



UN and Obama Administration pushing pseudo-science to justify policies that hurt energy, jobs, liberty – and people

A report by Paul Driessen, with contributions by Marc Morano

Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow
ClimateDepot.com

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION: How the climate scare began	1
Government reports inflate alleged climate change risks, to justify regulations	1
Climate policies will adversely affect people's lives and living standards	2
The EPA trumpets models to instill fear and grab power	7
The National Climate Assessment report is pseudo-science at its worst	9
The IPCC: The foundation of climate fraud	11
CONCLUSION: Our energy and economic futures are at stake	14
ENDNOTES	17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Launched in 1988 at the urging of activists opposed to hydrocarbon energy, economic growth, and modern living standards, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was originally charged with assessing possible human influences on global warming and potential risks of human-induced warming. Over the subsequent decades, however, the IPCC increasingly minimized non-human factors, to the extent that it now claims *only* human influences matter – and *any* climate changes would “threaten our planet.”

The **climate change scientist-government-industrialist complex** has grown increasingly wealthy and powerful. It now spends billions of dollars annually on climate and weather research, focusing almost exclusively on carbon dioxide and other “greenhouse” gases, and many billions more on renewable energy research and subsidies that raise energy prices, cost jobs, and reduce living standards.

Indeed, laws and regulations implemented in the name of preventing climate change have increased the cost of virtually everything people make, grow, ship, drive, eat, and do. They affect our lives, liberties, livelihoods, living standards, health, and welfare. Expert analysts calculate that climate-related rules will cost U.S. families and businesses almost \$51 billion and 224,000 U.S. jobs every year through 2030 – on top of the *\$1.9 trillion* in regulatory costs that Americans already pay every year.

With so much at stake, it is essential that climate research is honest, accurate and credible, and that the resultant energy and climate policies are based on sound, replicable science. Instead, the studies and reports are consistently defective and even deceitful. They incorporate every study financed by this multi-billion-dollar system that supports the “dangerous manmade climate change” thesis – no matter how far-fetched and indefensible their claims might be – and ignore all contrary studies and experts. They rely on faulty, manipulated data, secretive working sessions that revise the “science” to reflect political “summaries,” and computer models that completely fail to predict actual real-world climate trends.

Because average global temperatures have not risen for 18 years (and have even cooled slightly), even the terminology has shifted: from global warming to climate change, climate disruption, and extreme weather.

Relying on the IPCC work, the \$2.5-billion-a-year U.S. Global Change Research Program (GCRP) issued a 2014 National Climate Assessment (NCA) that claimed climate change “is already affecting” the lives of Americans in a “multitude of ways.” President Obama said its effects “are already being felt in every corner of the United States.” The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and other federal agencies use IPCC studies to justify costly vehicle mileage standards, delays and bans on oil and gas drilling and pipelines, and rules that are closing hundreds of coal-fired power plants and preventing new ones from being built.

As ClimateDepot.com director Marc Morano explains, the IPCC is “a political body masquerading as a science body.” It makes its pseudo-science fit its political agenda. The GCRP and the EPA do likewise. Their actions violate information quality laws and basic standards of sound science and peer review – to drive an anti-growth, anti-fossil fuel agenda. They exaggerate every conceivable cost associated with hydrocarbons, but completely ignore even the most obvious and enormous benefits of using fossil fuels.

Now the White House wants to commit the United States to a new international “agreement” on climate change, energy use, economic growth, and wealth redistribution – without presenting it to Congress, in violation of constitutional requirements that any treaty receive the “advice and consent” of the Senate.

Every American concerned about our nation’s future should read this report, to understand what is happening and what is at stake. They should resist these actions by unelected, unaccountable regulators, challenge them in courts and legislatures, and demand that every study, report, and proposed rule be presented for review by citizens, legislators, and independent experts outside the closed circles of the **climate change scientist-government-industrialist complex**. If the climate alarmists are truly confident in their claims and have nothing to hide, they should be happy to participate in this honest, commonsense approach.

INTRODUCTION: How the climate scare began

President Obama has long promised to prevent “abrupt and irreversible” damage from global warming, by curbing fossil fuel development and use, slashing carbon dioxide emissions, causing electricity rates to “skyrocket,” and “bankrupting” any company that tries to build a coal-fired generating plant. Climate change, he insists, threatens coastal cities, Americans’ health and well-being, wildlife, and our planet.

At the President’s direction, the EPA is issuing increasingly restrictive regulations covering emissions from cars, electricity generating plants, and major industrial, manufacturing, and other facilities. He is also exploring ways to commit the United States to a new international agreement on climate change. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Heritage Foundation, and other expert analysts estimate that these regulations and restrictions will cost Americans thousands of jobs and tens of billions of dollars annually. The impacts on our lives and living standards will be profound.

To justify his concerns and policies, Mr. Obama and his government agencies rely heavily on the IPCC and its steady output of scary studies, reports, and warnings.

The IPCC was launched in 1988 during a 20-year period of planetary warming, at the urging of activists opposed to hydrocarbon energy, economic growth, and capitalism. It was originally charged with assessing possible human influences on global warming and potential risks of human-induced warming. But because it is an intergovernmental body, its founding principles require that the process must “involve both peer review by [IPCC] experts and review by governments.” That innocuous sounding phrase soon corrupted climate change science, by providing billions of dollars in government research grants for studies that focus on carbon dioxide (CO₂), a major byproduct of fossil fuel use.¹

It means governments nominate lead science authors who support this agenda; governments then have the final say on what the IPCC publishes, by writing the “Summary for Policymakers” (SPM) and using that summary to revise the underlying scientific studies, to support SPM analyses and conclusions.

Its First Assessment Report promoted the non-binding United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change that was put forth at the 1992 “Earth Summit” in Rio de Janeiro, and ratified by the U.S. Senate later that year. The IPCC report had trouble distinguishing between natural and human influences on Earth’s climate. However, because the Clinton Administration wanted to use IPCC reports to secure binding “greenhouse gas” emission targets in a UN treaty, the 1995 Second Assessment Report *had* to find human and fossil fuel influences. And so it did – sort of.

After weeks of discussions, IPCC scientists and bureaucrats and U.S. State Department officials finally agreed that the SPM would say: “The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate.” The word “discernible” simply means detectable and says nothing about *how much* people might be affecting the climate, or whether any changes would be harmful or beneficial.²

However, over the next two decades, “discernible” morphed into “dominant,” and the IPCC increasingly minimized and ignored non-human factors. It now claims *only* human influences matter – and any changes in climate or weather would be extremely detrimental. The sun and other complex, powerful, interrelated natural forces – which clearly caused ice ages, interglacial periods, and countless climate and weather fluctuations throughout Earth and human history – are now deemed irrelevant.

Subsequent reports predicted increasingly worse disasters for the climate, oceans, plant and wildlife species, agriculture, and human civilization.

Government reports inflate alleged climate change risks, to justify regulations

In 2013 and 2014, amid a then-17-year period in which planetary temperatures did not rise at all, and in the wake of “Climategate” and other scandals, the IPCC issued its Fifth Assessment Report. This one finally acknowledged the warming “pause” and backtracked somewhat on prior warnings about the collapse of the Arctic, Antarctic, and Greenland ice sheets, with a consequent dramatic rise in sea levels.³

However, it continued to emphasize “manmade catastrophes,” due to the climate’s “extreme sensitivity” to even small increases in atmospheric CO₂ and methane. The report insisted that IPCC computer models provide reliable climate

forecasts, and that the world must take immediate, drastic actions to prevent “unprecedented” climate and weather events. IPCC co-chair Thomas Stocker [declared](#) that human-induced warming “threatens our planet, our only home.”

Relying heavily on the IPCC work, the White House issued a new [National Climate Assessment](#) (NCA), under the auspices of the \$2.5-billion-a-year Global Change Research Program (GCRP). The May 2014 report spanned 829 pages, plus a 127-page “summary,” and detailed “the multitude of ways climate change is already affecting and will increasingly affect the lives of Americans.” The release was accompanied by press releases, television appearances, interviews, and photo ops with victims of recent tornadoes.

President Obama’s impassioned statements went well beyond what even the IPCC and NCA reports had said. Human-induced climate change, “once considered an issue for the distant future, has moved firmly into the present,” he claimed. It is “affecting Americans right now,” disrupting the weather and people’s lives. The effects “are already being felt in every corner of the United States.”

Corn producers in Iowa, oyster growers in Washington, maple syrup producers in Vermont, crop-growth cycles in Great Plains states, and many more “are all observing climate-related changes that are outside of recent experience,” Mr. Obama insisted. Wildfires and extreme weather events “have become more frequent and intense.” This is happening because “carbon pollution in our atmosphere has increased dramatically.” Furthermore, “97% of scientists” agree with these dire assessments.

The President also made it clear that, “If Congress won’t act, I will.” In fact, Congress has [rejected](#) nearly 700 cap-and-trade and other climate-related bills. It has done so because not enough members have been persuaded that anti-fossil fuel, anti-carbon dioxide laws, and regulations would actually control Earth’s perpetually changing climate or reduce alleged dangers like those cited by the President, the NCA, and the IPCC. Senators and congressmen were also concerned that other countries would not follow U.S. initiatives, and that climate-related actions would harm America’s economy, manufacturing jobs, and living standards while having no measurable effect on the climate.

True to his word, President Obama directed his EPA and other agencies to continue issuing rules that restrict hydrocarbon energy use and “greenhouse gas” emissions. Citing climate change, hurricanes, rising seas, endangered species, ocean acidification, and even mercury, soot (carbon), and asthma to justify the increasingly draconian rules, federal bureaucrats imposed regulations requiring that vehicles get [54.5 miles](#) per gallon, delayed or prohibited onshore and offshore oil and gas leasing and drilling, further delayed construction of the [Keystone XL](#) pipeline, and closed down hundreds of coal-fired power plants while preventing construction of new coal-based generators.

For good measure, the regulators also devised vague and open-ended “sustainable development” and “social justice” policies to buttress their climate change and other environmental decisions and to justify further expansion of their budgets, personnel, and agency missions.⁴

Most recently, President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry announced that they may pursue a sweeping international “accord” to control emissions of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases – even without congressional approval. Their plan is to draft a global agreement that (they say) falls short of the kind of “treaty” that would require the “advice and consent” of the U.S. Senate, and then present it at the 2015 UN climate conference in Paris. A key component of the plan is that countries would agree to emission reductions, but would face few or no penalties if they do not achieve their “goals” – whereas U.S. companies would be obligated to slash emissions or face severe penalties.⁵

The end result of all these regulations – if not their deliberately intended effect – is to put the federal government and UN firmly in charge of virtually everything Americans make, grow, ship, eat, drive, and do. It means government regulators will control people’s lives, livelihoods, liberties, living standards, and even life spans – all in the name of safeguarding Planet Earth from the purported ravages of “dangerous manmade climate change.”

Climate policies will adversely affect people’s lives and living standards

The regulations mean the price of everything people do **will** skyrocket: heating and air conditioning, lights and refrigeration, televisions, computers, medical equipment, machinery, and everything else that runs on electricity or requires transportation fuels. Poor, minority, and blue-collar families will have to find hundreds of dollars a year somewhere in their already stretched budgets to pay the rising bills.

Shops and other small businesses will have to find thousands of dollars, by delaying other purchases or laying people off. Factories, malls, school districts, hospitals, and cities will have to send out search parties to locate millions a year at the end of rainbows. Many businesses will simply close, as Obama policies “fundamentally transform” America’s constitutional, economic, and social structure, as promised.

Hundreds of thousands will lose their jobs – in coal mines, power plants, factories, shops, and other businesses. Entire families and communities will be impacted and impoverished. Real people’s hopes, dreams, pride, and work ethic will be replaced by despair and dependency. Bread winners will be forced to work multiple jobs, commute longer distances if they can find work, and suffer sleep deprivation.

Studies show that this often leads to increasing numbers of people who must cope with stress, depression, drug and alcohol abuse, and spousal and child abuse. Nutrition and medical care will also likely suffer. More people can be expected to have strokes and heart attacks. More will likely die prematurely or commit suicide. *For no measurable climate benefits.*

The rules will slowly eliminate fossil fuels that now provide over 80% of the energy that powers the United States. What would replace those fuels? Probably not hydroelectric and nuclear energy, since radical environmentalists oppose those sources just as vigorously as they detest hydrocarbons. Most likely, the replacements would be wind, solar, biofuel, and geothermal energy – which are far more expensive and far less reliable, and which impact the environment in many more ways than do fossil fuels.

These “replacements” would also require that Americans accept much lower expectations and lower standards of living than they enjoy today – and get used to having electricity only [when it is available](#), rather than when it’s needed. Most appalling and immoral, the regulations mean the lives of people in the most impoverished, energy-deprived, malnourished, diseased, and destitute nations on Earth will be improved only at the margins, but will never enjoy anything near current U.S. standards.

Moreover, these absurdly expensive climate rules will be *on top of* the [\\$1.9 trillion](#) in regulatory compliance costs that American businesses and families already pay every year. That is 11% of the entire U.S. economy (gross domestic product), and EPA rules already account for \$353 billion of this total. Their impacts on innovation, job creation and preservation, and economic growth are already serious.

With so much at stake, it is absolutely essential that any climate change regulations, treaties, restrictions, and obligations be *based on solid science and irrefutable evidence*. Unfortunately, that is not the case. In fact, supposed scientific support for EPA, NCA, and IPCC hype and hysteria over “climate chaos” and their “solutions” to this “crisis” is illusory – a house of cards.

It is a leaning Tower of Pisa, built on quicksand and requiring repeated reengineering to strengthen its flimsy foundation and keep it from collapsing – via constant machinations, carefully selected studies, reformulated computer models, manipulated data, secretive working sessions, and vicious attacks on any scientists or other experts who disagree with their “science,” conclusions, and calamitous forecasts.

Sioux Indians – renowned in environmental lore as pursuing the epitome of sustainable lifestyles – would describe climate science in their native Lakota language as *tatonka chesli*: big bull bison doodoo.

A brief review of climate change realities underscores the bogus nature of climate catastrophe claims. Computer models and headlines versus reality

The White House, the EPA, the IPCC, well-paid alarmist scientists, and “mainstream” media stories continue to disseminate a steady diet of cataclysmic events that they say are due to “dangerous” carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from hydrocarbon energy use. This climate cabal uses computer models to conjure up countless “scenarios” and “projections” of what will happen if CO₂ and other “greenhouse gas” levels continue to rise in Earth’s atmosphere. Their claims do not withstand scrutiny.

Computer models reliably predict global temperatures and climate changes. No, they don’t. Computer models used by the IPCC cannot possibly forecast future global temperatures, climate conditions, or flood, drought, hurricane and other events.

The models employ highly simplified configurations of Earth’s extremely complex climate systems; greatly exaggerate climate sensitivity to CO₂ levels; assume all warming since the industrial revolution began are due to human CO₂; input data contaminated by urban heat island effects; and assume rising CO₂ will have only “positive feedbacks” and will only

increase global warming (as by increasing cloud cover that will only trap more heat, rather than also reflecting the sun's rays and heat back into outer space). They also ignore most of the powerful natural forces that we know affect our planet's climate, such as solar variations, cosmic ray fluxes, winds, clouds, precipitation, ocean currents, recurrent phenomena like the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (El Niño and La Niña), atmospheric and volcanic dust, urban and other land use changes, the tilt of the Earth's axis, and Earth's position in an elliptical orbit that constantly and significantly changes its relationship to the sun and other planets.⁶

In computer lingo, this can be summarized as: Faulty assumptions, faulty data, faulty codes and algorithms, simplistic analytical methodologies and other *garbage in – predictive garbage out*.

A graph in the IPCC's 2013 draft report [dramatically demonstrated](#) that every single climate model used between 1990 and 2012 predicted that average global temperatures would be as much as 0.9° C (1.6° F) *higher* than they actually were! The graph was *deleted* from the final IPCC report, to make it appear that its computer models actually predicted temperatures with reasonable accuracy.

These computer models are built on unproven alarmist assumptions, and they have never been “validated” by being tested against actual temperature and weather observations. In fact, they are contradicted by real-world evidence, meaning their results are worthless as a basis for public policy, yet they drive policy.

The notion of using computer “scenarios,” “projections” or “predictions” to determine energy, economic and environmental policies is as absurd as using a computer model focused on the play of a theoretical guard and safety to predict Super Bowl winners ten or twenty years from now.

Planetary temperatures are rising dramatically. No, they are not. As the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) and many other experts have documented, Earth's average temperature *has not risen for 18 years* – even as atmospheric CO₂ levels continued to increase steadily.⁷ As to supposed “record high” temperatures in recent years, while scary news stories declared that 2005 and 2010 were the “hottest” years on record, a closer examination revealed that the claims were based on year-to-year temperature data that differ by only [a few hundredths](#) of a degree Fahrenheit.⁸ The claims are also wrong.

The highest temperature ever recorded in Alaska was 100° F on June 27, 1915, in Fort Yukon. A number of Alaskan communities established new [record highs](#) during the summer of 2013, but most U.S. states and cities set their records for the highest temperatures during the decades of the *1930s and 1950s*. Maps like this one [for Wisconsin](#) dramatically illustrate the wild temperature swings that can occur within a single state over the course of a century or so for one summer month: a record high of 114° F on July 14, 1936 – and a record low of 0° F on July 4, 2003!

It's a fact that Detroit temperatures didn't dip below freezing in January and February in '79 – followed by a [frost in June](#). But that was 1879! “Not only in summer, but in the winter, the ocean was free of ice, sometimes with a wide strip of water to at least 200 miles from the shore in the Bering Sea,” Swedish explorer Oscar Nordkvist reported – in 1822. “We were astonished by the total absence of ice in Barrow Strait. [Six years ago the area was] still frozen up, and doubts were entertained as to the possibility of escape,” Captain Francis McClintock wrote in his ship's log – in 1860.⁹

And don't forget the Medieval Warm Period, the Little Ice Age, and the five frigid epochs that buried North America, Europe, and Asia under glaciers a mile thick. Or the [4,000-year-old trees](#) that recently emerged as modern glaciers melted back – proving that a forest grew in the same Alps just 40 centuries ago.

Thus it has been throughout Earth and human history: wild weather and climate swings on a recurring basis. But now, climate chaos cultists want us to believe such events began only recently, and we could stop today's climate and weather aberrations – if we would just eliminate fossil fuels, destroy our economies, and condemn Third World families to permanent poverty and disease.

Any planetary warming of more than a degree would be dangerous. No, it wouldn't. Moderate warming up to 2° C (3.6° F) would cause no net harm to the environment or human well-being, numerous experts emphasize. Indeed, it would likely be *beneficial*, lengthening growing seasons and expanding croplands and many wildlife habitats, especially in conjunction with more carbon dioxide, which helps plants grow faster and better, even [under adverse conditions](#) like pollution, limited water, or high temperatures.¹⁰ By contrast, even 2° C of *cooling* could be disastrous for agriculture and efforts to feed growing human populations without plowing under more habitats.

Rapidly melting polar ice packs will cause oceans to rise dangerously. It's not happening. Sea levels have risen some 400 feet since the end of the last ice age -- 10,000 years ago. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration says

sea level is rising very slowly, and a recent [peer-reviewed study](#) found that sea level rise has *decreased* over the past 10 years. Oceans are currently rising at just [7 inches per century](#) – hardly a cause for alarm, and a rate not likely to flood coastal cities anytime soon.

Most of the fear about rising sea level is based on computer models that predict rapid melting of polar and Greenland ice fields, and on inane claims by alarmists like Al Gore, who asserted in 2007 that the Arctic ice cap “could be completely gone in summer in as little as 7 years.” By the summer of 2014, that same expanse of ice had expanded by up to 63% since 2012, according to satellite measurements by the U.S. National Snow and [Ice Data Center](#). In other words, an area the size of Alaska that was open water during August 2012 but was completely covered in ice by the end of August 2014.¹¹

There have been similar Arctic melting ice panics in the past. A November 2, 1922, [Washington Post article](#) was headlined “Arctic Ocean getting warm: Seals vanish and icebergs melt.” The Arctic Ocean is warming, icebergs are growing scarcer, and in places the seals are finding the water too hot, it said.

Hurricanes are growing in number, intensity, and destructive force. No, they’re not. As of fall 2013, it had been 8 years since a Category 3 to 5 hurricane made landfall in the United States. That is the longest such period [since 1900](#) or even [the 1860s](#).

According to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration data, the worst decade for major (category 3, 4, and 5) hurricanes was the 1940s, and overall global tropical cyclone activity has decreased to historically low levels during the past 5 years. Scientists have also [rejected climate change links](#) to “superstorm” Sandy that hit the East Coast in October 2012. As hurricane expert Prof. Roger Pielke, Jr., explained, “Sandy was terrible, but we’re currently in a relative hurricane ‘drought.’ Connecting energy policy and disasters makes little scientific sense.”¹²

Tornadoes are growing in number, intensity, and destructive force. No, they are not. Actually, “there has been a downward trend in strong (F3) to violent (F5) tornadoes in U.S. since 1950s,” climatologist [Dr. Roy Spencer](#) points out. In fact, global warming will supposedly occur primarily in the northern latitudes – which would *reduce* tornado frequency and intensity, as it would mean *warmer* Arctic air coming into the Great Plains states and other areas – whereas violent thunderstorms and tornadoes form and intensify when *colder* air mixes with warm, moist Gulf of Mexico air.

Even with the recent Midwestern and East Coast twisters, U.S. tornado frequency remains close to a [record low](#). Would President Obama and other climate change alarmists attribute *that* as due to CO₂ emissions?

Property damage and insurance claims from tornadoes and hurricanes have certainly increased since the 1930s and 1950s. However, that is because more people are building more [expensive homes](#) in the paths of violent storms that do occur.

Wildfires are getting more frequent and devastating. Forest fires have nothing to do with “global climate change,” though regional droughts can make fires more likely and damaging. U.S. [National Interagency Fire Center](#) and Canadian data show that the number of wildfires is actually about half of what occurred 50 years ago. Moreover, contrary to White House claims, the Center’s latest data reveal that, as of September 5, 2014, burned acreage for the year was 1.1 million acres less than the burned acreage by that date in 2013 – and was less than one-half the 10-year average of 6.2 million acres.

Despite these facts, Obama science advisor John Holdren claimed in an August 2014 video that climate change is making U.S. fire seasons “longer and, on average, more intense.” The May 2014 National Climate Assessment report likewise makes the completely false claim that longer, drier summers supposedly caused by CO₂ emissions will “continue to increase the frequency and intensity of large wildfires in the United States.”

Devastating U.S. wildfires are due primarily to a [failure to thin](#) forests or remove dead and diseased trees – due largely to environmentalist protests and lawsuits – and failure to use available modern fire control technologies. Fires that occur today are far more devastating than timber harvesting and clear cutting.

Western state infernos exterminate wildlife habitats, roast eagle and spotted owl fledglings alive in their nests, boil away trout and trout streams, leave surviving birds and mammals to starve for lack of food, and incinerate every living organism in the thin soils. Downpours and snowmelts in the ensuing years cause massive erosion that clogs streambeds and kills new fish. Many areas will not recover their foliage or biodiversity for decades. Better forest management and firefighting practices are the answer.

Recent droughts are due to man-made global warming. Nonsense. Across time scales required for any meaningful analysis, “droughts have generally become shorter, less frequent, and cover a smaller portion of the U.S. over the last

century,” [Professor Roger Pielke, Jr.](#), observes. “That is not skepticism; that’s according to the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,” he adds.

Even U.S. government scientists have admitted that recent droughts are not due to climate change. “This is not a climate change drought,” [said Dr. Robert Hoerling](#), a NOAA research meteorologist who served as the lead author of the U.S. Climate Change Science Plan Synthesis and Assessment Report: “The good news,” he emphasized, “is that this isn’t global warming. This is not the new normal in terms of drought.”

Nor has U.S. flooding increased over the past 85 to 127 years, Pielke adds. Indeed, the world’s ten deadliest floods all occurred before 1976, when CO₂ was well below 350 parts per million (ppm) – or 0.04% of Earth’s atmosphere, and before it rose to its current 400 ppm level. A U.S. Geological Survey study found that in some parts of the U.S. “floods became *less severe* as greenhouse gas emissions increased.”

Oxygen represents 21% of atmospheric gases (210,000 ppm). Argon is 0.93% (9,300 ppm). About 90% of the “greenhouse effect” is from water vapor – another byproduct of burning fossil fuels, although it is not as politically convenient as CO₂. Furthermore, roughly 95% of the annual addition to atmospheric CO₂ levels is from volcanoes, subsea vents, and other *natural* sources.

Carbon pollution threatens all life on the planet. When President Obama talks about “carbon pollution,” remember: It’s not “carbon” – another term for soot. It’s *carbon dioxide*. And it’s not “pollution.” CO₂ is the plant-fertilizing gas that makes all life on Earth possible.

Misusing legal and scientific terminology in this way is nothing more than a deliberate attempt to mislead people, change the subject from the absence of global warming and climate change over the past 18 years, and distract attention from the Obama Administration’s huge foreign and domestic policy failures.

Human carbon dioxide emissions are making oceans more acidic. This is a ridiculous statement – another attempt to replace exaggerated, disproven climate scares with a new panic. Earth’s oceans have never been acidic; they are alkaline, by a wide margin. It is impossible for their vast volumes of water to become acidic from mankind’s fossil fuel combustion: that is, to drop from their current pH of 8.1 into the acidic realm of 7.0 on this logarithmic scale. (Most rainwater is pH 5.6.)

What has been observed in recent years is a decline of about 0.034 pH unit on a 14-point scale. At this rate, marine scientists say (and assuming human CO₂ emissions continue at their current rate, which is highly unlikely, since energy technologies change greatly over time) it would take some 700 years for the oceans to become even minimally acidic. The effects of any pH (potential of hydrogen) changes on marine life are hard to determine, since most organisms are quite resilient and have adapted to numerous seawater and other changes for countless millennia. But the impacts will certainly not be cataclysmic.¹³

Climate change regulations also reduce asthma in children. Not only is this another attempt to change the subject. It is also false. Carbon dioxide from cars and coal-fired power plants has nothing to do with asthma – nor do mercury, soot, or other emissions from those sources. The EPA’s claim that shutting down coal-fueled generators will have “ancillary health benefits” like reduced asthma is simply false.

In fact, asthma rates have been going *up* for years, while pollution levels have been going *down* (which does not mean we should increase pollution to reduce asthma). The real causes of asthma, according to health experts, are that [young children](#) live in tightly insulated homes, spend less time outdoors, don’t get exposed to enough allergens to reduce immune hyperactivity and allergic hypersensitivity, engage in sedentary activities, and get insufficient exercise to keep their lungs robust and control asthmatic reactions.

Scientists agree that humans are causing dangerous climate change. No, they don’t. When the President claims “97% of scientists say” such things, remember: This assertion is based on 75 of 77 “climate scientists” who were carefully selected from [a 2010 survey](#) that went to 10,257 scientists. To call that a consensus of scientists is deliberately false and misleading.

A 2014 study by Professor John Cook at the University of Queensland purported to demonstrate that 97.1% of published scientific papers reflected a consensus that humans had caused at least half of the 1.3° F (0.7° C) global warming since 1950. That analysis was likewise shown to be wrong and misleading. In reality, only 41 of the 11,944 papers that Cook examined (0.3%) explicitly said this.¹⁴

Probably no scientist on Earth says the climate does not change, and nearly all agree that humans contribute in some ways to recent and ongoing changes. However, more than [1,000 climate scientists](#), [31,000 American scientists](#), and [48% of U.S. meteorologists](#) say there is no evidence that humans are causing dangerous warming and climate change.¹⁵

Even saying humans are “contributing to” climate change is meaningless. Is it a 1%, 5%, 20%, or 90% contribution? Is it local or global? Is it due to CO₂ or land use changes and urbanization? Do scientists know enough to separate human factors from the numerous, powerful, interrelated solar, cosmic, oceanic, terrestrial, and other forces that have repeatedly caused minor to major climate changes, climate cycles, and weather events throughout human and geologic history? At this point, they do not.

Other countries are working hard to prevent dangerous climate change. Not so. Europe certainly went down the “Green energy” path, but at the price of skyrocketing energy prices, millions of lost jobs, and thousands of people *dying from hypothermia* in cold homes because they could no longer afford to heat them properly. Spain had led the way on wind and solar power, but it slashed subsidies after realizing its policies had cost numerous jobs and devastated its economy. Now Spain, Germany, and other EU countries are building dozens of coal-fired power plants, while some 1,200 are being built worldwide.

In 2012, the world emitted 31 gigatons of CO₂, and China alone was responsible for one-fourth of that, the International Energy Agency reports. India, other Asian countries, African nations, and much of Latin America are also using coal to energize their economies and lift billions of people out of poverty. That means atmospheric CO₂ levels will continue to rise, no matter what the United States does.

What is really behind any “international cooperation” on climate change is a determined effort by developing countries to use this issue to secure billions of dollars annually in “compensation, reparation, mitigation, and adaptation” money from wealthier countries that the IPCC, the EPA, and other alarmists blame for “climate disruptions” that they claim are occurring. Indeed, Christiana Figueres, chief secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, has said the next climate treaty will bring about a “complete economic transformation of the world.” IPCC Working Group III co-chair Ottmar Edendorfer has admitted that international climate policy is not even about environmental protection; it is about “how we redistribute the world’s wealth.”¹⁶

Exactly how that next treaty will be negotiated, signed, and implemented is a mystery, however. Chinese President Xi Jinping, Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel early on announced their intention to skip the 2014 UN climate conference in New York (set for September 22-28). Their decisions to snub Ban Ki-Moon’s invitation strongly suggest that efforts to forge a replacement for the now-defunct Kyoto Protocols ahead of the 2015 summit in Paris have already all but collapsed.¹⁷

That means Obama Administration efforts to slash fossil fuel use and replace hydrocarbons with renewable energy will have no effect on atmospheric CO₂ levels – and will reduce average global temperatures by a meaningless and undetectable 0.03° F by 2100 (if the U.S. completely eliminates fossil fuel use, and assuming IPCC and EPA claims about CO₂ are correct).¹⁸

In sum, climate catastrophists have *no evidence* to support their disaster claims – or their assertions that “the international community” is reducing greenhouse gas emissions to prevent climate change.

To deal with these hugely inconvenient realities, purveyors of climate change Armageddon scare stories resort to a number of ingenious strategies that most people would likely view as questionable, dishonest or even fraudulent, if they knew what was actually going on.

The EPA trumpets models to instill fear and grab power

The Information Quality Act and relevant Office of Management and Budget guidelines require that all federal agencies ensure and maximize “the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information disseminated by Federal agencies.” The rules also call for proper peer review of all “influential scientific information” and “highly influential scientific assessments,” particularly if they could be used as the basis for regulatory action. They direct federal agencies to provide adequate administrative mechanisms enabling affected parties to review agency failures to respond to requests for correction or reconsideration of the scientific information. The EPA routinely violates all these requirements.

The EPA simply ignores both these requirements and the real-world facts presented in the previous section. It trumpets computer model “projections” that bear no resemblance to actual planetary events and treats the projections and “scenarios” as actual facts.

The agency does virtually no original climate research. Instead, it relies on IPCC analyses, which as explained below are erroneous, deceptive, and meaningless. It cherry-picks data and studies that support its agenda, ignores libraries of contradictory research, attacks experts whose analyses question EPA conclusions, and pays advisors and activists millions of dollars annually to rubberstamp its regulations.

The EPA refuses to divulge its data and internal analyses, even to members of Congress. The agency claims these materials are somehow “proprietary,” even though they have been paid for with tax dollars – and are being used to justify onerous regulations that dictate and impair our livelihoods, liberties, and living standards. EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy says she intends to “protect” the agency’s work product from those who she determines “are not qualified to analyze it.” As with the IPCC and Al Gore, EPA officials will not debate experts who question assertions that climate change is dangerous and manmade.

In violation of constitutional “separation of powers” doctrines, the EPA rewrote the Clean Air Act provisions that specify 250-ton-per-year emission limits for critical pollutants. So that those limits could be used to shut down coal-fired power plants, without immediately impacting millions of other facilities, the agency illegally and arbitrarily raised the threshold to 100,000 tons per year for CO₂, and ignored the fact that in 692 bills [Congress never contemplated](#) applying the Clean Air Act to greenhouse gases.

Thankfully, the [Supreme Court blocked](#) the 250-becomes-100,000 regulatory sleight-of-hand trick. However, the EPA continues to impose climate change rules, with the goal of ultimately controlling millions of natural gas generators, refineries, factories, paper mills, shopping malls, apartment and office buildings, hospitals, schools, and churches. And the courts have let most of the agency’s other climate actions stand, saying they will continue deferring to “agency discretion,” no matter how damaging.

The EPA and other federal agencies have paid billions in taxpayer dollars to finance and hype “research” that makes ludicrous claims that manmade global warming is hidden in [really deep ocean waters](#) or obscured by [pine tree vapors](#); that tens of thousands of [offshore wind turbines](#) could weaken hurricanes; and that climate change will cause more [rapes and murders](#), to cite just a few of thousands of examples.

The EPA’s Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (CASAC) reviews the agency’s CO₂ and pollution data, studies, and conclusions. For these services, the EPA has paid CASAC’s 15 members [\\$180.8 million](#) since 2000. CASAC excludes from its ranks industry and other experts who might question EPA findings. The agency has also given the [American Lung Association](#) nearly [\\$25 million](#) in grants over the past 15 years, for applauding and promoting government regulatory decisions. Big Green foundations bankrolled the ALA with an additional [\\$76 million](#), under 2,806 grants.

These payoffs raise serious questions about the integrity and credibility of the EPA, CASAC, and the ALA.

In violation of the Information Quality Act and other federal laws, the EPA hypothesizes or exaggerates almost every conceivable “social cost of carbon “ that it can attribute to CO₂ emissions – every conceivable impact on agriculture, forests, water resources, coastal cities, human health and disease, ecosystems, and wildlife. However, it *completely ignores* even the most obvious and enormous *benefits* of using fossil fuels and emitting plant-fertilizing carbon dioxide: affordable heat and electricity, jobs, transportation, better crop growth and nutrition, and improved living standards, health, and welfare.

The agency claims its latest coal-fueled power plant rules (requiring a 30% reduction in CO₂ emissions by 2030) would bring \$30 billion in “climate benefits” – versus “only” \$7.3 billion in costs. Even the liberal [Brookings Institution](#) has said the agency’s analysis is erroneous and illegal. Contrary to clear legal requirements, the EPA calculated its highly conjectural and exaggerated benefits on a *global* basis, to inflate them as much as possible; however, the (low-balled) costs imposed by its regulations will be paid solely by American taxpayers, consumers, families, businesses, and workers.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce calculates EPA regulations will actually **reduce** our nation’s Gross Domestic Product – and thus cost American families and businesses – by almost [\\$51 billion per year](#). They will also result in 224,000 fewer U.S. jobs being created every year through 2030. These adverse impacts are far in excess of what the EPA claims its rules will cost.

Approaching the issue from a different perspective, energy analyst Roger Bezdek estimates that the benefits of using carbon-based fuels outweigh any hypothesized “social costs of carbon” by [orders of magnitude](#): *50-to-1* (using the inflated SCC of \$36/ton of CO₂ concocted by the EPA and other federal agencies in 2013) – and *500-to-1* (using the equally arbitrary \$22/ton estimate that they cooked up in 2010). For the EPA to flout the imaginary costs of using carbon-based fuels while ignoring the incredible benefits that those fuels continue bringing to modern civilization is arbitrary, capricious, and illegal.

When questions arise, the EPA stonewalls and slow-walks FOIA requests and denies requests for correction and reconsideration. One lawyer who has filed FOIA cases since 1978 says the Obama Administration is bar-none “the worst” in history on transparency. Even members of Congress get nowhere, resulting in testy confrontations with Ms. McCarthy and other EPA officials.

The EPA also does all it can to incorporate the views and concerns of environmentalist pressure groups that style themselves as “stakeholders.” It routinely engages in “sue and settle” litigation, which allows the EPA to settle out of court with radical Green groups that bring the lawsuits and thus deny parties actually affected by the shady maneuvers their day in court.¹⁹

All these deceitful, conniving schemes mean the real stakeholders – families and companies that will be severely impacted by the rules, and organizations and experts that try to protect their interests – are systematically denied access to data, scientific assessments, and fair treatment by the EPA.

The EPA won’t even hold hearings in Coal Country or states that will be hardest hit by soaring electricity costs. Instead, it hosts showy hearings and “listening sessions” in big cities like Atlanta, Chicago, San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. – where it knows passionate lefty students and eco-activists will dominate. People who will be grievously impacted by the draconian job-killing regulations must travel long distances and pay for expensive hotels and meals ... or remain silent and ignored.

That stacks the deck – the same way the “public comment” process is tilted in favor of ultra-rich Big Green agitators who have the funding and organization to generate thousands or millions of comments.

The EPA has done all of this knowingly and deliberately, to drive an anti-hydrocarbon agenda, without regard for the consequences that its agenda will inflict on countless American businesses and families.

This goes far beyond mere sloppiness or incompetence. It is dishonest. It violates the law. If the EPA’s actions were examined according to legal standards that government agencies routinely apply to taxpayers and businesses, they would be rejected, prosecuted, and penalized as *fraudulent*.

The damage is far greater than the harm inflicted by ObamaCare, which affects one-sixth of the economy. By controlling the energy that powers our nation, the EPA’s carbon and CO₂ policies affect and hobble virtually *100% of our economy*. They will wipe out millions of jobs, impair the health and welfare of numerous citizens, and kill thousands of people – *for no health or environmental benefits*.

The National Climate Assessment report is pseudo-science at its worst

As noted earlier, in May 2014, the White House released the U.S. Global Change Research Program’s latest [National Climate Assessment](#). Its 829-page report and 127-page “summary” were quickly followed by press releases, television appearances, interviews, and photo ops with tornado victims – all to underscore President Obama’s central claim: “once considered an issue for the distant future,” human-induced climate change “has moved firmly into the present.” It is “affecting Americans right now,” disrupting their lives in countless ways, as enumerated above.

It was pretty scary sounding – and much of the White House and media spin went far beyond what even the NCA report actually said. For example, the report said “there has been no universal trend in the overall extent of drought across the continental U.S. since 1900.” But the President and his spin doctors claimed droughts were getting much worse. The fear-mongering was essential.

First, the report and spin were designed to distract voters from topics that the President and Democrats do not want to talk about: ObamaCare, IRS scandals, Benghazi, foreign policy failures and a steady rise in aggression and terrorism, still

horrid jobless and workforce participation rates, and an abysmal *minus* 0.5% first quarter 2014 GDP growth rate that reminded many voters of the Great Depression.

Second, fear-inducing “climate disruption” claims are needed to justify job-killing, economy-choking policies like carbon dioxide restrictions; still more wind, solar, and ethanol mandates, tax breaks, and subsidies; and regulatory compliance costs that have reached [\\$1.9 trillion](#) per year – nearly one-eighth of the entire U.S. economy – with \$353 billion of those costs coming from EPA alone.

Third, scary hyperventilating serves to obscure the realities examined above, concerning Earth’s actual weather and climate, and the fact that all the end-of-Earth cataclysms were conjured up by computer models and a close-knit group of scientists, activists, and bureaucrats who are working desperately to protect their turf, reputations, funding, and power.

The United States government alone doles out some [\\$2.6 billion annually](#) in grants for climate research – but only for work that reflects White House, EPA, and IPCC perspectives. Billions more support subsidies and loans for renewable energy programs that represent major revenue streams for companies large and small, and part of that money ends up in campaign war chests for (mostly Democrat) legislators who support the **climate change scientist-government-industrialist complex**.

None of them is likely to admit any doubts, alter any claims or policies, or reduce the increasingly vitriolic attacks on skeptics of “dangerous manmade global warming.” They do not want to risk being exposed as false prophets, or worse. To understand the true situation, simply *follow the money*.

Last, and most important, climate disruption claims drive a regulatory agenda that few Americans support. Presidential candidate Obama said his goal was to “fundamentally transform” the United States and ensure that electricity rates “necessarily skyrocket.” On climate change, President Obama has made it clear that he will not wait for a “dysfunctional Congress” to do its job. “Where they won’t act, I will,” he said, and his EPA, Departments of the Interior and Energy, and other officials are zealously implementing his anti-hydrocarbon policies.

This agenda translates into greater government control over energy production and use, job creation, and economic growth – and over people’s lives, livelihoods, living standards, liberties, health, and welfare. It means fewer opportunities and lower standards of living for elderly, poor, minority, and middle class working Americans. It means greater power and control for politicians, bureaucrats, activists, and judges – but with little or no accountability for mistakes made, damage done, or health and economic penalties deliberately exacted on innocent people.

A strong economy, modern technologies, and abundant, reliable, affordable energy are absolutely essential if we are to adapt to future climate changes, whatever their cause – so that we can survive the heat waves, cold winters, floods, droughts, and vicious weather that will most certainly continue coming.

It’s no wonder then that many experts raked President Obama’s 2014 National Climate Assessment report over the coals. One group of 15 scientists and meteorologists called it “a masterpiece of marketing” that is trying to scare people but is devoid of actual evidence to support its claims. Independent experts need to be involved in an open, robust debate on these issues – not just those scientists who are “paid to support the administration’s version of ‘global warming,’ ‘climate change,’ ‘climate disruption,’ or whatever their marketing specialists call it today,” those critical experts said.²⁰

Other climate specialists called the NCA report “pseudo-science,” said it was a “total distortion” of actual weather and climate records, and pointed out that “lead authors” for the report included activists from the radical Union of Concerned Scientists, Planet Forward, and the Nature Conservancy.

Climatologist Dr. Judith Curry noted that the report is based on “the false premise that any change in the 20th Century has been caused by anthropogenic global warming.” Added climate scientist Dr. Roy Spencer, parts of the report are “simply made up. There is no fingerprint of human-caused climate change” that can be separated from naturally occurring changes.

University of Colorado environmental studies professor Roger Pielke, Jr., observed that the NCA report claims “risks associated with extreme events like hurricanes are increasing” – whereas in reality “U.S. hurricane landfalls have decreased by 25% since 1900.” Weather Channel co-founder John Coleman blasted the report as a “600-page litany of doom,” a “total distortion of the data” and an “agenda-driven, destructive episode of bad science gone berserk.”

And yet the National Climate Assessment report is being employed as yet another justification for highly destructive energy, economic, and wealth redistribution policies. Incredibly, Secretary of State John Kerry even called climate change “the world’s most fearsome weapon of mass destruction” – even as true weapons of mass destruction were increasingly

falling into the hands of the most vicious butchers and terrorists since the Nazi SS death camps ... or perhaps in human history.²¹

The IPCC: The foundation of climate fraud

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) remains the primary foundation for the National Climate Assessment report and for the vast majority of climate studies and regulations developed by the EPA, the Departments of Energy and the Interior, and similar government agencies worldwide. IPCC findings also form the basis for restrictions on fossil fuel use and CO₂ emissions, for hundreds of billions of dollars in renewable energy programs – and for the vast consortium of scientists, research institutions, activist groups, politicians, journalists, and companies that collectively profit from the contrived hysteria over manmade global warming.

It is therefore absolutely essential that IPCC work products be honest, accurate and credible, and that the resultant energy and climate policies be based on sound, replicable science.

Unfortunately, IPCC efforts are defective in every aspect. Indeed, the organization has continued many of the misleading and deliberately deceitful practices it employed in every previous Assessment Report.

For instance, contrary to repeated claims by IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri (and the EPA) that the Panel's reports rely solely, entirely, and exclusively on scholarly peer-reviewed source material, *fully 30%* of the papers and other references cited in the IPCC's 2007 Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) were *not* peer reviewed, and many of the IPCC's authors and lead authors were not independent Ph.D. scientists, but instead were graduate students or even environmental activists working for Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund, and similar groups.²²

In fact, many of the IPCC's scariest, most headline-grabbing, most frequently repeated claims of climate disasters deviated flagrantly from basic standards of scrutiny, credibility and integrity. To cite just two of many egregious examples from the 2007 AR4:

- Claims that droughts caused by global warming would destroy 40% of the Amazon rainforest were premised on a World Wildlife Fund press release, which was based on “research” by two young activists who predicated their analysis on a science journal article that addressed forest *logging and burning by local people*, and said nothing whatsoever about rainfall or climate change.²³
- Claims that Himalayan glaciers would “disappear by the year 2035,” depriving communities of water, were based on yet another World Wildlife Fund press release. The release was based on a non-peer-reviewed article in a popular science magazine – which was based on an email from a single glaciologist, who later admitted his prediction was pure “speculation.” The IPCC lead author in charge of this section subsequently confessed that the glacial “meltdown” had been included – despite his *knowing* of its false pedigree – because he thought highlighting it would “encourage” policy makers and politicians “to take concrete action” on global warming.²⁴

Previous Assessment Reports also featured and relied on computer models, such as the one that generated Michael Mann's infamous “hockey stick” graph, to support IPCC claims that previously “unprecedented” global warming would soon cause global catastrophes. Those prominent claims were subsequently demolished by independent experts, like Ross McKittrick and Steve McIntyre, who demonstrated that Mann's computer program would generate the same graph even if random telephone numbers were fed into it. IPCC stalwarts, typically, vilified these experts as “climate change deniers” who should be ignored, banished from meteorology societies, or even jailed.

The IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) continued many of these deceitful practices – although it also finally admitted that there had been no global warming for 17 years. Indeed, the final draft AR5 contained a graph that dramatically showed how far actual measured global temperatures deviated from every IPCC computer model temperature projection – and how the discrepancies between planetary reality and computer forecasts became worse with every passing year.

As McKittrick, an economics professor at the University of Guelph in Canada and one of the world's leading authorities on climate data, put it at the time: “Everything you need to know about the dilemma the IPCC faces is summed up in one remarkable graph” that shows how significantly its models “over-predicted the warming effect of CO₂ emissions for the past 22 years.”²⁵

The climate model predictions were based primarily on the assumption that rising atmospheric CO₂ would send temperatures upward, and that this effect would be amplified by “positive forcing” from water vapor and other greenhouse gases. The actual observed global temperatures were measured by satellites and temperature stations, in the real world outside the computer modelers’ windows.

How did the IPCC deal with this hypothesis-shattering information? A previous IPCC report had “used Mike’s *Nature* [magazine] trick ... to hide the decline” in global temperatures, referring to Dr. Mann’s clever apples-and-oranges tactic of combining recent instrumental temperature data with reconstructed and averaged tree ring data. (That analysis also assumed wider tree rings were due only to warmer temperatures, but ignored the important role that rainfall also plays in tree growth).²⁶

This time the IPCC simply *deleted the graph from the final report*, so that it could claim its models were correct and the climate change situation is far worse than anyone thought it could possibly be.

In 2009, climate scientist Kevin Trenberth had said, “The fact is that we can’t account for the lack of warming at the moment, and it is a travesty that we can’t.” The same year, in another leaked ‘Climategate’ email, Professor Phil Jones, head of the East Anglia University Climatic Research Unit, said the lack of warming “has to continue for a total of 15 years before we get worried.”²⁷

By the end of 2013, the absence of warming had continued for some 17 years, and it had been 8 years since a category 3-5 hurricane had struck the United States. Moreover, in 2010, leading IPCC officials were already saying, “the next climate warming report will be dramatically worse.” Former executive secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change Yvo de Boer had predicted that the next report “is going to scare the wits out of everyone,” and that failure to devise a new climate treaty “could plunge the world into conflict.”

IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri had said his organization would be “at the beck and call” of the governments that fund it. He has also admitted that the purpose of IPCC reports is to make the case that “action is needed on climate change.” And Dr. Mann had said it is essential that the world switch to “a carbon-free economy” to “solve this [climate] problem that threatens us all.”²⁸

Leading U.S. politicians added to the Al Gore *Earth in the Balance* clamor. Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA) proclaimed: “In California we can just look out the window and see climate change’s impacts.” Senator Debbie Stabenow (D-MI) insisted: “Global warming increases volatility, and I can feel it when I’m flying.”

These comments underscore how totally invested the “climate establishment” is in maintaining perceptions that fossil fuel emissions are the primary or sole cause of global warming, climate change, or climate “disruption” (whatever they currently call it), and the results will be disastrous.

Everything you need to know about the IPCC’s “integrity” and the credibility of manmade climate change hysteria is embodied in those statements and the deletion of that terribly inconvenient graph. As Dr. Roy Spencer observed, “We are now at a point in the age of global warming hysteria where the IPCC global warming theory has crashed into the hard reality of observations.” But the situation gets much worse, and even more farcical and embarrassing.

Despite the increasing amount of real-world evidence aligning against IPCC hype and hypotheses, Mr. Pachauri continues to insist, “There’s definitely an increase in our belief that climate change is taking place and that human beings are responsible.” Now his organization is 95% confident it’s been right all along – an increase from just 90% confidence in 2007, when Earth’s temperatures had failed to increase for only 10 or 11 years.

Other researchers have raised the ante even higher, claiming it is now a “99.999% certainty” (one chance in 100,000) that the average global temperature since 1954 would not have risen so much if it had not been for human greenhouse gas emissions. (Whether the human contribution was 1% or 99.999% they would not say; nor did they bother to examine the undeniable role of multiple, powerful, complex and interrelated *natural forces* in causing numerous climate fluctuations throughout the course of planetary and human history.)

Dr. Judith Curry, professor and former chair of the School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences at the Georgia Institute of Technology, summed the situation up perfectly: “As temperatures have declined, and climate models have failed to predict this decline, the IPCC has gained confidence in [its predictions of] catastrophic warming.” In other words, **the more they are wrong about nearly everything, the more confident IPCC officials have become that they are right about nearly everything.**²⁹

Equally disturbing and damning is the unscientific and deceptive study, review, summary, and public relations process that the IPCC engages in, to ensure that its final conclusions will always be that humans are responsible for climate change – and that the changes are increasingly dangerous and destructive.

According to ClimateDepot.com, the IPCC is essentially “a political body masquerading as a science body.” It always makes its science fit its political agenda. It examines numerous studies that support its “dangerous manmade climate change” hypothesis, while ignoring or dismissing studies that contradict its assumptions, assertions, and conclusions. Then, after it has spent years in that process, it hosts “detailed discussions with politicians, UN officials, and government delegates to the IPCC conference.” There its supposedly scientific conclusion are discussed, revised, and agreed to line by line for its Summary for Policymakers (SPM). Each IPCC report, he says, “represents the culmination of years of predetermined science,” in which even rape statistics and avocado shortages are presented as evidence of human-caused climate change.

In many cases, reports ClimateDepot.com, this process discovers that the authors of the various scientific chapters made significant “errors” that have to be corrected. Some truly are simple mistakes – math errors, for example. But others involve instances where “peer-reviewed” scientific studies turn out to have been activist press releases or articles from ski or hiking magazines. And many other “errors” are actually policy, political, or public relations decisions made for the SPM that now must be reflected in the main body of scientific literature. In the 2013 Fifth Assessment Report, Chapter 2’s 52 authors made 18 scientific errors that had to be fixed; Chapter 5 authors made 11 mistakes; and Chapter 11 had 21 errors.³⁰

The entire summary was negotiated behind closed doors, with the public and news media barred, and no television cameras allowed. One sentence after another was projected onto large screens, IPCC analyst and critic Donna Laframboise wrote. “Diplomats, bureaucrats, and politicians from dozens of UN nations [then] haggle, horse trade, and negotiate [every one of them]. Eventually, phrasing that everyone can live with [is] agreed upon. Then they move on to the next sentence.” The 2013 process involved 66 supposed expert authors (a number of whom are actually environmentalist activists), 271 politicians and bureaucrats from 115 countries, and 57 observers.³¹

As statistician and analyst [Steve McIntyre explained](#), there was a 3-month delay between publication of the SPM and release of the actual Working Group 1 Scientific Report on Physical Science for the Fourth Assessment Report. The delay was needed so that the reviewers and original scientists would have time to “make any ‘necessary’ adjustments to the technical report,” to ensure that it would “match the policy summary.” McIntyre is the ClimateAudit.org editor who with Ross McKittrick was most responsible for debunking Dr. Michael Mann’s infamous “hockey stick” temperature graph.

McIntyre pointed out that entire paragraphs were inserted into the scientific reports, dates and numbers were altered, italics were added to highlight certain passages, and some material simply disappeared -- including graphs and scientific explanations and conclusions that are “inconvenient to” or “in conflict with” the political Summary for Policymakers and its “manmade climate chaos” claims. That’s how the IPCC did it in 2007 – and how it did it again in 2013.

“Can you imagine what securities commissions would say if business promoters issued a big promotion, and then the promoters made the ‘necessary’ adjustments to the qualifying reports and financial statements, so that they matched the promotion? Words fail me,” McIntyre said.

But should anyone really be surprised by any of this? As climate scientist Bob Tisdale pointed out in a letter to Secretary of State John Kerry: In reality, “the vast majority of the scientific research reflected in [the IPCC Summary for Policymakers] was funded by governments. As a result, the summary presents only research efforts that adhere to the agendas of the political entities that financed it.”³²

Then why isn’t the IPCC completely revamped or simply scuttled? Because tens of billions of taxpayer dollars are devoted annually to climate change and renewable energy programs. There are just too many professional and political budgets and reputations to be protected, too many companies and universities and government agencies with huge stakes in keeping this money train on track, not to keep the “dangerous manmade climate change” illusion alive.

CONCLUSION: Our energy and economic futures are at stake

If any business engaged in duplicitous actions like these, it would be prosecuted for fraud and its officers likely jailed. Indeed, the anti-human nature of IPCC and EPA actions is underscored by the fact that they are driven by a determination to impose anti-hydrocarbon energy policies that will hamper economic growth, redistribute wealth, kill jobs, impair human health and welfare, and cost lives.

It's no wonder that [fewer than half](#) of Americans believe climate change is manmade or dangerous – and far fewer support these punitive policies. A May 2014 [Gallup poll](#) found that 56% of respondents said the economy, unemployment, and dissatisfaction with government are the most serious problems facing our nation; only 3% said environmental issues are of paramount concern, and climate change represented only a small segment of that low number. An August 2014 [Pittsburgh Post-Gazette poll](#) echoed those results.

Top Chinese, Indian, German, and Australian leaders pointedly declined to attend the September 2014 UN climate change summit in New York City. In an action that suggests Europe is shifting its focus from climate change to economic recovery, competitiveness and energy prices, the EU Commission announced that it will consolidate its energy and environmental functions, eliminating what had been a separate climate office. The decision reflects growing business, consumer and family concerns about access to reliable, affordable electricity and motor fuels, experts said.³³

That means that, at least for now, the U.S. may be almost the only nation whose government is forcing its citizens to accept draconian, even suicidal, energy and climate policies.

Perhaps worse, those rules will be implemented not in the form of laws enacted by duly elected representatives, but through regulations imposed by increasingly dictatorial Executive Branch agencies.

Meanwhile, the Middle East and other parts of world are exploding and imploding in a frenzy of butchery, beheadings, rapes and genocide – and Islamic State terrorists are threatening to spill more American blood on American soil. These realities are pushing “climate disruption” even further down voters’ lists of priorities, and making more voters outraged that the Obama Administration is still fixated on the notion that climate change is “the world’s most fearsome weapon of mass destruction.”³⁴

The issue is not whether climate and weather are changing. Of course they are. They change all the time and have done so throughout history. The issues are whether, and to what degree, humans are affecting Earth’s climate – and whether slashing fossil fuel use and reducing our economic growth and living standards will stop climate change. Put another way: Can we control our planet’s climate and weather, by addressing one politically motivated factor (CO₂), while having no effect whatsoever on the myriad of powerful natural forces that affect climate change? It is ludicrous to think we can.

What can be done?

Citizens and voters should remind their legislators of these facts through letters, at town meetings, and when they go to the polls. However, other proactive actions will also be required.

Governors, state attorneys-general, other elected officials, and affected companies and communities should file lawsuits under the Freedom of Information Act, the Information Quality Act, and related laws. Such legal actions can compel the EPA, the IPCC, and alarmist scientists to release data and analyses to outside experts who up to now have been denied the right to review and challenge the scientific, health and economic claims that these entities use to justify efforts to slash fossil fuel use in the name of stabilizing planetary climate and weather that have been anything but stable since time immemorial.

Governors, state attorneys general, other elected officials, and affected companies and communities should also resist any attempts by the EPA and other government officials to impose economy-crippling, job-killing, health-impairing “climate change” regulations.

They should also demand debate – force the IPCC, the EPA, and alarmist scientists and bureaucrats to defend their science and policies in public. Force them to present their data and analyses for citizens and experts outside their now-closed circle of like-minded, self-interested reviewers – and prove with clear and convincing evidence that their claims of

“dangerous manmade climate change” are correct. Force them to prove that the harmful effects of climate change truly are far worse than the enormous harm that their anti-energy, anti-growth regulations will perpetrate and perpetuate, especially on America’s and the world’s poorest citizens.

If they have nothing to hide, they should be happy to do so.

The U.S. Senate and House of Representatives should trim billions of dollars from the annual EPA and IPCC budgets. That money is currently being used to advance research focused almost solely on carbon dioxide and “dangerous manmade climate change,” and on regulations designed to drive anti-hydrocarbon and renewable energy agendas, regardless of the economic and human costs.

Elected officials from the United States and all countries should also act to amend or clarify IPCC and GCRP missions and directives – to make it clear that these organizations are not to focus only on CO₂ or greenhouse gases as they explore climate change causes and effects. At this time, the most glaring omissions from these research portfolios are studies that would help scientists better understand, assess, and factor in the powerful, complex, interrelated *natural* forces that drive climate fluctuations, cycles, and changes. If such changes are not forthcoming, the U.S. should pull out of the UN climate process altogether.

Only when these changes are implemented will we be able to discern and separate significant human influences – and begin to predict why, when, how, and where Earth’s climate is likely to change in the future. That is essential because, as many scientists have observed, the sun seems to have entered a “quiet phase” that may mark a return to Little Ice Age conditions over the coming decades. The impacts on weather, agriculture, and food production would be profound -- and humanity needs to be prepared.

Only by *accurately* predicting future climate fluctuations will nations and communities be able to prepare for and adapt to future climatic conditions. Humans have always adapted to climate change. We have had no choice but to do so, because powerful natural forces completely dwarf anything humans might muster up in feeble attempts to control climate and weather.

However, our constantly growing wealth and improving technologies will make adaptation and mitigation much easier in the future – if we do not stifle those abilities by imposing misguided regulations.

The **climate change scientist-government-environmentalist-industrialist climate complex** is well funded and powerful. But it is also arrogant and dishonest, and its assertions are so far removed from reality that they can no longer survive scrutiny and challenge. The time has come to end its attempt to control our lives, livelihoods, liberties, living standards, and life spans.

PAUL DRIESSEN is senior policy analyst for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT) and Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), public policy institutes that promote environmental stewardship, the enhancement of human health and welfare, and personal liberties and civil rights. He writes and speaks frequently on the environment, energy and economic development, malaria eradication, pesticides, climate change, human rights, corporate social responsibility and sustainable development.

His articles have appeared in newspapers (*Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Times*, *Investor's Business Daily*, *New York Post*, *Houston Chronicle*, and others) and magazines (*Risk Management*, *American Coal*, *Hispanic Times* and others) and on news and opinion websites in the United States, Canada, Germany, Italy, Peru, Venezuela, South Africa, Uganda, Bangladesh and other countries.

Driessen's book, *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power - Black Death*, documents the harm that restrictive environmental policies often have on poor people, especially in developing countries, by restricting their access to life-enhancing modern technologies. It is in its second U.S. printing and has also been published in Argentina (Spanish), India (English), Germany (German), and Italy (Italian).

He was editor for *Energy Keepers - Energy Killers: The new civil rights battle*, by CORE national chairman Roy Innis and *Rules for Corporate Warriors: How to fight and survive attack group shakedowns*, by Nick Nichols. He has also written detailed reports on the role of CO₂ in enhancing plant growth, modern mining methods in Peru, sustainable development, and EPA regulations.

Driessen's studies and analyses have also appeared in *Conserving the Environment* (Doug Dupler, editor), *Resurgent Diseases* (Karen Miller, editor) and *Malnutrition* (Margaret Haerens, editor), all part of the Thomson-Gale "Opposing Viewpoints" Series used in many high schools and colleges; *Redefining Sovereignty: Will liberal democracies continue to determine their own laws and public policies, or yield these rights to transnational entities in search of universal order and justice?* (Orin Judd, editor); and other publications. He played a lead role in the "Kill Malarial Mosquitoes Now" campaign, an international effort that restored the use of DDT to African and other malaria control programs, and served as an advisor to the film "3 Billion and Counting," examining how the environmentalist and EPA campaign against DDT has had devastating impacts on families in poor developing countries.

Paul received his B.A. in geology and field ecology from Lawrence University and a J.D. from the University of Denver College of Law, before embarking on a career that also included tenures with the United States Senate, U.S. Department of the Interior and an energy trade association.

ENDNOTES

¹ Shardul Agrawala, *Explaining the Evolution of the IPCC Structure and Process*, Belfer Center for Science & International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, August 1997; Bert Bolin, *A History of the Science and Politics of Climate Change: The Role of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press (2007); Tim Ball, *The Deliberate Corruption of Climate Science*, Mount Vernon, WA: Stairway Press (2014). The focus on carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases reflects the fact that they were chosen for the political reason that they are unavoidable byproducts of fossil fuel use, which radical environmental activists detest and want to reduce or eliminate.

² See Rupert Darwall, *The Age of Global Warming: A History*, Plymouth, UK: Quartet Books (2013).

³ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *IPCC Fifth Assessment Report* (2013), www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/. See also, Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), *Climate Change Reconsidered II, Physical Science and Biological Impacts*, and their Summaries for Policymakers, Chicago: Heartland Institute (2013). The 15-page NIPCC summaries are easy to digest and should be read by legislators, regulators, journalists, and anyone interested in climate change science. The summaries and lengthy reports were prepared by 50 climatologists and other scientists from 15 countries, under the direction of lead authors Craig Idso (USA), Robert Carter (Australia), and Fred Singer (USA). <http://ClimateChangeReconsidered.org/> and <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/ccr2a/pdf/Summary-for-Policymakers.pdf>

⁴ See Paul Driessen, *The Three Faces of Sustainability*, Chicago: Heartland Institute (2014); “EPA Chief: CO₂ regulations are about ‘justice’ for ‘communities of color,’” *Daily Caller*, August 27, 2014.

⁵ Ben Wolfgang, “Obama eyes a global climate deal without Congress,” *Washington Times*, August 28, 2014; Timothy Cama, “Climate plan spooks Dems,” *The Hill*, August 28, 2014.

⁶ In fact, Almost 90% of the National Weather Service’s climate-monitoring stations failed NWS “siting” requirements, by being too close to heat sources that contaminated data and caused stations to report higher than actual temperatures. Yet, their records and other biased data were relied on by the EPA and the IPCC as evidence of U.S. and global warming trends. Anthony Watts, *Is the U.S. Surface Temperature Reliable? How do we know global warming is a problem if we can’t trust the U.S. temperature record?* SurfaceStations.org: 2009, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/05/10/a-report-on-the-surfacestations-project-with-70-of-the-ushcn-surveyed/>; Craig Idso and S. Fred Singer, *Climate Change Reconsidered: Physical Science*, The report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), Chicago, IL: Heartland Institute, 2009 (pages 114-130).

⁷ NIPCC, *Climate Change Reconsidered II: Physical Science and Summary for Policymakers* (2013): <http://ClimateChangeReconsidered.org/> and <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/ccr2a/pdf/Summary-for-Policymakers.pdf>

⁸ As British science journalist Matt Ridley pointed out in “Whatever happened to global warming?” *Wall Street Journal*, September 5, 2014, the warming “pause” has actually continued now for 16, 19, or even 26 years, “depending on whether you choose the surface temperature record or one of two satellite records of the lower atmosphere. That’s according to a new statistical calculation by Ross McKittrick, a professor of economics at the University of Guelph in Canada,” and one of the world’s foremost analysts of climate data and statistics.

⁹ Paul Driessen and Willie Soon, “Desperately looking for Arctic warming,” May 1, 2010, http://townhall.com/columnists/pauldriessen/2010/05/01/desperately_looking_for_arctic_warming/page/full; Paul Driessen, “Risking lives and property to promote climate change hype: Yet another global warming expedition gets trapped in icebound ideology,” January 10, 2014, <http://www.cfact.org/2014/01/10/risking-lives-and-property-to-promote-climate-change-hype/>

¹⁰ See Paul Driessen, *Carbon Dioxide: The gas of life – Tiny amounts of this miracle molecule make life on Earth possible*, Washington, D.C.: Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (2013), <http://www.cfact.org/pdf/CO2-TheGasOfLife.pdf>.

¹¹ Mr. Gore is also famous for absurdly misinforming his 2009 “Tonight Show” audience that the [Earth’s interior](#) is “really hot, several million degrees” – the *core* is actually 9,000° F – and for [refusing to debate](#) anyone on climate change or even take audience questions that he has not preapproved. Perhaps in his defense, Nobel Laureate Gore managed [only a C+ and a D](#) in the only college-level science courses he ever took.

¹² See Paul Driessen and Patrick Moffitt, “Super Sandy,” a four-part series of articles on the storm that devastated New York and New Jersey in October 2012, and the storm’s hype, history and lessons. <https://www.MasterResource.org/climate-exaggeration/superstorm-sandy-i-climate-weather-spin/>

¹³ See Ross McLeod, “Ocean acidification claims are misleading – and deliberately so,” *Principia Scientifica*, August 12, 2014; Roger Andrews, “Is ‘ocean acidification’ a threat?” *Energy Matters*, August 1, 2014, <http://EuanMearns.com/is-ocean-acidification-a-threat/>; Summary for Policymakers: Biological Impacts, Climate Change Reconsidered II; and <http://www.co2science.org/data/acidification/background.php>.

¹⁴ See Anthony Watts, “Cook’s ‘97% consensus’ disproven by a new peer-reviewed paper showing major math errors,” September 3, 2013, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/03/cooks-97-consensus-disproven-by-a-new-paper-showing-major-math-errors/>; Steve

McIntyre, “Cook’s trick,” <http://climateaudit.org/2014/07/29/cooks-trick/>; David R. Legates, et al., “Climate Consensus and Misinformation: A rejoinder to ‘Agnotology, Scientific Consensus, and the Teaching and Learning of Climate Change’,” *Science and Education Journal*, doi 10.1007/s1119-013-9647-9.

¹⁵ See Andrew Montford, *Fraud, Bias and Public Relations: The 97% ‘consensus’ and its critics*, Global Warming Policy Foundation (2014): <http://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2014/09/Warming-consensus-and-its-critics.pdf>

¹⁶ William F. Jasper, “UN summit fails to enact ‘complete transformation’ of world,” *The New American*, December 10, 2012; Anthony Watts, “IPCC Official: ‘Climate policy is redistributing the world’s wealth,’” November 18, 2010, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/11/18/ipcc-official-%E2%80%9CClimate-policy-is-redistributing-the-worlds-wealth%E2%80%9D/>; Andrew Montford, “The disastrous revolution,” <http://www.bishop-hill.net/blog/2014/8/17/the-disastrous-revolution.html>. See also *Brief of the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow as Amicus Curiae in Support of Petitioners Southeastern Legal Foundation, et al.* against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, et al., before the United States Supreme Court, December 16, 2013: <https://www.cfact.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/CFACT-amicus-brief-to-US-SCt-in-SLF-v-EPA-Dec-2013.pdf>

¹⁷ See Sebastian Luening and Fritz Vahrenholt, “Imagine there’s a climate conference, but no one goes,” September 9, 2014, <http://notrickszone.com/2014/09/09/german-scientists-ridicule-new-york-climate-conference-as-major-world-leaders-decline-to-show-up/#sthash.dgAcuLtu.dpuf>

¹⁸ Paul C. “Chip” Knappenberger and Patrick J. Michaels, “0.02°C Temperature Rise Averted: The vital number missing from EPA’s “By the Numbers” Fact Sheet,” June 12, 2014: <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/06/12/epa-leaves-out-the-most-vital-number-in-their-fact-sheet/>

¹⁹ It has been suggested that these activist “stakeholders” hold the stakes that government bureaucrats are driving into the hearts of American companies, working families, and communities.

²⁰ Marc Morano, “Climate hustle or American doomsday: Obama climate report panned by scientists,” a Climate Depot Special Report, May 7, 2014: <http://www.climatedepot.com/2014/05/07/climate-hustle-or-american-doomsday-obama-climate-report-panned-by-scientists-pseudoscience-sales-pitch-follow-the-money-total-distortion/>; Michael Bastasch, “Skeptical scientists debunk White House global warming report,” *The Daily Caller*, May 16, 2014: <http://dailycaller.com/2014/05/16/skeptical-scientists-debunk-white-house-global-warming-report/#ixzz3BdG4Z8ED>

²¹ UN IPCC Working Group III co-chairman Ottmar Edenhofer put it bluntly: “One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy,” he said. It is about “how we redistribute the world’s wealth.” See <http://www.WashingtonTimes.com/news/2013/nov/10/Rothbard-Pressing-ahead-on-climate-salvation/?page=all>. Simon Denyer, “Addressing students in Indonesia, Kerry calls climate change a weapon of mass destruction,” *Washington Post*, February 16, 2014.

²² See Donna Laframboise, *The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World’s Top Climate Expert: An IPCC expose*; Toronto: Ivy Avenue Press (2011); pp. 184-185 (the citizen audit of AR4); D. Laframboise, *Into the Dustbin: Rajendra Pachauri, the Climate Report & the Nobel Peace Prize*, Seattle, WA: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform (2013); Tim Ball, *The Deliberate Corruption of Climate Science*, Mount Vernon, WA: Stairway Press (2014); and various books and articles about Climategate.

²³ Jonathan Leake, “UN climate panel shamed by bogus rainforest claim,” *Sunday Times* (London), January 31, 2009; Richard Gray and Ben Leach, “The never-ending scandal: New list of errors in IPCC report,” *Sunday Telegraph*, February 7, 2010. See CFACT’s [amicus curiae brief](#) to the U.S. Supreme Court in *Southeastern Legal Foundation, et al. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, et al.*

²⁴ Jonathan Leake and Chris Hastings, “IPCC mislead world over Himalayan glacier meltdown,” *The Times* (London), January 17, 2010; Gerald Traufetter, “Can climate forecasts still be trusted? Confidence melting away,” ABC News Internet Ventures, January 28, 2010; F. William Engdahl, “Glacier Meltdown: Another Scientific Scandal Involving the IPCC Climate Research Group,” Global Research, January 27, 2010; David Rose, “Glacier scientist: I knew data hadn’t been verified,” London *Daily Mail*, January 24, 2010. *The Times* of London reported that India’s top glaciologists called Hasnain’s claims about imminent glacial meltdown “inherently ludicrous.” India’s most renowned glacier experts had just completed an exhaustive study that found no evidence of unusual temperature upturns in the Himalayas and said it would take 300 years for the glaciers to melt.

²⁵ Ross McKittrick, “IPCC models getting mushy,” *Financial Post*, September 16, 2013: <http://opinion.financialpost.com/2013/09/16/ipcc-models-getting-mushy/>

²⁶ The quote about using a “trick” to “hide the decline” comes from an email released in the first group of Climategate emails and other documents. The email was sent by climatologist Phil Jones to the original hockey stick authors: Michael Mann, Raymond Bradley and Malcolm Hughes. See Anthony Watts, “Mike’s Nature trick,” <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/11/20/mikes-nature-trick/>

²⁷ See Anthony Watts, “Kevin Trenberth struggles mightily to explain the lack of global warming,” May 22, 2013, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/05/22/kevin-trenberth-struggles-mightily-to-explain-the-lack-of-global-warming/>; James Delingpole,

“There has been no warming since 1998,” *The Telegraph*, July 6, 2011: <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100095506/there-has-been-no-global-warming-since-1998/>

²⁸ See Suzanne Goldenberg, “IPCC chairman dismisses climate report spoiler campaign: Rajendra K Pachauri says 'rational people' will be convinced by the science of the forthcoming blockbuster climate report,” *The Guardian*, September 19, 2013. http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/sep/19/ipcc-chairman-climate-report?CMP=twf_fd

²⁹ Judith Curry, “IPCC diagnosis – permanent paradigm paralysis,” September 28, 2013, <http://judithcurry.com/2013/09/28/ipcc-diagnosis-permanent-paradigm-paralysis/>. Dr. Curry has called for abolishing the IPCC, because of its demonstrated inability to be honest and objective. She has also pointed out that Antarctic ice sheet collapses “have happened in the past” without human-caused global warming, “and they will inevitably happen sometime in the future, with or without AGW” [anthropogenic global warming].

³⁰ Marc Morano, “This new IPCC report represents the culmination of years of predetermined science,” March 31, 2014, <http://www.climatedepot.com/2014/03/31/climate-depots-morano-statement-on-new-un-ipcc-report-this-new-ipcc-report-represents-the-culmination-of-years-of-pre-determined-science/>; “Political manipulation of a ‘scientific’ document?! 10 pages of UN IPCC science mistakes?” <http://www.climatedepot.com/2013/10/02/10-pages-of-un-ipcc-science-mistakes-in-chapter-2-alone-the-52-authors-are-collectively-responsible-for-18-instances-of-scientific-mistakes-that-now-need-fixing-political-manipulation/>

³¹ Donna Laframboise, “10 pages of IPCC science mistakes?” Political manipulation of a scientific document – or pages upon pages of newly discovered scientific errors? You decide.” October 2, 2013, <http://NoFrakkingConsensus.com/2013/10/02/10-pages-of-ipcc-science-mistakes/>; Suzanne Goldenberg, “IPCC report: climate change felt 'on all continents and across the oceans',” *The Guardian*, March 28, 2014, http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/mar/28/ipcc-report-climate-change-report-human-natural-systems?CMP=twf_gu

³² Bob Tisdale, Open Letter to the Honorable John Kerry U.S. Secretary of State, September 30, 2013, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/09/30/open-letter-to-the-honorable-john-kerry-u-s-secretary-of-state/>

³³ “The climate: biggest loser of the new Commission?” *EurActive.com*, September 12, 2014, <http://www.euractiv.com/sections/climate-environment/climate-biggest-loser-new-commission-308420>; Michael Bastasch, “EU Dismantles Its Climate Commission Amid Economic Struggles,” *Daily Caller*, September 12, 2014, <http://dailycaller.com/2014/09/12/eu-dismantles-its-climate-commission-amid-economic-struggles/>

³⁴ Just two months after calling climate change “the world’s most fearsome weapon of mass destruction” – and amid radical Islamist chaos and conflagrations across the Arab world – on September 3, Mr. Kerry said “Muslim-majority countries are among the most vulnerable” to climate change. “Scriptures,” he claimed, make it clear that Americans have a “responsibility” to prevent this calamity.



Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow

1875 Eye Street NW, 5th Floor

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 429-2737 ♦ www.cfact.org