

A Better Copenhagen 2009 Agenda

5 September 2009

If the Copenhagen conference is about addressing climate concerns, the focus should be on the detrimental effects of 'global cooling' and not about 'global warming' which ended over a decade ago. While 'global warming' was not only benign, it was beneficial, improving the global food supply with extended growing seasons for countries such as Canada which supplies wheat to many parts of the world facing food shortages. 'Global cooling' on the other hand has no beneficial attributes as is clearly demonstrated by the historical accounts of the Little Ice Age that caused such great hardships for large parts of the world.

The physical data clearly shows that the world has been cooling since 2002 at a somewhat alarming rate. Unlike the global cooling episode from 1942 to 1975, which was part of a shorter period cycle, this cooling might be part of the longer period cycle that brought the world from the Medieval Warm Period, to the Little Ice Age, to the warming that peaked in 1998, and is now reverting back to a long period of cooling. Most scientists agree that this cooling will last until the end of solar cycle 25 in 2030, but many fear that this cooling may last a lot longer.

To anyone with basic physical data and a modicum of common sense, the concept of a conference about greenhouse gas emissions reductions to stop 'global warming' can only be seen as ridiculous; considering 'global warming' ended over a decade ago, but CO2 emissions have kept increasing as the Earth continues to cool.

The conference is clearly not about climate and should be renamed to reflect the actual purpose of the conference.

If the conference is about greenhouse gases; it should be restricted to the use of CO2 in greenhouses as a way of improving productivity as CO2 is the only true greenhouse gas in the strictest sense of the word.

If the conference is about curbing fossil fuel energy; it should be restricted to nuclear energy, the only other viable energy source.

If the conference is about biofuels; it should be restricted to the detrimental effects of biofuels on the world food supply and the current global food crisis.

If the conference is about pollution; it should be restricted air water and soil pollution and how to make the western technology, that has come a long way in addressing these problems, and making this available to developing countries who are in desperate need of such technology to solve their pollution problems.

If the conference is about the economy; it should be restricted to the potentially disastrous economic implications of carbon trading which is a multi billion dollar enterprise that is about to collapse because there is absolutely no actual physical basis for it.

The Copenhagen Conference could be pivotal in ending this whole climate change issue that has had such devastating consequences for the world's poor and has crippled the world economy, but unfortunately anyone with the common sense to make this happen will be barred from attending by those who want to perpetuate this global warming fraud.

Norm Kalmanovitch
Calgary, Canada