

Date published: Monday, February 4th, 2012
Latest update:

APPENDIX 2

The United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, UN IPCC

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with,
all parts of and appendices to the document entitled *CSIROh!*

In addition to specific references cited within the text below, the four following links provide information on the UN IPCC. They each contain many further references:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/scientific_untruths.php

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/political_scam_exposed.php

www.conscious.com.au

The UN IPCC is intimately associated with CSIRO. It relies on CSIRO for extensive input into UN IPCC reports to national governments and media worldwide. Its reports are publicly endorsed by CSIRO.

The UN IPCC is the basis of climate policies of both parties in the current Labor-Greens coalition minority government.

It has a self-developed and styled reputation as the world's top climate science body. Its reports are the basis of many national governments' climate policies and taxes.

The UN IPCC has existed for almost a quarter of a century. Since 2009 it has received wider and deeper scrutiny. Is it worthy of guiding our inherent human care for our planet? Can it be relied upon? Is CSIRO acting responsibly in ceding national sovereignty over climate science to the UN IPCC?

Definitions

Please refer to Appendix 1d for definitions of the words *science*, *scientist*, *scientific*, *corruption*, *lie*, *fraud* and *propaganda*.

1. UN IPCC damned by the world's peak scientific academic body, the Inter Academy Council, IAC that exposes the issue of conflicts of interest

The Climategate scandal tarnished the UN IPCC globally. It essentially forced the UN IPCC to be scrutinised. As a result, the UN IPCC requested the world's peak scientific

academic body, the Inter Academy Council (IAC) to review processes and procedures used in the UN IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report (AR4), 2007.

The IAC released its report in August 2010 report. The report's Executive Summary deceptively failed to convey the report's essence. Yet no window dressing can hide the clear comments and devastating message in the body of the report.

After extensive detailed analysis of the IAC report, Peter Bobroff AM says, quote: *"The body of the IAC Report contained many serious and substantial criticisms concerning: conflict of interest, political interference, bias, poor treatment of uncertainty, vague statements not supported by evidence, failure to respond to critical review comments, and various management problems. These matters are not merely academic quibbles but impact directly on the integrity of the science assessment. The statements on bias indicate that AR4 was written by people with conflicts of interest and obvious bias who examined only the papers that suited them and who rejected or ignored any critical review comments and published evidence in conflict with the IPCC's view. The poor treatment of uncertainty brings into question every one of the 800 likelihood and confidence statements in Working Group 1 of AR4. This refutes the credibility of AR4"*.

Item 2 here: <http://tome22.info/Top/AnnotatedDocuments.html#id2>

Concise Overview: <http://tome22.info//Docs-Ann/IACReport-Overview.html>

The body of the IAC's report has been swept aside by the Australian Academy of Science and the Department of Climate Change, or at best it seems they seemingly deliberately or negligently ignored the report. Yet the Department of Climate Change agreed in principle to all the IAC report's recommendations. Do the Department and Academy know yet not disclose?

Respected retired journalist Tony Thomas provides a succinct analysis here:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/6/our-planet-saving-science-lobbyist-the-integrity-of-the-australian-academy-of-science>

He includes significant comments on the role of the Australian Academy of Science.

The Academy's President when the IAC report was released was Professor Kurt Lambeck. He was reportedly responsible for monitoring the IAC's Executive Summary. He failed in his responsibility under IAC guidelines to ensure that the report's Executive Summary reflected the body of the report. Wouldn't a financial adviser be jailed for such non-disclosure and/or misrepresentation?

The IAC's report's key findings are listed on pages 8 and 9 here:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/SteffenMPCCC&IPCC.pdf>

In summary, they are:

- Bias: precautions necessary to produce a credible unbiased scientific assessment or systematic review are well known by reputable scientists yet repeatedly ignored;
- Uncertainty downplayed and even removed: Many AR4 conclusions were based on little or no evidence, and were not traceable to underlying science, if it existed at all;

- Conflict of interest: The UN IPCC lacked provisions covering conflict of interest;
- Management: UN IPCC management did not conduct an unbiased scientific assessment as indicated by significant shortcomings uncovered by the IAC.

Tony Thomas' summary is, quote: *"The inquiry was into the IPCC's impartiality, accuracy and balance, not into the science. The report found "significant shortcomings in each major step of IPCC's assessment process".[32] (Try substituting the word every for each.) The report concluded, "Some fundamental changes to the process and the management structure are essential."[33] Specifically,*

Review editors were not ensuring that authors heeded reviewers' comments. They should "ensure that genuine controversies are adequately reflected in the [IPCC] report".[34]

In the "impacts" section of the 2007 report, "authors reported high confidence in some statements for which there is little evidence" and had made some statements deliberately vague so they could claim "high confidence" for them: "Such statements have little value."[35] The Summary for Policy Makers "contains many such statements that are not supported sufficiently in the literature, not put into perspective, or not expressed clearly."[36]

The IPCC responses to proven errors were "slow and inadequate" and IPCC leaders [IPCC head Rajendra Pachauri, obviously] were hurting the IPCC's credibility by straying into political advocacy.[37]

The IPCC's processes for selecting key authors and science papers were poorly understood and not transparent.[38] [This would enable reports to be "stacked" to deliver a particular agenda]

IPCC authors were not ensuring that unpublished and non-peer-reviewed literature were critically evaluated.[39] [In fact, such grey literature comprised 30% of all the 2007 report's citations].[40]

There had been "opportunities for political interference with the scientific results" during final negotiations on the reports' key summaries.[41]

So how did the Australian Academy, led by Cory, react to the announcement of this important report, on which it was strongly represented? The Academy said nothing. Then, seven months later, on page 40 of the Academy's annual report, signed by Cory, we read: "The report released on 30 August 2010 concluded that the process employed by the IPCC had been successful overall but recommended a range of reforms particularly in relation to management structures to strengthen procedures." Move along, nothing to see here.

The IPCC itself then began watering down and rejecting key elements of the IAC's "fundamental" and "essential" recommendations. The Australian Academy did not react. It's called Totschweigetaktik, or "death by silence". In a frank e-mail, a Fellow and Academy office-bearer explained:

Needless to say, any adverse findings do great damage to the credibility of climate scientists as a whole, especially in the current climate of almost religious opposition to the acceptance of climate change science as a whole. Regretfully the climate change nay-sayers apply different ethical standards

when it comes to their own unsubstantiated proclamations! They remind me of Tea Party activists.[42]

Cory says the IAC report was outside her professional area. The Academy is necessarily selective on what third-party material it endorses or publicises, she says. An example was the Academy's comments on the 2012 Gonski education report, where the Academy had a direct interest. She believes Lambeck and Zillman worked on the IAC review as scientists, not Academy representatives."

Thus the UN IPCC was biased, was managed in a way as to be unscientific, was open to conflicts of interest at many levels and attributed high confidence on little evidence and to vague statements."

Please refer to associated comments in the radio interview of Professor Will Steffen available at:

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20111020-aj2-willsteffen.mp3>

Although the whole interview is revealing, the relevant portion is from eight minutes and 30 seconds onwards. To save you time and to assist your understanding the annotated transcript for that portion is available at:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/Steffen_transcript_highlighted.pdf

For the UN IPCC's latest reports (2001, 2007) Working Group 2 (WG2) writing on supposed consequences of global warming was doing so as its sister Working Group 1 (WG1) was supposedly identifying whether or not global warming was even occurring and whether or not it was attributable to human CO₂. Simultaneously Working Group 3 was working on supposed measures to address warming and its cause. This was before any cause was known. The only way this could be done is by presuming the cause before work started.

2. UN IPCC has no evidence for its core claim of warming by human CO₂.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer reveals no evidence exists.

UN IPCC Lead Author claiming human CO₂ caused warming has no evidence.

UN IPCC data itself contradicts UN IPCC's core claim.

The UN IPCC's latest report to national governments and media is The Fourth Assessment Report, AR4, published in 2007. It includes just one chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂. That sole chapter, chapter 9 of Working Group 1, WG1, provides no empirical scientific evidence or any logical scientific rationale for its false core claim about human CO₂.

That chapter's equivalent sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ in the preceding 2001 UN IPCC report, the Third Assessment Report (TAR) contains no empirical scientific evidence or scientific rationale showing causation.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray has over 60 years real-world experience as a research scientist across varied industries and scientific fields, including 22 years in climate. He reviewed all four UN IPCC reports to national governments and media: 1990, 1995, 2001 and 2007.

Dr. Gray provided by far the most comprehensive, detailed and thorough review of the UN IPCC's 2007 report. He made one sixth of all review comments. His review on chapter 9 alone totalled 575 comments. His comments range from identifying important grammatical changes ensuring scientific accuracy to highlighting the UN IPCC's lack of evidence for its core claim to the UN IPCC's glaring omission of known major natural drivers of climate that explain natural climate variation.

His review comments can be accessed here: www.conscious.com.au

His review comments specifically on chapter 9 are available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/gray%20documents/Chapter%209%20UN%20IPCC%20WG1%20AR4%20Vincent%20Gray.pdf>

Dr. Gray confirms that the UN IPCC's core chapter avoids serious consideration of known major drivers of global climate: solar activity and ocean-atmosphere decadal cycles such as El Nino and La Nina.

Dr. Gray says there is no evidence of human causation of global warming or climate change. He says there is doubt that any significant warming occurred. I conclude that at most it was modest cyclic global atmospheric warming that ended in 1998 (some say 2002, others say 1997, others 1995).

Dr. Gray confirms that unlike true scientific peer-review, his comments have never been acknowledged.

I've read the 2007 report's chapter 9 twice. There is no evidence anywhere of human CO2 causing warming. Independently I came to the same conclusion as Dr. Gray.

Dr. Gray subsequently advised me that he has never received acknowledgment of his review comments even though he provided an estimated one sixth of all review comments on the 2007 report. That is a clear breach of scientific processes. It confirms the Inter Academy Council's scathing condemnation of UN IPCC processes and procedures.

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110608-aj2-vincentgray.mp3>

Data and statements in various UN IPCC reports reveal many errors, contradictions and omissions enabling the UN IPCC's false core claim about human CO2. Please refer to examples 1-21 here:

http://www.scienceheresy.com/2011_09/HappsVsChubb.pdf

Combining unvalidated computer models and deceptive language

Chapter 9 is buried deep within the massive 2007 report. It's written in a way such that readers could easily misconstrue output from unvalidated and erroneous computer model projections as real-world measurements. Thus, although the chapter implies it relies on scientific evidence it has no empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning showing cause-and-effect.

Chapter Nine's usage of specific words was analysed. It's revealing:

Phrase	Occurrences
model	406
model in references	101
simul as in simulation/ed	264
certain	176
uncertain	16
analys	89
likely	83
not likely	0
may	60
expected	35
fingerprint	26
assum as in assume/ption	26
difficult	23
error	13
very likely	13
appear	12
assign	3
limitation	1
compensating	1

The UN IPCC's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO2 employs many words such as *may*, *likely* and *expected* in ways conjuring or implying discovery of relationships. Arbitrarily and contrary to empirical scientific evidence it implies or states relationships and events as scientifically '*likely*'. Through an overwhelmingly voluminous, tortuous and confusing maze of jargon, chapters and Summaries, the UN IPCC massages a lack of evidence into its core claim.

The UN IPCC uses the word *attribution* instead of correlation to infer correlation. It uses the word *projections* not prediction because projections are based on the presumption that we agree on the assumptions. Supposedly quantitative statements of implied statistical probability are assigned purely as a guess and an opinion from people paid to do it. The word *evaluation* is used instead of validated—and often evaluation is self-evaluation by the modelers themselves.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Vincent Gray describes UN IPCC methods in his article entitled *Spinning the Climate* available here:

http://www.klimanotizen.de/2008.07.12_Gray_Spinning_the_Climate.pdf

He further explains the UN IPCC's vocabulary in his article entitled *The Triumph of Doublespeak* here:

http://nzclimatescience.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=483&Itemid=32

As Vincent explains, the UN IPCC is the triumph of doublespeak over science.

Canadian climatologist Tim Ball explains why models misrepresent Nature and the beauty of our planet's climate and weather systems:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/static-climate-models-in-a-virtually-unknown-dynamic-atmosphere/>

And:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/soil-moisture-illustrates-why-ipcc-computer-models-fail/>

And:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/what-causes-el-nino-la-nina-ipcc-doesnt-know-but-builds-models-and-makes-projections-anyway/>

As does Sydney professor, Murry Salby who reveals (Appendix 4) that the relationship between temperature and CO2 assumed by UN IPCC computer models is the reverse of that actually revealed by Nature in the real world:

<http://www.thesydneyinstitute.com.au/podcast/global-emission-of-carbon-dioxide-the-contribution-from-natural-sources/>

And video with slides:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YrIo3ts--9I&feature=youtu.be>

Viscount Monckton identifies flaws and errors in the substitution of unvalidated computer models instead of real-world empirical data:

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/climate/earths-climate-crisis-aint-necessarily-so/story-e6frg6xf-1225992476627>

These include:

- Much of the radiation that models say should be warming Earth's surface is

escaping to space as before;

- The upper air in the tropics that the models predict should warm at thrice the surface rate is warming only at the same rate; model-predicted surface evaporation in response to warming is a third of the observed rate;
- The missing heat energy imagined by the models but not present as warming in the past decade is not lurking in the oceans; and the entire warming of the late 20th century can easily be explained without blaming man.

Each of these discrepancies alone dismisses climate catastrophism. Combined with the models' contradiction of empirical data, they raise serious questions about the methods, competence and motives of the UN IPCC.

UN IPCC Expert Science Reviewer Dr. Gray says, quote: "*The (IPCC) climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies.*"

Dr. Gray's unsolicited summary on the UN IPCC is available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/gray%20documents/SpinningThe%20Climate.pdf>

Professor David Karoly now works at the University of Melbourne and is on the Gillard-Brown Climate Commission's Science Advisory Panel and many other organisations involved in *climate science* and in advocacy of climate alarm. He is a Lead Author of the 2001 UN IPCC's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ (chapter 12). Although that chapter reportedly formed the basis of the equivalent sole chapter in the 2007 UN IPCC report, David Karoly was the Review Editor of that chapter too. He was a writer of the UN IPCC's 2007 Summary for Policy Makers distributed to governments and media worldwide and falsely purporting human CO₂ as the cause of warming. By his own work David Karoly has made himself arguably the most senior UN IPCC climate person.

If anyone in the world should have such evidence of human causation of global warming it is David Karoly. Yet in his responses to my requests David Karoly has repeatedly failed to provide any empirical scientific evidence for his claim.

Despite this he repeatedly makes false alarming media announcements of catastrophes supposedly caused by human CO₂. He falsely makes projections claiming future catastrophe. All are unfounded.

David has been making many misrepresentations of climate and science. My email to him dated January 25th, 2012 summarises some of these. It's available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/academic%20experts/Karoly%20E-mail%20January,%202011.pdf>

Consider some details. Under David Karoly's watch as Lead Author in 2001, 60% of references cited by authors of chapter 12 were by those authors and co-authors. One wonders how many of those papers couldn't provide source data. If source data was not available, how could another scientist validate the data?

Climate data analyst and PhD candidate John McLean's paper entitled "*Prejudiced authors, prejudiced findings*" reveals many details of chapter 9 from the UN IPCC's 2007 report, including the following:

1. It shows, on the first page, that David Karoly co-authored papers with 10 authors of IPCC WGI chapter 9, i.e. the chapter for which he was one of three Review Editors.
2. 37 of the chapter authors (plus David Karoly) had co-authored papers with other authors of the chapter. These were not just any papers but were papers cited by the chapter (and amounted to 40% of papers). All but about 4 of these 37 people were in a network of people who had worked together. To them should be added co-workers (e.g. 10 people were from the Hadley Centre, of whom some but not all were in the 37). To that should be added academic associates (possibly students and their supervisor, such as Kenyon and Lavine neither of whom were authors of a cited paper but came from the same establishment as Gabriele Hegerl, one of two Coordinating Lead Authors for the chapter).

(2007 report chapter 9 had 53 authors in total, including 10 people from Hadley Centre, 4 from Oxford University, 4 from University of Michigan, 3 Environment Canada, 3 Duke University, 3 NCAR)

3. Looking back to the authors of chapter 8 in the IPCC's 2nd Assessment report (1995) reveals that of the 36 chapter authors back then 10 didn't write any papers cited in 2007 but 26 did. Of those 26, 9 were also authors of the 2007 chapter and 1 (David Karoly) was a review editor. It's not immediately clear how many new papers - i.e. how much that 39.9% will grow by - because many of these papers were written with a 2007 chapter 9 author.
5. As a review editor David Karoly was required to make a written report to the Working Group (see the IPCC's procedures document) but his entire report was a one-sentence letter. That is presented in *Prejudices authors, prejudiced findings*.

Another important point about chapter 9's key claims is that the "*extremely unlikely*", "*very likely*" likelihood statements, etc are merely opinions of the author of the relevant section of the chapter. Contrary to appearances, these opinions are not statistically valid. They are in essence unsupported guesses/opinions being expressed according to IPCC directive. They are without scientific foundation yet become the baseline. Any reviewer who disagreed would need to convince the IPCC author that he or she was wrong and that some other expression applied. To convince an author would take very good evidence but compiling evidence to support an opinion is highly subjective. Even with the best evidence in the world the author was free to ignore it (except for making a written response within the system of recording the review comments and responses).

Further observations and comments about David Karoly's involvement are provided in Appendix 9.

The fundamental claim often repeated by politicians is that we need to avoid a two-degree warming. The reality is that the original two-degree warming was plucked out of the air. It's not scientific: <http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/climate-catastrophe-a-superstorm-for-global-warming-research-a-686697-8.html>

3. Former President of America's National Academy of Sciences condemns UN IPCC

The late Professor Frederick Seitz, former President of America's National Academy of Sciences publicly and in writing exposed the UN IPCC as, quote: "*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.*"

(126)

Professor Seitz's comments have been reported in many publications including the prestigious Wall Street Journal and NIPCC at:

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf.

4. There is no scientific consensus claiming warming by human CO2

For its 2007 report, only five (5) UN IPCC Reviewers endorsed the UN IPCC's core claim of global warming due to human CO2.

Although Kevin Rudd as Prime Minister spread the false claim that 4,000 scientists endorse the UN IPCC's core claim, data from the UN IPCC itself reveals that only five reviewers of chapter 9 endorsed that claim. Not 4,000, just five.

UN IPCC data obtained from the UN IPCC itself reveals that chapter 9 was the product of a close-knit cabal of '*scientists*'. Many of the 53 authors were computer modellers, including many with financial interests in the chapter's outcome.

John McLean presents the UN IPCC data. His work cannot be sensibly refuted since he merely presents data obtained from the UN IPCC. Is CSIRO not aware or is it ignoring?

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf

http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/McLean_IPCC_bia

[s.pdf](#)

http://folk.uio.no/tomvs/esef/McLean_ipcc_review.pdf

Kevin Rudd was not alone in falsely fabricating a non-existent consensus of scientists. The UN IPCC's Chairman Rajendra Pachauri did the same internationally.

5. UN IPCC Guidelines require science to be modified to suit the politics

See page 5 and 6 of: http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

The UN IPCC is not a scientific body. It is a political body that fabricates supposed science to suit its political agenda.

There is an irreconcilable break between UN IPCC science report and the Summary for Policy Makers (SPM) fed to politicians and media worldwide. For example, the original 1995 science report said, quote: *"While some of the pattern-base discussed here have claimed detection of a significant climate change, no study to date has positively attributed all or part of climate change observed to man-made causes."*

Yet without consulting the other authors, one of the chapter's Lead Authors, Ben Santer, reportedly falsified comments in chapter 8 by submitting this comment, quote: *"The body of statistical evidence in chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points to a discernible human influence on the global climate."*

Headlines in western nations screamed the phrase "discernible human influence".

Reportedly, five times in the 1995 science report there were specific declarations of a lack of scientific evidence showing human causation of the possible modest temperature rise.

Moving to the 2007 report's chapter on computer modeling (now Chapter 8) identifies problems with the models. Some problems are listed in the following article:

<http://drtimball.com/2012/climate-change-of-the-ipcc-is-daylight-robberyclimate-change-of-the-ipcc-is-daylight-robbery/>

It's a much longer list than presented by the UN IPCC, but almost any single item reveals the results as not viable. Yet the IPCC's SPM published the unfounded and false claim that, quote *"Another unusual aspect of recent climate change is its cause: past climate changes were natural in origin (see FAQ 6.1), whereas most of the warming of the past 50 years is attributable to human activities"*. This was done without raising red flags. It is unscientific, false and contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Reliance on computer model projections uses circular reasoning. The models assume that higher CO₂ levels will cause warming and then projections are used to imply CO₂ will warm the atmosphere. That is not science.

I'm reliably advised that using UN IPCC definitions attributes 90 percent of the warming of the last 50 years to human production of CO₂. There is no scientific basis for that claim. It contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

As stated by climate scientist, Tim Ball, quote: "How can they make such a claim when *natural albedo* change alone exceeds the entire change due to CO₂."

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2007/10/17/earths-albedo-tells-a-interesting-story/>

In its 2007 science report the UN IPCC itself published Table 2-11 showing purported levels of understanding for sixteen factors claimed to affect radiative forcing assumed in computerized numerical climate models. Of the sixteen factors two have a claimed medium level of understanding. One has a claimed high level of understanding despite empirical scientific evidence to the contrary. The remaining 13 have low or very low levels of understanding.

Thus over 80% of the factors that are the basis of the UN IPCC's unvalidated computerized numerical models have low or very low levels of understanding.

Yet the *unvalidated* models are the basis of the UN IPCC's 2007 claim that warming was caused by human CO₂. They are the UN IPCC's so-called *scientific* evidence.

That's the supposed '*basis*' for UN IPCC computer model projections of future warming. There is no scientific basis. That's why the models are already proven wrong. UN IPCC reports are unscientific and misleading. They contradict empirical scientific evidence.

6. Fundamental Breaches of UN IPCC Guidelines

Page 4 of: http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

The Review Editor of the 2007 report's chapter 9 is David Karoly. For the previous 2001 report he was Lead Author of the equivalent sole chapter claiming human warming in that report, chapter 12.

Although chapter 12 in 2001 reportedly became the foundation for chapter 9 in 2007, David Karoly was appointed Review Editor of chapter 9 in 2007.

He was a writer of the 2007 UN IPCC draft Summary for Policy Makers distributed to national governments and media worldwide. It implied evidence for warming despite the UN IPCC having no such empirical scientific evidence of human causation and despite scientific doubt that any significant warming occurred at all.

Since 2007 that doubt has increased to confirm no global atmospheric temperature increase since 1998 and an apparent likely cooling trend since 2006.

UN IPCC reporting processes and procedures are so poor that despite being a Lead

Author in 2001 and a Review Editor in 2007, David Karoly was a significant contributor to both chapters through his own papers.

As Lead Author of chapter 12 in 2001 David Karoly reportedly breached the UN IPCC's own guidelines for appointing that chapter's contributing editors.

Instead of appointing authors from a wide variety of institutes worldwide, he selected authors from a narrow group of institutes dominated by the Hadley Centre. That agency is now infamous for the Climategate scandal.

Almost three quarters of authors were selected from two nations: America and Britain.

60% of papers cited by chapter 12's authors were their own papers.

Chapter 12 in 2001 and chapter 9 in 2007 were not scientifically peer-reviewed.

The sole chapter in each report (2001 and 2007) that claimed warming and attributed it to human CO₂ was written in contradiction of scientific principles.

This is confirmed by McLean's analysis of UN IPCC data on UN IPCC processes. He obtained that data from the UN IPCC.

In his responses to my requests for evidence of human causation of global warming, David Karoly has repeatedly failed to provide empirical scientific evidence and/or scientific logic proving causation.

Combined with the Inter Academy Council's report highlighting the opportunity for serious conflicts of interest with the biased subjective stacking of authors by colleagues and the apparent associations with the Climategate Scandal, chapter 9 is open to many questions. That it lacks any empirical scientific evidence or logical scientific reasoning for its unfounded claim is damning.

Another criticism of the UN IPCC is that it fails to include adequate representation of geologists, palaeontologists, palaeoclimatologists, geophysicists and astrophysicists among its contributors. Instead it seems to concentrate on meteorologists and environmentalists. Is that due to influence by the UN's World Meteorological Organisation (WMO) that co-sponsored the UN IPCC and reportedly has influence over national weather bureau and weather bureau funding?

Or is it because geologists and palaeontologists understand empirically that Earth's past reveals variations in CO₂ have not driven climate. Or is it because empirically they can prove that Earth's recent cooling-warming-cooling cycle is modest and entirely normal?

Or is it because a growing number of astrophysicists, physicists, chemists, radiation specialists and engineers who understand thermodynamics question the basic supposition of enhanced radiative warming built on poor understanding of gases and atmospheric processes 150 years ago.

Respected retired journalist Tony Thomas writes, quote: “*Lambeck claimed to the National Press Club in 2006 that in compiling IPCC assessment reports, “An independent judiciary is set up to ensure that all criticisms are properly answered.”*[59] *This was wildly incorrect, as shown in the IAC audit of 2010, and Donna Laframboise’s 2011 documentation of IPCC realities.*”

That illustrates how the media has been misled on both the UN IPCC and global warming.

7. UN IPCC data on its reporting processes reveals UN IPCC is unscientific

Please refer to page 2 here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

This provides links to four documents by John McLean presenting UN IPCC data on its own reporting processes.

John McLean’s work cannot be sensibly refuted. That data was obtained from the UN IPCC. It reveals that the UN IPCC 2007 report’s sole chapter claiming human warming is unfounded. It contains no evidence of warming by human production of CO₂.

The UN IPCC’s own data reveals peer-review has been corrupted, bypassed and at times prevented.

When peers seek data supposedly underpinning major UN IPCC papers, loss of data seems more common than one would expect in documents underpinning global policy:

<http://climateaudit.org/2012/06/25/nic-lewis-on-forest-et-al-2006/>

8. Climategate scandal reveals prominent UN IPCC *scientists* hiding data, excluding empirical data from UN IPCC reports, preventing access to data, misrepresenting data, interfering with and destroying scientific peer-review

The Climategate scandal rocked the UN IPCC. Viscount Monckton’s analysis of emails to and from the heart of the UN IPCC’s fabrication of temperature data revealed scientists engaging in the following unscientific practices:

- Colluding to fabricate warming;
- Conspiring to prevent journal editors publishing real scientists’ papers contrary to UN IPCC claims;
- Colluding to prevent real science from entering UN IPCC’s 2007 report (AR4);
- Colluding to use a ‘*trick*’ to hide the decline in global temperatures;
- Colluding to prevent access to the raw data;
- Colluding to maintain their cash flow;
- Colluding to bypass scientific peer-review by using pal-review;
- Tampering with their own data to conceal inconsistencies and errors;

- Secretly expressing their dismay that contrary to all their predictions global temperatures had not risen for 15 years and had been falling for nine years;
- Blaming Nature's defiance of their predictions as a '*travesty*';
- Concealing internal doubt that contradicted their public claims that the present decade was the warmest ever and global warming science is settled;
- Conspiring to remove a learned journal's editor solely because he did not share their desire to corrupt science as part of a political agenda;
- Venomously campaigning by spreading misinformation to denigrate scientific opponents using a website they had expensively created;
- Criminally conspiring to conceal and then destroy computer codes and data after a person had sound reason to question whether their '*research*' was incompetent and/or dishonest.

<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/Monckton-Caught%20Green-Handed%20Climategate%20Scandal.pdf>

Internationally eminent physicist, climate scientist and environment professor Fred Singer summarises the significance of Climategate and the inability to penetrate the wall built by universities receiving government funding to contradict empirical scientific evidence in support of the UN IPCC's false core claim:

<http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=3285>

Tellingly, initial investigations were really whitewashes giving the deceptive pretense that Climategate had been investigated and found clear. Climategate has never been investigated.

<http://thegwpf.org/images/stories/gwpf-reports/Climategate-Inquiries.pdf>

And page 4 here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

And:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf

I conclude that the University of East Anglia contravened its assurances to the United Kingdom parliament. Although some in parliament were upset, little, if anything seems to have been done about the apparent deceit.

9. History reveals UN IPCC born in corruption and rife with corruption

The meticulous work of John McLean reveals a history of corrupted climate science from the inception of the United Nations Environmental Program, UNEP in 1972. That corruption was widened and deepened with the UN IPCC sponsored by UNEP and the UN's World Meteorological Organisation, WMO in 1988. The UN IPCC's corruption is pervasive, systemic and systematic.

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_science_corrupted.pdf

And:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean_we_have

[been conned.pdf](#)

And:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

My documents and links on *Eco-Fraud* present a timeline of UN IPCC corruption and its effects:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

And: www.conscious.com.au

The lack of independent investigations coupled with whitewashes falsely presented to media and governments as objective and independent widens the corruption. Additional references on the whitewashes are available here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/climategate%20references.pdf

And:

<http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=3285>

A short history of UN corruption of science and fabrication of unfounded global warming blamed on human CO₂ is available here:

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2012/5/the-serpent-s-egg>

Leon Pittard's personal research reveals sources and aims of the UN's climate corruption:

http://fairdinkumradio.com/?q=climate_podcasts

Click on the blue text: **'Where did the climate change propaganda start?'**

10. UN IPCC '*peer-review*' corrupted, often bypassed, sometimes prevented

Some journalists and politicians and many academic advocates and extremist groups claim their belief in global warming caused by human CO₂ is based on scientifically peer-reviewed papers. That claim is false. It relies on an appeal to authority. Outsourcing critical thinking and judgment is dangerous.

Fundamental to the UN IPCC's supposed authority and the government's supposed validity of cutting human CO₂ is the claim that such authority is based on scientifically peer-reviewed literature. Peer-review is pushed publicly as validation of UN IPCC and CSIRO '*science*' and government policy.

Yet UN IPCC data itself reveals that peer-review processes are corrupted, often bypassed and sometimes **prevented**. As revealed below, the UN IPCC's 2007 report cites and relies on 5,587 references not peer reviewed—including bushwalkers' stories, newspaper articles and political activists' campaign material. Yet IPCC Chairman Pachauri falsely claims 100% use of scientifically peer-reviewed science. That's yet another blatant falsity from the top of the UN climate body, spread by the top of the Rudd-Gillard-Brown government.

<http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/press-release.php>

Core temperature data relied on by the UN IPCC as the basis for its core claim is prevented from being peer-reviewed. That automatically means it should be scientifically disregarded.

Separately, the fabricated basis for the UN IPCC's 2001 claim of human warming was closed to scientific peer-review. Thanks to diligence from Canadian statisticians Steve McIntyre and Ross McKittrick and other independent assessments including Wegman for the USA Congress, the Mann Bradley Hughes 'hockey stick' temperature fabrication has since been scientifically discredited worldwide. Commentators in the field have described it as fraudulent. Yet the Mann Bradley Hughes graph was the core of the UN IPCC's global media campaign and the core of Al Gore's movie 'An Inconvenient Truth'.

Climategate emails reveal apparent collusion by conspirators to prevent publication of papers by skeptics whose research findings contradict those of climate alarmists. Despite that collusion to prevent sceptic scientists from publishing scientific papers, there are thousands of scientific papers, articles, books and web publications opposing and contradicting the UN IPCC's core claim.

A lawyer's study of supposed peer-review:

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1612851

Quote: "A review of the peer-edited literature reveals a systematic tendency of the climate establishment to engage in a variety of stylized rhetorical techniques that seem to oversell what is actually known about climate change while concealing fundamental uncertainties and open questions regarding many of the key processes involved in climate change."

Bob Carter has published many scientifically peer-reviewed papers and provides his informed opinion of the peer-review process here:

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2012/06/14/money-corrupts-peer-review-process/>

John McLean has published scientifically peer-reviewed papers and has analysed UN IPCC processes. At my invitation he provided his views here:

[21 JohnMcLeanAboutPeerReview.pdf](#)

And:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/agu_censorship.pdf

Science reporter Jo Nova analyses of corruption of scientific papers in an article entitled *Scientists behaving badly - more retractions are cheats not mistakes*. It's available here:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2013/01/scientists-behaving-badly-more-retractions-are-cheats-not-mistakes/>

Quote: "A detailed review of all 2,047 biomedical and life-science research articles indexed by PubMed as retracted on May 3, 2012 revealed that only 21.3% of retractions were attributable to error. In contrast, 67.4% of retractions were attributable to misconduct, including fraud or suspected fraud (43.4%), duplicate publication (14.2%),

and plagiarism (9.8%). Incomplete, uninformative or misleading retraction announcements have led to a previous underestimation of the role of fraud in the ongoing retraction epidemic. The percentage of scientific articles retracted because of fraud has increased ~10-fold since 1975. Retractions exhibit distinctive temporal and geographic patterns that may reveal underlying causes.”

Jo Nova comments that studies indicate her quoted could be the tip of the iceberg. It raises the question that although papers have been retracted after effective peer review, how many other papers in an obviously subjective and variable process got past the reviewers? How many are now being cited by the UN IPCC as peer-reviewed?

The UN IPCC claims it relies on scientific peer-review. It does not. It prevents scientific peer-review. Its contributors have corrupted scientific peer-review.

11. The UN IPCC’s rot starts at the top with conflicts of financial and other interests

The current UN IPCC Chairman, railway engineer Dr. Rajendra Pachauri reportedly has many conflicts of financial interest. These are in addition to his many false statements on climate. These are increasingly widely documented:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri_and_the_ipcc_no_fossil_fool.pdf

More articles are linked on pages 29 and 30 of ‘Two Dead Elephants in Parliament’, available here:

<http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/dead%20elephants.pdf>

And page 9, here:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri_letter.pdf

The serious absence of any UN IPCC policy on conflicts of interest is a major issue raised by the Inter Academy Council’s report in August 2010. The IAC raises fundamental concerns such as the selection of authors by a hidden process producing serious conflicts of interest.

The UN IPCC has a history of senior officeholders contradicting the science and/or pushing a political agenda contrary to empirical scientific evidence. Please refer to four links at the start of this appendix and to John McLean’s detailed work.

Dennis Ambler’s investigation of Dr. Pachauri’s behaviour, statements and many serious conflicts of interest concludes with, quote: “*If there were any doubts that the IPCC is anything but a political advocacy arm of the UN, then travelling salesman Rajendra K Pachauri should surely have dispelled them.*”

Breathtakingly, Dr. Pachauri now advocates that India needs to use coal:

<http://sppiblog.org/news/ipcc-chairman-says-india-doesnt-have-any-choice-but-to-use-coal>

12. UN IPCC Lead Authors & contributing scientists reveal corrupt UN IPCC

UN IPCC Lead Authors are among the many scientists informally leading the spontaneous worldwide people's movement revealing UN IPCC misrepresentations and corruption. These include John Christy who has documented examples of corruption and breaches of science observed first-hand during his work for the UN IPCC. Some more UN IPCC contributors' comments about the UN IPCC are quoted on pages 25-29 of '*Loss of Independence and Integrity*', available here:

<http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/CSIROpaperFinalNoLink.pdf>

The eminent scientists who voluntarily formed the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, the NIPCC include UN IPCC scientists. Its initial summary report is available here:

http://sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf

It's more detailed report is available here:

<http://www.nipccreport.org/>

Unlike UN IPCC reports, the NIPCC provides the ultimate arbiter of science: empirical scientific data. Unlike the UN IPCC, the NIPCC scientifically explores Nature, the true purpose of science.

Consider this sample of radio interviews of prominent scientists and informed citizens:

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110527-aj2-timothyball.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120426-aj-timball.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120530-aj-morano.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=12506

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110725-aj2-vaclavclaus.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110620-aj2-johnmclean.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=10678

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110517-aj2-richardlinzen.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=10871

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110704-aj2-stewartfranks.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=9774

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110518-aj2-malcolmroberts.mp3>

http://www.2gb.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=6295&Itemid=13

4

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110712-aj2-lordmonckton.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110707-aj1-lordmonckton.mp3>

<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110802-aj2-nigellawson.mp3>
<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20110729-aj2-bjornlomborg.mp3>
<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20111020-aj2-willsteffen.mp3>
http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=1748
<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120518-aj-weather.mp3>
<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120503-dellingpole.mp3>
<http://podcasts.mrn.com.au.s3.amazonaws.com/alanjones/20120430-aj-roberts.mp3>

A partial list of many UN IPCC contributing scientists critical of unscientific UN IPCC processes is available here:

http://www.scienceheresy.com/2011_09/HappsVsChubb.pdf

Internationally eminent meteorologist and UN IPCC contributing scientist Richard Lindzen says of the UN IPCC's 2001 Third Assessment Report, quote: *"This (IPCC) is an unusual review because fundamentally you are your own editor. You decide, together with a Review Coordinator whether you pay attention to the reviews or not. Generally you ignore them."*

13. Canadian investigative journalist reveals UN IPCC as unscientific, tainted, unworthy and deceptive

Canadian investigative journalist Donna Laframboise's book entitled *'The Delinquent Teenager who was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert'* reveals that the UN IPCC cannot be relied upon in any way.

<http://nofrackingconsensus.com/2011/10/13/a-book-is-born/>

The UN IPCC's own self-publicity has been carefully and cleverly orchestrated. Its reporting strategy has successfully hidden reality from journalists. Donna's book is reportedly the first serious and deep journalistic scrutiny of the UN IPCC.

Donna Laframboise said, quote: *"Every time you take a close look at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPCC you find out that almost nothing you've been told is true."*

http://www.2gb.com/index2.php?option=com_newsmanager&task=view&id=10678

Consider the so-called reliance on the world's top scientists, using this excerpt, quote: *"One group consists of graduate students. Typically these are individuals in their twenties. Their experience of the world is neither broad nor deep. If they were merely performing administrative tasks that would be one thing. But the IPCC has long relied on their expert judgment."*

Richard Klein, now a Dutch geography professor, is a classic example. In 1992 Klein turned 23, completed a Masters degree, and worked as a Greenpeace campaigner. Two

years later, at the tender age of 25, he found himself serving as an IPCC lead author.

(The IPCC has three classes of writers. Coordinating lead authors are in charge of an entire chapter and are therefore the most senior in rank. Each chapter usually has two. Lead authors are expected to write a significant amount of text. Their numbers vary from a handful to several dozen. Contributing authors provide supplemental knowledge. They typically don't participate in the meetings attended by the other two kinds of authors, but are asked to write briefly about a narrow, specific topic. A chapter may have no contributing authors or as many as 20 of them.)

Klein's online biography tells us that, since 1994, he has been a lead author for six IPCC reports. On three of those occasions, beginning in 1997, he served as a coordinating lead author. This means that Klein was promoted to the IPCC's most senior author role at age 28 - six years prior to the 2003 completion of his PhD. Neither his youth nor his thin academic credentials prevented the IPCC from regarding him as one of the world's top experts. [FOOTNOTE 4-1]

Nor is he an isolated case. Laurens Bouwer is currently employed by an environmental studies institute at the VU University Amsterdam. In 1999-2000, he served as an IPCC lead author before earning his Masters in 2001.

How can a young man without even a Masters degree become an IPCC lead author? Good question. *Nor is it the only one. Bouwer's expertise is in climate change and water resources. Yet the chapter for which he first served as a lead author was titled Insurance and Other Financial Services.*

It turns out that, during part of 2000, Bouwer was a trainee at Munich Reinsurance Company. This means the IPCC chose as a lead author someone who a) was a trainee, b) lacked a Masters degree, and c) was still a full decade away from receiving his 2010 PhD.

Who else falls into this category? Step forward Lisa Alexander. As recently as 2008, this woman was a research assistant at Australia's Monash University. After earning her PhD in 2009, she was hired by another Aussie university - which noted in its announcement that she had already "played a key role" in both the 2001 and 2007 editions of the Climate Bible. (She was a contributing author the first time, and a lead author the second.)

The IPCC selected its 2001 authors during 1999. This means its leadership decided that Alexander was a world-class expert 10 years before she, too, had earned her doctorate.

*Sari Kovats, currently a lecturer at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, is an even more egregious example. She didn't earn her PhD until 2010. **Yet back in 1994 - 16 years prior to that event and three years before her first academic paper was published - Kovats was one of only 21 people in the entire world selected to work on the first IPCC chapter that examined how climate change might affect human health.** In total, Kovats has been an IPCC*

lead author twice and a contributing author once - all long before she'd completed her PhD.

One of Kovats' health chapter colleagues was an American named Jonathan Patz. He earned a Masters degree in Public Health in 1992 and had his first academic paper published in late 1995. Yet in 1994 the IPCC judged his credentials so impressive he was appointed one of its lead authors.

Given the involvement of both Kovats and Patz, Paul Reiter's description of the IPCC's 1995 health chapter as amateurish starts to make sense. Rather than recruiting real experts like Reiter the IPCC enlisted young, inexperienced, non-experts instead.

It has been doing so since the mid-1990s. Yet in 2011 newspapers still report that the IPCC is a collection of "the world's leading scientists."

It's feasible that some young and inexperienced people may be tapped within the UN IPCC. If they were to leave, newcomers may reveal the *quality* of their work.

Yet some of the world's experts in their fields are outside the UN IPCC. These include for example Dr. William Gray on tropical storms, Dr. Paul Reiter on insect-borne diseases, Nils-Axel Morner on sea levels, Professor Chris Landsea on storms, ... Some resigned in disgust at corruption within the UN IPCC. Chris Landsea said, quote: *"I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by preconceived agendas and scientifically unsound."*

Quoting from a review summarizing the book: *"It is impossible not to feel angry when reading this book. It is not just the sheer scale of bad practice, the bad faith and the outright lies. It's the painful lack of objectivity from the world's media. The IPCC is, as the title of the book makes plain 'a delinquent teenager' who has never been subjected to serious criticism. It has gotten away with things because the media have looked the other way again and again. No matter how egregious the errors, no matter how appalling the behaviour, the IPCC is still treated as though it is the impartial scientific body it pretends to be. In the same way, the scientific journals and academies are also guilty."*

<http://www.londonbookreview.com/lbr0061.html>

In my experience reading the UN IPCC's 2007 report, it seems that UN IPCC reports deliberately use structures, jargon and language that make it difficult for outsiders to read and make sense of reports. This presumably deters journalists and politicians from reading the report and misleads journalists who persevere. Instead, journalists seemingly are steered to the political Summary For Policy Makers that misrepresents reality and misleads readers such as politicians and journalists. In turn they then mislead voters. I conclude this is deliberate and a careful part of the UN's strategy to develop and spread unfounded climate alarm within the UN's broader political agenda.

The UN IPCC has been carefully yet deceptively and dishonestly presented as a legitimate, prestigious and powerful scientific organisation. In reality it is unscientific

and contradicts and misrepresents science, climate and Nature.

Yet the carefully manipulated image developed over four (4) decades has successfully fooled journalists and politicians worldwide. Sadly, as Tolstoi's quote advises in the main report, people tend to believe what they hear first. As politicians and media then lock in initial perceptions it becomes almost impossible for eminent scientists presenting hard data to overturn people's initial perceptions and emotional images carefully manipulated and cultivated by the UN.

This approach by the UN IPCC seems to be combined with subtly and carefully orchestrated tainting of opponents by slick and emotive media productions like Hollywood's *'An Inconvenient Truth'*. Even reputable scientists then resile from publicly exposing or even opposing the UN IPCC. Legitimate scientists remain quiet fearing loss of government-funded research grants, threats from universities and/or being prevented from being published in scientific journals.

That is why the defence of science was initially by retired scientists with nothing to lose and driven simply by their deep desire to restore scientific integrity.

Accurate reviews describe Laframboise's book as presenting data revealing the UN IPCC to be, quote "*a hotbed of cronyism, shoddy science in the service of political activism, and politically-correct hand wringing*". The UN IPCC structurally escapes accountability. It is effectively a law unto itself.

The UN IPCC was falsely sold to Australians as a scientific body. The reality though is that it is political. Worse, it is corrupted by the "*sheer number of Greenpeace, WWF and other activists that parade through its pages as IPCC authors and high officials*".

During her lecture in Brisbane, Australia on July 12, 2012 Donna Laframboise advised that, "*Greenpeace is at the centre of the IPCC*".

Donna Laframboise's book confirms that the UN IPCC is dysfunctional partly because it is "*composed of climate activists from Nongovernment Organisations like Greenpeace, the WWF and EDF. Its about how the IPCC ignores its own rules, especially on grey literature*".

In her book she says, quote: "After a few days of searching, cross-checking, and tabulating here are my findings with respect to the IPCC's 2007 report:

- 28 out of 44 chapters (two-thirds) included at least one individual affiliated with the WWF
- 100% of the chapters in Working Group 2 – all 20 of them - included at least 1 WWF-affiliated
- Scientist
- 15 out of 44 chapters (one-third) were led by WWF-affiliated scientists – their coordinating lead
- Authors belong to the panel
- In three instances, chapters were led by two WWF-affiliated coordinating lead

authors

Ladies and gentlemen, the IPCC has been infiltrated. It has been wholly and entirely compromised.

[FOOTNOTE 31-5]”

Quote: “Pachauri, who authors forewords for Greenpeace publications, is still in charge (of the UN IPCC). This fact, in itself, delivers a fatal blow to *AR5's credibility.

* *The Fifth Assessment Report*

Ove Hoegh-Guldberg - whose ties to Greenpeace extend back 17 years - is now leading a chapter. So is Michael Oppenheimer, who worked for the Environmental Defense Fund for more than two decades.

Greenpeace 'legend' Bill Hare is serving as a lead author. Richard Moss, the former World Wildlife Fund vice-president, and Jennifer Morgan, the former WWF chief spokesperson, are both involved.

* *Reportedly lobby groups pay these activists.*

Andreas Fischlin and Guy Midgley, the two WWF-linked individuals who led the species extinction chapter are participating. So are Rik Leemans and Lesley Hughes, two more WWF-linked individuals from that chapter.

Sari Kovats, who only earned her PhD last year, is leading a chapter. As is Jens Hesselbjerg Christensen - who cited 10 research papers that hadn't even been accepted by a journal when he led an IPCC chapter the last time.

Gabriele Hegerl, who refused outright to allow Steve McIntyre to check her data, is involved. So is Kevin Trenberth - whose hurricane pronouncements sparked Chris Landsea's resignation. Alistair Woodward is now in charge of the health chapter, despite the overtly political treatises he has authored.*

* *Statistician*

And let us not forget Thomas Stocker, the climate modeler who heads AR5's 'hard science' working group. Since he thinks gasoline prices should triple and that everyone should participate in the grand goal of de-carbonizing society it's clear his mind is already made up. Do we really suppose that a working group led by him is going to acquit the accused? [FOOTNOTE 36-1]”.

Some of these nongovernment organisations (NGO's) were reportedly cultivated and strengthened by Maurice Strong as an aid in ramming the UN's 'Agenda 21 Sustainability' campaign through the UN's 1992 Rio Conference in Brazil. The measures were then hastily signed by world leaders despite bypassing parliamentary or congressional scrutiny in elected houses representing the people.

The measures have since been implemented by local governments under UN programs funded by taxpayers lacking awareness of the programs' broader purpose and agenda. Government agencies have abetted the undemocratic push to destroy private property

rights. Taxpayers have funded government organizations such as CSIRO to speak at conferences advocating global governance.

These programs are funded by people's taxes. Yet their purpose and implementation strategy are hidden from the people. Why do the programs need to be implemented under cover?

14. UN IPCC relies on and endorses reports by ideologues, extremists, and political activists

<http://climateaudit.org/2011/06/14/ipcc-wg3-and-the-greenpeace-karaoke/>

Quote: *"It is totally unacceptable that IPCC should have had a Greenpeace employee as a Lead Author of the critical Chapter 10, that the Greenpeace employee, as an IPCC Lead Author, should (like Michael Mann and Keith Briffa in comparable situations) have been responsible for assessing his own work and that, with such inadequate and non-independent 'due diligence', IPCC should have featured the Greenpeace scenario in its press release on renewables.*

Everyone in IPCC WG3 should be terminated and, if the institution is to continue, it should be re-structured from scratch."

<http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2011/6/16/ideological-money-laundering.html>

And:

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/06/16/a-blunder-of-staggering-proportions-by-the-ipcc/>

15. India dumped the UN IPCC

Tiring of UN IPCC corruption and misrepresentations, quote: *"The Indian government has moved to establish its own body to address and monitor science surrounding climate change, saying it "cannot rely" on the official United Nation panel."*

<http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/20100205/india-ipcc-un-climate-change-global-warming.htm>

http://www.nal-jsc.org/Climate_Change_Symposium_Leighton_Steward_Presentation.pdf

http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2010-01-19/india/28133382_1_ipcc-r-k-pachauri-glaciers

16. UN IPCC researchers seeking immunity from prosecution

It's easy to understand why UN IPCC contributors are reportedly seeking immunity from prosecution.

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/06/14/un-climate-scientists-plead-for-immunity-from-criminal-prosecution/>

17. UN IPCC Lead Author misled USA Congress

Roger Pielke is professor of environmental studies at the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado at Boulder. He recently stated, quote: *“The politicization of climate science is so complete that the lead author of the IPCC's Working Group II on climate impacts feels comfortable presenting testimony to the US Congress that fundamentally misrepresents what the IPCC has concluded. I am referring to testimony given today by Christopher Field, a professor at Stanford, to the US Senate.*

This is not a particularly nuanced or complex issue. What Field says the IPCC says is blatantly wrong, often 180 degrees wrong. It is one thing to disagree about scientific questions, but it is altogether different to fundamentally misrepresent an IPCC report to the US Congress. Below are five instances in which Field's testimony today completely and unambiguously misrepresented IPCC findings to the Senate. Field's testimony is here in PDF.”

<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com.au/2012/08/ipcc-lead-author-misleads-us-congress.html>

This illustrates how the media and governments were captured by misrepresentations of climate impacts by people supposedly with scientific authority. It's difficult for harried, rushed politicians to cope with and respond to the media reaction stirred by alarmist misrepresentations. It forces them to take action—without sound scientific backing.

Additional points revealing UN IPCC corruption:

Please refer to documentation of UN IPCC corruption in my document entitled *‘Freedom's Foundation. Reclaiming our country and our planet using Truth: Exposing Corruption of Climate Science—Misrepresentations, Distortions, Omissions, Evasions, Myths and Lies’* available here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/freedom_exposing.pdf

Please note the following items from that document:

18. (Item 5 on page 5) Each of the four UN IPCC reports to national governments and media is based on an unscientific falsity. ie, 1990, 1995, 2001 and 2007.

The UN IPCC's core claim now rests on unvalidated computer models. These models used to predict temperature increases have been wide of the mark, revealing serious defects in the UN IPCC's supposed *‘theory’*. To become a theory, a supposition must be

consistent with known laws and proven theories. Thus the UN IPCC's core supposition fails to qualify as a theory. It is a political fabrication, a supposition driven by a political agenda.

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/07/17/official-probe-shows-climategate-whitewash-link-to-sandusky-child-sex-case/>

19. (Item 7 on page 7) The UN IPCC's corruption of climate science originated in the United Nations Environmental Program, UNEP led specifically by Maurice Strong, UNEP's first Secretary-General.

This is extensively documented in published papers, books and Internet articles. Note the work of John McLean:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_science_corrupted.pdf

And:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean_we_have_been_conned.pdf

And:

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/mclean-disband_the_ipcc.pdf

Along the way Maurice Strong became a co-director of the Chicago Climate Exchange together with Al Gore. Dennis Ambler says, quote: "*Maurice Strong, architect of the UNEP and hence the IPCC, is a Director of the Chicago Climate Exchange. Al Gore's Generation Investment Management Company (GIM) owns 10% of CCX. Tata Power Company Limited, Tata Motors Limited and Tata Steel Limited, are all members of the CCX.*"

Current UN IPCC Chairman Dr. Rajendra Pachauri is closely involved with Tata.

How did it get to this?

Through its charter, the UN IPCC was specifically restricted to investigate only human-induced climate change. That excluded natural drivers of climate. Its reason for existence was to find human causation of climate change. In absence of data, human causation was fabricated.

Elaine Dewar's book *Cloak of Green* and James Delingpole's book entitled *Killing the Earth to Save it* discuss the UN IPCC's background and Maurice Strong's influence.

His own words reveal Maurice Strong's two key aims being de-industrialisation of western democracies and global socialist government through the UN. An introduction is available here:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/restoring_morality_justice.php

And:

http://www.galileomovement.com.au/protecting_freedom.php

Note the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate change and its report entitled *Ad Hoc Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action Under the Convention* at the Seventh session Bangkok, 28 September to 9 October 2009, and Barcelona, 2–6 November 2009:

<http://wattsupwiththat.files.wordpress.com/2009/10/un-fccc-copenhagen-2009.pdf>

A colleague and practicing lawyer advises, quote: “*For example Section 38 on page 18 of UNFCCC describes how any scheme agreed upon will have the status of a government with vast financial capacity and enforcement capability. The document allows for the creation of a supervising board of UN bureaucrats with powers to issue fines based on multiples of the market price of carbon. So, for instance, if Australia does not confine its output to a target specified by UNFCCC and as agreed ... fines up to \$1 billion could be levied.*”

As well as penalties for non-compliance with emission targets, the main purpose of UNFCCC is to facilitate a massive transfer of wealth from developed nations to the economies of poorer nations. The justification for this is contained in Section 17 of annex 111 E on page 122 which states the developed nations should compensate the poorer nations “for lost opportunities, resources, lives, land and dignity, as many will become environmental refugees”.

The expected total of this compensation is described in Section 33, page 39, as being in the range of \$US 70 – 140 billion per year. Each offending developed nation shall have at least 0.7% of its annual Gross Domestic Production assessed for compulsory contribution [Section 41, page 43]. In Australia’s case this would amount to \$7 billion per year.”

End of quote.

More significantly please refer to Appendix 14.

A brief timeline is provided in *The Eco Fraud: Part 1 A Timeline of International Fraud* is available here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/The%20Eco%20Fraud_part%201.pdf

Note that 1974’s preoccupation with projections of catastrophic global cooling was blamed on the use of coal and oil. It followed cyclic atmospheric cooling from 1958 through 1975. At the time, the late Stephen Schneider was prominent in scaring people about projected imminent catastrophic global cooling. He later became involved with the UN IPCC and a strong supporter of the UN IPCC’s unscientific claims blaming supposed catastrophic global warming on use of coal and oil.

Based on Nature’s uncooperative event in one year, 1976, the original claim of forecast imminent, irreversible catastrophic global cooling blamed on use of fuels containing carbon was reversed to forecast imminent, irreversible catastrophic global warming blamed on fuels containing carbon. ie, global atmospheric warming due to human CO₂. That was subtly altered to become climate change due to human CO₂. Then subtly reworked to become climate change due to carbon. That was followed by attempts to rework it into climate disruption due to carbon.

Despite changes in terminology, two characteristics remain constant:

- Nature's empirical data reveals Nature alone determines global climate; and,
- The real issue is fabricated global warming due to aligning vested interests aiming to control industry and government worldwide as stated by Maurice Strong.

Maurice Strong's outstanding networking skills and intelligent understanding of human nature enabled him to install key people in influential positions to establish systems that drove aligned behaviours. A large number of diverse groups were aligned as listed on page 40 here:

http://www.conscious.com.au/documents/Thriving%20with%20nature%20and%20humanity_single.pdf

The bandwagon was formed and underway.

His effectiveness can be measured by widespread use of the political term *consensus*. That is fundamentally against science that relies on objective repeatable measurements not consensus. Yet *consensus* almost prevailed and almost replaced real science.

Subtle, astute use of propaganda, control of finances, clever use of fear and guilt and an appeal to authority preyed on people's vulnerability and inherent care for the natural environment.

UN IPCC Chairman Dr. Rajendra Pachauri illustrates the insanity of the position advocated by Maurice Strong. Quoting Dennis Ambler on Dr. Pachauri: "*He was effectively saying that the West should de-industrialise and let developing nations industrialise in the interest of solving poverty. This has also been a long stated aim of his friend and colleague on many boards and institutions, Maurice Strong.*"

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/pachauri_and_the_ipcc_no_fossil_fool.pdf

Their plan for bringing developing nations out of poverty is to plunge developed nations into poverty. That is not only antihuman, it contradicts history. Development is not a zero-sum game. Instead, the more wealth that's generated, the more there is to share.

The problem is that governments have claimed to be fairer at redistributing yet history shows that central control always destroys wealth creation. Central control kills wealth and brings poverty because millions of independently creative hearts and minds are replaced and thwarted by a few bureaucrats focused fearfully on maintaining control.

Their ignorance of basic human behaviour and history is astounding. That so many people could fall for it is even more astounding. That people are awakening is refreshing.

Maurice Strong is now recognised as deceitful yet impressively intelligent and capable. He almost succeeded.

20. (Item 8 on page 8) The so-called '*climate science*' was settled politically before the *science* even started. By his own words, the UN IPCC's first Chairman, Bert Bolin was an advocate for taxing CO₂ before the UN IPCC had even been formed

and without scientific evidence for his position. Bert Bolin became UN IPCC Chairman after first working in the corrupt UNEP.

Typically, after each of many various scandals the UN IPCC initially denies allegations, then admits some truth to the allegations and then states it will clean up its act. Yet subsequently little changes as the UN IPCC continues corrupting science and misrepresenting climate.

The UN IPCC's next Assessment Report, No. 5, is already being revealed to be corrupt. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/02/22/omitted-variable-fraud-vast-evidence-for-solar-climate-driver-rates-one-oblique-sentence-in-ar5/>

A broader initial analysis of AR5 is available here: <http://tome22.info/Top/AnnotatedDocuments.html#id4>

On the supposedly '*scientific*' challenge that political leaders shrieked as being '*the greatest moral ... challenge of our time*' the UN IPCC failed to win a Nobel science prize. Instead, it '*won*' a Peace Prize adjudicated by a political committee of the Norwegian parliament. That its co-winner was Al Gore fraudulently pushing his personal financial interests by contradicting empirical scientific evidence is of further concern.

By spreading the UN IPCC's propaganda after failing to do its due diligence, the media generally has betrayed the public's trust.

Contradictions within, and problems with, the UN IPCC abound: <http://sppiblog.org/news/ipcc-confirms-we-do-not-know-if-the-climate-is-becoming-more-extreme>
<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.co.uk/2012/03/handy-bullshit-button-on-disasters-and.html>

Yet:

http://bigpondnews.com/articles/TopStories/2012/03/30/Global_warming_linked_to_extreme_weather_734390.html

Additional material on the UN IPCC is available in my earlier documents at www.conscious.com.au. Specifically, these are *Thriving With Nature & Humanity*, *Two Dead Elephants in Parliament* and the *Eco-Fraud* series.

Graham Williamson provides a succinct summary of problems with the UN IPCC in Part 3, pages 24 to 35 in '*Loss of Independence and Integrity*' available here: <http://www.galileomovement.com.au/docs/CSIROpaperFinalNoLink.pdf>

21. UN IPCC reporting strategy deceptively misled key people

Section 2 above illustrates how the UN IPCC converted a lack of scientific evidence for its core claim into a report that fooled key politicians, media and even scientists.

Employing fearful alarm pushed through scientifically illiterate mass media the UN IPCC converted its false and unfounded core claim into political pressure. Politicians and journalists lacking understanding of science and scientific logic are swamped in overwhelming misrepresentations. They are buried politically in a massive propaganda campaign from the UN IPCC and its intimate prominent Nongovernment* allies including Greenpeace, WWF and EDF. These were previously developed for the UN's 1992 Rio Conference. Evidence reveals that NGO's have cultivated UN IPCC claims. Politicians are forced to act or face political suicide.

* Their roles are discussed in Appendix 15.

UN IPCC reports in 2001 and 2007 reveal the UN IPCC's apparent deceptive strategy. It employs massively voluminous reports too daunting in terms of structure, writing style, convoluted language and scientific jargon for harried journalists and politicians. Instead journalists and politicians are steered to each report's *Summary* (SPM) that contradicts empirical scientific evidence to falsely imply evidence of human causation.

Funding to influence scientists susceptible to confirmation bias provided grants for scientists' continued employment. Many of the people involved in the UN IPCC's deception seem to have been innocent of any wrongdoing. Gullibility, lack of thought and innocent bias reveal faults in the system of awarding grants by government. History reveals humans are vulnerable in a mob. History reveals a minority of people ready to use that vulnerability in meeting a fundamental need for acceptance and belonging.

Only the informed, honest and morally courageous politicians did their due diligence on behalf of voters. For that they're ridiculed and vilified to deter free speech. Parliament and national governance are smashed.

The UN IPCC pulls off a remarkable feat in using language to defeat science. Consider that climate is known to contain many massive scientific uncertainties and unknowns. The UN IPCC's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ contains no empirical scientific evidence. Yet many massive uncertainties and unknowns are conjured into the basis for a global emergency supposedly requiring drastic global action through global treaties controlling national, regional, local and personal rights.

The UN's tactics are revealed by close open scrutiny. Through the UN IPCC the UN aimed to fabricate scientific authority to move people systematically as momentum built. Strategically it applied public pressure to politicians through media and nongovernment organisations and to prevent dissent and frighten the public. Its tactics included creating the illusion of scientific authority through corrupted reconstructions, blatant use of falsities and corrupt use of unvalidated computer models. It buried these tricks deep within massive reports that were avoided by journalists and politicians who read the political Summary for Policy Makers. Journalists and politicians rarely accessed the core reports and those who spoke out were ridiculed. To that were added false claims by senior UN IPCC officials claiming imminent, fearful catastrophes.

The strategy was to maintain momentum using fear and guilt and systematize the crisis in ways that align financial beneficiaries such as major international bankers, national

governments seeking new taxes while implementing 'trading' schemes to provide the UN with massive funding.

Four phenomena stopped the UN's run-away train:

- The so-called global financial crisis that provided a delay allowing;
- Nature to reveal she controls climate;
- Persistent scientists working to restore scientific integrity;
- Revelations of corruption within the UN IPCC.

22. Many real scientists were initially fooled by UN IPCC corruption. Unlike many journalists they awoke to the scam.

The deliberately deceptive message to politicians, media and the public through unfounded headlines screaming alarm originated in the difference between the supposed science report and the Summary for Policymakers (SPM). Seemingly, senior UN IPCC officers expected nobody would read or understand the Science Report—especially the media. It seems that they expected they could later isolate and attack the few who dared to challenge the science and what the UN IPCC was doing. This they did. Meanwhile enough scientists initially swallowed UN IPCC's unscientific claims without reading the Reports and in too many cases not understanding what the reports claimed. This was summarised recently by German physicist and meteorologist Klaus-Eckhart Puls who admitted, quote:

"Ten years ago I simply parroted what the IPCC told us. One day I started checking the facts and data – first I started with a sense of doubt but then I became outraged when I discovered that much of what the IPCC and the media were telling us was sheer nonsense and was not even supported by any scientific facts and measurements. To this day I still feel shame that as a scientist I made presentations of their science without first checking it. The CO₂-climate hysteria in Germany is propagated by people who are in it for lots of money, attention and power."

<http://notrickszone.com/2012/05/09/the-belief-that-co2-can-regulate-climate-is-sheer-absurdity-says-prominent-german-meteorologist/>

Another scientist with the courage and integrity to admit he was wrong in initially assuming the UN IPCC was reliable is David Evans. He worked in the Australian government's Carbon Accounting computer modelling says that it's a scam:

<http://joannenova.com.au/2011/03/david-evans-carbon-modeler-says-its-a-scam/>

He too admits that initially he simply accepted it was true. When things didn't fit he asked questions, investigated and came to the clear conclusion that it's a scam. He had the courage to speak out. One thousand peers, including eminent scientists have had the courage to publicly reveal they are now sceptics. Many initially assumed the UN IPCC was, as its Chairman falsely claimed, science of gold-plate standard. It is not. Scrutiny proves the UN IPCC repeatedly contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

23. Big government using big tobacco's tactics and methods?

Tricks used by the UN IPCC to hide data reportedly included and went beyond those used by the tobacco industry lobbyists to prevent discovery of the data showing smoking to be dangerous:

- Scientists were paid for research to provide desired conclusions;
- Journalists were paid to write articles claiming global warming was due to human CO₂;
- Scientists were paid to produce results (using models);
- Data was falsified (hockey stick graph);
- Data was hidden and audit prevented;
- Tobacco industry ridiculed opponents;

The tobacco industry ceased its tricks when the case eventually went to court where evidence is required under oath.

Is that why the UN is seeking immunity from prosecution?

<http://johnosullivan.wordpress.com/2012/06/14/un-climate-scientists-plead-for-immunity-from-criminal-prosecution/>

John O'Sullivan says, quote: "*John Bolton, a former U.S. Ambassador to the UN, questioned the motives, "The creeping expansion of claims for privileges and immunities protection for UN activities is symptomatic of a larger problem." Especially worrisome is that in conjunction with the application for a sweeping "get out of jail free card" for all it's scientists the UNFCCC is remorselessly promoting a mammoth Green Climate Fund, intended to help mobilize as much as \$100 billion a year for projects to lower global greenhouse gases. At the Rio conference the UN plans to trumpet a new [draft planning and agenda document, "The Future We Want,"](#) that will compel American families to pay \$1,325 per year to "stop" climate change. Bolton, alongside many savvy taxpayers, is right to worry when such an organization seeking to manage a \$100 billion a year fund based on dodgy science is at the same time demanding immunity from prosecution. Can you think of a better recipe for corruption?"*

Surely on such an issue as supposed catastrophic climate alarm, if the UN IPCC and governments had evidence they would want to go to court.

My Conclusions:

The UN IPCC is the antithesis of science. It contradicts science.

CSIRO's endorsement of the UN IPCC reveals that Australia has ceded scientific sovereignty to the UN. It reveals that CSIRO has failed to do its due diligence. It reveals that on the topic of global warming and climate CSIRO is not scientific. Endorsing corruption is corrupt.

Without evidence the UN IPCC contradicts empirical scientific evidence answering all four fundamental questions on alleged global warming (aka climate change). Empirical scientific evidence reveals:

- There is no unusual or unnatural global atmospheric warming trend or pattern;
- Temperature determines atmospheric CO₂ levels. That's the opposite of the UN IPCC's core claim;
- Nature alone determines atmospheric CO₂ levels, regardless of human CO₂;
- Warmer periods are beneficial to people, humanity, civilisation and the environment.

The UN IPCC shamelessly and falsely propagates three core climate misrepresentations. The UN IPCC:

- Reverses empirical science to falsely claim human CO₂ drives climate;
- Contradicts empirical scientific evidence to falsely project future disasters and unfounded sea level scares;
- Falsely promotes the lie that a consensus of scientists supports its position and that it is an eminent scientific organisation.

The UN IPCC Summary for Policy Makers seems, in my view, to move subtly—without causation—from no proof to inferred causation, to implied causation, to future conjecture to forecasts of catastrophe. ie, without justification it simply implies and then assumes correlation and causation. None of the many government funded advocates requested to, quote: “*find any supporting scientific justification*” have found any such evidence.

On climate, the UN IPCC is completely corrupt. Scientifically, it is completely discredited. It fails the ultimate arbiter of science: empirical scientific evidence. The UN IPCC's core claim contradicts empirical scientific evidence.

Conclusions:

- The UN IPCC's severest critics include its own contributors and Lead Authors;
- The UN IPCC's documented behaviour, actions and outputs are evidence against it;
- The UN IPCC is unscientific. It corrupts science. Given that the UN IPCC and some corrupters benefit financially and/or in other ways from corruption, is it fraudulent?
- The UN IPCC is not a scientific body. It is a political body fabricated to drive a political agenda to falsely concoct an unfounded crisis. By their own words, fomenting unfounded perceptions of crisis is reportedly part of the strategy of a small cabal of UN bureaucrats seeking to force global governance within the UN's Agenda 21 ‘*Sustainability*’ campaign;
- • The UN IPCC has used propaganda techniques to falsely cultivate a public aura of being a leading scientific body when it is not;
- • Corruption and conflicts of interest are documented as infecting the ‘work’ of key UN IPCC officeholders;
- CSIRO plays a significant role in processes developing UN IPCC reports;
- CSIRO contradicts empirical scientific evidence by endorsing and promoting the UN IPCC's deception and unscientific reports;

- CSIRO has thus ceded sovereignty over Australian science to an unscientific foreign political organisation pushing its own political agenda;
- CSIRO is thus abetting massive systemic, systematic and pervasive documented orchestrated corruption of science.

A fundamental question: If the UN IPCC cannot find and present evidence of an association between CO₂ and temperature, how can it find causation between CO₂ and temperature?

The UN IPCC's claims and projections on climate cannot and should not be relied upon. Basing policy in part or in full on UN IPCC projections is a failure of due diligence by public officials. Such policies and resultant legislation need to be struck down and rescinded. The legislation's movers and active advocates should resign from parliament.

David Karoly's connection

The Lead Author of the 2001 UN IPCC report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ (chapter 12) is David Karoly. That chapter contains no empirical scientific evidence of that claim.

Despite that, he was appointed Review Editor of the 2007 UN IPCC report's sole chapter claiming warming and attributing it to human CO₂ (chapter 9). That chapter contains no empirical scientific evidence of that claim yet implies there is evidence.

David Karoly contributed papers that he authored or co-authored in his 2001 chapter and in his 2007 chapter.

David Karoly was a writer of the 2007 UN IPCC draft Summary for Policy Makers sent to all national governments and media worldwide. The SPM implied evidence for warming despite the UN IPCC having no such empirical scientific evidence of human causation and despite scientific doubt that any significant warming occurred at all.

David Karoly publicly misrepresents the UN IPCC in public as a credible body.

Will Steffen's connection

Will Steffen is a contributing author to the UN IPCC.

He is aware of the Inter Academy Council (IAC) report yet has publicly advised audiences that the report endorses UN IPCC science. That's false. The report condemns UN IPCC processes and procedures and undermines reports' conclusions.

Will Steffen publicly misrepresents the UN IPCC by claiming it's a credible body.

UN IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri is quoted as saying, *“If the IPCC wasn’t there, why would anyone be worried about climate change?”* Claims of catastrophic global warming supposedly due to human CO₂ have been fabricated without any evidence and while contradicting empirical scientific evidence. The UN IPCC’s purpose has been to falsely fabricate global warming and blame it on human CO₂.

My analysis of the UN IPCC produces two main conclusions and one simple question:

1. UN IPCC reports are corruptions of science. The UN IPCC’s implied core claims contradict empirical scientific evidence. They’re based on beliefs. The UN IPCC is driven by ideology and is an ideological tool.
2. Through a clever network in developed nations, the corruption is being perpetrated by misappropriating government spending and resources. Some involved are seemingly doing this deliberately. Many others are unwitting supporters.
3. Why? What’s the motive? Could it be Maurice Strong’s stated goal: establishing centrally controlled socialist global governance?

These conclusions provide reassurance on climate. As explained in later sections, it provides huge opportunity for improving human life and for caring for the natural environment. Restoring science will pave the way for resumption of humanity’s proven relentless march to safer, easier, more comfortable, abundant, secure and fairer lifestyles with even greater understanding, respect and care of our planet and our natural environment.

"People's beliefs and convictions are in almost every case gotten at second-hand, and without examination, from authorities who have not themselves examined the questions at issue but have taken them at second-hand from other non-examiners, whose opinions about them were not worth a brass farthing." Mark Twain.