
Climategate still resonates. In spite of many advocates dismissing the revelations as insignificant, as today's Science Editorial discusses, Climategate is symptomatic of the entire IPCC process.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #41-2009 (Dec 26, 2009)

By S. Fred Singer, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project

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

Junk Science #2: IPCC's Second Assessment Report (IPCC-AR-2, 1995, published in 1996)

IPCC assessment reports, and particularly their Summaries for Policymakers (SPM), are noted for their selective use of information and their bias to support the political goal of control of fossil fuels in order to fight an alleged anthropogenic global warming (AGW).

Perhaps the most blatant example is IPCC's Second Assessment Report (SAR), completed in 1995 and published in 1996. Its SPM contains the memorable phrase "the balance of evidence suggests a discernable human influence on global climate." You may recall that this 1996 IPCC report played a key role in the political deliberations that led to the 1997 Kyoto Protocol.

This ambiguous phrase suggests a group of climate scientists, examining both human and natural influences on climate change, looking at published scientific research, and carefully weighing their decision. Nothing of the sort has ever happened. The IPCC has consistently ignored the major natural influences on climate change and has focused almost entirely on human causes, especially on GH gases and more especially on carbon dioxide, which is linked to industrial activities and therefore 'bad' almost by definition.

How then did the IPCC-SAR arrive at "balance of evidence"? It was the work of a then-relatively-junior scientist, Dr Benjamin D. **Santer** of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), who has recently re-emerged as a major actor in ClimateGate. As a Convening Lead Author of a crucial IPCC chapter, Santer carefully removed any verbiage denying that human influences might be the major or almost exclusive cause of warming and substituted new language. There is no evidence that he ever consulted any of his fellow IPCC authors, nor do we know who instructed him to make these changes and later approved the text deletions and insertions that fundamentally transformed IPCC-SAR.

The event is described by *Nature* [381(1006):539] and in a 1996 *WSJ* article by the late Professor Frederick **Seitz** (See also my Science Editorial #2-09). Seitz compared the draft of IPCC Chapter 8 (Detection and Attribution) and the final printed text. He noted that, before printing, key phrases had been deleted from the draft that had earlier been approved by its several scientist-authors. For a full account of these text changes see my *Hoover Essay in Public Policy* No. 102 [2000] "*Climate Policy: From Rio to Kyoto*"

Exec Summary http://media.hoover.org/documents/epp_102a.pdf

Essay pdf http://media.hoover.org/documents/epp_102b.pdf

Essay Notes http://media.hoover.org/documents/epp_102c.pdf

[PLEASE NOTE: If you cannot bring up these documents as you expect, please try entering the stated URL's directly on your internet browser.]

Seitz wrote [*WSJ*, Aug 13, 1996]:

“Last week the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a United Nations organization regarded by many as the best source of scientific information about the human impact on the earth's climate, released "The Science of Climate Change 1995," its first new report in five years. The report will surely be hailed as the latest and most authoritative statement on global warming. Policy makers and the press around the world will likely view the report as the basis for critical decisions on energy policy that would have an enormous impact on U.S. oil and gas prices and on the international economy.

This IPCC report, like all others, is held in such high regard largely because it has been peer-reviewed. That is, it has been read, discussed, modified and approved by an international body of experts. These scientists have laid their reputations on the line. But this report is not what it appears to be--it is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists listed on the title page. In my more than 60 years as a member of the American scientific community, including service as president of both the National Academy of Sciences and the American Physical Society, I have never witnessed a more disturbing corruption of the peer-review process than the events that led to this IPCC report.

A comparison between the report approved by the contributing scientists and the published version reveals that key changes were made after the scientists had met and accepted what they thought was the final peer-reviewed version. The scientists were assuming that the IPCC would obey the IPCC Rules--a body of regulations that is supposed to govern the panel's actions. Nothing in the IPCC Rules permits anyone to change a scientific report after it has been accepted by the panel of scientific contributors and the full IPCC.

The participating scientists accepted "The Science of Climate Change" in Madrid last November; the full IPCC accepted it the following month in Rome. But more than 15 sections in Chapter 8 of the report--the key chapter setting out the scientific evidence for and against a human influence over climate--were changed or deleted after the scientists charged with examining this question had accepted the supposedly final text.

Few of these changes were merely cosmetic; nearly all worked to remove hints of the skepticism with which many scientists regard claims that human activities are having a major impact on climate in general and on global warming in particular.

The following passages are examples of those included in the approved report but deleted from the supposedly peer-reviewed published version:

· "None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed [climate] changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases." "No study to date has positively attributed all or part [of the climate change observed to date] to anthropogenic [man-made] causes." "Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the total natural variability of the climate system are reduced." The reviewing scientists used this original language to keep themselves and the IPCC honest. I am in no position to know who made the major changes in Chapter 8; but the report's lead author, Benjamin D. Santer, must presumably take the major responsibility.

IPCC reports are often called the "consensus" view. If they lead to carbon taxes and restraints on economic growth, they will have a major and almost certainly destructive impact on the economies of the world. Whatever the intent was of those who made these significant changes, their effect is to deceive policy makers and the public into believing that the scientific evidence shows human activities are causing global warming.

If the IPCC is incapable of following its most basic procedures, it would be best to abandon the entire IPCC process, or at least that part that is concerned with the scientific evidence on climate change, and look for more reliable sources of advice to governments on this important question."

But in addition to these text changes there are also two key graphs that were doctored in order to convey the impression that anthropogenic influences are dominant. Again, my Hoover essay gives the details.

1. According to all climate models, GH warming shows a characteristic 'fingerprint': a 'hot spot' in temperature trend values in the tropical upper troposphere. **Michaels and Knappenberger** [*Nature* 384 (1996):522-523] discovered that the IPCC's claimed agreement with observations was spurious and obtained by selecting a convenient *segment* of the radiosonde temperature data and ignoring the rest.

2. Santer also claimed that the modeled and observed patterns of geographic surface temperatures were correlated, with the correlation coefficient increasing over time (suggesting to the reader that a growing human component gradually emerged from background noise). I found, however, that Santer had obtained this result by simply deleting from a published graph all the trend lines that disagreed with his desired outcome [*Eos* 80 (1999):372]. In fact, the original paper had Santer himself as lead author and did not appear in print until *after* the IPCC report was completed – in contravention of IPCC rules.

It is interesting that these several documented falsifications went largely unreported and had little impact on scientists and politicians, who went on to support the passage of the Kyoto Protocol -- in spite of the absence of any scientific support. A wide-ranging investigation of ClimateGate may yet serve to bring this IPCC triple-malfeasance to light.

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

1. Special to SEPP, from James Marusek, The Office of Science and Technology Policy initiates a "Public Access Policy Forum" to invite public participation in thinking through what the U.S. Federal government's policy should be with regard to public access to published federally-funded research results.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/open>

2. APS (American Physical Society) Appeals to Authority
By Professor Howard Hayden, The Energy Advocate, December 2009,
<http://www.energyadvocate.com/1405aps.pdf>

3. Copenhagen accord keeps Big Carbon in business
By Christopher Booker, Dec 19, Telegraph, UK
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/6845686/Copenhagen-accord-keeps-Big-Carbon-in-business.html>

4. Eyewitness: How China sabotaged climate talks
Author unidentified, AU ABC News, Dec 23 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]
<http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2009/12/23/2779498.htm?section=justin>

5. A Climatology Conspiracy
By David H. Douglass and John R Christy, The American Thinker, Dec 20, 2009
http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/12/a_climatology_conspiracy.html
[SEPP Note: An important article but due to the length only the initial part is included in the pdf.]

6. Wikipedia's climate doctor

How Wikipedia's green doctor rewrote 5,428 climate articles

By Lawrence Solomon, Financial Post, Dec 19, 2009

<http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2009/12/18/lawrence-solomon-wikipedia-s-climate-doctor.aspx>

7. No Substitute for Fossil Fuels

Investors Business Daily, 12/22/09

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=516042>

8 The 'Science Mantra'

All sorts of agendas wrap themselves in the mantle of science

By Thomas Sowell, National Review Online, Dec 22

<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZTk4ZmVjYzUyMGMwMTJlOGM0ZTY5OWJiOGJmMmQyN2E>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

For an interview with Fred Singer in Copenhagen please see:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AmNQoQ2Tr18&feature=rec-LGOUT-exp_fresh+div-1r-5-HM

According to the New York Times the real success of Copenhagen was Western nations pledging to fund developing countries through international mechanisms. "Copenhagen's One Real Accomplishment: Getting Some Money Flowing" by James Kanter, New York Times, Dec 20

http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/21/business/energy-environment/21iht-green21.html?_r=1&hpw.

However journalists for Der Spiegel consider Copenhagen a failure. "Copenhagen Was an All-Out Failure" by Sobhan Dowling and Daryl Lindsey, Spiegel Online, Dec 21, 2009

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,668352,00.html#ref=rss>

For the Journal "Nature" the major issue is the failure of scientists (advocates) to communicate. "After Copenhagen: The agreement reached last week lends fresh urgency to challenges in science and communication," Editorial, Nature, international weekly journal of science, 12/24/09

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v462/n7276/full/462957b.html> [SEPP Note: in this lengthy editorial the editors ignore the lack of physical evidence that carbon dioxide was the cause of the recent warming.]

Few have asked who will be handling the payments from developed nations to developing ones amounting to hundreds of billions of dollars. Christopher Booker and Richard North have a few suggestions in "Questions over business deals of UN climate change guru Dr. Rajendra Pachauri." UK Telegraph, Dec 20 <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/6847227/Questions-over-business-deals-of-UN-climate-change-guru-Dr-Rajendra-Pachauri.html>

The Asian Development Bank is likely to be one entity that expects to profit from carbon trading and allocation of funds: "Eminent Persons to Advise ADB on Climate Change" Asian Development Bank Press Release, May 4, 2009, <http://www.adb.org/Media/Articles/2009/12885-adb-annual-meetings/>

On her web site, Jo Nova has posted a 30 year time line of Climategate created by Mohib Ebrahim. It is long, but demonstrates that the Climategate scandal is not isolated or insignificant.

<http://joannenova.com.au/global-warming/climategate-30-year-timeline/>

Many advocating that human emissions of CO2 cause global warming claim that the electricity produced by coal fired utilities can easily be replaced by wind or solar power both of which require huge amounts of land. Of course, in the US California is leading the way as illustrated in this New York Times article: "Desert Vistas vs. Solar Power" by Todd Woody, NYT, Dec 22, 2009

http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/22/business/energy-environment/22solar.html?_r=1&th&emc=th

Big Green is heavily involved in the well financed lobbying group, US-CAP, which advocates cap and trade. According to one US Representative, US-CAP provided the "blueprint" for the House passed cap and trade bill. No doubt some supporters of cap and trade assume that Big Green will not oppose sources for energy to replace coal. Will Big Green deliver? This article in the Wall Street Journal may provide a partial answer. "Sierra Club's Pro-Gas Dilemma" by Ben Casselman, WSJ, Dec 21

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126135534799299475.html?mod=WSJ_hps_sections_news#

The Investors Business Daily has its own views on why development of US sources of natural gas is becoming difficult. "Get The Frackin' Gas," IBD, 12/22/09,

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=516041>

Not everyone is bowing the EPA's finding that science supports the claim that greenhouse gases threaten public health and welfare, thus must be regulated. "Cattlemen challenge EPA greenhouse gas ruling in court," Dec 24, 2009, [H/t Brad Veek] <http://www.farmanddairy.com/news/cattlemen-challenge-epa-greenhouse-gas-ruling-in-court/13835.htmlprint/>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

In the last two weeks we received suggestions for environmental friendly food sources – garlic milk and green lamb. Now we have a suggestion for a third source in "Polluting pets: the devastating impact of man's best friend," by Isabelle Toussaint and Jurgen Hecker, Yahoo! News, Dec 20, 2009

http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20091220/lf_afp/lifestyleclimatewarminganimalsfood

If you have ever desired to become an automobile manufacturer, Fisker Automotive may have the ideal business plan: one, form a new company with a few people who have been associated with automotive design, two, get "the right" backers, three, design an exciting concept car that is a plug-in electric – hybrid which will sell for \$90,000, four, have the Department of Energy loan you almost \$600,000,000 on the promise of building "affordable" versions that will sell for \$40,000, assuming appropriate tax breaks, five, buy a manufacturing plant worth hundreds of millions from the US government for pennies on the dollar, and, six, get the state to commit tens of millions in incentives. Now you are in business: "Venture Capitol: New VC Force," By Neil King Jr., Wall Street Journal, Dec 15, 2009

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB126074549073889853.html?mod=WSJ_hps_MIDDLEForthNews

#####

1. Special to SEPP, from James Marusek, The Office of Science and Technology Policy initiates a "Public Access Policy Forum" to invite public participation in thinking through what the U.S. Federal government's policy should be with regard to public access to published federally-funded research results. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/open>

The Office of Science and Technology Policy in the Executive Office of the President and the White House Open Government Initiative have launched a "Public Access Policy Forum" to invite public participation in thinking through what the U.S. Federal government's policy should be with regard to public access to published federally-funded research results. The comment period is currently open. It seems that after the fallout from the CRU scandal, scientist might have a bit to say in this area.

Specifically, government funded data should be made freely available to the public - including climate data.

OSTP is conducting an interactive, online discussion beginning Thursday, December 10. The discussion will focus on three major areas of interest:

* Implementation (Dec. 10 to 20): Which Federal agencies are good candidates to adopt Public Access policies? What variables (field of science, proportion of research funded by public or private entities, etc.) should affect how public access is implemented at various agencies, including the maximum length of time between publication and public release?

* Features and Technology (Dec. 21 to Dec 31): In what format should the data be submitted in order to make it easy to search and retrieve information, and to make it easy for others to link to it? Are there existing digital standards for archiving and interoperability to maximize public benefit? How are these anticipated to change?

* Management (Jan. 1 to Jan. 7): What are the best mechanisms to ensure compliance? What would be the best metrics of success? What are the best examples of usability in the private sector (both domestic and international)? Should those who access papers be given the opportunity to comment or provide feedback?

A description of this initiative is available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/open>

Currently the "Policy Forum on Public Access to Federally Funded Research: Implementation" at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2009/12/10/policy-forum-public-access-federally-funded-research-implementation> is accepting comments. Open the link to the Office of Science & Technology Policy (OSTP) Blog at <http://blog.ostp.gov/2009/12/10/policy-forum-on-public-access-to-federally-funded-research-implementation/>, then register on-line, then leave a comment.

2. APS (American Physical Society) Appeals to Authority

By Professor Howard Hayden, The Energy Advocate, December 2009,
<http://www.energyadvocate.com/1405aps.pdf>

There are no authorities in science. Experts, yes. Brilliant, well educated experts, yes. *Mistaken*, brilliant, well-educated experts, yes. (The only people who never make mistakes are those who never do anything.) But there are no authorities.

It is therefore distressing to find that an ad-hoc committee of the American Physical Society (APS) has asserted on no uncertain terms that authority rules.

The background is this. The Executive Committee of the APS issued a statement in November 2007 saying

“Emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities are changing the atmosphere in ways that affect the Earth's climate. Greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide as well as methane, nitrous oxide and other gases. They are emitted from fossil fuel combustion and a range of industrial and agricultural processes.

“The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth’s physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.

“Because the complexity of the climate makes accurate prediction difficult, the APS urges an enhanced effort to understand the effects of human activity on the Earth’s climate, and to provide

the technological options for meeting the climate challenge in the near and longer terms. The APS also urges governments, universities, national laboratories and its membership to support policies and actions that will reduce the emission of greenhouse gases.”

The second and third lines of the first paragraph are reasonable statements of fact, and the only other reasonable part is “the APS urges an enhanced effort to understand the effects of human activity on the Earth’s climate.” Would that they had followed their own counsel, and even broadened the sentence to include *natural* effects on the climate.

About 100 APS members, including many Fellows and Distinguished Professors have signed a petition submitted by Robert H. Austin [1] challenging the APS 2007 *Statement on Climate Change*. One very good reason for issuing the challenge was not in the petition: the executive board has no business pretending that they speak for the membership. A second is that the board itself has no expertise in climate science. The petition drive was initiated because the *Statement* is riddled with unproven assertions.

The petition did not seek to discard the *Statement*, but instead to supplant it, using phrases like, “[M]easured or reconstructed temperature records indicate that 20th – 21st century changes are neither exceptional nor persistent.” Later, “The APS supports an objective scientific effort to understand the effects of all processes—natural and human—on the Earth’s climate and the biosphere’s response to climate change.”

Accordingly, the APS cobbled together an ad-hoc committee to consider the petition. The Chairman was Dan Kleppner (MIT) who has expertise in laser cooling and trapping [TEA January 2009, “Optical Molasses”], a topic that relates to precisely one component of climate. Robert Adair (Yale) has written some nice books about the physics of baseball. I am unacquainted with the others, David M. Ceperley (theoretical physics, U. of Illinois) Alexander L. Fetter (bosonic gases, Stanford), Helen R. Quinn (missing antimatter, CP violation, Stanford), and Ellen D. Williams (surface physics, U. of Maryland). This is obviously a group of brilliant people—but where is the expertise in anything related to climatology?

Anybody who has followed the global-warming discussions would know that skeptics challenge the data, methodology, and conclusions of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Accordingly, it would be reasonable to do some independent investigation of those topics. Apparently the ad-hoc committee did no such thing. I quote:

To review these issues we have relied primarily on the 4th Assessment Report [AR4] of the International Panel on Climate Change, in particular its first volume: *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Solomon et al, Cambridge University Press]. (PSB). We have also turned to the NRC report *Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last 2,000 Years*, Committee on Surface Temperature Reconstructions for the Last 2,000 Years, (National Research Council, 2006). (STR).

It may come as a surprise to the ad-hoc committee, but skeptics have also read those reports—thoroughly—and still disagree. (By its vocabulary, the NC’s STR seems to have been lifted uncritically from AR4.) It adds no intellectual or scientific content to the two reports merely to read and parrot them.

To put it fairly but bluntly, the ad-hoc committee of the APS said that the reports are true because the reports say they are true.

[1] Robert H. Austin, Professor of Physics, Princeton University, Fellow APS, AAAS; APS Council: 1991-1994, 2007-2010, Member National Academy of Sciences, American Association of Arts and Sciences

3. Copenhagen accord keeps Big Carbon in business

By Christopher Booker, Dec 19, Telegraph, UK

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/6845686/Copenhagen-accord-keeps-Big-Carbon-in-business.html>

As fairy-tale snow gently descended on Copenhagen, the great global warming conference degenerated through pantomime, boredom, chaos and anger to its entirely predictable conclusion – a colossal pile of fudge with a very hard and nasty rock hidden at its centre. The "world summit" on climate change was never really going to be about saving the world from global warming at all. Even if the delegates had got all they wanted, it would no more have had any influence on emissions of CO₂ – let alone on the world's climate – than the 1997 Kyoto Protocol before it.

As was argued in 1997 by Tom Wigley, one of Al Gore's trusted allies and formerly head of the East Anglia Climatic Research Unit, or CRU (recently at the centre of the Climategate scandal over rigged temperature data), even if the world had implemented Kyoto to the full, it would only have delayed global warming by six years. In fact, as was revealed last summer by the German renewable energy institute IWR, CO₂ emissions are now 40 per cent above their level in 1990, the baseline Kyoto was meant to return them to.

Copenhagen was not about global warming but money. The cash that Hillary Clinton so dramatically plonked on the table, rising to \$100 billion by 2020, which includes the £1.5 billion offered by Gordon Brown (money which of course he hasn't got) and which like a crazed gambler he last week upped to £6 billion (even more money he hasn't got), was merely a "sweetener" to persuade the developing countries to maintain the money-machine set in motion by Kyoto.

This is the new global industry based on buying and selling the right to emit CO₂, estimated soon to be worth trillions of dollars a year, which through schemes such as the UN's Clean Development Mechanism and the EU's Emissions Trading System is making a small minority of people, including Al Gore, extremely rich.

The only really concrete achievement of Copenhagen was to win agreement to the perpetuating of those Kyoto rules that have created this vast industry, which has two main beneficiaries. On one hand are that small number of people in China and India who have learnt how to work this system to their huge advantage. On the other are all those Western entrepreneurs who have piled into what has become the fastest-growing commodity market in the world.

The part played at Copenhagen by all the tree-huggers, abetted by the BBC and their media allies, was to keep hysteria over warming at fever pitch while the politicians haggled over the real prize, to keep the Kyoto system in place.

The only tree they were concerned with hugging was the money tree and all the vast political apparatus that now supports it, allowing governments to tax and regulate us into handing over ever more of our money, largely without realising it, every time we drive a car, fly in a plane, pay our electricity bill or carry out any of a vast range of activities that involve the emission of CO₂. Compared with these sums, even the billions we all unwittingly spend on subsidies to the developers of useless wind turbines are chicken feed.

It was timely that while the gabfest and the backstairs haggling were continuing in that dreary concrete shed, further shocking evidence should have been released to show how the Met Office's Hadley Centre and the CRU have been rigging the most important of all the four official global temperature records. HadCRUT, as it is called, constructed by Hadley and the CRU from raw data supplied from weather stations all over the globe, is relied on by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) as the most prestigious temperature record we have.

What was released last week from Russia was evidence that the stars of Climategate have been cherry-picking the temperature data they receive from Russia, to use only the 25 per cent of the data that makes for a warming trend. Put it together with all the data they have suppressed and what emerges is a trend

over the past 80 years that remains flat, showing no net warming at all. Yet this is the most oft-cited of all the temperature records on which the whole global warming scare of recent decades has been built.

Naturally none of this was allowed to percolate the discussions in Copenhagen where, behind all the playacting and flim-flam of the stage army of activists (most of them subsidised by the world's taxpayers), the only real concern was to maintain the greatest financial scam the world has ever seen.

4. Eyewitness: How China sabotaged climate talks

Author unidentified AU ABC News, Dec 23 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2009/12/23/2779498.htm?section=justin>

A writer and environmental activist who was present at the final Copenhagen climate talks says China sabotaged the deal and ensured Barack Obama would shoulder the blame.

While China's Premier Wen Jiabao insisted his government had played an "important and constructive" role, the talks in the Danish capital ended with a political accord rather than a binding agreement.

Mark Lynas, who was attached to the Maldives delegation, described what he saw at the talks as "profoundly shocking".

"I am certain that had the Chinese not been in the room, we would have left Copenhagen with a deal that had environmentalists popping champagne corks in every corner of the world," he [wrote in the The Guardian](#).

"The truth is this: China wrecked the talks, intentionally humiliated Barack Obama, and insisted on an awful 'deal' so Western leaders would walk away carrying the blame.

He says Prime Minister Kevin Rudd and other Western leaders were visibly upset when China started "removing all the numbers that mattered" in the final talks, including emissions cuts by developed countries of 80 per cent by 2050.

"Why can't we even mention our own targets?" demanded a furious [German Premier] Angela Merkel.

"Australia's prime minister, Kevin Rudd, was annoyed enough to bang his microphone. Brazil's representative too pointed out the illogicality of China's position. Why should rich countries not announce even this unilateral cut?

"The Chinese delegate said no, and I watched, aghast, as Merkel threw up her hands in despair and conceded the point. Now we know why - because China bet, correctly, that Obama would get the blame for the Copenhagen accord's lack of ambition.

"But I saw Obama fighting desperately to salvage a deal, and the Chinese delegate saying "no", over and over again."

Lynas says the 2020 peaking year was then "replaced by woolly language" and the global 50 per cent cuts by 2050 were also removed.

"No-one else, perhaps with the exceptions of India and Saudi Arabia, wanted this to happen," Lynas said.

'Took the bait'

Lynas fears "the truth about what actually happened is in danger of being lost amid the spin and inevitable mutual recriminations".

"China's strategy was simple: block the open negotiations for two weeks, and then ensure that the closed-door deal made it look as if the west had failed the world's poor once again. And sure enough, the aid agencies, civil society movements and environmental groups all took the bait," he said.

"The failure was 'the inevitable result of rich countries refusing adequately and fairly to shoulder their overwhelming responsibility', said Christian Aid. 'Rich countries have bullied developing nations,' fumed Friends of the Earth International.

"All very predictable, but the complete opposite of the truth."

He is dismissive of the role played by Sudanese delegate Lumumba Di-Aping, who negotiated on behalf of China and developing countries, accusing Sudan of behaving as China's puppet and helping to create the "perfect stitch-up".

Lynas also said China carried out a clear diplomatic snub at the talks.

"The Chinese premier, Wen Jinbao, did not deign to attend the meetings personally, instead sending a second-tier official in the country's foreign ministry to sit opposite Obama himself," he said.

"The diplomatic snub was obvious and brutal, as was the practical implication: several times during the session, the world's most powerful heads of state were forced to wait around as the Chinese delegate went off to make telephone calls to his 'superiors'."

India's stance

India has [already confirmed](#) it worked with China and other emerging nations to ensure there were no legally binding targets at the talks.

India's Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh earlier faced parliament for the first time since the UN talks, saying the nation had "come out quite well in Copenhagen".

"We can be satisfied that we were able to get our way on this issue," declared Mr Ramesh, who has consistently said India would be one of the countries hardest hit by climate change.

He said India, China, South Africa and Brazil had emerged as a powerful force and said the group had protected its right to continued economic growth.

Mr Ramesh said India would continue to work with its allies "to ensure that the interests of developing countries and India in particular are protected in the course of negotiations in 2010 and beyond".

Britain's blame

Britain has also said the meeting was lurched into farce and pointed the finger of blame at Beijing.

While British Prime Minister Gordon Brown refrained from naming countries, his climate change minister Ed Miliband said China had led a group of countries that "hijacked" the negotiations which had at times presented "a farcical picture to the public".

"We did not get an agreement on 50 per cent reductions in global emissions by 2050 or on 80 per cent reductions by developed countries," he wrote in The Guardian.

"Both were vetoed by China, despite the support of a coalition of developed and the vast majority of developing countries."

China, the world's top polluter, doggedly resisted pressure for outside scrutiny of its emissions.

5. A Climatology Conspiracy

By David H. Douglass and John R Christy, The American Thinker, Dec 20, 2009

http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/12/a_climatology_conspiracy.html

[SEPP Note: An important article but due to the length only the initial part is included in the pdf.]

The CRU e-mails have revealed how the normal conventions of the peer review process appear to have been compromised by a team* of global warming scientists, with the willing cooperation of the editor of the International Journal of Climatology (IJC), Glenn McGregor. The team spent nearly a year preparing and publishing a paper that attempted to rebut a previously published paper in IJC by Douglass, Christy, Pearson, and Singer (DCPS). The DCPS paper, reviewed and accepted in the traditional manner, had shown that the IPCC models that predicted significant "global warming" in fact largely disagreed with the observational data.

We will let the reader judge whether this team effort, revealed in dozens of e-mails and taking nearly a year, involves inappropriate behavior, including (a) unusual cooperation between authors and editor, (b) misstatement of known facts, (c) character assassination, (d) avoidance of traditional scientific give-and-take, (e) using confidential information, (f) misrepresentation (or misunderstanding) of the scientific question posed by DCPS, (g) withholding data, and more.

*The team is a group of climate scientists who frequently collaborate and publish papers which often support the hypothesis of human-caused global warming. For this essay, the leading team members include Ben Santer, Phil Jones, Timothy Osborn, and Tom Wigley, with lesser roles for several others.

[Please see the referenced web site for the full article]

6. Wikipedia's climate doctor

How Wikipedia's green doctor rewrote 5,428 climate articles

By Lawrence Solomon, Financial Post, Dec 19, 2009

<http://network.nationalpost.com/np/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2009/12/18/lawrence-solomon-wikipedia-s-climate-doctor.aspx>

The Climategate Emails describe how a small band of climatologists cooked the books to make the last century seem dangerously warm.

The emails also describe how the band plotted to rewrite history as well as science, particularly by eliminating the Medieval Warm Period, a 400 year period that began around 1000 AD.

The Climategate Emails reveal something else, too: the enlistment of the most widely read source of information in the world — Wikipedia — in the wholesale rewriting of this history.

The Medieval Warm Period, which followed the meanness and cold of the Dark Ages, was a great time in human history — it allowed humans around the world to bask in a glorious warmth that vastly improved agriculture, increased life spans and otherwise bettered the human condition.

But the Medieval Warm Period was not so great for some humans in our own time — the same small band that believes the planet has now entered an unprecedented and dangerous warm period. As we now know from the Climategate Emails, this band saw the Medieval Warm Period as an enormous obstacle in their mission of spreading the word about global warming. If temperatures were warmer 1,000 years ago than today, the Climategate Emails explain in detail, their message that we now live in the warmest of all possible times would be undermined. As put by one band member, a Briton named Folland at the Hadley Centre, a Medieval Warm Period “dilutes the message rather significantly.”

Even before the Climategate Emails came to light, the problem posed by the Medieval Warm Period to this band was known. “We have to get rid of the Medieval Warm Period” read a pre-Climategate email, circa 1995, as attested to at hearings of the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment & Public Works. But the Climategate transcripts were more extensive and more illuminating — they provided an unvarnished look at the struggles that the climate practitioners underwent before settling on their scientific dogma.

The Climategate Emails showed, for example, that some members of the band were uncomfortable with aspects of their work, some even questioning the need to erase the existence of the Medieval Warm Period 1,000 years earlier.

Said Briffa, one of their chief practitioners: “I know there is pressure to present a nice tidy story as regards ‘apparent unprecedented warming in a thousand years or more in the proxy data’ but in reality the situation is not quite so simple. ... I believe that the recent warmth was probably matched about 1,000 years ago.”

In the end, Briffa and other members of the band overcame their doubts and settled on their dogma. With the help of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the highest climate change authority of all, they published what became the icon of their movement — the hockey stick graph. This icon showed temperatures in the last 1,000 years to have been stable — no Medieval Warm Period, not even the Little Ice Age of a few centuries ago.

But the UN’s official verdict that the Medieval Warm Period had not existed did not erase the countless schoolbooks, encyclopedias, and other scholarly sources that claimed it had. Rewriting those would take decades, time that the band members didn’t have if they were to save the globe from warming.

Instead, the band members turned to their friends in the media and to the blogosphere, creating a website called RealClimate.org. “The idea is that we working climate scientists should have a place where we can mount a rapid response to supposedly ‘bombshell’ papers that are doing the rounds” in aid of “combating dis-information,” one email explained, referring to criticisms of the hockey stick and anything else suggesting that temperatures today were not the hottest in recorded time. One person in the nine-member Realclimate.org team — U.K. scientist and Green Party activist William Connolley — would take on particularly crucial duties.

Connolley took control of all things climate in the most used information source the world has ever known – Wikipedia. Starting in February 2003, just when opposition to the claims of the band members were beginning to gel, Connolley set to work on the Wikipedia site. He rewrote Wikipedia’s articles on

global warming, on the greenhouse effect, on the instrumental temperature record, on the urban heat island, on climate models, on global cooling. On Feb. 14, he began to erase the Little Ice Age; on Aug. 11, the Medieval Warm Period. In October, he turned his attention to the hockey stick graph. He rewrote articles on the politics of global warming and on the scientists who were skeptical of the band. Richard Lindzen and Fred Singer, two of the world's most distinguished climate scientists, were among his early targets, followed by others that the band especially hated, such as Willie Soon and Sallie Baliunas of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, authorities on the Medieval Warm Period.

All told, Connolley created or rewrote 5,428 unique Wikipedia articles. His control over Wikipedia was greater still, however, through the role he obtained at Wikipedia as a website administrator, which allowed him to act with virtual impunity. When Connolley didn't like the subject of a certain article, he removed it — more than 500 articles of various descriptions disappeared at his hand. When he disapproved of the arguments that others were making, he often had them barred — over 2,000 Wikipedia contributors who ran afoul of him found themselves blocked from making further contributions. Acolytes whose writing conformed to Connolley's global warming views, in contrast, were rewarded with Wikipedia's blessings. In these ways, Connolley turned Wikipedia into the missionary wing of the global warming movement.

The Medieval Warm Period disappeared, as did criticism of the global warming orthodoxy. With the release of the Climategate Emails, the disappearing trick has been exposed. The glorious Medieval Warm Period will remain in the history books, perhaps with an asterisk to describe how a band of zealots once tried to make it disappear.

7. No Substitute for Fossil Fuels

Investors Business Daily, 12/22/09

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=516042>

Energy: Earlier this year, Congress approved a scheme to pour \$80 billion — on top of the tens of billions already spent — into renewables. A government report released last week indicates the money will be wasted.

Renewable energy is the shiny gem that everyone wants but no one can have. Not even a president. Campaigning last year in Lansing, Mich., President Barack Obama said that it was his goal for the U.S. to generate 10% of its electric power from renewable sources by 2012 and 25% by 2025. But he cannot, by the force of will or executive order, change the laws of physics and economics.

America has long relied on fossil fuels to power its economy. Oil, natural gas and coal provide about 84% of the nation's energy.

And for good reason. They are plentiful and typically easy to retrieve, and, consequently, cheap.

At the other end of the spectrum are renewable sources such as solar, wind, biomass and geothermal. They supply only about 4% of our energy, the remainder coming from hydro and nuclear power.

An axis of environmentalists and Democrats want to change this ratio, because, according to the usual complaint, we depend too heavily on the fossil fuels that emit carbon dioxide.

Trouble is, the market for renewables is poor. Few want to use the inefficient, unreliable and expensive sources. But that hasn't slowed the renewable energy campaign, which has succeeded in persuading the public that renewables are a sensible energy source and convincing Congress to fund supporters' daydreams.

The government can continue to "invest" in renewables, and the dreamers will keep using public money to find the magic formula. But little will change over the next 25 years.

The federal Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Outlook says in 2035, demand for liquid fuels will increase by almost 10% over 2008 levels, natural gas by nearly 7% and coal by 12%.

While use of renewables will increase as well — by 81%, including hydropower — they will still be unable to unseat our dominant energy source. Fossil fuels' share of consumption will fall by only six percentage points, from 84% to 78% by 2035. Renewables will provide about 8%.

It's clear that renewables, which have benefited from government subsidies far in excess of what fossil fuels have received, can't compete in today's market and won't be faring much better a quarter century from now, according to the government's own reckoning.

It's just as clear that throwing taxpayers' dollars at renewables has produced little progress.

Spain provides perhaps the best lesson. The government there has spent \$43 billion on solar energy projects, yet solar provides less than 1% of the country's electric power. It was a bad investment.

Chasing the wind is just as ineffective. When Congress temporarily eliminated wind power credits in 1999, 2001 and 2003, the number of new turbine projects fell sharply. The Texas Public Policy Foundation says that providing a modest level of wind power in that state would cost taxpayers at least \$60 billion through 2025.

Biomass is also a poor substitute. It's both primitive — its sources are wood and trash — and an environmental nightmare, devouring in some cases as much as 10 times the land mass than needed to create a wind farm. And wind farms themselves are big land eaters.

Geothermal energy, considered "free" energy from the earth, is also a space eater that requires heavy capital investment, which is often hard to recoup. In California earlier this month, a geothermal project was abandoned, despite a \$6 million grant from the Energy Department and roughly \$30 million in venture capital.

Geothermal has, as well, some environmental drawbacks. The day before the California project was closed, Swiss government officials permanently shut down a geothermal project in Basel because, the New York Times reports, "of the damaging earthquakes it produced in 2006 and 2007."

Maybe some of these renewables will one day be cheap and reliable. Technological advances will help. But today they are neither cheap nor reliable, and, based on the government's report, won't be for another generation.

Until they can compete, the country has to rely on proven sources: fossil fuels and nuclear power. To force cutbacks on these so that renewables can get a bigger market share, and to continue to fund projects with public money, is foolish and irresponsible.

8 The 'Science Mantra'

All sorts of agendas wrap themselves in the mantle of science

By Thomas Sowell, National Review Online, Dec 22

<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZTk4ZmVjYzUyMGMwMTJlOGM0ZTY5OWJiOGJmMmQyN2E>

Science is one of the great achievements of the human mind and the biggest reason why we live not only longer but more vigorously in our old age, in addition to all the ways in which it provides us with things that make life easier and more enjoyable.

Like anything valuable, science has been seized upon by politicians and ideologues, and used to forward their own agendas. This started long ago, as far back as the 18th century, when the Marquis de Condorcet coined the term “social science” to describe various theories he favored. In the 19th century, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels distinguished their own brand of socialism as “scientific socialism.” By the 20th century, all sorts of notions wrapped themselves in the mantle of science.

“Global warming” hysteria is only the latest in this long line of notions, whose main argument is that there is no argument, because it is “science.” The recently revealed destruction of raw data at the bottom of the global warming hysteria, as well as revelations of attempts to prevent critics of this hysteria from being published in leading journals, suggests that the disinterested search for truth — the hallmark of real science — has taken a back seat to a political crusade.

An intercepted e-mail from a professor at the Climate Research Unit in England to a professor at the University of Pennsylvania warned the latter: “Don’t any of you three tell anybody that the UK has a Freedom of Information Act” and urged the American professor to delete any e-mails he may have sent a colleague regarding the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

When a business accused of fraud begins shredding its memos and deleting its e-mails, the media are quick to proclaim these actions as signs of guilt. But, after the global warming advocates began a systematic destruction of evidence, the big television networks went for days without even reporting these facts, much less commenting on them.

As for politicians, Senator Barbara Boxer has urged prosecution of the hackers who uncovered and revealed the e-mails! People who have in the past applauded whistleblowers in business, in the military, or in Republican administrations, and who lionized the *New York Times* for publishing the classified Pentagon papers, are now shocked and outraged that someone dared to expose massive evidence of manipulations, concealment and destruction of data — and deliberate cover-ups of all this — in the global warming establishment.

Factual data are crucial in real science. Einstein himself urged that his own theory of relativity not be accepted until it could be empirically verified. This verification came when scientists around the world observed an eclipse of the sun and discovered that light behaved as Einstein’s theory said it would behave, however implausible that might have seemed beforehand.

Today, politicized “science” has too big a stake in the global warming hysteria to let the facts speak for themselves and let the chips fall where they may. Too many people — in politics and in the media, as well as among those climate scientists who are promoting global warming hysteria — let the raw data on which their calculations have been based fall into the “wrong hands.”

People who talk about the corrupting influence of money seem to automatically assume that it is only private money that is corrupting. But, when governments have billions of dollars invested in the global-warming crusade, massive programs are underway, and whole political careers are at risk if that crusade gets undermined, do not expect the disinterested search for truth.

Among the intelligentsia, there have always been many who are ready to jump on virtually any bandwagon that will take them to the promised land, where the wise and noble few — like themselves —

can take the rest of us poor dummies in hand and tell us how we had better change the way we live our lives.

No doubt some climate scientists honestly believe that global warming poses a threat. But other climate scientists honestly believe the opposite. That is why the raw data have had to be destroyed before the latter get their hands on it.

This is tragically the case as regards many other issues, besides global warming, where data are made available only to the true believers and kept out of the hands of those who think otherwise.

#####