

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312531919>

Expert Review of the 5th IPCC Climate Report, as submitted to the IPCC (Reviewer file: 721; submission date: 2012-11-30; Reviewer ID: 1249). <http://clima-virtual-vs-real.blogspot.p...>

Technical Report · November 2012

CITATIONS

0

READS

33

1 author:



Igor Khmelinskii

Universidade do Algarve

290 PUBLICATIONS 3,227 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Photophysics & photochemistry of biologically important compounds [View project](#)



Spectral fingerprints as a tool for quality assessment of fruit juices [View project](#)

Clima | Climate || Virtual vs Real

A IPCC/ONU quer convencer-nos que a Pequena Idade de Gelo - é o Aquecimento Global Antropogénico || The IPCC/UN wants to convince us that the Little Ice Age is in fact the Anthropogenic Global Warming

CO2: Things to Know	Blog	Clima para Políticos: Perguntas e Respostas	Clima para Donas de Casa: Mitos e Realidade
Criminalizar a Incompetência Política		Faz a tua pergunta!	

Thursday, November 29, 2012

My official Expert Review of the 5th IPCC Climate Report

Follows the text of my expert review, as submitted to the IPCC (Reviewer file: 721; submission date: 2012-11-30; Reviewer ID: 1249).

1. Legal Disclaimer. IPCC and/or any of its representatives/ associates/ affiliates/ divisions/ governing bodies/ subsidiaries will not use my name in the IPCC documents and publications, unless they make the entire text of the dissenting minority opinions expressed in my review available to general public, the text of this Disclaimer included. In no case will they mention me as a person who had endorsed or otherwise approved the presently reviewed Draft, unless fraudulent content is removed in the final version of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report.
2. This and the following Paragraphs, up to and including Paragraph 8, refer to the entire Chapter 9. Chapter 9 is the key part of the entire Report, as it is supposed to discuss the climate models, which allegedly provide (the only existing) material evidence that the warming observed in the second half of the 20th century is caused by greenhouse gases generated by humanity, which I will henceforth refer to as the "Anthropogenic Global Warming" (AGW) hypothesis. In fact, apart from models, there is no other way to establish cause-and-effect relation between greenhouse gases (most importantly, carbon dioxide) and climate, as we are unable to perform well-controlled experiments on our climate system. Interpretation of historic climate data does not provide any alternative demonstration of such relation, as any such interpretation is based on the same (wrong, as I shall demonstrate) climate models, and thus amounts to circular reasoning.
3. The Scientific Method had been defined, for example, by Richard Feynman (Feynman, Richard (1965), The Character of Physical Law, Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, ISBN 0-262-56003-8.; p. 156) as follows: "In general we look for a new law by the following process. First we guess it. Then we compute the consequences of the guess to see what would be implied if this law that we guessed is right. Then we compare the result of the computation to nature, with experiment or experience; compare it directly with observation, to see if it works. If it disagrees with experiment it is wrong." As a consequence of this definition, a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis, whereas no amount of corroborating evidence may prove or confirm a hypothesis - by stating otherwise one would commit a logical fallacy called "affirming the consequent/denying the antecedent" (see <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fallacy>). The logical fallacy of this Chapter is in making the (implicit and ever present in the Report) statement that it is the anthropogenically produced carbon dioxide that is causing the global warming, based on the knowledge that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases affect climate to some extent. In other words, they accept the AGW hypothesis as final truth, without even trying to use the Scientific Method and test the hypothesis. By doing that, this key Chapter and the entire Report assume a non-scientific dogmatic approach, as all of the previous Reports uniformly do, which necessarily and inevitably produces non-scientific (and, as I shall demonstrate, fraudulent) conclusions.
4. In effect, Chapter 9 failed to address two key questions, which must be addressed before one tries using the models for understanding present and future climate: (1) Do the models represent the physics of our terrestrial climate system correctly? (with the emphasis on "correctly") (2) Have the predictions made by these same (or slightly modified) models five, ten or fifteen years ago become true? These should be the questions to ask before one tries making any climate predictions and/or policy recommendations based on the models. I shall address these questions in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7, and 8, respectively.
5. I will discuss only two of the publications that allow us to reject the AGW hypothesis, although, according to Paragraph 3, a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. The first one is the paper by Lindzen and Choi ("On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data", R. Lindzen, Y.-S. Choi, Geophys. Res. Lett. 36, 2009, pp. L16705. doi:10.1029/2009GL039628.). These authors demonstrate in their Fig. 2 and in the rest of the paper that the IPCC climate models distort the essential physics of the terrestrial climate system. Indeed, all of the climate models produce a reduction in the outgoing infra-red radiation upon an increase in surface temperature on Earth, whereas the experimental results, extracted from satellite data, evidence an increase in the outgoing infra-red radiation, in the same conditions. Therefore, our terrestrial climate system behaves as if it were in a stable state of equilibrium: indeed, its behaviour corresponds to the Le Chatelier's principle (the

Faith: Pat Condell

[Pat Condell channel](#)

[Why should we respect faith?](#)

Truth on Climate Change

[The Biofuels Disaster - report by the GWPF](#)

[CO2 Science](#)

[The Climate Dossier](#)

[Science refuting the AGW hypothesis](#)

[Climate Change Reconsidered](#)

[Committe for a Constructive Tomorrow](#)

[The Global Warming Policy Foundation](#)

Assinar

[Posts](#) ▾

[Comments](#) ▾

Follow by Email

Blog Archive

- ▶ [2014](#) (1)
- ▶ [2013](#) (2)
- ▼ [2012](#) (10)
 - ▼ [November](#) (2)
 - [My official Expert Review of the 5th IPCC Climate ...](#)
 - [A despendiosa Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia...](#)
 - ▶ [October](#) (3)
 - ▶ [September](#) (2)
 - ▶ [July](#) (1)
 - ▶ [June](#) (1)
 - ▶ [January](#) (1)

system always reacts to any change in such a way that the externally imposed change is partially compensated; see, for example, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Le_Chatelier%27s_principle), whereas the climate models behave like an unstable system, amplifying all and every temperature change. We therefore see that the models that reproduce the conditions and conclusions of the AGW hypothesis do so at the cost of distorting essential physics of the terrestrial climate system. Therefore, the AGW hypothesis is wrong, as it has not been reproduced in models describing the climate physics correctly. Moreover, the AGW hypothesis can not be reproduced in models describing climate physics correctly, as it is impossible to attribute the warming of the 20th century to carbon dioxide based on correct models. The important conclusion that necessarily and inevitably follows from this paper is that the AGW hypothesis is wrong, as it is only viable in the virtual reality of the IPCC climate models, fundamentally different from the physical reality of the terrestrial climate system.

6. The second publication I will discuss is the one by Khmelinskii and Stallinga ("Climate Change in the XX1st Century: Mechanisms and Predictions", I. Khmelinskii and P. Stallinga, in Proceedings of the 6th IASME / WSEAS International Conference on ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT (EE '11), Cambridge, UK, February 20-25, 2011, eds. Z. Bojkovic et al., RECENT RESEARCHES in ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT, WSEAS Press, 2011, ISSN: 1792-8230; ISBN: 978-960-474-274-5, pp. 26-31. Available: <http://www.wseas.us/e-library/conferences/2011/Cambridge/EE/EE-02.pdf>). These authors in their Fig. 1 and in the text of the paper analyze the recent history of the global average Sea Surface Temperature (SST) and compare it to the recent history of atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations, in an attempt to find the signature of the AGW in the SST data. In fact, they could find no such signature, due to the fact that human carbon dioxide emissions started growing exponentially in the second half of the 20th century, whereas SST had two (virtually identical) growth periods, one of which in the first half of the 20th century, when little or no excess carbon dioxide had been liberated into the atmosphere by humanity. These authors therefore conclude that the AGW hypothesis has to be rejected, based on the recent SST history. Note that SST is a better indicator of the climate evolution than the global average temperature, being unaffected by interfering factors such as the Urban Heat Island effect. The latter distorts climate data gathered on the continents, with additional uncertainty introduced by the corrections made to compensate for it.
7. In Paragraphs 5 and 6 I discussed two papers, each of the two providing sufficient grounds to reject the AGW hypothesis. I shall not discuss any further evidence against the AGW hypothesis, considering it rejected, according to Feynman's definition presented in Paragraph 3. Additionally, I conclude that the IPCC climate models are wrong, as they obviously distort the essential climate physics, and therefore any and all of their results and conclusions should be expressly and unconditionally rejected and disregarded in their entirety.
8. It is well known that there has been no global warming for the last 15 years, contrary to the IPCC predictions produced by IPCC climate models for the same period of time. Moreover, we have reasons to believe (see, for example, H. Abdussamatov, 2008, The Sun defines the Climate, http://www.gao.spb.ru/english/astrometr/abduss_nkj_2009.pdf) that instead of the "global warming" we are in for a new Little Ice Age, already in progress, which will be similar to the Maunder minimum of solar activity as regards temperatures and other climate-related consequences. Therefore, the IPCC models have not (because they distort climate physics) and will not (for the same reason, and also because they neglect solar change) predict future climate, and thus should be rejected and disregarded, as I have obtained negative answers for the two key questions of Paragraph 4.
9. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 2. Chapter 2 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Atmosphere and Surface". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is frequently done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.
10. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 3. Chapter 3 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Ocean". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as

► 2011 (13)

► 2010 (10)

Palavras-chave

agricultura alterações climáticas
ansiedade alterações climáticas
anthropogenic global warming
aparelho central do estado
aquecimento global
antropogénico AR5 report
aspartame health risks assassinio bancos
internacionais biocombustíveis biodiesel
bioetanol bioethanol cansaço visual carbon
credits carbon dioxide carbon emissions
mentorship classe política climate change
climate fraud climate treaty Combustíveis
Fósseis combustíveis verdes Comunidade
Europeia court créditos de carbono
crise de dívida pública death dinheiro virtual
dióxido de carbono dívida pública dívida
soberana dores de cabeça durban emissões
Energia Eólica Energias Renováveis
energias verdes entrevista Eolic Energy estado
da nação Europa fossil fuels fraude genocídio
verde Gore green green fuels Green
Genocide greenhouse gases Impostos
incompetente IPCC IPCC climate fraud
lâmpadas de LED lâmpadas economizadoras
mercúrio metálico methanol poisoning monarquia
morte NY Times ocean acidification Olivier de
Schutter Orçamento do Estado Pachauri
photosynthesis Portugal pseudo-science
redução de despesa pública Renewable
Energy renewable energy sources república
responsabilizar criminalmente science
scientific method soberania tratado climático
tribunal verde

Procurar neste blog

About Me



Igor Khmelinskii

Faro, Algarve, Portugal

Olha a sua volta! | Look around! | Посмотри вокруг!

30 октября - день памяти жертв политических репрессий

[View my complete profile](#)

Networked blogs



scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is frequently done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.

11. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 4. Chapter 4 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Cryosphere". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is frequently done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.
12. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 5. Chapter 5 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Paleoclimate Archives". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in our my 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is frequently done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.
13. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 6. Chapter 6 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is frequently done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.
14. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 7. Chapter 7 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Clouds and Aerosols". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is frequently done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.

Followers (2)



The Importance of Being Sceptical

Are you indoctrinated?

Pat Condell on the European Union

Pat Condell: Why does faith deserve respect? This certainly applies to IPCC climate faith as well.


George Carlin: Saving the Planet | 8 minutes

Noreena Hertz: How to use experts -- and when not to | 18 minutes

The Colbert Report: Ban de Soleil | 6 minutes


Henrik Svensmark - videos on the Anthropogenic Global Warming Fraud

Where is the climate going: Solar activity prediction



Over 30 years ago, the current solar cycle had been predicted to be much weaker than the previous (**Theodor Landscheidt**), and it is going to be weak. The next solar cycle will be still weaker. Our Sun is cooling down - we are on our way to a Grand Solar Minimum.

Sea levels: are they still growing? Really?



Please see the plot with "seasonal signals retained on their page - they have no permanent link to that plot. We expect the sea level to start dropping by 2020 (as of 2012/10/12).

Publicações relevantes

SCIENTIFIC NEWS - WSEAS

Everything you've heard about fossil fuels may be wrong

Black list: promoters of the anthropogenic global warming

15. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 8. Chapter 8 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Anthropogenic and Natural Radiative Forcing". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is frequently done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.
16. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 10. Chapter 10 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Detection and Attribution of Climate Change: from Global to Regional". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, the data interpretation in the publications is exclusively done based on the same climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitutes a fraud.
17. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 11. Chapter 11 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Near-term Climate Change: Projections and Predictability". These projections and predictions are based exclusively on the same IPCC climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitute a fraud.
18. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 12. Chapter 12 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Long-term Climate Change: Projections, Commitments and Irreversibility". The projections, predictions and scenarios discussed here are based exclusively on the same IPCC climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitute a fraud.
19. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 13. Chapter 13 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Sea Level Change". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis, known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, data interpretation and projections, predictions and scenarios are based exclusively on the same IPCC climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitute a fraud.
20. This paragraph refers to the entire Chapter 14. Chapter 14 reviews some of the published information on the topic "Climate Phenomena and their Relevance for Future Regional Climate Change". However, the motivation for the reviewed research effort and the logic behind it is more often fraudulent than not, as the respective research frequently follows the pseudo-scientific reasoning that "more corroborating evidence produces a stronger case for the AGW hypothesis". In fact, nothing can be further from the truth, as shown in my Paragraph 3. Indeed, no amount of corroborating evidence can prove a hypothesis, while a single piece of contradictory evidence is sufficient to reject a hypothesis. In effect, the only (dubiously) useful result of this research effort is the "general progress of science", resulting from wasteful usage of public money on climate studies, where no real problem requiring study may be found. Even the PhD degrees earned as a result of such research are of dubious (in the very least) value, as we are producing more pseudo-scientists certified as scientists, in addition to the already existing pseudo-scientists. Research based on the AGW hypothesis,

fraud, carbon taxes and green genocide

[IUPAC and Sociedade Portuguesa de Química](#)

[Naturlink and World Bank](#)

[Caixa Geral de Depósitos - "O Planeta Agradece"](#)

[NY Times environmental blog](#)

[University: The MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change](#)

["Transition Network" - uma organização internacional](#)

[Promitheas - an international academic organization](#)

[EDP renováveis - sendo certo que os custos de renováveis são quase 3 vezes superiores, o negócio apenas pode ser viabilizado pelos subsídios](#)

[Estado Portugues - procure a frase "Fundo Portugues de Carbono", que custa 70 milhões, e ainda subsídios ao biodiesel, que custam 100 milhões.](#)

[Euractiv - one more chlorofill campaigner](#)

[Sair da Casca](#)

[APPB ASSOCIAÇÃO PORTUGUESA DE PRODUTORES DE BIOCOMBUSTÍVEIS](#)

[NÚCLEO DE AMBIENTE DA UNIVERSIDADE DO ALGARVE](#)

[Carbono zero](#)

Independence for Europe

ORCID ID

[My ORCID ID](#)

Scopus Author ID

[Scopus Author ID](#)

ResearcherID

[R - My researcher profile.](#)

PubFacts

[My profile - health-related](#)

Google Scholar

[My Citations](#)

eLibrary.ru

[My publications](#)

Research Gate

[My Profile](#)

map of science RU

[My profile](#)

Mendeley

[My profile](#)

Visitors, total:

25839
[View My Stats](#)

known to be wrong, may provide no valid scientific results, as its conclusions are already known before the research even began - these conclusions being "AGW is happening, and we are to blame for it". Additionally, data interpretation and projections, predictions and scenarios are based exclusively on the same IPCC climate models, which are demonstrably wrong (as shown in my Paragraphs 2 to 8), and therefore constitute a fraud.

21. This paragraph refers to the entire "Summary for the policy makers". As detailed above, the Report is built from fraudulent pseudo-scientific constructs based on the AGW dogma, containing no science. Therefore, any conclusions and recommendations presented in this chapter have no scientific backing, and should be expressly ignored. The corrected Summary for policy makers should thus read "There is nothing wrong with our climate. We have no climate problem, and need no solutions for this climate problem. All of the currently implemented solutions to the alleged climate problem should be revoked, effective immediately. We are sorry for defrauding the general public in the previous Reports we have produced so far."
22. This paragraph refers to the entire Report. As amply demonstrated above, the current draft Report is a fraudulent pseudo-scientific construct based on the AGW dogma, adopted uncritically and never questioned. Its climate projections and predictions have no scientific backing and can't be used as a justification for any type of public policies. Similarly, all of the public policies implemented as the result of previous Reports have no scientific backing and should be immediately and entirely revoked and discontinued.
23. This paragraph refers to the entire Report. The body of the research that the Report pseudo-scientifically presents as "proof" of the AGW hypothesis is constituted by the primary and direct fraud of the IPCC climate models and general research approach, and by the secondary and indirect fraud of the most of the remaining research that uses these models in the interpretation of climate data, for climate predictions, and in discussing development scenarios for the humanity and for the natural systems. The only research that may be valid as regards to facts (but never as regards their interpretation, because the interpretation is based on fundamentally wrong models) is the research studying current consequences of the climate change. However, this research is non-scientific in its motivation, aiming to provide "proof" for the AGW hypothesis by presenting corroborating evidence (which is a logically impossible task - see Paragraph 3), and largely irrelevant. That because no action humanity might feasibly take could revert the natural phenomena that we are not the cause of in the first place. The Report and the body of research it reviews are therefore a waste of public funds and a scientific fraud.
24. This paragraph refers to the entire report, containing final notes for the reader who is not well-versed in the philosophy of science, and should be read in conjunction with all of the previous paragraphs of my Review. Note that I did not need to read the entire draft Report, nor enter into details of each Chapter, in order to understand whether or not the Report is scientifically valid. This is because I am able to produce the judgement of the fraudulent character of this and other previous Climate Reports based on their failure to implement the Scientific Method and question the AGW hypothesis. The AGW hypothesis is commonly implemented in the form of one or more climate models that are being used to interpret current and past experimental results and make predictions about future climate. In order to attribute the recent global warming to greenhouse gas emissions, and thus to human activities, these models have been specifically tuned, by introducing positive climate feedbacks. The draft Report discusses climate models in its Chapter 9, therefore Chapter 9 would be the logical place to implement the Scientific Method and question the validity of the climate models and thus the validity of the AGW hypothesis. Reading through Chapter 9 and its list of references, I find that no such questioning had been done, and no papers that question the validity of climate models have been discussed. By failing to implement the Scientific Method, the authors of Chapter 9 have confirmed their status of pseudo-scientists, having transformed their Chapter into an exercise in dogmatic propaganda. Its fraudulent character is evident from the ease with which these authors could have rejected the AGW hypothesis, same as I had in the present Review. Thus, based on the fraudulent science of Chapter 9, the entire Climate Report loses any connection to the objective reality, becoming a pseudo-scientific construct based on the AGW dogma. Indeed, there may be no Science if one chooses to ignore the Scientific Method, as the Report authors do. Without the Scientific Method, they are limited to the pseudo-scientific and logically faulty search of evidence that "confirms" their AGW hypothesis, stalling the scientific progress and insulting the general public in their expectations of obtaining scientifically valid climate predictions, instead of the climate fraud that over the years of its existence has been, and now once more is being, produced by the IPCC.

Posted by [Igor Khmelinskii](#) at 5:40 AM

 Recommend this on Google

Labels: [anthropogenic global warming](#), [IPCC climate fraud](#)

No comments:

[Post a Comment](#)

Authenticus

[My profile](#)

Kudos

[My profile](#)

Copyright



 **Blogger**

Total Pageviews



59,233

Memorial



[Blogs citing this blog](#)

Enter your comment...

Comment as: Select profile... ▼

PublishPreview

[Newer Post](#) [Home](#) [Older Post](#)

Subscribe to: [Post Comments \(Atom\)](#)

Abaixo o Acordo Ortográfico, Viva a Bela Língua Portuguesa!

Google+ Badge

Igor Khmelinskii

 Follow

© Igor Khmelinskii 2010-2012. Awesome Inc. template. Powered by [Blogger](#).