

Climate change caused by “dominant” Natural Causes, not Humans

By [Luis R. Miranda](#)
[The Real Agenda News](#)
April 11, 2014

BRAZIL – Back in 2008, a report titled [*Nature, Not Human Activity, Controls the Climate*](#) was published by the Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC). The report was an analysis of peer-reviewed papers and other published literature which purportedly studied climate change and how humanity contributed to the phenomenon. A total of 24 independent scientists participated in the review, which resulted in a 50 page document on the causes and consequences of climate change. This study was different because it included papers that the IPCC ignored and also because it did not start with the assumption that human activity is the main cause of climate change or global warming.

The international coalition of independent scientists hit the nail on the head on two aspects. First, point out the fact that the IPCC, a political organization, “is pre-programmed to produce reports to support the hypotheses of anthropogenic warming and the control of greenhouse gases, as envisioned in the Global Climate Treaty.” In other words, the IPCC is not a scientific organization, but a cheerleader of what the United Nations sees as the human threat to enhancing naturally occurring climate change. The IPCC does not objectively analyze data in order to reach a scientific conclusion. Instead, it cherry picks material that best supports its theory of man-made global warming.

The conclusion of the 2008 report was clear, as its title states: **Nature, Not Human Activity, Controls the Climate**. What does the NIPCC bases its conclusion on? The analysis states that although facts such as melting glaciers and disappearing Arctic sea ice are irrelevant when explaining the causes of any warming, because any kind of warming, either anthropogenic or natural would cause melting. “The hockey-stick analysis was beset with methodological errors, as has been demonstrated by McIntyre and McKittrick [2003, 2005] and confirmed by statistics expert Edward Wegman [Wegman et al. 2006],” reads the report. This statement refers to the infamous Hockey Stick Theory used by Al Gore in his disinformation piece “An Inconvenient Truth”. Instead of judging human influence on climate as the only cause of severe change, the NIPCC study shows that there have been periods of extreme warming and precede the Little Ice Age, such as the Medieval Climate Optimum, which, without any human influence, experienced much warmer temperatures than on the 20th or 21st centuries.

Another important point that NIPCC makes in its report, is the weak relation between CO2 emissions and planetary warming. “The IPCC affirms that there is a correlation of global mean temperature with increases in atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide (CO2) in the twentieth century to support its conclusion. The argument sounds plausible; after all, CO2 is a

GH gas and its levels are increasing. However, the correlation is poor and, in any case, would not prove causation,” says the document.

To explain its conclusion, the NIPCC provides the trend recorded from climate behavior back in 1940-1975. According to data from satellites, while the amount of CO₂ rose rapidly, the planet did not experience a warming trend. In fact, there hasn't been any increase in warming since about 2001, even though CO₂ emissions are continuing to rise. Besides analyzing the relation between CO₂ emissions and warming, the NIPCC also studied the role of computer models in predicting global warming. The conclusion was that such models do not give any evidence of global warming. The reason for this conclusion is that the parameters used in computer models are very limited in comparison with the total number of factors. Each computer model uses as few as 6 parameters of a total of 100 or more. Incidentally, the IPCC models always choose the ones that better justify the commonly publicized theory of anthropogenic warming, leaving out the rest. “The IPCC undervalues the forcing arising from changes in solar activity (solar wind and its magnetic effects) – likely much more important than the forcing from CO₂. Uncertainties for aerosols, which tend to cool the climate and oppose the GH effect, are even greater, as the IPCC recognizes in a table on page 32 of the AR4 report,” says the NIPCC report.

In 2009, the organization led by an international panel of nongovernment scientists and scholars published another report to rebut of the [Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) (IPCC). The 2009 rebuttal took three years to be put together before being released in June of that year. The document was coauthored and edited by [S. Fred Singer, Ph.D.](#), and [Craig Idso, Ph.D.](#) and complemented by the work of contributions and reviews by a group of scientists from around the world. The paper titled “[Climate Change Reconsidered](#)” not only described the limitations of the IPCC's attempt to forecast future climate, but also studied empirical data on past temperatures, reviewed observational data on glacier melting, sea ice area, variation in precipitation, and sea level rise, summarized the research of a growing number of scientists who say variations in solar activity, not greenhouse gases, are the true driver of climate change, investigated and debunked the widespread fears that global warming could cause more extreme weather, examined the biological effects of rising CO₂ concentrations and warmer temperatures, examined the IPCC's claim that CO₂ increases in air temperature will cause unprecedented plant and animal extinctions and challenged the IPCC's unscientific claim that CO₂-induced global warming is harmful to human health.

In their analysis, the independent scientists behind the 2009 report concluded that “global data on glaciers do not support claims made by the IPCC that most glaciers are retreating or melting.” Data for this analysis came from all over the world, including places like Africa, Antarctica, the Arctic, Europe, North America, and South America. On the issue of solar influence over climate cycles, the NIPCC paper reviewed recent and older literature which concluded that solar activity is the true driver of planetary climate. According to the literature, “cosmic ray variability was the major driver of changes in earth's surface air temperature over the past millennium... this forcing was primarily driven by variations in solar activity, modulated by the more slowly changing geomagnetic field strength of the planet, which sometimes strengthened the solar forcing and sometimes worked against it.” The report indicates that the powerful influence of solar cosmic rays leave little room for only a small impact of anthropogenic CO₂ emissions in the last two centuries.

Another important point touched by the 2009 report was the prediction of extreme weather as a result of anthropogenic activity. On this issue, the NIPCC took the propaganda bull by its horns by showing information that scientifically contradicts what climate alarmists love to use to scare the public. “When the historical record is reviewed, the data reveal there have not been any significant warming-induced increases in extreme weather events. Scientific evidence shows that increases in precipitation or increased frequency of floods, droughts or storms are consequences of anthropogenic activity, as the IPCC claims.

Later, in 2011, the NIPCC issued an updated version of its 2009 “Climate Change Reconsidered” report. Here, the NIPCC addressed more in depth the debate about whether the effects global warming -naturally occurring or not- might have a negative effect on human health and the natural environment. “We find the latest available research shows a warmer world would be a safer and healthier world for humans and wildlife alike. Climate change will continue to occur, regardless of whether human emissions contribute to the process, and some of those effects may be positive and some negative for human health and wildlife in different areas of the world. But **the net effect of continued warming and rising carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere is most likely to be beneficial to humans, plants, and wildlife.**”

The reason why the NIPCC reached this conclusion is that the more CO₂ there is available the more plants will grow, both on land and on water. According to the report, the increased volume of plant life has the ability to affect Earth’s climate in several ways, almost all of them tending to counteract the heating effects of CO₂’s thermal radiative forcing. In other words, current concentrations of CO₂ promote lush vegetation, which means more food for humans and animals, while the very same plants we would use for food would also become important reducers of the thermal effects that CO₂ may have. It sounds like a well equipped self-regulating natural mechanism, doesn’t it? Proof of this conclusion is the Medieval Warm Period, which Earth experienced 1000 years ago. During that time, there was about 28 percent less CO₂ in the atmosphere than there is currently, but the climate was warmer than today’s world. Historical records also indicate that a period of elevated surface temperatures precede periods of cold weather, as it happened before the Little Ice Age.

Since it has been demonstrated that there has been no warming since at least 2001, despite increases in CO₂ emissions, and that warm periods precede colder ones, it is no coincidence that independent observation has detected cooling since the last time the planet had any signs of getting warmer. That’s right. The Earth has gotten cooler, not warmer, since 1998. On chapter 4 of the 2011 report, the NIPCC indicates that observations on “changes in the cryosphere, oceans, precipitation, and rivers and streamflow, show less melting of ice in the Arctic, Antarctic, and on mountaintops than previously feared, no sign of acceleration of sea-level rise in recent decades, no trend over the past 50 years in changes to the Atlantic meridional overturning circulation (MOC), and no changes in precipitation patterns or river flows that could be attributed to rising CO₂ levels.”

One important aspect of the whole climate change, global warming debate that the NIPCC does not forget to take on is the economic one. According to government funded disinformation, one of the direst results of so-called man made warming will be the economic cost for third world nations. As it turns out, the IPCC also fails to produce an accurate analysis on this issue. On

chapter 10 of the 2011 report, the NIPCC draws important conclusions about how the dire economic predictions are full of errors due to the way in which official impact analyses, and recent studies concerning biofuels and the relationship between climate, war and social unrest are conducted. The NIPCC analysis finds decades-long empirical trends of improving human well-being according to measures that are climate-sensitive. Why are IPCC estimates erroneous? Because they “underestimates society’s adaptive capacity by failing to take into account the greater wealth and technological advances that will be present at the time for which impacts are to be estimated,” says the document. “Even in worst-case scenarios, mankind will be much better off in the year 2100 than it is today, and therefore able to adapt to whatever challenges climate change presents.” This is assuming that some of the worse predictions from government issued reports actually become real, of course.

The notion that global warming might cause war and social unrest is not only wrong, but even backwards – that is, global cooling has led to wars and social unrest in the past, whereas global warming has coincided with periods of peace, prosperity, and social stability.

The scientific work completed by the Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), which is supported by The Science and Environmental Policy Project ([SEPP](#)), the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change ([CO2 Science](#)), and [The Heartland Institute](#), continued uninterrupted until today with two new reports issued in 2013 and 2014. In its latest version, the NIPCC addresses topics that are often ignored by climate alarmists and fake environmentalists. Among them are the biological impacts of climate change, human welfare, energy needs and new policies derived from the climate change debate.

The newest issue of the Climate Change Reconsidered series starts with a statement that is as sharp as the science provided by the independent scientists who compose the organization. The title is “The Global Warming Crisis Is Over”. The conclusions of this last document is a stunning summary of what previous studies have confirmed for the past 6 years. On the scientific side of things, the NIPCC says:

- There is no scientific consensus on the human role in climate change.
- Future warming due to human greenhouse gases will likely be much less than IPCC forecasts.
- Carbon dioxide has not caused weather to become more extreme, polar ice and sea ice to melt, or sea level rise to accelerate. These were all false alarms.
- The likely benefits of man-made global warming exceed the likely costs.

The impacts of the previous conclusions are all but exaggerated. In fact, they affect not one, but several aspects of human development. When it comes to public policy, the tool of choice for bureaucrats who push Agenda 21 and similar recommendations coming from the United Nations itself, for example, the NIPCC says:

- Global warming is not a crisis. The threat was exaggerated.
- There is no need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and no point in attempting to do so.
- It’s time to repeal unnecessary and expensive policies.

- Future policies should aim at fostering economic growth to adapt to natural climate change.

Despite the fact that global warming is at the very least a debatable phenomenon, there are those in government and corporate-funded NGOs and environmental organizations who still believe that global warming is a crisis, that climate change and global warming are the same thing, or that humans are to blame for both of these phenomena. On this regard, the NIPCC says:

- The UN's new report walks back nearly a dozen earlier claims, contains more than a dozen errors, and tries to cover up new discoveries that contradict its earlier claims.
- The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) relies heavily on the UN's reports for its finding that carbon dioxide is a pollutant. That finding is now falsified.
- Environmental groups refuse to admit they were wrong. It was never about the science for them.

All of the NIPCC's reports on Climate Change can be accessed for free in PDF form on the Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change's website at <http://climatechangereconsidered.org/>.

The 2008 Climate Report can be accessed on PDF format [here](#).

The 2009 Climate Report can be accessed [here](#).

The 2011 Climate Report can be read [here](#).

The 2013 Climate Report can be read on PDF format [here](#).

The 2014 Climate Report can be read on PDF format [here](#).