

THE UN'S IPCC HAS NO CREDIBILITY ON GLOBAL WARMING – by Allan MacRae

In 2002 the PEGG, the journal of the Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA) solicited the following debate on the now-defunct Kyoto Accord (Kyoto Protocol), between Dr. Matthew Bramley and Matt McCullough, P.Eng. of the Pembina Institute, who supported the Kyoto Accord and relied upon the IPCC's position, and Dr. Sallie Baliunas, Harvard Astrophysicist, Dr. Tim Patterson, Carleton Paleoclimatologist, and Allan MacRae, P.Eng., who opposed Kyoto based on scientific statements in their PEGG article and rebuttal.

<http://www.friendsofscience.org/assets/documents/KyotoAPEGA2002REV1.pdf>

Now, after 13 years, it is instructive to look back at the two positions and determine how they have fared.

One's predictive track record is perhaps the only objective measure of one's competence. The IPCC has a negative predictive track record, because ALL of its scary projections have failed to materialize. **The IPCC thus has NO credibility, actually it has NEGATIVE credibility.** Probabilistically; based the IPCC's negative predictive track record, one would more correct if one assumed the opposite of the IPCC's scary projections.

All the IPCC's scary projections of catastrophic humanmade global warming, wilder weather, and climate change have failed to materialize, despite significant increases in atmospheric CO₂, the purported driver of this falsely-predicted "weather weirding". According to the best data from satellites, global temperatures measured in the Lower Troposphere (LT) have not increased significantly in about 18 years. Hurricane frequency and intensity are at record low levels. The climate has been remarkably stable despite substantial increases in atmospheric CO₂.

The IPCC's sycophants responded by falsifying the Surface Temperature (ST) record to overstate global warming:

See: <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2015/08/14/problematic-adjustments-and-divergences-now-includes-june-data/>

In 2008 I calculated the "Warming Bias Rate" [for 1979 to end-2007] = (Hadcrut3 ST - UAH LT anomalies) / time = 0.2C/2.8 decades or about **0.07C/decade**. That was the apparent Warming Bias Rate in the ST versus the LT. In 2015 the Warming Bias Rate [for 1979 to mid-2015] = (Hadcrut4 ST - UAH LT anomalies) / time = [0.685 - 0.204]/3.5 decades = about **0.14/decade**.

THIS IS TWICE THE WARMING BIAS RATE OF JUST ~6 YEARS AGO – AN UNBELIEVABLE INCREASE!

It is extremely improbable that the total (since 1979) difference in the (ST minus LT) temperature anomalies diverged this much in just 6 years. It is much more probable that the ST data was falsified to overstate global warming.

Pembina in its 2002 Rebuttal quoted the IPCC's Third Assessment Report Summary for Policymakers as follows:

"In the light of new evidence and taking into account the remaining uncertainties, most of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations..."

The globally averaged surface temperature is projected [in business-as-usual scenarios] to increase by 1.4 to 5.8° C over the period 1990 to 2100."

In reality, the only quality data - from satellites - shows NO significant global warming for the past 18 years!

Pembina further stated:

"The IPCC, however, finds good agreement between model simulations and observed temperature over the past 140 years, including the temperature increase up to 1940, if the simulations include solar variation and volcanic activity along with emissions of GHGs and particulates."

In reality, the models quoted by the IPCC have grossly over-predicted the amount of future global warming.

These models were utterly corrupted by fabricated aerosol data that was used to justify an incredibly high climate sensitivity to CO₂ (ECS). The fabricated aerosol data was used to force the models to hindcast the global cooling that occurred circa 1940 to 1975. This false aerosol data was literally created "out of thin air" and is contradicted by actual data. See Dr. Douglas V. Hoyt's comments at: <http://www.climateaudit.org/?p=755>

The IPCC and its sycophants have fabricated a false scenario of catastrophic humanmade global warming and wilder weather that has NO credibility and is contradicted by two decades of data. There is evidence of the falsification of climate model inputs and surface temperature data to overstate claims of global warming.

In comparison, let us review the eight predictions we made on our 2002 Rebuttal [my comments in brackets]:

Kyoto has many fatal flaws, any one of which should cause this treaty to be scrapped.

Climate science does not support the theory of catastrophic human-made global warming - the alleged warming crisis does not exist. [NO net global warming has occurred for about 18 years.]

Kyoto focuses primarily on reducing CO₂, a relatively harmless gas, and does nothing to control real air pollution like NO_x, SO₂, and particulates, or serious pollutants in water and soil. [Note pollution in China and former Soviet Union.]

Kyoto wastes enormous resources that are urgently needed to solve real environmental and social problems that exist today. For example, the money spent on Kyoto in one year would provide clean drinking water and sanitation for all the people of the developing world in perpetuity. [Since the start of global warming hysteria, about 50 million children below the age of five have died from contaminated water.]

Kyoto will destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs and damage the Canadian economy - the U.S., Canada's biggest trading partner, will not ratify Kyoto, and developing countries are exempt. [Canada adopted Kyoto but then most provinces wisely ignored it – the exception being now-depressed Ontario, where government drank the Kool-Aid.]

Kyoto will actually hurt the global environment - it will cause energy-intensive industries to move to exempted developing countries that do not control even the worst forms of pollution. {Note the air in China.]

Kyoto's CO₂ credit trading scheme punishes the most energy efficient countries and rewards the most wasteful. Due to the strange rules of Kyoto, Canada will pay the former Soviet Union billions of dollars per year for CO₂ credits. [We shamed our government into not paying the FSU, but other governments did so, to bribe them to sign Kyoto.]

Kyoto will be ineffective - even assuming the overstated pro-Kyoto science is correct, Kyoto will reduce projected warming insignificantly, and it would take as many as 40 such treaties to stop alleged global warming. [IF one believed the utterly false climate models, one would probably conclude that we must cease fossil fuel consumption.]

The ultimate agenda of pro-Kyoto advocates is to eliminate fossil fuels, but this would result in a catastrophic shortfall in global energy supply - the wasteful, inefficient energy solutions proposed by Kyoto advocates simply cannot replace fossil fuels. [Those governments who adopted “green energy” schemes such as wind and solar power are finding these schemes are not green and produce little useful energy. Their energy costs are soaring and those governments are in retreat, dropping their green energy subsidies as they try to save face.]

In summary, all our predictions have proven correct in those venues that fully embraced the now-defunct Kyoto Accord, whereas none of the IPCC's scary projections have materialized.

So what happens next? Will we see catastrophic humanmade global warming? No, our planet will cool.

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2013/12/13/over-2000-cold-and-snow-records-set-in-the-usa-this-past-week/#comment-1502081> [excerpts]

I (we) predicted the commencement of global cooling by 2020-2030 in an article published in the Calgary Herald in 2002. That prediction is gaining credibility as solar activity [in current SC24] has crashed... It is still early in the prediction game, but SC25 is also projected to be very weak, so we will probably experience two consecutive very-weak Solar Cycles in SC24 and SC25... IF the Sun does indeed drive temperature, as I suspect, then successive governments in Britain and continental Europe have brewed the perfect storm. They have crippled their energy systems with excessive reliance on ineffective grid-connected wind power schemes. I suggest that global cooling probably WILL happen within the next decade or sooner, and Europe [and the world] will get colder, possibly much colder. I suggest that Winter deaths will increase in the Europe as cooling progresses. I suggest that Excess Winter Mortality rates will provide an estimate of this unfolding tragedy.

Timing is difficult to estimate, but I now expect global cooling to be evident by 2020 or sooner.