

AIM TO REFLECT A RANGE OF VIEWS

Many suspect the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is dominated by the Green Movement to support their latest campaign. To stop such dominance, many countries insisted that the mandate given to the IPCC was to have clear and precise instructions on how they should operate.

The mandate was well written, and all countries agreed with it. However, no mechanism was ever created to ensure that the IPCC operated as instructed by the member countries. Without such enforcement, no guidance, mandates or rules are likely to be followed.

This reading looks at that part of the IPCC's mandate that requires their reports to;

- **Its role is to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the latest scientific, technical and socio-economic literature, and**
- **They should be of high scientific and technical standards, and aim to reflect a range of views, expertise and wide geographical coverage.**

focussing on the words; "**reflect a range of views**" and be "**objective, open and transparent**".

None of the IPCC's reports have ever reflected a range of views. The only views allowed in the reports are those that support the "Green Cause". Other views are presented as the report is built but are carefully filtered out and discarded.

When questioned about this problem, we are told that "all the scientists agree" and consequently there is only one view. We now know that is a lie, and all the scientists don't agree so what happens to the "range of views". Some examples.

"Landsea, who was both an author and a reviewer for the IPCC's 2nd Assessment Report in 1995 and the 3rd Assessment Report in 2001, resigned from the 4th Assessment Report after charging the UN with playing politics with Hurricane science. "I am withdrawing because I have come to view the part of the IPCC to which my expertise is relevant as having become politicized.

In addition, when I have raised my concerns to the IPCC leadership, their response was simply to dismiss my concerns," Landsea wrote in a January 17, 2005 public letter. "My view is that when people identify themselves as being associated with the IPCC and then make pronouncements far outside current scientific understandings that this will harm the credibility of climate change science and will in the longer term diminish our role in public policy," he continued.

"I personally cannot in good faith continue to contribute to a process that I view as both being motivated by pre-conceived agendas and being scientifically unsound," Landsea added."

Dr. Christopher W. Landsea, an atmospheric scientist and hurricane expert with NOAA's National Hurricane Center who served as both a UN IPCC author and a reviewer^[1].

Paul Reiter, a malaria expert formerly of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, participated in a past UN IPCC process and now calls the concept of consensus on global warming a "sham." His contributions were also ignored.

Reiter, a professor of entomology and tropical disease with the Pasteur Institute in Paris, had to threaten legal action to have his name removed from the IPCC. "That is how they make it seem that all the top scientists are agreed," he said on March 5, 2007. "It's not true," he added.^[2]

Even knowing Reiter and Landsea's concerns, the IPCC continued to attach their names to the politically modified work to enhance its scientific credibility. Numerous attempts to have their names removed produced no response. Now let us look at this from an IPCC perspective.

We can understand that the IPCC could receive conflicting scientific views which might require them to accept one view but not another. If they thought Landsea (or Reiter) was wrong, would it not have been better to say something like this:

"Although Landsea is a well known expert in this area, on balance we have accepted the views of three other experts, Scientist A, B, and C, who explain their differences with Landsea in the following way....."

In this way, the difference of opinion is out in the open (i.e. meeting the Mandate's requirement of being "**objective, open and transparent**"), and the reader can accept or reject the IPCC view based on the arguments in the report.

What they did was immoral, and hardly displayed the letter of their own mandate's words, especially when they added both Landsea and Reiter's name to the list of scientists claiming they agreed with the consensus Green view.

Now you might say this is only two examples and might be the result of two fractious egotistical scientists who were not "getting their own way". Unfortunately, the more you look into the IPCC process the greater the number of disturbing examples of similar behaviour you will find.

As the debate rages, the IPCC's excuse that "all the scientists agree" becomes thinner by the day.

Conclusion

None of the IPCC reports "reflect a range of views" especially if those views disagree with the "Green Cause".

The IPCC does not follow its mandate and cannot be trusted to supply governments with objective reports reflecting a wide range of views – there is only one view published.

Notes:

1. **Dr Bob Carter, April 11,2007 op-ed in the UK Telegraph. Paleoclimate scientist Dr. Bob Carter of Australia's James Cook University and former chairman of the earth science panel of the Australian Research Council.**
2. **Dr. Paul Reiter, a malaria expert formerly of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and professor of entomology and tropical disease with the Pasteur Institute in Paris.**