

guardian.co.uk

Copenhagen climate summit

December 7-18



Copenhagen climate change talks must fail, says top scientist

Exclusive: World's leading climate change expert says summit talks so flawed that deal would be a disaster

Suzanne Goldenberg, US environment correspondent
guardian.co.uk, Wednesday 2 December 2009 20.54 GMT



'We don't have a leader who is able to grasp [the issue] and say what is really needed. Instead we are trying to continue business as usual,' say James Hansen. Photograph: Gareth Fuller/PA

The scientist who convinced the world to take notice of the looming danger of global warming says it would be better for the planet and for future generations if next week's Copenhagen climate change summit ended in collapse.

In an interview with the Guardian, James Hansen, the world's pre-eminent climate scientist, said any agreement likely to emerge from the negotiations would be so deeply flawed that it would be better to start again from scratch.

"I would rather it not happen if people accept that as being the right track because it's a disaster track," said Hansen, who heads the Nasa Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York.

"The whole approach is so fundamentally wrong that it is better to reassess the situation. If it is going to be the Kyoto-type thing then [people] will spend years trying to determine exactly what that means." He was speaking as progress towards a deal in Copenhagen received a boost today, with India revealing a target to curb its carbon emissions. All four of the major emitters – the US, China, EU and India – have now tabled offers on emissions, although the equally vexed issue of funding for developing

nations to deal with global warming remains deadlocked.

Hansen, in repeated appearances before Congress beginning in 1989, has done more than any other scientist to educate politicians about the causes of global warming and to prod them into action to avoid its most catastrophic consequences. But he is vehemently opposed to the carbon market schemes – in which permits to pollute are bought and sold – which are seen by the EU and other governments as the most efficient way to cut emissions and move to a new clean energy economy.

Hansen is also fiercely critical of Barack Obama – and even Al Gore, who won a Nobel peace prize for his efforts to get the world to act on climate change – saying politicians have failed to meet what he regards as the moral challenge of our age.

In Hansen's view, dealing with climate change allows no room for the compromises that rule the world of elected politics. "This is analagous to the issue of slavery faced by Abraham Lincoln or the issue of Nazism faced by Winston Churchill," he said. "On those kind of issues you cannot compromise. You can't say let's reduce slavery, let's find a compromise and reduce it 50% or reduce it 40%."

He added: "We don't have a leader who is able to grasp it and say what is really needed. Instead we are trying to continue business as usual."

The understated Iowan's journey from climate scientist to activist accelerated in the last years of the Bush administration. Hansen, a reluctant public speaker, says he was forced into the public realm by the increasingly clear looming spectre of droughts, floods, famines and drowned cities indicated by the science.

That enormous body of scientific evidence has been put under a microscope by climate sceptics after last month's release online of hacked emails sent by respected researchers at the climate research unit of the University of East Anglia. Hansen admitted the controversy could shake public's trust, and called for an investigation. "All that stuff they are arguing about the data doesn't really change the analysis at all, but it does leave a very bad impression," he said.

The row reached Congress today, with Republicans accusing the researchers of engaging in "scientific fascism" and pressing the Obama administration's top science adviser, John Holdren, to condemn the email. Holdren, a climate scientist who wrote one of the emails in the UEA trove, said he was prepared to denounce any misuse of data by the scientists – if one is proved.

Hansen has emerged as a leading campaigner against the coal industry, which produces more greenhouse gas emissions than any other fuel source.

He has become a fixture at campus demonstrations and last summer was arrested at a protest against mountaintop mining in West Virginia, where he called the Obama government's policies "half-assed".

He has irked some environmentalists by espousing a direct carbon tax on fuel use. Some see that as a distraction from rallying support in Congress for cap-and-trade legislation that is on the table.

He is scathing of that approach. "This is analagous to the indulgences that the Catholic church sold in the middle ages. The bishops collected lots of money and the sinners got redemption. Both parties liked that arrangement despite its absurdity. That is exactly what's happening," he said. "We've got the developed countries who want to continue more or less business as usual and then these developing countries who want money

and that is what they can get through offsets [sold through the carbon markets]."

For all Hansen's pessimism, he insists there is still hope. "It may be that we have already committed to a future [sea level rise of a metre](#) or even more but that doesn't mean that you give up.

"Because if you give up you could be talking about tens of metres. So I find it screwy that people say you passed a tipping point so it's too late. In that case what are you thinking: that we are going to abandon the planet? You want to minimise the damage."

- James Hansen's book *Storms of My Grandchildren* is published by Bloomsbury, £18.99

Ads by Google

Cutting CO2 Won't Work

Find out what the world's top economists suggest instead!

www.fixtheclimate.com

ClearEdge5 Fuel Cells

A New Way to Power Your Home Or Business. Request More Info!

www.ClearEdgePower.com

Good COP, Bad COP

Get the inside scoop at Copenhagen from Duke students and researchers

nicholas.duke.edu/cop15/

Comments in chronological order

Comments are now closed for this entry.

 Staff

 Contributor

Showing first 50 comments | [Go to all comments](#) | [Go to latest comment](#)



Irresistance

3 Dec 2009, 8:53AM

If the alarmists are right, then it could indeed very well be that Copenhagen is a Now or Never event. Although it has been apparent from the start there is no leadership to take on the perceived threats, it would take a serious dicatorship to make anything happening, especially if you're talking globally.

Politicians are in effect being asked to commit political suicide by introducing draconian unpopular and wealth-diminishing policies, all "for the planet".

The reality is that me, you and 90% of the other readers on CiF dont know jack about the climate science. It is too big, too complicated for us to grasp. What ever opinion we have of the subject is subjective, based on a very small subset of the total information.

Do you know you can trust stuff you read online? Do you go and call universities to find out if someone who claims he is a scientist, really IS a scientist? No, you dont, as 95% of people wouldnt. So all the information you get, really, in terms of forming an opinion, is useless, anecdotal.

And you're asking people to make rational, calculated choices (that will diminish their standard of living) based on stuff they really can't even begin to truly understand... god I hope the alarmists are wrong... this kind of problem is too large for humans to handle if it is really true.

[Recommend?](#) (138)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Feedback

3 Dec 2009, 8:54AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



Gudlard

3 Dec 2009, 8:55AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



Stairlift

3 Dec 2009, 9:03AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



atzo

3 Dec 2009, 9:05AM

If our Leaders tackle climate change as efficiently as they have so far with the economic recession, what hope is there for our Children's future? What a bunch of inept immoral, egofriendly twits!!!

[Recommend?](#) (64)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



ClaireinOz

3 Dec 2009, 9:05AM

The "experts" are in disarray on both sides of the argument, while the vast majority of us are just plain confused. Seems like all we're going to get in Copenhagen is political posturing and a whole load of hot air - and most of us are subjected to more than enough of that from our elected leaders at home.

[Recommend?](#) (49)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Cyphon1988

3 Dec 2009, 9:06AM

The reality is that me, you and 90% of the other readers on CiF dont know jack about the climate science. It is too big, too complicated for us to grasp. What ever opinion we have of the subject is subjective, based on a very small subset of the total information. Do you know you can trust stuff you read online? Do you go and call universities to find out if someone who claims he is a scientist, really IS a scientist? No, you dont, as 95% of people wouldnt. So all the information you get, really, in terms of forming an opinion, is useless, anecdotal.

Failure to provide information is one of the biggest failings of our society. There is still a

stranglehold on information to the extent that the masses can't access it and therefore are dependent on scientists, lawyers and so on. This really shouldn't be the case. The one factor that perhaps the average person can't access, is the breadth of information on Climate change, again, this would be easier if documents were accessible by non-scientists who could then disseminate this information.

Copenhagen will be a damn squib. Very little will be done, and while emission targets have been set, alot are on 2005 rather than 1990 levels, or on carbon intensity. Nations have a right to develop, but the onus for CO2 reductions is on the developed world, both as the main producers and main consumers of Co2 produced goods.

Frankly, I think we're doing too little, too late. May the future generations forgive us.

[Recommend?](#) (52)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Criticulus

3 Dec 2009, 9:08AM

Regardless of all the words bandied about for and against the arguments - %s and commitments etc , there has to be agreement that emissions/pollution/environment deterioration must be reduced.

Reductions can only improve conditions for humans and other animals (not forgetting vegetation) on this, our only planet.

Get real guys and pull your collective political and greedy fingers out and make it happen !

[Recommend?](#) (52)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Umgwarnakikbooty

3 Dec 2009, 9:08AM

BIG PROBLEM PLUS HUMAN BEHAVIOUR PLUS CAPITALISM PLUS VERY LITTLE TIME EQUALS

SUCH A SHAME; WE HAD SO MUCH POTENTIAL, IT'S TRAGIC.

[Recommend?](#) (87)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



peopleperson

3 Dec 2009, 9:08AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



Benjine

3 Dec 2009, 9:08AM

Top post **Irresistance**. None of us really has a clue about what the hell is going on.

I really don't know what to think about climate change any more other than that I want to go and lie down in a very dark corner for a very long time.

So much for "settled science".

[Recommend?](#) (35)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Berlinenglishman

3 Dec 2009, 9:09AM

He appears to have the common scientists's naivety about politics. We either get a compromise about reducing carbon emissions or we get nothing. When he says "there's no room for the compromises of elected politics" he is in effect saying that democracy is the problem and that we need autocracy to tackle global warming. I happen to agree, but for good or ill democracy is what we're stuck with.

[Recommend?](#) (43)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



chirpy

3 Dec 2009, 9:10AM

Sure, business as usual isn't good enough. What I think he is talking about is moving from a hydrocarbon based economy to something else within a generation. This is eminently possible. Yet the social change and dislocation that would come with transition would be enormous. I don't see any evidence of democratic countries willingly take radical transition steps unless there is an immediate external threat (eg war, epidemic) or if there are instant riches to be made (eg gold rush, oil boom of the 19th century). Trying to convince people of the threat of global warming has not succeeded (otherwise green parties would be winning elections wouldn't they?) so the choice now is either to accept moderate transition and adapt to the consequences, or force through a radical transition undemocratically.

[Recommend?](#) (40)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



CaptCrash

3 Dec 2009, 9:12AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



PickmansModel

3 Dec 2009, 9:12AM

@ **Irresistance**

The reality is that me, you and 90% of the other readers on CiF dont know jack about the climate science. It is too big, too complicated for us to grasp. What ever opinion we

have of the subject is subjective, based on a very small subset of the total information. Do you know you can trust stuff you read online? Do you go and call universities to find out if someone who claims he is a scientist, really IS a scientist? No, you dont, as 95% of people wouldnt. So all the information you get, really, in terms of forming an opinion, is useless, anecdotal.

Well, with very little effort you can look at magazines such as *New Scientist*, *Scientific American* and *Nature*, or more specialised journals like *Atmospheric Science*. Then there are websites like those of the UK Met Office and the Royal Society. I could go on. Then you can consider a couple of things.

- 1) Do these various, long-established scientific instutions point to a similar set of scenarios, probabilities and risks (with all the attendant caveats of observational science)?
- 2) If so, how likely is it they're all in cahoots with some shadowy conspiracy to institute a World Government dedicated to complete economic control of everyone in the world in order to enrich the through through unneccessary 'green' taxes and carbon trading? To the extent that their data and its interpretations are systematically falsified although a few maverick individuals, typically working alone and in many cases without any scientific background (Hi, Nigel Lawson) have seen through it to both the scientific and political truth, even though they typically make howlers when writing about science? I know whose judgmenet I'm inclined to trust even if I'm not a climate scientist.

[Recommend?](#) (139)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



westy60

3 Dec 2009, 9:14AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



fatbaldy

3 Dec 2009, 9:16AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



Clev

3 Dec 2009, 9:19AM

Irresistance.

Great. Let's do nothing. Our knowledge of man-made global warming is well established and measures needed to alleviate it, though unfortunately not prevent it, are fairly well known. Doing nothing is not an option.

Stairlift

What's a 'warmist'? Someone who accepts the overwhelming scientific consensus?

CaireinOz

The "experts" are in disarray on both sides of the argument,

The experts are not in disarray, they are in agreement. It is the politicians and the public who are in disarray and think there are two 'sides' to the 'argument', when there aren't.

Cyphon1988

Failure to provide information is one of the biggest failings of our society.

You're joking, right? Information is more widely available in society now than at any

time in human history. Welcome to the internet.

Berlinenglishman

I suspect you are right, sadly, but Hansen is right to try. I guess he feels if he doesn't speak out, in the starkest possible terms, he will always regret it. Even if it does little good.

[Recommend?](#) (111)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



CaptCrash

3 Dec 2009, 9:19AM

Benjine,

Not every science is a settled subject, there are aonly degrees of certainty.
Which is why scientific reseacrh into things as obvious as THE THEORY OF GRAVITY... which I am sure most of us believe in, but do not uinderstand it's workings. QUANTUM THEORY, a great and very uncertain one, but something upon which the transistirs in the keyboard you are using would not work.

Yes yes yes ... it's all a theory, and not everything about it is settled.

But who do you want to believe? A scientist on £35K or a polluting industrialist earning £200K , or a spanish £300K holiday home owner who needs to fly easy jet?

We can easily dismiss the climate change lobby as a big industry in it's own right, but other industries are far more powerful in their capability to cause and instill doubt.

[Recommend?](#) (66)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



CheshireRed

3 Dec 2009, 9:20AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



delphinia

3 Dec 2009, 9:21AM

I agree we are going to get failure from Copenhagen. All this talk of setting targets does diddly-squat towards reducing emissions.

In a democracy, no-one will plan for the long-term, because we are talking about threats in 30 or 40 years time, when the present power sharers will have retired to their gated homes with their personal security guards.

Scientists aren't helping either. They have zero communication skills whilen the denial industry has millions in funding from the fossil fuel lobbies to spend on PR, advertising and all today's techniques of opinion manipulating.

[Recommend?](#) (31)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



ClaireinOz

3 Dec 2009, 9:25AM

Good for you, PickmansModel. Glad you've made your choice and are so happy with it, but most of us are not going to jump in like you until there is irrefutable proof that climate change is anthropogenic. That proof has not been supplied. All we are getting is a million opinions, some more strident than others, but that's all they are. Opinions and theories. Statistics - well, we all know how pliable those are. Probabilities? That's postulation, not proof.

Sceptics do not equal conspiracy theorists, any more than we are Nazis, creationists, loonies, idiots or any of the other epithets being thrown around. To bandy about comparisons like that does your cause no good at all. We sceptics are simply saying that we don't consider either side has proved their arguments sufficiently to convince us and until they do, sceptical we remain. Insulting us isn't going to help.

In the meantime, loading already fragile economies with heavy taxes is not the answer, and many voters (myself included) will revolt against any leaders who try to do so.

[Recommend?](#) (72)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



sloggers

3 Dec 2009, 9:28AM

@fatbaldy

Quite right. Data is very important in science. All of it, not just the few bits that happen to suit your argument. So why are you ignoring the vast majority of scientific data?

[Recommend?](#) (22)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



fatbaldy

3 Dec 2009, 9:29AM

@ Clev

The science is far from settled, I suggest you open your mind a bit and look at what scientists on the other side are saying: Richard Siegmund Lindzen is a good starting point - he is the Sloan Professor of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. As you probably are not familiar with science institutions I will let you in on a closely guarded secret MIT is a slightly better institution of scientific learning and research than the University of East Anglia in Norwich ? just slightly.

[Recommend?](#) (54)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



sloggers

3 Dec 2009, 9:31AM

@Clairein Oz

but most of us are not going to jump in like you until there is irrefutable proof that climate change is anthropogenic

You mean until the experiment has been done and its too late to change any thing.

[Recommend?](#) (68)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



WelshMorgan

3 Dec 2009, 9:32AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



Clev

3 Dec 2009, 9:34AM

ClaireinOz

What proof would do it for you? Australia turned into desert? Famine? Your house 10 feet under water? Might be too late by then.

There may be 'a million opinions' on the internet from a million people who don't know what they are talking about. I suggest instead you listen to every major scientific body in the world, and to the people who have actually done of years of research in this area.

Start with the website RealClimate.org and take it form there.

Use you brain.

[Recommend?](#) (84)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



montefeltro

3 Dec 2009, 9:34AM

Both examples quoted by Mr Hansen, slavery and Nazism, involved nations actually going to war. In the former case, a civil war, in the latter a world war.

Is Mr Hansen suggesting the kind of leadership is needed that might lead to wars being fought between different factions of the climate debate?

[Recommend?](#) (9)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



kiwiest

3 Dec 2009, 9:34AM

Whatever happens in Copenhagen, it can hardly make things "worse". As of today, India, China, EU, Brazil and the US all have numbers to put on the table. Something will emerge short of a deal but enough to get us to a new treaty next year. That's not unimportant.

There are truly amazing things being done already, even in the absence of a global political deal. Have a read about what National Grid, Marks & Spencers, the Co-Op, BT, Nike, Starbucks, e-Bay, Apple and other big corporates are doing. To say you can't cut carbon and still make money and grow is b*locks. The only companies threatened by a green future are
[thehttp://www.petrostrategies.org/Links/Worlds_Largest_Oil_and_Gas_Companies_Sites.htmse](http://www.petrostrategies.org/Links/Worlds_Largest_Oil_and_Gas_Companies_Sites.htmse)

[Recommend?](#) (11)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Clev

3 Dec 2009, 9:36AM

fatbaldy

The science is very strongly established. If you can point to a single peer-reviewed paper that refutes global warming, and has not since been debunked, please do so. There are thousands that support it.

[Recommend?](#) (49)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



fatbaldy

3 Dec 2009, 9:37AM

@ sloggers

I like raw data. I dont disagree that the climate is changing it always has and always will. Unfortunately correlation does not imply causality so even if temperatures go up as CO2 goes up this does not mean the temperature rise is caused by the CO2. The martian Ice caps have been receding perhaps this is caused by all the probes there giving off CO2 or perhaps temperatures are rising there for the same reason they are rising on earth. Also, take a look at the second graph in this link that shows raw data:
<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/11/25/uh-oh-raw-data-in-new-zealand-tells-a-different-story-than-the-official-one/>

[Recommend?](#) (20)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



sloggers

3 Dec 2009, 9:37AM

@fatbaldy

This would be the same Richard Siegmund Lindzen who claims that the risks of smoking are overstated?

[Recommend?](#) (35)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)**CampaignerWill**

3 Dec 2009, 9:38AM

Every day, week and month that we delay on a fair, safe and honest deal on climate change we increase the cost and difficulty of keeping climate change below an average increase of 2degrees and we delay the assistance that poorer countries need to help them adapt to climate change. It's already predicted that the numebr of people affected by Climate-related disasters will increase from 250 million per year to 375 million per year by 2015 and we need to cut emissions now to stop that number increasing further. I agree that an inadequate deal would be a disaster. But while government's around the world attempt to manage our expectations down we have to remain solid in our demand to them to get the deal that is needed.

I am going to be phoning, faxing and emailing my protests to the countries that are blocking progress, as well as congratulating those countries who are working for a just deal- If you want to join me please go to

<http://www.oxfam.org.uk/applications/blogs/pressoffice/?p=8659&v=campaigns>.

[Recommend? \(18\)](#)[Report abuse](#)[Clip |](#)[Link](#)**ClaireinOz**

3 Dec 2009, 9:40AM

You mean until the experiment has been done and its too late to change any thing.
No, I mean until the scientists have done what they are allegedly paid to do. "Science" is defined as the fact of knowing something (not postulating it); knowledge or understanding of a truth. Truth must be verifiable beyond dispute. If it can be disputed, that makes it a theory.

[Recommend? \(27\)](#)[Report abuse](#)[Clip |](#)[Link](#)**Bioluminescence**

3 Dec 2009, 9:40AM

ClaireinOz

There is ample evidence that human activities are the most likely cause of recent climate change. The fact that some people choose to ignore this evidence doesn't mean that it isn't there.

This aside, climate science hasn't changed with this statement by Hansen. He's talking about the political side of climate change, one which hasn't been able to find any solutions to the problem and which is busy protecting national interests. But good on him for attacking carbon market schemes.

[Recommend? \(43\)](#)[Report abuse](#)[Clip |](#)

[Link](#)



Benjine

3 Dec 2009, 9:40AM

@**WelshMorgan**

The evidence for the holocaust is a lot less convincing, being confined to history (written by the victors) and events I couldn't personally witness as they occurred before I was born, but to deny that is to be at best uneducated and at worst crazy and/or racist. Personally, I found my visit to Auschwitz/ Birkenau to be pretty "convincing". Why do you have to go and despoil your otherwise good post with this claptrap?

[Recommend?](#) (20)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



FightNeoCons

3 Dec 2009, 9:40AM

This comment has been removed by a moderator. Replies may also be deleted.



sloggers

3 Dec 2009, 9:41AM

@**fatbaldy**

So your extensive examination of all the data boils down to "correlation is not causation". Did they also teach you at university that simply picking what you like out of raw data is dubious practice and that rigorous statistical analysis is necessary?

[Recommend?](#) (32)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



fatbaldy

3 Dec 2009, 9:42AM

@ **clev**

try this:

<http://www.ecd.bnl.gov/steve/pubs/HeatCapacity.pdf>
peer reviewed and accepted for publication.

[Recommend?](#) (8)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



rainbowjoy

3 Dec 2009, 9:43AM

I hate to agree with this man, but he is right, the delegates at the conference have no idea about what is really needed to stop Climate change, they are just getting together to

find out how little they can actually get away with.

Climate Change deniers are getting so desperate and boring it is getting more and more laughable if the spent more time on finding out and reading up on the stuff that is really to do with it and not take notice of the odd headline and newspaper story they would be really frightened and perhaps get off their lazy butts and do something about it.

Copenhagen is a nicotine patch on the arm of the planet, they have little knowledge and only want to maintain their greedy self serving ways.

I hate to say it but it will take a really devastating happening to convince people that this is really truly happening and by this time it will be too late to actually stop the worst of climate change.

Ever the optimist though I know that people like myself and family and many people I know are already doing quite a bit towards helping this planet, we do not have axes to grind we are not seeking green taxes and we are not stupid, we have studied and read and have worked out for ourselves that it is really happening and have put in places our way for doing our bit.

I feel sorry for the politicians and public that live in their own lets pretend this isn't happening bubble, but don't forget, they and you will also suffer there is no bomb shelter you can retire to if this carries on to its destructive end.

[Recommend?](#) (39)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[Bioluminescence](#)

3 Dec 2009, 9:43AM

fatbaldy

What do you know about climate on Mars? What is it driven by mainly? Where are the thousands of papers written on this topic that would suggest that it is the same factor driving changes on both planets?

[Recommend?](#) (20)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[fatbaldy](#)

3 Dec 2009, 9:44AM

@ slogger that would be the same rigorous statistical analysis as done by the lerned chaps at the CRU would it?

[Recommend?](#) (15)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



[sloggers](#)

3 Dec 2009, 9:44AM

@ClaireinOz

Perhaps you can explain how you can avoid postulating something without it actually

happening?

[Recommend?](#) (17)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



davejustdave

3 Dec 2009, 9:45AM

In Hansen's view, dealing with climate change allows no room for the compromises that rule the world of elected politics. "This is analagous to the issue of slavery faced by Abraham Lincoln or the issue of Nazism faced by Winston Churchill," he said. "On those kind of issues you cannot compromise. You can't say let's reduce slavery, let's find a compromise and reduce it 50% or reduce it 40%."

He added: "We don't have a leader who is able to grasp it and say what is really needed. Instead we are trying to continue business as usual."

er... Lincoln was elected, and so was Winston Churchill.

mind you Lincoln was anti-slavery before the civil war and Churchill was warning about the dangers of nazism before the second world war.

the trick with climate change (and indeed all environmental issues - of resource depletion) is to avoid the war...

Dave

[Recommend?](#) (6)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Bluejohn

3 Dec 2009, 9:45AM

To call Hansen a climate expert is not correct. Dr. Hansen achieved his PhD in astrophysics. He was employed by NASA as an astrophysicist but eventually became head of the NOAA, a division of NASA. His grasp of climatology and geohistory is very poor but he does shout loudly and I agree Copenhagen must fail because it is addressing a problem that is not happening.

[Recommend?](#) (45)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Irresistance

3 Dec 2009, 9:46AM

Personally, I think the proponents of MMGW are faced with an impossible task. How do you convince a largely ignorant population to act. How do you convince the political class to act now on what, whether you like it or not, are still best guesses and supposedly informed research. When you have people judging the merit of the claims put forward by the weather last week or the fact that two summers ago it was really hot or really cold. The pro-MMGW camp is not making its own job easier by coming up with various doom-scenarios which only serve to further polarize the debate between pro- and anti-

MMGW people.

I am not saying we should do nothing, but what IS true is that the current way of trying to win hearts and minds is an utter waste of time. In a way, the skeptics/denialists (for want of better word) are winning, they are keeping the debate at a rather childish level that has the ultimate result that all we see is inaction. If MMGW is real, the best thing we can do is adjust and adapt to the inevitable climate change. If it isn't, it's still a good idea to move to greener energies, also because it seems fairly plausible that oil will run out or become significantly scarcer sooner or later.

See ? how about you pro-MMGW folk just stand still for a moment and instead of trying to make us all join your camp and come up with yet another doom-scenario, just chill out and think for a moment what you are REALLY asking of the world to do to avert a disaster. You want all the industrialized nations to reduce emissions. At the same time, you want them to donate/spend billions of dollars on poor nations to ?survive? the MMGW-caused problems, AND at the same time to develop and not remain poor. You will have to make a choice what is more important, it will be impossible to get it all. We cannot AND change our lifestyles AND help the poor world AND make them develop.

[Recommend?](#) (26)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



Jeromeco

3 Dec 2009, 9:46AM

climate denial or climate acceptance misses the point. We are so used to cheap and powerful fossil fuel energy that we throw it away, willy nilly wasting it. Drive a car?, moving 90kgs of human in a 1500kg metal box on wheels!! Thats smart!

We are reliant on fossil fuel and addicted to the easy life it has given us leading to obesity, to over consumption, to destruction of habitats for other living beings . Too much of a good thing leads to obesity, toxic environments, ill health. Is this a 'high' quality of life?

In reality the change is simple and easy. stop being so darned wasteful...the trick is that a non carbon future needs to be planned and delivered with care and thought for people and the planet.

[Recommend?](#) (40)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



fatbaldy

3 Dec 2009, 9:47AM

@ Bioluminescence

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v446/n7136/abs/nature05718.html>

[Recommend?](#) (2)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



cynicalmonk

3 Dec 2009, 9:47AM

It seems to me that this article is nothing more than publicity for Hanson's book. He attacks world leaders and businesses for wanting to cut carbon emissions by a certain percentage instead of altogether. However we need to be realistic - we live in a world of capitalism, which by its very nature engages in destructive activities which, amongst other things, create pollution. We can't expect this to change overnight or even in a few years, and Hanson knows this.

I ask, is his new book being manufactured in a totally non-carbon emitting way? I very much doubt it.

He reminds me of Al Gore - the very man who he criticises. This is another man wanting to sell books, make millions, and boost his ego even more than it is already inflated.

What he proposes is totally unachievable without a massive world revolution, which, let's face it, isn't going to happen.

[Recommend?](#) (12)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)



DrJazz

3 Dec 2009, 9:47AM

Cyphon1988:

The one factor that perhaps the average person can't access, is the breadth of information on Climate change, again, this would be easier if documents were accessible by non-scientists who could then disseminate this information.

New Scientist is a weekly magazine which regularly publishes summaries of science that lay people can understand. It also cites the peer reviewed papers so you can look them up if you're so inclined. Virtually every article contains comments by scientists who have slightly different valid interpretations of the data.

[Recommend?](#) (32)

[Report abuse](#)

[Clip](#) |

[Link](#)

[Showing first 50 comments](#) | [Go to all comments](#) | [Go to latest comment](#)

Comments are now closed for this entry.