

Global Warming (AGW): Separating Fact From Fiction & Recognising False Claims

Issue 3: IPCC Again Agrees with 'Sceptics' & Admits 15 Year 'Hiatus' Shows Failure of Climate Models

Graham Williamson
August 2014 (2nd edit)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper examines the IPCC AR5 report with respect to the 15 year temperature 'hiatus' and the reliability of climate models.

The following conclusions are based upon the content of the IPCC [AR5 Working Group 1 Physical Science Basis report](#) and the [Working Group 1 Summary for Policymakers \(SPM\)](#).

- IPCC confirm, in the AR5 WG1 science report, that there has been a 15 year 'hiatus' in global warming, in spite of 'anthropogenic' emissions allegedly increasing at a record rate.
- IPCC also confirm that this 15 year 'hiatus' has been caused predominantly by natural climate variability.
- IPCC also conclude in the WG1 scientific report, that the inability to predict this natural variability and the resulting 'hiatus' is due to the failure or unreliability of climate models.
- IPCC have however, once again politicised the WG1 SPM version and have deleted comments relating to failure of climate models from the final SPM. Following IPCC tradition, the alarmism in the WG1 SPM contradicts the science in the WG1 Science report.
- Even though the SPM has been politicised to censor the science and increase the sensationalism, public commentary, even by scientists, almost exclusively cites the politicised SPM and avoids the scientific report. Many scientists, even WG1 authors, seem to prefer to cite the IPCC report only after the science has been politicised by government representatives as in the SPM.
- Although IPCC scientists confirm that AR5 climate models '*got it wrong*' as far as predicting the 'hiatus' is concerned, they also point out that AR4 climate models were even more unreliable.

The ever increasing gap between the science, as recorded in the IPCC scientific report, and the final politicised sensationalised version of the science contained in the SPM, raises extremely serious questions about the IPCC and all those involved in the IPCC process.

- Why is climate science so radically different to other areas of science? For instance, after contributing to the IPCC WG1 scientific report, why do many participating scientists then authorise the politicising or sensationalising of their scientific research?
- Why do many scientists prefer to cite the politicised version of the IPCC report rather than the scientific version?
- After agreeing with the claims of 'sceptics' that global warming has ceased and climate models are unreliable, why do the IPCC and contributing scientists then increase the alarmist rhetoric in the SPM instead of stating the facts?
- And why does the media exaggerate or completely misrepresent the data contained in the IPCC AR5 scientific reports?
- What is the agenda driving this process?

The strange IPCC process has as one of its main aims, the deliberate blurring of the science – politics interface. Obfuscation, not clarity and scientific truth, is the key driver. Scientists do not normally subject their work to censor by those who have a vested interest in the maintenance of political power and popularity so why is this a standard part of the IPCC process?

The latest IPCC report confirms the fact that the IPCC is continuing their suicidal slide into complete

irrelevance as the alarmist rhetoric of the SPM increasingly departs from science and reality.

One enduring lesson learned from repeated IPCC reports is that urgent action is required to ensure the true independence of science and a very clear separation from politics. Not to do so is to ensure the continued corruption of science by those who seek power by spin and deception.

‘Global Warming’ Stops: IPCC Confirm the 15 - 17 Year ‘Hiatus’

For the past two decades we have been subjected to endless global warming doomsday predictions ([1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)), with headlines like “[Apocalypse Now: How Mankind is Sleepwalking to the End of the Earth](#)”. But the fundamental basis of global warming science, that as CO2 emissions increase temperatures will increase proportionately, has been completely shattered by the observation that warming has virtually ceased in spite of increasing emissions. [According to John Christy and Patrick Michaels](#):

“Global temperatures collected in five official databases confirm that there has been no statistically significant global warming for the past 17 years, according to Dr. John Christy, professor of atmospheric science and director of the Earth System Science Center at the University of Alabama Huntsville (UAH). Christy's findings are contrary to predictions made by 73 computer models cited in the United Nation’s latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fifth Assessment Report (5AR)..... ‘October 1st marks the 17th year of no global warming significantly different than zero,’ agreed Dr. Patrick Michaels, director of the Cato Institute’s Center for the Study of Science. ‘And those 17 years correspond to the largest period of CO2 emissions by far over any other 17-year period in history.’”

In [Chapter 10](#) of the IPCC [AR5 Working Group 1 Physical Science Basis report](#) the IPCC confirms the inconvenient truth that increasing CO2 emissions are NOT associated with progressively increasing temperatures as they have repeatedly predicted:

“The observed recent warming hiatus, defined as the reduction in GMST trend during 1998–2012 as compared to the trend during 1951–2012, is attributable in roughly equal measure to a cooling contribution from internal variability and a reduced trend in external forcing (expert judgement, medium confidence). The forcing trend reduction is primarily due to a negative forcing trend from both volcanic eruptions and the downward phase of the solar cycle. However, there is low confidence in quantifying the role of forcing trend in causing the hiatus because of uncertainty in the magnitude of the volcanic forcing trends and low confidence in the aerosol forcing trend. Many factors, in addition to GHGs, including changes in tropospheric and stratospheric aerosols, stratospheric water vapour, and solar output, as well as internal modes of variability, contribute to the year-to-year and decade- to-decade variability of GMST. {Box 9.2, 10.3.1, Figure 10.6}”

Australian scientists involved in writing Chapter 10 include **Coordinating Lead Author** [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), and **Contributing Authors**, [Catia M. Domingues](#), [Paul J. Durack](#), and [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#).

And in [Chapter 9, box 9.2, of the AR5 WG1 report](#), IPCC scientists state:

“The discrepancy between simulated and observed GMST trends during 1998–2012 could be explained in part by a tendency for some CMIP5 models to simulate stronger warming in response to increases in greenhouse gas (GHG) concentration than is consistent with observations (Section 10.3.1.1.3, Figure 10.4)..... Almost all CMIP5 historical simulations do not reproduce the observed recent warming hiatus. There is medium confidence that the GMST trend difference between models and observations during 1998–2012 is to a substantial degree caused by internal variability, with

possible contributions from forcing error and some CMIP5 models overestimating the response to increasing GHG and other anthropogenic forcing.”

Australian scientists involved in writing Chapter 9 include **Lead Author** [Christian Jakob](#), **Contributing Authors**, [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [Jennifer Catto](#), [Paul J. Durack](#), [Sandy Harrison](#), and **Review Editor**, [Andy Pitman](#).

And finally, [according to the AR5 WG1 Technical Summary](#):

“The observed GMST has shown a much smaller increasing linear trend over the past 15 years than over the past 30 to 60 years (Box TS.3, Figure 1a, c). Depending on the observational data set, the GMST trend over 1998–2012 is estimated to be around one third to one half of the trend over 1951–2012.This difference between simulated and observed trends could be caused by some combination of (a) internal climate variability, (b) missing or incorrect RF, and (c) model response error..... During the 15-year period beginning in 1998, the ensemble of HadCRUT4 GMST trends lies below almost all model-simulated trends (Box TS.3, Figure 1a), whereas during the 15-year period ending in 1998, it lies above 93 out of 114 modelled trends..... the hiatus is in part a consequence of internal variability that is predictable on the multi-year time scale..... The discrepancy between simulated and observed GMST trends during 1998–2012 could be explained in part by a tendency for some CMIP5 models to simulate stronger warming in response to increases in greenhouse-gas concentration than is consistent with observations..... In summary, the observed recent warming hiatus, defined as the reduction in GMST trend during 1998–2012 as compared to the trend during 1951–2012, is attributable in roughly equal measure to a cooling contribution from internal variability and a reduced trend in external forcing (expert judgement, medium confidence)..... Almost all CMIP5 historical simulations do not reproduce the observed recent warming hiatus. There is medium confidence that the GMST trend difference between models and observations during 1998–2012 is to a substantial degree caused by internal variability, with possible contributions from forcing error and some CMIP5 models overestimating the response to increasing GHG forcing.”

In other words, the official verdict from IPCC scientists is that the predictions of climate models, upon which they have been so eager to base the future of global politics and the expenditure of trillions of dollars, are wrong. Alarming, the IPCC admit that they, and their models, forgot to allow for natural climate variability.

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 Technical Summary include **Lead Authors**: [Lisa V. Alexander](#), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [John Church](#), and **Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#).

But the true significance of the so called ‘hiatus’ cannot be fully appreciated until it is realised that this hiatus corresponds with the period of the greatest acceleration of allegedly ‘anthropogenic’ emissions. According to the [BOM/CSIRO State of the Climate 2014 report](#):

“Global anthropogenic CO₂ emissions into the atmosphere in 2013 are estimated to be 38.8 billion tonnes of CO₂ (10.6 billion tonnes of carbon), the highest in history and about 46 per cent higher than in 1990.The global CO₂ annual increase from 2012 to 2013 was 2.5 ppm, and the increase of 5.1 ppm since 2011 is the largest two-year increase observed in the historical record.”

According to IPCC scientists therefore, as ‘anthropogenic’ emissions have spiked, global warming has gone into reverse.

[Isdo and colleagues](#), and [Singer](#), have noted a revolutionary reversal in the previous alarmist attitude adopted by the IPCC regarding the hiatus:

“The IPCC concedes for the first time that a 15 year-long period of no significant warming occurred since 1998 despite a 7% rise in carbon dioxide (CO2). It also acknowledges that on a longer (more climatic) time scale the rate of global warming has decelerated since 1951, despite an accompanying 80 ppm or 26% increase in carbon dioxide (312 to 392 ppm). The statement represents a significant revision in IPCC thinking, because their concern about dangerous warming rests upon the assumption that temperature increases will proceed in parallel fashion with CO2 increases, and not just sometimes or in a stepped fashion. NIPCC, in contrast, has documented that temperatures in the geologic time scale, the twentieth century, and the early twenty-first centuries have not changed in parallel with CO2 levels (NIPCC, Chapter 4).”

We have seen previously that the IPCC has reversed its earlier alarmist claims in regard to [health](#) and [droughts](#), and now supports the views of so called climate ‘sceptics’. And now the IPCC have also agreed with sceptics that their climate models are wrong, they have not allowed for natural climate variability, and increasing CO2 emissions do NOT necessarily cause increased temperatures.

In defence of the IPCC however, it should be noted that they claim that climate models were not intended to predict short periods of change, or ‘inter-decadal variability’, and such changes do not detract from the long term warming trend. However, this flies in the face of repeated claims that one hot year, or even one hot summer, confirms anthropogenic global warming.

We have also observed repeatedly, that in their [Summary for Policymakers](#), the IPCC [sensationalises and politicises the scientific data](#). So does their current AR5 WG1 [Summary for Policymakers](#) reflect the scientific facts as outlined above?

IPCC Again Politicises Summary for Policymakers

The content of the final version of the SPM has resulted in global turmoil in the world of climate alarmists as governments and scientists sought to put their own particular spin on the final report ([8](#), [9](#), [10](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), [14](#)). Headlines such as [“Row over IPCC report as nations 'try to hide lack of climate change”](#) and [“IPCC report summary censored by governments around the world”](#) suddenly appeared as the political drivers of global climate change alarmism clearly exposed their underlying political agenda and contempt for science. [According to Mendick](#):

“Scientists working on a landmark UN report on climate change to be published this week are at loggerheads over their explanation for why the earth’s surface temperature has stopped rising as rapidly as they previously predicted.The behind-the-scenes wrangling is likely to cast a shadow over the publication on Friday of the 2,000-page report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The report is still in a draft version and will be finalised over the next five days with heated discussion centring on how to explain the fact that since 1998 the earth’s temperature has barely risen. It is claimed some governments have even tried to intervene to remove references to the 15 year climate change ‘hiatus’ or ‘pause’.....But the documents, according to AP, show Germany called for the reference to the slowdown to be deleted while the US urged scientists to include as its “leading hypothesis” that the reduction in warming is linked to more heat being transferred to the deep ocean. Both countries’ governments have policies which state their belief in man-made climate change.....The row will fuel claims by global warming sceptics that the issue has become too political and that governments are now spending vast sums of money on policies to combat a phenomenon that may not exist and may not be man-made. The effect of those policies, claim sceptics, is to increase global poverty because the policies are expensive to implement.”

According to Dixon in an article entitled "[Top climate scientists admit global warming forecasts were wrong](#)":

"The governments which fund the IPCC have tabled 1,800 questions in relation to the report. One of the central issues is believed to be why the IPCC failed to account for the "pause" in global warming, which they admit that they did not predict in their computer models. Since 1997, world average temperatures have not shown any statistically significant increase.

The summary also shows that scientist have now discovered that between 950 and 1250 AD, before the Industrial Revolution, parts of the world were as warm for decades at a time as they are now. Despite a 2012 draft stating that the world is at it's warmest for 1,300 years, the latest document states: "Surface temperature reconstructions show multi-decadal intervals during the Medieval Climate Anomaly (950-1250) that were in some regions as warm as in the late 20th Century."..... Despite the uncertainties and contradictions, the IPCC insists that it is more confident than ever – 95 per cent certain - that global warming is mainly human's fault."

The longstanding IPCC tradition of politicising and sensationalising the SPM is clearly being continued in regard to the 'hiatus' and the reliability of climate models. As noted by [Judith Curry](#) and also [Isdo and colleagues](#), the Draft version of the Summary for Policymakers correctly stated as follows, although this was removed from the Final version:

"Models do not generally reproduce the observed reduction in surface warming trend over the last 10–15 years."

[According to Isdo and colleagues](#):

"Though this statement was removed from the final, published version of the SPM, it remains patently true, as does the fact that IPCC's climate models have failed to project the lack of warming over the last 15 (now 17) years."

In the [final of the Working Group 1 Summary for Policymakers](#) the IPCC not only avoided using the term 'hiatus', they also omitted mentioning the total failure of the climate models, which they referred to in the [AR5 Technical Summary](#) and which they had previously claimed were so reliable:

"In addition to robust multi-decadal warming, global mean surface temperature exhibits substantial decadal and interannual variability (see Figure SPM.1). Due to natural variability, trends based on short records are very sensitive to the beginning and end dates and do not in general reflect long-term climate trends. As one example, the rate of warming over the past 15 years (1998–2012; 0.05 [–0.05 to 0.15] °C per decade), which begins with a strong El Niño, is smaller than the rate calculated since 1951 (1951–2012; 0.12 [0.08 to 0.14] °C per decade)5. {2.4}"

As the IPCC Scientific report continued to agree with the criticisms of global warming science long publicised by sceptics, and confirm the cessation of global warming and the failure of climate models, the [Summary for Policymakers](#) moved in the opposite direction and ramped up the alarm, even claiming "climate models have improved since AR4":

"Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and since the 1950s, many of the observed changes are unprecedented over decades to millennia. The atmosphere and ocean have warmed, the amounts of snow and ice have diminished, sea level has risen, and the concentrations of greenhouse gases have increased (see Figures SPM.1, SPM.2, SPM.3 and SPM.4).... Each of the last three decades has been successively warmer at the Earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850 (see Figure SPM.1). In the Northern Hemisphere, 1983–2012 was likely the warmest 30-year period of the

last 1400 years (medium confidence)..... Climate models have improved since the AR4. Models reproduce observed continental-scale surface temperature patterns and trends over many decades, including the more rapid warming since the mid-20th century and the cooling immediately following large volcanic eruptions (very high confidence)..... Observational and model studies of temperature change, climate feedbacks and changes in the Earth's energy budget together provide confidence in the magnitude of global warming in response to past and future forcing.....Human influence has been detected in warming of the atmosphere and the ocean, in changes in the global water cycle, in reductions in snow and ice, in global mean sea level rise, and in changes in some climate extremes (see Figure SPM.6 and Table SPM.1). This evidence for human influence has grown since AR4. It is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century."

So according to IPCC scientists, the climate models which have been shown to be so unreliable in the AR5 report, were even worse in the AR4 report, although the unreliability of the AR4 models was not made clear by the IPCC at that time.

Australian scientists involved in writing the WG1 SPM include **Drafting Authors** [Lisa V. Alexander](#) (also lead author for the Technical Summary), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#) (also lead author for both Chapt 10 and the Technical Summary), [John Church](#) (also lead author for the Technical Summary), and **Draft Contributing Authors** [Viviane Vasconcellos de Menezes](#), [Scott Power](#), and [Stephen Rintoul](#).

[As mentioned elsewhere](#), the IPCC has a long history of politicising the Summary for Policymakers in line with its ideological objectives. Here again we see the IPCC has deleted from the final SPM the fact that climate models, in NOT predicting the hiatus, have once again been shown to be unreliable, a fact which again reinforces the long held views of so called 'sceptics'. **The fundamental message here, yet again, is that climate models are far too unreliable to form the basis of global political policies projected decades into the future and costing trillions of dollars. Though this lesson is learned again and again, still the ideological agenda prevails over the scientific facts.**

As the fallacy of doomsday climatic predictions are increasingly exposed the fact that [the entire agenda is being politically or ideologically driven](#) is being increasingly admitted. According to EU Climate Commissioner Connie Hedegaard, "[climate change is right even if science was wrong](#)":

"Regardless of whether or not scientists are wrong on global warming, the European Union is pursuing the correct energy policies even if they lead to higher prices, Europe's climate commissioner has said. However, EU and other policymakers are worried that the IPCC's forthcoming admission, expected on Sep 27, that previous forecasts are wrong will damage the legitimacy of climate change policies, such as levies and fuel taxes on consumers to fund renewable energy. Leaked IPCC reports, reviewing forecasts made in 2007, have called into question how much climate change has taken place by concluding that, even with a doubling of carbon emissions from 1990 levels, the global temperature has risen little or more slowly than predicted over the last 10-20 years.....'Let's say that science, some decades from now, said 'we were wrong, it was not about climate', would it not in any case have been good to do many of things you have to do in order to combat climate change'?"

It is clear that fear of climate change has been promoted and used to justify a global political agenda. Amazingly, regardless of the evidence regarding cessation of global warming, some scientists still prefer to cite the politicised SPM and avoid the scientific version in the IPCC WG1 Scientific Report.

Scientists & Media Respond to the IPCC AR5 Report

Given the well-known politicisation of the SPM it is abundantly clear that decision makers, journalists, and other interested parties have a clear responsibility to source their data directly from the scientific report. But it is indeed alarming when scientists themselves seek to cite the SPM and avoid the scientific report ([15](#), [16](#)), the well-known [Skeptical Science](#) web site for instance, even asking “[Why is the IPCC AR5 so much more confident in human-caused global warming?](#)” This [Skeptical Science](#) report, like politicians and those seeking to put a political ‘spin’ on the science, repeatedly cites the politicised SPM and avoids the failure of climate models confirmed in the IPCC Scientific report.

According to climate scientist and IPCC lead author [Andy Pitman](#), in an article entitled “[Is global warming in a hiatus](#)”:

“The slowing in the rate of warming over the last 15 years is not in the least surprising. We have seen a combination of the solar minimum, anthropogenic aerosol emissions and [back-to-back La Niñas](#)..... One way that this makes sense is if climate scientists have underestimated how dominant CO₂ and other greenhouse gases are in warming the climate. In other words, CO₂ and other greenhouse gases are countering the cooling effects of natural variability by much more than we anticipated..... If you see the slowing of warming over the last 15 years as a hint that climate scientists [might have been wrong](#) and that global warming is less of a problem than predicted, you are very likely being lulled into a false sense of security”

Pitman carefully avoided the conclusions of the IPCC in the scientific report that the models had been shown to be unreliable since they had failed to predict the hiatus.

Similarly, according to Bala in an article entitled “[Why the “hiatus” in global mean surface temperature trends in the last decade](#)”:

“IPCC carefully addresses this issue in the SPM: “In addition to robust multi-decadal warming, global mean surface temperature exhibits substantial decadal and interannual variability. Due to natural variability, trends based on short records are very sensitive to the beginning and end dates and do not in general reflect long-term climate trends. For example, the rate of warming over the past 15 years, which begins with a strong El Niño, is only 0.05o C per decade while the long term trend over 1951-2012 is 0.12oC per decade”. The current climate models do not reproduce this slowdown in warming because the timing of events related to internal variability (e.g. El Niño and Pacific Decadal Oscillation) probably could be different in models and observations and hence the way these internal oscillations combine with those associated with anthropogenic forcing is likely to be different.”

Bala also refrains from mentioning the fact that the unreliability of climate models has again been confirmed by the IPCC AR5 report and he also avoids citing the IPCC WG1 scientific report, apparently preferring the politicised SPM instead. In attempting to explain the hiatus Bala points out “*The text book definition of climate is an average of weather conditions over a sufficiently longer period, usually about 30 years.*” **Dr Bala would do well to remind CSIRO, BOM, and other scientists of this fact, since they frequently claim one hot summer is [all that is needed to confirm ‘climate change’](#).** But in spite of Bala’s view that the 15 year hiatus has not continued long enough, [according to Lewis and Crok](#), “*virtually all the models that the IPCC uses in its report have been running too hot over the last 35 years as well, long enough to judge them on a climatic time scale.*”

Recently, BOM scientist and IPCC author [Scott Power](#) addressed a climate change forum in Melbourne organised by the [Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society \(AMOS\)](#) specifically to discuss the IPCC [AR5 Working Group 1 Physical Science report](#). Brief mention of the

forum was made in their [December bulletin](#) with the full videos available in [You Tube](#). Even though forum moderator Rob Gell described Power's contribution as an explanation of the "content" of the IPCC AR5 Physical Science report, [Power avoided mentioning the conclusions of the IPCC](#) regarding the unreliability of the models and their failure to predict the 'hiatus'. Instead, Power claimed the 'hiatus' acknowledged by the IPCC is a "[hiatus in one particular statistic](#)":

"some people refer to this as an 'hiatus', however it is important to note that it is a hiatus in one particular statistic"

Of course the "some people" referred to by Power included the IPCC and contributing scientific authors such as [Lisa V. Alexander](#), [Nathaniel Bindoff](#), [John Church](#), and Chapter 9 Review Editor [Andy Pitman](#).

Although Power, in an attempt to contradict the alleged hiatus, cites recent hot temperatures in one Australian summer, [he then points out that](#) "*recent trends are a very poor guide to what might happen next*". According to Power, the best way of predicting the future are the climate models which the IPCC admit have got it so wrong. Interestingly, fellow scientist and contributor to the forum, Professor Neville Nicholls, apparently contradicted Power and the IPCC and [claimed there is no 'hiatus'](#). While [other scientists](#) also disagree with the IPCC and claim there has been no hiatus, many other scientists are desperately trying to explain the hiatus that does not exist as well as the hiatus the climate models failed to predict ([17](#), [18](#), [19](#), [20](#), [21](#)). [According to Readfearn](#), the term 'hiatus' used by the IPCC, is an "offending word":

"The idea that global warming has "paused" or is currently chillaxing in a comfy chair with the words "hiatus" written on it has been getting a good run in the media of late.....But this is almost unavoidable. You can hardly blame journalists and commentators for repeating the phrase that "global warming is in a hiatus" when the offending word is in the title of the scientific paper itself"

Though Readfearn may seek to censor the words of scientists, others seek to encourage open debate.

And just as so many scientists have avoided the science contained in the AR5 report and opted to cite the politicised SPM instead, so too journalists and the mainstream media hungrily sought sensationalised headlines derived from the politicised SPM ([22](#), [23](#), [24](#), [25](#)). [According to Michael Parker](#), in an article entitled "***Global warming 'unequivocal' and 'unprecedented' – IPCC***":

"In the strongest language yet deployed in the fight against increasing temperatures, the report concluded that the 30 years until 2012 were probably the warmest in 1,400 years, driven by "unprecedented" levels of greenhouse gases – these are now at levels not seen for 80,000 years"

However, this article by Michael Parker does not even cite the SPM correctly, [as I pointed out in a complaint](#) to [The Conversation](#). As a result of that complaint, to their credit, [The Conversation did amend the article to correct the misinformation](#), however they did not go far enough.

The details of that complaint are reproduced in [volume 5](#) of this series.

Climate change misinformation, and misrepresentation of the IPCC AR5 report, has clearly been widely propagated by the media. But as Andrew Bolt has pointed out, "[Tim Flannery has been sacked - and so too should journalists who are climate change scaremongers.](#)"

Global awareness of IPCC fallacies and exaggerations, and the agenda driving the process, is increasing as even the IPCC abandons previous alarmist claims. Sadly though, the credibility of science and scientists will pay an enormous price for decades to come.