The Week That Was (December 5, 2009)
Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

##

Ken Haapala will host TWTW while Fred Singer lectures/briefs/debates in Europe.
Come by if you are close. Get detailed schedule and contacts from Ken@Haapala.com
Brussels (EU Parliament) Nov 18-19. London (IEA) Nov 20-24. Zurich Nov 25. Stuttgart (DLR) Nov 26. Heidelberg, Mainz Nov 27-28. Brussels Nov 30-Dec 2. Berlin Dec 4. Copenhagen Dec 6 –11.

$$

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
There is but one straight course, and that is to seek truth and pursue it steadily.” *George Washington*
****

THIS WEEK - SPECIAL ON UPCOMING ACTIVITIES AT COPENHAGEN

SEPP’s Fred Singer has joined many others in countering the extensive press coverage of the upcoming UN Conference of Parties (COP) that will take place on December 7 which, in the United States, is Pearl Harbor Day. Beginning that day at 8 am Central Time, a virtual video conference will start and will continue until the end of the UN conference. The virtual conference will include many experts in climate and plant sciences from around the world. The topics are below. You can access the virtual conference from the following web sites as well as others:
http://speakoutforamerica.com/
http://www.co2science.org/video/cop/cop15.php
http://www.youtube.com/co2science,

Copenhagen Climate Concerns

Background

Bureaucratic Beginnings: The powers that be have always envisioned a global energy regulatory system.
The Annual Meeting of the Conference of Parties: Yearly mega-conferences have kept nations on track to achieve the ultimate objective.
What happens at a COP meeting?: While the public is distracted by an outward circus-like atmosphere, "stewards of the planet" make policy behind closed doors.
From Kyoto to Copenhagen: One step at a time, earth's nations are being led to surrender their right to determine their own destinies.

The IPCC

Who is behind the IPCC movement?: Trans-nationalist "citizens of the planet" comprise the primary force that enervates the IPCC.
The IPCC Assessment Report Process: Hundreds of researchers produce a massive scientific document that ultimately becomes a political statement by the time its summary is produced.
The Bias of the IPCC: The IPCC was created to promote a specific policy; and it works in such a way as to comply with that directive.
The IPCC and its "Correct" Conclusions: Money and political clout determine the organization's objectives and conclusions.
The IPCC Assessments: Statements of Faith: In lieu of adequate facts, and actually ignoring some contrary ones, a predetermined faith guides all aspects of the IPCC's operations.
Vulnerability to the IPCC Message: It's difficult for the "man on the street" to stand up to scientific intimidation.

CO2 Regulation

What is Cap and Trade?: It is a means of transferring wealth from "you" to "them."
Cap and Trade: Gaming the System: The possibilities are limitless.
Gaming the System: Private and Public Companies: They're already lining up at the subsidy watering trough.
California: Not the Model for Our Nation to Follow: Unless, of course, we have an economic death wish!
What is the regulation of CO2 all about?: It is about the taking of power from the people and vesting it in the enlightened few.
Waxman/Markey Amendments Reveal True Cost of CO2 Regulation: Five-dollar-a-gallon gas, doubled electric rates, and 15% unemployment may be only the *beginning* of the cost of Cap and Trade.
What happens if the US signs a COP treaty to regulate CO2?: Whereas other countries will have "wiggle room" to preclude strict adherence to stated objectives, we will have none; and we will suffer the economic consequences.
Once enacted, how difficult is it to remove regulation policies?: It's like trying to put the genie back in the bottle.
Is the "cure" worse than the "disease"?: When the magnitude of the undertaking is fully appreciated, the odds are that it is.
Bureaucratic Accountability to No One: It's essentially already here; and it's only going to get worse if the Copenhagen Crowd gets its way.
No Copenhagen Agreement Without Support of LDCs: Anything less would be an exercise in futility.
A global enforcement mechanism at COP 15?: Let's all *insure* our economic destruction!

Economics of CO2 Regulation

What effect will CO2 regulation have on the average American?: It will be "through the roof," and unbelievably devastating.
False Economic Assumptions of Currently Proposed CO2 Regulation Legislation: They make required economic sacrifices seem much less onerous than they truly are.

CO2 Regulation = Global Economic Recession: History indicates that the only way to significantly reduce CO2 emission is to orchestrate a contraction of the economy.

Morality

CO2 Regulation: The Essence of Immorality: Climate alarmists turn morality on its head by coming down on the wrong side of truth.
Taking from the Poor of Today and Giving to the Rich of Tomorrow: It's not only illogical; it's immoral.
The Morality of Climate Change: One has to know all the facts to determine the morality of an issue.

Real Reasons for Copenhagen

Wealth Transfer: An Ulterior Motive of COP 15: Are country-to-country transfers of wealth more important than reductions of CO2 emissions?
The Transfer of Wealth from Developed to Developing Countries: It's a good means for reducing the entire world to undeveloped status.

Science

"Settled" Science: The only parts that are settled are those the world's climate alarmists would rather you didn't know.
The Science is Not Settled: If you forgive our hyperbole, a greater truth was never spoken.
Missing Science at Copenhagen: Why is the *good* news not shouted from the rooftops?
Assessing model projections: Real-world data suggest their projections of warming are much too high.
Could all the models be wrong?: Of course they could, as a single common error would seal the deal.
Did the rise in CO2 cause the modern increase in temperature?: There is no compelling reason to believe it did.
Is a warm climate good?: It is not only *good*, it is actually *better* than its opposite.
Negative Feedbacks Dominate the Climate System: If it were not so, we would not be here.
No warming of the past decade?: That is correct; and it is disturbing to the world's climate alarmists.
Climate Change in Copenhagen: Doom and gloom pervade an international meeting of climate alarmists earlier this year in this famed city.
Copenhagen in a Nutshell: Great pain, but no gain.
The Essence of Copenhagen: A setback for science.
Is CO2 a pollutant?: By no means. In fact, it is the *breath of life*.
Carbon Dioxide: The Breath of Life: Hear the testimony and see the results of *the man who breathed life into plants*.

Additional Considerations

Bias in the Media: Claims of climatic catastrophe excite the media; good news draws little attention.
In Academia, Climate Hysteria Rules: To obtain tenure, junior staff must not denigrate the dogma of the powers that be.
The Influence of Federal Dollars: Many there are who compromise their integrity to drink at the great money trough.
The Orwellian Movement of Global Warming: The powers that be can even change the past!
Intimidation Tactics: They seem to be standard procedure for silencing those skeptical of climate-alarmist claims.
Renewable Energy in Place of Fossil Fuels?: Some day, perhaps, but not yet.
Renewable Energy Problems: The energy's not always there when it's needed.
Policies to Stabilize Climate are at Odds with Nature: They always have been, and they always will be.
Skepticism Lives: Scientists, scholars and the general public are beginning to disavow climate-alarmist claims of human-induced global warming and resist their curative prescriptions.
Copenhagen Predictions: The meeting will be called a great success, no matter what occurs. And, of course, the struggle will go on.

THE COPENHAGEN CLIMATE CHALLENGE:

In addition to the virtual video conference there will be a two day conference in Copenhagen featuring S. Fred Singer, Lord Monckton, Ian Plimer and others. This two day conference will start on December 8. For details please see: **http://www.climate-sense.com/**

****

SEPP EDITORIAL:

By Kenneth Haapala

As the questionable actions of the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia are being revealed, we are witnessing how the life work of Hubert H. Lamb was tarnished by the very organizations he helped create. A pioneer in the scientific study of climate change, H.H. Lamb was the founder and first director of the CRU.

After he retired, Lamb wrote the classic, **Climate, History and the Modern World**, (Routledge, 1982 & 1995). Lamb synthesized the physical evidence demonstrating that since the last ice age ended, the earth has been both warmer and cooler than today. For over 3,000 years, 5,000 to 8,000 years ago, it was 2-3 degrees C warmer than today. The evidence for the Northern Hemisphere is extensive. Throughout North America and Eurasia trees grew 200 to 400 km closer to the North Pole than they grow today and in the mountains grew at higher elevations than they do today. The Sahara Desert was wetter. For example, cave paintings in the middle of the Sahara show natives hunting hippopotami in canoes or boats.

Because the land mass of the Southern Hemisphere is far less than the land mass of the Northern Hemisphere there is less physical evidence in the Southern Hemisphere. However, in the mountains of the Southern Hemisphere trees grew at higher elevations than today and Australia was wetter.

Lamb contended that temperature and climate changes were not uniform and differed both spatially and temporally; but, they existed world-wide and that temperature changes were more pronounced in the mid and upper latitudes than in the tropics. Based on his analysis, Lamb stated that warm periods were beneficial for humanity, and cold periods were harmful. He advocated that governments should fund studies on climate change so humanity will be better prepared for the next cold period that was sure to come. In the 1995 edition, he expressed concern that the study of climate change (global warming) had taken a wrong turn.

Lamb's research has been largely dismissed by the human caused global warming community. For example in discussing Lamb's work, Chapter 6, "Palaeoclimate" of the 2007 The Fourth IPCC Assessment Report (AR4) states:

> These local warm periods were very likely not globally synchronous and occurred at times when there is evidence that some areas of the tropical oceans were cooler than today (Figure 6.9) (Lorenz et al., 2006). When forced by 6 ka orbital parameters, state-of-the-art coupled climate models and EMICs capture reconstructed regional temperature and precipitation synchronous and occurred at times when there is evidence that some areas of the tropical oceans were cooler than today (Figure 6.9) p. 460

The IPCC offers a graph showing a cooling of the tropical North Indian Ocean and the tropical Pacific Ocean as claimed proof that the extended warm period demonstrated by Lamb was regional not global. Of course, there is little physical evidence of warming or cooling of these oceans to verify or contradict the computer simulations. Thus according to the IPCC, compelling physical evidence of extensive warming in one part of the globe is counterbalanced by computer simulations of cooling in another part of the globe for which physical evidence is lacking. The life work of Lamb in compiling physical evidence has been trumped by computer simulations with little or no supporting physical evidence.

Perhaps there is a bit of irony in this week's statement by Rajendra Pachauri, the chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, when he claimed that the information in the emails "in no way damages the credibility" of the IPCC's AR4.
****

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

1. The Climate Science Isn't Settled – Richard S. Lindzen, Wall Street Journal, Dec. 1
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

2. A Conundrum That Awaits in Copenhagen – Eugene Robinson, Investors Business Daily, Dec 1 – A view from a non-skeptic
http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=513983

3. The Real Copenhagen Agenda – The Wall Street Journal, Dec 3
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567921682049840.html

4. Climategate: Science Is Dieing – Daniel Henning, Wall Street Journal, Dec. 2
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574566124250205490.html

5. Climategate: Follow the Money – Bret Stephens, Wall Street Journal, Dec. 1
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574566124250205490.html

6. NASA-Gate – Investors Business Daily, Dec 4
http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=514429

7. Cap-And-Trade Loss: A Stunner In Aussie Vote – Time Andrews, Investors Business Daily, Dec 2.
http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=514118

8. The Mathematics of Global Warming – Peter Landesman, The American Thinker
http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/11/the_mathematics_of_global_warm.html [H/t Deke Forbes]
****

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

The news this week can be divided roughly into three parts: one, the preparations for Copenhagen and the attendant Cap and Trade regulations; two, Climategate; and three, the defeat of Cap and Trade in Australia.

As governments prepare for Copenhagen, western governments are being urged to ignore climategate and its possible effects on the science of human caused global warming. For example, President Obama's science advisor, John Holgren, urges climate action (http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125977808310373065.html). Yet skeptics including some US Senators are pressing for the opposite: **(**http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/dec/05/skeptics-press-obama-on-climate-summit//print/). Of course these skeptics include Fred Singer. At the same time it appears that Cap and Trade in the US is dead for now (http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703499404574558070997168360.html). More on these issues can be found in articles 1 through 3.

****

Climategate is now clearly established as part of the public domain similar to the Pentagon Papers or the Watergate reports. The issue of who is responsible, a whistleblower or a hacker, may be legal issue but not a scientific one. The contents of the emails, particularly how they apply to scientific integrity, are clearly a scientific issue. Articles four through six contain comments on climategate. Additional comments are found below:

For a CBS news comment please see "Fallout over 'ClimateGate' Data Leak Grows": http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2009/12/02/taking_liberties/entry5860171.shtml [SEPP comment: the photo of water vapor condensing above cooling towers giving the appearance of pollution billowing from smoke stacks is almost obligatory in some publications when they carry carbon dioxide news stories. Of course, carbon dioxide is colorless.]

For a report on the temporary resignation of Phil Jones the head of the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia please see "Climate-Change Scientist Steps Aside Amid Probe": http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125970198500271683.html?mod=WSJ_hps_MIDDLEThirdNews

For a report from the Sunday Times please see "Climate change data dumped": http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6936328.ece

For an article in the Washington Times including Michael Mann's defense of his actions please see "Climate Researcher defends actions, claims 'smear'": http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/dec/05/climate-research-furor-might-not-stop-us-deal//print/

For an editorial in the Journal *Nature* please see "Climatologists under pressure": http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v462/n7273/full/462545a.html

For a lengthy essay from Christopher Monckton on the Science & Public Policy Institute web site please see "Climategate: Caught Green-Handed!" http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/Monckton-Caught%20Green-Handed%20Climategate%20Scandal.pdf
[SEPP comment: **please note** Lord Monckton made a rare but, significant, error. He states that the satellite data are calibrated to surface data. According to Roy Spencer they are not. Also, satellites carry thermometers. Thus, the commentary on satellite data is in error. No doubt this error will be corrected shortly. A hat tip and a deep bow to Cal Beisner for clarifying this issue and, of course, to Roy Spencer for his prompt correction]

For an editorial in the New York Times by John Tierney please see "E-Mail Fracas Shows Peril of Trying to Spin Science": http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/01/science/01tier.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print

For another editorial on the general issues please see "The Dominoes Fall": http://www.investors.com/News and Analysis/Article.aspx?id=514128

For comments from Mike Hulme, a climate scientist at the University of East Anglia, please see "The Science and Politics of Climate Change":
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704107104574571613215771336.html
****

The unexpected defeat of the Emissions Trading Scheme (Cap and Trade) in Australia is covered in article seven. Both Prime Minister Kevin Rudd and the leader of the opposition party (termed liberal but actually conservative) Malcolm Turnbull invested heavily in its passage. Turnbull lost his leadership of the Liberal Party. (Party discipline is extremely important in this Parliamentary system.). To avoid confusion, we chose to highlight an article from an American newspaper written by an Australian to explain the events. An amusing take can be found on the web site of Joanne Nova who gives thanks to the climate investigator who leaked the emails that may have saved Australian taxpayers billions.
http://joannenova.com.au/2009/12/the-global-gravy-train-takes-a-major-political-hit/
****

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

In preparation for regulations controlling greenhouse emissions, some Australian scientists are trying to breed sheep that burp less than sheep generally do – thus emit less methane. If such sheep are developed will they be considered "green?" Or organic? For a BBC article please see "Australia aims for 'green' sheep":
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/8385068.stm

##########

1. The Climate Science Isn't Settled

By Richard S. Lindzen, Wall Street Journal, Dec 1
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567423917025400.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

Is there a reason to be alarmed by the prospect of global warming? Consider that the measurement used, the globally averaged temperature anomaly (GATA), is always changing. Sometimes it goes up, sometimes down, and occasionally—such as for the last dozen years or so—it does little that can be discerned.

Claims that climate change is accelerating are bizarre. There is general support for the assertion that GATA has increased about 1.5 degrees Fahrenheit since the middle of the 19th century. The quality of the data is poor, though, and because the changes are small, it is easy to nudge such data a few tenths of a degree in any direction. Several of the emails from the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit (CRU) that have caused such a public ruckus dealt with how to do this so as to maximize apparent changes.

The general support for warming is based not so much on the quality of the data, but rather on the fact that there was a little ice age from about the 15th to the 19th century. Thus it is not surprising that temperatures should increase as we emerged from this episode. At the same time that we were emerging from the little ice age, the industrial era began, and this was accompanied by increasing emissions of greenhouse gases such as CO2, methane and nitrous oxide. CO2 is the most prominent of these, and it is again generally accepted that it has increased by about 30%.

The defining characteristic of a greenhouse gas is that it is relatively transparent to visible light from the sun but can absorb portions of thermal radiation. In general, the earth balances the incoming solar radiation by emitting thermal radiation, and the presence of greenhouse substances inhibits cooling by thermal radiation and leads to some warming.

That said, the main greenhouse substances in the earth's atmosphere are water vapor and high clouds. Let's refer to these as major greenhouse substances to distinguish them from the anthropogenic minor substances. Even a doubling of CO2 would only upset the original balance between incoming and outgoing radiation by about 2%. This is essentially what is called "climate forcing."

There is general agreement on the above findings. At this point there is no basis for alarm regardless of whether any relation between the observed warming and the observed increase in minor greenhouse gases can be established. Nevertheless, the most publicized claims of the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) deal exactly with whether any relation can be discerned. The failure of the attempts to link the two over the past 20 years bespeaks the weakness of any case for concern.

The IPCC's Scientific Assessments generally consist of about 1,000 pages of text. The Summary for Policymakers is 20 pages. It is, of course, impossible to accurately summarize the 1,000-page assessment in just 20 pages; at the very least, nuances and caveats have to be omitted. However, it has been my experience that even the summary is hardly ever looked at. Rather, the whole report tends to be characterized by a single iconic claim.

The main statement publicized after the last IPCC Scientific Assessment two years ago was that it was likely that most of the warming since 1957 (a point of anomalous cold) was due to man. This claim was based on the weak argument that the current models used by the IPCC couldn't reproduce the warming from about 1978 to 1998 without some forcing, and that the only forcing that they could think of was man. Even this argument assumes that these models adequately deal with natural internal variability—that is, such naturally occurring cycles as El Nino, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, etc.

Yet articles from major modeling centers acknowledged that the failure of these models to anticipate the absence of warming for the past dozen years was due to the failure of these models to account for this natural internal variability. Thus even the basis for the weak IPCC argument for anthropogenic climate change was shown to be false.

Of course, none of the articles stressed this. Rather they emphasized that according to models modified to account for the natural internal variability, warming would resume—in 2009, 2013 and 2030, respectively.

But even if the IPCC's iconic statement were correct, it still would not be cause for alarm. After all we are still talking about tenths of a degree for over 75% of the climate forcing associated with a doubling of CO2. The potential (and only the potential) for alarm enters with the issue of climate sensitivity—which refers to the change that a doubling of CO2 will produce in GATA. It is generally accepted that a doubling of CO2 will only produce a change of about two degrees Fahrenheit if all else is held constant. This is unlikely to be much to worry about.

Yet current climate models predict much higher sensitivities. They do so because in these models, the main greenhouse substances (water vapor and clouds) act to amplify anything that CO2 does. This is referred to as positive feedback. But as the IPCC notes, clouds continue to be a source of major uncertainty in current models. Since clouds and water vapor are intimately related, the IPCC claim that they are more confident about water vapor is quite implausible.

There is some evidence of a positive feedback effect for water vapor in cloud-free regions, but a major part of any water-vapor feedback would have to acknowledge that cloud-free areas are always changing, and this remains an unknown. At this point, few scientists would argue that the science is settled. In particular, the question remains as to whether water vapor and clouds have positive or negative feedbacks.

The notion that the earth's climate is dominated by positive feedbacks is intuitively implausible, and the history of the earth's climate offers some guidance on this matter. About 2.5 billion years ago, the sun was 20%-30% less bright than now (compare this with the 2% perturbation that a doubling of CO2 would produce), and yet the evidence is that the oceans were unfrozen at the time, and that temperatures might not have been very different from today's. Carl Sagan in the 1970s referred to this as the "Early Faint Sun Paradox."

For more than 30 years there have been attempts to resolve the paradox with greenhouse gases. Some have suggested CO2—but the amount needed was thousands of times greater than present levels and incompatible with geological evidence. Methane also proved unlikely. It turns out that increased thin cirrus cloud coverage in the tropics readily resolves the paradox—but only if the clouds constitute a negative feedback. In present terms this means that they would diminish rather than enhance the impact of CO2.

There are quite a few papers in the literature that also point to the absence of positive feedbacks. The implied low sensitivity is entirely compatible with the small warming that has been observed. So how do models with high sensitivity manage to simulate the currently small response to a forcing that is almost as large as a doubling of CO2? Jeff Kiehl notes in a 2007 article from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, the models use another quantity that the IPCC lists as poorly known (namely aerosols) to arbitrarily cancel as much greenhouse warming as needed to match the data, with each model choosing a different degree of cancellation according to the sensitivity of that model.

What does all this have to do with climate catastrophe? The answer brings us to a scandal that is, in my opinion, considerably greater than that implied in the hacked emails from the Climate Research Unit (though perhaps not as bad as their destruction of raw data): namely the suggestion that the very existence of warming or of the greenhouse effect is tantamount to catastrophe. This is the grossest of "bait and switch" scams. It is only such a scam that lends importance to the machinations in the emails designed to nudge temperatures a few tenths of a degree.

The notion that complex climate "catastrophes" are simply a matter of the response of a single number, GATA, to a single forcing, CO2 (or solar forcing for that matter), represents a gigantic step backward in the science of climate. Many disasters associated with warming are simply normal occurrences whose existence is falsely claimed to be evidence of warming. And all these examples involve phenomena that are dependent on the confluence of many factors.

Our perceptions of nature are similarly dragged back centuries so that the normal occasional occurrences of open water in summer over the North Pole, droughts, floods, hurricanes, sea-level variations, etc. are all taken as omens, portending doom due to our sinful ways (as epitomized by our carbon footprint). All of these phenomena depend on the confluence of multiple factors as well.

Consider the following example. Suppose that I leave a box on the floor, and my wife trips on it, falling against my son, who is carrying a carton of eggs, which then fall and break. Our present approach to emissions would be analogous to deciding that the best way to prevent the breakage of eggs would be to outlaw leaving boxes on the floor. The chief difference is that in the case of atmospheric CO2 and climate catastrophe, the chain of inference is longer and less plausible than in my example.

—Mr. Lindzen is professor of meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

****

2. A Conundrum That Awaits In Copenhagen

By Eugene Robinson, IBD Editorials, Dec 1
http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=513983

Climate-change skeptics are barking up the wrong smokestack. The shell game being played isn't with the science, it's with the solutions — specifically, the carbon emissions targets that enlightened world leaders are pledging to meet. That's where the numbers don't add up.

When the Copenhagen climate summit convenes next week, the European nations that have led the crusade against global warming will be able to report that the continent has met the targets for carbon emission reductions set in the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. There may be shoulder dislocations from all the self-congratulatory back-patting.

But the Kyoto targets were well on the way toward being met before they were even established. The targets are based on 1990 emissions levels — after the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc had been fouling the air for years with their antiquated, carbon-spewing heavy industries.

When the communist regimes — and their creaky economies — collapsed in a heap, emissions from the former Soviet-dominated zone fell by nearly 40%. Now they are rising again, but they remain about 35% below Kyoto's benchmark 1990 levels.

This post-Soviet industrial meltdown is responsible for most of the progress in reducing carbon emissions that Europe is able to claim. It's not that Europeans have done nothing. Leaving aside the Soviet collapse, they managed to keep emissions relatively constant. By contrast, Japan — the proud host of the Kyoto talks — has seen its carbon emissions increase by nearly 9% since then.

The United States, of course, never ratified the Kyoto treaty. Since 1997, carbon emissions here have increased by an estimated 7%. In China — which has now taken over as the world's leading source of atmospheric greenhouse gases — carbon emissions actually doubled over the past 12 years. Along with other fast-growing economic powers such as India and Brazil, China took a pass on any limits Kyoto might have wanted to impose.

The bottom line is that since the Kyoto agreement 12 years ago, worldwide carbon emissions have increased by nearly 30%.

President Obama, who has decided to attend the Copenhagen summit, plans to offer a 17% cut in U.S. carbon emissions — using 2005 levels as a benchmark — by 2020. Leaving aside for the moment whether this is achievable, either politically or technologically, the problem remains that climate change is a global phenomenon. Local action can be rendered meaningless.

China is prepared to offer its first emissions target at Copenhagen, and at first glance it looks impressive: a reduction of between 40% and 45% in its "carbon intensity" by 2020. But this "intensity" business is a huge caveat, because it refers to carbon emissions relative to the size of the Chinese economy.

If the economy grew by 10% in a given year and carbon emissions grew "only" by 9%, that would count as a reduction. Assuming growth continues at current rates, China's carbon emissions could easily increase by 40% by 2020 — and Chinese leaders could proclaim that they had met their target.

That's a lot of numbers, a lot of assumptions, a lot of scenarios. But even if the Copenhagen summit is wildly successful, the concentration of heat-trapping carbon in the atmosphere will continue to rise. This

doesn't mean that the whole exercise is futile, it just means that Copenhagen won't provide any definitive solution to what so many scientists say is an urgent problem.

It's also true that even if all greenhouse emissions could magically be halted tomorrow, the elevated levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere — higher than at any time in the past 800,000 years, according to researchers who study Antarctic ice-core samples — would take many decades to decline to historical levels.

If the planet is warm now because of human-generated greenhouse gases, it's going to get warmer. If the low-lying Maldives disappear beneath the Indian Ocean because of sea-level rise, that will be a disaster. If "extreme" weather events such as major hurricanes really do become more frequent, that will increase the potential for catastrophe in coastal cities around the world.

But if there's a longer growing season in the higher latitudes? If cross-polar shipping slashes transportation costs? If winters are milder — more pleasant, even — in Chicago, Moscow and Beijing? We may all be in this together, but there are going to be winners and losers. That's something they should talk about in Copenhagen, too.

****

3. The Real Copenhagen Agenda

The U.N.’s climate chief tells all.
The Wall Street Journal Editorial, Dec. 3
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574567921682049840.html

Phil Jones, director of the research program at the center of "climategate," temporarily stepped down from his post Tuesday. And last week, Pennsylvania State University said it would launch an inquiry into the conduct of Michael Mann, one of its professors and perhaps the world's most prominent paleoclimatologist.

Messrs. Jones and Mann have both been key contributors to the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The emails leaked from the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit two weeks ago revealed, among many inconvenient truths, the corruption of the IPCC's process of assessing climate science. Still, despite the probes into some of the IPCC's key participants, the chair of that body insists nothing rotten is about to happen in the state of Denmark, where world leaders are set to debate sweeping policies based on IPCC conclusions.

"It is a very transparent, a very comprehensive process which insures that even if someone wants to leave out a piece of peer reviewed literature there is virtually no possibility of that happening," Rajendra Pachauri told the Guardian on Sunday, adding that "people who are aware of how the IPCC functions and are appreciative of the credibility that the IPCC has attained will probably not be swayed by an incident of this kind."

But the heightened awareness of the IPCC's functioning seems precisely what now plagues the U.N.'s global warming frontman. So it's not surprising that, for all his insistence that the group's methods are spotless, he seems eager to change the subject from science. What he has chosen to talk about instead is instructive. It seems what most concerns Mr. Pachauri now is not climatology, or glaciology, or oceanography—but the way we live. "Today we have reached the point where consumption and people's desire to consume has grown out of proportion," he told the Observer, also on Sunday. "The reality is that our lifestyles are unsustainable."

Mr. Pachauri's actions speak even louder than his words. Last month, he branded the Indian environment minister "arrogant" after his office released a study that called into question whether climate-change is causing abnormal shrinkage of Himalayan glaciers. The IPCC's line is that Himalayan glaciers could be reduced by 80% or disappear entirely by 2035—but for this factoid, it cites no scientists, only the activist group, World Wildlife Fund. Now, the meteorologist and expert IPCC reviewer Madhav Khandekar says on Roger Pielke Sr.'s blog that the 2035 date may have been derived from a typo, based on a 1996 paper on snow and ice edited by V.M. Kotlyakov, which estimates the glaciers could be severely depleted or gone by *2350*.

Mr. Pachauri was not available for comment as of press time, but on his personal Website last week he made clear that the science, for him, comes second. Conceding that Copenhagen was "clearly not making much headway," he advocated a focus on "the larger problem of unsustainable development, of which climate change is at best a symptom."

In other words, if Mr. Pachauri is sanguine about the undermining of the IPCC's scientific methods, it's because his chief concern isn't the science at all. Rather, to judge by his recent public statements, he is more focused on an ideological economic agenda in which climate change is little more than a useful tool. Given the cover-ups exposed by the leaked emails, we'll take Mr. Pachauri's remarks as a welcome instance of full and voluntary disclosure.

****

3. Climategate: Science Is Dieing

Science is on the credibility bubble

By Daniel Henning, Wall Street Journal, December 2

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704107104574572091993737848.html

Surely there must have been serious men and women in the hard sciences who at some point worried that their colleagues in the global warming movement were putting at risk the credibility of everyone in science. The nature of that risk has been twofold: First, that the claims of the climate scientists might buckle beneath the weight of their breathtaking complexity. Second, that the crudeness of modern politics, once in motion, would trample the traditions and culture of science to achieve its own policy goals. With the scandal at the East Anglia Climate Research Unit, both have happened at once.

I don't think most scientists appreciate what has hit them. This isn't only about the credibility of global warming. For years, global warming and its advocates have been the public face of hard science. Most people could not name three other subjects they would associate with the work of serious scientists. This was it. The public was told repeatedly that something called "the scientific community" had affirmed the science beneath this inquiry. A Nobel Prize was bestowed (on a politician).

Global warming enlisted the collective reputation of science. Because "science" said so, all the world was about to undertake a vast reordering of human behavior at almost unimaginable financial cost. Not every day does the work of scientists lead to galactic events simply called Kyoto or Copenhagen. At least not since the Manhattan Project.

What is happening at East Anglia is an epochal event. As the hard sciences—physics, biology, chemistry, electrical engineering—came to dominate intellectual life in the last century, some academics in the humanities devised the theory of postmodernism, which liberated them from their colleagues in the sciences. Postmodernism, a self-consciously "unprovable" theory, replaced formal structures with subjectivity. With the revelations of East Anglia, this slippery and variable intellectual world has crossed into the hard sciences.

This has harsh implications for the credibility of science generally. Hard science, alongside medicine, was one of the few things left accorded automatic stature and respect by most untrained lay persons. But the average person reading accounts of the East Anglia emails will conclude that hard science has become just another faction, as politicized and "messy" as, say, gender studies. The New England Journal of Medicine has turned into a weird weekly amalgam of straight medical-research and propaganda for the Obama redesign of U.S. medicine.

The East Anglians' mistreatment of scientists who challenged global warming's claims—plotting to shut them up and shut down their ability to publish—evokes the attempt to silence Galileo. The exchanges between Penn State's Michael Mann and East Anglia CRU director Phil Jones sound like Father Firenzuola, the Commissary-General of the Inquisition.

For three centuries Galileo has symbolized dissent in science. In our time, most scientists outside this circle have kept silent as their climatologist fellows, helped by the cardinals of the press, mocked and ostracized scientists who questioned this grand theory of global doom. Even a doubter as eminent as Princeton's Freeman Dyson was dismissed as an aging crank.

Beneath this dispute is a relatively new, very postmodern environmental idea known as "the precautionary principle." As defined by one official version: "When an activity raises threats of harm to the environment or human health, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically." The global-warming establishment says we know "enough" to impose new rules on the world's use of carbon fuels. The dissenters say this demotes science's traditional standards of evidence.

The Environmental Protection Agency's dramatic Endangerment Finding in April that greenhouse gas emissions qualify as an air pollutant—with implications for a vast new regulatory regime—used what the agency called a precautionary approach. The EPA admitted "varying degrees of uncertainty across many of these scientific issues." Again, this puts hard science in the new position of saying, close enough is good enough. One hopes civil engineers never build bridges under this theory.

The Obama administration's new head of policy at EPA, Lisa Heinzerling, is an advocate of turning precaution into standard policy. In a law-review article titled "Law and Economics for a Warming World," Ms. Heinzerling wrote, "Policy formation based on prediction and calculation of expected harm is no longer relevant; the only coherent response to a situation of chaotically worsening outcomes is a precautionary policy. . . ."

If the new ethos is that "close-enough" science is now sufficient to achieve political goals, serious scientists should be under no illusion that politicians will press-gang them into service for future agendas. Everyone working in science, no matter their politics, has an stake in cleaning up the mess revealed by the East Anglia emails. Science is on the credibility bubble. If it pops, centuries of what we understand to be the role of science go with it.

****

5. Climategate: Follow the Money

Climate change researches must believe in the reality of global warming just as a priest must believe in the existence of God

By Bret Stephens, Wall Street Journal, Dec. 1

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703939404574566124250205490.html

Last year, ExxonMobil donated $7 million to a grab-bag of public policy institutes, including the Aspen Institute, the Asia Society and Transparency International. It also gave a combined $125,000 to the

Heritage Institute and the National Center for Policy Analysis, two conservative think tanks that have offered dissenting views on what until recently was called—without irony—the climate change "consensus."

To read some of the press accounts of these gifts—amounting to about 0.00027% of Exxon's 2008 profits of $45 billion—you might think you'd hit upon the scandal of the age. But thanks to what now goes by the name of climategate, it turns out the real scandal lies elsewhere.

Climategate, as readers of these pages know, concerns some of the world's leading climate scientists working in tandem to block freedom of information requests, blackball dissenting scientists, manipulate the peer-review process, and obscure, destroy or massage inconvenient temperature data—facts that were laid bare by last week's disclosure of thousands of emails from the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit, or CRU.

But the deeper question is why the scientists behaved this way to begin with, especially since the science behind man-made global warming is said to be firmly settled. To answer the question, it helps to turn the alarmists' follow-the-money methods right back at them.

Consider the case of Phil Jones, the director of the CRU and the man at the heart of climategate. According to one of the documents hacked from his center, between 2000 and 2006 Mr. Jones was the recipient (or co-recipient) of some $19 million worth of research grants, a sixfold increase over what he'd been awarded in the 1990s.

Why did the money pour in so quickly? Because the climate alarm kept ringing so loudly: The louder the alarm, the greater the sums. And who better to ring it than people like Mr. Jones, one of its likeliest beneficiaries?

Thus, the European Commission's most recent appropriation for climate research comes to nearly $3 billion, and that's not counting funds from the EU's member governments. In the U.S., the House intends to spend $1.3 billion on NASA's climate efforts, $400 million on NOAA's, and another $300 million for the National Science Foundation. The states also have a piece of the action, with California—apparently not feeling bankrupt enough—devoting $600 million to their own climate initiative. In Australia, alarmists have their own Department of Climate Change at their funding disposal.

And all this is only a fraction of the $94 billion that HSBC Bank estimates has been spent globally this year on what it calls "green stimulus"—largely ethanol and other alternative energy schemes—of the kind from which Al Gore and his partners at Kleiner Perkins hope to profit handsomely.

Supply, as we know, creates its own demand. So for every additional billion in government-funded grants (or the tens of millions supplied by foundations like the Pew Charitable Trusts), universities, research institutes, advocacy groups and their various spin-offs and dependents have emerged from the woodwork to receive them.

Today these groups form a kind of ecosystem of their own. They include not just old standbys like the Sierra Club or Greenpeace, but also Ozone Action, Clean Air Cool Planet, Americans for Equitable Climate Change Solutions, the Alternative Energy Resources Association, the California Climate Action Registry and so on and on. All of them have been on the receiving end of climate change-related funding, so all of them must believe in the reality (and catastrophic imminence) of global warming just as a priest must believe in the existence of God.

None of these outfits is *per se* corrupt, in the sense that the monies they get are spent on something other than their intended purposes. But they depend on an inherently corrupting premise, namely that the hypothesis on which their livelihood depends has in fact been proved. Absent that proof, everything they represent—including the thousands of jobs they provide—vanishes. This is what's known as a vested interest, and vested interests are an enemy of sound science.

Which brings us back to the climategate scientists, the keepers of the keys to the global warming cathedral. In one of the more telling disclosures from last week, a computer programmer writes of the CRU's temperature database: "I am very sorry to report that the rest of the databases seems to be in nearly as poor a state as Australia was. . . . Aarrggghhh! There truly is no end in sight. . . . We can have a proper result, but only by including a load of garbage!"

This is not the sound of settled science, but of a cracking empirical foundation. And however many billion-dollar edifices may be built on it, sooner or later it is bound to crumble.

****

6. NASA-Gate

IBD Editorial Dec 4
http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=514429

Science: For two years, our space agency has refused Freedom of Information requests on why it has repeatedly corrected its climate figures. A leading researcher threatens to sue to find more inconvenient truths.

What's become known as "Climate-Gate" may be about to explode on this side of the pond as well. Chris Horner, a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, has threatened a lawsuit against NASA if by year-end the agency doesn't honor his FOI requests for information on how and why its climate numbers have been consistently adjusted for errors.

"I assume that what is there is highly damaging," says Horner, who suspects, based on the public record, the same type of data fudging, manipulation and suppression that has occurred at Britain's East Anglia Climate Research Unit. "These guys (NASA) are quite clearly determined not to reveal their internal discussions about this."

They may have good reason. NASA was caught with its thermometers down when James Hansen, head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, announced that 1998 was the country's hottest year on record, with 2006 the third hottest.

NASA and Goddard were forced to correct the record in 2007 to show that 1934, decades before the advent of the SUV, was in fact the warmest. In fact, the new numbers showed that four of the country's 10 warmest years were in the 1930s.

Hansen, who began the climate scare some two decades ago, was caught fudging the numbers again in declaring October 2008 the warmest on record. This despite the fact that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration had registered 63 local snowfall records and 115 lowest-ever temperatures for the month, and ranked it as only the 70th-warmest October in 114 years.

Scores of temperature records from Russia and elsewhere were not based on that October's readings at all. Figures from the previous month had simply been carried over and repeated two months running. Was Hansen, like his CRU counterpart Michael Mann, trying to "hide the decline" in temperatures?

Goddard now says it got the data from another body and didn't have the resources to verify them. There's a phrase for this: garbage in, garbage out. Goddard's figures are one of the four data sets used by the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to come up with its doomsday scenarios. Britain's CRU is another.

Hansen has said in the past that "heads of major fossil-fuel companies who spread disinformation about global warming should be tried for high crimes against humanity and nature." What penalties would he recommend for himself and his CRU colleagues?

We recall the unguarded admission of climate alarmist Steven Schneider of Stanford, printed in Discover in 1989: "To capture the public imagination, we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified dramatic statements and make little mention of any doubts we may have. Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest."

The warm-mongers at CRU and NASA may be neither. Let's open their books to find how well they may have been cooked.

****

7. Cap-And-Trade Loss A Stunner In Aussie Vote

By Tim Andrews, Dec 2, Investors Business Daily
http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=514118

Cap-and-trade in Australia — which just a week ago was declared a certainty — is officially dead.

This is the first major climate change turnaround anywhere in the Western world, with significant implications for our domestic debate.

Combined with the Climate-gate e-mails revealing the data suppression and deceit underpinning "scientific consensus," the whole climate change alarmism house of cards is coming crashing down.

Early last week, the leader of Australia's conservative opposition, Malcolm Turnbull, announced that he had reached agreement with the government to implement cap-and-trade, thus binding his party to support it in parliament en bloc.

The agreement was signed, sealed and delivered — cap-and-trade would become law with bipartisan support.

Its passage was a certainty. The elite rejoiced.

But then a funny thing happened on the way to the Senate: The Australian public woke up.

The days that followed were simply stunning. An unprecedented, uncoordinated and spontaneous grass-roots campaign erupted to force the opposition to reverse course.

Political offices went into meltdown, unable to cope with the torrent of phone calls, faxes and e-mails opposing what was effectively a massive tax hike.

By the end of the week, 14 members of the opposition leadership had resigned in protest. As the public outcry intensified, Turnbull refused to back down, staking his entire reputation and future on his passionate support for cap-and-trade.

He violently attacked true conservatives, and repeatedly cried out that to win government you must be "moderate."

So on early Tuesday morning, opposition parliamentarians met and voted to replace him. For the first time since 1916, the leader of a major Australian political party was deposed on the grounds of just one policy decision: the decision to support cap-and-trade.

His political career is over, his aspirations to become prime minister have come to naught.

The newly elected leader promptly announced that the opposition would once again start acting like conservatives, and would oppose the government's great green tax. Without their support, the legislation was soundly defeated in the Senate.

Cap-and-trade, a scheme initially promoted by Enron to allow traders to profit at the expense of taxpayers, is currently before the U.S. Senate. According to the U.S. Treasury, this proposal includes between $100 billion and $200 billion in additional taxes a year, costing an additional $1,761 per family — equivalent to a 15% hike in the personal income tax.

A further report commissioned by the U.S. Senate has shown that the additional gas taxes in the proposal equate to $3.6 trillion by 2035. According to an analysis by the independent Heritage Foundation, once fully implemented this would lead directly to a staggering 2.5 million jobs lost.

More To Follow

It is because of this that the Australian experience is so instructive, and there are two important lessons to be learned.

First, the tide of international opinion has swung sharply away from the climate-change alarmists.

What happened in Australia is just the beginning. Next week, the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen — once billed as Kyoto 2 — will end in miserable failure: Even its most ardent supporters now admit that nothing will be achieved.

More and more countries will refuse to sign on to this scam. Australia is simply the first domino to fall; we have reached the international tipping point.

Second, this is a clear lesson to Republican legislators.

This is an issue that will mobilize Americans like nothing else. No longer are taxpayers going to be dictated to by the elites.

The tea parties, which mobilized over a million taxpayers to march in support of smaller government earlier this year, are merely the beginning.

Republican legislators such as Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., who preach "bipartisanship" must realize that their actions have consequences. If you are elected as a conservative, you are expected to vote as such. Like their Australian counterparts, the American people will stand up and take action against those who betray them.

Because as Malcolm Turnbull has learned, if you vote to send millions of people to the unemployment line, you might just find that the very first job gone will be your own.

****

8. The Mathematics of Global Warming

By Peter Landesman
The American Thinker
http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/11/the_mathematics_of_global_warm.html

The forecasts of global warming are based on mathematical solutions for equations of weather models. But all of these solutions are inaccurate. Therefore, no valid scientific conclusions can be made concerning global warming. The false claim for the effectiveness of mathematics is an unreported scandal at least as important as the recent climate data fraud. Why is the math important? And why don't the climatologists use it correctly?

Mathematics has a fundamental role in the development of all physical sciences. First, the researchers strive to understand the laws of nature determining the behavior of what they are studying. Then they build a model and express these laws in the mathematics of differential and difference equations. Next, the mathematicians analyze the solutions to these equations to improve the scientists' understanding. Often the mathematicians can describe the evolution through time of the scientists' model.

The most famous successful use of mathematics in this way was Isaac Newton's demonstration that the planets travel in elliptical paths around the sun. He formulated the law of gravity (that the rate of change of the velocity between two masses is inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them) and then developed the mathematics of differential calculus to demonstrate his result.

Every college physics student studies many of the simple models and their successful solutions that have been found over the three hundred years since Newton. Engineers constantly use models and mathematics to gain insight into the physics of their field.

However, for many situations of interest, the mathematics become too difficult to be helpful. The mathematicians are unable to answer the scientist's important questions because a complete understanding of the differential equations is beyond human knowledge. A famous, longstanding example is the n-body problem: if more than two planets are revolving around one another, according to the law of gravity, will the planets ram each other or will they drift out to infinity?

Fortunately, in the last fifty years, computers have been able to help mathematicians solve complex models over short time periods. Numerical analysts have developed techniques to graph solutions to differential equations and thus to yield new information about the model under consideration. All college calculus students use calculators to find solutions to simple differential equations called integrals. Space-travel is possible because computers can solve the n-body problem for short amounts of time and small n-values. The design of the stealth jet fighter could not have been accomplished without the computing speed of parallel processors. These successes have unrealistically raised the expectations for the application of mathematics to scientific problems.

Unfortunately, even assuming the model of the physics is correct, computers and mathematicians cannot solve more difficult problems, such as weather equations, for several reasons. First, the solution may require more computations than computers can make. Faster and faster computers push back the speed barrier every year. Second, it may be too difficult to collect enough data to accurately determine the initial conditions of the model. Third, the equations of the model may be non-linear. This means that no simplification of the equations can accurately predict the properties of the solutions of the differential equations. The solutions are often unstable. This means that a small variation in initial conditions will lead to large variations some time later. This property makes it impossible to compute solutions over long time periods.

As an expert in the solutions of non-linear differential equations, I can attest to the fact that the more than two-dozen non-linear differential equations in weather models are too difficult for humans to have any idea how to solve accurately. No approximation over long time periods has any chance of accurately predicting global warming. Yet approximation is exactly what the global warming advocates are doing. Each of the more than thirty models being used around the world to predict the weather is just a different inaccurate approximation of the weather equations. (Of course, this is an issue only if the model of the weather is correct. It is probably not, because the climatologists probably do not understand all of the physical processes determining the weather.)

Therefore, one cannot logically conclude that any of the global warming predictions are correct. To base economic policy on the wishful thinking of these so-called scientists is just foolhardy from a mathematical point of view. The leaders of the mathematical community, ensconced in universities flush with global warming dollars, have not adequately explained to the public the above facts.

President Obama should appoint a Mathematics Czar to consult before he goes to Copenhagen.

Peter Landesman (mathmaze@yahoo.com) is the author of the 3D-maze book Spacemazes, with which children can have fun while learning mathematics.

##########