

For those interested in climate issues

CO₂ Guilt. Origins of an Ideological and Political Saga

Story of a mystification

In the 19th century, British Prime Ministers used to say there were "lies, damned lies, and statistics". In the 21st century, we may say there are frauds, serious frauds, and IPCC Assessment Reports.

(Lord Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, "Frauds, Serious Frauds, and IPCC Assessment Reports", p. 2)

The episode I relate here is unfamiliar to most. Understandably enough, the IPCC circles had little interest in its being publicized. Emblematic as it is, this episode reveals, first and foremost, the UN institution's disregard for scientific truth. But there is more. The manipulations we see at work bring to light the deep seated ideological and political biases that govern the IPCC's thinking.

The truthfulness of our assertions is unarguable since the author of these manipulations has admitted responsibility. Moreover, the new practice at work received an after the fact blessing from IPCC's then President Rajendra Pachauri. We will go into all this in detail. Additionally, scrutinizing this episode will provide insights on the supposed "scientific consensus" flaunted by the official climate science community.

Climate change sceptics are accused of denying facts well-established by science:

- The earth's global temperature has increased by 0.8°C in 150 years.
- Global warming is caused by human activities.

Climate sceptics do not dispute the modest global warming observed. However, they dispute the claim of an anthropogenic origin and, above all, the assertion that this is something well established and about which there is a consensus in the scientific community. To make it clear, let us refer to the IPCC's Report which concludes that the weight of evidence suggests a perceptible human influence on global climate.

First, let us recall what the UN body thinks of the quality of its reports.

Reports that would be of exemplary quality

The IPCC Factsheet: How does the IPCC review process work? extolls the gold standard of IPCC Assessment Reports.

The IPCC is committed to preparing reports that aim for the highest standards of scientific excellence, balance, and clarity. Multiple stages of review are an essential part of the IPCC process to ensure a comprehensive, objective and transparent assessment of the current state of knowledge of the science related to climate change. Expert Reviewers and governments are invited at different stages to comment on the scientific, technical and socio-economic assessment and the overall balance of the drafts. The review process includes wide participation, with hundreds of reviewers critiquing the accuracy and completeness of the scientific assessment contained in the drafts.¹

One might therefore expect that the assertion of anthropogenic responsibility for global warming will be scientifically excellent, unbiased, and will have passed the critical scrutiny of evaluators.

Let us now return to Assessment Report 2 (AR2), published in 1995, which pointed to human responsibility for the first time. Indeed, the 1990 Assessment Report 1 (AR1) concluded:

Because we do not understand the reasons for these past warming events, it is not yet possible to attribute a specific proportion of the recent, smaller warming to an increase of greenhouse gases.²

How Santer blames the CO₂³

Spotlight on chapter 8 of the AR2, entitled « Detection of Climate Change and Attribution of Causes » and addressing the question of "attribution of causes": In this chapter, section 8.4.2.1 **should have read**:

None of the studies cited above have shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases.⁴

1 IPCC Factsheet: How does the IPCC review process work?:

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/FS_review_process.pdf.

2 Houghton J., Jenkins G., Ephraums J. (ed), Climate Change: The IPCC scientific assessment, Contribution of Working Group I to the first assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Cambridge University Press, 1990, quoted in: Montford A.W., The Hockey Stick Illusion, Anglosphere Books, 2010, p. 4.

3 CO₂ is explicitly mentioned in section 8.4.2.3; other sections are mostly concerned with greenhouse gases.

4 Gray V., The Global Warming Scam: And the Climate Change Superscam, Stairway Press, Seattle, 2015, p. 120 [emphasis added].

Undeniably, this was one of the crucial passages in the text, which the authors of the chapter all signed off on. Actually, very few people ever heard of this passage for the following two reasons.

1) The Assessment Report is several thousand pages long. Politicians, the media, and most people prefer to get their information from the *Summary for Policymakers* (SPM) approved by government representatives⁵, which is only a few dozen pages long. However, in **total contradiction to the above passage in bold** – which, again, was meant to appear in the Assessment Report –, the SPM of the AR2 underscored the anthropogenic responsibility for global warming, stating:

The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate.⁶

2) There is another, much more serious reason for the near-total ignorance of the passage in bold: it never appeared in the published version of the AR2 because it was deleted beforehand! Chapter 8 of AR2 was cut at the last minute. Ben Santer, the lead author of the chapter, replaced and completed passages in the final version its authors sent him. He substituted or inserted elements taken from an article signed in his own hand whose title is, coincidentally enough: “A search for human influence on the thermal structure of the atmosphere”⁷. The result was the following alteration of section 8.4.2.1 that had been validated by Vincent Gray, Expert Reviewer of the AR2.

NEW :

Implicit in these global mean results is a weak attribution statement – if the observed global mean changes over the last 20 to 50 years cannot be fully explained by natural climate variability, some (unknown) fraction of the changes must be due to human influences.

DELETED :

None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases. (See: Gray, p. 120)

Dedicated to "detecting climate change" and "attributing causes", Chapter 8, which at first was supposed to state that no study had provided clear evidence of responsibility for greenhouse gases (deleted), finally suggested (new) **that if climate change could not be fully explained by natural variability, some of it should be attributed to human influence**. Santer incriminated greenhouse gases on behalf of all the scientists involved in the preparation of AR2, of his own accord and made this the official IPCC's position.

5 “The final draft of the report is distributed to governments for a final round of written comments on the SPM, before governments meet in plenary session to approve the SPM line by line and accept the underlying report.”: FS_review_process.pdf (ipcc.ch)

6 Gray V., *The Global Warming Scam: And the Climate Change Superscam*, Stairway Press, Seattle, 2015, p. 113.

7 Santer B., Taylor K.E., Wigley T.M.L., Johns T.C., Karoly D.J., Mitchell J.F.B., Oort A.H., Penner J.E., Ramaswamy V., Schwarzkopf M.D., Stouffer R.J. and Tett S., 1996: “A search for human influence on the thermal structure of the atmosphere”, *Nature* 382: 39-46.

Systematic redaction

Santer did not do things halfway. He resorted to systematic redaction. We know about this through Vincent Gray. As Expert Reviewer, Gray⁸ had access to the preliminary versions and all the "drafts" of the Report. On pages 115 to 123 of his book *The Global Warming Scam*, he restores the modifications of the various sections of chapter 8: passages preserved but with sentences crossed out, paragraphs removed and/or paragraphs added.

All the amendments introduced are along the same lines and minimize natural climate variations while attributing the observed warming to human activities.

At the outset, in the Chapter Summary, **Santer exaggerates the proportion of studies that consider it unlikely that the warming is entirely natural**: he deletes "Many but not all" and replaces it with "The majority"; he then **removes a major reservation affecting the "proof" of anthropogenic causality**; and finally, **he introduces a new paragraph minimizing the role of natural variability**.

Summary :

~~Many but not all~~ *The Majority* of these studies show that the observed changes in global mean, annually-averaged temperature over the last century is unlikely to be due entirely to natural fluctuations of the climate system.

DELETED :

The evidence rests heavily on the reliability of the (still uncertain) estimates of natural variability noise levels.

NEW :

Furthermore, the probability is very low that these correspondences could occur by chance as a result of natural internal variability. The vertical patterns of change are also inconsistent with the response patterns expected for solar and volcanic forcing.

Viewed as a whole, these results indicate that the observed trend in global warming mean temperature over the past 100 years is larger than our current best estimates of natural climate variations over the last 600 years. unlikely to be entirely natural in origin. (See: Gray, p. 115)

In sections 8.1 and 8.3.3, **Santer removes restrictions or caveats related to the detection of anthropogenic climate change on a case-by-case basis**.

Section 8.1

(...) The claimed statistical detection of an anthropogenic signal in the observations must always be accompanied by the caveat that other explanations for the detected climate-change signal cannot be ruled out completely, unless a rigorous attempt has been made to do so. (See: Gray, p. 116)

8 Hereon in, bold facing in the quotations is all introduced by J.-C. Pont.

Section 8.3.3.3

DELETED :

(...) Unless paleoclimatic data can help us to 'constrain' the century time scale natural variability estimates obtained from CGCMs⁹, it will be difficult to make a convincing case for the detection and attribution of an anthropogenic climate change signal. (See: Gray, p. 118)

In section 8.4.1, Santer deletes a passage that says that studies draw conclusions about the causality of climate change without justification.

Section 8.4.1

DELETED :

While none of these studies has specifically considered the attribution issue, they often draw some attribution-related conclusions, for which there is little justification. (See: Gray, p. 118)

In section 8.4.1.1, **Santer deletes the passage indicating that "natural forcing factors" cannot be completely ruled out**, leaving room for attributing a fraction of the warming trend to "human influences".

Section 8.4.1.1

*The conclusion that can be drawn from this body of work, and earlier studies reported in Wigley and Barnett (1990) is that the warming trend to date is unlikely to have occurred by chance due to internally-generated variability of the climate system, ~~although this explanation cannot be ruled out. This, however, does not preclude the possibility that a significant part of the trend is due to natural forcing factors.~~ Implicit in such studies is a **weak attribution statement – i.e., some (unknown) fraction of the observed trend is being attributed to human influences.** (...) (See: Gray, p. 118-19)*

In section 8.4.2.3, Santer introduces a new paragraph insisting on anthropogenic causality despite the difficulties in measuring or distinguishing it from natural variability.

Section 8.4.2.3

NEW :

To date, pattern-based studies have not been able to quantify the magnitude of a greenhouse gas or aerosol effect on climate. Our current inability to estimate reliably the fraction of the observed temperature changes that are due to human effects does not mean that this fraction is negligible. The very fact that pattern-based studies have been able to discern sub-global-scale features of a combined CO₂ + aerosol signal relative to the ambient noise of natural internal variability implies that there may be a non-negligible human effect on global climate. (See: Gray, p. 120-21)

⁹ "Coupled general circulation models (CGCMs) integrate our knowledge about atmospheric and oceanic circulation": <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/288/5473/1991.full>.

In section 8.6, among other things, Santer crosses out the crucial question: "**When will the detection and unambiguous attribution of human induced climate change occur?**"; and he obviously crosses out the equally crucial and embarrassing answer, which ends with "**We do not know**". In the sentence that precedes and replaces the last deleted sentence, the perverse addition of the adjectives "confident" and "anthropogenic" should also be noted: it is not simply the detection of a climate change, which would therefore have already taken place, but a "confident detection" of an "anthropogenic climate change".

Section 8.6

*Finally, we come to the ~~most~~ difficult question of all: ~~«When will the detection and unambiguous attribution of human induced climate change occur?»~~ when the detection and attribution of human-induced climate change is likely to occur. The answer to this question must be subjective, particularly in the light of the very large signal and noise uncertainties discussed in this Chapter, ~~it is not surprising that the best answer to this question is «We do not know»~~. Some scientists maintain that these uncertainties currently preclude any answer to the question posed above. Other scientists would and have claimed, on the basis of the statistical results presented in Section 8.4, that **confident** detection of a significant **anthropogenic** climate change has already occurred. ~~Would and have claimed, on the basis of the results presented in Section 8.4, that detection of a significant climate change has already occurred.~~ As noted in Section 8.1, attribution involves statistical testing of alternative explanations for a detected observed change and few ~~if any~~ would be willing to argue that completely unambiguous attribution of (all or part of) this change ~~to anthropogenic effects~~ has already occurred, or was likely to happen in the next several years. (See: Gray, p. 121-22)*

The paragraph added to this Section merits a general comment. Santer argues that a breakthrough has been made regarding anthropogenic causality, **while nothing of this type is found in the scientists' report**. "Correspondences" between predictions and observations would have been "seen", "found",... in response to greenhouse gas changes – these correspondences being better than those expected for natural forcing elements. **But these are gratuitous assertions, which do not appear in the scientists' own report and which** Santer manipulates as he pleases. Neither do we find in their report any allusion to "our best information" that is in this addition. Reference is also made to a general "increase over the last 20 to 50 years", while the period 1945-1975 is unanimously recognized as cold. And what about the "evidence from the patterned-based studies", when on all sides this belief in the predictivity of models is denounced and illustrations of their shortcomings abound?¹⁰

NEW :

*However, **evidence from the patterned-based studies** reported here suggests that an initial step has now been taken in the direction of attribution, since correspondences between observations and model predictions in response to combined changes in greenhouse gases and anthropogenic sulphate aerosols:*

- have now been seen both at the surface and in the vertical structure of the atmosphere;*
- have been found in terms of complex spatial patterns rather than changes in the global mean alone;*

¹⁰ Lord Monckton, special advisor to Margaret Thatcher from 1982 to 1986, was among the first to draw her attention to global warming caused by greenhouse gases; subsequently, he fundamentally changed his views on the issue.

- **show an overall increase over the last 20 to 50 years;**
- *are significantly different from our best model-based estimates of the correspondence expected due to natural internal climatic variability.*

*Furthermore, although quantitative attribution studies have not explicitly considered solar and volcanic effects, **our best information** indicates that the observed patterns of vertical temperatures change are not consistent with the responses expected for these forcings.*

*The body of statistical evidence in Chapter 8, when examined in the context of our physical understanding of the climate system, now points toward a discernible human influence on global climate. **Our ability to quantify the magnitude of this effect is currently limited by uncertainties in key factors, including the magnitude and pattern of longer-term natural variability and the time-evolving patterns of forcing by (and response to) greenhouse gases and aerosols.** (See: Gray, p. 122-23)*

Monckton confirms, Santer admits

Like Gray and others, Lord Christopher Monckton of Brenchley was acquainted with what should have been the final version of chapter 8 of the AR2. He confirms the facts.

Santer rewrote the scientists' conclusions after they sent in their final version, in which it was written five times that there is no identifiable impact of human activity on global temperatures. I have seen that copy. But Santer revised that version, crossed out the five passages and substituted his own conclusion, which has remained the official conclusion ever since.¹¹

The IPCC's credibility has already been damaged (...) by its rewriting of its Second Assessment Report after submission of the scientists' final draft, to state the opposite of their finding that **no discernible human influence** on climate is detectable.¹²

Santer's redacting efforts made greenhouse gases, and accordingly, CO₂, the main culprit for global warming in the eyes of the world - CO₂'s responsibility has been hammered home ever since. But could one man, even if he was the principal author of the chapter, be naive enough to think he could indulge with impunity in this systematic falsification? If no one in the IPCC arcane was moved by this, it is probably because Santer was only the hand that carried out a concerted task. It was necessary, explains Vincent Gray, to align the *Assessment Report* with the SPM, which had been subsequently approved by and reflected the position of government representatives.

All the Reports suffered from the problem that arises by agreeing to the *Summary for Policymakers* after the Final Version of the Main Report had been produced. Since the conclusions of the main Report did not agree with the Government Approved *Summary*, one of the scientists (Ben Santer) had the thankless task of altering statements in the full report to coincide with the *Summary*.¹³

11 Quoted in:

https://solidariteetprogres.fr/actualites-001/Un-redacteur-du-GIEC-admet-avoir-triche_06127.html;
<http://changementclimatique.over-blog.com/article-un-redacteur-du-giec-admet-avoir-triche-41451288.html>;
<https://www.skyfall.fr/2009/11/22/la-main-dans-le-sac-suite/comment-page-16/>;
<https://blog.lefigaro.fr/climat/2009/12/copenhague-j9instantanes.html>;

12 Christopher Monckton of Brenchley, "Frauds, Serious Frauds, and IPCC *Assessment Reports*", Science & Public Policy Institute, September 18, 2013, p. 2.

13 Gray V., *The Global Warming Scam. And the Climate Change Superscam*, Stairway Press, Seattle, 2015, p. 114.

Years later (2009), Santer recognized the facts in front of a camera, confirming that it was indeed a matter of making the chapter in question "consistent with the rest of the report".

"Lord Monckton speaks of deletions in this chapter, and there have been some; we have abandoned the conclusive summary to make the chapter consistent with the rest of the report".¹⁴

Far from summarizing the AR5 for politicians, according to its primary vocation, the SPM was dictating the experts' conclusions - but behind their backs!

An institutionalised practice

That Santer was only the hand carrying out a concerted task is what the rest of the story seems to confirm, because the case did not end there. This took the form of an official directive in the procedure for accepting reports as early as 1999. In paragraph 4.2 of "Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work", written in San Jose between April 15 and 18, 1999, there is indeed a directive to adapt the *Assessment Report* to the SPM, **for reasons of "consistency"**.

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 or the Overview Chapter.¹⁵

It is therefore logical that the "IPCC Factsheet: How does the IPCC approve reports?" reproduces this directive word for word when it refers to the "acceptance" process.

Changes (other than grammatical or minor editorial changes) after acceptance are limited to those necessary to ensure consistency with the Summary for Policymakers, and are identified in writing after SPM approval.¹⁶

This probably also explains why Santer shamelessly recognized his act in 2009. All the more so since in 2007, during an interview, the current president of the IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri, himself justified the alignment of the scientific report, which the SPM's Donna Laframboise, the Canadian investigative journalist, reports here.

14 Santer acknowledged the amendments on December 2, 2009, in the Conspiracy Theory programme: <https://www.dailymotion.com/video/x4v6qpz>. Minute 29 states that Santer admits "deletions" of chapters. The deleted sentences are quoted in an article by Frederick Seitz in the Wall Street Journal of June 12, 1996. See also:

http://www.solidariteetprogres.org/actualites-001/Un-redacteur-du-GIEC-admet-avoir-triche_06127.html.

See also Fred Singer's letter to The Wall Street Journal, September 6, 2015, at:

<https://tallbloke.wordpress.com/2015/09/06/blast-from-the-past-fred-singer-on-the-tampering-of-ipcc-ar-3/>

15 IPCC. Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work: Procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of IPCC reports:

<https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/ipcc-principles/ipcc-principles-appendix-a-final.pdf>, § 4.5 Acceptance for reports.

16 IPCC Factsheet: How does the IPCC approve reports?:

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/FS_ipcc_approve.pdf.

When asked, during a 2007 interview, why the summary of the first section of the Climate Bible had been released before the full text was available, Rajendra Pachauri said there was a perfectly logical explanation.

(...)

Pachauri explained that the draft version of the summary, written by IPCC scientists, had undergone some changes during the plenary. In his opinion, these changes were not significant.

(...)

Nevertheless, said Pachauri, "we necessarily have to ensure that the underlying report conforms to the refinements."

(...)

According to the chairman himself, the IPCC tweaks their words *so that the underlying scientific sections accord with the version of reality that was hammered out by the politicians.*

(...) An unending chorus of activists, journalists, and politicians continue to promote the myth that, via the IPCC, *science has spoken.*¹⁷

The Scientists' Report must formally comply with the *Summary for Policymakers*. Santer's way of doing things is therefore "institutionalized" and systematized. Therefore, one can neither deny that politics control science nor that science is being leveraged to back up a political agenda.

The omnipotence of the SPM and of the Politics

We find **confirmation of the political stranglehold** in chapter 12 of Michael Shellenberger's book, *Apocalypse Never*¹⁸. Entitled "Climate Politics Takes its Toll", the chapter tells how **Richard Tol became involved in the IPCC, until his resignation due to the alarmist politics that prevailed there**¹⁹. It clearly shows the influence of politics on the scientific line of thinking, through the orientation given to the SPM - with which the Assessment Report must ultimately be aligned.

As a university student in the Netherlands, Shellenberger tells us, Richard Tol was a member of both Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth. Concerned about climate change, he earned a PhD in economics in 1997 and delved into the then-emerging field of economics of climate change with gusto, becoming one of the most-cited economists in the world on the topic. (Shellenberger, p. 253)

Tol joined the IPCC where he became **lead author** of the AR5, then **he joined the team writing the SPM.**

17 Laframboise D., *The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert*, Ivy Avenue Press, Toronto, 2011, p. 87-88.

18 Michael Shellenberger, *Apocalypse Never*, HarperCollins, 2020, pp. 253-57.

19 Richard Tol explains in: Richard Tol, "Why I resigned from the IPCC WGII", *The Global Warming Policy Forum*, April 26, 2014, <https://www.thegwpf.com/richard-tol-why-i-resigned-from-the-ipcc-wgii>.

Now a professor at the University of Sussex, in Britain, Tol became involved with the IPCC shortly after it was created, in 1994. He played a major role in all three working groups: science, mitigation, and adaptation.

(...)

In 2012, Tol was named the convening lead author of one of the chapters in the IPCC's fifth review of climate change, a prestigious position that is reflective of his expertise and of the respect he receives from his peers. He was assigned to the team to draft the IPCC's *Summary for Policymakers*, which is often the only version of the report most journalists, politicians, and informed members of the public read. (Shellenberger, p. 253-254)

The extraordinary and unreasonable subservience of science to politics as far as the IPCC is concerned is manifest in the following excerpt.

The *Summary* authors are charged with distilling key messages into forty-four pages, even though "everyone knows that policy and media will only pick up a few sentences," Tol says.²⁰ "This leads to a contest between [authors of] chapters. "My impact is worst, so I will get the headlines."

Tol said that the primary message of an earlier draft of the *Summary* was the same one I've emphasized with regards to the Congo: "Many of the more worrying impacts of climate change are really symptoms of mismanagement and underdevelopment."²¹

But representatives from European nations wanted the report's focus to be on emissions reductions, not economic development. "IPCC is partly a scientific organisation and partly a political organisation," Tol explained. As a "political organisation, its job is to justify greenhouse gas emission reduction." (Shellenberger, p. 254)

By leaving the floor largely to Tol, Shellenberger highlights the obstinate will of the authors of the SPM to **exaggerate and practice unjustified alarmism** with regard to the scientific elements, **their deafness** also with regard to the protests of those who remain attached to scientific rigor.

The *Summary* was written during a weeklong meeting in Yokohama, Japan. "Some of these delegates are scholars, others are not," Tol explained. "The Irish delegate, for instance, thinks that unmitigated climate change would put us on a 'highway to hell', referring, I believe, to an AC/DC song rather than a learned paper."²²

Two years later, despite Tol's protests, IPCC approved a *Summary for Policymakers* that was far more apocalyptic than the science warranted. "The IPCC shifted from... 'Not without risk, but manageable', to 'We're all gonna die'," explained Tol. It was a shift, he said, "from what I think is a relatively accurate assessment of recent developments in literature to... the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse..."²³ Pestilence, Death, Famine and War were all there."²⁴

20 Richard Tol, "IPCC Again", Richard Tol, April 24, 2014:
<http://richardtol.blogspot.com/2014/04/ipcc-again.html>.

21 Tol, "IPCC again".

22 Tol, "Why I resigned from the IPCC WGII".

23 Song by Metallica, American thrash metal band (N.d.T.).

24 Richard Tol, Interview with Roger Harrabin, "In Conversation: Roger Harrabin and Richard Tol", The Changing Climate, BBC-TV, November 16, 2015.

The IPCC *Summary* left out key information, Tol alleges. The *Summary* “omits that better cultivars and improved irrigation increase crop yields. It shows the impact of sea level rise on the most vulnerable country but does not mention the average. It emphasizes the impacts of increased heat stress but downplays reduced cold stress. It warns about poverty traps, violent conflict and mass migration without much support in the literature. The media, of course, exaggerated further.”²⁵ (Shellenberger, p. 254-255)

To top it all off, Shellenberger noted, the apocalyptic SPM trick on the AR5 was nothing new. There had been high-profile precedents such as the 2010 SPM and what was to become the “Himalayagate”.

It wasn't the first time IPCC had exaggerated climate change's impact in a *Summary*. In 2010, an IPCC *Summary* falsely claimed climate change would result in the melting of the Himalayan glaciers by 2035. This was a serious case of alarmism given that 800 million people depend on the glaciers for irrigation and drinking water.

Shortly after, four scientists published a letter in *Science* pointing out the error, with one of them calling it “extremely embarrassing and damaging”, adding, “These errors could have been avoided had the norms of scientific publication including peer review and concentration upon peer-reviewed work, been respected.”²⁶ (Shellenberger, p. 255)

Another precedent was the appeal to Roger Pielke's expertise regarding a matter on which he had never been consulted.

Roger Pielke, the University of Colorado expert on climate change and natural disasters, similarly found instances where IPCC authors were exaggerating or misrepresenting the science for effect.

“What does Pielke think about this?” an external IPCC reviewer at one point asked about a claim being made about climate change and natural disasters. The official IPCC response was, “I believe Pielke agrees.” But he didn't. Indeed, he had never been consulted. “The IPCC included misleading information in its report,” Pielke said, “and then fabricated a response to a reviewer, who identified the misleading information, to justify keeping that material in the report.”²⁷ (Shellenberger, p. 255)

In the “IPCC Factsheet: How does the IPCC review process work?”, one can also read: “The Review Editors ensure that all substantive comments received during review are given appropriate consideration by the author teams and ensure that genuine diversity in perspectives in the literature is reflected adequately in the report.”²⁸

25 Tol, “IPCC again”.

26 J. Graham Cogley, Jeffrey S. Kargel, G. Kaser, and C. J. van der Veen, “Tracking the Source of Glacier Misinformation”, *Science* 327, no. 5965 (2010) :: 522, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.327.5965.522-a>. Lauren Morello of the New York Times wrote, “Pielke said his concern is heightened because he believes Working Group II also misrepresented his research about the link between climate change and monetary damages of natural disasters, highlighting a white paper produced for a conference he organized – when ultimately, attendees at the conference “came up with a contrary conclusion to what the background paper said.”’.” Lauren Morello, “Climate Science Panel Apologizes for Himalayan Error”, *New York Times*, January 21, 2010: <https://www.nytimes.com>.

27 Roger Pielke, Jr. *The Climate Fix: What Scientists and Politicians Won't Tell You About Global Warming* (New York: Basic Books, 2010), 176-78, 182. *Topics 2000: Natural Catastrophes – the Current Position*, Munich Re Group: <https://www.imia.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/EP17-2003-Loss-Potential-of-Natural-Hazards-sm.pdf>.

28 “IPCC Factsheet: How does the IPCC review process work?”: https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/FS_review_process.pdf

The following narrative by Shellenberger shows what it really is: despite recommendations by the InterAcademy Council, the international organization of national academies of science, the IPCC has continued to be alarmist.

Thanks in part to the criticisms of IPCC by Pielke and other scientists, environment ministers from around the world demanded an independent review of IPCC policies and procedures by the InterAcademy Council, the international organization of national science academies. The InterAcademy Council made recommendations for improving research quality that IPCC adopted, such as better practices for including research that had not yet been published in peer-reviewed journals.²⁹

But the IPCC kept publishing apocalyptic summaries and press releases, and IPCC contributors and lead authors kept making apocalyptic claims, such as that sea level rise will be “unmanageable” and that “the potential risk of multi-breadbasket failure is increasing”.³⁰ And, as Tol noted, journalists exaggerated further. The system appeared biased toward exaggeration. (Shellenberger, p. 255-256)

Shellenberger also mentions resignations. That of Jesse Ausubel³¹, one of the contributors to the creation of the IPCC, which he then left because of its politicization. And then that of Tol, who, overcome by the prevailing alarmism, ends up throwing in the towel: “I quietly withdrew”.

Ausubel was one of the first to recognize the politicization of climate science. After pioneering ways to forecast energy demand, transitions, and emissions for *Changing Climate*, he helped create the IPCC. “And then the expected happened,” Ausubel said. “Opportunists flowed in. By 1992, I stopped wanting to go to climate meetings.”³²

In response to the IPCC’s decision to let the exaggerators write the *Summary for Policymakers*, Tol resigned. “I simply thought it was incredible,” he said. “I told Chris Field, the Chairman, about this, and I quietly withdrew.”³³ (Shellenberger, p. 256)

29 Harold T. Shapiro, Roseanne Diab, Carlos Henrique de Brito Cruz, et al., *Climate Change Assessment: Review of the Processes and Procedures of the IPCC*, Committee to Review the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, October 2010:

<http://reviewipcc.interacademycouncil.net/report/Climate%20Change%20Assessments,%20Review%20of%20the%20Processes%20&%20Procedures%20of%20the%20IPCC.pdf>

30 Christopher Flavelle, “Climate Change Threatens the World’s Food Supply, United Nations Warns”, *New York Times*, August 8, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com>.

31 Jesse Ausubel is Director of the Human Environment Programme at Rockefeller University. He was one of the main organisers of the First World Climate Conference in Geneva in 1979. From 1977 to 1988, Ausubel worked for the National Academies in Washington DC as a member of the National Academy of Sciences, Director General of the National Research Council for Atmospheric and Climate Science, and from 1983 to 1988, as Director of Programmes at the National Academy of Engineering (NAE).

32 Nicholas Wade, “A Passion of Nature, and Really Long Lists”, *New York Times*, April 25, 2011: <https://www.nytimes.com>.

33 Richard Tol, Interview with Roger Harrabin, “In Conversation: Roger Harrabin and Richard Tol”, *The Changing Climate*, BBC-TV, November 16, 2015.

In conclusion

Who upon reviewing these elements will argue that the IPCC and its sponsors are driven by scientific concerns? Who can dispute the fact that the manipulations implemented by Benjamin Santer are of an ideological-political nature? **We have demonstrated** in this Letter 15 that **the prevailing role of CO₂** in global warming was fabricated, out of thin air, in 1995 by a climatologist working for the IPCC – nudge nudge, wink wink (Say no more) !



With my thanks to François Meynard and Guy Perrin for their invaluable advice.

To Evelyne Pinard, aforementioned, for her consistently careful translations.

To my friend Gérard Chabbey, layout designer of my book.

To the friends of the scientific council of the Association of climato-realists.

Kind regards

Prof. Jean-Claude Pont

jean-claude.pont@bluewin.ch