expertise in this area.

Dr Chris Landsea, meteorologist with the National Hurricane Center in Miami, was so annoyed about this unsubstantiated claim that he withdrew from the IPCC.

Landsea wrote:

“I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized. In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns.”

Example (g)

Atmospheric Physicist (MIT), Professor Richard Lindzen was Lead Author for the IPCC Third Assessment Report (TAR). He relates how, as an insider, he was able to observe how manipulation took place. He noted how the reports and summaries were subject to constant pressure to push findings in a definite direction:

"Throughout the drafting sessions, IPCC "co-ordinators" would go around insisting that criticism of (computer) models be toned down and that "motherhood" statements be inserted to the effect that models might still be correct despite the cited faults. Refusals were occasionally met with ad hominem attacks. I personally witnessed co-authors forced to assert their "green" credentials in defence of their statements." (50)

Example (h)

The IPCC "Summary for Policymakers" stated:

"Climate change is likely to have wide-ranging and mostly adverse impacts on human health, with significant loss of life."

Professor Paul Reiter heads the Insects and Infectious Disease Unit at the Pasteur Institute. Because of his history of excellence in research of diseases transmitted by mosquitoes and other insects, the U.S. State Department in 2001 nominated Professor Reiter to be a lead author of the IPCC's health chapter.

The IPCC was taking the line (with no supporting evidence) that global warming was increasing the habitats for mosquitoes, putting hundreds of millions of people in the tropics at risk of contracting malaria and dengue fever. They promoted the view that these diseases would spread around the world with CAGW.

Reiter was not surprised when the IPCC rejected him as a lead author since he had been a critic of the pseudo-science the IPCC had previously disseminated about this matter. Neither was he surprised when the IPCC failed to select any scientists with expertise in mosquito-borne diseases. Reiter reported that, in its Second Assessment Report chapter on human population health, the IPCC displayed "glaring ignorance" about mosquitoes, their survival temperatures and the altitudes where mosquitoes can be found.

Reiter testified to a U.K. parliamentary committee in 2005. He said:

“The paucity of information was hardly surprising: Not one of the lead authors had ever written a research paper on the subject. Moreover, two of the authors, both physicians, had spent their entire career as environmental activists.”

In summary, the treatment of this issue by the IPCC was ill-informed, biased, and scientifically unacceptable. Reiter commented emphatically on pre-report meetings:

“For the 2001 report, I was a contributory author. And we had these meetings that were absolute bullshit. I mean they had an agenda, and that was it.” (51)

In 2010 Dr Benny Peiser reported:

“The IPCC review process has been shown on numerous occasions to lack transparency and due diligence. Its work is controlled by a tightly knit group of individuals who are completely convinced that they are right. As a result, conflicting data and evidence, even if published in peer reviewed journals, are regularly ignored, while exaggerated claims, even if contentious or not peer-reviewed, are often highlighted in IPCC reports. Not surprisingly, the IPCC has lost a lot of credibility in recent years. It is also losing the trust of more and more governments who are no longer following their advice – as the Copenhagen summit showed.” (52)

Dr Andrei Kapitsa described how:

“A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace....As a result, the discussion was one-sided and heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact.” (53)

7. Should we call this behaviour coercion?

Dr Sonja Boehmer-Christiansen wrote, in a submission to the UK Parliament:

“I inherited the editorship of Energy & Environment from a former senior scientist at the Department of the Environment (Dr. David Everest) because we shared doubts about the claims made by

environmentalists and were worried about the readiness with which politicians accepted these claims, including 'global warming' which followed so seamlessly from the acid rain scare, my previous research area. As editor of a journal which remained open to scientists who challenged the orthodoxy, I became the target of a number of CRU manoeuvres. The hacked emails revealed attempts to manipulate peer review to E&E's disadvantage, and showed that libel threats were considered against its editorial team. Dr Jones even tried to put pressure on my university department. The emailers expressed anger over my publication of several papers that questioned the 'hockey stick' graph and the reliability of CRU temperature data." (54)

Dr Tom Wigley complained that Professor Hans von Storch, from the Meteorological Institute of the University of Hamburg, was partly to blame for papers critical of CAGW being published at *Climate Research*. He suggested (in emails) they tell publishers that the journal was being used for misinformation. He also said that whether this was true or not didn't matter. Wigley suggested they got the editorial board to resign.

In other emails, Dr Michael Mann discusses tactics for screening and delaying postings at *Real Climate*.

When Dr McIntyre published a paper in *Geophysical Research Letters* in 2005, Michael Mann challenged the editor, James Saiers over the publication. Tom Wigley said that if Saiers was sceptical about anthropogenic global warming they should get him ousted. In fact, Saiers was ultimately ousted.

In one email Phil Jones says:

"I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. Kevin [Trenberth] and I will keep them out somehow - even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!" (55)

In email exchanges, Jones and Mann discussed how they were able to pressure an academic journal not to accept the work of climate sceptics with whom they disagreed. Jones said:

"I will be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor." (56)

In other emails Grant Foster was looking for suitable comments about a paper which was critical of the notion of anthropogenic global warming. Jones gave Foster a list of people, telling him that:

“These reviewers would know what to say about the paper without any prompting.” (57)

When Keith Briffa discussed a sceptical article review with Ed Cook, he said that (confidentially) he needs to put together a case to reject that article. (58)

When discussing the IPCC AR4 draft, Mann acknowledged that the paleoclimate chapter would be contentious but that the author team had the right personalities to deal with skeptics. (59)

8. Have other scientists called this behaviour fraud?

Dr Vincent Gray, climate consultant, long-standing member of the New Zealand Royal Society and expert reviewer for all four IPCC Assessment Reports described the IPCC's climate change statements as:

“An orchestrated litany of lies.” (60)

Former Professor of Climatology at the University of Winnipeg, Dr Tim Ball was equally explicit:

“The argument that global warming is due to humans, known as the anthropogenic global warming theory (AGW) is a deliberate fraud. (61)

Dr Ian Plimer, Professor of Mining Geology at The University of Adelaide and Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences at The University of Melbourne agrees:

“Here we have the Australian government underpinning the biggest economic decision this country has ever made and it's all based on fraud.” (62)

Professor Tim Ball was also explicit about the leaked emails and documents:

“The argument that global warming is due to humans, known as the anthropogenic global warming theory (AGW) is a deliberate fraud. I can

now make that statement without fear of contradiction because of a remarkable hacking of files that provided not just a smoking gun, but an entire battery of machine guns."

and

"Carbon dioxide was never a problem and all the machinations and deceptions exposed by these files prove that it is the greatest deception in history, but nobody is laughing. It is a very sad day for science." (63)

Dr. Christopher Kobus says:

"In essence, the jig is up. The whole thing is a fraud. And even the fraudsters that fudged data are admitting to temperature history that they used to say didn't happen...Perhaps what has doomed the Climategate fraudsters the most was their brazenness in fudging the data." (64)

Dr Hilton Ratcliffe was equally clear:

"The whole idea of anthropogenic global warming is completely unfounded. There appears to have been money gained by Michael Mann, Al Gore and UN IPCC's Rajendra Pachauri as a consequence of this deception, so it's fraud." (65)

Russian Antarctic ice core researcher, Dr Andrei Kapitsa also considered the Kyoto Protocol as:

"The biggest ever scientific fraud." (66)

Dr Harold Lewis, Emeritus Professor of physics at the University of California, Santa Barbara, recently resigned from the American Physical Society (APS). He pointed to:

"... the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist." (67)

Professor Bob Carter, Research Fellow at James Cook University is a palaeontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist. Professor Carter describes the notion of anthropogenic global

warming (AGW) as promoted by the IPCC as:

“The greatest self-organised scientific and political conspiracy that the world has ever seen.” (68)

Princeton University physicist Dr. Robert Austin told a congressional committee:

“Unfortunately, climate has become a political science. It is tragic that some perhaps well-meaning but politically motivated scientists who should know better have whipped up a global frenzy about a phenomenon which is statistically questionable at best.” (69)

Anthony Cox has degrees in law and climatology and he makes the interesting observation that none of the climate scientists (or the IPCC) accused of fraud have launched legal proceedings against their accusers. (70) Perhaps they are aware that those who are skeptical of the notion of CAGW and who have accused the IPCC of fraud would now have a very long line of credible witnesses waiting to testify on their behalf.

9. Does the IPCC have confidence in its computer predictions?

Dr Kevin Trenberth, IPCC senior scientist and lead author, has admitted to the problems associated with computer prediction. Additionally, senior IPCC representative, Dr. Jim Renwick (2007), stated that:

“Climate prediction is hard, half of the variability in the climate system is not predictable, so we don’t expect to do terrifically well.” (71)

IPCC authors wrote in 3AR (Section 14.2.2.2, p. 774):

“In climate research and modelling, we should recognise that we are dealing with a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore that long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.”

It’s worth repeating that statement:

Senior IPCC representative, Dr. Jim Renwick (2007), stated that:

“Long-term prediction of future climate states is not possible.” (72)

So why does the IPCC continue to pretend they can tell us about global climate 100 years into the future?

Dr Howard Hayden at the University of Connecticut has looked at the 19 or so Global Circulation Models (GCM's) used by the IPCC to predict global temperatures over the next century.

He notes that not one of the IPCC models has got a forecast right, and they all disagree with one another. He said:

"They take garbage in and spit gospel out." (73)

Douglass et al. (2007) tested computer model predictions against real world observations. They said:

"We have tested the proposition that greenhouse model simulations and trend observations can be reconciled. Our conclusion is that the present evidence, with the application of a robust statistical test, supports rejection of this proposition." (74)

Professor James Koermer, Director of the Meteorological Institute at Plymouth State University summarises:

"Global warming hysteria is based to a large extent on the unproven predictions of climate models. These numerical models are based on many simplified approximations of very complicated physical processes and phenomena. My biggest concern is their (computer models) lack of ability to adequately handle water vapor and clouds, which are much more important as climate factors than anthropogenic (human) contributors. Until we can realistically simulate types of clouds, their optical thicknesses, and their altitudes, which we have a difficult time doing for short-term weather forecasts, I can't have much faith in climate models." (75)

Basing any climate prediction on computer modelling is meaningless no matter how sophisticated the mathematical functions are. The IPCC models cannot provide future climate predictions or forecasts and they have admitted as much. IPCC practices and claims made about their computer predictions are again shown to be questionable.

10. Does the IPCC have an agenda other than the impartial examination of climate science research?

It is essential that IPCC integrity is fully tested since the IPCC is still regarded (by some) as the main source of scientific advice for all countries which operate under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Governments response to the IPCC reports have major implications for global energy policies and the way in which large amounts of taxpayer money are spent.

Dr Roger Sedjo, a senior research fellow at the US research organisation Resources for the Future who also contributed to the IPCC's latest report, makes the point:

"The IPCC is, unfortunately, a highly political organisation..." (76)

So the question has to be asked - what exactly are the aims of the IPCC?

Maurice Strong, architect of the Kyoto Protocol, described himself as the world's leading environmentalist. He stated explicitly:

"Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn't it our duty to bring that about?" (77)

and

Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class – involving high meat intake use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing – are not sustainable. A shift is necessary." (78)

There is clear evidence that the IPCC has close working relations with sympathetic non-government environmental lobby groups such as Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Friends of the Earth. (79) (80) (81)

In leaked emails from the CRU we see how some scientists assess others according to their ideology. Phil Jones comments about Piers Corbyn who has made clear his skeptical position about CAGW. Jones says of Corbyn:

"He's an utter prat but he's getting a lot of air time at the moment."

Jones continues:

“For his day job he teaches physics and astronomy at a University and he predicts the weather from solar phenomena.”

Jones softens his attitude towards Corbyn because of his ideology:

“He’s not all bad as he doesn’t have much confidence in nuclear-power safety.” (82)

Ronald Brunner, in his paper ‘*Science and the Climate Change Regime*’, discusses the factors which have catalysed public concern and transformed global warming into a political issue. We see a shift from advice about the state of scientific knowledge to political and policy advice about what should be done. (83)

Dr. Andrew Lacis makes the comment:

“There is no scientific merit to be found in the (IPCC) Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department.” (84)

Dr Roy Spencer, climate research scientist at the University of Alabama, knows first hand about the politics behind the IPCC. He said:

“Politicians formed the IPCC over 20 years ago with an endgame in mind: to regulate CO2 emissions. I know, because I witnessed some of the behind-the-scenes planning. It is not a scientific organization. It was organized to use the government-funded scientific research establishment to achieve policy goals.” (85)

But what about the large number of scientists working willingly for the IPCC as contributors/editors/reviewers? Dr Roy Spencer again:

“The climate science community has allowed itself to be used on this issue, and as a result, politicians, activists, and the media have successfully portrayed the biased science as settled.” (86)

The scientific community initially trusted the IPCC only to find that trust misplaced. We can now appreciate why there has been such a massive shift in support away from the IPCC by the scientific community. Whereas many governments and scientists once trusted the methodology and conclusions reached by the IPCC, this situation

has clearly changed as more and more come to realise there are major, systemic problems within the organization.

Some government representatives clearly know there are problems within the IPCC but remain steadfast in their support because they have publicly nailed their global warming colours to the mast. For instance, Senator Timothy Wirth, former under-secretary for global affairs, made clear his political stance when he addressed the U.N. sponsored Rio Earth Summit in 1992:

"We have to ride the global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong." (87)

The former Canadian Environment Minister Christine Stewart stated:

"No matter if the science is all phony.... climate change [provides] the greatest chance to bring about justice and equality in the world." (88)

A decisive majority of scientists now consider the IPCC *"findings"* to be dramatic and in need of closer scrutiny. There is good evidence to suggest that the IPCC process has been associated with a number of other questionable practices, including:

1. Use of unsatisfactory statistical methods by Mann et al. to eliminate the Medieval Warm Period (MWP). The now discredited *"hockey stick"* graph was publicly paraded by Al Gore and the IPCC until it was shown to be wrong by McIntyre, McKittrick and Wegman. Attempts at damage control by the IPCC, via later claims that the MWP was a localised event, have been refuted by 670 scientists from 391 institutions in 40 countries. Peer-reviewed, published papers have clearly established that the MWP was a global event. (89) (90)

Professor Wegman concluded:

"Overall, our committee believes that Mann's assessments that the decade of the 1990s was the hottest decade of the millennium and that 1998 was the hottest year of the millennium cannot be supported by his analysis." (91)

2. The withholding of data from scientists wanting to check IPCC findings despite persistent requests for those data under Freedom of Information legislation. Leaked emails from the CRU strongly suggest that authors conspired to ensure data was not made available to other

researchers who requested such data via Freedom of Information Acts in both the UK and the USA.

Dr Jones attempted to thwart the UK's Freedom of Information Law. He writes in one email:

"The two MMs [McKittrick and McIntyre] have been after the CRU station data for years. If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act (FOI) now in the UK, I think I'll delete the file rather than send it to anyone." (92)

3. The deliberate discarding of raw terrestrial temperature data on which IPCC predictions of global warming are based. Scientists at the CRU have admitted to throwing away much of the raw terrestrial temperature data on which IPCC predictions of global warming are based. This meant that other scientists were not able to check basic calculations which (the IPCC claims) show an increase in global temperature over the past 150 years.

4. Data, collected from weather stations around the world being "*adjusted*" to exaggerate warming. Dr Phil Jones and his colleague Dr Wei-Chyung Wang, stand accused of scientific fraud over a research paper which suggested global warming from Chinese temperature data.

"The fraud Allegation Against Some Climatic Research of Wei-Chyung Wang" has been published in the journal *Energy and Environment*, 2007 by Doug Keenan. (93)

5. Ignoring published research which does not subscribe to dramatic IPCC claims such as solar influence, ocean acidification; sea level rise and glacier melting or ignoring it even if it is included in the scientific reports.

Dr Judith Lean was the only solar physicist who proclaimed solar influences on climate were minimal. Objections were raised in the AR4 second draft comments:

"I would encourage the IPCC to [re-]consider having only one solar physicist on the lead author team of such an important chapter. In particular since the conclusion of this section about solar forcing hangs on one single paper in which J. Lean is a coauthor. I find that this paper, which certainly can be correct, is given too much weight" (94)

There is abundant evidence (ignored by the IPCC) which directly links solar activity and climate change (95)

On the IPCC and ocean acidification, Dr Klaus Kaiser, environmental chemist says:

“The supposedly happening Ocean Acidification, frequently termed “the other effect of CO₂”, is largely based on unrealistic biological experiments, actual measurements over an insufficient time to allow any definite trend delineation, and a lack of understanding of the chemistry involved.” (96)

On the IPCC and glaciation, Dr Georg Kaser, tropical glaciology expert from the University of Innsbruck says:

“This number (of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC) is not just a little bit wrong, but far out of any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing.” (97)

On sea levels, Professor Cliff Ollier, School of Earth and Environment, University of Western Australia says:

“Graphs of sea level for twelve locations in the southwest Pacific show stable sea level for about ten years over the region. The data are compared with results from elsewhere, all of which suggest that any rise of global sea level is negligible.” (98)

6. Ignoring uncontaminated satellite data which show that global warming stopped in the 1970's;

Professor Henrik Svensmark says:

“Indeed, global warming stopped and a cooling is beginning. No climate model has predicted a cooling of the Earth, on the contrary. This means that projections of future climate is unpredictable.” (99)

7. Strong reliance on unvalidated computer models which predict significant global warming over the next 100 years;

Atmospheric Scientist Dr Joanne Simpson:

“Since I am no longer affiliated with any organization nor receiving any funding, I can speak quite frankly....As a scientist I remain

skeptical...The main basis of the claim that man's release of greenhouse gases is the cause of the warming is based almost entirely upon climate models. We all know the frailty of models concerning the air-surface system." (100)

8. De-emphasising other factors which contribute to climate change whilst emphasising the role of carbon dioxide;

Dr Habibullo Abdussamatov, Director of the St Petersburg Space Research Laboratory, bemoans the IPCC's political agenda and insists scientists should stick to the observable facts:

"Global warming results not from the emission of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, but from an unusually high level of solar radiation and a lengthy - almost throughout the last century - growth in its intensity." (101) (102)

9. Ignoring or marginalising criticism of draft chapters of IPCC reports.

Dr Vincent Gray commented in (IPCC WG1 FAR):

"The chief defect of this chapter is the total absence of the main greenhouse gas, water vapour. By comparison, the others are insignificant. The usual excuse for this blatant omission is that computer models are so defective that the only way they can deal with the undoubted importance of water vapour is to relegate it to the status of a "feedback" and so remove its importance from public scrutiny." (103)

His criticisms were ignored.

10. Exaggerating the consequences of (imaginary) global warming.

Dr Theodore Landscheidt:

"Analysis of the sun's varying activity in the last two millennia indicates that contrary to the IPCC's speculation about man-made global warming as high as 5.8°C within the next hundred years, a long period of cool climate with its coldest phase around 2030 is to be expected." (104)

11. Government delegates have adjusted summaries, which typically go out to politicians and the media, to change what scientists have stated in the scientific reports.

Dr Roger Pielke: *“All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not as a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system.”* (105)

Many more errors and omissions, emanating from the IPCC, have been well documented and fully referenced by Christopher Monckton in papers located at the Science and Public Policy site (106)

Summary

The shift in attitude, from the scientific community and the public, about the reliability of the IPCC has changed significantly in recent years. It is now apparent and well documented how the IPCC and its supporters have:

1. Ignored scientific data which conflicts with the notion of CAGW;
2. Promoted the false view that only a minority of scientists oppose the notion of CAGW;
3. Implied incorrectly that scientists, skeptical of CAGW, have few publications;
4. Circumvented the normal peer review system;
5. Falsely claimed there are thousands of scientists associated with the IPCC, who support the notion of a significant human influence on climate;
6. Implied that the IPCC conclusions about CAGW are endorsed by the world's best climate scientists;
7. Relied on the outputs of unvalidated computer models, produced with (admitted) incomplete knowledge about many forcing agents, to make unsubstantiated claims about CAGW;

8. Engaged in practices that are not acceptable within the scientific community. These practices have included:
- (a) Changing statements made by contributing scientists to suggest a more certain and exaggerated conclusion;
 - (b) Making statements which are not supported by the weight of scientific evidence;
 - (c) Applying pressure to persuade writers to tone down criticisms and any uncertainties about IPCC findings;
 - (d) Following a peer review process which lacks transparency;
 - (e) Applying pressure to prevent the publication of papers arguing against the notion of CAGW, those critical of the (now discredited) Mann Hockey-stick graph and those critical of the temperature data provided by the Climatic Research Unit (CRU).

Governments around the world have trusted and planned to act on the advice received from the IPCC, a panel established via the sponsorship of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO). The first chairman of the IPCC was Bert Bolin who (Nairobi, 1989) initially expressed some doubt about the changing climate and human impact:

"There are some key issues on which much uncertainty exists. For example, how much has climate changed in the last 100 to 150 years? How much have human activities contributed to such change?" (107)

How quickly his views changed. In Washington (February, 1990) Bolin made clear his philosophy, saying:

"The fossil fuel issue .. is however undoubtedly the critical one and must be addressed now." (108)

Bolin went on to speak about the financial aid and technology transfer that would be required from developed countries to developing countries.

Ottmar Edenhofer is a leading member of the UN's IPCC. He was co-chair of the IPCC's Working Group III, and a lead author of the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report released in 2007. He made clear the UN's

position:

"The climate summit in Cancun ---- is not a climate conference, but one of the largest economic conferences since the Second World War."

He described what the UN intentions are:

"We redistribute de facto the world's wealth by climate policy." (109)

Bolin was well supported by John Houghton the first chairman of Working Group I, which reported on observed climate change and causes. Houghton held this position from 1988 to 2002. He was instrumental in setting up the Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and the CRU which supplied temperature data to the IPCC. Houghton made clear his religious views about the environment, referring to mankind as *"stewards"* who must look after the Earth *"as God wants it looked after."* (110)

The IPCC is not a scientific body which makes a dispassionate analysis of current knowledge about climate science. Rather it is a political organization driven by the beliefs and ideology of the UNEP and the personal philosophies of those key players within the IPCC.

Some environmental groups, green politicians and an over-excited media were quick to promote the notion of a human-induced overheating planet for their own ends. The IPCC and other aligned groups which stand to profit in various ways from the CAGW scare, need to justify their ongoing existence which essentially depends on government funding and its continued acceptance of the unproven notion of CAGW.

It appears that the real image of the IPCC and its supporters is slowly filtering through to the community at large. Princeton University physicist Dr. Robert Austin told a congressional committee that, unfortunately, climate has become a political science with politically motivated scientists stirring up a CAGW frenzy which is questionable at best. We can understand why the US House of Representatives voted to eliminate funding for the IPCC, saying it no longer wanted to have the IPCC prepare its climate science assessments. (111)

Former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt has called for an independent inquiry into the IPCC saying:

“The IPCC have encountered skepticism, especially since some of their researchers have shown themselves to be fraudsters.” (112)

It is clear that a full independent inquiry into the IPCC and its promoters is needed rather than a repeat of the embarrassing whitewash that masqueraded as an investigation into the IPCC. The review panel was appointed by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and IPCC chairman Rajendra Pachauri. There was no analysis of the accuracy of IPCC climate models; no independent witnesses were called and no scientists, skeptical of CAGW were consulted. IPCC scientists need to be cross-examined under oath and under the guidance of skeptical climate scientists and statisticians.

We could be witnessing the biggest scandal in the history of science and the scientific community needs to stand up and loudly demand a full, independent inquiry into the IPCC and its acolytes. The integrity of science is at stake and public trust of scientists and the scientific process must be restored.

REFERENCES:

- (1) Reported in The UK Guardian, 10th March, 2009.
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/mar/10/nicholas-stern-accuses-climate-change-deniers>
- (2) Grootes (1992). Decade to century climate variability recorded in ice cores.
http://www.gisp2.sr.unh.edu/Contri_Series/full/06.html
- (3) Adams et al. (1999). Sudden climate transitions during the Quaternary.
<http://ppg.sagepub.com/content/23/1/1.short>
- (4)
<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/icecore/greenland/summit/document/>
- (5) Mayewski and Bender (1995). The GISP Ice Coring Effort.
<http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/paleo/icecore/greenland/summit/document/gispinfo.htm>
- (6) <http://deforestation.geologist-1011.net/>
- (7) Petit, J.R., Jouzel, J., Raynaud, D., Barkov, N.I., Barnola, J.-M., Basile, I., Bender, M., Chappellaz, J., Davis, M., Delaygue, G., Delmotte, M., Kotlyakov, V.M., Legrand, M., Lipenkov, V.Y., Lorius, C., Pepin, L., Ritz, C., Saltzman, E. and Stievenard, M. 1999. Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420,000 years from the Vostok ice core, Antarctica. *Nature* 399: 429-436.
- (8) Sime, L.C., Wolff, E.W., Oliver, K.I.C. and Tindall, J.C. 2009. Evidence for warmer interglacials in East Antarctic ice cores. *Nature* 462: 342-345.
- (9)
<http://globalwarming.house.gov/files/HRG/052010SciencePolicy/happer.pdf>
- (10) www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/sres/emission/index.php?idp=500
- (11) <http://www.ipcc.ch/organization/organization.shtml>

(12) http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/publications_and_data_reports.shtml

(13) <http://www.populartechnology.net/2009/10/peer-reviewed-papers-supporting.html>

(14) <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/mar/30/climate-change-nicholas-stern-interview>

(15) <http://www.climatedepot.com/a/9035/SPECIAL-REPORT-More-Than-1000-International-Scientists-Dissent-Over-ManMade-Global-Warming-Claims--Challenge-UN-IPCC--Gore>

(16) http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf

(17) The Heidelberg Appeal:
<http://raymondpronk.wordpress.com/2007/11/20/the-heidelberg-appeal-beware-of-false-gods-and-prophets/>

(18) The Oregon Petition:
<http://www.petitionproject.org/>

(19) The Manhattan Declaration:
http://www.climatescienceinternational.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=63

(20) Open Letter to UN Secretary General:
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/reprint/UN_open_letter.pdf

(21) The Petition by German Scientists to the Chancellor:
<http://www.climatedepot.com/a/2282/Consensus-Takes-Another-Hit-More-than-60-German-Scientists-Dissent-Over-Global-Warming-Claims>

(22) The Leipzig Declaration:
<http://www.his.com/~sepp/policy%20declarations/leipzig.html>

(23) Statement from Atmospheric Scientists:
<http://www.his.com/~sepp/policy%20declarations/statment.html>

(24) Letter to the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate:

<http://www.co2science.org/education/truthalerts/v14/TruthAboutClimateChangeOpenLetter.pdf>

(25) Memorandum submitted by the Institute of Physics to the UK Parliament:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3902.htm>

(26) <http://www.opendemocracy.net/debates/article-6-129-2490.jsp>

(27) <http://www.jameslovelock.org/page11.html>

(28)

http://www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com/letters/Butler_letter_31032008.pdf

(29) (Radio National, 2nd October 2010)

(30) http://epw.senate.gov/109th/Carter_Testimony.pdf

(31) <http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/not-as-advertised.php>

(32) <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2008/sgsm11767.doc.htm>

(33) (34) <http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/not-as-advertised.php>

(35) IPCC peer review not

<http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/findings-main-page.php>

(36) FAR

<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/presentations/valencia-2007-11/pachauri-17-november-2007.pdf>

(37) <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/the-pms-address-to-the-lowy-institute/story-e6frg6nf-1225795141519>

(38) McLean on numbers

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf

(39) http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf

(40) Christy

<http://www.sustainableoregon.com/ipccscientists.html>

(41) Schlesinger on scientists

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2009/02/16/christyschlesinger-debate-part-ii/>

(42) Lindzen

<http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv15n2/reg15n2g.html>

(43) Earlier warming but no doubts

<http://goklany.org/library/World%20Economics%202007%20Response%20to%20S&S.pdf>

(44) Santer changes

<http://www.greenworldtrust.org.uk/Science/Social/IPCC-Santer.html>

(45) MacDonald, G.M. et al. (2000). Holocene Trelene History and Climate Change Across Northern Eurasia. Quaternary research, 53 (3), 302-311.

(46) Balling

http://www.ideasinactiontv.com/tcs_daily/2006/05/inconvenient-truths-indeed.html

(47) <http://climaterealist.com/index.php?id=3477>

(48) Deitz

http://www.americanthinker.com/2011/03/good_bye_kyoto.html

(49) Landsea

<http://stevengoddard.wordpress.com/2010/12/11/repost-chris-landseas-resignation-from-the-ipcc/>

(50) Lindzen

<http://www.john-daly.com/TAR2000/lindzen.htm>

(51) Reiter

http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202007/GW_malaria.pdf

(52) Peiser

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2010/01/19/example-of-the-lack->

of-due-diligence-of-the-ipcc-summarized-by-benny-peiser/

(53) Kapitza

<http://www.h2oaccess.com/articles.php/20090206>

(54) Sonja

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc2602.htm>

(55) Jones to Mann

<http://www.nature.com/climate/2010/1003/full/news.2010.71.html>

(56) Jones to Mann

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/11/21/AR2009112102186.html>

(57) (58) (59)

<http://justgetthere.us/blog/archives/Bishop-Hills-compendium-of-CRU-email-issues.html>

(60) Gray

http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=312&Itemid=1

(61) Ball

http://www.iceagenow.com/Hacked_files_reveal_global_warming_is_a_deliberate_fraud.htm

(62) Plimer

<http://www.australianclimatemadness.com/tag/ian-plimer/>

(63) Ball

<http://uddebatt.wordpress.com/2009/11/21/climate-gate---all-the-manipulations-and-lies-revealed-2/>

(64) Kobus

<http://www.metro.us/boston/international/article/715638--scientists-come-out-against-warming>

(65) Ratcliffe

<http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com/2010/04/astrophysicist-anthropogenic-global.html>

(66) Kapitsa
<http://sites.google.com/site/atmabharathi/pages-you-must-read/challenging-the-basis-of-kyoto-protocol>

(67) Lewis
http://beforeitsnews.com/story/209/646/Physicist_Hal_Lewis_Resigns_Over_Global_Warming_Corruption.html

(68) Carter
<http://www.the-philosopher.co.uk/reviews/counter-consensus.htm>

(69) Austin
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/social/Richard2/fred-upton-climate-change_n_820511_77942970.html

(70) Cox
<http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/35828.html>

(71) Trenberth
<http://aefweb.info/articles59.html>

(72) Renwick
http://www.eap-journal.com.au/archive/v38_i2_03_carter.pdf

(73) Hayden
<http://floppingaces.net/2008/05/07/computer-models-on-global-warming-wrong-again/>

(74) Douglass et al. (2007). A comparison of tropical temperature trends with model predictions. International Journal of Climatology (www.interscience.wiley.com) DOI: 10.1002/joc.1651

(75) Koermer
http://jer-skepticscorner.blogspot.com/2009/05/skeptics-from-around-globe_6697.html

(76) Sedjo
<http://uddebatt.wordpress.com/2010/01/31/climate-gate---all-the-manipulations-and-lies-revealed-259/>

(77) Strong
<http://green-agenda.com/sustainabledevelopment.html>

- (78) Strong
http://www.robodoon.com/global_un_agenda_21.htm
- (79) Greenpeace contact
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/01/29/now-its-greenpeace-reports-cited-in-the-ipcc-ar4/>
- (80) WWF
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/01/24/the-scandal-deepens-ipcc-ar4-riddled-with-non-peer-reviewed-wwf-papers/>
- (81) Friends of the Earth
http://nofrakingconsensus.blogspot.com/2010/01/greenpeace-and-nobel-winning-climate_28.html
- (82) Jones on Corbyn
<http://www.eastangliaemails.com/emails.php>
- (83)
<http://www.springerlink.com/content/r833863k36522784/>
- (84) Lacis
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/02/09/hansen-colleague-rejected-ipcc-ar4-es-as-having-no-scientific-merit-but-what-does-ipcc-do/>
- (85) (86) Spencer
<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2011/02/on-the-house-vote-to-defund-the-ipcc/>
- (87) Wirth
<http://www.nationalcenter.org/dos7130.htm>
- (88) Stewart
<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/policy.html>
- (89) MWP
http://www.cominofoundation.org.uk/PDF/Let_Cool_Heads_Prevail.pdf
- (90) Deing & MWP
http://epw.senate.gov/hearing_statements.cfm?id=266543
- (91) Wegman
http://energycommerce.house.gov/108/home/07142006_Wegman_fact

_sheet.pdf

(92) Jones

<http://politicalintegritynow.com/2009/11/yes-those-infamous-emails-that-debunk-global-warming-enjoy/>

(93) Keenan

<http://www.informath.org/pubs/EnE07a.pdf>

(94) Lean

<http://climaterealist.com/?id=5910>

(95) Solar literature

<http://ks.water.usgs.gov/waterdata/climate/jasr8755.pdf>

(96) Kaiser

<http://climaterealist.com/index.php?id=6141>

(97) Kaser

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=17155>

(98) Ollier

<http://climaterealist.com/index.php?id=3839>

(99) Svensmark

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/09/10/svensmark-global-warming-stopped-and-a-cooling-is-beginning-enjoy-global-warming-while-it-lasts/>

(100) Simpson

<http://drtimball.com/2011/how-the-world-was-bullied-into-silence/>

(101) Abdussamatov

<http://www.canada.com/nationalpost/story.html?id=edae9952-3c3e-47ba-913f-7359a5c7f723>

(102) Abdussamatov H.I. (2009). 'The Sun Dictates the Climate of the Earth, St. Petersburg, Logos Press.

(103) Gray

http://climatechange.thinkaboutit.eu/think4/post/vapourgate_the_vaporised_solar_forcing

- (104) Landscheidt
<http://landscheidt.wordpress.com/papers-by-dr-theodor-landscheidt/>
- (105) Pielke
<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2010/06/16/my-comments-on-questionnaire-on-ipcc-processes-and-procedures/>
- (106) SPPI
<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/>
- (107) "Report of the second session of the WMO/UNEP intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)"
<http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session02/second-session-report.pdf>.
- (108) "Report of the third session of the WMO/UNEP intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)"
<http://www.ipcc.ch/meetings/session03/third-session-report.pdf>.
- (109) Ottmar Edenhofer
<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/554439/201011191859/The-Climate-Cash-Cow.aspx>
- (110) John Ray Institute document
<http://www.jri.org.uk/brief/christianchallenge.htm>
- (111)
<http://www.climatewatch.org/2011/02/19/house-votes-244-179-to-kill-u-s-funding-of-ipcc/>
- (112) Schmidt
<http://icecap.us/index.php/go/joes-blog>

