

46 'Climate Change Denying' Statements Made By Former IPCC Scientists

- by Cap Allon at Electroverse, 30 Mai 2023, [LINK](#)

Dr Robert Balling: The IPCC notes that "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected." This did not appear in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers.

Dr Lucka Bogataj: "Rising levels of airborne carbon dioxide don't cause global temperatures to rise... temperature changed first and some 700 years later a change in aerial content of carbon dioxide followed."

Dr John Christy: "Little known to the public is the fact that most of the scientists involved with the IPCC do not agree that global warming is occurring. Its findings have been consistently misrepresented and/or politicized with each succeeding report."

Dr Rosa Compagnucci: "Humans have only contributed a few tenths of a degree to warming on Earth. Solar activity is a key driver of climate."

Dr Richard Courtney: "The empirical evidence strongly indicates that the anthropogenic global warming hypothesis is wrong."

Dr Judith Curry: "I'm not going to just spout off and endorse the IPCC because I don't have confidence in the process."

Dr Robert Davis: "Global temperatures have not been changing as state of the art climate models predicted they would. Not a single mention of satellite temperature observations appears in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers."

Dr Willem de Lange: "In 1996 the IPCC listed me as one of approximately 3000 'scientists' who agreed that there was a discernible human influence on climate. I didn't. There is no evidence to support the hypothesis that runaway catastrophic climate change is due to human activities."

Dr Chris de Freitas: "Government decision-makers should have heard by now that the basis for the long-standing claim that carbon dioxide is a major driver of global climate is being questioned; along with it the hitherto assumed need for costly measures to restrict carbon dioxide emissions. If they have not heard, it is because of the din of global warming hysteria that relies on the logical fallacy of 'argument from ignorance' and predictions of computer models."

Dr Oliver Frauenfeld: "Much more progress is necessary regarding our current understanding of climate and our abilities to model it."

Dr Peter Dietze: "Using a flawed eddy diffusion model, the IPCC has grossly underestimated the future oceanic carbon dioxide uptake."

Dr John Everett: "It is time for a reality check. The oceans and coastal zones have been far warmer and colder than is projected in the present scenarios of climate change. I have reviewed the IPCC and more recent scientific literature and believe that there is not a problem with increased acidification, even up to the unlikely levels in the most-used IPCC scenarios."

Dr Eigil Friis-Christensen: "The IPCC refused to consider the sun's effect on the Earth's climate as a topic worthy of investigation. The IPCC conceived its task only as investigating potential human causes of climate change."

Dr Lee Gerhard: "I never fully accepted or denied the anthropogenic global warming concept until the furor started after NASA's James Hansen's wild claims in the late 1980s. I went to the [scientific] literature to study the basis of the claim, starting with first principles. My studies then led me to believe that the claims were false."

Dr Indur Goklany: "Climate change is unlikely to be the world's most important environmental problem of the 21st century. There is no signal in the mortality data to indicate increases in the overall frequencies or severities of extreme weather events, despite large increases in the population at risk."

Dr Vincent Gray: "The [IPCC] climate change statement is an orchestrated litany of lies."

Dr Mike Hulme: "Claims such as '2500 of the world's leading scientists have reached a consensus that human activities are having a significant

influence on the climate' are disingenuous ... The actual number of scientists who backed that claim was only a few dozen."

Dr Kiminori Itoh: "There are many factors which cause climate change. Considering only greenhouse gases is nonsense and harmful."

Dr Yuri Izrael: "There is no proven link between human activity and global warming. I think the panic over global warming is totally unjustified. There is no serious threat to the climate."

Dr Steven Japar: "Temperature measurements show that the climate model-predicted mid-troposphere hot zone is non-existent. This is more than sufficient to invalidate global climate models and projections made with them."

Dr Georg Kaser: "This number [of receding glaciers reported by the IPCC] is not just a little bit wrong, it is far out by any order of magnitude ... It is so wrong that it is not even worth discussing."

Dr Aynsley Kellow: "I'm not holding my breath for criticism to be taken on board, which underscores a fault in the whole peer review process for the IPCC: there is no chance of a chapter [of the IPCC report] ever being rejected for publication, no matter how flawed it might be."



Dr Madhav Khandekar: "I have carefully analysed adverse impacts of climate change as projected by the IPCC and have discounted these claims as exaggerated and lacking any supporting evidence."

Dr Hans Labohm: "The alarmist passages in the IPCC Summary for Policymakers have been skewed through an elaborate and sophisticated process of spin-doctoring."

Dr Andrew Laci: "There is no scientific merit to be found in the Executive Summary. The presentation sounds like something put together by Greenpeace activists and their legal department."

Dr Chris Landsea: "I 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."

Dr Richard Lindzen: "The IPCC process is driven by politics rather than science. It uses summaries to misrepresent what scientists say and exploits public ignorance."

Dr Harry Lins: "Surface temperature changes over the past century have been episodic and modest and there has been no net global warming for over a decade now. The case for alarm regarding climate change is grossly overstated."

Dr Philip Lloyd: "I am doing a detailed assessment of the IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science. I have found examples of a summary saying precisely the opposite of what the scientists said."

Dr Martin Manning: "Some government delegates influencing the IPCC Summary for Policymakers misrepresent or contradict the lead authors."

Steven McIntyre: "The many references in the popular media to a 'consensus of thousands of scientists' are both a great exaggeration and also misleading."

Dr Patrick Michaels: "The rates of warming, on multiple time scales, have now invalidated the suite of IPCC climate models. No, the science is not settled."

Below is an enlightening list of comments made by former IPCC contributors after cutting ties with the politicized body — so scientists no longer subject to professional repercussions.

Dr Nils-Axel Morner: "If you go around the globe, you find no sea level rise anywhere."

Dr Johannes Oerlemans: "The IPCC has become too political. Many scientists have not been able to resist the siren call of fame, research funding and meetings in exotic places that awaits them if they are willing to compromise scientific principles and integrity in support of the man-made global-warming doctrine."

Dr Roger Pielke: "All of my comments were ignored without even a rebuttal. At that point, I concluded that the IPCC Reports were actually intended to be advocacy documents designed to produce particular policy actions, but not a true and honest assessment of the understanding of the climate system."

Dr Paul Reiter: "As far as the science being 'settled,' I think that is an obscenity. The fact is the science is being distorted by people who are not scientists."

Dr Murry Salby: "I have an involuntary gag reflex whenever someone says the science is settled. Anyone who thinks the science is settled on this topic is in fantasia."

Dr Tom Segalstad: "The IPCC global warming model is not supported by the scientific data."

Dr Fred Singer: "Isn't it remarkable that the Policy-makers Summary of the IPCC report avoids mentioning the satellite data altogether, or even the existence of satellites — probably because the data show a slight cooling over the last 18 years, in direct contradiction of the calculations from climate models?"

Dr Hajo Smit: "There is clear cut solar-climate coupling and a very strong natural variability of climate on all historical time scales. Currently I hardly believe anymore that there is any relevant relationship between human CO2 emissions and climate change."

Dr Richard Tol: "The IPCC attracted more people with political rather than academic motives. In AR4, green activists held key positions in the IPCC and they succeeded in excluding or neutralising opposite voices."

Dr Tom Tripp: "There is so much of a natural variability in weather it makes it difficult to come to a scientifically valid conclusion that global warming is man made."

Dr Gerd-Rainer Weber: "Most of the extremist views about climate change have little or no scientific basis."

Dr David Wojick: "The public is not well served by this constant drumbeat of alarms fed by computer models manipulated by advocates."

Dr Miklos Zagoni: "I am positively convinced that the anthropogenic global warming theory is wrong."

Dr Eduardo Zorita: "Editors, reviewers and authors of alternative studies, analysis, interpretations, even based on the same data we have at our disposal, have been bullied and subtly blackmailed."

The global warming theory is being unraveled by the same researchers formerly charged with its promotion. But with the baton continually passed to the next generation of duped university graduates—thoroughly schooled by AGW Party doctrines—the same climate yarns are forever repackaged and re-distributed to the next generation of naive citizenry.

An endless cycle of 'control by ignorance', of 'The Science says' preachings.

Regardless of said narrative, however, natural forcings continue to dominate as they were always destined to do.

The Sun is shutting down, relatively; a meridional jet stream flow is now a common phenomenon; and cloud-nucleating Cosmic Rays are influxing.

The upshot of all these forcings...?

Swings between extremes, and, ultimately, global cooling.