

> Writing a book is a journey. When I began, I intended to examine arguments for & against dangerous, human-caused climate change, to let the public know there was actually a diversity of opinion. Instead, I ended up writing an expose of a United Nations body.

What I learned along the way turned me into a climate skeptic or - as I like to call myself these days - a climate rebel. Those of us who are climate rebels, those of us who dissent from mainstream thinking about climate change, have a big fat problem.

On the one hand there's us – scattered groups of individuals, voices in the wilderness.

On the other hand there is a worldwide, government-funded, politically influential organization that is on the cusp of celebrating its 25th anniversary. It's known as the IPCC – the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

>Most people have never heard of the IPCC. Which makes it difficult to even have a conversation about this organization. But make no mistake, your government has.

If you write to your elected representatives expressing doubt about climate dogma you will almost certainly receive a reply back that says your government *accepts the findings of the IPCC*.

This is a letter dated last year from your ministry of Environment and Water.

>To provide another example, here's a slick, 28-page document available on the government of Alberta website. It's called "Facts about climate change"

On the page that follows the table of contents one of the first things we hear about is the great IPCC – along with its web address.

>On page 12 we're told that that the IPCC believes that climate change will cause more intense storms. Those of you who've already read my book know that peer-reviewed research currently finds no link between more intense storms & climate change. As I explain there, the IPCC relied on a single, non-published, non-peer-reviewed paper to make that argument.

On page 18 of your government's discussion of climate change *facts*, rank speculation about what's going to happen centuries hence is presented to the public as a sound "conclusion".

Even here in Alberta where fossil fuels are such an important part of the economy, even here where political conservatives have governed for decades, the IPCC is the unquestioned authority.

It's a similar story the world over. For years now officials at all levels – from small municipalities to federal ministries - have insisted that we need to fight climate change because *the IPCC says so*.

>In other words, while many UN bodies don't have any direct influence on your life - or your pocketbook - this UN body does. And it wants to intrude even further.

Thomas Stocker, a Swiss climate modeller, is currently in charge of the IPCC's *hard science* section (aka Working Group 1). Last June a reporter interviewed him at length for a story that appeared in the Vancouver Sun. This headline suggests what will happen to your family's finances if the IPCC is ever in charge.

>Rajendra Pachauri has been chairman of the IPCC for the past decade. He thinks new taxes should be introduced to deter us little people from flying - meanwhile he himself flies practically non-stop. He thinks we should eat less meat, and that & we all need to undergo a *radical value shift*.

Now let's think about that for a minute. This UN official wants to change not merely my lifestyle but my *values*. What makes him imagine that *my* values are any of *his* business?

> So, to recap: the IPCC is a UN body that already influences our governments and our lives. And it wants to expand that influence.

It seems to me, therefore, that we should be paying a bit more attention to this organization. But here's a remarkable fact: Even though the IPCC has been around for almost a quarter of a century, even though it was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2007, even though it is relied on by governments far & wide, my book is the first independent examination of this organization. No other journalist has bothered.

So what happens when we begin to look closely? What do we find?

I'm here to tell you that the IPCC suffers from *a number* of problems that fatally undermine its credibility. On this occasion I'm going to talk about 2 of them: who writes its reports, & the overall structure of the organization.

> Since the mid 1990s the media has been telling us that the people writing IPCC reports are the world's top scientists & best experts.

> Green groups have been singing from exactly the same hymn book.

> Nor is there any mystery as to where this idea comes from - it comes straight from the chairman. Here's what Rajendra Pachauri told a newspaper a few years back:

>But those claims turn out to be total nonsense. A number of talented & experienced scientists have indeed helped to write IPCC reports over the years. The problem is that many other IPCC authors don't come close to being *leading scientists* at the *top of their profession*. Among these people is a group of 20-something graduate students.

>Other authors are professional activists employed by green lobby groups.

>What is a WWF climate change spokesperson doing within a mile of a *scientific* assessment? What is she doing there? How could the IPCC possibly have mistaken her for a world-class scientist?

>Speaking of the WWF, something rather curious happened back in 2004.

...This is the equivalent of a judge in a murder trial, a judge who's supposed to be neutral and impartial, partying with the prosecution team in the evenings while the trial's going on during the day.

More than 100 “leading climate scientists” couldn’t figure out that this was a problem. Are they naive? Dense? Politically unsophisticated rubes? You decide.

>So what does this mean? What was the fallout?

>So that’s reason #1 why we can’t trust the IPCC. Contrary to the official mythology, these reports are not written by the world’s top experts. Many IPCC authors are inexperienced students, activists employed by NGOs, & scientists with links to green lobbyists.

In other words, the IPCC makes claims about its own personnel that are not supported by the evidence.

>Which brings me to my second reason. Suppose we lived in a magical world & we could fix that first problem.

Suppose it were possible to clean house from top to bottom, to be absolutely sure that every last IPCC author was top-notch, thoroughly dispassionate, with no activist connections whatsoever.

Would the IPCC *then* be trustworthy? Could we place our faith in it? I’m afraid not.

>Here’s why. On the IPCC’s website you will find this 300-word description. We are expressly told that this is a “scientific body.” As you can see from the bolding I’ve inserted, the words “scientific” and “scientist” get used rather often. 7 times, in fact, in this 5-paragraph discussion.

We are supposed to come away from the IPCC’s website convinced that what’s going on there is *science*.

>But let’s pay special attention to paragraphs 4 and 5.

> I’ve enlarged them here & highlighted some of the text in red. Before continuing I’m going to give you just a few seconds to quickly read these over.

First of all it’s important to note that scientists do not belong to the IPCC. Nations do.

The membership of the IPCC is essentially the same as the membership of the UN. In other words, the IPCC is a venue in which *governments* arrive at a common understanding about climate change. That’s what the red sentence in the final paragraph is talking about. By participating in the IPCC process, governments agree to the interpretation of the science contained within IPCC reports.

What these paragraphs do not tell us – and what the media has utterly failed to point out - is that scientists get overruled by politicians in this organization. The IPCC has been deliberately designed that way.

>IPCC reports can be thousands of pages long. The 2007 report is 3,000 pages. Most of us don’t have weeks of spare time to wade through documents of that length. As a result, it’s the much shorter, executive summaries that really matter.

The IPCC calls these *Summaries for Policymakers*. These are the documents that actually get read by politicians & by journalists.

What few people appreciate is that these summaries are only *drafted* by IPCC authors. Even if every last one of them was a top-notch scientist, the final wording of these documents is *beyond their control*.

What happens is that countries send diplomatic teams to IPCC plenary meetings. Behind closed doors – neither the public nor the media are permitted so there is no transparency about what is taking place - the final wording of these summaries is *negotiated*. Sentence by sentence. By bureaucrats & politicians.

Those negotiating sessions go on for days – sometimes dragging on all night. People who've attended them say that the teams with the most stamina often secure the wording they want by wearing down everyone else. They also say that, as the final deadline approaches, in the rush to finish things up, errors make their way into these summaries.

>In 2007 a reporter with Bloomberg News asked chairman Pachauri why the IPCC had released a Summary for Policymakers but not the full report itself. The reporter was told that the delay was due to the fact that the IPCC needed to “ensure that the underlying report conforms to the refinements” hammered out by the politicians.

Got that? The chairman of the IPCC admits that his organization goes back & tweaks what those allegedly top scientific minds have written so that the science reports conform to the version of reality negotiated by the politicians.

>Is that really how a *scientific body* operates? Is scientific truth established by negotiators in the middle of the night?

>This, ladies and gentleman, is the organization on which your government relies when it explains climate change “facts” to the public.

~~This, ladies and gentleman, is the organization on which your government relies when it explains climate change “facts” to the public.~~

This is the organization on which your government relies when it makes decisions that affect your heating bills, your taxes, & your ability to run a profitable business.

NB

The original version of this document was 6 pages long. The font size has been reduced here and page numbers have been inserted.