

**The Week That Was (December 19, 2009)
Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)**

\$

SEASONS GREETINGS

SEPP Needs Your Support! Donations are fully tax-deductible

SEPP relies on private donors only, does not solicit support from industry or government!

SEPP does not employ fundraisers, mass mailings, or costly advertisements!

SEPP has a modest budget, no employees, pays no salaries, relies on volunteers!

SEPP scientists donate their time pro bono and assign book royalties and speaking fees to SEPP!

Please make checks to SEPP; mail to 1600 S Eads St., # 712-S, Arlington, VA 22202

SEASONS GREETINGS

\$

Quote of the Week

Innocence about Science is the worst crime today. *Sir Charles Percy Snow (1905-80)*

THIS WEEK:

The dominate issues of the week were the UN Conference of Parties (COP-15) in Copenhagen and the continued revelations of Climategate – the release of emails from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia and subsequent developments.

The weather and the atmosphere in Copenhagen turned ugly this week. The weather became cold, snowy, and miserable. As all too usual, some protesters turned violent. But the official reaction was unforgivable. Fully credentialed, respectable, well behaved skeptics such as Australian Senator Fielding and Lord Monckton were denied access to events and the Danish Police knocked Lord Monckton out.

As predicted in the September 19 and October 3 issues of TWTW, the conference was declared a success and a triumph of international diplomacy but accomplished little except agreement to continue with expensive, meaningless meetings and a promise from these world leaders they will not allow the world's future temperatures to rise more than 2 degrees C.

Showmanship was the order of the day. European officials pledged that western governments will establish a fund for developing nations up to \$5 Billion per year. The developing nations demanded \$10 billion. Demonstrating less than keen negotiating skills, President Obama's administration raised the ante to \$100 billion. Few taxpayers of western countries will be delighted with the generosity their leaders demonstrate at their expense. Fortunately, to the frustration of many of the participants, no binding agreements were signed.

Before any lasting damage could be concluded, Mother Nature showed her humor. She forced President Obama to leave early. On this autumn weekend, the Washington, DC area is experiencing blizzard conditions with the heaviest December snowfall ever recorded and what may become one of the ten heaviest snowfalls ever. The records date back at least as far as 1880.

Climategate has entered a new phase. As you may recall, a number of researchers have questioned the tree ring studies used to support reported increases in surface temperature for the late 20th Century. For example, at the October 2009 annual meeting of the Geological Society of America, Don Easterbrook presented graphs demonstrating how tree ring data from Russia showing a cooling after 1961 were truncated and artfully disguised in IPCC publications. Several weeks later, emails from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia appeared from a computer server in Siberia. Although the person who posted these emails is yet to be identified, the emails are apparently correct. These emails indicate that the method for disguising truncated data was planned. The emails also indicate that trees showing warming were selected for use in temperature data and a far greater number of trees showing no warming were eliminated.

The new phase started on Tuesday. The Russian Institute of Economic Analysis (IEA) reported that the Hadley Center for Climate Change of the British Meteorological Office had probably tampered with Russian climate data and that the Russian meteorological station data do not support human caused global warming. The plot thickens, but the US press generally ignores these developments.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #30-2009 (Dec 19, 2009)

By S. Fred Singer, President of SEPP

[Note: This will be the first of a series of mini-editorials on the "junk science" influencing the global warming issue. Other topics will include the IPCC's Assessment Reports 2, 3, and 4, the UN Environmental Program and some individuals heavily involved in these matters.]

Junk Science #1: IPCC's First Assessment Report

In 1988, two UN agencies, the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) and the UN World Meteorological Organization (WMO), set up a climate science panel, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Its Charter directs the IPCC to assess worldwide scientific, technical and socio-economic literature "relevant to the understanding of the risk of human-induced climate change."

And indeed, the IPCC has steadfastly pursued this goal and has given a short shrift to any possible natural influences on climate. (This despite the fact that the historic record shows unending changes in climate, both warming and cooling, on time scales ranges from years to eons.) It would be strange indeed to think that such natural changes stopped with the onset of the Industrial Revolution, but this logical point seems to have been ignored by the IPCC and many others.

The IPCC charter also states that IPCC will assess the science on a "comprehensive, objective, open and transparent" basis. Unfortunately, none of these aims have been realized – as was brought home by the recent revelations contained in the e-mails of ClimateGate.

The first IPCC science assessment, FAR or AR-1, was published in 1990 and formed the science basis for the Rio Climate Summit of 1992 that led to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC or 'Global Climate Treaty'), which in turn forms the basis for the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, the COP (Conference of the Parties – to Kyoto), and all national and international efforts to control the emission of greenhouse gases.

The Summary for Policymakers (SPM) of IPCC-FAR concluded that observations and Greenhouse (GH) models (all of which show a steady increase of global temperature as the level of GH gases rises) are "broadly consistent." They ignore not only the lengthy period of cooling (from 1940 to 1975) but also the existence of weather satellites, which, at that time, had shown no warming since 1979 (when data from MSU – microwave sounding units -- became available) -- or even a slight cooling. No wonder that IPCC denied the existence of such 'inconvenient truth.'

To correct such biases and deficiencies, we set up the NIPCC (Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change) to examine the same peer-reviewed science literature as the IPCC, but including also papers ignored by the IPCC. Our conclusion is given by the title of the NIPCC summary report of 2008: "Nature, not human activity, rules the climate."

ARTICLES: [For the numbered articles below please see the attached pdf.]

1. Comments by Lee C. Gerhard, IPCC reviewer, Dec. 16, 2009

These important comments should be kept in mind when reading articles about climate issues. [Note: these comments are now posted on the ICECAP web site: <http://www.icecap.us/>]

2. The Copenhagen (CHP) Debacle – An (almost) eye-witness account

By S. Fred Singer, Dec 19. *SFS spent the first week of COP-15 in CHP and avoided the protests, the violence, and the weather of the second week.*

3. Climate Summit Ends With Deal

By Alessandro Torello and Stephen Power, Wall Street Journal, Dec 19
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126112727324796837.html?mod=djemalertNEWS>

4. Copenhagen: Climate Alarmism meets its Waterloo

By Roger Helmer, Member of the European Parliament (UK- East Midlands - Conservative), Dec 19
To be posted on his blog: <http://www.rogerhelmer.com/>

5. Copenhagen's Lesson in Limits: And we don't mean carbon limits

Wall Street Journal, Dec 19
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703523504574604130737360364.html?mod=djemEditorialPage>

6. Obama praises a climate flop: Copenhagen talks end with dud of a deal

By Charles Hurt, The New York Post, Dec 19 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]
http://www.nypost.com/p/news/international/obama_praises_NuPTfoiIjqtEu92UmDiwaP#ixzz0a8ZXcS9G

7. Russia affected by Climategate

Comments in Russian Newspapers
RIANOVOSTI, Dec 16, <http://en.rian.ru/papers/20091216/157260660.html>

8. To Denmark, From Russia, With Lies

Investors Business Daily, Dec 18

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=515789>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

For the actions by the Danish police against peaceful skeptics please see: “Is the European police state going global?” By The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley in Copenhagen, SPPI Blog, Dec 17
<http://sppiblog.org/news/is-the-european-police-state-going-global>

For diverse comments on the Copenhagen Accord please see: “Instant View – Reaction to Copenhagen climate deal” Forbes.com, Dec 18,
http://www.forbes.com/feeds/reuters/2009/12/18/2009-12-18T233720Z_01_LDE5BH27K_RTRIDST_0_CLIMATE-COPENHAGEN-INSTANT-VIEW_print.html

For Lord Monckton’s comments on the Copenhagen Accord please see: “Parturient montes: nascetur ridiculus mus” on the SPPI Blog, Dec 19, <http://sppiblog.org/news/parturient-montes-nascetur-ridiculus-mus#more-314>

For other comments on the continuation of the COP process please see: “Climategate: we won the battle, but at Copenhagen we just lost the war,” By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, Dec 18
<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100020288/climategate-we-won-the-battle-but-at-copenhagen-we-just-lost-the-war/>

For comments on Climategate from Patrick Michaels please see: “How to Manufacture a Climate Consensus: The East Anglia emails are just the tip of the iceberg. I should know.”
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704398304574598230426037244.html?mod=djemEditorialPage>

For comments by Jo Nova on the article “DenierGate” in “New Science” defending the perpetrators of Climategate data manipulation please see:
<http://joannenova.com.au/2009/12/new-scientist-becomes-non-scientist/>

For a recent piece defending the IPCC in the Scientific American please see: “Seven Answers to Climate Contrarian Nonsense: Evidence for human interference with Earth’s climate continues to accumulate” by John Rennie, Nov 30, [SEPP NOTE: this is probably best read after reading the comments by Lee Gerhard] <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=seven-answers-to-climate-contrarian-nonsense&page=1>

For a piece by Michael Mann defending his actions please see: “E-mail furor doesn’t alter evidence for climate change,” The Washington Post, Dec. 18 [SEPP NOTE: this is probably best read after reading the comments by Lee Gerhard, or the Dec 18 comments in the IBD]
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/12/17/AR2009121703682.html>

For a press release on Roy Spencer’s Dec 16 invited talk to the American Geophysical Union on the “Chicken and Egg Question” – which comes first clear skies or warming please see the Dec 13 entry on his web site: www.drroyspencer.com.

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

CFACT, a group of climate realists, pulled a Greenpeace trick on Greenpeace. Please see: “CFACT drops the banner on Greenpeace ships in daring land and sea raids. Activists tag Greenpeace Rainbow Warrior with ‘Propaganda Warrior’ banner; Artic Sunrise hit with ‘Ship of Lies’ banner earlier in the day.” With photos, Dec 16. <http://cfact.org/a/1674/CFACT-drops-the-banner-on-Greenpeace-ships-in-daring-land-and-sea-raids>

For cutting edge research on possible effects of climate change on stink bugs please see: “Indirect effects of temperature on stink bug fitness via maintenance of gut-associated symbionts,” [H/t SFS] <http://aem.asm.org/cgi/content/abstract/AEM.02034-09v1?ct>

We conclude this TWTW with part of a statement on the Copenhagen Conference by Mr. Viv Forbes, Chairman, Carbon Sense Coalition, Australia:

“The Global Warming Industry will also be there, creating scares, drowning polar bears, melting ice, generating publicity, demanding handouts, seeking exemptions, defending paper credits, and pushing for subsidies and special deals.

“And of course we will have battalions of largely gullible and fawning media, many also from government media monoliths touring on the tab of the tax payers.

“We are told that Australian tax payers have sent 114 official delegates there, all concerned to reduce our consumption of carbon fuels.

“If they are fair dinkum, they should all lead by example, use Green Energy, and walk home.”

#####

1. Comments by Lee C. Gerhard, Geologist, IPCC reviewer, December 16, 2009

These important comments should be kept in mind when reading articles about climate issues.

[Note: these comments are now posted on the ICECAP web site: <http://www.icecap.us/>]

It is crucial that scientists are factually accurate when they do speak out, that they ignore media hype and maintain a clinical detachment from social or other agendas. There are facts and data that are ignored in the maelstrom of social and economic agendas swirling about Copenhagen.

Greenhouse gases and their effects are well-known. Here are some of things we know:

- The most effective greenhouse gas is water vapor, comprising approximately 95 percent of the total greenhouse effect.
- Carbon dioxide concentration has been continually rising for nearly 100 years. It continues to rise, but carbon dioxide concentrations at present are near the lowest in geologic history.
- Temperature change correlation with carbon dioxide levels is not statistically significant.
- There are no data that definitively relate carbon dioxide levels to temperature changes.
- The greenhouse effect of carbon dioxide logarithmically declines with increasing concentration. At present levels, any additional carbon dioxide can have very little effect.

We also know a lot about Earth temperature changes:

- Global temperature changes naturally all of the time, in both directions and at many scales of intensity.
- The warmest year in the U.S. in the last century was 1934, not 1998. The U.S. has the best and most extensive temperature records in the world.
- Global temperature peaked in 1998 on the current 60-80 year cycle, and has been episodically declining ever since. This cooling absolutely falsifies claims that human carbon dioxide emissions are a controlling factor in Earth temperature.
- Voluminous historic records demonstrate the Medieval Climate Optimum (MCO) was real and that the “hockey stick” graphic that attempted to deny that fact was at best bad science. The MCO was considerably warmer than the end of the 20th century.
- During the last 100 years, temperature has both risen and fallen, including the present cooling. All the changes in temperature of the last 100 years are in normal historic ranges, both in absolute value and, most importantly, rate of change.

Contrary to many public statements:

- Effects of temperature change are absolutely independent of the cause of the temperature change.
- Global hurricane, cyclonic and major storm activity is near 30-year lows. Any increase in cost of damages by storms is a product of increasing population density in vulnerable areas such as along the shores and property value inflation, not due to any increase in frequency or severity of storms.
- Polar bears have survived and thrived over periods of extreme cold and extreme warmth over hundreds of thousands of years extremes far in excess of modern temperature changes.
- The 2009 minimum Arctic ice extent was significantly larger than the previous two years. The 2009 Antarctic maximum ice extent was significantly above the 30-year average. There are only 30 years of records.
- Rate and magnitude of sea level changes observed during the last 100 years are within normal historical ranges. Current sea level rise is tiny and, at most, justifies a prediction of perhaps ten centimeters rise in this century.

The present climate debate is a classic conflict between data and computer programs. The computer programs are the source of concern over climate change and global warming, not the data. Data are measurements. Computer programs are artificial constructs.

Public announcements use a great deal of hyperbole and inflammatory language. For instance, the word “ever” is misused by media and in public pronouncements alike. It does not mean “in the last 20 years,” or “the last 70 years.” “Ever” means the last 4.5 billion years.

For example, some argue that the Arctic is melting, with the warmest-ever temperatures. One should ask, “How long is ever?” The answer is since 1979. And then ask, “Is it still warming?” The answer is unequivocally “No.” Earth temperatures are cooling. Similarly, the word “unprecedented” cannot be legitimately used to describe any climate change in the last 8,000 years.

2. The Copenhagen (CHP) Debacle – An (almost) eye-witness account.

By S. Fred Singer, Dec 19. SFS spent the first week of COP-15 in CHP and avoided the protests, the violence, and the weather of the second week.

President Obama called it “an unprecedented breakthrough” but CPH failed to achieve its hoped-for goal: an extension of the Kyoto Protocol (which expires in 2012) to cover all nations, with tough mandated emission targets for all greenhouse (GH) gases, and especially for CO₂. He noted that the agreement was merely a political statement and not a legally binding treaty and might not need ratification by the entire conference. Indeed, the Conference of the Parties (COP) merely agreed to “take note” of the final document, named the Copenhagen Accord

The Accord commits neither industrialized nor developing nations to firm targets for midterm or long-term GH gas emissions reductions. The Accord is nonetheless significant in that it codifies the commitments of individual nations to act on their own. Europe may undertake such commitments; the matter is in doubt for the US; China, India, Brazil are unlikely to do so.

According to the NYT, the Accord provides a system for monitoring and reporting progress toward those national pollution-reduction goals, a compromise on an issue over which China bargained hard. It also calls for hundreds of billions of dollars to flow from wealthy nations to those countries alleged to be most vulnerable to a changing climate. And it sets a goal of limiting the global temperature rise to 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels by 2050 (what hubris!). If one were to believe the climate science of the IPCC, this implies deep cuts in emissions over the next four decades.

The Accord leaves the implementation of its provisions uncertain. It is likely to undergo many months, perhaps years, of additional negotiations before it emerges in any internationally enforceable form – if ever. The 192 delegations and their backups and hangers-on have simply assured themselves of lifetime cushy jobs, interesting travel with stays at expensive hotels, and generous pensions – all at taxpayers’ expense. Guess which country pays most of this multi-billion-dollar bill?

Opponents said the Accord, which holds out the prospect of \$100 billion in annual aid for developing nations, was too weak. An acrimonious final session hit a low point when a Sudanese delegate said the plan in Africa would be like the Holocaust by causing more deadly floods, droughts, mudslides, sandstorms and rising seas. “The developed countries have decided that damage to developing countries is acceptable,” he told reporters, saying that the 2-degree target would “result in massive devastation to Africa and small island states.” He and many other representatives of the most vulnerable countries wanted a target of 1.5 degrees. The document “is a solution based on the same very values, in our opinion, that channeled six million people in Europe into furnaces,” said Sudan's Lumumba Stanislaus Dia-ping. “The reference to the Holocaust is, in this context, absolutely despicable,” said Anders Turesson, chief negotiator of Sweden.

It is highly unlikely that Congress will cover the financial promises of President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. The US public is already skeptical about human-caused global-warming disasters. The climate has not warmed for more than a decade. The natural rise in sea levels has not accelerated. There is no great feeling of “climate guilt.” Since increased CO₂ levels benefit agriculture around the globe, maybe money is owed to industrialized nations. Perhaps we should all thank China for putting more CO₂ into the atmosphere.

Yet the idea seems to persist that “climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time” – all based on the IPCC science that is being undermined by recent revelations from the e-mails of ClimateGate. The investigations now being started will likely confirm the “axis of evil,” stretching from East Anglia University to Penn State, and extending to the NSF-supported National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) in Boulder and DOE's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). This axis has

produced a perversion of the climate science on which the US government has lavished some \$20 billion in the past decade; it could lead to wasteful multi-trillion expenditures that accomplish absolutely nothing.

Of course, those of us involved in NIPCC (Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change) or familiar with its Summary Report (“Nature, not human activity, rules the climate”) are not surprised. Climate “realists” have long suspected the frauds being uncovered in ClimateGate and had already discounted the conclusions of the IPCC.

The main problem now may be to overcome the vested interests that profit from climate scares: The bankers and brokers who plan to make billions from “cap and trade,” the ‘alternative energy’ crowd that depends on fat government subsidies, the bureaucrats angling for more power and prestige. And then there are those whose objectives are ideological: World governance, income redistribution, collectivism and opposition to free enterprise.

It is interesting to contemplate that the real cause of the debacle of Copenhagen was the extremism of environmental NGOs who pitted developing nations against industrialized nations – simply because the zealots hate industry, capitalism, and economic growth – the only realistic cures to global poverty. Maybe we should thank these NGOs for what they accomplished: The failure of CPH may some day be remembered as the turning point in history that saved the world from economic ruin and loss of freedom.

3. Climate Summit Ends With Deal

By Alessandro Torello and Stephen Power, Wall Street Journal, Dec 19
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126112727324796837.html?mod=djemalertNEWS>

The White House said Friday that U.S. President Barack Obama, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and South African President Jacob Zuma reached a "meaningful agreement" for combating climate change. The deal was described by an administration official as "not sufficient to combat the threat of climate change but it's an important first step."

The White House official said developed and developing countries have agreed to listing their national actions and commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There will be a mechanism to funnel money to help developing nations pay for technology and projects to cope with the affects of climate change, such as rising sea levels.

The agreement sets a target of two degrees Celsius for the increase in global temperatures. Countries are supposed to provide information on the implementation of actions to cut carbon dioxide emissions through national communications, with provisions for international consultations and analysis under clearly defined guidelines, the official said.

Details of the language on verification of steps to curb greenhouse gases – which could be critical to political acceptance of the agreement in Congress – weren't immediately available. The so-called transparency issue was a critical stumbling block in discussions between the U.S. and China.

The administration official said "no country is entirely satisfied with each element but this is a meaningful and historic step forward and a foundation from which to make further progress."

Earlier Friday, Mr. Obama met with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and the two leaders indicated they are close to agreement on a new arms-reduction treaty.

But on the climate issue, disagreements over fundamental issues continued into the evening Friday, despite efforts by the Danes and others to broker compromises.

"It is now clear there won't be a comprehensive accord," Italy's Environment Minister Stefania Prestigiacomo said. "There will be a text that refers to next year for a comprehensive agreement," she said.

A draft agreement circulated Friday said cuts in greenhouse-gas emissions by 50% by 2050 from 1990 levels are required according to science to keep the earth temperature increase below two degrees Celsius, according to a text reviewed by Dow Jones Newswires.

But agreements on specifics eluded representatives of more than 190 nations at the summit.

Rich countries should commit to reduce their CO2 emissions by at least 80% by 2050, the draft states.

The draft also drops a previous 2010 deadline for achieving a legally binding treaty to fight global warming.

Draft texts are emerging from a meeting of world leaders at the United Nations-sponsored conference on climate change, in a last-minute effort to hammer out a deal after two weeks of inconclusive talks by lower officials.

Earlier Friday, Mr. Obama said "time is running out" to salvage a deal to curb emissions of heat-trapping gases, as he and China's Mr. Wen "made progress" in an earlier private meeting.

But Mr. Obama warned that the U.S. is prepared to walk away from the talks empty-handed, rather than accept a "hollow victory" in which developing nations refuse to allow their own emissions controls to be monitored.

"These discussions have taken place for two decades, and we have very little to show for it other than an increase and an acceleration in the climate-change phenomenon," Mr. Obama said.

The White House later said that Messrs. Obama and Wen met for 55 minutes in a room at the Bella Center, and "made progress" in discussions toward a climate accord. The meeting ended at 1:35 p.m. Copenhagen time, the White House said.

A White House official said the discussion was constructive and that the two leaders asked negotiators to meet with each other, and with other countries, to see if an agreement could be reached. "They took a step forward and made progress," the White House official said. He said that the hope is to reach an agreement Friday.

Mr. Obama's speech appeared to only underscore the deep divisions that have stalled negotiations for the past two weeks. It came shortly after a last-ditch meeting with more than a dozen world leaders, in which he and his counterparts tried to find consensus on emissions targets they could commit to; financing to help poor countries respond to climate change; and a way to verify one another's emissions-related pledges.

But with the clock ticking down, Mr. Obama and his counterparts appeared far from the "meaningful" agreement that the White House had said was possible only a few weeks ago.

Mr. Obama was one of several heads of state addressing the conference early Friday afternoon. His speech followed remarks by Mr. Wen, and Brazilian President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, and ahead of addresses by Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh

With the exception of Mr. Lula -- who announced Brazil's willingness to contribute to the fight against climate change in the poorest, most vulnerable countries -- none of the world leaders who spoke as of 1 p.m. local time had offered any major new commitments related to controlling their greenhouse-gas emissions. Instead, they largely repeated what have been their government's talking points.

Mr. Wen reiterated his country's pledge to reduce the emissions intensity of China's economy by 40% to 45% by 2020. But citing the estimated 150 million Chinese living below the poverty line, and his country's reliance on coal, he said his country would refuse to commit to a legally binding accord.

"We are confronted by special difficulties in emissions reductions," Mr. Wen said.

As the world's two largest greenhouse-gas emitters, China and the U.S. are pivotal to any long-term deal to halt the atmospheric build-up of such gases. Throughout the conference, however, the two nations have been locked in a standoff over the Obama administration's insistence that agreements developing nations commit to be subject to some form of international review and monitoring -- an idea that strikes many developing nations' as impinging on their sovereignty.

Early reaction from delegates, environmentalists and relief groups to the leaders' speeches -- and particularly to President Obama's remarks -- was cool.

"This is disappointing," said Barr Bibobru Bello Orubebe, a member of the Nigerian delegation. "We expected Obama to provide leadership. But instead, he just keeps insisting on monitoring, and that intrudes or even undermines our sovereignty."

Environmentalists expressed disappointment that Mr. Obama didn't declare that passage of legislation capping U.S. emissions would be first priority once the U.S. Senate concludes a months-long debate over health-care legislation.

Environmentalists expressed disappointment that Mr. Obama didn't declare that passage of legislation capping U.S. emissions would be first priority once the U.S. Senate concludes a months-long debate over health-care legislation.

"The only way the world can be sure the U.S. is standing behind its commitments is for the president to clearly state that climate change will be his next top legislative priority," said World Wildlife Fund CEO Carter Roberts.

4. Copenhagen: Climate Alarmism meets its Waterloo

By Roger Helmer, MEP (UK- East Midlands - Conservative), Dec 19

To be posted on his blog: <http://www.rogerhelmer.com/>

History may look back to the 2009 UN COP 15 Conference in Copenhagen as the high-water-mark of the Great Climate Scam. I have been campaigning for climate realism for years, and for much of that time it's seemed like a lost cause: now I believe that the tide is turning.

The ponderous UN process of consensus and acclamation was clearly failing to deliver anything substantive in Copenhagen, so the USA, China and a few other countries cobbled together their own Copenhagen Accord, and presented it to the plenary session on a take it or leave it basis -- you can have our text, or go home empty-handed. But the Accord itself lacks substantive content. No targets, no verification, no legal framework. Just aspirations and wishful thinking. Some weeks ago I predicted that the best they could hope for at Copenhagen was an agreement to keep talking. That, in effect, is what they have achieved.

Of course Obama, and the Chinese PM, and other leaders, were only too aware that any deal they struck in Denmark had to stand the test of their domestic political processes. Obama is clearly very conscious of the difficulties he will have in getting aggressive climate policies through the Senate. He will recall that the USA signed the Kyoto protocol -- but was unable to ratify it. Some of the most aggressive commitments were made by our own Gordon Brown -- happy in the knowledge that he will never have to deliver, but hoping that his legacy of extravagant promises will at least be an embarrassment for the next Conservative government.

And all those leaders are aware (or should be) that a majority of their electorates simply don't believe the doomsters, and certainly aren't prepared to pay the price of mitigation.

This all comes at a time when the scientific case on which alarmism is based is rapidly crumbling. The implications of the leaked CRU memos are sinking in. These were not just a few casual and thoughtless comments in an off moment. No. They are evidence of a deliberate and sustained campaign of misinformation, designed to achieve nothing less than a revolution in global governance. The phrase "Hide the Decline" has come to be a short-hand for the scandal. Yet it is poorly understood. Many commentators seem to think it refers to the decline in mean global temperatures over the last few years. But that decline is admitted (through gritted teeth), even by the alarmists. The decline the e-mails were referring to is much more fundamental.

For temperature records back in the nineteenth century and earlier, scientists have to rely on "proxies", since reliable measurements are not available. These proxies may be tree rings, ice cores, sediment layers or whatever. The issue is the overlap between the proxies and the measurements. In the early and mid twentieth century, the proxy data matched observation pretty well. But in the late 20th century, and especially from 1980, the proxies failed to show the sharp increases which were coming from the measured data (which may have been affected by the Urban Heat Island effect, and by some very creative selection and interpolation). So they decided to "hide the decline" (in the proxy data) by simply switching from proxies to measurements at the best point to support their case.

An honest scientist at this point would have said "We have a conflict in the data sets, and no major policy decisions should be based on our temperature data until this conflict is resolved". But instead they continued to assert the Gospel According to Climate Change, and refused to consider or debate any criticism. The fact is that if the proxies and the measurements disagree, then one or both must be wrong. In which case claims that the rise in temperature is too rapid to be caused by anything other than human action is unsustainable (it was always nonsense -- there are many examples in the records of more rapid

natural changes). And claims that we are now experiencing "the warmest climate for a thousand years" cannot be sustained either. It was warmer in 1200.

I believe that the US Congress will now demand an independent statistical analysis of the data. That is the least they can do before they agree to cripple the US economy and pauperise their grandchildren. And the data will not sustain that analysis. We have seen the reluctance of world leaders to commit to major emissions reductions even on the assumption that man-made global warming is an established fact. As they come to realise that it is highly suspect, they will see that they cannot continue to press vastly expensive mitigation policies on their reluctant citizens.

On the BBC news summaries this morning (Dec 19th) the two lead stories were the failure of Copenhagen -- and the disruption of road, rail and air traffic by exceptionally cold weather. Who says that God lacks a sense of humour?

A few years ago, Britain and America were drawn into war on the basis of a "Dodgy Dossier". We are now being invited to undertake an even more expensive project, based on a new Dodgy Dossier, this time from the IPCC. But I suspect that in the end, we will come to our senses and avoid making the same mistake again.

5. Copenhagen's Lesson in Limits: And we don't mean carbon limits

Wall Street Journal, Dec 19

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703523504574604130737360364.html?mod=djemEditorialPage>

Whatever led President Obama to believe that his personal intercession at the climate-change summit would achieve something major, his very presence in Copenhagen made "a significant breakthrough" a political imperative, no matter how flimsy. And that's exactly what a senior Administration official called a last-ditch deal—details to come—in a media leak as we went to press last evening and the conference headed into overtime.

Mr. Obama's inexplicable injunction yesterday that "the time for talk is over" appears to have produced an agreement to continue talking. The previous 12 days of frantic sound and pointless fury showed that there isn't anything approaching an international consensus on carbon control. What Copenhagen offered instead was a lesson in limits for a White House partial to symbolic gestures and routinely disappointed by reality.

Apparently, the agreement provides "the foundation for an eventual legally binding treaty," but that same "foundation" has been laid many times before. Copenhagen was supposed to deliver "legally binding" limits. However, the successor to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol became a pre-emptive dead letter because countries like China, Brazil and India said they were unwilling to accept anything that depressed their economic growth.

No doubt under the agreement China will continue to get a free climate pass despite its role as the world's No. 1 emitter. At Copenhagen the emerging economies nonetheless proved skilled at exploiting the West's carbon guilt, and in exchange for the nonconcession of continuing to negotiate next year, or the year after that, they'll receive up to \$100 billion in foreign aid by 2020, with the U.S. contributing the lion's share.

We can't wait to hear Mr. Obama tell Americans that he wants them to pay higher taxes so the U.S. can pay China to become more energy efficient and thus more economically competitive.

Copenhagen also got hung up on whether countries (especially China) will be "transparent" about whether they are meeting their anticarbon commitments, and the Administration claims to be satisfied with whatever verification pact was struck. Yet nearly every country that ratified Kyoto cheats on it today. Honest carbon accounting would also impede programs like the corrupt "clean development mechanism," where European consumers end up paying Chinese companies for emissions reductions that either aren't real or would have happened anyway. At least Copenhagen's talk did less tangible harm.

6. Obama praises a climate flop: Copenhagen talks end with dud of a deal

By Charles Hurt, The New York Post, Dec 19 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/international/obama_praises_NuPTfoIjqtEu92UmDiwaP#ixzz0a8ZXcS9G

WASHINGTON -- After a day spent frantically darting around Copenhagen trying to locate world leaders, getting snubbed by China's premier and crashing a meeting where he had initially been kept out, President Obama heralded a last-minute, largely toothless UN global-warming summit deal that drew fast fire from all sides as a sham.

Almost no one was happy with the outcome of the two-week confab and even the president, who was slammed by liberals and Republicans alike, along with other world leaders, admitted that the pact doesn't legally commit any of the nations involved -- the point of the summit in the first place.

Obama may become known as "the man who killed Copenhagen," said Greenpeace US head Phil Radford, one of many activists to rap the president for the flimsy agreement with India, South Africa, Brazil and China, which thwarted the president throughout the conference.

The deal, which would have to be accepted by all nations to be adopted, asks all parties to list how they'll cap emissions by set amounts, among other general goals.

But critics say it pushes any legally binding steps into the future.

It was roundly blasted as a farce from all quarters.

"The president has wrecked the UN and he's wrecked the possibility of a tough plan to control global warming," said Bill McKibbin of the progressive group 350.org. "It may get Obama a reputation as a tough American leader, but it's at the expense of everything progressives have held dear."

Friends of the Earth tore into the pact as well. "Climate negotiations in Copenhagen have yielded a sham agreement with no real requirements for any countries," the group said in a statement. "This is not a strong deal or a just one -- it isn't even a real one."

Despite the liberal outrage, Democratic House Speaker Nancy Pelosi boosted the president by saying he fostered the "critical" deal, which British Prime Minister Gordon Brown called a "a big step forward."

But some world leaders couldn't swallow the agreement, including German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who said she had hoped all nations would promise deeper cuts in emissions, mainly from burning fossil fuel.

"The decision has been very difficult for me," she said.

And leaders of poorer nations called the deal a "disaster."

In fact, Sudan's Lumumba Stanislaus Di-aping said the plan "is a solution based on the same very values, in our opinion, that channeled six million people in Europe into furnaces."

The conservative Club for Growth offered tongue-in-cheek applause for Obama.

"Like most Americans, I feared President Obama went to Copenhagen to sign a binding, job-killing, economic suicide pact," said the group's president, Chris Chocola.

The deal came after a long day of testy negotiations and surprisingly dire pleadings by Obama.

"I come not to talk, but to act," the visibly irritated president told negotiators on the last day of the two-week conference. "The time for talk is over."

White House aides described an extraordinary scene of desperation and disarray during the final hours of negotiations in Copenhagen.

Obama and his team were prepared to give up hope for a broad deal after hearing that leaders of India, Brazil and other key nations -- along with much of the entire Chinese delegation -- had already left for the airport.

But that wasn't the case.

Instead, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao insultingly skipped a high-level meeting in the morning, leaving Obama and other world leaders negotiating with a lower-level government official.

Wen later attend a meeting with President Lula de Silva of Brazil as well as the leaders of India and South Africa. Obama decided he wanted to go, and was forced to barge into the meeting.

"Mr. Premier, are you ready to see me? Are you ready?" the exasperated Obama inquired loudly from the conference-room door, in front of the press and other world leaders who had already gathered.

"We can't get into the room to look at it," explained one of the advance officials. "They're all having a meeting."

There wasn't even a seat for Obama.

"The president walks in and by the time I finally push through I hear the president say, 'There aren't any seats,' " explained one of the officials. "And the president says, 'No, no, don't worry, I'm going to go sit by my friend Lula,' and says, 'Hey, Lula,' " the advance official said.

Obama walked over, moved a chair beside the Brazilian leader and took a seat.

He later tried to put a positive spin on the meeting, saying a "meaningful and unprecedented breakthrough" had been reached. "We have come a long way, but we have much further to go," the president said.

And although officials called it a "meaningful agreement," UN officials acknowledged it would not do enough to combat the threat they say is posed by global warming.

Others derided the conference as a failure that did little more than provide Third World dictators like Venezuela's Hugo Chavez and Zimbabwe's Robert Mugabe a platform for again bashing the United States.

7. Russia affected by Climategate

Comments in Russian Newspapers

RIANOVOSTI, Dec 16, <http://en.rian.ru/papers/20091216/157260660.html>

A discussion of the November 2009 Climatic Research Unit e-mail hacking incident, referred to by some sources as "Climategate," continues against the backdrop of the abortive UN Climate Conference in Copenhagen (COP15) discussing alternative agreements to replace the 1997 Kyoto Protocol that aimed to combat global warming.

The incident involved an e-mail server used by the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia (UEA) in Norwich, East England. Unknown persons stole and anonymously disseminated thousands of e-mails and other documents dealing with the global-warming issue made over the course of 13 years.

Controversy arose after various allegations were made including that climate scientists colluded to withhold scientific evidence and manipulated data to make the case for global warming appear stronger than it is.

Climategate has already affected Russia. On Tuesday, the Moscow-based Institute of Economic Analysis (IEA) issued a report claiming that the Hadley Center for Climate Change based at the headquarters of the British Meteorological Office in Exeter (Devon, England) had probably tampered with Russian-climate data.

The IEA believes that Russian meteorological-station data did not substantiate the anthropogenic global-warming theory.

Analysts say Russian meteorological stations cover most of the country's territory, and that the Hadley Center had used data submitted by only 25% of such stations in its reports.

Over 40% of Russian territory was not included in global-temperature calculations for some other reasons, rather than the lack of meteorological stations and observations.

The data of stations located in areas not listed in the Hadley Climate Research Unit Temperature UK (HadCRUT) survey often does not show any substantial warming in the late 20th century and the early 21st century.

The HadCRUT database includes specific stations providing incomplete data and highlighting the global-warming process, rather than stations facilitating uninterrupted observations.

On the whole, climatologists use the incomplete findings of meteorological stations far more often than those providing complete observations.

IEA analysts say climatologists use the data of stations located in large populated centers that are influenced by the urban-warming effect more frequently than the correct data of remote stations.

The scale of global warming was exaggerated due to temperature distortions for Russia accounting for 12.5% of the world's land mass. The IEA said it was necessary to recalculate all global-temperature data in order to assess the scale of such exaggeration.

Global-temperature data will have to be modified if similar climate-date procedures have been used from other national data because the calculations used by COP15 analysts, including financial calculations, are based on HadCRUT research.

8. To Denmark, From Russia, With Lies

Investors Business Daily, Dec 18

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=515789>

Global Warming: Russian analysts accuse Britain's Meteorological Office of cherry-picking Russian temperature data to "hide the decline" in global temperatures. Is Copenhagen rooted in a single tree in Siberia?

Michael Mann, a Penn State meteorologist, wrote in Friday's Washington Post that "stolen" e-mails from the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit still don't alter the evidence for climate change.

Mann, a creator of the discredited hockey-stick graph used in reports from the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to show man-made warming, attacks climate skeptics, including former Alaska Gov. Sarah Palin, saying they "confuse the public."

Chutzpah has been redefined.

As Ronald Reagan used to say, facts are stubborn things. The fact is that imminent man-made climate disaster has been shown to be a massive fraud driven by manipulated data and deliberate suppression of facts to the contrary.

The latest Climate-gate shoe to drop is the Moscow-based Institute of Economic Analysis (IEA) accusation that the Hadley Center of Britain's Meteorological Office deliberately relied on a carefully selected 25% of Russia's weather stations that fit its theory of global warming.

By ignoring those that don't, the Russians say, the CRU overestimated warming in the country by more than half a degree Celsius.

Russia accounts for 12.5% of the earth's land mass and has weather stations throughout, so ignoring vast swaths of it can greatly skew any analysis. The IEA says CRU ignored data covering 40% of Russia, preferring data from urban centers and data that showed a warming trend. On the final page of the IEA report is a chart that shows the CRU's selective use of Russian data produced 0.64C more warming than using all the data would have done.

Steve McIntyre at ClimateAudit reports that the CRU has long been suspected of misusing Russian data. He notes a March 2004 e-mail from CRU director Phil Jones to Mann that says: "Recently rejected two papers (one for JGR and for GRL) from people saying CRU has it wrong over Siberia. Went to town in both reviews, hopefully successfully. If either appears (in these journals) I will be very surprised, but you never know with GRL." (JGR and GRL are scientific journals).

Siberia has played a pivotal role in this outright fraud. In 1995, a paper by the CRU's Keith Briffa asserted the medieval warm period was actually really cold, and recent warming is unusually warm. It relied on tree ring data from trees on Siberia's Yamal Peninsula.

Here too data were carefully selected. Those from just 12 trees from 252 cores in the Yamal data set were used. A larger set of 34 tree cores from the vicinity shows no dramatic recent warming, and warmer temperatures in the Middle Ages. They weren't used.

The hockey-stick graph was produced in 1999 by Mann using these manipulated tree ring data. The graph supposedly proved air temperatures had been stable for 900 years, then soared off the charts in the 20th century. Mann et al. had to make the Medieval Warm Period (A.D. 800 to 1400) and the Little Ice Age (A.D. 1600 to 1850) statistically disappear.

McIntyre, who with fellow Canadian researcher Ross McKittrick exposed the hockey-stick fraud, says the evidence from only one Siberian tree, known as YAD061, seemed to show a hockey-stick pattern. If they look hard enough, the CRU can probably find a tree that shows evidence of elves making cookies.

This tree spawned the hockey stick that found its way into the reports of the U.N.'s climate change panel. It led to Kyoto and Copenhagen, which is why McIntyre calls it "the most influential tree in the world." As the CRU e-mails and other evidence reveal, Mann and his unindicted co-conspirators are barking up the wrong one.

#####