



No doubt, the US, especially President Obama, will be expected to make some great benevolent gesture. It is all about feeling good about generosity – at the expense of the taxpayers who pay for this generosity.

Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd must be having second thoughts after the stunning defeat of his ETS (Cap and Trade bill) in the Senate that appeared to be a certain victory for Rudd a few days before the vote. Probably no such second thoughts will occur to President Obama even though the US Senate has refused to act on its Cap and Trade bill and a strident foe of the measure, Senator James Inhofe, is in Copenhagen preparing to greet him. A few days ago, President Obama received a letter from Senator Jim Webb cautioning against any deal in Copenhagen even though Senator Webb is of the same party as President Obama and was considered a supporter of Cap and Trade.

\*\*\*\*\*

The endangerment finding by the EPA was fully expected. The EPA's science is based upon the 2007 IPCC Assessment Report especially its Summary for Policymakers. The finding has little or no basis in physical science and is largely based on the simulation science of computer models. As illustrated in last week's TWTW, these reports ignore or dismiss the massive quantity of physical evidence indicating that the 20<sup>th</sup> Century warming was neither unprecedented nor dangerous. The administration has warned the US Senate that if the Senate does not pass cap-and-trade the administration will leash the EPA to impose draconian regulations that will be economically destructive. Is this a false dilemma? No doubt the EPA will face strident opposition in court demanding it produce physical evidence, which it has not done. And Congress can always change the law giving the EPA the power to regulate

\*\*\*\*\*

With a few major exceptions Climategate is largely ignored by the main stream media. However it continues to remain a hot topic on the web. No one has identified the person who leaked the information – was it a whistleblower or a hacker – and much speculation has been made as to that person's motivation. Some suggest it was a whistleblower who became concerned over what was taking place at the CRU. Others, noting that the emails appeared on a server in Siberia, claim it was a Russian computer expert well paid by Russian oil companies to discredit the Copenhagen conference. Still others claim it was a cyber-terrorist and that news organizations reporting on Climategate embrace cyber-terrorism.

It may be some time before we know, if ever. At this time, only a part of the information extracted has been posted. There may be more to come. The e-mails and other revelations regarding the CRU such as elimination of data that did not support a claimed rapid warming in the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century are of great concern. Truncation of data has appeared before, such as graph based on balloon data that was published in a popular scientific journal shortly before Kyoto. The graph showed a striking warming trend, but it was based on truncated data. When all the data was included, there was no warming trend.

Perhaps Climategate will prompt governments funding research to require the release of all data for independent review and verification. Roy Spencer and John Christy, in their UAH satellite data, have taken the lead. But it may be too much to expect others to follow.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL:**

By S. Fred Singer, President of SEPP

There has been much confusion created by the announcement of the World Meteorological Organization (UN-WMO) that the past decade has shown some of the warmest years, based on the record of 160 years of temperature data.

Whether intended or not, the WMO press release just at the opening of COP-15 in Copenhagen, has created the impression that human-caused warming (AGW) is the cause and that the IPCC conclusion is correct after all.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The WMO confuses (purposely?) two quite different concepts: TEMPREATURE (measured in degrees C) and TEMPREATURE TREND (measured in degrees C per year).

Of course, temperatures are at their highest, and may eventually become even higher, as the global climate recovers from the Little Ice Age -- without any human assistance. It may even reach the high values seen in the Medieval Warm Period around 1100AD.

But temperature trends have been downward -- even as GH gases like CO2 are increasing. This negative correlation contradicts the results of GH models and indicates that anthropogenic GW is quite small.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**1. Copenhagen Climate Challenge, Scientists ask UN for convincing evidence, "Climate science is still up in the clouds," Open Letter to Secretary-General of United Nations, December 8**

<http://www.copenhagenclimatechallenge.org/>

**2. Who Wants What in Copenhagen, WSJ OnLine, Dec 6**

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704533904574548141677888208.htm>

**3. Climate Deal Likely to Bear Big Price Tag**

By John M. Broder, New York Times, Dec 9

[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/09/science/earth/09cost.html?\\_r=1&pagewanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/09/science/earth/09cost.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all)

**4. Alarmists cold-shoulder facts**

By Robert Bradley, The Washington Times, Dec 8

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/dec/08/alarmists-cold-shoulder-facts//print/>

**5. Administration Warns of 'Command-and-Control' Regulation Over Emissions**

FoxNews.com, Dec 9

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/12/09/administration-warns-command-control-regulation-emissions/>

**6. EPA Must Be Stopped, Investors Business Daily, Dec 9**

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=514830>

**7. The EPA's Carbon Bomb Fizzles, The administration has given a skittish Congress another reason not to pass cap and trade**

By Kimberley Strassel, Wall Street Journal, Dec 11

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703514404574588120572016720.html>

**8. In Energy Innovation, Everything New Is Old Again**

By Russell Gold, Wall Street Journal, Dec 11

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126048948482786623.html?mod=WSJ\\_hps\\_MIDDLEThirdNews](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126048948482786623.html?mod=WSJ_hps_MIDDLEThirdNews)

\*\*\*\*\*

**NEWS YOU CAN USE:**

Roy Spencer has posted on his web site a primer entitled “Global Warming Skepticism 101.” <http://www.drroyspencer.com/2009/12/global-warming-skepticism-101/> It is well worth reading.

Marc Sheppard has a lengthy article reviewing Climategate “Understanding Climategate’s Hidden Decline” in the December 6 issue of The American Thinker. [http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/12/understanding\\_climategates\\_hid.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/12/understanding_climategates_hid.html)

For a review of the missing tree data see “Climategate reveals ‘the most influential tree in the world’” by Christopher Booker in the UK Telegraph on Dec. 5 [H/t Francois Guillaumat] <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/6738111/Climategate-reveals-the-most-influential-tree-in-the-world.html>

For another lengthy review please see “Scientists Behaving Badly” by Steven F. Hayward in The Weekly Standard, Dec 14 [http://www.weeklystandard.com/Utilities/printer\\_preview.asp?idArticle=17300&R=164473349](http://www.weeklystandard.com/Utilities/printer_preview.asp?idArticle=17300&R=164473349)

For by William Gray’s view please see “Famous weather scientist: Climategate ‘tip of iceberg’” by Bob Unruh in WorldNetDaily, Dec 8. <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=118432>

For a reaction to Climategate please see “Top scientists rally to the defence of the Met Office” by Ben Webster in Time Online on Dec 10 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6951029.ece>

For a review of the entire issue of climate change please see: “Beyond debate” by Martin Cohen in THE Times Higher Education on Dec 10 [H/t Peter Taylor] <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=409454>

For a review of the improbability of the goals of COP-15 see: “Earth’s Next Last Chance” by George Will on Dec 6 [http://townhall.com/columnists/GeorgeWill/2009/12/06/earths\\_next\\_last\\_chance](http://townhall.com/columnists/GeorgeWill/2009/12/06/earths_next_last_chance)

The web site of Anthony Watts carries a piece by Willis Eschenbach entitled “The Smoking Gun At Darwin Zero.” It is an investigation of the changes made to the data from the Darwin, Australia weather station which is in the tropics. It further illustrates why government agencies must release their data and methods of adjustment for independent review and verification. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/12/08/the-smoking-gun-at-darwin-zero/>

\*\*\*\*\*

**BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE**

In further preparation for regulations controlling greenhouse emissions, some Welsh farmers may try feeding their cows garlic and oats. How well will garlic milk pair with green lamb? Please see “Feeding garlic to cows could help cut global warming” in the UK Daily Mail Dec 9 <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1234419/Feeding-garlic-cows-help-cut-global-warming-milk-taste-odd.html#>

Roger Pielke Jr.'s Blog <http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2009/12/not-true-trick.html> on Dec 10 exposes what is now an all too familiar trick – the distortion of history. Manmade global warming advocate Steve Schneider claims “The amazing scientific thing that nobody seems to be covering is that the "hockey stick" was never used as proof of anthropogenic global warming by IPCC.” Apparently, Steve Schneider never read the Summary for Policymakers of the IPCC Third Assessment Report. Pielke’s photograph completely demolishes Mr. Schneider.

Last, but not least, beyond the fringe is “Fox News Embraces Cyber-Terrorism to Subvert the Copenhagen Summit” by David Fiderer, in OpEdNews.com, Dec 8  
<http://www.opednews.com/articles/Fox-News-Embraces-Cyber-Te-by-David-Fiderer-091208-786.html>

#####

## **1. Copenhagen Climate Challenge**

Scientists ask UN for convincing evidence

“Climate science is still up in the clouds”

Open Letter to Secretary-General of United Nations, December 8

<http://www.copenhagenclimatechallenge.org/>

Dear Secretary-General,

Climate change science is in a period of ‘negative discovery’ - the more we learn about this exceptionally complex and rapidly evolving field the more we realize how little we know. Truly, the science is NOT settled.

Therefore, there is no sound reason to impose expensive and restrictive public policy decisions on the peoples of the Earth without first providing convincing evidence that human activities are causing dangerous climate change beyond that resulting from natural causes. Before any precipitate action is taken, we must have solid observational data demonstrating that recent changes in climate differ substantially from changes observed in the past and are well in excess of normal variations caused by solar cycles, ocean currents, changes in the Earth's orbital parameters and other natural phenomena.

We the undersigned, being qualified in climate-related scientific disciplines, challenge the UNFCCC and supporters of the United Nations Climate Change Conference to produce convincing OBSERVATIONAL EVIDENCE for their claims of dangerous human-caused global warming and other changes in climate. Projections of possible future scenarios from unproven computer models of climate are not acceptable substitutes for real world data obtained through unbiased and rigorous scientific investigation.

Specifically, we challenge supporters of the hypothesis of dangerous human-caused climate change to demonstrate that:

1. Variations in global climate in the last hundred years are significantly outside the natural range experienced in previous centuries;
2. Humanity’s emissions of carbon dioxide and other ‘greenhouse gases’ (GHG) are having a dangerous impact on global climate;
3. Computer-based models can meaningfully replicate the impact of all of the natural factors that may significantly influence climate;
4. Sea levels are rising dangerously at a rate that has accelerated with increasing human GHG emissions, thereby threatening small islands and coastal communities;
5. The incidence of malaria is increasing due to recent climate changes;
6. Human society and natural ecosystems cannot adapt to foreseeable climate change as they have done in the past;

7. Worldwide glacier retreat, and sea ice melting in Polar Regions , is unusual and related to increases in human GHG emissions;
8. Polar bears and other Arctic and Antarctic wildlife are unable to adapt to anticipated local climate change effects, independent of the causes of those changes;
9. Hurricanes, other tropical cyclones and associated extreme weather events are increasing in severity and frequency;
10. Data recorded by ground-based stations are a reliable indicator of surface temperature trends.

It is not the responsibility of ‘climate realist’ scientists to prove that dangerous human-caused climate change is not happening. Rather, it is those who propose that it is, and promote the allocation of massive investments to solve the supposed ‘problem’, who have the obligation to convincingly demonstrate that recent climate change is not of mostly natural origin and, if we do nothing, catastrophic change will ensue. To date, this they have utterly failed to do.

Signed by:

[Science and Technology Experts Well Qualified in Climate Science](#)

\*\*\*\*\*

**2. Who Wants What in Copenhagen**

WSJ OnLine, Dec 6

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704533904574548141677888208.htm>

This week, officials from 192 countries will meet in Copenhagen to tackle global climate change, seeking a successor to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol.

Even if they can't negotiate a binding agreement, many countries hope at least to work out commitments to reduce their greenhouse-gas emissions and provide assistance to poorer countries likely to be hardest hit by the effects of global warming.

Each country, of course, has its own particular priorities and concerns, which is why an agreement is so difficult to reach. Here's a look at some of their agendas for Copenhagen.

**U.S.:** The U.S.'s failure to pass climate-change legislation has meant a delay in a deal at Copenhagen. But pending bills in Congress and the Obama administration's authority to regulate emissions give the country credibility—and negotiating leverage toward an eventual agreement. The U.S. may still pledge to cut emissions about 17% by 2020, while offering funding of low-carbon initiatives for poorer countries to draw them to an agreement. The U.S. also wants other countries, mainly China and India, to commit on when their greenhouse-gas emissions will peak, and will demand stringent standards for reporting, monitoring and verification of emissions and reductions.

**China:** China has pledged to curb carbon emissions as a percentage of gross domestic product by 40% to 45% by 2020. These would be voluntary cuts and therefore unlikely to be part of a binding climate-change pact. But it signals China's interest in an agreement at Copenhagen. Such a deal could bring the country benefits: more funding and technology transfers from developed nations, and as an exporter of solar-power and wind-power equipment, increased demand for its products. What China dreads most is the end of Kyoto provisions that grant tradable credits for reducing emissions; China has been the top receiver for the credits, getting 59% of the total.

**India:** India, which has long resisted the imposition of carbon-emission caps, says it is ready to cut emissions intensity 20% to 25% by 2020, but won't accept legally binding targets. It argues that it needs development and economic growth before it should consider fixed emission caps and that the developed world has a historic responsibility to take more restrictive measures because it caused decades of atmospheric damage. India also favors financing and technology transfer to boost green energy solutions.

**Russia:** Climate change isn't high on Russia's agenda; its attention is on the massive investments it needs to make its aging Soviet-era industrial infrastructure more energy-efficient—with a goal of a 40% improvement in energy efficiency by 2020. Diplomats say the country is willing to reduce emissions between 20% and 25% from 1990 levels. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin says Russia will join a post-Kyoto agreement only if other countries sign up for it and if Russian forests' contribution to reducing global carbon dioxide is taken into account.

**Brazil:** Brazil's government will aim to cut greenhouse-gas emissions between 36% and 39% by reducing deforestation in the Amazon rain forest and increasing the use of fuel-efficient cars and trucks that use biofuels as well as gasoline. But the emissions target is voluntary and depends on the government obtaining financing for the aggressive goals, indicating that Brazil isn't willing to stifle industrial output in Latin America's largest economy. And efforts to reduce deforestation in the Amazon could be stymied by lawlessness in the poverty-stricken region.

**European Union:** The 27-member European Union aims to speak with one voice in Copenhagen. Its goal: taking action that would limit global warming to two degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit). The EU intends to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions 20% by 2020 from 1990 levels and is willing to raise that target to 30% if other countries commit to do their part. It is also ready to help developing countries financially, but it hasn't committed to specific figures. Some Western European countries advocate generosity, but some newer members from Eastern Europe are much less willing to pay.

**Poland:** Poland and other Eastern European nations want a deal that isn't too economically burdensome. The issue is how financial support for developing countries should be shared by EU members. Wealthy members propose making contributions proportional to a country's emissions. But because Eastern members' energy sectors rely heavily on coal, they would pay disproportionately more than if shares were based on their economic output. Poland also wants to be able to continue selling certain carbon credits after the Kyoto protocol expires in 2012. Because Poland has reduced CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 30% over the past 20 years, it can sell credits worth billions of euros.

**Africa:** African countries blame developed countries for greenhouse-gas emissions and want to be compensated for the impact of global warming. But they disagree on priorities. The African Union wants billions of dollars (leaders won't say exactly how much) to adapt to climate change, which is blamed for record droughts in East Africa and flooding in other regions. Oil-producing nations, such as Nigeria, want compensation for the lost revenues that could result from expected declines in oil consumption by industrialized nations.

**Indonesia:** In Indonesia, the world's No. 3 carbon-dioxide emitter (after China and the U.S.), much of the emissions result from deforestation. It probably will ask for international technology and funds for forest conservation. Also, it favors self-monitoring in future programs that give credits for reducing emissions from deforestation, and hints it will oppose efforts to create an international monitoring body. The nation pledges to cut emissions 26% by 2020 from "business-as-usual" levels, but officials say Indonesia will raise its target to 41% if it receives the international funding and technology support it needs.

**Ecuador:** Ecuador, an oil producer, will come to Copenhagen with a novel idea: get rich countries to pay \$3.5 billion to keep 850 million barrels of its crude in the ground. The oil is located in a natural reserve of

the Amazonian forest whose protection will be a cornerstone of the talks. A delegation of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (Ecuador gets the group's presidency next year) has visited to look at the project. The government, which has renamed its oil ministry the "ministry of non-renewable resources," has pitched the idea to some European governments.

--Compiled by Ian Talley, Jing Yang, Paul Beckett, Alexander Kolyandr, Jeff Fick, Alessandro Torello, Marek Strzelecki, Benoit Faucon and Max Lin. They can be reached at [reports@wsj.com](mailto:reports@wsj.com).

\*\*\*\*\*

### 3. Climate Deal Likely to Bear Big Price Tag

By John M. Broder, New York Times, Dec 9

[http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/09/science/earth/09cost.html?\\_r=1&pagewanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/09/science/earth/09cost.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all)

WASHINGTON — If negotiators reach an accord at the climate talks in Copenhagen it will entail profound shifts in energy production, dislocations in how and where people live, sweeping changes in agriculture and forestry and the creation of complex new markets in [global warming](#) pollution credits.

So what is all this going to cost?

The short answer is trillions of dollars over the next few decades. It is a significant sum but a relatively small fraction of the world's total economic output. In energy infrastructure alone, the transformational ambitions that delegates to the [United Nations climate change conference](#) are expected to set in the coming days will cost more than \$10 trillion in additional investment from 2010 to 2030, according to a new estimate from the International Energy Agency.

As scary as that number sounds, the agency said that the costs would ramp up relatively slowly and be largely offset by economic benefits in new jobs, improved lives, more secure energy supplies and a reduced danger of climate catastrophe. Most of the investment will come from private rather than public funds, the agency contends.

"People often ask about the costs," said Kevin Parker, the global head of [Deutsche Bank](#) Asset Management, who tracks climate policy for the bank. "But the figures people tend to cite don't take into account conservation and efficiency measures that are easily available. And they don't look at the cost of inaction, which is the extinction of the human race. Period."

Whatever global warming's effects — and most scientific projections are less dire — there are also varying estimates of the economic costs of failing to act to address the problem soon, some of them very high.

In Copenhagen, some of the most intense and difficult discussions for negotiators center on any potential agreement's near-term financial arrangements. Some of the poorest and most vulnerable nations are calling for a gigantic transfer of wealth from the industrialized world to island nations and countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America that are most likely to feel the ravages of a changing climate.

Many poor nations are insisting that wealthier nations make deeper cuts in their emissions and contribute more money to help the poorer countries, a split that widened in Copenhagen on Tuesday as competing documents of a potential agreement circulated.

Over time, some of the hundreds of billions of dollars the poorer countries are demanding will begin to flow, as global carbon markets become established and governments in rich countries begin to open the spigot of public spending.

But in the meantime, the industrialized countries have proposed a relatively modest fund of about \$10 billion a year for each of the next three or four years to help poorer countries adapt. Even that effort remains the subject of conflict over which countries should contribute how much, what body should oversee the spending and how to determine which projects qualify for finance.

[President Obama](#)'s spokesman said last week that the president supported a short-term fund to aid developing nations and that the United States would pay "its fair share." In many multilateral efforts, the United States picks up a quarter to a third of the tab.

"Providing this assistance," the White House statement said, "is not only a humanitarian imperative — it's an investment in our common security, as no climate change accord can succeed if it does not help all countries reduce their emissions."

The money would be used to help developing nations reduce emissions by switching to renewable energy sources like wind and solar and by compensating landowners for not cutting down or burning forests, a major source of carbon dioxide emissions. Other funds might be used to adjust to effects of a changing climate, like rising sea levels, by building flood walls or relocating settlements to higher ground.

Mr. Obama will travel to Copenhagen on Dec. 18 to attend the final day of the meeting, a sign that the White House believes that a far-reaching accord, including deals on some of the sticky financial issues, is possible.

"This is the question that is being posed in Copenhagen," said Robert N. Stavins, director of the environmental economics program at [Harvard University](#). "How much money do the developed countries have to put on the table to bring developing countries into the conversation?"

Mr. Stavins said that the bulk of the money would have to come from private investment because, he said, it was "inconceivable" that the governments of the wealthy countries would come up with adequate financing and also because private entities spent money much more efficiently.

The climate and energy legislation passed by the House in June sets aside roughly \$8 billion a year for assistance to developing countries by 2030, Mr. Stavins said. That figure, he suggested, represents the upper limit of public financial support from the United States.

The perspective from the developing world is, not surprisingly, somewhat different.

Álvaro Umaña Quesada, the leader of Costa Rica's climate delegation, said that it was important to the developing world to have early resources and a predictable flow of long-term financing. He said that the \$10 billion in so-called quick start financing that was now on the table was adequate but that such spending had to rise to roughly \$80 billion and as much as \$150 billion a year by 2020.

"That is not very much compared to the size of the world economy or the financial crisis bailouts," he said. "There are great needs for adaptation, where the small island nations are really at risk. Some of them are one severe weather event away from disappearing."

The [European Union](#) has endorsed a fund of that size; the United States remains noncommittal. The Obama administration has asked for \$1.2 billion in climate-related financing in the 2010 budget, far below the needs being discussed at Copenhagen. But administration officials said they would seek more money for international climate programs in future years.

Perhaps the most detailed analysis of the financing needs of any climate change agreement comes from Project Catalyst, an initiative of the European Climate Foundation and ClimateWorks, a foundation-supported policy group based in San Francisco. The group's work has helped shape the negotiations in Copenhagen.

The group estimates that roughly \$100 billion will be needed by 2020 to finance climate-change programs in the developing world. About half could come from the growing global market in carbon emissions credits under a [cap-and-trade](#) system, which would be worth an estimated \$2 trillion a year by 2020.

A cap-and-trade system is already operating in Europe and is under consideration by Congress. Such a system sets a ceiling on the carbon emissions of a given country or industry and allows trading of pollution permits within the cap. As the overall limit on emissions grows tighter, the price of pollution permits rises, creating a sizable market in carbon credits.

Countries would grant some of the carbon market allowances directly to energy and environmental programs in the developing world, with other funds coming from a relatively small fee on each transaction.

An additional \$10 billion to \$20 billion would come from taxes on fuels used in aviation and shipping. The rest, perhaps \$25 billion to \$35 billion, would be loans and grants from industrialized nations to poorer countries, split roughly three ways among the United States, the European Union and Canada, Japan and Australia.

"The good news is that everybody now is supporting our proposal for financing," said Dr. Umaña, the Costa Rican delegate. "The bad news is that it's happening 15 years too late. Without real money on the table, this will be a disaster."

\*\*\*\*\*

#### [4. Alarmists cold-shoulder facts](#)

By Robert Bradley, The Washington Times, Dec 8

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/dec/08/alarmists-cold-shoulder-facts//print/>

Facts are awfully stubborn things. And global-warming alarmists - who generally don't let facts get in the way of a good, agenda-driven argument - recently lost a key ally in the run-up to the U.N. global-warming pep rally opening today in Copenhagen. They lost actual data supporting their claims.

In defiant acts of desperation, many out-of-the mainstream environmental alarmists quickly moved to plan B. Some cite the current El Nino - a natural climate variation - warning of "record" high temperatures just on the horizon.

Others continue to trumpet "studies" that paint terrifying environmental fairy tales if world governments do not immediately criminalize carbon, ban fossil fuels and ration energy.

But these tactics are not new. Paul Ehrlich's "population bomb" of the 1960s predicted food riots in the United States and around the world. Today, obesity is bigger problem.

Remember the Club of Rome's 1972 prediction of resource exhaustion? Fifty-seven predictions were made regarding 19 minerals, and all either have been proved false or will be.

Perhaps most hypocritical is the global-cooling scare promoted by, among others, Mr. Obama's science czar, John Holdren. Today, Mr. Holdren says a billion people may perish from global warming by 2020.

It's understandable why public opinion continues to squarely reject the apocalyptic vision of climate change. In Washington, pragmatic politicians of both parties balk at even watered-down proposals to cap greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that will bring higher energy costs and more government control.

There simply is not an appetite for this social-engineering project. And despite the dire warnings of an intellectual cadre, the public is getting it right. The Earth's average temperature is virtually unchanged from a dozen years ago - a result not predicted by climate modelers or activists.

The rate of sea-level rise has slowed to a crawl, throwing cold water on ice-melting scares. Global hurricane activity is near a 30-year low. Fatalities from tornadoes across the United States this year are on course to be the lowest in more than a decade. (Yes, some scientists link global warming to tornadoes.) In 2009, much of the Midwest and Northeast shivered through the coldest summer in recent memory.

While climate models are supposed to be snapshots of the Earth's real climate, the mismatch between observed and modeled climate behavior shows that even the best models are not accurate and are likely overestimating outcomes. Gerald North, a Texas A&M atmospheric sciences and oceanography professor, estimates climate models overestimate warming by roughly 50 percent.

Though climate models have proved to be an obvious inconvenient truth, alarmists continue to ignore this elephant in the room.

In fact, this is buried on Page 805 of the latest assessment from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC): "The set of available models may share fundamental inadequacies, the effects of which cannot be quantified."

It's telling why this was not stated forthrightly in the assessment's summary. Science, after all, should trump politics, social engineering and agendas.

Public opinion continues increasingly to reflect this, as the case against climate alarmism continues to grow.

But there is a crisis that international leaders need to address at Copenhagen. The real planetary emergency is that 1.5 billion people do not have access to modern affordable and reliable forms of energy or the electricity they produce.

The poorest and most underprivileged in the world would benefit most from coal furnaces, natural gas plants and other modern resources that our carbon-based economy and infrastructure help generate.

Some environmental elitists may say: "Let them use solar panels." But the moral imperative of the 21st century is to liberate the master resource of energy from the politics of these reactionary enemies of democratizing progress, prosperity and quality of life.

*Robert L. Bradley is the chief executive officer and founder of the Institute for Energy Research, a nonprofit, market-oriented energy think tank. He is author of "Climate Alarmism Reconsidered" (Institute of Economic Affairs, 2003).*

\*\*\*\*\*

## 5. Administration Warns of 'Command-and-Control' Regulation Over Emissions

FoxNews.com, Dec 9

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/12/09/administration-warns-command-control-regulation-emissions/>

The Obama administration is warning Congress that if it doesn't move to regulate greenhouse gases, the Environmental Protection Agency will take a "command-and-control" role over the process in a way that could hurt business.

The warning, from a top White House economic official who spoke Tuesday on condition of anonymity, came on the eve of EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson's address to the international conference on climate change in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Jackson, however, tried to strike a tone of cooperation in her address Wednesday, explaining that the EPA's new powers to regulate greenhouse gases will be used to complement legislation pending in Congress, not replace it.

"This is not an 'either-or' moment. It's a 'both-and' moment," she said.

But while administration officials have long said they prefer Congress take action on climate change, the economic official who spoke with reporters Tuesday night made clear that the EPA will not wait and is prepared to act on its own.

And it won't be pretty.

"If you don't pass this legislation, then ... the EPA is going to have to regulate in this area," the official said. "And it is not going to be able to regulate on a market-based way, so it's going to have to regulate in a command-and-control way, which will probably generate even more uncertainty."

Climate change legislation that passed the House is stuck in the Senate, but the EPA finding Monday was seen as a boost to the U.S. delegation in Denmark trying to convince other countries that Washington is capable of taking action to follow through with any global commitments.

The economic official explained that congressional action could be better for the economy, since it would provide "compensation" for higher energy prices, especially for small businesses dealing with those higher energy costs. Otherwise, the official warned that the kind of "uncertainty" generated by unilateral EPA action would be a huge "deterrent to investment," in an economy already desperate for jobs.

"So, passing the right kind of legislation with the right kind of compensations seems to us to be the best way to reduce uncertainty and actually to encourage investment," the official said.

Republicans fear that the EPA will ultimately end up stepping in to regulate emissions -- though many oppose the congressional legislation as well. They had urged Jackson to withdraw the finding in light of leaked e-mails from a British research center that appeared to show scientists discussing the manipulation of climate data.

Rep. James Sensenbrenner, R-Wis., ranking Republican on the House Select Committee for Energy Independence and Global Warming, said Tuesday he is going to attend the Copenhagen conference to inform world leaders that despite any promises made by President Obama, no new laws will be passed in the United States until the "scientific fascism" ends.

"I call it 'scientific fascism,'" Sensenbrenner said during a press conference with fellow climate change skeptics. Sensenbrenner said, "The U.N. should throw a red flag" on scientists who support global warming to the exclusion of dissent.

Administration officials, though, said the e-mails do not change the debate.

Former Vice President Al Gore, a leader in the movement on man-caused climate change, told CNN on Wednesday that the e-mails in questions were 10 years old and taken "out of context."

Fox News' Major Garrett and The Associated Press contributed to this report.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 6. EPA Must Be Stopped

Investors Business Daily, Dec 9

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=514830>

**Junk Science:** The Environmental Protection Agency's sneak attack on the U.S. economy and our freedoms, curiously timed for the opening day of the Copenhagen climate charade, won't go unchallenged. Nor should it.

The EPA's finding that carbon dioxide is a dangerous pollutant explains why the administration wasn't too concerned over possible failure at Copenhagen. This was their Plan B.

The finding is an environmental Sword of Damocles held over the head of the U.S. with a warning that if cap-and-trade legislation such as Waxman-Markey or Kerry-Boxer is not signed into law, the full regulatory fury of an unelected bureaucracy will be unleashed on the American people and the U.S. economy.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute has announced it will sue to overturn the endangerment finding on the grounds that the EPA has ignored major scientific issues, including those raised in the Climate-gate fraud scandal.

"EPA is clinging for dear life to the notion that the global climate models are holding up," said Sam Kazman, CEI general counsel. "In reality, those models are about to sink under the growing weight of evidence that they are fabrications."

EPA administrator Lisa Jackson, in a conversation with Sen. James Inhofe, ranking Republican on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, has in effect admitted the finding was based on the junk science and data manipulation practiced at Britain's East Anglia Climate Research Unit (CRU). "She told me that EPA accepted those findings without any serious independent analysis to see whether they were true," Inhofe said.

Dr. Alan Carlin — an EPA senior research analyst at the National Center for Environmental Economics who dared to say, in essence, that emperor Al Gore and his environmental toadies at the EPA were wearing no clothes — agrees that the EPA finding is based on the data manipulation of the CRU.

CRU data have become an integral part of the EPA's attempts to regulate emissions, Carlin wrote on his Web site Dec. 2.

The EPA plans to blunt opposition by "tailoring" the Clean Air Act for greenhouse-gas emissions, only covering big emitters that churn out at least 25,000 tons of gases a year.

But this may bring legal challenges from environmentalists who want everything regulated as well as from big businesses complaining of unequal treatment, since the Clean Air Act requires it to cover facilities emitting as little as 250 tons.

Coming after a "jobs summit," this is a job killer of unprecedented magnitude that will doom any economic recovery, and is based on made-up facts rooted in false assumptions. It must not be allowed to stand, either in the courts or the Congress.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 7. The EPA's Carbon Bomb Fizzles

The administration has given a skittish Congress another reason not to pass cap and trade  
By Kimberley Strassel, Wall Street Journal, Dec 11  
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703514404574588120572016720.html>

In the high-stakes game of chicken the Obama White House has been playing with Congress over who will regulate the earth's climate, the president's team just motored into a ditch. So much for threats.

The threat the White House has been leveling at Congress is the Environmental Protection Agency's "endangerment finding," which EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson finally issued this week. The finding lays the groundwork for the EPA to regulate greenhouse gas emissions across the entire economy, on the grounds that global warming is hazardous to human health.

From the start, the Obama team has wielded the EPA action as a club, warning Congress that if it did not come up with cap-and-trade legislation the EPA would act on its own—and in a far more blunt fashion than Congress preferred. As one anonymous administration official menaced again this week: "If [Congress doesn't] pass this legislation," the EPA is going to have to "regulate in a command-and-control way, which will probably generate even more uncertainty."

The thing about threats, though, is that at some point you have to act on them. The EPA has been sitting on its finding for months, much to the agitation of environmental groups that have been upping the pressure for action.

President Obama, having failed to get climate legislation, didn't want to show up to the Copenhagen climate talks with a big, fat nothing. So the EPA pulled the pin. In doing so, it exploded its own threat.

Far from alarm, the feeling sweeping through many quarters of the Democratic Congress is relief. Voters know cap-and-trade is Washington code for painful new energy taxes. With a recession on, the subject has become poisonous in congressional districts. Blue Dogs and swing-state senators watched in alarm as local Democrats in the recent Virginia and New Jersey elections were pounded on the issue, and lost their seats.

But now? Hurrah! It's the administration's problem! No one can say Washington isn't doing something; the EPA has it under control. The agency's move gives Congress a further excuse not to act.

"The Obama administration now owns this political hot potato," says one industry source. "If I'm [Nebraska Senator] Ben Nelson or [North Dakota Senator] Kent Conrad, why would I ever want to take it back?"

All the more so, in Congress's view, because the EPA "command and control" threat may yet prove hollow. Now that the endangerment finding has become reality, the litigation is also about to become real. Green groups pioneered the art of environmental lawsuits. It turns out the business community took careful notes.

Industry groups are gearing up for a legal onslaught; and don't underestimate their prospects. The leaked emails from the Climatic Research Unit in England alone are a gold mine for those who want to challenge the science underlying the theory of manmade global warming.

But the EPA's legal vulnerabilities go beyond that. The agency derives its authority to regulate pollutants from the Clean Air Act. To use that law to regulate greenhouse gases, the EPA has to prove those gases are harmful to human health (thus, the endangerment finding). Put another way, it must provide "science" showing that a slightly warmer earth will cause Americans injury or death. Given that most climate scientists admit that a warmer earth could provide "net benefits" to the West, this is a tall order.

Then there are the rules stemming from the finding. Not wanting to take on the political nightmare of regulating every American lawn mower, the EPA has produced a "tailoring rule" that it says allows it to focus solely on large greenhouse gas emitters. Yet the Clean Air Act—authored by Congress—clearly directs the EPA to also regulate small emitters.

This is where green groups come in. The tailoring rule "invites suits," says Sen. John Barrasso (R., Wyo.), who has emerged as a top Senate watchdog of EPA actions. Talk of business litigation aside, Mr. Barrasso sees "most of the lawsuits coming from the environmental groups" who want to force the EPA to regulate everything. The agency is going to get hit from all directions. Even if these outsiders don't win their suits, they have the ability to twist up the regulations for a while.

Bottom line: At least some congressional Democrats view this as breathing room, a further reason to not tackle a killer issue in the run-up to next year's election. Mr. Obama may emerge from Copenhagen [sic] with some sort of "deal." But his real problem is getting Congress to act, and his EPA move may have just made that job harder.

\*\*\*\*\*

## 8. In Energy Innovation, Everything New Is Old Again

By Russell Gold, Wall Street Journal, Dec 11

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126048948482786623.html?mod=WSJ\\_hps\\_MIDDLEThirdNews](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126048948482786623.html?mod=WSJ_hps_MIDDLEThirdNews)

PEORIA, Ariz. -- As light filled the sky on a recent morning here, a handful of giant mirrored dishes were being prepared to track the sun and ultimately feed solar-generated electricity into the Phoenix area.

High-tech marvels, the solar dishes look like three-story-tall mirrored flowers atop steel stems. But at the heart of each dish is a very old-fashioned invention: a Stirling engine, patented by a Scotsman in 1816, decades before the diesel or internal combustion engine.

The cutting edge of renewable energy is littered with long-established ideas such as the Stirling. From generating power from the wind to harvesting liquid fuel from algae, some of today's most promising new technologies are actually quite old.

Technology often stands on the shoulders of prior discovery. In the energy field in particular, there are precious few killer apps -- ideas that supersede earlier methods. New energy technologies tend to develop

slowly and spread at a snail's pace. It takes time and money to accomplish small improvements, and even more of both to spread those improvements across the energy system.

The invention of the gas turbine -- used to power aviation and generate electricity -- is the only true energy breakthrough in the 20th century, says Vaclav Smil, a prolific author on energy topics and professor at the University of Manitoba. "There is nothing new under the sun."

Others would disagree. They cite nuclear power, even though a nuclear plant incorporates old-fashioned steam turbines. And other inventions might yet turn out to be game changers, such as the lithium-ion battery or regenerative braking, the technology hybrid vehicles use to capture energy while reducing the car's speed.

So while the Obama administration is pouring billions of dollars into renewable-energy research and counting on green technology to create new jobs, some energy experts warn that change is likely to be less rapid than many Americans -- conditioned by the lively pace of computer innovation -- expect.

Even technology enthusiasts admit that innovation is slow, and costly. "If you want to speed up the innovation process, you are not going to do it on the cheap," says Ted Nordhaus, chairman and founder of the Breakthrough Institute, an energy think tank in Oakland, Calif. "You are going to do it with brute-force expenditure."

Other optimists say that improvements in alternative energy now occur more rapidly than in the past, because the quest for renewables is no longer the province of inexperienced enthusiasts but has been embraced by corporations with big research budgets.

"What has really shifted in the last five, 10 years is the caliber of talent and resources and infrastructure that is being brought to bear," says Nicholas Parker, the chairman of the Cleantech Group LLC, a San Francisco research and consulting firm.

But he acknowledges the time to move an energy idea from patent to market is generally measured in decades, not years.

Things have moved faster in some other areas of science and technology, such as genetics, which in less than half a century went from the description of the double-helix to cloning and gene therapies. But in the energy arena, ideas tend to percolate longer.

American inventor Charles Fritts developed the first solar cell in 1883, introducing the basic design still in use today. Five years later, the first wind turbine used to generate electricity was built in Cleveland.

President George W. Bush ushered cellulosic ethanol into mainstream consciousness when he spoke about turning wood chips and switchgrass into liquid fuels during his 2006 State of the Union address. But the first effort at turning wood into fuel was made by German chemists more than a century ago.

When Exxon Mobil Corp. said this summer it would invest up to \$600 million over the next six years on research on turning algae into fuel, it was the second turn for the tiny organisms. The federal government poured money into algae-to-fuels research from 1978 until 1996.

Royal Dutch Shell PLC is building a multibillion dollar facility in Qatar to turn natural gas into a clean-burning liquid fuel. It is the culmination of years of work, but the basic technology -- the Fischer-Tropsch Process -- dates back to the 1920s.

Even when a groundbreaking new energy source emerges, its spread is often slow. It took oil 80 years from the first commercial production in the 1860s for it to capture one-quarter of the global energy market.

And sometimes, a new energy technology turns out to have significant drawbacks once it is employed on a large scale, which makes the energy industry adopt new technologies only slowly.

Consider the case of solar thermal generation -- a group of inventions that concentrate the heat of the sun to make electricity. Hundreds of large-scale solar installations have been proposed from Southern California to West Texas to take advantage of the region's ample blue-sky days.

There is a catch. More traditional big solar plants guzzle water to turn turbines -- much like a coal plant burns the fossil fuel to heat up water to turn turbines.

"Look at where solar is going to be deployed. By and large it is in sunny places where water is scarce," says Justin Elliott, head of field operations for Stirling Energy Systems, which built the Peoria solar project.

He is happy to talk about this because his solar dishes use a tiny amount of water to produce electricity thanks to the old Stirling engine. Put simply, the engine uses an external heat supply to cause a trapped gas to expand, driving a piston. By comparison, an internal combustion engine uses heat within the engine (the spark plug-fired explosion of petroleum droplets) and a continuous supply of new fuel.

The 1,000 square feet of mirrors on each dish concentrate solar heat on a nine-inch aperture, heating up coils of hydrogen to 720 degrees Celsius. The hydrogen expands, pushing pistons that turn a generator. The hydrogen is then cooled through a radiator and the process starts anew.

If the Stirling solar dish is finally finding its place in the sun, the road has been long.

The idea of powering a Stirling engine with the sun's rays was taken up by Ford Motor Co. in the 1970s. It sold its work to McDonnell-Douglas, which was later bought by Boeing, which sold it to Southern California Edison. In 1996, it ended up in the hands of a group of investors led by a holistic health-care entrepreneur. Last year, a majority stake in the company was acquired by Ireland-based NTR PLC and has a portfolio of renewable-energy companies, including Stirling Energy.

The first thing the new corporate parent did was to focus on driving down costs. It cut the amount of steel needed for each dish by 38%. It replaced three specially made radiators, used to cool the hydrogen, with a single off-the-shelf radiator for heavy-duty construction equipment.

The basic Stirling engine may have been around for a long time, says Steve Cowman, chief executive of Stirling Engine Systems, but making it work on a large scale hasn't been easy. "If it were easy, everyone would be doing it."

#####