

## Heaven and Earth IPCC

The IPCC is clearly an ascientific political organization in which environmental activists and government representatives are setting the agenda for a variety of reasons including boosting trade, encouraging protectionism, adding costs to competitors and pushing their own sovereign barrow (sic).

### Why the International Panel on Climate Change?

#### Early History

In 1827 Joseph Fourier suggested that the Earth's atmosphere traps heat radiated by the sun.

In 1860 John Tyndall reported that it is only the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere that have this property.

In 1896 Svante Arrhenius tried to calculate the effect of CO<sub>2</sub> that was being added to the atmosphere – he calculated that if the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> were to double, the temperature would rise by 5 Centigrade degrees – he was wrong.

In 1938 Because of the warming in the 1920's and 1930's English meteorologist Guy Chandler suggested that the temperature rise might be due the release of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere from human activity.

Chandler argued that the increased CO<sub>2</sub> would be good for agriculture – he was right. Chandler also argued that CO<sub>2</sub> might dampen the effects of the next inevitable ice age. As soon as Chandler had argued that CO<sub>2</sub> was good for humans, the climate started to cool (1940-1976)

#### Climate Scares

June 24, 1974 – Time magazine warned that we would suffer from a new ice age

April 28, 1975 – So did Newsweek.

!976 – National geographic also.

April 3, 2006 – Time had a special report on global warming – the effects of the predicted global cooling on humans in 1974 were exactly the same as the effects on humans in 2006.

In 1977 Climatologist Stephen Schneider co-authored a book warning off the horrors of global cooling.

In 1975 Lowell Ponte states in his book on global cooling:

Global cooling presents humankind with the most important social, political, and adaptive challenge we have had to deal with for 110,000 years. Your stake in the decisions we make concerning it is of ultimate importance: the survival of ourselves, our children, our species.

We only need to substitute the word “warming” for “cooling” and we have the identical alarmism 30 years later.

Meanwhile the climate stubbornly refuses to cooperate with the computer models and the writers of alarmist popular articles and books.

### The Opportunists Arrive

During the Cold War environmental groups were anti-nuclear groups.

After the end of the Cold war it was difficult for environmental groups to attract attention – many were looking for a new global problem to tackle.

In 1988 - the establishment by the UN of the international Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) gave an opportunity to make global warming the main theme of environmental groups.

This theme had the ability to attract public interest and it did.

In 1989 global warming was discussed by the US Senate Committee on Science, Technology and space chaired by Senator Al Gore. The committee heard submissions by:

- Dr. Roger Revelle – he had taught Gore at Harvard
- Dr. James Hansen – Director, Goddard Institute for Space Studies

The summer of 1988 was one of drought, fires in Yellowstone National Park, and sweltering weather in Washington, DC.

Hansen announced at a Senate hearing that global warming had arrived – evidence urging caution and that the science was controversial was dismissed.

The Climate Action Network was formed.

The media went into years of brouhaha about global warming  
Fellow travelers boarded the bandwagon at every opportunity.

The cause became fashionable amongst climate experts such as Robert Redford, Barbara Streisand, Meryl Streep and numerous other show business folk

Those that had other scientific views were attacked.

In the New York Times Gore even compared “true believers”, such as himself, to Galileo who bravely stood up to the truth against the blind orthodoxy of the time.

### The IPCC

In 1990 the first IPCC report was issued –it was gathered by many climatologists, meteorologists, environmentalists, and political activists.

These reports comprised a three-part scientific report under the IPCC’s directed headings.

Three working groups had authors who contributed to a series of chapters under the guidance of lead authors and a lead chapter author.

These people are touted as the 2500 scientific experts who constitute a consensus.

In the 1996 report on the impact of global warming on health – some authors were environmental activists

In the 2007 report the health effects of global warming were dealt with by two lead authors – one of whom was a hygienist and another was a specialist in coprolites (fossil faeces) Those who drove the publication of the chapters on the health effects of global warming had no formal expertise in the chapters' subject material – especially tropical diseases.

The second stage of the IPCC process is that a draft “Summary for Policymakers” is submitted to governments – each of which can insist upon changes.

These changes are made behind closed doors – the scientists who wrote three bulky volumes have no avenue for objections to political changes – the final draft of the “Summary” forms the basis for a negotiating process between a few lead scientists and politicians.

This is not the process of science and is not a peer review process – it is a process of politics!!!

***The IPCC process is related to environmental activism, politics, and opportunism. It is unrelated to science.***

It is commonly cited that the IPCC's Fourth assessment was written by 2500 scientists – a head count shows that there were 1656 authors and many of them were authors of many parts of the report.

Some of them used their given name in one part, used an initial in another part, and used an abbreviation in another.

Furthermore, if we investigate the biographies of the 2500 “climate scientists” we find that many are not even scientists.

To claim that this group of 2500 people represents the world's top scientists is untrue.

It seems that of the 1190 separate individuals who wrote the scientific part of the report – many were not scientists but were political and environmental activists.

The “Summary” is significantly different in key areas from the main scientific report.

The “Summary” is the most widely read, publicized and quoted part of the various IPCC reports.

The “Summary for Policymakers” using the expert ‘scientific’ opinion in the chapter on health effects of global warming was able to categorically state “climate change is likely to have wide-ranging and mostly adverse effects on human life with significant loss of life.”

The “Summary” predicted that 60% of human were vulnerable to malaria – leading to an additional 50-60 million cases per year. This was contrary to expert opinion ignored by the IPCC.

The IPCC reports gave the global warming campaign enormous momentum.

In 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro attracted 20,000 environmental activists from all over the world and politicians from 170 countries.

In 1996 the IPCC reports became bolder.

The 1996 “Summary for Policymakers” claimed that “The balance of evidence suggests that there is discernible human influence on global climate.”

The public was convinced that the august body of IPCC scientists had given a considered consensus opinion.

### Deceit in IPCC Reporting

What was not known then was that after the authors of Chapter 8 had signed off, a lead author had added the statement above about “discernable human effect” and deleted passages in Chapter 8 that stated:

*None of the studies above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases (and)*

*No study to date has positively attributed all or part (of the climate change observed) to man-made causes (and)*

*Any claims of positive detection and attribution of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced (and) When will an anthropogenic effect on climate be identified? It is not surprising that the best answer to this question is ‘We do not know’.*

The lead author then added references to his own work which showed warming from 1943 to 1970 – However, when a full set of data from 1905 to after 1970 was analyzed by others, no warming was seen.

There were dissenters:

- “The Wall Street Journal” had a blistering editorial exposing the IPCC process.
- The former president of the National Academy of Scientists wrote an article entitled “Major Deception on Global Warming”.

The IPCC continued to claim a consensus of scientists despite the fact that the “UN Climate Change Bulletin” reported in 1996 that only 10% of 400 American, Canadian, and German climate researchers expressed strong agreement that they are ‘certain that global warming is a process already underway.’

Some 48% of those surveyed stated that they did not have faith in global climate forecast models.

In 1997 this finding was confirmed by a survey of climatologists employed by 50 states in the USA.

Nevertheless, the IPCC and the media still claimed consensus as support for their findings.

## Misleading (or false) Analyses

One of the persistent problems that the IPCC faced was the Little Ice Age (1280-1850 AD) and the Medieval Warming (900-1300 AD).

Evidence from a great diversity of sources showed that during the Medieval Warming, the global temperature was a few degrees higher than today.

This created a problem for the IPCC because there were no major CO2 emitting industries at that time.

***The solution was simple and elegant – change history.***

By creating a ‘hockey stick’ graph that showed that the Little Ice Age and the Medieval Warming did not exist and that temperatures started to rise dramatically in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century – clearly the result of industrialization.

In 2001 the IPCC’s report used the ‘hockey stick’ as proof that we were all doomed to fry and that it was our fault!

It was highlighted on the first page of the “Summary for policymakers” and was shown another four times in the 2001 “Summary for policymakers”

The IPCC’s intent was clear – the media went into a frenzy, governments had even more pressure from environmental lobby groups, and the global warming juggernaut increased its momentum.

***It took eight years to show that the ‘hockey stick’ was a fraud.***

The IPCC – without explanation – quietly withdrew the ‘hockey stick’ from the “Summary for policymakers” in subsequent publications and had it buried in a scientific chapter of the 2007 report.

Many policy makers, environmental groups, and the media conclude an IPCC “Summary for Policymakers” is actually the consensus view of a large number of scientists.

It is not.

It is the consensus of governments with a great diversity of agendas.

And at times the “Summary for Policymakers” has been underpinned by fraud that has been undetected by environmental agitators, journalism, or the public.

The IPCC is clearly an ascientific political organization in which environmental activists and government representatives are setting the agenda for a variety of reasons including boosting trade, encouraging protectionism, adding costs to competitors and pushing their own sovereign barrow (sic).

Climate change can be summarized:

- The Earth's climate has always changed with cycles of warming and cooling long before humans appeared on Earth. Numerous overlapping cycles range from 143 million years to 11.1 years. These cycles can be greatly affected by sporadic unpredictable processes such as volcanoes.
- Measured global warming in the modern world has been insignificant in comparison with these natural cycles.
- Although man-made increases in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> may theoretically make some contribution to temperature rise, such links have not been proven and there is abundant evidence to the contrary.
- Contrary to nearly two dozen different computer models, temperature has not increased in the last decade despite an accelerated input of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere by human activities.
- Other factors such as major Earth processes, variable sun activity, solar wind and cosmic rays appear to have far more significant factor on the earth's climate than previously thought. The IPCC has not demonstrated that the Sun was not to blame for recent warmings and coolings.
- Humans have adapted to live at sea level, at altitude, on ice sheets, in the tropics and in deserts. As in the past, humans will again adapt to any future coolings or warmings.

Excerpts from "Heaven and Earth" by Ian Plimer  
pp 17-23