

# IPCC's Bias Raises Serious Issues of Public Policy

## Contents

1.	Climate debate is filled with confusion about what is true .....	3
1.1	It's about the cause: does man-made CO <sub>2</sub> drive climate change? .....	3
1.2	It's not about effects: ice-caps, glaciers, polar bears or sea levels .....	3
1.3	The AGW hypothesis is unsupported by observational evidence .....	3
1.4	There are newer, better theories - solar, orbital, tectonic, oceanic and cloud .....	3
2.	Observational evidence suggests that CO <sub>2</sub> has little measurable effect.....	4
2.1	The correlation problem .....	4
2.2	The steady level problem.....	4
2.3	The CO <sub>2</sub> lag problem.....	4
2.4	The logarithmic problem .....	4
2.5	The uniformity problem .....	5
2.6	The fingerprint problem .....	5
3.	Why is western intelligentsia convinced of the truth of AGW?.....	5
3.1	UN's IPCC has great credibility as a source of climate alarm .....	5
3.2	UN-sponsored climate alarm builds public concensus.....	5
3.3	Public concensus is needed for major government funding .....	6
3.4	Government funding is needed for 'big science' projects.....	6
3.5	Government-funded 'big science' enlarges bureaucratic power .....	6
3.6	AGW crisis & 'big science' build academic careers.....	6
3.7	AGW belief is propagated by irresponsible media .....	7
3.8	AGW belief feeds the feel-good nature of political correctness.....	7
3.9	AGW belief boosts green power & green social-engineering .....	7
3.10	AGW benefits financial institutions that trade CO <sub>2</sub> securities.....	7
4.	IPCC is politicised .....	8
4.1	It promotes a political conclusion to a problem of physics .....	8
4.2	It is compromised by its own charter .....	8
4.3	Its staff is deliberately alarmist instead of being neutral.....	8
4.4	Its publications are government-directed for government purposes.....	8

5.	IPCC's procedures are corrupt.....	9
5.1	It favours selected insider groups of specialists.....	9
5.2	It perverts the peer review process.....	9
5.3	It corrupts the public comment process.....	9
5.4	It acts unprofessionally towards its own authors.....	9
6.	IPCC is intellectually dishonest.....	10
6.1	It ignores well-documented solar effects.....	10
6.2	It ignores NASA satellite data of the highest quality.....	10
6.3	It cherry-picks data in critical areas of research.....	10
7.	IPCC is scientifically incompetent.....	11
7.1	Its predictions depend entirely on computer models.....	11
7.2	Computer models of climate fail all tests of validity.....	11
7.3	It uses invalid models creates to create false alarms.....	11
7.4	It asserts false certainty without real scientific basis.....	11
8.	IPCC's incompetence has economic consequences.....	12
8.1	It imposes an implicit tax on inexpensive energy.....	12
8.2	It thereby distorts the global economy.....	12
8.3	It leads to creation of questionable CO <sub>2</sub> securities.....	12
8.4	It leads to huge potential claims for compensation.....	12
9.	IPCC's dishonesty has political consequences.....	12
9.1	It diverts resources from immediate environmental crises.....	12
9.2	It risks a loss of faith in science.....	12
9.3	It risks the credibility of UN agencies.....	12
9.4	It could destroy the credibility of green politics.....	13
10.	In summary.....	13

## **1. IPCC's Bias Raises Serious Issues of Public Policy**

### **1.1 IPCC is a source of public confusion and misinformation on climate change**

IPCC was set up in 1988 as a joint panel of the World Meteorological Organisation and the UN Environmental Program, and has its headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. It should be noted at the outset that IPCC is not a scientific body but a governmental one; it employs bureaucrats, not scientists; its chairman, for example, Rajendra Pachauri, is a railway engineer.

IPCC's main role is to produce every five or six years an 'assessment report', the first part of which is called the 'Summary for Policymakers', written by bureaucrats and published first, followed by reports of three working groups, compiled by researchers, which are edited before publication to conform to the 'Summary for Policymakers'.

From the outset, a disinterested observer can see in this process how science can be corrupted to favour bureaucratic policy - and, sadly, this has indeed been the story of IPCC in its brief 21-year history.

### **1.2 Impartial research would focus on all causes of climate change**

Climate is the outcome of transporting heat energy from the Equator to the Poles. An impartial, disinterested panel would consider all the main drivers of changing climate. At the top of the list must come the Sun, that vast thermonuclear furnace at the centre of our universe from which comes all the heat energy received by Earth and indeed by all the planets in the Solar System. In particular, the interactions of solar magnetic cycles, sunspot cycles and cosmic radiation have recently been shown to correlate well over millennial timescales with planetary temperatures.

A disinterested panel would also look at climate change linked to the Earth's orbit (or eccentricity), axial tilt (or obliquity); Earth's axial orientation (or precession); Earth's evolving shape (or dynamic oblateness); Earth's magnetic field; the rotational velocity of Earth's core; tectonic movements of the Earth's surface; volcanic eruptions; circulation patterns of the oceans; salinity and chemistry of the oceans; reflectivity of the Earth (or albedo); variations in atmospheric water vapour, clouds and cloudiness. Somewhere close to last on the list would come minute variations in trace atmospheric gases, such as carbon dioxide.

### **1.3 The AGW hypothesis is unsupported by observational evidence**

IPCC, for reasons of government policy - primarily European government policy - focuses solely on anthropogenic global warming, or AGW, which I shall call catastrophism. Back in the '80s, when temperatures seemed to be rising, after data from the Vostok ice cores were first reported, CO<sub>2</sub>-driven AGW seemed a plausible theory. But since then, more compelling theories have emerged, which IPCC studiously ignores.

It will come as a surprise to many that no researcher has empirically demonstrated the fact of AGW with direct observational evidence. We constantly hear from people who should really know better that climate change science is supposedly 'settled'. But it is central to the scientific method that no hypothesis can be accepted unless it is empirically verified by observation; that accumulation of scientific knowledge never ceases; and science is never 'settled'.

### **1.4 Composition of the atmosphere and carbon cycle calls AGW into question**

The dry atmosphere is 78% nitrogen, 21% oxygen, 0.9% argon, and of the trace gases CO<sub>2</sub> represents 0.0385%, or 385 parts per million by volume. The wet atmosphere holds an average of 1% water vapour, which is 95% of all greenhouse gases, while CO<sub>2</sub> amounts to 3%.

There is an estimated 40 trillion tonnes of carbon on Earth, of which a mere 0.02% - or 760 billion tonnes - takes the form of CO<sub>2</sub>. Of this, about 30% - or 225 billion tonnes - is exchanged with the oceans and vegetation each year; and of this exchange, man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is believed to account for a mere 3% - or 7 billion tonnes.

As a percent of the atmosphere, then, man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is 1% x 3% x 30% x 3%, which is 0.00027% - less than one-third of one thousandth of one percent.

Meanwhile, Nature is releasing far greater quantities of CO<sub>2</sub> into the oceans and atmosphere than mankind. Around 85% of volcanic activity, which releases huge quantities of CO<sub>2</sub>, is under the sea and invisible, as tectonic processes drive the continents apart.

To say, as IPCC does, that climate change is driven by an unsubstantiated theory of man-made CO<sub>2</sub> from three decades ago is, to put it mildly, unscientific.

## **2. Observational evidence suggests that CO<sub>2</sub> has little measurable effect**

There is in fact a theoretical basis whereby rising CO<sub>2</sub> can add to the greenhouse and thereby can cause temperatures to rise; but it remains a hypothesis unconfirmed by direct observational evidence. If anything, the observational evidence runs against CO<sub>2</sub> having any measurable effect; if CO<sub>2</sub> in general has no decisive influence on climate, then man-made CO<sub>2</sub> has no detectable influence at all.

Here are six serious problems about CO<sub>2</sub> as a cause of climate change on which any logical person can make their own judgment.

### **2.1 The correlation problem**

First, the correlation between temperature and CO<sub>2</sub> is weak. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> has risen steadily since spectroscopic measurement began in 1952, but since then temperature has gone down and up, and is now going down. In the past decade, warming has ceased. During the '80s and '90s, CO<sub>2</sub> offered a good theory of climate change; now better theories of this poorly-understood subject, such as solar and oceanic effects, have emerged.

### **2.2 The steady level problem**

Second, looking at history, you find that every millennium or so, there's been a warm period, when civilisations rose and flourished, including the Minoan, the Roman and the Medieval, all of which are believed to have been several degrees warmer than today. Clearly, man-made CO<sub>2</sub> had nothing to do with these warm spells.

### **2.3 The CO<sub>2</sub> lag problem**

Third, re-analysis in 2003 of the original Vostok ice-cores shows that temperature changes precede, and do not follow, changes in CO<sub>2</sub> levels, by an interval of around 800 years. The reason isn't known, but it is surmised that warmer air leads to warmer ocean surfaces, and warming oceans emit CO<sub>2</sub> in the same way warming beer does. Just as lung cancer doesn't cause smoking, more CO<sub>2</sub> doesn't cause warmer air – it's the other way round.

### **2.4 The logarithmic problem**

Fourth, it is generally known that the greenhouse effect of diminishes logarithmically with increasing concentration. The largest lick of climate forcing by CO<sub>2</sub>, by far, comes from the first

50ppmv of CO<sub>2</sub>; the next 50ppmv absorbs far less IR heat energy, and so on, for each doubling of CO<sub>2</sub>. If the pre-industrial level of 270ppmv were doubled to 560ppmv, the theoretical increase in temperature would be about 0.5°C - far less than the several degrees projected by the 21 computer models on which IPCC relies.

## **2.5 The uniformity problem**

Fifth, the largest emitters of man-made CO<sub>2</sub> are north of the Equator. It follows that, if rising CO<sub>2</sub> levels are mainly caused by man, rising concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> should be detected first in the northern hemisphere. Yet recent research based on airborne carbon isotopes shows that CO<sub>2</sub> levels change uniformly and simultaneously all over the globe. This supports the concept that rising levels of CO<sub>2</sub> are due mainly from respiration from the oceans.

## **2.6 The fingerprint problem**

Sixth – and this is the clincher – the theory of CO<sub>2</sub> as the main source of temperature change fails a simple test against observed real-world data. Greenhouse theory, as reflected in all 21 computer models of climate relied upon by IPCC, requires that when CO<sub>2</sub> levels rise, a belt of warm air should form around the tropics between 8km and 12km of altitude, in order to raise the temperature of the surface. In 2006, NOAA's US Climate Change Science Program published balloon measurements of temperature, collected by the UK Met Office over the 20 warming years from 1979 to 1999, up to 25km; these data show clearly that no such pattern exists. In this direct test of AGW theory against observed data, it fails.

You don't need to be a degreed physicist to understand these arguments – just an informed and critical thinker.

# **3. Why is western intelligentsia convinced of the truth of AGW?**

## **3.1 As a UN body, IPCC has great credibility**

As a UN body, and viewed by the world as a scientific group - which it isn't - IPCC has great credibility. Its conclusions are accepted by many nations, including Australia, and used as the basis of national policies. For example, when Professor Ross Garnaut was asked by Kevin Rudd to prepare the intellectual case for emission trading, he was directed not to question the IPCC position, but to take it as his starting point.

However, contradictions in IPCC's charter, flaws in its motivations, and basic errors in its publications have laid the basis for a huge and costly historical mistake. What the politicians in countries like Australia overlook is the fundamental corruption of IPCC's role, structure and processes.

## **3.2 UN-sponsored climate alarm builds public consensus**

A government isn't going to redirect a large lick of public funding to a research project unless it is to solve a major public problem, preferably one that is both well-publicised and frightening. The more a research project is seen to be a response to a full-blown crisis, the better chance it has of getting and keeping a large publicly-funded budget.

### **3.3 Public consensus is needed for major government funding**

An obvious explanation of government support for AGW is its revenue potential. Western governments are manoeuvring for control of huge flows of cash, as is the Rudd government here in Australia, from schemes like emissions trading.

As an example of a revenue grab, the Rudd-Wong scheme is breathtaking. It would establish a bureaucracy that will estimate, and on the basis of its estimates, extract from the nation's most competitive industries, great sums of quasi-taxation, without little recourse.

It would certainly undermine this country's low-cost electricity from low-cost coal, with appalling consequences in lost jobs, higher costs, destroyed industries and lower growth. The four large brown-coal-fired electricity plants in Victoria, all now owned by private-sector investors, would be bankrupted. The nation's metals smelting industries would be sent offshore and its cement industry killed, to be replaced by imports.

This entire self-destructive project is proposed on the basis of an unproven hypothesis and would have no detectable effect whatsoever on either local or global temperature or climate.

### **3.4 Government funding is needed for 'big science' projects**

There are other less obvious explanations and one lies in the way national science budgets are funded, and the way big science projects are staffed and managed.

As research projects have become more difficult and costly, more of the funding has had to come from governments. Likewise, as research teams have become larger and more costly, control has become more managerial, and less tolerant of viewpoints that question the ideologies of the governments behind the funding.

Any questioning of government priorities is seen by management of a research project as a threat to public funding of big science. A powerful conformity emerges to compel adherence to the party line, to protect the budgets of big science projects and to protect the careers and mortgages of many scientists.

Professor Garth Paltridge tells an eye-opening story in his book 'The Climate Caper'. When he was rounding up funding for the Antarctic CRC, of which he became director, he held a conference of prospective donors. Afterwards, he spoke candidly to the press about his professional views. A couple of days later, he got a call from a senior person at CSIRO, from which he was seeking a large lick of the dollars, saying that unless he buttoned his lip, the funding was at risk. In other words, if he down-played the sense of crisis, the government would see no point in supporting his project.

### **3.5 Government-funded 'big science' enlarges bureaucratic power**

Large-scale public funding of big science projects has dangerous consequences. First, it increases the power of the bureaucracy; second, it augments the power of international science bureaucrats; third, it amplifies the voice of their allies in the global intelligentsia.

These effects become serious when the research becomes an industry, which must protect its funding and the livelihoods and perks of its those who depend on it. It can lead, all too easily, to slanted research, slanted publications and slanted conclusions.

### **3.6 'Big science' projects support academic papers and careers**

### **3.7 AGW belief is propagated by irresponsible media**

Journalists are often inexperienced and always forced to meet tight deadlines. They're also under career pressure to deliver headlines that sell papers - 'if it bleeds, it leads'. They don't have the time or resources to research the validity of a scientific conclusion. And they usually have a left-of-centre view of the world and of solutions to its problems. Consequently, they tend to accept the IPCC line, particularly when it is repeated by their own government.

The media has a great deal to answer for in perpetuating unproven views of climate science. Instead of investigating the issue, the media merely repeat press releases and declarations. Instead of questioning a proposition, they report it as factual. In the CO<sub>2</sub> debate, a decaying media, driven by the need to sustain circulation demonstrates that if an unsubstantiated report is repeated often enough, it passes for truth and is believed.

### **3.8 AGW belief feeds the feel-good nature of political correctness**

The political class of the West - particularly in Europe - believes unquestioningly in AGW. Those who don't are derided a 'flat-earthers'. They are treated with the contempt typically dished out to scientologists. Why is this? It is politically incorrect to question AGW. Political correctness is the stock-in-trade of the supposedly educated, well-informed intellectuals of the West. Political correctness has its own pay-off, though: it delivers a socially-acceptable halo and a personal inner glow of virtue. And so it is for belief in AGW.

### **3.9 AGW belief boosts green power & green social-engineering**

On environmental issues, the loudest voice is that of the green element. By its nature, it is anti-development and favours less rather than more consumption of resources. It is consequently anti-business, anti-globalisation and tends to be anti-American as well, all of them issues ready for media beat-up.

Publicity gives the green element a role in the game of political power. In a nation with preferential voting, like Australia, second preferences of the Green Party are essential to the Labor Party's electoral success. Consequently, a labor government will twist itself into knots to lock Green preferences in place.

What is not discussed are the consequences of Green policies. Research shows that CO<sub>2</sub> levels rise almost exactly in line with per capita GDP, because energy use must rise in order to lift living standards. With today's technology, you can only cut back on emissions by cutting back on living standards.

Given the world's dependence on coal as its main source of affordable electricity, on oil and petrol for transport, and cement for construction, outcomes envisaged by green social engineers can be achieved only by stopping growth in the developing world entirely; and by cutting living standards in developed countries back to the days of the horse-and-cart.

### **3.10 AGW benefits financial institutions that trade CO2 securities**

It's informative to see the split in industry councils between producers and traders. The practical types that actually make something oppose climate catastrophism; but those who trade securities, among which CO<sub>2</sub> credits and permits already loom large, want a piece of the profitable new market that catastrophism offers.

## **4. IPCC is politicised**

### **4.1 It promotes a political conclusion to a problem of physics**

Climate arises from redistributing the energy received from the Sun from the Earth's Equator to its poles, through the oceans and atmosphere. It's a matter of energy transport. Energy transport is a problem of physics. Physics is based on measurement. In this debate, what you must measure are trends in oceanic and atmospheric temperature and in atmospheric carbon dioxide.

It turns out that atmospheric temperature hasn't actually been measured with the precision needed to establish a correlation with CO<sub>2</sub> trends, and measurement of ocean temperature, until 3000 Argo buoys were installed in 2003, has been spotty. We have a surface temperature record that's unreliable; a satellite temperature record that's brief; an ice-core record of CO<sub>2</sub> that's flat for unknown reasons; and a spectroscopic CO<sub>2</sub> record that's rising steadily for reasons in heated, even ideological, dispute.

But the fundamental problem is that IPCC has been, from the outset, committed by its charter to a prior conclusion. Many of IPCC's specialists strive to do a professional job of reporting the measurements, but IPCC procedures and habits corrupt the process, as we'll shortly see. As a result, its assessment reports stoke a debate that has less and less to do with physics and more and more to do with politics, culture and ideology.

### **4.2 It is compromised by its own charter**

Set up in 1988 as a stepchild of the World Meteorological Organisation and the UN Environment Program, IPCC benefits from the sponsorship by governments and the credibility of science. Yet IPCC itself is no more than a secretariat - although a richly-funded one - which commissions technical work from outside specialists.

But it was a bastard child from the moment of birth, due to its stated mission: to assess "the scientific, technical and socioeconomic information relevant to understanding the risk of human-induced climate change". If you set up a bureaucracy to investigate human-induced climate change, naturally the first thing it's going to do is establish that it's actually there.

The result is that civil servants who benefit from the supposed man-made climate crisis now drive IPCC's programs and the agenda of its publications and conferences. Its entire approach has been one-sided from its inception, instead of impartial, as that of a scientific body should be. In the 21 years of its life, the historical objectivity of science has been increasingly subordinated to IPCC's slanted views.

### **4.3 Its staff is deliberately alarmist instead of being neutral**

### **4.4 Its publications are government-directed for government purposes**

Every five years or so, IPCC publishes 'assessment reports', of which the fourth and latest, called AR4, came out in 2007. The most-quoted part is the government-written Summary for Policymakers, which, pursuant to IPCC rules, was published before the rest of it. In other words, the political conclusions preceded any objective evaluation of scientific knowledge both temporally and philosophically. This by itself is a corruption of the scientific process, but it goes unremarked in official quarters.

The research portions are prepared by three working groups, the first - WG1 - focuses on the physical science; the second - WG2 - on impacts; and the third - WG3 - on mitigation. Since Working Groups 2 and 3 start off by accepting the conclusions of WG1, if these are wrong, then

the entire work product of WG2 and 3 must also be wrong. So the entire edifice of AR4's logic rests on the credibility of WG1; and the entire credibility of WG1 rests on ch.9 of its 'physical science report': if ch.9 is undermined, then IPCC's entire AGW argument is compromised and all the catastrophist conclusions of the AR4 report collapse.

Disclosures show that ch.9 had 53 authors, all of whom were part of a network who previously worked together. The last exposure draft received comments from many reviewers, only 5 of whom explicitly endorsed the entire chapter. So a more accurate view on IPCC's basic claim in AR4 - that man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is causing temperatures to rise dangerously - is that 53 possibly biased authors and 5 reviewers agree with it – far from IPCC's duplicitous claim that 2,500 'scientists' (most of whom are actually not scientists at all, but engineers, lawyers, activists and government officials) agree upon so-called 'settled science'.

## **5. IPCC's procedures are corrupt**

### **5.1 It favours selected insider groups of specialists**

A classic example of IPCC's insider problem can be seen in the notorious hockeystick graph, first published in 1998. It purported to show average temperatures for the last 1000 years declining gently until the last century, and then climbing sharply like the blade on a hockeystick.

In IPCC's Third Assessment Report's Summary for Policymakers, published in 2001, the notorious hockeystick graph was prominently featured. When it was discredited by independent researchers, a US Senate subcommittee investigated and upheld those who had exposed it. The subcommittee's report, in scathing terms, attributed the episode to IPCC having relied on a small coterie of tree-ring specialists, most of whom peer-reviewed each other's work.

This insider-originated but basically faked graph formed the basis to IPCC's answer to the critical question of average temperatures of the recent past. It exposed in a dramatic way a pattern of favouritism and a lack of professionalism at IPCC.

### **5.2 It perverts the peer review process**

The peer-review system itself, designed to promote rigorous science by weeding out poor research, has been twisted backwards by IPCC. In the normal procedure, the names of peer reviewers are kept confidential to encourage independent criticism, while the author's work is public. In IPCC's peer review system, according to one respected contributor, the procedure is inverted: the peer reviewers' names are disclosed to the authors, but the authors' deliberations are kept confidential, so that disagreements can be hidden and conforming results only published.

The violence this does to normal scientific protocols is simply ignored.

### **5.3 It corrupts the public comment process**

IPCC was recently forced by independent researchers, using the freedom-of-information process, to publish the comments of reviewers to the drafts of its Fourth Assessment Report. The results are eye-opening for the obviously selective manner in which comments are treated. Comments supportive of AGW line were largely accepted, while comments questioning it were ignored or dismissed, often in ways that disregarded the issues raised.

### **5.4 It acts unprofessionally towards its own authors**

A well-known case is that of Paul Reiter, head of the Insects and Infectious Disease Unit at the Pasteur Institute in France, and a contributing author of IPCC's Third Assessment Report. In 2001 Reiter was nominated by the U.S. State Department to be a lead author of the health chapter in the Fourth Assessment Report, but was turned down by IPCC in favour of lesser-qualified candidates with suitably catastrophist views on the health threats of AGW.

IPCC's action was almost certainly because Reiter had objected to being listed as one of the falsely-tallied '2,500 IPCC scientists' who supported AGW. It was only after he threatened legal action that IPCC agreed to remove his name from what was clearly an inflated list of AGW supporters. Reiter has not been alone in his experience with IPCC.

## **6. IPCC is intellectually dishonest**

### **6.1 It ignores well-documented solar effects**

Practically all of the energy on Earth comes from the Sun. As climate is an outcome of energy transport around the Earth, it is intuitively obvious that small changes in the Sun's behaviour, and in the Earth's orientation to the Sun, must play a large role in shaping our climate. Not according to IPCC.

None of its assessment reports gives more than passing attention to the increasing wealth of data and newly-developed theory on solar effects as a driver of our climate. In 1801 Sir William Herschel published the first evidence that solar magnetic flux - sunspot activity - has a direct relationship to agricultural harvests. In 2007, Henrik Svensmark proved experimentally the previously unknown mechanism of low-level cloud formation and showed that low-level cloud cover decreases when there are fewer sunspots.

It has also been known for centuries that predictable changes in Earth's eccentricity, or the shape of its orbit, in its obliquity or axial tilt, and in its precession or axial orientation, all are likely to affect climate. These effects build on each other harmonically, causing many different solar cycles of differing frequency and duration, all of which clearly have an effect on climate.

All of this is ignored by IPCC.

### **6.2 It ignores NASA satellite data of the highest quality**

Satellite measurement of temperature began in 1979, using microwave sounding units to infer temperature from the energy of atmospheric oxygen molecules, and has been continued with increasingly accurate instruments on later satellites. These measurements have the great advantage of recording atmospheric temperature at uniform altitudes in every corner of the globe, including the 71% of the Earth's surface that is ocean.

Although satellite data has been criticised for technical reasons – mainly the issue of orbital decay, for which corrections can be made - it has been unarguably validated by weather balloon measurements, which go back 20 years earlier. IPCC does not use satellite data, claiming the record is brief and unreliable, despite the fact that it is more comprehensive and offers better comparability.

### **6.3 It cherry-picks data in critical areas of research**

It ignores data that don't fit its predetermined political conclusion that man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is

dangerously heating the planet. Take the historical record of CO<sub>2</sub> levels as an example. IPCC uses data from ice-cores, which show CO<sub>2</sub> levels flat for thousands of years, even though it isn't known why this should be so. It ignores measurements made in the last two centuries using the gas analysis method, which show much higher and more variable levels. It also ignores data from a different source, concerning the size of stomata or apertures in tree leaves that absorb CO<sub>2</sub>, which confirm the historical gas analysis results.

It is fundamental to proper science that you consider all data, however inconvenient - not just those that fit the outcome you want.

## **7. IPCC is scientifically incompetent**

### **7.1 Its predictions depend entirely on computer models**

This is the field where IPCC is most vulnerable, because all of its predictions of climate catastrophe depend on computer modelling. Computer modelling is reliable when all parameters are known with absolute certainty. In climate science, relatively little is known with certainty about its infinitely complexity and the result is garbage in, garbage out.

IPCC publishes predictions and conclusions based on 21 completely unreliable computer models, which have widely varying outcomes. All these models are 'tuned' - that is to say tweaked - to deliver outcomes consistent with the party line. None shows any accuracy when run backwards, and none has accurately predicted temperature in close-in years that have elapsed since the predictions were made.

### **7.2 Computer models of climate fail all tests of validity**

To think that informed governments of intelligent beings are going to risk their wealth on predictions from sources such as these would be laughable if it weren't so serious.

### **7.3 It uses invalid models creates to create false alarms**

This is where we come to all the alarming stuff about sea-level rises, polar bears drowning, mosquitoes spreading disease, and so on. All of these scenarios depend directly on computer-modelled outcomes, which as we've seen, have neither theoretical rigour nor scientific credibility.

We are teaching little children that all of these catastrophes lie ahead of them. Even among adults we are beginning to see catastrophist-induced anxiety. The other side of the story, it seems, isn't told. We don't hear of the natural sinking of shorelines, nor the sea-level stasis of islands, nor of the many polar bear populations that are thriving, nor of historical outbreaks of mosquito-borne disease in high latitudes.

This sort of alarmism isn't science. It's propaganda.

### **7.4 It asserts false certainty without real scientific basis**

In its Fourth Assessment Report, published in 2007, IPCC states in ch.9, p.665, "Greenhouse gas forcing has very likely caused most of the observed global warming over the last 50 years." It defines 'very likely' as a certainty level of 90%.

This figure is technically meaningless and unscientific, because it is based only on questionable computer modelling we looked at earlier. For an international body that purports to gather and

publicise current scientific knowledge to make such false claims to certainty is a disgrace. For a national government in a boy-scout country such as Australia to take such unprofessional work seriously is an even greater disgrace.

Ross McKittrick, professor of environmental economics at the University of Guelph, Ontario, wrote in Canada's National Journal on October 1, 2009: "The IPCC review process, of which I was a member last time, is nothing at all like what the public has been told: Conflicts of interest are endemic, critical evidence is systematically ignored and there are no effective checks and balances against bias or distortion."

## **8. IPCC's incompetence has economic consequences**

### **8.1 It imposes an implicit tax on inexpensive energy**

### **8.2 It thereby distorts the global economy**

### **8.3 It leads to creation of questionable CO<sub>2</sub> securities**

### **8.4 It leads to huge potential claims for compensation**

Finally, when the great inverted pyramid of treaty, legal, financial and social obligations that have developed, particularly in Europe, collapses, as it inevitably will following the realisation that the global warming scare was based on illusion, the financial costs will be great and the consequent liabilities enormous.

You have only to look at the alphabet soup of CO<sub>2</sub>-based securities already traded to get a sense of the claims that are likely to follow. The litigation could last for years and lead to the misdirection of yet more resources that could be put to better use elsewhere.

## **9. IPCC's dishonesty has political consequences**

### **9.1 It diverts resources from immediate environmental crises**

There are serious environmental problems that are killing people today - lack of food, lack of clean water, pollution of the oceans, pollution of rivers, loss of wildlife. It makes no sense at all - even if AGW were proven, which of course it isn't - to tax the developed world and spend huge amounts of money to combat a problem that wouldn't harm anyone for decades.

### **9.2 It risks a loss of faith in science**

When the scientific world eventually accepts that CO<sub>2</sub> catastrophism was never more than a hypothesis, and that more compelling theories about the drivers of climate exist, the credibility of science will be compromised. International and national scientific bodies will be devalued, academic institutions will be tarnished and reputations will be destroyed.

### **9.3 It risks the credibility of UN agencies**

Likewise with the reputation of the UN. It is already recognised to be a dysfunctional organisation of vast expense, limited capability and an inherent habit of contradicting its own

principles. When one of its best-known agencies is exposed as having recklessly led the world down a mistaken but hugely costly path, the reputation of the UN as a whole may not recover for decades.

And this will brush off on many other areas of international collaboration, which will be less likely to find support from western voters.

#### **9.4 It could destroy the credibility of green politics**

Also among the losers in this coming debacle will be mainstream politicians who espoused the 'science is settled', 'moral imperative of our time' mantras. It will include journalists, mainly at the ABC and the Fairfax press, who espoused CO<sub>2</sub> catastrophism. It will also include lobbies that bought into this line, such as ACTU and Australian Industries Group, and will exclude those that didn't, such as AWU and Minerals Council of Australia.

The greatest loser is likely to be the greens. It's hard to see how they could recover from such a devastating defeat on the facts, from such loss of face and public humiliation. When the voting public realise the climate is getting colder, sea levels aren't rising and catastrophism was a load of bunk, they will be unforgiving. The credibility of the Greens may never recover.

### **10. In summary**

IPCC is politicised; it is conflicted; it is procedurally corrupt; it is scientifically incompetent; and its deceptions will have costly consequences politically, diplomatically and legally.

It's astonishing to reflect that western civilisation continue it and its pronouncements.

I'd like to close with a quote from Dr. Richard Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in Boston - one of the most credible climate researchers in the academic world and a tenured professor who need not fear for his funding or career.

In an article titled 'Resisting climate hysteria', published in Quadrant, he wrote:

“The fact that the developed world went into hysterics over changes in global mean temperature anomaly of a few tenths of a degree will astound future generations. Such hysteria simply represents the scientific illiteracy of much of the public, their susceptibility to substitution of repetition for truth, and the exploitation of these weaknesses by politicians, environmental promoters, and, after 20 years of media drum-beating, many others as well. Climate is always changing.”