



Blooming brilliant. Devastating.

Matt Ridley, author of The Rational Optimist

...shines a hard light on the rotten heart of the IPCC.

Richard Tol, Professor of the Economics of Climate Change and convening lead author of the IPCC

...you need to read this book. Its implications are far-reaching and the need to begin acting on them is urgent.

Ross McKittrick, Professor of Economics, University of Guelph

The Delinquent Teenager

who was mistaken for the world's top climate expert

© 2011 by Donna Laframboise

ISBN: 978-1-894984-05-8
Ivy Avenue Press, Toronto, Canada
IvyAvenue.com

The following exposé of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change was written by an investigative journalist and is the product of two years of research.

There are no real experts, only people who understand their own little pieces of the puzzle. The big picture is a mystery...

Danny Hillis, Millennium bug skeptic, *Newsweek*, May 1999

Science is a mosaic of partial and conflicting visions.

Freeman Dyson, *The Scientist as Rebel*, 2006

Table of Contents

1 - A Closer Look at the World's Leading Climate Body	4
2 - Showered With Praise	5
3 - The Top Scientists & Best Experts?	6
4 - Twenty-Something Graduate Students	8
5 - The Right Gender or the Right Country	9
6 - Activists	10
7 - Climate Modelers	13
8 - Clear as Mud	16
9 - The Immense Edifice That Wasn't	19
10 - The Shield and the Sword	21
11 - The Peer Review Fairy Tale	24
12 - Facts and Fiction	26
13 - Screw the Rules	28
14 - The Stern Review Scandal	29
15 - Cutoff Dates, What Cutoff Dates?	31
16 - This is Called Cheating	32
17 - Cross-Examination	34
18 - Endangered: Independent Minds	36
19 - The International Political Stage	39
20 - The Cart Before the Horse	41
21 - What's a Nice Scientist Like You Doing in a Place Like This?	43
22 - Science Has (Not) Spoken	44
23 - Science is Not a Tyrant	47
24 - A Solution in Search of a Problem	49
25 - Pachauri's Cause	51
26 - Following the Leader	54
27 - Moral Midgets	59
28 - Spinning Straw into Gold	63
29 - The Cut-and-Paste Job	66
30 - Steering Society	69
31 - Extinction Fiction	74
32 - The Hockey Stick	79
33 - Peer Review IPCC Style	83
34 - A Damning Assessment	87
35 - If the Jury Has Been Rigged	90
36 - Disband the IPCC	91
Praise for this Book	93
About Donna Laframboise	94
Acknowledgments	96
A word about my evidence	99
The Citizen Audit	100
Footnotes	103

1 - A Closer Look at the World's Leading Climate Body

This book is about a spoiled child. Year after year, this child has been admired, flattered, and praised. There has been no end of self-esteem-building in his life. What there has been little of, though, is honest feedback or constructive criticism.

When we're young, our parents ensure that we confront our mistakes. When our ball shatters a neighbor's window we're required to apologize - and to help pay for a replacement. What happens, though, if a child is insulated from consequences? What if he hears his parents tell the neighbor that because he's special and precious he hasn't done anything *that* wrong by trampling the neighbor's flower bed?

The answer is obvious. A child who is never corrected is unlikely to develop self-discipline. A child whom everyone says is brilliant feels no need to strive for excellence. Nor does he have much hope of developing what, in this tale, is the most important quality of all: sound judgment.

The child at the center of this book was brought into the world by two United Nations bodies - one focused on the weather, the other on the environment. Called the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - IPCC for short - this child arrived more than 20 years ago. [\[FOOTNOTE 1-1\]](#)

Notice that the word *intergovernmental* is part of its name. This means that every country that chooses to send delegates to infrequent meetings is a godparent of the IPCC. Any child with over 100 godparents is bound to be spoiled. Even when he torments small animals there will always be those who think he can do no wrong.

Which means that disciplining this child is next to impossible.

Having morphed into an obnoxious adolescent, the IPCC is now everyone's problem. This is because it performs one of the most important jobs in the world. Its purpose is to survey the scientific literature regarding climate change, to decide what it all means, and to write an ongoing series of reports. These reports are informally known as the Climate Bible.

The Climate Bible is cited by governments around the world. It is the reason carbon taxes are being introduced, heating bills are rising, and costly new regulations are being enacted. It is why everyone thinks carbon dioxide emissions are dangerous.

Put simply: the entire planet is in a tizzy because of a UN report. What most of us don't know is that, rather than being written by a meticulous, upstanding professional in business attire, this report was produced by a slapdash, slovenly teenager who has trouble distinguishing right from wrong.

For now, let us consider just one example. In the grown-up world, whenever important decisions and large amounts of money are involved conflict-of-interest mechanisms are firmly in place. Lawyers, accountants, politicians, and many others are subject to these rules as a matter-of-course. People who expect to be trusted by the public adopted them long ago.

Yet even though the IPCC is one of the world's most influential bodies, and even though it evaluates matters in which trillions of dollars are at stake, well into the 21st century it saw no need to even discuss

conflict-of-interest. This organization is so arrogant, so used to being fawned over, that its leaders failed to take the most ordinary of precautions.

2 - Showered With Praise

The IPCC has lounged, for more than two decades, in a large comfy chair atop a pedestal. When the IPCC is mentioned in broadcasts, newspapers, and books it is portrayed as a paragon of scientific truth and authority. Here are some direct quotes from people describing the IPCC:

- phenomenally successful
- a remarkable history of accomplishments
- there is not a parallel on this planet, in any field of endeavour
- its place in the history books is clear
- if the IPCC says something, you had better believe it [\[FOOTNOTE 2-1\]](#)

Journalists are among the IPCC's most ardent admirers. They say the Climate Bible is written by thousands of the world's top experts who all agree with its conclusions. They routinely use words such as *gold standard*, *authoritative*, and *pre-eminent* to describe it. Indeed, when discussing the IPCC the media sound more like cheerleaders than hard-nosed reporters:

- the IPCC...has shown us the way (*Time* magazine)
- It is chapter and verse, it is Holy Writ (*Irish Independent*)
- most scientists have been awed by the IPCC's deliberate work (*New York Times*)
- The greatest feat of global scientific cooperation ever seen...utterly unique and authoritative (UK *Guardian*) [\[FOOTNOTE 2-2\]](#)

In 2007, the Nobel committee joined the chorus of praise singers and crowned the IPCC with a Nobel Peace Prize. During his presentation speech, the Nobel chairman thanked the IPCC for its "outstanding scientific work" and for all it has done "for mother earth." According to the Nobel committee, although it was once unclear whether human activities were causing global warming, "Thanks to the IPCC there is very little such doubt today."

If you know a bit about history, though, that Nobel speech may have left you uneasy. This is how it ended: "Action is needed now. Climate changes are already moving beyond human control." [\[FOOTNOTE 2-3\]](#)

Let us be sensible for a moment. Planet Earth is 4.5 billion years old. During that time it has endured all sorts of perfectly natural climate transformations. As recently as 20,000 years ago 97% of Canada was covered by ice. [\[FOOTNOTE 2-4\]](#) That ice melted and retreated and the Ice Age ended all on its own. The Egyptian pharaohs, remember, only came into the picture 5,000 years ago, while the Romans ruled 2,000 years ago. To suggest that the climate has ever been within *human control* is surely a bit silly.

Mark Twain once [observed](#) that:

...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.

If Twain were alive today, he might have sharp words for all the hype surrounding the IPCC. Twain was talking about religion and politics when he made the above remarks and, for some people, environmentalism has become a substitute religion. It is their worldview, the lens through which they interpret everything. Moreover, because the IPCC is a child of the United Nations - the stage on which so many of the world's power blocs jostle with one another - whether we like it or not the IPCC is also mixed up with politics.

It has long been fashionable to be green. For half a century we've taught our children that the planet is fragile, that humans treat it carelessly, and that we are on the brink of ecological disaster. Smart individuals armed with plenty of facts and figures [argue](#) that the opposite is actually the case. They say the state of the world is steadily improving, that it's becoming cleaner and healthier. But their voices barely register.

The larger point is that because we have been told so frequently that humans are a threat to the planet we are all *predisposed* to believe that our actions might trigger dangerous climate change. Most of us have never seriously questioned this idea. Among us are prime ministers, regulators, and supreme court judges. Among us are educators, community activists, and parents understandably concerned about the world their children will inherit.

This is why the IPCC has received so little scrutiny. This is why no one noticed that conflict-of-interest guidelines were missing. We all made the mistake of believing the IPCC was a gem of an organization simply because it is connected to protecting the environment.

Closer examination reveals that many of the things we've been told about the IPCC are mistaken. For instance, a great deal of noise is made about the allegedly rigorous manner in which its reports get written. The implication is that the IPCC has procedures and that these procedures are followed diligently.

But while the IPCC has taken the time to write down some rules of the road, it has never hired any traffic cops. Since many people exceed the speed limit when police officers are plentiful, what do we suppose happens when they're entirely absent?

In the real world, when undisciplined youngsters slide behind the wheel of a fast car, how many of them can be counted on to behave?

3 - The Top Scientists & Best Experts?

The people who write IPCC reports are the *crème de la crème*. Everyone says so. Rajendra Pachauri, the person who has been the IPCC's chairman since 2002, tells us this repeatedly. In 2007 he [explained](#) to a newspaper how his organization selects individuals to help write the Climate Bible:

These are people who have been chosen on the basis of their track record, on their record of publications, on the research that they have done...They are people who are at the top of their profession...

Two years later, when testifying before a committee of the US Senate, Pachauri [argued](#) that "all rational persons" should be persuaded by the IPCC's conclusions since his organization mobilizes "the best talent available across the world."

Whether he speaks in Austria or Australia, whether he gives an interview or writes articles himself, Pachauri [says](#) he "can't think of a better set of qualified people" to write IPCC reports. At various times he has said the IPCC consists of:

- thousands of the best scientists
- the best scientific expertise from around the world
- almost four thousand of the world's best specialists [\[FOOTNOTE 3-1\]](#)

Nor is he the only one to make such claims. Robert Watson, who chaired the IPCC for the five years before Pachauri took over, also [says](#) the "IPCC engages thousands of the world's best experts." Media outlets have [repeated](#) these assertions time and again.

But such claims are bogus. For starters, some of the world's most experienced experts have been left out in the cold. In 2005 an atmospheric science professor from Colorado State University named William Gray [told](#) a US Senate Committee:

Despite my 50 years of meteorology experience and my many years of involvement in seasonal hurricane and climate prediction, I have never been asked for input on any of the [IPCC] reports.

The reason he wasn't invited to the party, he says, is because he doesn't think global warming causes more (or stronger) hurricanes. "They know my views and do not wish to have to deal with them."

Six months prior to Gray's testimony, an expert on the other side of the Atlantic was [raising](#) his own concerns before a committee of the British House of Lords. Paul Reiter knows little about atmospheric science. What he does know is the field in which he has specialized for more than 40 years - diseases that are spread by mosquitoes. According to him, the people who've been writing about those diseases in the Climate Bible are not experts.

While a large portion of the health chapter in the 1995 edition dealt with malaria, Reiter points out that "not one of the lead authors had ever written a research paper on the subject!" Only those with limited knowledge of this field, he says, could have produced such "amateurish" work.

For example, the Climate Bible said malaria-transmitting mosquitoes usually don't survive in areas where winter temperatures drop below 16°C (60°F). Reiter says that's nonsense. We now associate malaria with tropical locales, but poverty and an absence of health care are important factors. Hawaii, Aruba, and Barbados are all tropical, but malaria isn't a problem there. On the other hand, in the 1800s thousands died of malaria in North America and Europe - even in Siberia. [\[FOOTNOTE 3-2\]](#)

It's the same story with sea levels. The former president of a Commission on Sea Level Change, Nils-Axel Mörner, also [addressed](#) the House of Lords committee. Mörner, who has 40 years experience in his field, called attention to the disparity between what genuine sea level specialists think and what those who write IPCC reports believe. Those in the second group, he says, lack hands-on expertise. Instead, they attempt to predict the future via mathematical formulas that have been fed into computers (computer modeling).

Mörner told the House of Lords that, between 1999 and 2003, genuine sea level experts held five international meetings to discuss the available real-world evidence. They concluded that sea levels are unlikely to increase by more than 10 cm (4 inches) by the year 2100. Mörner says the claim that sea levels are rising quickly - or that entire island nations are in imminent danger of drowning - are simply not true.

Dr. Gray, the hurricane specialist, resides in America. Dr. Reiter, the malaria expert, works at the Pasteur Institute in Paris. Dr. Mörner is the former head of a geodynamics unit at the University of Stockholm, in Sweden.

Each of them possesses highly specialized knowledge. Each of them is a seasoned professional with long experience in his field. They are, in other words, exactly the kind of people you'd expect to find at the heart of an organization comprised of world-class scientists examining one of the planet's most important questions.

But they are all IPCC outsiders. This suggests the IPCC defines *top scientists* and *best experts* differently than do most of us.

4 - Twenty-Something Graduate Students

So if malaria experts aren't writing the section on malaria in the Climate Bible and world-renowned sea level experts aren't writing the section on sea levels, who *is* writing IPCC reports?

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."

5 - The Right Gender or the Right Country

In early 2010 the InterAcademy Council, an organization comprised of science bodies from around the world, took an historic step. It established a committee whose purpose was to investigate IPCC policies and procedures. [\[FOOTNOTE 5-1\]](#)

The committee posted a [questionnaire](#) on its website and invited interested parties to respond. Answers to those questionnaires were eventually made public after the names of the respondents had been removed. Those provided by IPCC insiders can be separated from the ones submitted by concerned citizens because the questionnaire begins by asking what role the respondent has played in the IPCC. [\[FOOTNOTE 5-2\]](#)

People with direct experience of this organization were remarkably frank in their feedback. According to them, scientific excellence isn't the only reason individuals are invited to participate in the IPCC.

Remember, this is a UN body. It therefore cares about the same things other UN bodies care about. Things like diversity. Gender balance. Regional representation. The degree to which developing countries are represented compared to developed countries.

The [collected answers](#) to the questionnaire total 678 pages. As early as page 16, someone complains that: "some of the lead authors...are clearly not qualified to be lead authors." Here are other direct quotes:

- There are far too many politically correct appointments, so that developing country scientists are appointed who have insufficient scientific competence to do anything useful. This is reasonable if it is regarded as a learning experience, but in my chapter...we had half of the [lead authors] who were not competent. (p. 138)
- The whole process...[is] flawed by an excessive concern for geographical balance. All decisions are political before being scientific. (p. 554)
- half of the authors are there for simply representing different parts of the world. (p. 296)

Lest anyone think that people from less affluent countries were being unjustly stereotyped, the person whose comments appear on page 330 agrees:

The team members from the developing countries (including myself) were made to feel welcome and accepted as part of the team. In reality we were out of our intellectual depth as meaningful contributors to the process.

The questionnaire did not contain the word *gender*. Nevertheless, it is uttered dozens of times in the answers people provided. While some feel the IPCC should not aim for gender balance, others applaud the use of this selection criteria.

Among those with firsthand IPCC experience, therefore, it is an open secret that some people are appointed for reasons that have little to do with world-class scientific expertise. Depending on whose opinion you believe, this is true in either a small minority of cases or with regard to as many as half of the authors. In the view of at least one person, *every* IPCC personnel decision is influenced by concerns unrelated to science.

If the United Nations regards the IPCC as a training ground for scientists from the developing world that's perfectly OK. If it thinks one of the main goals of the IPCC is to raise the profile of female scientists that's OK, too. It is entitled to do whatever it wants with its own organization. But it is dishonest to tell the world you've assembled a group of competitive cyclists when many on your team are actually riding tricycles.

Journalists say we should trust the IPCC's conclusions because its reports have been written by the world's finest scientific minds. But in order for that to be the case the IPCC would need to apply very different criteria when selecting its authors.

It would need an explicit policy that says something along the lines of: Even though we are a UN body, we are not influenced by UN diversity concerns. We select the world's best experts and only the best experts - regardless of where they come from or what gender they happen to be.

That is the kind of IPCC I could believe in. But that is not the IPCC we have.

6 - Activists

Many environmental organizations employ people whose sole purpose is to raise awareness about global warming. The more effective these people are at convincing the public there's an urgent problem, the more money we're likely to contribute to their cause.

Since activists bring their own agenda to the table, and since agendas and science don't mix, environmentalists need to keep their distance from scientific endeavors. Data cannot be considered

scientifically reputable if it has been collected and analyzed by activists. Scientific conclusions - especially those involving judgment calls - cannot be trusted if activists have played a role.

But activists have not kept their distance from the IPCC. Nor has that organization taken steps to safeguard its reputation by maintaining a strict boundary between itself and green groups. This is one of those red flags, an indicator that the IPCC is a spoiled child that feels no need to conduct its affairs in a grown-up, professional manner.

The improper relationship between activists and the IPCC is illustrated by a 2007 Greenpeace [publication](#). The [foreword](#) to that document was written by none other than Rajendra Pachauri. At the end of his remarks, beside his photograph, he is identified not as a private individual expressing private opinions but as the chairman of the IPCC.

The following year Pachauri wrote another [foreword](#) for another Greenpeace publication. Think about this for a moment. The IPCC's role is similar to that of a trial judge. It examines the scientific evidence and decides whether or not human-produced carbon dioxide is guilty of triggering climate change.

How much faith would you have in the impartiality of a murder trial if the judge was hearing evidence during the day and partying with the prosecution team during the evening?

As has been mentioned above, the fact that [Richard Klein](#) worked as a Greenpeace campaigner at age 23 was no impediment to the IPCC appointing him a lead author at age 25. But that's just the beginning.

[Bill Hare](#) has been a Greenpeace [spokesperson](#) since 1992 and [served](#) as its 'chief climate negotiator' in 2007. A Greenpeace blog post [describes](#) him as a *legend* in that organization. Yet none of this has prevented him from filling senior IPCC roles.

When the 2007 edition of the Climate Bible was released, we learned that Hare had served as a [lead author](#), that he'd been an [expert reviewer](#) for two out of three sections of the report, and that he was [one of only 40 people](#) on the "core writing team" for the overall, big-picture summary known as the Synthesis Report.

It's worth noting that the IPCC is less-than-candid about Hare's Greenpeace ties. The 2007 Climate Bible lists his [affiliation](#) as the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany. Since Hare is a ['visiting scientist'](#) there the IPCC hasn't lied. Nevertheless, it has committed a sin of omission. His Greenpeace affiliation means he's not just any researcher.

Imagine you're an accident victim on the side of the road. You're told not to worry, that the person who's going to remain with you until the ambulance arrives is trained in first aid. What you aren't told is that he is also a vampire and that the blood seeping from your wound will be difficult for him to resist. You have not been warned about the presence of another agenda - one that changes the picture dramatically.

In 2009 an activist think tank [observed](#) that both Hare and a person named Malte have "long been key members of the Greenpeace International climate team." Malte's surname is Meinshausen. In 2001 he and Hare [co-authored](#) an analysis of the Kyoto Protocol. During 2002 and 2003 he was a Greenpeace spokesperson. [\[FOOTNOTE 6-1\]](#)

But these facts didn't prevent him from being recruited as a contributing author to not [one](#), not [two](#), but [three](#) chapters of the 2007 Climate Bible. Like the graduate students discussed above, Meinshausen's

participation demonstrates that many IPCC authors are hardly elder scholars. He only [received](#) his doctorate in 2005.

A number of passages in the 2007 Climate Bible blandly cite research papers authored by Hare and Meinshausen as though it's immaterial that they are Greenpeace personnel. Indeed, the IPCC goes so far as to [reprint](#) a graph that appears in a paper for which these two men are the sole authors.

But the Greenpeace connection extends still further. Australian marine biologist Ove Hoegh-Guldberg is often [described](#) as a "world renowned reef expert." Nine chapters of the 2007 Climate Bible base their conclusions partly on his work. [\[FOOTNOTE 6-2\]](#) He was a [contributing author](#) to that report and has been appointed a [coordinating lead author](#) for the upcoming edition.

The problem is that Hoegh-Guldberg has had close ties to activist organizations for the past 17 years. Between 1994 and 2000 he wrote [four reports](#) about coral reefs and climate change that were funded, vetted, and published by Greenpeace. Since then he has written two more for the World Wildlife Fund (WWF).

Someone who has spent 17 years working closely with activist groups is thoroughly tainted. By no stretch of the imagination can he be considered a disinterested party who will carefully weigh the pros and cons and then write a scrupulously objective account of the situation.

Speaking of the WWF, its [website](#) includes a formal photograph of 20 of the IPCC's most senior personnel. In the second row there's a gentleman named Richard Moss, who has been involved with the IPCC for nearly 20 years. During part of that time he was employed by the WWF as one of its vice-presidents. [\[FOOTNOTE 6-3\]](#)

Similarly, [Jennifer Morgan](#) spent several years as the WWF's chief spokesperson on climate change. She led its global climate change program and headed its delegation to the Kyoto Protocol negotiations. Prior to that, she worked for the Climate Action Network. Currently she is director of a climate program for the World Resources Institute.

In other words, Morgan is not one of the world finest scientific minds. She is a professional activist. Yet in June 2010 the IPCC [appointed](#) her to work on a report it describes as objective, rigorous, and balanced.

Michael Oppenheimer is also worth a mention. When the public hears the term 'scientist' we think of someone who is above the fray - who's disinterested and dispassionate and who goes wherever the scientific results happen to lead. This implied neutrality is what gives scientists their authority. But in the 1970s a new kind of scientist began to emerge - the activist scientist. Nowadays these people occupy impressive positions at universities. They are often employed by respectable government bodies. All of that disguises the fact that they hold activist worldviews and that those views can influence their scientific judgment. [\[FOOTNOTE 6-4\]](#)

Research findings are rarely clear-cut. Data is collected, selected, discarded, adjusted, and interpreted by human beings. At every juncture there is the risk of going astray, of dismissing information that is actually important. The bits and pieces that get left on the cutting-room floor might add up to a different story. Because activist scientists begin with a particular narrative in mind, they may be unconsciously blind to these other possibilities.

At first glance, [Oppenheimer](#) could hardly seem more eminent. He is director of a program in science, technology and environmental policy at Princeton University, as well as a professor in the atmospheric sciences department.

Prior to these appointments, however, Oppenheimer spent more than two decades as the chief scientist for the activist Environmental Defense Fund (EDF). That organization is so wealthy its list of [staff experts](#) includes more than 100 names. Among them are seven attorneys, eight economists, and a vice-president of corporate sponsorships.

Although we are familiar with the idea that big business exerts an influence on public debates, most of us have overlooked the fact that there's also such a thing as big green. Groups like the EDF lobby ferociously to advance their particular perspective. They also hire people who provide their activist agenda with a veneer of scientific respectability. Even now, Oppenheimer continues to [advise](#) the EDF. This means that his professional life has been spent in an activist milieu.

The IPCC doesn't think that matters. His online [biography](#) says Oppenheimer has been "a long-time participant." He was a lead author for the 2007 edition of the Climate Bible, is serving as an [even more senior author](#) for the upcoming edition, and also helped the IPCC write a special report on "climate extremes and disasters." [\[FOOTNOTE 6-5\]](#)

Perhaps one of the reasons the IPCC doesn't view Oppenheimer as irredeemably contaminated is because the scientific profession itself appears to have lost its bearings on such matters. Oppenheimer's Princeton bio further tells us that he:

has been a member of several panels of the National Academy of Sciences and is now a member of the National Academies' Board on Energy and Environmental Studies. He is also...a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The activist scientists who emerged in the 1970s have been working their way into high-status, leadership positions. Rather than keeping its distance from those whose careers have been associated with activism, the scientific establishment now honors, celebrates, and promotes such people.

But this has consequences. The public is supposed to accept the Climate Bible's findings because it is a scientific document written by the world's top scientific experts. What happens when the public discovers that those involved are actually brazen activists? What happens when it discovers that the world's most illustrious science bodies have themselves stopped drawing a line in the sand between activists and those who strive to pursue science in a genuinely neutral and unbiased fashion?

If scientists want us to trust their expert opinions they need to behave in a trustworthy manner. If they want us to be impressed by their high standards, they need to enforce these standards.

From this perspective, the shenanigans at the IPCC shed light on a broader malaise within the scientific community as a whole.

7 - Climate Modelers

Along with graduate students, those appointed due to their gender or their county, and activists, yet another group is prominent among IPCC authors - climate modelers. Although these people are often called *scientists*, their work has little in common with traditional science.

The scientific method involves forming an hypothesis, testing that hypothesis in the real world, and then confirming, adjusting, or abandoning the hypothesis according to what the real-world tests reveal. But there is no duplicate planet Earth on which experiments may be safely conducted. No one knows, therefore, what will happen if the number of carbon dioxide molecules in the atmosphere increases from 390 to 600 parts per million.

These really are the amounts under discussion. Scientists believe carbon dioxide used to comprise less than 0.03% of the atmosphere - 280 parts per *million* - prior to the industrial revolution. Currently, at 390 parts per million, it's approaching 0.04%. Barring emissions reductions, by the year 2100 that number could reach 0.06%. All this fuss is based on a hypothesis that says our planet is so unstable a slight increase in one particular trace gas will trigger disaster. [\[FOOTNOTE 7-1\]](#)

Since there's no way to actually test this hypothesis, some people have adopted an alternative approach. They say that supercomputers programmed with complex mathematical formulas confirm that a bit more CO₂ in the atmosphere will be really bad news. In the view of climate modelers, these computer *simulations* are as good as hard evidence.

But this requires a rather large leap of faith. If math and computing power were the only things necessary to predict the future, investors would already know the price at which gold will be trading five, ten, and twenty years hence. But the world is chaotic and unpredictable. It rarely unfolds in the manner that even the smartest people, aided by graphs, charts, and computers, think it will.

Many of the same institutions now involved in long-term climate modeling got their start predicting short-term weather. We all know how unreliable that can be. Sometimes the weather behaves the way the experts think it will. Often it does not.

[Freeman Dyson](#), one of the world's most eminent physicists, has studied climate models. He [says](#) that although they do some things well,

They do not begin to describe the real world that we live in. The real world is muddy and messy and full of things that we do not yet understand. It is much easier for a scientist to sit in an air-conditioned building and run computer models, than to put on winter clothes and measure what is really happening outside in the swamps and the clouds. That is why the climate model experts end up believing their own models.

In other words, climate modelers spend their professional lives in a virtual world rather than in the real one. If an engineer's bridge is faulty, it doesn't matter how highly his fellow engineers praise its design, harsh reality will make its shortcomings evident to everyone. Since climate modelers are insulated from real world checks-and-balances (there's no way to verify their long term predictions in the short term), the only thing that seems to matter are the opinions of other modelers. This is a recipe for tunnel-vision. It is groupthink waiting to happen.

The research bodies that fund climate modeling teams don't appear to have taken any precautions against groupthink. Nor has the IPCC subjected climate models to rigorous evaluation by neutral, disinterested parties. Instead, it recruits the same people who work with these models on a daily basis to write the section of the Climate Bible that passes judgment on them. This is like asking parents to rate their own children's attractiveness. Do we really expect them to tell us their kids are homely?

The relationship between one country's climate modelers and the IPCC illustrates this point. [George Boer](#) is considered the [architect](#) of Canada's climate modeling efforts. As an employee of Environment

Canada (which also produces weather forecasts), he has spent much of his career attempting to convince the powers-that-be that climate models are a legitimate use of public money. There has been a direct relationship between how persuasive he has been and how many staff he's been permitted to hire, how much computing power he's been permitted to purchase, and the amount of professional prestige he has acquired.

Given that his own interests are closely linked to the effectiveness with which he *promotes* climate models, he is emphatically not the sort of person who's likely to conduct the cold, hard assessment the public is entitled to expect before the entire world begins taking climate model results seriously.

Nevertheless, when the IPCC [chose](#) 10 lead authors to write a chapter titled *Climate Models - Evaluation* for its 1995 edition, Boer was among them. So was [Andrew Weaver](#), another Canadian whose entire career depends on climate modeling. (The term 'climate modeler' would seem to apply to a minimum of five of that chapter's other eight lead authors.)

When the same chapter of the 2001 edition of the Climate Bible got written, the story was [similar](#). Weaver and two other modelers repeated their lead author roles. Boer, along with four other Canadians who earn their living as climate modelers, all served as contributing authors.

By the time the IPCC published the 2007 Climate Bible, had it realized that asking climate modelers to evaluate their own handiwork was foolhardy? Nope. Climate modelers once again comprised the vast majority of [lead authors](#) for the *Climate Models and Their Evaluation* chapter.

I'm sure that all of those [currently involved](#) in writing the *Evaluation of Climate Models* chapter of the upcoming Climate Bible are marvelous human beings. But if the world were to decide that climate models are a colossal waste of time and money, many of them would be out of a job. How likely is it, therefore, that this chapter will come to such a conclusion?

In other words, nothing like an independent assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of these models is actually taking place.

But the story gets worse. Climate modelers also write other sections of the Climate Bible - including the crucial [attribution chapter](#). This is where the most important question of all gets decided: Is the slight recent warming of the planet due to human activity or is it part of a perfectly natural, ongoing cycle of both warming and cooling?

For the IPCC's 2007 report, the two most senior authors of that chapter – [Gabriele Hegerl](#) and [Francis Zwiers](#) – were both climate modelers. They based their decision on what they believe their models reveal. [\[FOOTNOTE 7-2\]](#)

The IPCC may claim that the world's top scientific minds and climate modelers are one and the same. But I think that's a stretch. In July 2007, five IPCC authors wrote an [article](#) for *Scientific American* in which they equated climate models with a fortune-teller's crystal ball.

On the one hand, they declared it a certainty that people, plants, and animals would all be living with the consequences of human-induced climate change "for at least the next thousand years." On the other, they said:

Unfortunately, the crystal ball provided by our climate models becomes cloudier for predictions out beyond a century or so.

Each of us has to make up our own mind regarding whom to trust and what to believe. But when I became a grownup, I stopped believing in crystal balls.

Buy the complete PDF edition of this book at: TinyUrl.com/ipcc-expose

Please share this free sample of *The Delinquent Teenager* with friends. A Kindle e-book edition will be available at Amazon.com and Amazon.co.uk in October 2011. (A paperback edition will also be available from Amazon.com - which ships internationally.)

The author feels strongly that e-books should be affordable since paper, printing, and shipping costs are absent. Digital editions therefore cost \$4.99 USD.

Want to avoid shipping costs but don't own an e-reader? Buy the downloadable, print-it-yourself PDF edition (from which this sample has been taken) [HERE](#). Formatted to save paper, it totals 123 pages - the final 20 of which are footnotes.

Praise for this Book

Blooming brilliant. Devastating. I read this book with mounting horror at the failure of the journalistic profession to do its job. Donna Laframboise has done a lonely and thorough investigation exposing shocking bias, distortion and deception in an international institution

[Matt Ridley](#), author of *The Rational Optimist*

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has for long been a public disgrace awaiting exposure. Donna Laframboise's accomplished dismemberment of that organization's pious and often unscientific alarmism, which so many bureaucrats and politicians have fallen for, is a must-read for anyone who has an interest in good public climate policy.

Professor [Robert Carter](#), author of *Climate: the Counter Consensus*

Donna Laframboise does what good journalists do. She does not parrot authority, but asks "is that so?" In this book, she shines a hard light on the rotten heart of the IPCC.

[Richard S.J. Tol](#), Professor of the Economics of Climate Change and convening lead author of the IPCC

As much as it took courage for Donna Laframboise to write this remarkable book, it will likely take even more courage for people to read it, for it shatters one of the most passionately-held illusions of the modern age. The IPCC is widely believed to be an authoritative, trustworthy source of scientific information on climate change. Billions of dollars worth of policy decisions have been made around the world based on this assumption. But in this quietly devastating exposé, investigative journalist Donna Laframboise shows that the IPCC's actual operations bear little resemblance to its public reputation; that far from being an open network of top experts it has turned itself into a narrow clique of like-minded activists; and that its reports have come to be more like agenda-driven propaganda than competent, objective scientific assessments. If you have suspected these things yourself, you will want to read this book. If the idea upsets or offends you, you need to read this book. Its implications are far-reaching and the need to begin acting on them is urgent. I congratulate Donna Laframboise for her outstanding investigation of this complex issue and I recommend this book highly.

[Ross McKittrick](#), Professor of Economics, University of Guelph

Donna Laframboise has written an excellent book describing major problems with the IPCC. Written in clear and compelling language, she makes the case for major reform at that institution with example after example. Although some of these examples are continuations of her investigative work found on her highly readable weblog, much of the material is new - and all of it is fascinating. This will sit on my bookshelf right next to Andrew Montford's *The Hockey Stick Illusion*, another example of the value provided by those willing and able to challenge the climate change consensus.

[Tom Fuller](#), co-author of *Climategate: The CRUtape Letters*

In the past important ideas were subject to open, public contest. Donna Laframboise's excellent book shows how the IPCC has escaped the processes which once disciplined institutions of power and influence. It does not respond to criticism or challenges without a tantrum - and it conceals itself from open debate. Worst of all, politicians take the advice of this spoilt and conceited institution at face-value, deflecting criticism of their own policies by hiding behind its scientific expertise.

[Ben Pile](#), Climate-Resistance.org

About Donna Laframboise

I worked as a journalist during the 1990s, frequently writing difficult, investigative pieces for Canadian magazines and newspapers. Among the editors to whom I reported I had a reputation for tenacity and meticulous documentation.

For four years I wrote a weekly opinion column for *The Toronto Star* - the nation's largest circulation newspaper. Between 1998 and 2001, I was a staffer with the [National Post](#) - where I wrote feature articles, columns, and served on the editorial board. In late 2001 the newspaper was sold and more than 100 of us were laid off. I left journalism and ceased writing altogether. I never expected to author another book ([my first](#), published in 1996, was about the women's movement).

By early 2009, however, emotionally-laden climate change coverage was everywhere - including the pages of my most trusted news sources. Much of the analysis struck me as shallow. I began conducting my own research - eventually reading dozens of books that explored multiple sides of the climate debate (see the second photograph in [this blog post](#)).

When I learned there are many reputable scientists who don't think global warming is a catastrophe-in-the-making, I was offended that I hadn't heard about them before. I started a website called [NOconsensus.org](#) - which was aimed at letting people know there was another side to the story.

For the record, I didn't arrive at my conclusions via FOX News or talk radio. I'm a print-oriented Canadian. I rarely listen to the radio and, other than the occasional hockey game and Obama's inauguration, haven't watched live TV in years. Indeed, I don't recall having ever seen a FOX News broadcast. Right-wing media sources are not, therefore, remotely responsible for my climate change views.

What are those views? After more than two years of research, I'm firmly in the climate skeptic camp. After all, journalists are supposed to be skeptical. They aren't supposed to take anyone's word for anything. They're supposed to dig, and question, and challenge.

When I worked as a journalist I was besieged by people who tried to enlist me in their private little wars, who hoped I'd give their side of the story - and only their side of the story - publicity. In my view journalists who allow themselves to be used by climate activists betray their calling - and the public's trust.

I'm also a former vice president of the [Canadian Civil Liberties Association](#) (1998-2001). I believe fervently in free speech. That some climate activists have been trying to 'disappear' alternative points-of-view is, therefore, a huge red flag. It's one thing to disagree with people. It's another matter altogether to pretend their opinions don't exist - or to [argue](#) that their opinions don't deserve a hearing.

I agree with the American writer, [Archibald MacLeish](#), who declared: "Once you permit those who are convinced of their own superior rightness to censor and silence and suppress those who hold contrary opinions, just at that moment the citadel has been surrendered."

I also agree with [John Stuart Mill](#), who pointed out 150 years ago that censorship harms not just the person whose voice is silenced, but the wider community - since everyone else is denied the right to hear the alternative point-of-view and to make up their own minds. As Mill said, no matter how strongly someone feels, they "have no authority to decide the question for all mankind."

I began a blog called [NoFrakkingConsensus](#) – the title of which reveals my growing sense of exasperation. People like Al Gore were trying to shut down the discussion by saying "the debate is over" (see [this sound clip](#) and [this video](#) at the 4:12 mark). UN representatives were declaring it *immoral* to even *question* the need for climate change action (see page 2 [here](#)). They were [saying](#) that failing to take such action was *criminally irresponsible*. To me, these were all signs that something was amiss.

In my youth I wore an activist button that read: *Question Authority*. As a feminist who holds an undergraduate degree in women's studies, I believe in making my own decisions. I don't allow myself to be bossed around. Not by men - and not by green activists.

Nor was I born yesterday. By now I've seen too many media-hyped scare stories that didn't pan out. The Y2K Millennium Bug is only one example. We were told January 1st 2000 would be the day the world shut down, that large numbers of businesses would fail, that millions in the third world could starve to death, that Asia would be 'toast'. We were advised that the only people who weren't terrified were those who didn't appreciate the magnitude of the problem. But in the end, it was a non-event (see [here](#) and [here](#)).

When I was a child, we were told that forests were being wiped-out by acid rain. This, too, was an overblown non-crisis. Adults sat us down in school and showed us frightening films that, with the passage of time, turned out to be nonsense.

People who want me to believe there's a planetary emergency need to *persuade* me. I'm not going to take their word for it. If they attempt to browbeat me rather than explaining their position in a calm, rational, and professional manner, I'm not likely to be won over.

The global warming debate is a strange one. I can't think of any other topic in which people go around declaring that 'the debate is over.' Where - and when, precisely - did this *bona fide* debate take place? How was the winner decided? Who made that call - and on what grounds?

It is peculiar, indeed, that people who see things differently try to link my climate views to [racists](#), [Holocaust deniers](#), [child murderers](#), [mental illness](#), and the [tobacco industry](#) (see more [here](#)). It is bizarre that Prime Ministers and other officials think it remotely appropriate to publicly [denounce](#) climate skeptics as *cowards*, *saboteurs*, and *anti-science* Flat-Earthers (see the UK's Gordon Brown [here](#) and Australia's Kevin Rudd [here](#)).

In which universe is it sensible to demean and bully those who have reached conclusions that differ from your own? Whatever happened to tolerance and mutual respect?

I spent a few years writing about family law. When it comes to divorce court, it's a given that everyone despises everyone else. There, as in this debate, all the name-calling and maligning of other people's motives is an irrelevant distraction. My job as a journalist is to see past the emotion, to examine the evidence that exists in black-and-white, and to draw some conclusions about what is going on.

One of my first stories as a young journalist was about a man [wrongly convicted of murder](#). Even though numerous irregularities came to light during his trial, the jury still found him guilty.

Juries operate by consensus – every member must agree with the verdict. But juries can, and do, make mistakes. In that trial forensic science was used improperly to secure a conviction. I learned then that science can be abused by people who have an agenda. Sometimes those people are police officers and prosecutors. Sometimes they are environmental activists and UN bureaucrats.

I helped keep the spotlight on that story until a man who had been imprisoned for a murder he did not commit was released, exonerated, and financially compensated.

In other words, I've held minority views before – and I know the world is capable of coming to its senses.

-- see my Google profile [here](#)

A word about my evidence

When the subject under discussion is controversial and the stakes are high, we should all be wary of taking anyone's word for it.

Although it is time-consuming, I strive to back-up every factual statement with a direct link to its source so that readers may readily verify matters for themselves. This standard of proof is much higher than that provided by a typical newspaper, news magazine, or television broadcast. It is also higher than that found in many books.

A good example is Thomas Friedman's 2008 [Hot, Flat and Crowded](#): *Why We Need a Green Revolution - and How it Can Renew America*. Page 125 of that bestseller appears to be the origin of the oft-repeated John Holdren 'immense edifice' quote from which [Chapter 9](#) of my book takes its title. But the context in which Holdren made these comments is far from clear. Was it in a public speech? A private conversation? In what year did he utter these words? Friedman tells us none of these.

In my view it is troubling that so many people were prepared to take Friedman's word for thousands of other assertions as well. In a review for Slate.com Gregg Easterbrook [points out](#) that it is difficult to verify **any claim** that appears in *Hot, Flat, and Crowded*:

Friedman embraces worst-case scenarios for climate change, warning not just of global warming but "global weirding." Yet his factual assertions are impossible to weigh, since *Hot, Flat, and Crowded* contains no footnotes or source notes...Friedman devotes several pages to asserting that the strength of Hurricane Katrina was caused by greenhouse gases, a claim that is first sourced to "many climatologists," none of whom he pauses to name; later in the book, his authority is a climate analyst for the Weather Channel. That global warming causes strong hurricanes, however, is far from a settled scientific view. [Friedman's 2008 book makes no mention of hurricane expert Chris Landsea's 2004 withdrawal from the IPCC. To review Landsea's story jump to [Chapter 26](#).]

In sharp contrast, the e-book version of the title you are now reading (which currently sells for \$4.99 on Amazon.com) links you to the speeches, advocacy publications, news articles, scientific papers, and IPCC documents discussed. Unlike Friedman, I back-up my assertions. Moreover, the vast majority of my sources are freely available on the Internet. There is no need for readers to travel to a well-resourced reference library to verify most of my claims.

This approach, I might observe, is eminently more user-friendly than the one adopted by the IPCC itself. At the time the 2007 Climate Bible was produced there was no reason why links to much of the IPCC's source material could not have been embedded into the online version of that report. But that raises another problem. Much of the scientific literature cited by the IPCC is behind paywalls. Scientific

journals - including *Science*, which is published by the [non-profit](#) American Association for the Advancement of Science - charge members of the public [\\$15](#) to [\\$35](#) to view a single scholarly paper.

This means the average person has no meaningful access to the vast majority of the material on which the IPCC builds its case. Once again, we're expected to take the IPCC's word for it that the source material actually says what IPCC authors say it does. Once again we're left wondering why, if science academies around the world sincerely believe the planet is in peril, they haven't used their influence to ensure that everyone has access to all of the scholarly material on which the IPCC bases its findings.

My more accessible approach has a downside, however. Content on the Internet is often transient. Academic bios get moved to different web addresses. Newspapers take down older articles. Text on websites is updated with newer text.

Citing sources on the Internet is therefore a tricky business. In this book I make use of a valuable public service provided by [WebCitation.org](#). This service makes a (time-stamped) copy of a webpage and then stores that copy so it can be referenced even if the original page disappears.

That this is an important and necessary service is demonstrated by the fact that the statement originally published at [OpenLetterFromScientists.com](#) has now vanished (see [Chapter 13](#) and [Chapter 14](#) of this book). Clicking on that web address currently brings one to an entirely unrelated page of German-language text. A record still survives, however, because I used WebCitation to make a [copy](#) of the original webpage.

WebCitation appears to be associated with the [International Internet Preservation Consortium](#), which is led by [senior librarians](#) from around the world. Like other online services, however, it occasionally suffers from software and hardware glitches - and can also be sluggish. This means that sometimes documents I've linked to are temporarily unavailable.

If you experience outages or delays while attempting to access a web address that looks something like this <http://www.webcitation.org/XXXXX> please be patient and try again later.

The links in this book were double-checked by a third party. For a brief period, the person doing the verification reported that WebCitation was serving up the wrong documents. Later, however, matters righted themselves and everything behaved the way it is supposed to.

The Citizen Audit

Introduction

The Citizen Audit was a fact-checking exercise conducted over five weeks in March and April 2010. My [call for volunteers](#) was answered by more than 40 private citizens from 12 countries. (See [here](#) and [here](#).)

Rajendra Pachauri, the chairman of the IPCC, has repeatedly claimed that the Climate Bible relies solely, entirely, and exclusively on peer-reviewed source material. Moreover, he has declared that non-peer-reviewed research is unworthy of the IPCC's attention and deserves to be tossed "into the dustbin." (For examples of such claims, see [here](#) and [here](#). The dustbin remark appears at the end of [this news article](#).)

Prior to our audit, no news agency, science body, government department, or think tank had gone to the trouble of checking whether Pachauri's public statements were actually supported by the facts.

When I discovered that two chapters of the 2007 Climate Bible relied on a significant number of sources that were not peer-reviewed scholarly papers, the question then became: To what degree were these two chapters representative of all 44 chapters? (See [here](#) and [here](#).)

I devised a methodology - a set of guidelines - by which to conduct a wider investigation. The references at the end of each chapter were examined by three citizen auditors working independently of each other. Only after the final results were released did they learn who else had audited that chapter. These volunteers sorted references into two categories - scholarly journal articles and everything else - and then reported the totals. When their findings differed slightly, we used the number most favorable to the IPCC. This wasn't about nitpicking, it was about the big picture. (See [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).)

At the time the 2007 report was written, the IPCC had a policy requiring non-peer-reviewed source material to be clearly designated as such when included in its reference lists. Had that policy been followed our audit would not have been necessary. (See [here](#).)

It is perhaps worth mentioning that our methodology was not the only one that could have been used. If we had had access to training seminars, funding, or oodles of time a more sophisticated approach might have been developed.

Summary of Findings

UN's Climate Bible Gets 21 'F's on Report Card

- all 18,531 references cited in the 2007 IPCC report were examined
- 5,587 are not peer-reviewed
- IPCC chairman's claim that the report relies solely on peer-reviewed sources is not supported
- each chapter was audited three times; the result most favorable to the IPCC was used
- 21 out of 44 chapters contain so few peer-reviewed references, they get an F (59% and below)
- 43 citizen auditors in 12 countries participated in this project

Main Findings

Grade	Chapters (out of 44)	% of Chapters receiving this grade
A (90 - 100%)	8	18%
B (80 - 89%)	5	11%
C (70 - 79%)	6	14%
D (60 - 69%)	4	9%
F (59% and below)	21	48%

Detailed Findings

2007 IPCC report (AR4)	% of references not peer-reviewed	number not peer-reviewed	total references
report overall	30	5,587	18,531
Working Group 1	7	431	6,226
Working Group 2	34	2,849	8,272
Working Group 3	57	2,307	4,033

Additional details are available at: <http://www.noconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/IPCC-report-card.php> and at <http://www.NOconsensus.org/ipcc-audit/findings-detailed.php>. Each of the three audits conducted for each of the 44 chapters is linked to in the tables appearing [here](#) (click *a*, *b*, and *c* beneath each chapter title).

The Citizen Audit report was released online on April 14, 2010. See the [press release here](#).

Footnotes

1-1

In August 2008, at an event celebrating the IPCC's 20th anniversary, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon [said](#) the occasion was a time "to acknowledge the *proud parents* of this wonderful institution, the UN Environment Programme and the World Meteorological Organization, for the vision and foresight they had to establish the IPCC in 1988 by a General Assembly resolution." (italics added) Backup link [here](#).

2-1

See also the list of quotes about the IPCC at: <http://NOconsensus.org/IPCC-quotes.php>. Many are from the media, others are from IPCC participants, politicians, and activist groups. Use CTRL-F to search the list.

- phenomenally [successful](#) (Stephen Schneider, *Science as a Contact Sport*, 2009, p. 125)
- a [remarkable](#) history of accomplishments (UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon speech, 31 August 2008, p. 1 and p. 3 - backup link [here](#))
- there is not a [parallele](#) on this planet, in any field of endeavour (Rajendra Pachauri, Rediff.com, 5 June 2007 - backup link [here](#))
- its place in the [history books](#) is clear (UNEP head Achim Steiner speech, 31 August 2008, p. 3 - backup link [here](#))
- if the IPCC says something, you had better [believe](#) it (Tim Flannery, *The Weather Makers*, 2005, p. 246)

2-2

See also the list at: <http://NOconsensus.org/IPCC-quotes.php>. Use CTRL-F to search the list. To preview the source of the quote hover your mouse over a link. The web address will display in the bottom left corner of your browser.

- the IPCC...has shown us the way (Bryan Walsh, *Time*, 9 December 2007 - backup link [here](#))
- It is chapter and verse, it is Holy Writ (Mike McCarthy, Irish *Independent*, 19 November 2007 - backup link [here](#))
- most scientists have been awed by the IPCC's deliberate work (Elisabeth Rosenthal and James Kanter, *New York Times*, 18 November 2007 - backup link [here](#))
- The greatest feat of global scientific cooperation ever seen...utterly unique and authoritative (Damian Carrington, UK *Guardian*, 28 July 2011 - backup link [here](#))

2-3

The speech by the Chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, delivered in Oslo in December 2007, may be read [here](#) (backup [link](#)).

2-4

Regarding Canada being 97% covered by ice see [here](#) (backup [link](#)).

3-1

See also the list of IPCC-related quotes at: <http://NOconsensus.org/IPCC-quotes.php>

- can't think of a better set of [qualified](#) people (interview with Rediff.com - backup link [here](#))
- thousands of the [best](#) scientists (speech in Poznan, Poland; 1 December 2008, p. 1 - backup link [here](#))
- the best scientific [expertise](#) from around the world (interview with *The Progressive*, May 2009 - backup link [here](#))
- almost four thousand of the world's best [specialists](#) (speech, 22 September 2009, p. 1 - backup link [here](#))

3-2

The full text of the 1995 IPCC health chapter is available [here](#). At the bottom of page 571 (page 11 of the PDF), it reads: "Although anopheline mosquito species that transmit malaria do not usually survive where the mean winter temperature drops below 16-18°C, some higher-latitude species are able to hibernate in sheltered sites." Backup link [here](#).

Malaria in a historical context is discussed [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#). (Backup links are [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).)

4-1

Large IPCC reports are known as *assessments*. There have been [four so far](#) - dated 1990, 1995, 2001, and 2007. In this book they are called the Climate Bible. The IPCC has also produced a number of smaller reports on specific topics. Klein has participated in, and counts both, in his total.

5-1

The background to the establishment of the 2010 [InterAcademy Council \(IAC\) committee](#) is discussed in [Chapter 33](#). The short version is that it was a response on the part of the UN and the IPCC to the Himalayan glacier scandal - one of the few occasions in which some parts of the mainstream media covered the IPCC in a properly skeptical fashion.

Another view of the 2010 IAC investigation of the IPCC is presented in Ross McKittrick's *Reforming the IPCC: Why and How* published by the [Global Warming Policy Foundation](#). (As this book went to press McKittrick's report was scheduled for release in late 2011; the quote below is from a pre-publication copy and should be double-checked against the final version.) McKittrick observes:

At the time of its selection, the IAC did not have any track record in evaluation of agency procedures, nor was it credibly independent of the IPCC. Prior to the 2010 IPCC Review its most recent report was a 2007 study promoting alternative energy, coauthored by a 15-member committee that included IPCC Chair Rajendra Pachauri, and IPCC Lead Authors Nebojsa Nakicenovic and Ged Davis.

The IAC Report did make some useful recommendations...[but] should not, however, be considered as the last word on the subject of reforming the IPCC; in many respects it should only be seen as the first word.

5-2

The 678-page PDF containing the questionnaire answers is available at <http://reviewipcc.interacademycouncil.net/Comments.pdf> (backup link [here](#)). Oddly, there is a discrepancy between the number of submissions publicly released and the number of people we were told provided input to the 2010 committee. See [here](#).

6-1

In [this](#) October 2002 document, Meinshausen is presented as a Greenpeace spokesperson and his contact info includes a Greenpeace e-mail address. In [this](#) June 2003 document, his affiliation is listed as Greenpeace International. In [this](#) December 2003 document, he is one of three Greenpeace International contact people listed at the bottom. Backup links [here](#) and [here](#).

6-2

See the end of [this blog post](#) for the nine Climate Bible chapters that list papers by Hoegh-Guldberg among their references.

6-3

[This press release](#) says Moss was appointed a WWF vice-president in November 2007. According to [this bio](#): "During a business leave of absence from 2006-2009, he served as Vice President/Managing Director for Climate Change at WWF and Senior Director for Energy and Climate at the U.N. Foundation." As of August 2011, the WWF website still [listed](#) Moss as a WWF 'Senior Fellow, Climate Change.' Backup links: [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).

In June 2009 Moss participated in a meeting in which he represented both the WWF and the IPCC's Task Group on Data and Scenarios for Impact and Climate Analysis (see page 1 of [this PDF](#) - backup link [here](#)). In June 2010, the IPCC appointed him a Review Editor for the upcoming edition of the Climate Bible (see page 13 of [this PDF](#)).

Review editors are not discussed elsewhere in this book. They come into the picture when external expert reviewers are asked to provide feedback on what IPCC authors have written (see [Chapter 11 - The Peer Review Fairy Tale](#), [Chapter 14 - The Stern Review Scandal](#), and [Chapter 33 - Peer Review IPCC Style](#)). In theory, review editors are supposed to ensure that reviewers' comments are accorded due consideration and that a wide spectrum of scientific thought is reflected in the text of their chapter. This is one of the mechanisms by which the IPCC says it avoids bias.

But as the 2010 InterAcademy Council committee reported, review editors can be overruled by a chapter's authors and therefore have no real power. (See the top of page 16 of this [123-page PDF](#) - numbered as page xiv within the report. Backup link [here](#).)

In other words, supposed IPCC checks-and-balances are toothless and illusory - and have been that way for two decades.

6-4

A 1976 book titled [RIO: Reshaping the International Order](#) was prepared for the Club of Rome. On page 133 (Chapter 7, section 5) this book speaks approvingly of the emergence of full-blown activist scientists by the mid-1970s:

In the past, [scientists] have often been reluctant to engage in political debate or to share their knowledge and fears with the general public. Given social dilemmas, they have often preferred to adopt neutral rather than value positions, to tacitly advise rather than openly advocate. This generalization no longer holds true. **In many branches of science there are radical movements. Increasingly, both in the rich and poor worlds, scientists are involved in active advocacy** which they see as an intellectual and ethical duty. [bold added; see photo of that page [here](#)]

6-5

Oppenheimer served in six distinct capacities connected to the 2007 Climate Bible. He was a contributing author for [Chapter 2](#) and a lead author for [Chapter 19](#) of the Working Group 2 report. He helped write Working Group 2's [Summary for Policymakers](#) as well as its [Technical Summary](#). He is also listed as an [expert reviewer](#) for the Working Group 1 report and an [expert reviewer](#) of the summary of summaries known as the Synthesis Report.

7-1

Climate activists frequently talk about the fact that CO₂ could *double* - from 0.03% to 0.06% of the atmosphere. That *sounds* significant. But if your chance of catching a cold increases from one chance in a hundred to two chances in a hundred the risk remains small even though it has, indeed, doubled. The important question is whether the change is meaningful.

Smart, experienced, trustworthy scientists remain divided on the question of whether a doubling of CO₂ in the atmosphere is something about which we should get alarmed. Just because there is a dominant/fashionable position does not mean that those with less fashionable views are wrong. As Roy Spencer, a meteorologist with 40 years experience (who is also the recipient of NASA's Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal) has [written](#) on this topic: an increase in a very small number "is still a very small number."

7-2

These days Zwiers and Hegerl are better known for their work with statistics. But Zwiers [headed](#) Canada's "flagship climate modelling research laboratory" between 1997 and 2006 (backup link [here](#)). During the 1990s, many of Hegerl's earliest published papers focussed on climate model simulations (see her CV [here](#) - backup link [here](#).)