

The Four Pillars Supporting Climate Change Claims



One of the most formidable challenges of our times is that (due to the Internet, etc.) we are continually being bombarded with information, advice, propositions, stimuli, etc. In a word, all of us are overwhelmed.

In such an environment, it's a daunting ordeal to keep things in *perspective*.

For example: *what is **true** and what is not?*

For example: *what is **important** and what is not?*

So let's cut to the chase about what is **true** and **important** about one of the main issues of our times: **Anthropogenic Global Warming*** (AGW). When we separate the wheat from the chaff, belief in the AGW [hypothesis](#) is based on one or more of four pillars.

** Anthropogenic means man-made. AGW has several synonyms, like Climate Change.*

The Four Pillars:

- 1- the IPCC,
- 2- the Claimed Consensus of Scientists,
- 3- Computer Models, and
- 4- Extreme Weather Events.



Interestingly, most of these have a major commonality: they are an “Appeal to Authority.” (Such a tactic is well known as a [logical fallacy](#).) Let’s briefly look at each pillar, to determine the strength of its support for the AGW case.

Pillar #1: The IPCC —

A- IPCC Background.

The [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) (IPCC) is an agency of the United Nations. It was established in 1988 and is comprised of [195 members countries](#). Its [charter](#) was:

“The IPCC was established to provide the decision-makers and others interested in climate change with an objective source of information about climate change. *The IPCC does not conduct any research, nor does it monitor climate related data or parameters. Its role is to assess on a comprehensive, objective, open and transparent basis the latest scientific, technical and socio-economic literature produced worldwide relevant to the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change, its observed and projected impacts and options for adaptation and mitigation. IPCC reports should be neutral with respect to policy, although they need to deal objectively with policy relevant scientific, technical and socio economic factors. They should be of high scientific and technical standards, and aim to reflect a range of views, expertise and wide geographical coverage.*”

How many people have actually read this important Charter?

More importantly, how many people who have read it, are able to accurately unpack the misleading and misdirecting parts of this superficially seemingly sensible statement? (*Note: I put in italics a few parts of the Charter that warrant special attention.*)

Although this Charter might sound nice to a layman, what it really says is:

- 1) The IPCC is an organization with a political agenda: to influence global policies.
- 2) IPCC scientists are not selected because they are leaders in their fields, but rather because their views are consistent with the political agenda of their country.
- 3) A truly scientific body would **objectively** and **comprehensively**:
 - a) determine if recent current global temperatures are outside of normal deviations, *and*
 - b) if yes, then investigate **all possible sources** of the temperature abnormality.However, *nothing like this happened!* Instead the IPCC started off with the *assumption* that temperatures were outside of normal deviations *and* the *assumption* that this deviation was due to humans... Their mission has always been to exclusively focus on “human-induced” climate contributors, and *nothing else*. **This is not how Science works!**
- 4) Those pre-determined qualifications (*examples of confirmation bias*) are the exact opposite to the claimed “comprehensive” and “objective” parts of their mission.
- 5) The IPCC does zero original research. (Instead they just do a *literature* search.)
- 6) What they discard in this literature search is **subjective**, and is **not identified**.
- 7) Dissenting views (i.e. minority reports) are “not accommodated” ([here](#), page v).
Again this is contrary to their Charter which says to “reflect a range of views.”
- 8) There is no “comprehensive” and “objective” analysis of the **actual costs** of any of the IPCC’s proposed future solution scenarios.
- 9) When the IPCC says they have a “high confidence” about an outcome, this is **not** based on a sound statistical analysis, but rather a set of *unproven assumptions*.
- 10) [RCP 8.5](#) is the least likely scenario to occur — yet it is the most frequently referenced in the media (because it shows more alarmist consequences).
- 11) Although the IPCC is supposed to be “neutral with respect to policy,” a reading of their material (e.g. [here](#)) demonstrates that they have redefined “neutral”.
- 12) The IPCC conclusions and recommendations are made by **politicians** (*not scientists*), and are based on political negotiations to appease its 195 members.

Any bureaucracy of that size has to satisfy numerous masters — so despite whatever good Science intentions there were along the way, the *Policymaker Recommendations* that come out of this sausage-making “climate change” regulation process do not even remotely resemble how a genuine Science-based assessment would be conducted.

In other words, although the IPCC mission statement sounds “sciency,” there are multiple indications that this is actually a *political*, **not** a *scientific*, process. (For samples of dozens of studies, reports and articles regarding IPCC issues, see Page 8.)

B- IPCC AGW Solutions.

The marketing pitch to legislators and citizens is that: the IPCC reports represent the combined wisdom of over a thousand scientists. That *sounds* good!

Rather than get into the weeds about the technical merits of the IPCC's AGW reports, an alternative, easier approach would be to examine a less complex matter: **the merits of a primary AGW solution that the IPCC is advocating.**

The IPCC's top solution to stopping "climate change," is: **industrial wind energy** (e.g. see [here](#) and [here](#)).

However, consider this: **there is no genuine scientific assessment (anywhere) that has empirically proven that wind energy saves any consequential CO2!**

If the IPCC believes their own claims of imminent cataclysmic disaster, why would they give major support to a "solution" that is scientifically unproven?

It goes downhill further. There are studies by independent experts that have concluded that wind energy actually makes climate change **worse!** (For some examples, see [here](#).)

Since a key IPCC AGW solution is **not** based on sound science, that would indicate that their whole process — despite the numerous scientists involved — is either **technically incompetent** or **deceptive** (i.e. promoting a political agenda, not Science).

So taking this alternative, simpler route ("B"), we come to the same conclusion as "A": what the IPCC is actually involved with is not real Science but rather **political science**.

Pillar #2: The Claimed Consensus of Scientists —

We've all read something akin to "97% of scientists say that global warming is a pending catastrophe!" *Is this claim accurate or meaningful?* No, because:

- Science is determined by empirical facts, *never* by votes.
- There have been many historical examples where the scientific consensus has been proven to be wrong.
- There are over 2 million scientists worldwide. There has never been *any* type of poll (AGW or otherwise) of these scientists.
- Climatologists make up only a very small percentage of worldwide scientists.
- Climatology is a field of Science in its infancy.
- The polls that have been done, have had poorly-phrased questions.
- The tiny polls that have been done, have been of pre-selected scientists.

- The “studies” done that claimed that there was a 97% scientific consensus regarding AGW, show nothing of the kind as the “97% consensus” claim is based on deception. (See [here](#) [1.6% in reality] and [here](#) [2.4% in reality].)
- Polls that do **not** support the 97% AGW narrative, don’t get well publicized (e.g. [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)).
- The same people who advocate a scientific consensus for AGW, dismiss the idea of scientific consensus on other matters (e.g. physicists supporting Yucca Mt). In other words, the same people who say “listen to the experts,” quickly dismiss findings supported by experts that don’t jive with their *political* agendas.
- Be aware that “the science is settled” is another variation of this false claim.

Consensus science is a phrase which does not refer simply to a scientific *hypothesis* which has the endorsement of a majority, but rather to an argument in which the consensus of scientists is given as the *primary* evidence of the argument.

One who believes that a hypothesis is supported by **both**: 1) scientific consensus, and 2) conclusive empirical evidence, would not consider it "consensus science", because that would be the significantly weaker confirmation.

For an eloquent answer to those promoting “consensus science” please read the [response](#) of Dr. Michael Crichton. (For samples of dozens of other studies, reports and articles regarding the realities of the so-called scientific consensus, see Page 8.)

Pillar #3: Computer Models –

Falling back on computer models is yet another *appeal to authority*.

An implication is: what mere mortals have the raw processing power of a high-end super-computer? Another: isn’t it audacious for humans to assert that a sophisticated computer – overseen by brilliant experts – can be egregiously wrong? More importantly, when such a criticism is made, which would the public believe is likely correct: a few individuals or super-computers?

Another main reason that computer models are a tool-of-choice by self-serving parties, is that the end result is easily controlled by the assumptions made. It’s literally child’s play for a competent programmer to create a computer model that proves that pigs fly.

Better yet, all the technical assumptions made by the programmers are deemed to be incomprehensible to the public, so they are hidden (i.e. simply not declared). For inquisitive minds they are protected behind such guises as “work product.” This is a major scientific no-no, as all scientific results should be *transparent*.

An analogy would be a business that hires a CPA to prepare their annual income taxes. Let's say that the end document is twenty pages of tax forms.

The accountant tells the customer the taxes owed, and touches on a few highlights. However, at no time do they go through *every* decision made in preparing the tax return — if for no other reason than they believe that the customer wouldn't really understand, so why should they bring up something that might lead to a dispute?

There are multiple other serious reasons why computer models for something of the complexity of AGW — and a long time in the future — are suspect. Here is a [brief overview](#) of eight (8) reasons. (For examples of the numerous studies, reports and articles regarding the problems with climate computer models, see Page 9.)

A respected climatologist made this [candid statement](#) about climate models:
“Apocalyptic climate predictions depend on unrealistic emissions scenarios and unrealistic climate model simulations.”

Pillar #4: Extreme Weather —

Almost every time there is an extreme weather event, there are quickly very predictable claims that this is more “evidence” that we are in the cataclysmic clutches of Climate Change. *But is that true?*

Interestingly, most proponents of the Global Warming narrative are quick to say that **climate** and **weather** are very different things (e.g. [here](#)). That is correct. Basically, *climate* is global and long-term, whereas *weather* is local and short-term. For example, a week of US cold weather is not relevant to the global climate issue.

However, the exact same distinction exists between **climate** and **extreme weather** events (e.g. Hurricane Dorian). They are also very different things. (Basically, extreme weather is more problematic weather — which is still local and is still short-term). For anyone to indicate that *climate* and *extreme weather* are synonymous indicates either a serious technical misunderstanding, or a devious intent.

Additionally, there have been numerous studies (by independent experts) analyzing the extreme weather data. Their conclusion is that there is **NO statistical correlation** to extreme weather events (e.g. hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, droughts, wildfires, etc.) and climate change.

A condensed way to look at the issue of extreme weather and Climate Change is:

- a) correlation does not prove causation, *and*
- b) furthermore, there is little correlation either.

So why don't more scientists speak out about this false connection? The simple (and unfortunate) reason is that when a scientist demonstrates that the political narrative is suspect, they (the messenger) get attacked by those whose agendas are threatened.

[Here](#) is just one example.

The takeaway is that any claims that Climate Change is causing a statistically significant increase in extreme weather events is a political (not scientific) assertion.

(For samples of dozens of studies, reports and articles regarding the claims regarding extreme weather and climate change, see Page 9.)

The Bottom Line —

Once we understand that all four (4) of the major pillars supporting the AGW case are highly suspect, what does that mean?

*It does **not** mean that the claims about global warming are false!*

Instead it simply reconfirms that AGW is still a scientific [hypothesis](#).

A layman's translation of what a scientific hypothesis is, is that it means that the jury is still out. More accurately it means that the trial is still ongoing.

AGW may eventually prove to be true, but so far its promoters have made a weak case.

What about the assertion that "it's better to be safe than sorry." Well, what does "safe" mean in this case? It's already been [shown](#) that wind energy is likely a net climate detriment. So how safe are we when trillions of dollars are wasted on palliative pabulum — while well-documented [serious problems](#) are largely ignored?

This is what happens when political science is substituted for real Science.

John Droz, jr. Physicist North Carolina 8-24-20 (rev 10-22-22)

— See the following pages for some sample references. More are available, on demand. —

Sample References Refuting the Four Climate Change Pillars

1: Some Sample Reading Relating to the IPCC –

Dr. John McLean: [IPCC AGW Data is Erroneous and Incomplete](#) (also [here](#))
Dr. Jay Bates: [Deficiencies In the IPCC's SR15 Special Report](#)
Dr. Mike Hulme, et al: [Climate Change: what do we know about the IPCC?](#)
Dr. Ed Berry: [Contradictions to IPCC's Climate Change Theory](#)
Dr. Nils-Axel Mörner: [IPCC Scientist Blows Whistle on Climate, Sea Level Lies](#)
Dr. Werner Kirstein: ["IPCC Is To Deceive People," Hockey Stick Graph "A Fake"](#)
Dr. Pat Frank: [Propagation of Error and the Reliability of Global Air Temp Predictions](#)
Dr. Roger Pielke: [Opening Up the Climate Policy Envelope](#)
Dr. Jyrki Kauppinen: [No Evidence for Significant Anthropogenic Climate Change](#)
Dr. Hans Labohm: [What is Wrong with the IPCC?](#)
Dr. John Christy: [IPCC has a satellite data error, that contradicts their models](#)
Dr. Luboš Motl (Harvard Physicist): ["I am no longer reading the IPCC garbage"](#)
Dr. David Whitehouse: [Moving The Goalposts, IPCC Secretly Redefines 'Climate'](#)
Dr. Nir Shaviv, et al: [Four Renown Scientists Expose Major IPCC Shortcomings](#)
[IPCC ≠ Science](#)
[Did the IPCC predict a climate apocalypse? No.](#)
[The IPCC's Seldom Mentioned 'Uncertainties'](#)
[Climate Change Assessments: Review of the Processes and Procedures of the IPCC](#)

2: Some Sample Reading Relating to the Claimed Consensus of Scientists –

[97 Articles](#) refuting the bogus 97% claim
1500+ papers support an AGW skeptical position, e.g.: [2017](#), [2018](#), [2019](#)
Dr. John Robson: [Excellent video debunking the 97% scientists AGW claims](#)
Dr. Richard Lindzen: [Global Warming: The Origin and Nature of the Alleged Scientific Consensus](#)
Dr. David Legates, et al: [Climate Consensus and 'Misinformation'...](#)
Dr. Judith Curry: [Re-evaluating the Manufacture of the Climate Consensus](#)
Dr. Robert Murphy: [The Bogus "Consensus" Argument on Climate Change](#)
Dr. John McClean: [The IPCC Wobbles Over Climate Models](#)
Dr. Jay Lehr: [It's Time for Us All to Recognize the 97% Con Game](#)
[The Cynical Myth of a Global Warming "Consensus"](#)
[The 97% Solution](#)
[The 97% consensus of climate scientists is only 47%](#)
[Global Warming and Consensus Claims Are Betrayals of Science](#)
[97% Consequential Misperceptions: Ethics of Consensus on Global Warming](#)
[What is there a 97% Consensus About?](#)
Short Video: [The Fake News 97% Consensus](#)
Short Video: [Do 97% of Scientists Agree?](#)

3: Some Sample Reading Relating to AGW Computer Models –

Dr. William Happer's short [video](#) about climate computer models
Dr. Judith Curry: [Escape from Model Land](#)
Dr. Ross McKittrick: [Two Peer-Reviewed Studies: Models Overstate Warming](#)
Dr. Patrick Frank: [Climate Change Computer Models are Unreliable](#)
Dr. David Henderson, et al: [Flawed Computer Models](#)
Dr. Sam Furfari, et al: [IPCC Climate Modeling Opens Door To 'Fake Conclusions'](#)
Dr. Mototaka Nakamura: [A Climate Modeler Spills the Beans](#)
Dr. Patrick Michael, et al: [The Great Failure of Climate Computer Models](#)
Dr. Roger Pielke: [It's Time to Move Beyond the Toy Models Guiding Climate Policy](#)
Dr. Paul Matthews: [New Climate Models: Even More Wrong](#)
Dr. Michel de Rougemont: [Climate Models Overheat](#)
Dr. Tom Segalstad: [Carbon cycle modeling and... Greenhouse Dogma](#)
Dr. Jay Lehr, et al: [Mathematical Modeling Illusions](#)
Dr. Nicola Scafetta: [On the Reliability of Computer-based Climate Models](#)
Dr. Maeregu Arisido, et al: [Spatio-temporal Quantification of Climate Model Errors...](#)
Dr. Frédéric Hourdin, et al: [The Art and Science of Climate Model Tuning](#)
Multiple Studies: ['Falsified' Climate Models 'Don't Agree With Reality'](#)
[We Must Rely on Forecasts by Computer Models. Are they Reliable?](#)
[Climate Scientists Manipulated Temperature Data to Fool Politicians and Public](#)

4: Some Sample Reading Relating to Extreme Weather Events –

A physicist does an analysis of [Hurricanes](#), [Tornadoes](#), [Floods](#), [Droughts](#) and [Wildfires](#).
Dr. Roger Pielke: [Why Climate Advocates Need To Stop Hying Extreme Weather](#)
Dr. Luc Feyen: [Empirical evidence of declining global vulnerability to climate-related hazards](#)
[What 50 Years Of Global Hurricane Landfall Data Teaches Us About Climate Change](#)
WeatherModels.com: [Global Hurricane Frequency graph](#) (12 month running sums)
Study: [No Significant Trend in US Hurricanes Over the Period 1900-2017](#)
Study: [Recent decrease in typhoon destructive potential and AGW implications](#)
Study: [Extremely Intense Hurricanes: Revisiting Webster et al. \(2005\) after 10 Years](#)
Study: [Tropical Hurricanes in the Age of Global Warming](#)
[2018 US tornadoes lowest in 65 years of record-keeping](#), by meteorologist A. Watts
[Strong Tornadoes in the US Trending Down](#), by meteorologist Bill Steffen ([graph](#)).
[Global integrated drought monitoring and prediction system](#) (and [graph](#))
NOAA & NCDC: [US percentage very wet or very dry](#) (and [graph](#))
[Activists Hope that Fake News about Droughts will Win](#) (*same for other extremes*)
Study: [Researchers Detect a Global Drop in Fires](#)
US Congressional Research Service: [US Wildfire Statistics](#)

If there are any link errors, or suggestions for additional good references, please email physicist John Droz jr at "aapjohn" at "northnet" dot "org".