

The Week That Was 2010-04-24 (April 24, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

The Heartland Institute's Fourth International Conference on Climate Change will be held in Chicago, Illinois on May 16-18, 2010 at the Chicago Marriott Magnificent Mile Hotel, 540 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. It will call attention to new scientific research on the causes and consequences of climate change, and to economic analyses of the cost and effectiveness of proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To register, click [here](#).

#####

This Week's TWTW: Due to travel commitments this week's TWTW was issued early.

#####

Quote of the Week

No rational argument will have a rational effect on a man who does not want to adopt a rational attitude. Karl Popper

THIS WEEK:

April 22, 2010 is the 40th anniversary of the first modern Earth Day. (No doubt a form of earth day was worshiped many times by primitive cultures.) Contrary to the expressed beliefs of many activists who participated in the first modern Earth Day, the planet is doing well. Humanity is thriving except in areas in the third world where humans are frequently oppressed by governments or social conditions. In the developed world, the environment is cleaner in cities than it has been for over 100 years. Overall, our waterways are no longer open sewers. This is result of the work of many and a prosperous society that can afford to clean its wastes. Much of 20th Century prosperity is due to the growth of mechanical power to replace human and animal muscle power, largely through the use of fossil fuels. Of particular note is the miracle of electricity that has greatly improved the lives of so many. Affordable and reliable electricity remains the key to prosperity in the 21st Century. The issue is how to generate it.

ClimateGate and other gates continue in the news. Repeated polls show that global warming is no longer the major issue to many. Recession and the distrust generated by Climategate have taken their toll. However, many politicians continue to turn a tin ear to the people. The science is imploding, but many government leaders appear to desperately seek to be at the head of the proverbial lemmings as they rush madly to the cliffs. The question is how much damage will they do before they realize they are going over?

In other news, on April 15 the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR) issued a press release stating that up to 50% of the heat that is believed to have been built up on earth by greenhouse gases is missing. Of course, the first thing to blame is inadequate instrumentation. There is no mention that perhaps the belief itself is wrong.

New Zealand's long time IPCC reviewer and critic, Vincent Gray issued a newsletter describing what he considers to be a significant weakness in the computer models predicting the warming of the planet. Briefly, the models over simplify the planet, creating a flat earth that does not rotate. It is assumed that there is a balance of the input of energy and the output everywhere, including no difference between day and night. This leads to potentially significant errors in calculation that cannot be resolved. (The missing heat?) As HH Lamb observed, the climate system, both the atmosphere and the oceans, moves heat from the tropics to the polar regions through convection. If Gray is correct, then the models do not account for this dynamic so critical to our climate system. Please see "The Flat Earth" below.

The volcano in Iceland has triggered predictable claims from alarmists that global warming will cause more such events. In his book "heaven+earth" Plimer discusses an increase in seismic activity in the Northern Hemisphere occurring with the great ice melt following the last ice age, when much of the

Northern Hemisphere was covered by thousands of feet of ice. (Indeed, the Canadian plate and Scandinavia are still rebounding from the weight of the ice.) Now we are to believe that a melting of tiny amounts of ice will produce similar events? The difference in scales is enormous.

SCIENCE EDITORIAL #13-2010 (April 24, 2010)

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

Let's keep our eyes on the ball.

We need to trace the path taken by Phil Jones (and by Jim Hansen of NASA-GISS and by NOAA-NCDC) in distilling the raw thermometer readings from thousands of stations into a single number -- the magical "global mean surface temperature" We need to document the process of how they selected stations. And we need to understand the kinds of corrections and adjustments they made.

The crucial period is 1979 to 1997 – the era of weather satellite data, which can provide an independent cross check. It is also the period during which the surface temperatures seemed to show a sustained rise – the ‘blade’ of the infamous ‘hockeystick’ graph.

In parallel, we need to examine the available proxy data for the same period. I predict they will not duplicate the claimed temperature rise of the surface

Doing all this is not a small job – it will take two teams of skilled and dedicated people. But it must be done to achieve closure -- and we will learn what's behind "hiding the decline" and "Mike [Mann]'s Nature trick."

This will be done -- if necessary, at the direction of the US Congress, provided the Nov 2010 elections produce a change in control. It's probably the best investment the government can make in climate research. Trillions of dollars are at stake here.

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

1. Some Unfriendly Economic Comments on Another Green Fantasy: Roadmap 2050

By Professor Ferdinand E. Banks, Uppsala University, Sweden

2. Challenge the source so-called global warming facts.

Perspective, Sun Journal, Lewiston, ME, Apr 13, 2010, [H/t Joe D'Aleo]

<http://www.sunjournal.com/node/831283>

3. Climate Science In Denial: *Global warming alarmists have been discredited, but you wouldn't know it from the rhetoric this Earth Day.*

By Richard Lindzen, WSJ, Apr 22 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704448304575196802317362416.html?mod=WSJ_hps_sections_opinion

4. Gambling Australia's Future on Sunbeams and Sea Breezes

By Viv Forbes, Carbon Sense Coalition, Apr 2010

<http://carbon-sense.com/2010/04/18/renewable-energy-targets/>

5. Obama's climate of fear: Earth Day hysteria is based on lots of phony science

Washington Times Editorial, Apr 22, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/22/obamas-climate-of-fear/>

6. Energy Update: Voters Take Global Warming A Bit Less Seriously

Rasmussen Reports, Apr 19, 2010, [H/t Tom Sheahan]

http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/current_events/environment_energy/energy_update

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

ClimateGate Continues

Climategate: a scandal that won't go away:

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Apr 17 2010 [H/t Hamish Johnson]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7601929/Climategate-a-scandal-that-wont-go-away.html>

GISS & METAR – dial ‘M’ for Missing minus signs: it’s worse than we thought

By Anthony Watts, Watts Up With That, Apr 17, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/17/giss-metar-dial-m-for-missing-minus-signs-its-worse-than-we-thought/#more-18590>

Gore takes cash for water campaign from chemical firm: Environmentalists condemn former vice-president for letting controversial company fund Life Earth

By Nina Lakhani, Independent, UK, Apr 18, 2010 [H/t Werner Stenzig]

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/gore-takes-cash-for-water-campaign-from-chemical-firm-1947723.html>

[SEPP Comment: The chemical company is Dow, which is a member of US CAP that is the primary lobbying group in the US for Cap and Tax.]

Missing Heat

“Missing” heat may affect future climate change

Press Release, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research (UCAR) Apr 15, 2010, [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www2.ucar.edu/news/missing-heat-may-affect-future-climate-change>

Where’s the Heat: Comments on a Roger Pielke Sr. Climate Science weblog

By Bill Dipuccio, ICECAP.US, Apr 19, 2010

<http://www.icecap.us/>

Missing Heat Hides From Climate Scientists

By Doug Hoffman, The Resilient Earth, Apr 18, 2010

<http://theresilientearth.com/?q=content/missing-heat-hides-climate-scientists>

Questioning the Orthodoxy

The Flat Earth

By Vincent Gray, NZ Climate Truth Newsletter, Apr 21, 2010

<http://www.icecap.us/>

Italian Senate Calls For Re-Assessment of Climate Science

By Carlo Stagnaro, Istituto Bruno Leoni, Apr 18, 2010 [H/t Climate Depot]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/international-news/828-italian-senate-calls-for-re-assessment-of-cimate-policy-ipcc-science.html>

A Seasoned Veteran’s View of the IPCC

By Donna Laframboise, NOconsensus.org, Apr 19, 2010 [H/t Climate Depot]

<http://nofrackingconsensus.blogspot.com/2010/04/seasoned-veterans-view-of-ipcc.html>

Climate skeptic wins landmark data victory ‘for price of a stamp’: Belfast ecologist forced to hand over tree-ring data describes order from information commission as a 'staggering injustice'

By Fred Pearce, Guardian, UK, Apr 20, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/apr/20/climate-sceptic-wins-data-victory>

‘Failure’ Would Have Many Benefits

By Marlo Lewis, CEI, Apr 19, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/04/whats-the-cost-if-congress-fai.php#1577132>

In response to the question “What’s The Cost If Congress Fails?”

By Connie Hedegaard, European Union’s Commissioner for Climate Action

The ABC – protecting big government from awkward questions

By Joanne Nova, Australia, Apr 17, 2010

<http://joannenova.com.au/>

Smoke

Volcanic ash cloud; Global warming may trigger more volcanoes: Climate change could spark more "hazardous" geological events such as volcanoes, earthquakes and landslides, scientists have warned.

Telegraph, UK, Apr 19, 2010

[H/t Malcolm Ross “This is unbelievable... or maybe not, given the complete desecration of science in recent years.]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7604188/Volcanic-ash-cloud-Global-warming-may-trigger-more-volcanoes.html>

Ash Backward

IBD Editorial, Apr 19, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=530765>

Icelandic Volcano May Be No Weather-Changing Pinatubo

By Stuart Biggs and Jeremy van Loon, Bloomberg.com, Apr 19, 2010 [H/t Climate Depot]

<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601087&sid=amGIJGA3ODkU>

And Mirrors

‘Cap And Innovate’ For Electric Utilities

By Ron Binz, Commentary, The Energy Daily, Apr 19, 2010 [H/t

http://www.theenergydaily.com/guest_column/Cap-And-Innovate-For-Electric-Utilities_4265.html

The EPA Monster

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, Apr 18, 2010

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/>

Leading the Lemmings

US climate report publicized in runup to Senate bill

Reuters, Thomas Reuters Foundation, Apr 20, 2010

<http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/N19159977.htm>

On Earth Day

Earth Day: Smile, don't shudder

By Bjorn Lomborg, USA Today, Apr 21, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/2010-04-21-column21_ST_N.htm

For Earth Day, 7 New Rules to Live By

By John Tierney, NYT, Apr 19, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/20/science/20tier.html?th&emc=th>

Energy Issues

Wind energy decision carries political impact

By Joseph Weber, Washington Times, Apr 19, 2010

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/19/wind-energy-decision-carries-political-impact/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today

[SEPP Comment: Massachusetts Cape Wind has significant political ramifications. Will the NIMBY's win?]

Green Energy rush hit by Headwinds

By Guy Chazan, WSJ, Apr 21, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304830104575171862699707280.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

Saudis to build nuclear, renewable energy centre

Petroleumworld.com, Apr 20, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.petroleumworld.com/story10042013.htm>

The Sierra Club: How Support for Industrial Wind Technology Subverts Its History, Betrays Its Mission, and Erodes Commitment to the Scientific Method (Part III)

By Jon Boone, Master Resource, Apr 19, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/04/the-sierra-club-how-support-for-industrial-wind-technology-subverts-its-history-betrays-its-mission-and-erodes-commitment->

Nuclear Waste Scam

By Ted Rockwell

<http://www.learningaboutenergy.com/2010/04/the-nuclear-waste-scam.html>

[SEPP Comment: Ted Rockwell also posts a recap of how quickly the US was able to design and build nuclear reactors for both ships and shore when it had the political will to do so. See:

<http://www.learningaboutenergy.com/2010/04/how-fast-can-we-build-new-reactors.html>]

In Case You Missed It

PowerPoint slides from Dr. Willie Soon’s Congressional staff briefing held in DC on April 13, 2010

By Willie Soon, Apr 16, 2010

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/reprint/carbon_myopia_talk.html

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

15 spectacularly stupid predictions from the first Earth Day

Editorial, I hate the media, Apr 21, 2010

<http://www.ihatethemedia.com/earth-day-2010-stupid-predictions-from-first-earth-day>

Environmentalism as Religion: While people have worshipped many things, we may be the first to build a shrine to garbage

By Paul Rubin, WSJ, Apr 22, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304510004575186343555831322.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion

Extramarital sex ‘causes more earthquakes’, Iranian cleric claims: Women who dress “inappropriately” incite extramarital sex that in turn cause more earthquakes, a senior Iranian hard-line cleric has claimed.

By Andrew Hough, Telegraph, UK, Apr 19, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/7606145/Extramarital-sex-causes-more-earthquakes-Iranian-cleric-claims.html>

Michael Mann Controversy

No Cap and Tax Blog

<http://www.nocapandtrade.com/michael-mann-controversy/>

[SEPP Comment: A farce is considered grounds for a lawsuit?]

#####

1. Some Unfriendly Economic Comments on Another Green Fantasy: Roadmap 2050

By Professor Ferdinand E. Banks, Uppsala University, Sweden

According to Hughes Belin (2010), “*Tout Brussels*” gathered on Tuesday (April 13) for the presentation of ‘Roadmap 2050’, by which he meant the flamboyant occasion on which the European Climate Foundation (ECF) – a so-called think tank – unveiled still another green fantasy about how Europe could be decarbonised for little more than lunch money. As will be noted later, what we are talking about here could necessitate deploying trillions of U.S. dollars, however the point is that once the investments proposed in the roadmap are carried out, and Europe’s existing energy infrastructure is replaced with certain low carbon alternatives, electricity prices in the long term will supposedly be constant, and dangerous levels of climate change can be avoided. Put somewhat more technically, (discounted) short-term costs, though high, will be at least compensated for by (discounted) long-term benefits.

In case you have forgotten your theoretical welfare economics, the mathematical and economic details of this arrangement are straightforward, albeit tedious, and once we leave the classroom for the real world, we might encounter some very disturbing prospects. However the environmental correspondent of the influential *Financial Times* (UK), Fiona Harvey (2010), does not seem to be bothered by unanticipated and/or troubling occurrences, and apparently believes that not only will fossil fuel power stations be banished from the face of the earth, but nuclear facilities will also be eventually liquidated.

As I have attempted to explain to Ms Harvey and her colleagues for many years, in a dozen or so of my articles, the optimal power generation strategy features a host of renewables and alternatives – and not just those mentioned in the Roadmap – but also a moderate increase in nuclear energy, and in particular – though not exclusively – energy from the next generation of nuclear equipment (Gen 4) when it becomes available in a decade or so.

According to Ms Harvey, Mr Matthew Phillips of the ECF said: “When the Roadmap 2050 project began it was assumed that high-renewable energy scenarios would be too unstable to provide sufficient reliability, that high-renewable scenarios would be uneconomic and more costly, and that technology breakthroughs would be required to move Europe to a zero-carbon power sector. Roadmap 2030 has found all of these assertions to be untrue.”

Well, Matt, with all due respect, as well as a profound understanding on my part that you could hardly do less than to praise Roadmap 2050 to the high heavens, I would like to emphasize that regardless of whether you and yours believe those initial *assumptions* you quoted, or not, they are not only true, but much truer than you, your friends and neighbours, and the ladies and gentlemen at the Roadmap launching site could possibly realize. Furthermore, the day after the Brussels extravaganza, I attended a seminar on coal in Stockholm, where among other things, during a lull in the proceedings, one of the speakers repeated to me some of the bunkum from the Brussels gig. In addition to waffle about Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS), he mentioned the wind farms that could be placed in the North Sea, and solar farms constructed in e.g. Spain, with all of these connected by a super-grid, and as a result providing the kind of reliable power that conventionally is not expected from items like isolated wind and solar, where *capacity factors* could be extremely low.

I of course had no choice but to inform that gentleman, and some others, that Roadmap 2050 was one of the most grotesque misconceptions ever presented audiences of sober engineers, researchers and executives. What I did not inform him and the other speakers was that I understood why Roadmap creators and disciples supported such obvious nonsense, foremost among which was the fact that it would provide many jet setters with an abundance of interesting – though socially unproductive – work that might last until they began drawing survivors’ benefits.

The Roadmap was also taken up by James Kantner of the *New York Times* (2010) in a short but informative article. That article deserves considerable attention, because according to Mr Kantner the cost of constructing the supergrid and providing facilities for reducing emissions by 80 percent was about 9.5 trillion dollars. Quite naturally, this is an informal estimate, and perhaps an exaggeration, but even so I suspect that in a seminar room or conference, it should be possible to classify an estimated cost of this amount as something so preposterous that it should never, under any circumstances, be considered. Here I want to mention that the Roadmap is very unlikely to be supported by engineers and economists who have nothing to gain financially and/or career-wise, and this is particularly true in France, where cost-benefit calculations are more or less routine. Of course in Sweden, engineers will show this bizarre ‘Roadmap’ deception an exaggerated amount of respect, because it would be a social and perhaps also an economic mistake to compromise their green credentials. Another organization that has indicated support for the Roadmap is the Stockholm Environmental Institute, which is a research establishment with a marked resemblance to what George Orwell called “a system of indoor welfare”.

I can terminate this short contribution by noting several of the peculiarities associated with the Roadmap, both directly and indirectly. The one of particular interest to me has to do with hearing that the Roadmap was derived from some reports of the well known consultancy McKinsey. Unless I am mistaken, that organization submitted a strange estimate for something to a firm in Chicago for whom I worked as a kind of applied mathematician. Similarly, their approach to the particular issues associated with the Roadmap display some equally strange analytical techniques developed with the Swedish utility Vattenfall, which is one of the largest electricity generators in Europe, and also owns some coal mines. According to one of the speakers at the coal seminar that was mentioned above, Vattenfall is genuinely interested in increasing the amount of electricity supplied to the growing world population, while decreasing the amount of carbon dioxide (CO₂) accompanying this pursuit. In other

words, they profess the kind of good Samaritan approach to their activities that was once practiced by Al Capone during his career as a very successful bootlegger and gang overlord in the ‘windy city’.

As far as I am concerned, their principal interest is in making money, which includes confusing the general public in Sweden and elsewhere about the ability to reduce CO₂ emissions with ‘Carbon Capture and Storage’ techniques – which the brilliant MIT engineer Jeffrey Michel, who lives in Germany, calls a ‘thermodynamic travesty’. They also accept the utility of cap-and-trade for reducing CO₂ emissions. I regard cap-and-trade as a scam, and I think it necessary that everyone who reads this short paper should know that it was rejected by the economists who first proposed it, Professors Thomas Crocker and the late John Dales, and also the leading climate scientist and believer in (*anthropogenic*) global warming, Dr James Hansen.

When Roadmap 2050 was introduced in Brussels, in the background was Shirley Bassey’s melodic rendition of ‘History Repeating’. Considering the high costs and low benefits that it entails, having Ms Bassey’s bellow her famous ‘Goldfinger’ would have been more appropriate.

REFERENCES

Banks, Ferdinand E. and Lim Tai Wei (2010), *Energy, Environment and Economic Theory*. World Scientific; London, New York and Singapore (Forthcoming)

Belin, Hughes (2010). ‘A heavy burden on EU policymakers’. *European Economic Review*.

Harvey, Fiona (2010). ‘No tariff rises seen in switch to greener electricity’. *Financial Times* (12 April)

Kantner, James (2010). ‘Europe urged to share power across continent’. *New York Times* (12 April)

2. Challenge the source so-called global warming facts.

Perspective, Sun Journal, Lewiston, ME, Apr 13, 2010, [H/t Joe D’Aleo]

<http://www.sunjournal.com/node/831283>

When you listen to those who say that human-caused global-warming is a fact, you will hear statements like “The science is settled,” and “We should defer to what the scientists say.”

So, the question is, is it science, or cult science?

First, let me explain why a writer whose column is titled “Populist Economics” is musing about climate science.

The reason is The-Mother-of-All-Environmental-Laws -- climate-change legislation -- is coming.

Every time an environmental law is passed, politicians affect the choices of your life and opportunities you have to get a job, make money to support yourself and your family.

Frankly, to this observer, the most of the environmental laws passed are detrimental to those ends, and ironically, do little to protect the environment or people, and, in fact, may actually harm them.

One recent example was the forced introduction of MTBE additive to gasoline by Angus King during his governorship. He eventually made the correct decision to withdraw the order, but not before wells and aquifers were poisoned.

The same may be true of wind-powered electricity today. King may realize that before Maine’s mountains, coastlines and economy are gutted. But don’t count on it. He stands to make too much money.

Let’s go back to the premise behind climate-change legislation and wind-powered electricity: global-warming.

Is it science?

Next time someone says global warming is human-caused, ask them to cite their source.

Usually they'll say something like, "Everyone says it's true," or "Didn't you watch Al Gore's movie?: or some other vapid reason.

After that, they'll cite some governmental report like the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or a report by NASA or NOAA that says the last 10 years were "the warmest in history."

Well, the studies may have been done by scientists, but aren't very scientific.

The scientists who did the IPCC study can't produce the original data they based their work on, just the adjusted data. Kind of like the kid who says "the dog ate my homework."

A report issued on April 14 by The Center for Science and Public Policy found the NASA/NOAA study to be faulty. These scientists, the report claims, reduced the number of temperature stations over the period of the study from 6,000 to less than 1,500. They systematically removed the colder rural, mountain, and northern weather stations, but they left in the warmer urban, airport and coastal stations, the report asserts.

This skewed the average temperature data upward.

As Joe d'Aleo, one of the authors of the study wrote, "Also, most of the stations did not meet the government's own criteria for siting, which also produced a warm bias. Had proper adjustments been made to correct for these data source issues, they would have found what we see when we look at well sited rural stations, cyclical changes but no net warming.

This means climate change is real, but natural.

Instead these issues were ignored and the data was manipulated in ways to introduce and enhance a net warming," d'Aleo said.

Human-induced bias is what forced the temperature averages upward, not CO2 emissions.

That is unscientific.

Are we supposed to trust the "science guys" that can't find their homework, or people whose pay and jobs are dependent on unscientific methods and manipulated data?

In doing these things, they have destroyed the credibility of climate science.

Yet, all of our congressional representatives believe in this man-made myth.

They and their staffs are all working on passing climate-change legislation.

Such laws will negatively impact the choices you and your family will have and be able to make.

Climate change legislation will change the price, quality and quantity of the food you buy, the clothes you wear, the car you drive, the vacations you take -- everything.

Several thousand high-paying jobs will be lost to better locations overseas.

If such legislation as the Waxman-Markey Bill, supported by Rep. Michael Michaud (D-Maine) and Rep. Chellie Pingree (D-Maine), or the Senate's Clear Act, supported by Sens. Collin and Snowe, pass, those jobs will go.

The managers and employees of Maine-based high-tech companies have warned our congressional representatives and their staffs of this fact.

Yet, they ignore these real warnings.

Higher unemployment, higher taxes and higher costs will be the result. Fewer quality job opportunities and a dim future await our children, while they and their staffs continue in high-paying tax-payer funded jobs that offer fully paid health care and lavish retirements, with all the perks and trappings of wealth and power. Our representatives would seem to prefer to play games with our lives and our children's lives to seemingly satisfy their greedy penchant for power and prestige.

Is this is their version of "social justice?"

They act like the fortune tellers at the fair, intoning concern over "serious dangers" and divine dire doom and disaster caused by global warming.

"We must appease the angry god of global warming for the good of the earth and humanity," they say.

Look, we all like a good show, but we can choose to not to enter their tent, let them con us out of our money or be alarmed by their dread tales and superstitions.

Suffice to say, when climate scientists and their political hawkers start acting like soothsayers and three-card monty dealers, it is time to shut down the carnival.

Better yet, vote them out of office and remove their staffs.

3. Climate Science In Denial: Global warming alarmists have been discredited, but you wouldn't know it from the rhetoric this Earth Day.

By Richard Lindzen, WSJ, Apr 22 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704448304575196802317362416.html?mod=WSJ_hps_sections_opinion

In mid-November of 2009 there appeared a file on the Internet containing thousands of emails and other documents from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in Great Britain. How this file got into the public domain is still uncertain, but the emails, whose authenticity is no longer in question, provided a view into the world of climate research that was revealing and even startling.

In what has come to be known as "climategate," one could see unambiguous evidence of the unethical suppression of information and opposing viewpoints, and even data manipulation. The Climatic Research Unit is hardly an obscure outpost; it supplies many of the authors for the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Moreover, the emails showed ample collusion with other prominent researchers in the United States and elsewhere.

One might have thought the revelations would discredit the allegedly settled science underlying currently proposed global warming policy, and, indeed, the revelations may have

played some role in the failure of last December's Copenhagen climate conference to agree on new carbon emissions limits. But with the political momentum behind policy proposals and billions in research funding at stake, the impact of the emails appears to have been small.

The general approach of the official scientific community (at least in the United States and the United Kingdom) has been to see whether people will bother to look at the files in detail (for the most part they have not), and to wait until time diffuses the initial impressions in order to reassert the original message of a climate catastrophe that must be fought with a huge measure of carbon control.

This reassertion, however, continues to be suffused by illogic, nastiness and outright dishonesty. There were, of course, the inevitable investigations of individuals like Penn State University's Michael Mann (who manipulated data to create the famous "hockey stick" climate graph) and Phil Jones (director of the CRU). The investigations were brief, thoroughly lacking in depth, and conducted, for the most part, by individuals already publicly committed to the popular view of climate alarm. The results were whitewashes that are quite incredible given the actual data.

In addition, numerous professional societies, including the American Society of Agronomy, the American Society of Plant Biologists and the Natural Science Collections Alliance, most of which have no expertise whatever in climate, endorse essentially the following opinion: That the climate is warming, the warming is due to man's emissions of carbon dioxide, and continued emissions will lead to catastrophe.

We may reasonably wonder why they feel compelled to endorse this view. The IPCC's position in its Summary for Policymakers from their Fourth Assessment (2007) is weaker, and simply points out that most warming of the past 50 years or so is due to man's emissions. It is sometimes claimed that the IPCC is 90% confident of this claim, but there is no known statistical basis for this claim—it's purely subjective. The IPCC also claims that observations of globally averaged temperature anomaly are also consistent with computer model predictions of warming.

There are, however, some things left unmentioned about the IPCC claims. For example, the observations are consistent with models only if emissions include arbitrary amounts of reflecting aerosols particles (arising, for example, from industrial sulfates) which are used to cancel much of the warming predicted by the models. The observations themselves, without such adjustments, are consistent with there being sufficiently little warming as to not constitute a problem worth worrying very much about.

In addition, the IPCC assumed that computer models accurately included any alternative sources of warming—most notably, the natural, unforced variability associated with phenomena like El Nino, the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, etc. Yet the relative absence of statistically significant warming for over a decade shows clearly that this assumption was wrong. Of course, none of this matters any longer to those replacing reason with assertions of authority.

Consider a letter of April 9 to the Financial Times by the presidents of the U.S. National Academy of Science and the Royal Society (Ralph Cicerone and Martin Rees, respectively). It acknowledges that climategate has contributed to a reduced concern among the public, as

has unusually cold weather. But Messrs. Cicerone and Rees insist that nothing has happened to alter the rather extreme statement that climate is changing and it is due to human action. They then throw in a very peculiar statement (referring to warming), almost in passing: "Uncertainties in the future rate of this rise, stemming largely from the 'feedback' effects on water vapour and clouds, are topics of current research."

Who would guess, from this statement, that the feedback effects are the crucial question? Without these positive feedbacks assumed by computer modelers, there would be no significant problem, and the various catastrophes that depend on numerous factors would no longer be related to anthropogenic global warming.

That is to say, the issue relevant to policy is far from settled. Nonetheless, the letter concludes: "Our academies will provide the scientific backdrop for the political and business leaders who must create effective policies to steer the world toward a low-carbon economy." In other words, the answer is settled even if the science is not.

In France, several distinguished scientists have recently published books criticizing the alarmist focus on carbon emissions. The gist of all the books was the scientific standards for establishing the alarmist concern were low, and the language, in some instances, was intemperate. In response, a letter signed by 489 French climate scientists was addressed to "the highest French scientific bodies: the Ministry of Research, National Center for Scientific Research, and Academy of Sciences" appealing to them to defend climate science against the attacks. There appeared to be no recognition that calling on the funding agencies to take sides in a scientific argument is hardly conducive to free exchange.

The controversy was, and continues to be, covered extensively by the French press. In many respects, the French situation is better than in the U.S., insofar as the "highest scientific bodies" have not officially taken public stances—yet.

Despite all this, it does appear that the public at large is becoming increasingly aware that something other than science is going on with regard to climate change, and that the proposed policies are likely to cause severe problems for the world economy. Climategate may thus have had an effect after all.

But it is unwise to assume that those who have carved out agendas to exploit the issue will simply let go without a battle. One can only hope that the climate alarmists will lose so that we can go back to dealing with real science and real environmental problems such as assuring clean air and water. The latter should be an appropriate goal for Earth Day.

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

4. Gambling Australia's Future on Sunbeams and Sea Breezes

By Viv Forbes, Carbon Sense Coalition, Apr 2010

<http://carbon-sense.com/2010/04/18/renewable-energy-targets/>

The Carbon Sense Coalition has produced a submission to the Australian Government Enquiry into "The Enhanced Renewable Energy Target Scheme", April 2010.

From the submission:

“The total justification for this massive upheaval of Australia’s industry and economy is the contention that man’s production of the colourless harmless gas, carbon dioxide, is likely to cause dangerous global warming. But never has the government conducted an open public enquiry to test the truth of this statement. Instead they have relied on an increasingly discredited political body, the UN’s IPCC, or on their own paid employees (who have learned the dangers of contradicting the message of powerful politicians.)”

Read the full submission: <http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/renewable-energy-targets.pdf> [PDF, 83KB]

5. Obama’s climate of fear: Earth Day hysteria is based on lots of phony science

Washington Times Editorial, Apr 22, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/22/obamas-climate-of-fear/>

The purported science behind the global-warming fad is in full retreat these days, but word has yet to reach the White House. President Obama is determined to promote the alleged climate crisis as a lever for pushing through his big-government agenda. The O Force doesn't believe in wasting a crisis, even if it's a mirage.

In mid-March, the White House Interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force did its bit for climate terror. "Climate-change impacts are pervasive, wide-ranging and affect the core systems of our society: transportation, ecosystems, agriculture, business, infrastructure, water and energy, among others," its report stated. The panel also expressed concern that "Climate change already is affecting the ability of federal agencies to fulfill their missions," which - if true - many Americans would view as a positive development.

This month, the State Department released the draft of the 2010 Climate Action Report, as required by the United Nations. The report makes the blanket statement that global warming "is due primarily to human-induced emissions of heat-trapping gases," despite growing skepticism about this claim in the scientific community. This new document is based on the "Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States" report from June 2009, which uncritically used the increasingly discredited 2007 U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change study as a base line and then extrapolated a series of improbable disaster scenarios.

The government claims that climate change is leading to, among other things, drought, heavy downpours, disease, poor air quality and extreme weather events. But reality stubbornly refuses to cooperate with the alarmists. There has been no noteworthy increase in tornadoes, sea levels, drought, climate-related disease or air pollution over the past two decades. The polar ice cap has grown back to around its 1999 dimensions. Cyclonic activity has declined 60 percent in the past five years despite frantic claims by post-Katrina alarmists that, by now, increasingly deadly storms would be stalking our coastal cities.

The State Department study contains a few inconvenient truths for the climate-change alarmists. U.S. energy consumption per person peaked sometime in the 1970s and since has declined and flattened. Greenhouse gases emitted by industry peaked in the mid-1990s and have since declined. Since 1990, total greenhouse gas emissions per unit of gross domestic product have declined almost 30 percent. Emissions per capita have basically flatlined since 1990. Strip away the alarmism, and where is the crisis.

The truth is, the government needs scary stories to push its agenda, so science must be subverted to politics. Chapter 5 of the State Department report is an explicit sales pitch for cap-and-trade legislation. The discussion of carbon-dioxide emissions supports the logic behind the Environmental Protection Agency's December 2009 endangerment finding that carbon dioxide is a threat to "the public health and welfare of current and future generations." This is a naked government power grab that will have

extensive negative economic and lifestyle consequences because the state has declared the very act of breathing a threat.

At times, the report reads like a White House press release, gushing, for example: "President Obama has outlined a comprehensive plan to address global climate change through investments that will save or create many jobs." The document uses the word "Obama" 47 times, triple the references to President George W. Bush in the previous edition. This tends to detract from the focus on science but is consistent with the virtually North Korean level of fawning in Obama-era official documents. Talk about a lot of hot air.

6. Energy Update: Voters Take Global Warming A Bit Less Seriously

Rasmussen Reports, Apr 19, 2010, [H/t Tom Sheahan]

http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/current_events/environment_energy/energy_update

Voters continue to show less worry about global warming.

A new Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey finds that 54% of voters still believe global warming is a serious problem, but that's down eight points from a year ago. The new numbers includes 29% who consider it very serious, a number, too, that has been inching down in recent months.

But 43% now say global warming is not serious, including 21% who say it is not at all serious. The number who say global warming is not serious at all is at its highest level measured in regular tracking in over a year. The overall number of voters who question the seriousness of global warming crossed into the 40s for the first time in January.

Forty-eight percent (48%) of voters say global warming is caused by long-term planetary trends, while only 33% blame human activity. These results are identical to those found last month.

Belief that human activity is the primary cause of global warming has declined significantly. In April 2008, the numbers were nearly the mirror image of the current findings. At that time, 47% blamed human activity, while only 34% named long-term planetary trends as the reason for climate change.

Many voters also continue to believe their president has different views on the topic than they do. Most (55%) say President Obama believes global warming is caused by human activity, while only 15% think the president blames long-term planetary trends.

(Want a free daily e-mail update? If it's in the news, it's in our polls). Rasmussen Reports updates are also available on Twitter or Facebook.

The decline in voter concern comes despite the failed UN effort in December to produce an international treaty aimed at limiting the human activity that Obama and others consider the primary cause of global warming. At that time, most Americans (52%) said there continues to be significant disagreement within the scientific community over global warming.

Fifty-nine percent (59%) also said it's at least somewhat likely that some scientists have falsified research data to support their own theories and beliefs about global warming.

That helps explain why Americans remain evenly divided over how urgent it is to deal with global warming: 43% say we must take immediate action to stop it, but another 43% say we should wait a few years to see if global warming is real before making major changes.

Seventy-one percent (71%) of Americans say stimulating the economy to create more jobs is a bigger priority for U.S. leaders than stopping global warming to protect the environment.

The plurality of voters (47%) says there is a conflict between economic growth and environmental protection, a number that has held fairly consistent over the past several months. Just 30% do not see this conflict, while 23% are not sure.

When it comes to U.S. efforts to help the environment, just 29% of voters now believe reducing the amount of energy Americans consume is more important than developing new energy sources. Most voters (63%) continue to see finding new energy sources as the more important goal.

The number of voters who think reducing energy consumption is the higher priority ties the lowest level measured in over one year. The number who put new energy sources first ties results found in January.

Women are more likely than men to place more importance on reducing energy consumption. While those over the age of 30 place much higher importance on finding new energy sources, voters under 30 are evenly divided on the question.

Fifty-eight percent (58%) continue to see renewable energy sources such as solar or wind power as a better long-term investment than fossil fuels. Thirty percent (30%) say investing in fossil fuels is the better plan.

Most Americans see a need for major lifestyle cutbacks to help the environment, but even more don't think that's likely to happen.

Voters support offshore oil drilling more than ever, and most don't agree with the president's decision to limit where that drilling can be done.

Despite major announcements in recent days from both Ford and Nissan about stepped-up development of electric cars, just 17% of Americans say it is at least somewhat likely that the next car they buy will be all-electric.

Separate polling finds that 44% of Americans believe solar energy should become a standard method of heating homes in the United States.

#####

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.