

**21 MAY 2013**

## **THE IPCC SHOULD BE ABOLISHED**

Ross McKittrick has a recent report entitled

**“What is Wrong with the IPCC ? Proposals for a Radical Reform” at**

**<http://tinyurl.com/cf6lxvy>**

The Report has a foreword by John Howard, former Australian Prime Minister.

It is published by the Global Warming Policy Foundation, whose Chairman is Lord Lawson, former British Foreign Secretary and whose Directors and Trustees include four other members of the British House of Lords.

McKittrick does an excellent job in explaining the origins and structure of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,

He also provides a damning indictment of its failings

He makes the following recommendations for its reform

- Recommendation 1: An objective and transparent Lead Author selection procedure.
- Recommendation 2: A transparent Contributing Author recruitment process.
- Recommendation 3: Appointment of an Editorial Advisory Board and identification of potentially controversial sections.
- Recommendation 4: Explicit assignment of both section authorship and reviewer positions.
- Recommendation 5: Adoption of an iterative process to achieve a final text under the joint supervision of authors, reviewers and editors.
- Recommendation 6: Adoption of a procedure for seeking technical input when necessary from outside the list of authors and reviewers during the assessment process.
- Recommendation 7: Due diligence regarding key supporting papers and full disclosure of all data and methods used to produce original IPCC Figures and Tables.
- Recommendation 8: Immediate online publication of the full report upon finalization, prior to production of summary.
- Recommendation 9: Production of Summary by Ad Hoc group appointed by the Panel based on recommendations from the Editorial Advisory Board.
- Recommendation 10: Release of all drafts, review comments, responses and author correspondence records within 3 months of online publication of the full report.
- Recommendation 11: That the nations involved in the IPCC Panel begin these reforms at once, and if such a process cannot be initiated then those national governments that seek objective and sound advice on climate change issues should withdraw from the IPCC and begin the process of creating a new assessment body free of the deficiencies identified herein.

McKittrick is one of the most active lecturers and writers to have exposed the errors of the “greenhouse” theory.

He is part author, with Christopher Essex of

“Taken by Storm 2007”, Key Press Books Canada

And part author with Essex and Bjarne Andresen of “Does a Global Temperature Exist” at

<http://tinyurl.com/37zsms>

This paper points out that **temperature** is an **intensive** property which means that it only exists for a substance that is in equilibrium. Contrary to the climate models favoured by the IPCC, the climate is constantly varying. The only approach to global temperature measurement, therefore, is to divide the entire system into transient infinitesimal increments of three linear dimensions, plus time, each of which would have a temperature. Such an array could not have a single average because day and night have such different temperature populations that a joint population involving both is heavily skewed, so there are therefore several different and conflicting definitions of an average.

It goes without saying that these measurements cannot currently be made and probably never will be.

It might be remarked that even an acceptable surface temperature in one place is also “elusive” as has been explained by Hansen at

<http://tinyurl.com/y8caby6>

The “Mean Global Surface Temperature Anomaly Record” (MGSTAR), which is regarded by the IPCC as a legitimate guide to Global Temperature, falls far short of being a scientific or mathematically acceptable guide to global temperature trends. If this fact were to be accepted by the IPCC most of its arguments would collapse.

Ross McKittrick has devoted much attention to displaying some of the the defects of this record.

Together with Pat Michaels at <http://tinyurl.com/av88cm4> he showed the record was influenced by socio-economic changes.

Together with Steve McIntyre, he carried out a long fight at <http://tinyurl.com/ahmmr> over the so-called “Hockey Stick” graph which joined past proxy temperatures to the MGSTAR. They showed that there were statistical irregularities in the use of the proxy temperatures, which, it should be said deviate even more sharply from conceivable scientific justification than the MGSTAR itself.

The MGSTAR is based on

- Temperature measurements from a constantly changing set of unrepresentative samples of the earth’s surface.
- It assumes that an average of a daily maximum and minimum temperature can be considered to be a genuine average.
- The conditions of measurement and their control are not standardised.
- The measurements are subjected to a set of averaging procedures for which no plausible estimates of accuracy are supplied.
- Single annual figures in the record are assumed to be constants.

- “Trends” of less than one degree Celsius over one hundred years are assumed to represent disastrous warming when any rational estimates of uncertainty would greatly exceed this amount.

McKittrick seems reluctant to reject MGSTAR completely despite these problems and the conclusions of his book and papers with Christopher Essex, which damage the credibility of the entire IPCC system and make “reform” impossible

## **PERSISTENT DISHONESTY**

The examples of fraud and dubious scientific and mathematical practices by the IPCC given by McKittrick are part of a persistent and continuing pattern of selection, distortion and fabrication throughout the activities of the IPCC which I have documented in the following papers

The Global Warming Scam 2008. <http://tinyurl.com/b356kf3>

Spinning the Climate 2013. <http://tinyurl.com/bf8jnwj>

The Triumph of Doublespeak 2009. <http://tinyurl.com/am5uo4w>

The Greenhouse Revisited 2013. <http://tinyurl.com/9wt26hx>

The “Evaluation” process carried out by the IPCC uses what it calls “attribution”, “likelihood”, “fingerprints”, and levels of “confidence”, which depend on the unacceptable belief that correlation is evidence of causation. They also go to the length of assigning numerical statistical levels of significance which are not based on a population of experimental measurements, but are purely matters of opinion. These are sharp practices bordering on fraud.

I have shown that the IPCC is not an honest independent body but a firmly established political lobby group set up with the task of imposing the global warming theory by any means, controlled by the 195 governments that have signed the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

It needs to be asked why there needs to be a politically motivated organisation to promote a theory of the climate which has not been proved to be correct, despite so much effort, even if it can be “reformed”.

There is already a well established discipline called meteorology which provides all over the world an essential weather forecasting service based on the very latest scientific understanding of the climate. The properties of the so-called greenhouse gases have never proved useful for this task, and current attempts to introduce “long-range” forecasts based on these properties has not been useful. For example, they have failed to predict the repeated cold winters in Britain or droughts in Australia and New Zealand.

## **CLIMATE CHANGE**

The Framework Convention on Climate Change which resulted from the United Nations Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, defined “Climate Change” as

**“a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods”**

They changed the meaning of the term “climate change” which had previously not involved any particular cause, to one restricted only to its being “attributed” to direct or indirect human changes in atmospheric composition. This means that they do not have to prove that all changes in climate have this cause.. All they need to do is to get people to use the term “climate change”, and they will suddenly discover that by saying these words they support the IPCC “attribution” whether they know it or not.

There does not need to be any actual evidence. All that is needed is for somebody, such as an IPCC climate scientist, an environmental activist, a politician, or a journalist, to “attribute” it. The “attribution” does not even need to be “direct”. It can be “indirect” which can be as obscure as they choose it to be.

This device has been an outstanding success. Any “climate change” which is disapproved of, be it a heat wave, cold spell, flood, drought, or hurricane, is today routinely “attributed” to human influence on the atmosphere. Most of the people who use the phrase do not understand that it assumes that “global warming” is actually happening, when the main records which purport to indicate global temperature trends have shown no significant change for 17 years

This definition of “Climate Change” is part of the title of all the Reports of the IPCC to make it plain that their purpose is to promote evidence to support it.

They have made only one concession, included as a footnote in several reports  
**“Climate change in IPCC usage refers to any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as the result of human activity”**

This was added purely to permit study of other influences on the climate apart from human activity, but they were not permitted to be involved in \*change”, only “variability” and throughout all the reports everything is done to claim that “natural variability| is unimportant

## **SUPPRESSING THE SCIENTISTS**

From the beginning there have been scientists who disagreed with the theory that increases in greenhouse gases are harmful but everything has been done to prevent their views from appearing in the IPCC Reports. This process is assisted by the successful attempts to influence editors of scientific journals and to capture the “peer review” process (as described in the “Climategate” emails). Critical comments have been comprehensively rejected and the existence of such activity concealed by secrecy. As a result, few critics now bother to comment at all. Some recognised experts have resigned or expressed their opposition to the entire exercise.

Deliberate bias was made clear in Appendix 4, of the First Report (1990) .in an introduction to a list of Reviewers, with the statement:

**“The persons named below all contributed to the peer review of the IPCC Working Group I Report. Whilst every attempt was made by the Lead Authors to incorporate their comments, in some cases these formed a minority opinion which could not be reconciled with the larger consensus. Therefore, there may be persons below who still have points of disagreement with areas of the Report.”**

The belief of McKittrick that “delegates from the member states.... “oversee and receive the findings of the assessment working groups” is far from the truth.

The “Summary for Policymakers” that is at the beginning of all Reports is dictated, line by line to the “Drafting Authors” of each Report. It represents the “consensus” opinion of these delegates and should not be interpreted as the opinion of the Drafting Authors or of any of the other authors.

Everything is done by these delegates to eliminate from the Reports any opinion which questions the Greenhouse “theory”

They had trouble in enforcement right from the beginning. The First Report (1990) was unashamed propaganda for the climate models for the first 6 Chapters, with actual observations left to Chapter 7

At the beginning they said:

**“The size of the warming is broadly consistent with the predictions of climate models, but it is also of the same magnitude as natural climate variability”**

Readers had to wait to Chapter 7 to find that the models were not “broadly consistent” with the claimed warming,

But they were still being allowed to say that **“The size of the warming.....is also of the same magnitude as natural climate variability”**

This was the only Report prepared to make “predictions” which, it turned out in the text to be exclusively based on the subjective opinions of “experts”. Later Reports admitted that this did not provide a basis for “predictions”, so they only supplied “projections” which were “evaluated” by the same procedure, the subjective opinion of “experts” without any scientifically acceptable evidence.

In the Second Report (1995) the original Working Group I report was approved by the IPCC in December, 1995. The Final Draft had been circulated only to Government Departments, but I was allowed to see it, at the time, by David Wratt

The Report contained a number of opinions that questioned whether the greenhouse theory was proven. One example was the following

**"Finally we come to the most difficult question of all: 'When will the detection and unambiguous attribution of human-induced climate change occur ?. In the light of the very large signal and noise uncertainties discussed in this Chapter, it is not surprising that the best answer to this question is 'We do not know'"**.

The government delegates and their scientific supporters decided that all opinions which did not support the view that greenhouse gases are the exclusive cause of “climate change” must be ruthlessly eliminated. They hired Ben Santer to alter all dissenting opinions. The above statement was then changed to

**"Finally we come to the difficult question of when the detection and attribution of human-induced climate change is likely to occur. The answer to this question must be subjective, particularly in the light of the very large signal and noise uncertainties discussed in this Chapter”**

To which they then added this new material

**"However, evidence from the patterned-based studies reported on here suggests that an initial step has now been taken in the direction of attribution, since**

**correspondences between observations and model predictions in response to combined changes in greenhouse gases and anthropogenic sulphate aerosols:**

- **have now been seen both at the surface and in the vertical structure of the atmosphere;**
- **have been found in terms of complex spatial patterns rather than changes in the global mean alone;**
- **show an overall increase over the last 20 to 50 years;**
- **are significantly different from our best model-based estimates of the correspondence expected due to natural internal climatic variability.**

**Furthermore, although quantitative attribution studies have not explicitly considered solar and volcanic effects, our best information indicates that the observed patterns of vertical temperature change are not consistent with the responses expected for these forcings.**

**The body of statistical evidence in Chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points toward a discernible human influence on global climate. Our ability to quantify the magnitude of this effect is currently limited by uncertainties in key factors, including the magnitude and pattern of longer-term natural variability and the time-evolving patterns of forcing by (and response to) greenhouse gases and aerosols”**

This still admits that they have no proof, only the subjective opinions of their “experts”

The many other changes that were made are listed in my “Spinning the Climate” at <http://tinyurl.com/bf8jnwj>

## **VALIDATION**

There was another fundamental change in the Second Report which must have disturbed the promoters. The First Report had a Chapter headed “Validation of Climate Models”. A Similar Chapter appeared in the First Draft. I commented that since no climate model had ever been validated the title was incorrect. To my surprise, in the Second Draft, they changed the words “Validation” and “Validate” to “Evaluation” and “Evaluate”, no less than 50 times. All subsequent Reports “evaluated” the model results but did not “validate” them.

“Validation” is the term used by computer engineers to describe the rigorous testing procedure that must be carried out before a computer model can be used to make future predictions. It would require an ability to predict past behaviour satisfactorily, but it must also involve evidence that the model can predict future behaviour over all the conditions that the model is used, to an acceptable accuracy. The IPCC have never made such an exercise and only in the Fifth Report drafts has there been any discussion of how it might be done. This means that the models are currently unsuitable for future prediction.

They say of their scenarios

**“Scenarios are not predictions of the future and should not be used as such”.**

and **“Since scenarios deal with the future they cannot be compared with observations”**

They do not give similar advice about the model calculations, but since the final model result is a combination of the model calculation plus a range of scenarios they are effectively telling us to ignore their own opinions on their “likelihood” of happening.

The Second Report ceased to claim that it was able to make “predictions”. The model outputs were merely “projections”, dependent on the opinions of “experts” for the plausibility of their assumptions.

## **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

McKittrick mentions conflict of interest, but he only considers doctrinal conflict of interest, where a difference of opinion is honestly held.

He does not seem to realise that the “Evaluation” process carried out by the IPCC is made by persons who are financed by one or other body committed to promoting the greenhouse theory so they have a financial interest in providing an evaluation opinion which suits their employers. There is ample evidence that failure to do so leads to discrimination and even dismissal. A number of established experts have resigned from the IPCC because they were unwilling to accept this pressure, often to their financial disadvantage.

## **RECENT REPORTS**

The Third Report (2001) had this statement in Chapter 1

**“The fact that the global mean temperature has increased since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and that other trends have been observed does not necessarily mean that an anthropogenic effect on the climate has been identified. Climate has always varied on all time-scales, so the observed change may be natural” .**

In the Fourth Report (2007) the delegates took their revenge and abolished the First Chapter “The Climate System: An Overview” and replacing it with one called “Historical Overview of Climate Change Science” which was little more than a public relations exercise for their own activities. It notably omitted the 90,000 peer reviewed published papers containing measurements of atmospheric carbon dioxide since 1812 compiled by Beck at <http://tinyurl.com/2ebtvnj>

This Fourth Report was challenged to comply with the Official Information Act by publishing comments by reviewers and the responses to them. Not all of these published papers seem to have survived, but the comments and the responses to the Second Draft of the WGI Report are to be found at the Harvard University archive at <http://tinyurl.com/acclvnz>

McKittrick claims to be a reviewer of the IPCC but his name is absent from the earlier reports and occurs only in the list supplied with the WG1 AR4 Report. According to John McLean (June 30 2007) he made a total of 37 comments, 11 to Chapter1, 1 to Chapter 2, 10 to Chapter 3, 14 to Chapter 6 and 1 to Chapter 9.

From the same source I made a total of 1878 comments, some on all Chapters with 572 on the vital Chapter 9. I had 16% of the total.

I have commented liberally on all the Reports except the First and I believe that I am the only person to have done so. In all of the Reports there have been only a small number of persons critical of the claims of the reports and no-one who has stuck it out for several Reports

The manipulation of the data and of the literature that was revealed by the “Climategate Emails” was carried out from the beginning, is still operating, and is supported and endorsed by the signatories of the FCCC.

McKittrick’s recommendations for reform are a set of proposals for the leopard to change his spots. His belief that the IPCC could become “fair” and operate a genuine scientific debate is futile because most of them know that this would lead to their departure.

Recommendation 12 seems to envisage this but there is no need for an international body to impose one point of view on any branch of science. The IPCC should be abolished

To be practical, its operations are so endemic and pervasive that the best we can hope for is their slow departure as the world responds to repairing the disastrous economic burdens for which they can be held responsible

**Vincent R. Gray , M.A., Ph.D.,  
F.N.Z.I.C. Climate Consultant**  
75 Silverstream Road, Crofton Downs  
Wellington 6035, New Zealand  
**PHONE (064) (4) 9735939**  
Email [vinmary.gray@paradise.net.nz](mailto:vinmary.gray@paradise.net.nz)