

United Nations IPCC Climate Alarmists Discredited Yet Again

Propaganda Disguised as Science and Sold by Supporters of Climate Change

Graham Williamson

June 2011

The United Nations IPCC has been caught again trying to pass off propaganda from environmental activists and vested interests as being “scientific research” ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#)). According to Gunter ([2](#)):

“Canadian researcher Steve McIntyre discovered earlier this week that the IPCC’s recent report on alternative energy — which asserted that it was possible to convert the world to 80% green energy by 2050 if politicians would simply tax conventional sources and spend billions on alternative sources — was lifted largely from Greenpeace reports.

The lead author of the IPCC report turns out to be Sven Teske, a Greenpeace climate and energy campaigner, who the IPCC does not identify as such in either the report or its media releases. Mr. Teske is also the author of much of the Greenpeace material on which the IPCC report is based, in effect making him a peer reviewer of the validity of his own material.

Imagine the reaction, for instance, if a government had produced a fossil-fuel friendly report based on work by an oil sands engineer, without revealing the source, and had paid the same engineer to write its own summary of his initial work.

That is what the IPCC has stooped to in this case and it eliminates any credibility the organization had left on the climate file.”

The seriousness of the IPCC’s misrepresentation that the report is based upon properly conducted scientific research has also been noted by an editorial in the **Washington Post** ([1](#)):

“Since this statement was supposedly based on actual scientific research, Steve McIntyre, editor of the Climate Audit blog, did what the IPCC must have assumed nobody would bother doing. He checked the sources cited in the report. He discovered the IPCC’s banner claim was not the work of prestigious and disinterested scientists toiling away in a laboratory, but of hacks with a political agenda and direct financial stake in the issue.”

Although the IPCC replied that they considered the report to be ([1](#)) “balanced”, the **Washington Post** responded ([1](#)):

“Claims of balance are hardly credible when the process is infiltrated by ideologues and industry insiders looking to apply the veneer of science to their craven grab for other people’s cash. Fortunately, the days when leftists could get away with passing off their global-warming scare stories unchallenged are over. Skeptics smell blood and closely examine every document, frequently identifying gaping holes in logic and credibility.”

Lynas, cited by Lloyd, described the report as being characterised by a “scandalous conflict of interest” ([3](#)):

“Activist and author Mark Lynas said: A more scandalous conflict of interest could scarcely be imagined. This campaigner for Greenpeace was not only embedded in the IPCC itself, but was, in

effect, allowed to review and promote his own campaigning work under the cover of the authoritative and trustworthy IPCC. While the journal-published version looks like proper science, the propaganda version on the Greenpeace website has all the hallmarks of a piece of work that started with some conclusions and then set about justifying them."

This latest controversy represents another instance, in a long line of instances, of improper or deliberately fraudulent misuse of supposed "climate science", or corruption of the scientific process, by the IPCC ([4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#), [15](#), [16](#), [17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#)), all of course in pursuit of their global political agenda.

The disgraceful history of the IPCC has recently been summarised by Gunter([2](#)):

"The period from November 2009 to March 2010 was a bad time for climate-change alarmists. That four-month period included the posting of thousands of emails and computer files from leading climate scientists showing that they had been cooking their global-warming data, working together to keep independent researchers from examining their raw figures and pressuring academic journals against publishing studies that contradicted the man-made climate-change orthodoxy.

Also during that time, it was shown that the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) had included questionable data on Himalayan glacier melt in its major 2007 climate assessment report and that it had done so deliberately to provoke government leaders to speed up environmental legislation. Indian climate scientist Murari Lal, the scientist in charge of the IPCC's glacier chapter, admitted he was aware at the time that the melt prediction had not been peer-reviewed, but included it anyway because "we thought that if we can highlight it, it will impact policy-makers and politicians and encourage them to take some concrete action."

By the end of March 2010 it had been shown that at least 16 claims of impending climate doom in the IPCC's vaunted 2007 report had been based on work done by environmental activists, most of which had not received independent reviews before being swallowed whole by the UN climate body. For instance, the IPCC's insistence that up to 40% of the Amazon rain forest was under imminent threat came from a World Wildlife Fund-International Union for the Conservation of Nature joint report written by a scientist-consultant and a freelance environmental journalist.

Of course, since that dark period, the environmental Sanhedrin has worked hard to re-establish its control over the climate-change debate. Four whitewash investigations — one conducted by one of the leading investors in wind power in Europe — have sought to exonerate the scientists most deeply enmeshed in the Climategate email scandal."

Even former believers in climate alarmism have become aware of the scientific fraud and reversed their position ([4](#), [5](#), [12](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#)). As is noted by David Evans ([12](#)):

"I am a scientist who was on the carbon gravy train, understands the evidence, was once an alarmist, but am now a skeptic. Watching this issue unfold has been amusing but, lately, worrying. This issue is tearing society apart, making fools out of our politicians..... We are now at an extraordinary juncture. Official climate science, which is funded and directed entirely by government, promotes a theory that is based on a guess about moist air that is now a known falsehood. Governments

gleefully accept their advice, because the only ways to curb emissions are to impose taxes and extend government control over all energy use. And to curb emissions on a world scale might even lead to world government — how exciting for the political class!”

Professor John Christy, a former lead author of the IPCC who has seen the workings of the IPCC from the inside, warns that IPCC data is biased and unreliable and there is no scientific evidence of catastrophic human caused global warming ([18](#), [19](#), [20](#)). According to Professor Christy ([20](#)):

“Regarding the Hockey Stick of IPCC 2001 evidence now indicates, in my view, that an IPCC Lead Author working with a small cohort of scientists, misrepresented the temperature record of the past 1000 years by (a) promoting his own result as the best estimate, (b) neglecting studies that contradicted his, and (c) amputating another’s result so as to eliminate conflicting data and limit any serious attempt to expose the real uncertainties of these data.”

Christy concludes in his submission to Congress in March, 2011 ([20](#)):

“Because this issue has policy implications that may potentially raise the price of energy significantly (and thus essentially the price of everything else), the U.S. Congress should not rely exclusively on the U.N. assessments because the process by which they were written includes biased, false, and/or misleading information about one of the most murky of sciences – climate.”

Christy has even observed other IPCC lead authors admitting that their contributions are not necessarily determined by the scientific facts, but rather by the desired political objective, which was stated as creating compliance with UN objectives and treaties ([19](#)).

Climate alarmists in Australia and around the world, so eager to enforce compliance with their extreme political agenda, often seek to spread terror, fear and anxiety by blaming extreme weather events upon human caused climate change. Extremists in Australia have even sought to exploit fear in Australians by blaming the Queensland floods on human caused climate change. Professor Christy however, looks in detail at these claims and points out ([18](#)):

“The tragic flooding in the second half of 2010 in NE Australia was examined in two ways, (1) in terms of financial costs and (2) in terms of climate history. First, when one normalizes the flood costs year by year, meaning if one could imagine that the infrastructure now in place was unchanging during the entire study period, the analysis shows there are no long-term trends in damages. In an update of Crompton and McAneney (2008) of normalized disaster losses in Australia which includes an estimate for 2010, they show absolutely no trend since 1966.

Secondly, regarding the recent Australian flooding as a physical event in the context climate history one sees a relative lull in flooding events after 1900. Only four events reached the moderate category in the past 110 years, while 14 such events were recorded in the 60 years before 1900. Indeed, the recent flood magnitude had been exceeded six times in the last 170 years, twice by almost double the level of flooding as observed in 2010. Such history charts indicate that severe flooding is an extreme event that has occurred from natural, unforced variability.

There is also a suggestion that emergency releases of water from the Wivenhoe Dam upstream of Brisbane caused “more than 80 per cent of the flood in the Brisbane River. ... Without this unprecedented and massive release ... the flooding in Brisbane would have been minimal.” (The

Australian 18 Jan 2011.) (See <http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2011/02/flood-disasters-and-human-caused.html> where Roger Pielke Jr. discusses extreme events and supplies some of the information used here.)”

Since the IPCC version of the “science” has been thoroughly discredited this probably explains Mr Combet’s determination not to answer enquiries and the government’s refusal to establish a true public scientific debate on the matter. But why does the government continue to base its policies upon discredited pseudoscience? Is it because, as suggested by David Evans (12), “to impose taxes and extend government control over all energy use. And to curb emissions on a world scale might even lead to world government”?

IPCC corruption of the peer review process pertaining to their “**The Science of Climate Change 1995** report has also been noted by Professor Seitz (21):

“This IPCC report, like all others, is held in such high regard largely because it has been peer-reviewed, That is, it has been read, discussed, modified and approved by an international body of experts. These scientists have laid their reputations on the line. But this report is not what it appears to be-it is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists listed on the title page. 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.”

IPCC corruption and distortion of scientific data have been further summarised by Professor Seitz (4):

“The IPCC is pre- Programmed to produce reports to support the hypotheses of anthropogenic warming and the control of greenhouse gases, as envisioned in the Global Climate Treaty. The 1990 IPCC Summary completely ignored satellite data, since they showed no warming. The 1995 IPCC report was notorious for the significant alterations made to the text after it was approved by the scientists – in order to convey the impression of a human influence. The 2001 IPCC report claimed the twentieth century showed ‘unusual warming’ based on the now-discredited hockey-stick graph. The latest IPCC report, published in 2007, completely devaluates the climate contributions from changes in solar activity, which are likely to dominate any human influence.” And, quote: “we do not currently have any convincing evidence or observations of significant climate change from other than natural causes.”

Booker has described the IPCC as (13) “an institution now so discredited and scientifically corrupted that only those determined to shut their eyes could possibly defend it.”

The problem is, though proven false, many still continue to perpetuate the lies and fraud upon which the carbon dioxide tax is based, just to protect their careers and jobs (12):

“The whole idea that carbon dioxide is the main cause of the recent global warming is based on a guess that was proved false by empirical evidence during the 1990s. But the gravy train was too big, with too many jobs, industries, trading profits, political careers, and the possibility of world government and total control riding on the outcome. So rather than admit they were wrong, the governments, and their tame climate scientists, now outrageously maintain the fiction that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant.”

Or in the words of Moran (15):

“The battle against measures to reduce carbon emissions is however hardly over. The issue has fuelled too many careers in politics, science, public service and the media for its beneficiaries to quietly move on. Recent public relations barrages by the CSIRO and gatherings in Canberra and Melbourne of the many beneficiaries of the scare is being repeated around the world.”

Summary

The evidence is clear and unequivocal, the IPCC and their claims of anthropogenic global warming have been thoroughly discredited by independent climate scientists from around the world. Further, the corruption and distortion of scientific data and peer review processes by the IPCC has destroyed the scientific credibility of the organisation.

Why does the Australian government continue to exploit community fears based upon fraudulent claims? Is it just because climate alarmism has become a very attractive and lucrative career choice, or is it to further the global political agenda of the UN and please their masters in the UN?

Of even more concern is the fact that IPCC associated scientists in Australia continue to express more concern about the scientific credibility of their independent non-IPCC aligned scientific colleagues than about the scientifically discredited IPCC which they seem to continue to pledge unconditional support to. The perception that IPCC scientists prefer to align themselves with reports prepared by environmental activists rather than their scientific colleagues should be immediately rectified.

References

1. **UN Climate Propaganda Exposed**, *The Washington Times*, 17/6/2011;
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jun/17/un-climate-propaganda-exposed/>
2. Lorne Gunter, **The IPCC Loses its Last Credibility**, *National Post*, 16/6/2011;
<http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2011/06/17/lorne-gunter-the-ipcc-loses-its-last-credibility/>
3. Graham Lloyd, **Greenpeaces’s Key Role in UN Climate Study**, *The Australian*, 18/6/2011;
<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/greenpeaces-key-role-in-un-climate-study/story-fn59niix-1226077352408>
4. S. Fred Singer, ed., *Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate: Summary for Policymakers of the Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change*, Chicago, IL: The Heartland Institute, 2008. http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/22835.pdf
5. Craig Idso, S. Fred Singer et al, **Climate Change Reconsidered**, *2009 Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC)*, The Heartland Institute 2009.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/2009report.html>
6. Robert M Carter; **Climate: The Counter Consensus**, Stacey International, London, 2010
7. Richard Lindzen, **Resisting Climate Hysteria: A Case Against Precipitous Climate Action**, 26/7/2009.
<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2009/07/resisting-climate-hysteria>

8. Richard Lindzen, **Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus**; Spring 1992, Cato Institute • 1000 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. • Washington D.C. 20001-5403
<http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv15n2/reg15n2g.html>
9. Richard Lindzen, **The Climate Science Isn't Settled**; *The Wall Street Journal*, 30/11/2009.
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html>
10. http://www.galileomovement.com.au/galileo_movement.php
11. http://www.tech-know.eu/uploads/Understanding_the_Atmosphere_Effect.pdf Joseph E. Postma, **Understanding the Thermodynamic Atmosphere Effect**, March 2011. See also <http://climaterealist.com/index.php?tid=816>
12. David Evans, **Climate Models go Cold; Carbon warming too minor to be worth worrying about**, *Financial Post*, 7/04/2011, <http://opinion.financialpost.com/2011/04/07/climate-models-go-cold/>; *Speech given to the Anti-Carbon-Tax Rally in Perth, Australia, on March 23.*
13. Christopher Booker, **Amazongate: New Evidence of the IPCC's Failures**, *The Telegraph* (UK), 30/1/2010;
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7113582/Amazongate-new-evidence-of-the-IPCCs-failures.html>
14. Marc Sheppard, **The IPCC Should Leave Science to Scientists**, 8/2/2007;
http://www.americanthinker.com/2007/02/the_ipcc_should_leave_science.html
15. Alan Moran, **Climate Change Requiem**, *The Drum*, ABC TV, 8/4/2010;
<http://www.abc.net.au/unleashed/33488.html>
16. Marc Morano, **Manufactured 'Science': Another IPCC Scientist Reveals How UN Scientists talked about 'trying to make IPCC report so dramatic that US would just have to sign Kyoto Protocol'**; <http://www.climatedepot.com/a/5064/Manufactured-Science-Another-IPCC-Scientist-Reveals-How-UN-Scientists-talked-about-trying-to-make-IPCC-report-so-dramatic-that-US-would-just-have-to-sign-Kyoto-Protocol>
17. Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts, **Surface Temperature Records: Policy Driven Deception?** *Science and Public Policy Institute* (SPPI), 27/8/2010; http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/surface_temp.pdf
18. John R. Christy, Written Statement of John R. Christy The University of Alabama in Huntsville, Subcommittee on Energy and Power Committee on Energy and Commerce, 8 March 2011;
<http://republicans.energycommerce.house.gov/Media/file/Hearings/Energy/030811/Christy.pdf>
19. John Christy, **No Consensus on IPCC's Level of Ignorance**, *BBC News*, 13/11/2007;
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7081331.stm>
20. John R. Christy, **House Science, Space and Technology Committee, Examining the Process concerning Climate Change Assessments**, 31 March 2011;
http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/ChristyJR_written_110331_all.pdf
21. Frederick Seitz, **A major deception on 'global warming'**, *Wall Street Journal*, New York; Jun 12, 1996;
http://stephenschneider.stanford.edu/Publications/PDF_Papers/WSJ_June12.pdf