

on the IPCC study and then it was changed significantly without scientific approval for the 1996 publication. More than 15 sections in Chapter 8 of the report—the key chapter setting out the evidence for global warming—were changed or deleted after the scientists had approved the 1995 text.⁷⁰⁴ The 1996 text took out the uncertainty and reservations about human induced climate change making statements that were bolder and directly linking human activity to increased temperatures. The rewriting, by UN officials, of the peer reviewed scientifically vetted 1995 paper which clearly stipulated that it is not known or proven that human induced climate change is real, or if real even a problem, to conclude the opposite has enraged many in the scientific community.⁷⁰⁵

The 2001 IPCC summary was also more a political than a scientific document. The Toronto Star points out that what was released on January 20th 2001 was an 18-page summary that was ‘hammered out during four days of horse-trading among officials from 99 governments.’⁷⁰⁶ The media erroneously refer to these political officials as scientists, which further exacerbates the erroneous perception that the IPCC is premised upon valid science. Andrew Weaver, a climate scientist at the University of Victoria and a Kyoto supporter, who holds the Canada Research Chair in atmospheric science is a lead author of the UN report but nevertheless admitted, ‘Based on the science you simply can’t make the statement that it [the earth] is going to warm faster.’ Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology, Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and one of the lead authors of the science sections of the IPCC report, has scathingly described the IPCC Summary as ‘very much a children’s exercise of what might possibly happen,’ prepared by a ‘peculiar group’ with ‘no technical competence.’⁷⁰⁷ The IPCC summaries for policy makers have never conformed to scientific evidence nor do they bear the imprimatur of the scientific community. That a scientific consensus exists on global warming is a major UN inspired myth.

Such provocative political rewriting of scientific findings with no evidence, has convinced in excess of 17,000 scientists, two-thirds with

advanced academic degrees, to sign a Petition against the climate accord concluded in Kyoto in 1997. In signing the Petition these applied scientists have also expressed their profound scepticism about the science underlying the Kyoto Accord, stating clearly that there is no scientific basis for global warming.⁷⁰⁸ The covering letter enclosed with the Petition, signed by Dr. Frederick Seitz, president emeritus of Rockefeller University and a past president of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, states it well: ‘The treaty is, in our opinion, based upon flawed ideas. Research data on climate change do not show that human use of hydrocarbons is harmful. To the contrary, there is good evidence that increased atmospheric carbon dioxide is environmentally helpful.’⁷⁰⁹ That CO2 emissions might actually aid the environment, agricultural production and lengthen growing seasons and cycles and aid in the faster development of flora is never addressed by the IPCC. In fact there is no discussion of any effects other than ecosystem disaster in the IPCC reports nor any mention of any beneficial effects that could occur from increased CO2 emissions.⁷¹⁰

There is a strong case to be made that the IPCC and UN have never satisfactorily presented any compelling evidence for human induced climate change through the emissions of global warming gases. Certainly there is no justification for the continual UN and media barrage of human induced global warming and attendant ecocatastrophe through the emissions of GHGs supported by a unified scientific community. It seems extraordinarily foolhardy that sovereign nations would impede their internal socio-economic development and subject themselves to UN sponsored regulations and enforced wealth transfers to poorer countries based on poorly understood models. Such costs are estimated to be 2 % of Global GDP or about U\$180 million per annum. As many analysts have pointed out it would be cheaper to take such funds and solve the pressing needs of clean water and proper health services in the Third World [about U\$90 billion] then it would be to fund an accord that might reduce insignificantly, global climate and temperature levels and impair the clean development of energy sources and by extension retard the development of national economies.⁷¹¹