

Edited

The Deception: Make an Unproven Theory Become Fact

Starting in 1990, the IPCC produced Summaries with each increasing the probability of their claim of a clearly discernible human signal.

Despite evidence discrediting claim after claim, the process did not stop.

It continued with the 2013 Assessment Report 5 (AR5).

In the face of failed predictions (projections) they increased their claim of certainty in their results from >90% to 95%.

It continues the pattern of ignoring the obvious—there are none so blind as those who will not see.

Throughout IPCC history a combination of events drove the misconceptions forward—overriding any attempts to point out errors, omissions and deliberate deceptions. Mainstream media bought into and promoted the unproven theory.

Massive amounts of government funding went through the WMO national agencies to support research that proved the theory.

Scientists who challenged were denied funding and marginalized.

National environmental policies were introduced based on the misleading information of the Summaries.

Very few people read IPCC Science Reports, and most wouldn't understand them if they did.

This is especially true of the chapter on climate models.

However, it is the most critical area to IPCC claims that human CO2 is causing warming.

They produce the predictions used to threaten impending doom.

Yet, despite their failures, they retain not so much credibility as awe.

Limitations of the models were manifest in the switch from making forecasts to producing scenarios; a move forced by the consistent failure of the forecasts as early as the 1995 Report.

Despite the switch, the public continues to believe they were making forecasts and IPCC scientists did nothing to disabuse them.

This is a vital part of the deception.

In the Science Report produced by Group I they provide a range of temperature scenarios.

Of course, the sensationalist media always focus on the highest numbers, implying they are predictions.

The deception is part of the entire pattern of IPCC behaviour and once again occurs in the gap between the Science report and the Summary for Policymakers.

The latter specifically says they are predictions in several places:

Based on current models we predict:95 and Confidence in predictions from climate models96

Nowhere is the difference more emphasized than in this comment from the Science Report in TAR:

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

Now you know why the IPCC made sure they released the Summary first.

World policy based on the output of the IPCC models is already bringing disasters.

We are told model reliability was poor, but has improved.

They have not improved in 18 years.

Harrabin's comment about the Reading Conference says: So far modellers have failed to narrow the total bands of uncertainties since the first report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1990.⁹⁷ Koutsoyiannis et al confirmed this in April 2008 where in an article they found: The GCM (General Circulation Models) outputs of AR4 (FAR) as compared to those of TAR, are a regression in terms of the elements of falsifiability they provide...⁹⁸ Most devastating is their finding: This makes the future climate projections not credible, but this is not surprising given even a very brief examination of the models.

Roger Harrabin, a BBC reporter, quotes Professor Roy Spencer saying: He thinks clouds are impossible to model at present. Imagine using a global climate model that cannot handle clouds as the basis for policy to devastate world economies.

Meanwhile, the IPCC violated many scientific principles. As Green and Armstrong note: We audited the forecasting processes described in Chapter 8 of the IPCC's WG1 Report to assess the extent to which they complied with forecasting principles.

We found enough information to make judgments on 89 out of a total of 140 forecasting principles.

The forecasting procedures that were described violated 72 principles.

Many of the violations were, by themselves, critical

The forecasts in the Report were not the outcome of scientific procedures.

In effect, they were the opinions of scientists transformed by mathematics and obscured by complex writing.

Research on forecasting has shown that experts' predictions are not useful.

We have been unable to identify any scientific forecasts of global warming.

Claims that the Earth will get warmer have no more credence than saying that it will get colder.

Ironically, the IPCC model forecasts are also their weakness because the public are very aware of weather forecast failures.

AGW proponents tried to deflect the cynicism by saying there was a difference between weather and climate forecasts.

The problem is climate is the average weather, so the mechanisms are the same. For example, Dr Donald Dubois noted:

If the major climate models that are having a major impact on public policy were documented and put in the public domain, other qualified professionals around the world would be interested in looking into the validity of these models.

Right now, climate science is a black box that is highly questionable with unstated assumptions and model inputs.⁹⁹ Or, as Dr. David Wojick explained: The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of false alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates.¹⁰⁰ New Scientist reported that Tim Palmer, a leading climate modeller at the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts in Reading England said: I don't want to undermine the IPCC, but the forecasts, especially for regional climate change, are immensely uncertain.¹⁰¹ Additionally, they report that he speaks to the discrepancy between faith in IPCC Reports and reality: ...he does not doubt that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has done a good job alerting the world to the problem of global climate change. But he and his fellow climate scientists are acutely aware that the IPCC's predictions of how the global change will affect local climates are little more than guesswork.

They fear that if the IPCC's predictions turn out to be wrong, it will provoke a crisis in confidence that undermines the whole climate change debate.¹⁰² The crisis in confidence about the climate debate is good news.

However, a growing problem is the loss of credibility for science on all issues, especially the environment. Emeritus Professor Garth Paltridge explains what is happening:

Basically, the problem is that the research community has gone so far along the path of frightening the life out of the man in the street that to recant publicly even part of the story would massively damage the reputation and political clout of science in general.

And so, like corpuscles in the blood, researchers all over the world now rush in overwhelming numbers to repel infection by any idea that threatens the carefully cultivated belief in climatic disaster.¹⁰³

We now know, through leaked emails from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia (UEA), how a small group who were also members of the IPCC, created a totally false picture supposedly based on science.

Some have described what the IPCC achieved as similar to Lysenkoism. The Skeptics Dictionary explains: Under Lysenko's guidance, science was guided not by the most likely theories, backed by appropriately controlled experiments, but by the desired ideology. Science was practiced in the service of the State, or more precisely, in the service of ideology.¹⁰⁴ Lysenko's version of genetics dominated and seriously diverted Soviet science from 1948 to 1965 until finally rejected.

Certainly the concept that human CO2 causes warming and climate change was based on unproven theory used by people with an ideology. They used instruments of state to dominate the science. They also attacked and abused anyone who dared to pursue proper science.

The small group who controlled the IPCC were unlikely to change their tune. A pattern that was borne out by the release of IPCC Report AR5 in September 2013, which denied the fact that for 17 years global temperature declined slightly while CO2 levels continued to increase.

The group, led by Canadian Donna Laframboise, was responding to IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri's comment in the Times of India: IPCC studies only peer-review science. Let someone publish the data in a decent credible publication. I am sure IPCC would then accept it, otherwise we can just throw it into the dustbin.¹⁰⁵ In addition, they found that: 21 of 44 chapters in the United Nations' Nobel-winning climate bible earned an F on a report card released today. Forty citizen auditors from 12 countries examined 18,500 sources cited in the report—finding 5,600 to be not peer-reviewed.

This raises questions about how and why so many people, especially scientists, were taken in by the deception that concerns Mann. It is instructive to understand how different groups became part of the so-called consensus.

The core IPCC people were carefully selected and most of them worked at the CRU.

The Ad Hoc Committee Report on the 'Hockey Stick' Global Climate Reconstruction commonly known as The Wegman Report said:

As analyzed in our social network, there is a tightly knit group of individuals who passionately believe in their thesis. However, our perception is that this group has a self-reinforcing feedback mechanism and, moreover, the work has been sufficiently politicized that they can hardly reassess their public positions without losing credibility.

Wegman identified most of the people involved with the leaked information from the CRU. IPCC participants are chosen by the national weather agencies of each member of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) required people who would achieve the political and scientific objective of identifying human activities as the cause of global warming, and later climate change, generally referred to as Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) theory. Their work effectively thwarted the standard scientific method of disproving the theory.

Scientists who dared to question the theory were derisively called skeptics.

When this epithet didn't stop them, they were called deniers with its holocaust connotations.

Most of the so-called skeptics were well qualified but excluded from the IPCC, making it a carefully selected group. Some, such as Richard Lindzen²¹², Alfred P Sloan professor of meteorology at MIT, participated—hoping to have reasonable scientific input but eventually gave up.

There's little doubt, Lindzen said, that the IPCC process has become politicized to the point of uselessness. How did the IPCC maintain control and convince many, including political leaders, they were right and were the authority?

Beyond using UN agencies as vehicles, they had the challenge of running an apparently open process while keeping total control.

They controlled who participated and who were the lead authors, especially of critical chapters. Richard Lindzen notes: IPCC's emphasis, however, isn't on getting qualified scientists, but on getting representatives from over 100 countries...the truth is only a handful of countries do quality climate research.

Most of the so-called experts served merely to pad the numbers.

The Deliberate Corruption of Climate Science by Tim Ball Phd