

When Science Gets Hijacked by Politics

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2008–05/msg00020.html>

- *From:* "Claudius Denk" <claudiusdenk@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 1 May 2008 09:11:13 –0700
-

How UN Structures Were Designed To Prove Human CO2 Was Causing Global Warming

Dr. Tim Ball

April 30, 2008

<http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/2840>

QUOTE: "The structure and mandate of the IPCC was in direct contradiction to this scientific method. They set out to prove the theory rather than disprove it."

QUOTE: "The IPCC is a political organization and yet it is the sole basis of the claim of a scientific consensus on climate change."

QUOTE: "The IPCC and those who were chosen or chose to participate were locked in to a conclusion by the rules, regulations and procedures carefully crafted by Maurice Strong. These predetermined the outcome – a situation in complete contradiction to the objectives and methods of science."

QUOTE: "Houghton gave an example of a disastrous statement when he announced "...the impacts of global warming are like a weapon of mass destruction", which is followed by the claim that it kills more people than terrorism. Trouble is more people die of cold each year than heat"

QUOTE: "Unless we announce disasters no one will listen"

In previous related articles (Environmental Extremism and Historical and philosophical context of the climate change debate. and How the world was misled about global warming and now climate change) we examined how environmentalism and particularly climate was hijacked to achieve the political goals of Maurice Strong, primarily to cause the demise of industrialized nations. We saw how he established the political vehicle the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the scientific vehicle, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) for his purpose. He brought them together at the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992. The fruits of his efforts and the policies they engendered are now

When Science Gets Hijacked by Politics

emerging and are hurting the poor and middle-income people of all countries, with rising food and energy costs. They're hurting the people they were ostensibly designed to help, but more on that later.

Sir John Houghton, first co-chair of the IPCC and lead editor of the first three Reports, signaled the objectives were political and not scientific. He said, "Unless we announce disasters no one will listen." The IPCC has done this with ruthless efficiency while pretending what they are doing is science not politics. Houghton gave an example of a disastrous statement when he announced "...the impacts of global warming are like a weapon of mass destruction", which is followed by the claim that it kills more people than terrorism. Trouble is more people die of cold each year than heat. Also, notice the word "impact" because that, not science, dominates the work of the IPCC. Two thirds of the people involved in the IPCC (1900 of 2500) are not climate experts and study what might happen, not will happen. So the entire process was established to achieve the goal of announcing (potential) disasters.

Bert Bolin, who Al Gore credits with creating the IPCC, was Houghton's co-chair. Bolin had a history of involvement in the politics of the environment. Both he and Houghton signed the 1992 warning to humanity essentially blaming the developed nations. It was more of the Club of Rome approach with no clear measures or evidence, simply a list of possible disasters if we didn't do things their way.

Science creates theories based on assumptions that are then tested by other scientists performing as skeptics. The structure and mandate of the IPCC was in direct contradiction to this scientific method. They set out to prove the theory rather than disprove it. Maurice Strong and his UN committees' objectives, especially the IPCC made sure the focus was on human caused change and CO2 as the particular culprit. They'd already biased the research by using a very narrow definition of climate change in article 1 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), a treaty produced at that infamous "Earth Summit" in Rio in 1992. Climate Change was defined as "a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over considerable time periods. This makes the human impact the primary purpose of the research. The problem is you cannot determine that unless you know the amount and cause of natural climate change.

Properly, a scientific definition would put natural climate variability first, but at no point does the UN mandate require an advance of climate science. The definition used by UNFCCC predetermined how the research and results would be political and pre-determined the result. It made discovering a clear 'human signal' mandatory, but meaningless. As noted it thwarted the scientific method.

Other parts of their mandate illustrate the political nature of the entire exercise. Its own principles require the IPCC "shall concentrate

When Science Gets Hijacked by Politics

its activities on the tasks allotted to it by the relevant WMO Executive Council and UNEP Governing Council resolutions and decisions as well as on actions in support of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change." (From Principles Governing IPCC work, approved at the 14th Session, Vienna 1–3 October 1998 and amended at the 21st Session, Vienna 6–7 November, 2003.) The role is also to "...assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the scientific, technical and socio-economic information relevant to understanding the scientific basis of risk of human-induced climate change, its potential impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation. IPCC reports should be neutral with respect to policy..." The process has been anything but "comprehensive, objective, open and transparent" as we will see later. However, the cynicism of the last sentence was exposed when they made the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) the most important part of IPCC reports and these have been anything but 'neutral' as we will see.

The IPCC is a political organization and yet it is the sole basis of the claim of a scientific consensus on climate change. Consensus is neither a scientific fact nor important in science, but it is very important in politics. There are 2500 members in the IPCC divided between 600 in Working Group I (WGI), who examine the actual climate science, and 1900 in working Groups II and III (WG II and III), who study "Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability" and "Mitigation of Climate Change" respectively. Of the 600 in WGI, 308 were independent reviewers, but only 32 reviewers commented on more than three chapters and only five reviewers commented on all 11 chapters of the report. They accept without question the findings of WGI and assume warming due to humans is a certainty. In a circular argument typical of so much climate politics the work of the 1900 is listed as 'proof' of human caused global warming. Through this they established the IPCC as the only credible authority thus further isolating those who raised questions.

The manipulation and politics didn't stop there. The Technical Reports of the three Working Groups are set aside and another group prepares the SPM. A few scientists prepare a first draft, which is then reviewed by governments and a second draft is produced. Then a final report is hammered out as a compromise between the scientists and the individual government representatives. It is claimed the scientists set the final summary content, but in reality governments set the form. The SPM is then released at least three months before the science report. Most of the scientists involved in the technical or science report see the Summary for the first time when it is released to the public. The time between its release to the public and the release of the Technical Report is taken up with making sure it aligns with what the politicians/scientists have concluded. Here is the instruction in the IPCC procedures. "Changes (other than grammatical or minor editorial changes) made after acceptance by the Working Group or the Panel shall be those necessary to ensure consistency with the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) or the Overview Chapter." Yes, you read that correctly. This is like an Executive writing a summary and then having employees write a report that agrees with the summary.

When Science Gets Hijacked by Politics

When you accept an hypothesis before it is proven you step on the treadmill of maintaining the hypothesis. This leads to selective and even biased research and publications. As evidence appears to show problems with the hypothesis the natural tendency is to become more virulent in defending the increasingly indefensible. This tendency is underlined by John Maynard Keynes sardonic question; "If the facts change, I'll change my opinion. What do you do, Sir." The IPCC and those who were chosen or chose to participate were locked in to a conclusion by the rules, regulations and procedures carefully crafted by Maurice Strong. These predetermined the outcome – a situation in complete contradiction to the objectives and methods of science.

As evidence grew that the hypothesis was scientifically unsupportable adherents began defending rather than accepting and adjusting. The trail they made is marked by the search for a clear human signal, identified in modern parlance as 'smoking guns.' They also became trapped in what Russian writer and philosopher Leo Tolstoi identified many years ago, namely, "I know that most men, including those at ease with problems of the greatest complexity, can seldom accept even the simplest and most obvious truth if it be such as would oblige them to admit the falsity of conclusions which they delighted in explaining to colleagues, which they have proudly taught to others, and which they have woven, thread by thread, into the fabric of their lives." Next we will examine how the political system that Strong and the UN set up allowed perpetuation of incorrect science and falsely identified smoking guns.

--

Warmest Regards

Bonzo

"Consensus is neither a scientific fact nor important in science, but it is very important in politics." Dr. Timothy Ball, Chairman of the Natural Resources Stewardship Project (NRSP.com), Former Professor Of Climatology, University of Winnipeg