

WASHINGTON The impact of a changing climate is already being felt across the United States, like shifting migration patterns of butterflies in the West and heavier downpours in the Midwest and East, according to a government study to be released on Tuesday. Even if the nation takes significant steps to slow emissions of heat-trapping gases, the impact of [global warming](#) is expected to become more severe in coming years, the report says, affecting farms and forests, coastlines and floodplains, water and energy supplies, transportation and human health.

The study was prepared by the [United States Global Change Research Program](#), a joint scientific venture of 13 federal agencies and the [White House](#). Under a 1990 law, the group is required to report every 10 years on natural and human-caused effects on the environment. The current study, which began in the [George W. Bush administration](#), builds on the findings of the 2000 one.

The study, overseen by the [White House Office of Science and Technology Policy](#), will be posted at www.globalchange.gov/usimpacts.

Some of the effects being seen today and cited in the report are familiar, like more powerful tropical storms and erosion of ocean coastlines caused by melting Arctic ice. The study also cites an increase in drought in the Southwest and more intense heat waves in the Northeast as a result of growing concentrations of carbon dioxide and other climate-altering gases in the atmosphere.

[SEPP says: No mention that the climate has stopped warming since 1998]

Reduced mountain snow pack means earlier melt-offs and reduced stream volumes across the West and Northwest, affecting residential and agricultural water supplies, habitats for spawning fish and reduced [hydroelectric](#) power generation, the study found. But the speed and severity of these effects in the future are expressed with less certainty in the report and will depend to some extent on how quickly the United States and other nations move to reduce emissions.

[SEPP says: This is clearly bunk. None of pending legislation can make a significant impact.]

What we would want to have people take away is that climate change is happening now, and its actually beginning to affect our lives, said **Thomas R. Karl**, director of the [National Climatic Data Center](#) at the [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration](#) and a principal author of the report. Its not just happening in the Arctic regions, but its beginning to show up in our own backyards.

Dr. Karl said the section of the 188-page report dealing with human-health effects generated the most discussion and uncertainty among the agencies. The study said rising average temperatures would cause more heat-related illnesses and deaths, along with some reduction in deaths from extreme cold.

[SEPP says: It's the other way round. Warmer climate would be better for human health]

Michael C. MacCracken, a leader of the 2000 study ***[which was challenged under the Information Quality Act and had to be withdrawn -- SEPP]*** and a principal outside reviewer of the current one, said in an e-mail message that the new report was a useful overview of the state of current climate science in the United States, but there is not much that is new.

=====
Surprisingly, the UK's *Guardian* gives the most detailed report:

Obama targets US public with call for climate action: Climate impacts report warns of flooding, heat waves, drought and loss of wildlife that will occur if Americans fail to act on global warming

The [Obama administration](#) is poised for its most forceful confrontation with the American public on the sweeping and life-altering consequences of a failure to act on global warming with the release today of a long-awaited scientific report on [climate](#)

[change.](#)

The report, produced by more than 30 [*government*] scientists at 13 government agencies dealing with climate change, provides the most detailed picture to date of the worst-case scenarios of rising sea levels and extreme weather events: floods in lower Manhattan; a quadrupling of heat waves deaths in Chicago; withering on the vineyards of California; the disappearance of wildflowers from the slopes of the Rockies; and the extinction of Alaska's wild polar bears in the next 75 years.

[Today's release](#) is part of a carefully crafted strategy by the White House to help build public support for Obama's agenda and boost the prospects of a [climate change bill now making its way through Congress](#). [*SEPP says: A calamity tailored for every region*]

For many Americans, the report released today, entitled "Global climate change impacts in the United States" provides the most tangible evidence of the economic costs of climate change - from the need to relocate airports in Alaska built on permafrost, to the increased need for pesticides in agriculture, to an electrical grid straining to meet the increased demand for air conditioning in summer, and ageing sewer systems brought to bursting point by heavy run-off in 770 American cities and towns.

"This report basically describes a state of emergency. It says we need to act quickly and decisively. Every state is going to be affected, and every sector of the economy."

The final draft of today's report uses climate models to map out starkly different futures if the current generation of Americans fails to act to reduce the carbon emissions that cause global warming.

Americans have already been living with evidence of changing climate, the report said. Over the last 30 years winters have grown shorter and milder, with a 2.1C (7F) [*sic!*] rise in winter temperatures in the Midwest and northern Great Plains. Hurricanes have become deadlier. If climate change is left unchecked, the future promises to bring even more ferocious hurricanes to coastal regions - in the Pacific as well as the Atlantic, punishing droughts to the Southwest, and increasingly severe winter storms in the Northeast and around the Great Lakes.

The human consequences, as envisaged by the draft, are similarly catastrophic: potential food shortages because of declining wheat and corn yields in the breadbasket of the mid-west, increased outbreaks of food poisoning and epidemic diseases. US cities will be choking because of deteriorating air quality; leisure pursuits will disappear. The report predicts that the ski season in the Northeast will be 20% shorter. As for summer holidays, 14 of 17 North Carolina beaches will be permanently underwater by 2080.

Today's release of the report was part of a methodically planned media rollout by the Obama administration. Scientists who have seen the report said the administration spent several weeks honing the language and graphics to make it accessible to non-scientists and to sharpen its core message: America must act now on climate change. As part of the PR surrounding the release of the report, the administration approached the San Francisco consulting firm, [Resource Media](#), which specialises in environmental campaigning, to oversee the release, and produce a shorter and more digestible brochure of today's report for wider public distribution.

On the morning of 16 April, [at a meeting in Washington](#), more than 30 [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration](#) scientists, climate change experts from a number of universities, environmental activists and media strategists discussed how to engage various communities with the findings of the report - town mayors, religious groups, even kindergarten pupils. Suggestions raised at the meeting for key messages from the White House included "green jobs", "middle class initiative" and "energy independence".

The release appeared timed to help Democratic leaders in Congress meet an ambitious target of passing a climate change bill through the House of Representatives by 26 June. The Democratic speaker, Nancy Pelosi, wants to hold a vote before the House breaks up for the 4 July Independence Day holiday. But the [bill has run into strong opposition](#) from some Democratic members of Congress, especially those from agricultural states, who say that putting limits on greenhouse gas emissions will hurt farmers' economic interests. That could complicate Pelosi's plans of getting the bill passed through various

committees by this Friday, 19 June, and put to a vote next week.

=====

SEPP Comment: This report is pure unadulterated hype -- but that's to be expected from Browner, Holdren and company. It is supposedly based on a synthesis of 21 reports of the federal Climate Change Science Program (CCSP), which has cost the nation ~\$20 billion in the past decade. I note that this 'impact report' skirts the key question: Is climate change natural or human-caused?

If mostly natural, then all the rest is academic, of course. CCSP report 1.1 settles the issue in favor of natural causes. And with climate cooling -- and continuing to cool -- the answer is a no-brainer.

The other key issue: To show that the climate bill supported by the WH will make a significant impact on GH gas levels. It won't -- not without China, India etc. It will just raise taxes and energy costs, prolong the recession and destroy jobs.

=====

Another Comment: "The timing, fanfare and level of alarm surrounding the release of this report as Congress contemplates cap and trade legislation and the EPA moves to re-classify CO₂ as a 'threat to health and public welfare' is quite interesting" says Jim Mayer, sponsor of AmericanEnergySecurity.com. "I suspect there are concerns [in the WH] that the American people don't strongly support government regulation of CO₂," notes Mayer.

Climate talks snarled up: Two-pronged negotiations fail to bridge divide between nations.

<http://www.nature.com/news/2009/090617/full/459894a.html>

Nature online 16 June 2009 | 459, 894-895 (2009) | doi:10.1038/459894a

International climate negotiators muddled through the latest round of global-warming talks in Bonn, Germany, last week, overshadowed by independent bilateral negotiations in Beijing between the United States and China.

Neither meeting produced any significant breakthroughs, and new disagreements seem to have outnumbered resolutions by a wide margin. At the United Nations climate talks that ended on 12 June in Bonn, delegates proposed so many new provisions and wording changes that the negotiation text ballooned fourfold to more than 200 pages — standard procedure for such negotiations, but one that flags up how much work remains to be done.

"We're at the point where we desperately need some higher-level leadership to get this process going," says Keya Chatterjee, deputy director for climate change at the WWF environmental group in Washington DC.

Many observers placed their hopes instead on the talks in China, which played host during 7–10 June to a US delegation led by Todd Stern, the nation's lead climate negotiator, and John Holdren, President Barack Obama's chief science adviser.

The two countries together produce some 40% of global greenhouse-gas emissions, and there is little chance of achieving an international agreement in Copenhagen, where the UN talks are scheduled to conclude in December, unless the United States and China come to an understanding. Nonetheless, expectations going into the Beijing meeting were low. "We're at the point where we desperately need some higher-level leadership to get this process going."

China released a position statement on 20 May calling on developed nations to reduce emissions to at least 40% below 1990 levels by 2020. The leading US climate legislation — a bill that could come up for a vote as early as this month in the House of Representatives — would establish an emissions-trading system to reduce US emissions to 1% below 1990 levels by 2020. Other provisions in the bill would go further, but even the most optimistic assessment, by the World Resources Institute, pegs potential reductions at only 17–23% below 1990 levels.

"We certainly did not agree with each other on everything," said Stern after returning to Washington, "but I think that we each came away with a better and a clearer understanding of each other's views and perspectives."

With just six months to go to Copenhagen and little convergence on any of the big issues, the question is whether countries are positioning themselves in expectation of striking a bargain there or merely digging trenches for a prolonged debate. Robert Stavins, an environmental economist at Harvard University, says he fears the latter might be true.

"The gulf between the countries of the industrialized world and what is usually referred to as the developing world," he says, "is, if anything, growing, or at least solidifying."

The largest pledged emissions cut on the table is of 30% from 1990 levels by 2020; that is what the European Union (EU) says it will do if others commit to similar cuts. If they don't, the EU offers only 20%. And things drop off quickly from there: Japan came under fire last week for proposing a plan to reduce domestic emissions by about 8% below 1990 levels.

Such numbers would seem to indicate a substantial divide among industrialized countries, but the gap largely disappears if the commitments are measured against a 2005 baseline.

[SEPP Science Editorial #18-2009 \(6/20/09\)](#)

How to Cheat with Statistics

The standard way is to simply ignore contrary data: for example, the IPCC-AR4 [2007] does not mention or reference climate forcing from changes in solar activity in spite of much published evidence. A more sophisticated method is selectivity: for example, choosing a time interval that will lead to a desired temperature trend [see SEPP Science Editorial #7-08 of Oct 4, 2008]. More difficult to spot is 'selective smoothing' of data that can produce a trend where none exists [see SEPP Science Editorial #8-09 2/28/09].

We now come to the misuse of averaging, as used in the WH report released this week. Recall that the last National Assessment report (NACC 2000, under Al Gore) used TWO climate models to predict dire futures. Trouble was, their results disagreed violently: in half of the 18 regions they even gave opposite predictions [see NIPCC Summary, figure 16]: For example, the Rio Grande region (New Mexico and West Texas), Upper and Lower Colorado would turn into a desert, acc to one model –while the other model turned them into swamps. So how to fix this strategic error? The new WH Assessment uses an AVERAGE of models instead of showing the results of individual models. It's the old story about the statistician who had one foot in a bucket of ice water and the other in a bucket of boiling water: on the average, he was quite comfortable.

An addendum on Negative Feedback [see SEPP Science Editorial #17 of June 13, 2009]

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/06/14/the-thermostat-hypothesis/>

**1. Western Governors have second thoughts about Global Warming – *Paul Chesser*
And soon Virginia too, perhaps**

2. The WH report “Global Climate Change Impacts in the US” and reactions – *Marc Morano*

3. U.S. Climate Report assailed – *John Tierney, NYTimes*

4. Reasons to distrust government reports –*Alan Caruba*

5. IPCC motives and financial beneficiaries of climate alarm – *Malcolm Roberts*

6. Checking the facts -- *The Scientific Alliance*

7. Media credibility, not ice caps, in meltdown – *Peter Glover*

NEWS YOU CAN USE

The US **Chamber of Commerce** has launched a public web page dedicated exclusively to the Waxman-Markey bill <http://www.uschamber.com/aces>. The purpose is to give the 10 or 15 documents most relevant to Waxman-Markey. Most key constituents or decision makers have not read this bill because it is so long; even the CRS (Congressional Research Service) analysis is 115 pages long. Therefore, the CoC summary is very helpful.

A bold new advertisement campaign by the **Heartland Institute** challenges our political leadership to undertake an open and honest debate on the causes and effects of climate change. Three full-page ads appeared in the Washington Post on June 16, 17 and 18. We applaud Heartland for these efforts. Images of each ad are presented here:

<http://www.heartland.org/suites/environment/LetUsDebate.html>

Some have given up on ever effectively controlling global growth of CO2 and are championing 'geo-engineering' schemes. A current offering on the altar of Climate Change by the World Bank: [Beyond Mitigation: Potential Options for Counter-Balancing the Climatic and Environmental Consequences of the Rising Concentrations of Greenhouse Gases:](http://go.worldbank.org/VPJ91FTKQ0)

<http://go.worldbank.org/VPJ91FTKQ0>

Sage words of Prof. Mike **Hulme** (U of East Anglia), while director of the Tyndall Centre:

<http://www.climate-resistance.org/2007/11/lucas-and-majority-of-some-scientists.html>

“The language of catastrophe is not the language of science. It will not be visible in next year's global assessment from the world authority of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)[Note: AR4]. To state that climate change will be "catastrophic" hides a cascade of value-laden assumptions that do not emerge from empirical or theoretical science. Is any amount of climate change catastrophic? Catastrophic for whom, for where, and by when? What index is being used to measure the catastrophe? The language of fear and terror operates as an ever-weakening vehicle for effective communication or inducement for behavioural change.”

Citing coming global warming legislation, Duke Energy, the third-largest U.S. utility, has asked North Carolina regulators for permission to raise electricity prices 12.6 percent. The requested price hike would cost North Carolina ratepayers \$496 million. <http://greenhellblog.wordpress.com/2009/06/17/global-warnings-first-electricity-price-hike-500-million-for-north-carolina/>

Global warming bill is a job killer <http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=330132018201124>

UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

BBC on June 19: The message from yesterday's [UK] Met Office report is loud and it is clear. "Climate change is real. It is already happening. Further change is inevitable. The question is only how big it will be. We must act now to prevent the worst. Just three days ago, a 196-page report on climate change in the United States, the starkest warning ever to be issued from the White

House, sounded a similar warning. Yesterday yet another study predicted the direst consequences for African harvests. Researchers at Stanford University reported in the journal *Global Environmental Change* that Africa's three main crops maize, millet and sorghum will not be able to grow at all in some countries within 40 years.

Even this may be on the optimistic side, as the official Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says that global warming is increasing even faster than predicted."

SEPP comment: Amazing! "faster than predicted" ...by IPCC models, we assume. So much for their reliability for assessing the future

#####

1. WESTERN GOVERNORS HAVE SECOND THOUGHTS ABOUT GLOBAL WARMING

Paul Chesser reports (6/17/2009)

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2009/06/17/more-from-two-key-western-governors/>

The annual meeting [1] of the Western Governors Association closed yesterday, and the *Deseret News* stuck with the global warming theme [2] of departing (once he's confirmed as ambassador to China) Utah Gov. Jon Huntsman Jr. (an alarmist) being replaced by Lt. Gov. Gary Herbert (a skeptic). The newspaper put Herbert in the spotlight once again about his intentions on the issue when he takes the top office:

Herbert, who will have to run in 2010 for the remainder of Huntsman's term, told the *Deseret News* he had no political agenda. "I'm certainly not going to be the same as Gov. Huntsman, Herbert said, but was not calculating to set myself apart."

He said other governors attending the meeting told him privately they agreed with him (about climate change) but the [WGA] had already decided its position. A resolution urging regional and national policies on global climate change was approved at the meeting.

Herbert said he hopes to organize his own conference in Utah so scientists on both sides of the issue can make their arguments.

Meanwhile Democratic Montana Gov. Brian Schweitzer (a somewhat reformed alarmist) reiterated his views that the debate about global warming is not settled:

[Schweitzer] said, while I believe and I think many people agree with me that human activity has contributed to greenhouse gases and those greenhouse gases are changing our climate and it is something we need to address, others don't believe it.

Schweitzer said most people fall between the extremes of dismissing climate change altogether and believing that unless we move immediately into a cave and live around a campfire that the world is going to be destroyed.

It would be nice if President Obama paid attention [3]

[1] annual meeting: <http://www.globalwarming.org/2009/06/16/incoming-wga-chair-debate-not-over/>

[2] stuck with the global warming theme: <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/705310937/Herbert-concerned-about-environment.html>

[3] if President Obama paid attention: <http://www.climatedepot.com/a/1421/Scaremongering-Scientists-Pan-Obama-Climate-Report-This-is-not-a-work-of-science-but-an-embarrassing-episode-for-the-authors-and-NOAAMisrepresents-the-science>

=====
And Virginia too: Meanwhile, Bob McDonnell, running for governor of Virginia, has taken a firm stance against the Democrat CO2 plan, calling it "misguided" and a "job-killer" that would have a negative impact on the economy. Costs to families under the plan could reach nearly \$2,200 annually. "In this difficult economic period, increasing costs on hard-working Virginians and threatening job growth are absolute wrong-headed ideas."

SEPP comment: The VA elections in Nov 2009 could turn out to be the earliest popular referendum on WH climate plans, the EPA CO2-control plan, and the Waxman-Markey bill.

2. THE White House REPORT “GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS IN THE US” AND REACTIONS

<http://www.globalchange.gov/publications/reports/scientific-assessments/us-impacts>

Some Key findings include:

Climate changes are underway in the United States and are projected to grow. Climate-related changes are already observed in the United States and its coastal waters. These include increases in heavy downpours, rising temperature and sea level, rapidly retreating glaciers, thawing permafrost, lengthening growing seasons, lengthening ice-free seasons in the ocean and on lakes and rivers, earlier snowmelt, and alterations in river flows. These changes are projected to grow.

Crop and livestock production will be increasingly challenged. Agriculture is considered one of the sectors most adaptable to changes in climate. However, increased heat, pests, water stress, diseases, and weather extremes will pose adaptation challenges for crop and livestock production.

Threats to human health will increase. Health impacts of climate change are related to heat stress, waterborne diseases, poor air quality, extreme weather events, and diseases transmitted by insects and rodents. Robust public health infrastructure can reduce the potential for negative impacts.

=====

'Scaremongering': Scientists Pan Obama Climate Report: 'This is not a work of science but an embarrassing episode for the authors and NOAA'...'Misrepresents the science'
By Marc Morano – full report at <http://www.climatedepot.com/> June 16, 2009

Below is a small sampling of first reactions to the President Obama's new global warming report. (See: Obama issues global warming report -- 'detailed picture of the worst case scenarios' -- 'poised for its most forceful confrontation with American public')

Meteorologist: 'This is not a work of science but an embarrassing episode for the authors and NOAA' - By Meteorologist Joe D'Aleo, the first Director of Meteorology at The Weather Channel and former chairman of the American Meteorological Society's (AMS) Committee on Weather Analysis and Forecasting. D'Aleo publishes www.IceCap.US

Excerpt: The report issued was the Hollywood-supported NOAA CCSP report, which after two rounds of comments by many scientists citing peer review reasons to change, largely ignored the comments and delivered a document even more alarmist than the UN IPCC. It starts out DAY ONE being wrong on many of its claims but goes much further to rely on climate models for 2050 and 2100 to make even more dire prognoses. This is not a work of science but an embarrassing episode for the authors and NOAA. They gave the administration the cover to push the unwise cap-and-tax agenda.

U.S. Government Scientist: 'I disagree strongly with the hurricane-related conclusions of this report!' - **Excerpt:** (Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA, expressing his personal views on the report, not those of any organization): "I saw the news story on this and looked up the report. I have a pretty good grasp of the hurricane and AGW issues. I have skimmed over the hurricane findings (by the way --- I didn't notice a single recognized hurricane climate expert in the list of authors) and they definitely ignore a large body of the published hurricane research. There are a number of hurricane climate experts (including myself) that would disagree strongly with the hurricane-related conclusions of this report! [...] I can only imagine how slanted the other portions of the report might be as well.

Report 'misrepresents the science' -- 'ignores relevant work in peer-reviewed literature' - Roger **Pielke Jr.**, professor of environmental studies at the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Excerpt: “Imagine if an industry-funded government contractor had a hand in writing a major federal report on climate change. And imagine if that person used his position to misrepresent the science, to cite his own non-peer reviewed work, and to ignore relevant work in the peer-reviewed literature. There would be an outrage, surely . . . The Obama Administration has re-released a report, first issued in draft form by the Bush Administration last July (still online PDF). The substance of the report is essentially the same as last year's version, with a bit more professionalism in the delivery. For instance, the photo-shopped picture of a flood appears to be removed and the embarrassing executive summary has been replaced by something more appropriate. This post is about how the report summarizes the issue of disasters and climate change, including several references to my work, which is misrepresented. [...] So to summarize: sentence one is not supported by the citations provided, which lead in both cases to selectively chosen non-peer reviewed sources, and the citations that are peer reviewed on this subject come to an opposite conclusion and are ignored.”

Geologist rips Obama's 'new scare report': “I become more skeptical every year. I am now beginning to conclude that global warming simply does not exist' - by Geophysicist Dr. David Deming, associate professor of arts and sciences at the University of Oklahoma who has published numerous peer-reviewed research articles. Excerpt: 1. The new scare report issued by the Obama administration refers to the work of Stephen H. Schneider six times. You will recall that Schneider is infamous for telling Discover magazine (October, 1989, p. 45-48) that "we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have...each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest." 2. There has been no sea level rise for the past three years. 3. Hurricane, typhoon, and tropical cyclone activity is at a 30-year low. 4. The satellite data (UAH MSU) currently show that mean global temperature is about the same as it was in June of 1979...no, if anything, it is LOWER. [...] Global "warming" is based almost entirely on the record from meteorological stations. Anthony Watts' survey of 1221 weather stations is now 70 percent complete, and shows that an astonishing 69 percent of these stations are likely to have serious errors, due to their being located near heat sources such as asphalt paving, air conditioning vents, etc. After following this subject now since the mid 1980s, I become more skeptical every year. I am now beginning to conclude that global warming simply does not exist.”

'So Much For That Whole Commitment To Science We Were Promised' - Excerpt: Wow, that's sure how I learned to handle a scientific report back when I was studying physics - scrub it of the science and give it to an activist PR firm! Do you need any more evidence that climate science has become substantially dominated by post-modernist scientists, where ideological purity and staying on message is more important than actually having the science right? [...] Apparently the report will make up for having all the science stripped out by spending a lot of time on gaudy worst case scenarios.

Obama 'hires PR firm to embellish past scaremongering generated exclusively from virtual climate computer models' - June 16, 2009 Excerpt: Despite the scientific evidence that the globe has been cooling (land, atmosphere and oceans) over the last 10+ years, Obama chooses to publish his first "science" report void of any recent, real-world climate science. Instead, his administration hires a PR firm to embellish the past scaremongering generated exclusively from virtual climate computer models. Unfortunately for real science and America, he has sided with the pseudo science of "virtual lies" and hysterical climate claims in order to get his badly needed revenue-generation engine, 'Cap & Trade,' passed in Congress.

Guest post by Bob Tisdale: Excerpt: The USGCRP report “Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States” was released today. As noted in the title, it fails to address the multiyear effects of El Nino-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) events on global temperature. Other than explosive volcanic eruptions, El Nino-Southern Oscillation events have the greatest impacts on global

climate on annual and multiyear bases. [...] Like the IPCC, the USGCRP either fails to accept the significant multiyear and cumulative impacts of ENSO on global temperatures or they chose to ignore them in their presentation of the causes of global temperature change.

Sen. Inhofe: 'No surprise report released just in time for Climate bill vote' Excerpt: "That the federal bureaucracy in Washington has produced yet another alarmist report on global warming is nothing new," Sen. Inhofe said. "It's also no surprise that such a report was released just in time for the House vote on Waxman-Markey. [...] I would suggest that, given a little time, the world's preeminent scientists will quickly and thoroughly debunk this study. As has been clearly demonstrated by the Senate Minority report of over 700 scientists questioning global warming hysteria, the debate on the science remains wide open."

3. U.S. CLIMATE REPORT ASSAILED

By JOHN TIERNEY, NYT, June 18, 2009

<http://tierneylab.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/06/18/us-climate-report-assailed/>

The new [federal report on climate change](#) gets a withering critique from Roger Pielke Jr., who says that it misrepresents his own research and that it wrongly concludes that climate change is already responsible for an increase in damages from natural disasters. Dr. Pielke, a professor of environmental studies at the University of Colorado, asks:

[Why] is a report characterized by [White House] Science Advisor John Holdren as being the most up-to-date, authoritative, and comprehensive analysis relying on a secondary, non-peer source citing another non-peer reviewed source from 2000 to support a claim that a large amount of non-cited and more recent peer-reviewed literature says the opposite about?

You can check out [Dr. Pielke's blog](#) for a detailed rebuttal of how the report presents science in his area of expertise, the study of trends in natural disasters and their relation to climate change. While the new federal report (prepared by 13 agencies and the White House) paints a dire picture of climate changes impacts, Dr. Pielke says that the authors of this new report, like those of previous reports from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Stern Review, cherry-pick weak evidence that fits their own policy preferences. [He faults all these reports](#) for all relying on non-peer reviewed, unsupportable studies rather than the relevant peer-reviewed literature and for featuring non-peer-reviewed work conducted by the authors.

Dr. Pielke contrasts these reports conclusions about trends in natural disasters with the some [quite different findings last year](#) by the federal Climate Change Science Program. Dr. Pielke summarizes some of its less sensational conclusions:

1. Over the long-term, U.S. hurricane landfalls have been declining.
2. Nationwide there have been no long-term increases in drought.
3. Despite increases in some measures of precipitation . . . there have not been corresponding increases in peak streamflows (high flows above 90th percentile).
4. There have been no observed changes in the occurrence of tornadoes or thunderstorms
5. There have been no long-term increases in strong East Coast winter storms (ECWS), called Nor'easters.
6. There are no long-term trends in either heat waves or cold spells, though there are trends within shorter time periods in the overall record.

Do those benign trends seem surprising to you? What do you think of Dr. Pielke's arguments? Here's his overall conclusion about the dangers of hyping the link between natural disasters and climate change: Until the climate science community cleans up its act on this subject it will continue to give legitimate opportunities for opponents to action to criticize the climate science community.

4. REASONS TO DISTRUST GOVERNMENT REPORTS

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2009/06/reasons-to-distrust-your-government.html>

By Alan Caruba, June 18, 2009

In the normal course of events, when voters no longer have confidence in the President, their Senators and their Representatives, they vote them out of office, but there are whole agencies of government that continue on no matter who is in office and, since their budgets and existence depend on the politics of whoever holds power, they bend to serve their policies.

A democracy is most in peril when citizens conclude they can no longer trust their government and there is no better example of that than a recent report, "Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States," issued by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It is sheer rubbish.

It is typical of the deliberate distortions and outright lies that have been put forth to an increasingly doubting public regarding "global warming." It is part and parcel of the deceptions perpetrated for decades now by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, all of which feature tortured data of dubious quality and, since 1998, have ignored the Earth's cooling trend.

The increasing reports from around the nation of "freaky" weather, of snow in June, and other anomalies are, in fact, a reflection of this cooling trend and it is likely to last at least thirty years or more.

John P. Holdren, Assistant to the President on Science and Technology, and a man who holds some of the most outlandish and baseless views on climate change, said "This new report integrates the most up-to-date scientific findings into a comprehensive picture of ongoing as well as expected future impacts of heat-trapping pollution on the climate experience of Americans, region by region and sector by sector."

No it doesn't. For one thing, the "heat-trapping pollution" to which he obliquely refers is mostly carbon dioxide, a gas vital to all life on Earth and a gas which, in the days when the dinosaurs roamed the Earth, could be found in concentrations five times or more higher than today. If CO2 was the great Earth destroyer that Holdren, Gore, and others insist, there should be no Earth at all as we know it today.

This product of the interagency U.S. Global Change Research Program is a 190-page piece of loathsome propaganda that predicts more frequent heat waves, more flooding and waterborne diseases, rising water temperatures, more insect infestations and wildfires, and that old standby, rising sea levels with coastal flooding that will no doubt drown Manhattan and other coastal cities.

Hollywood does a better job with such fantasy than the minions of Washington, D.C.

5. IPCC MOTIVES AND FINANCIAL BENEFICIARIES OF CLIMATE ALARM

Letter to Members of Parliament (Australia)

by Malcolm Roberts, BE (Hons), MBA (Chicago)

Fellow AICD, MAIM, MAusIMM, MAME (USA), MIMM (UK), Fellow ASQ (USA, Aust)

Beneficiaries of climate alarm include scientists seeking government research funding. This very strong vested interest in supporting the man-made global warming *theory* drives closed collaboration. Here's how:

1. The tight IPCC group selectively cites papers to claim man-made warming. Using its government auspices it feeds governments and media its claims;

2. To ensure they're perceived as taking action, governments direct research funding as the IPCC proposes;
3. Climate scientists seeking employment must toe the line. They pitch funding proposals in compliance with government-approved thinking;
4. Researchers generate scientific papers that follow the apparently official line or risk losing future funding;
5. IPCC selectively draws on these new papers. Restart Step 1.

Proposing claims of manmade warming ensures IPCC bureaucrats continued employment. Scientists get money.

Climatologists and modellers wanting work are under pressure. Understandably, some innocently or knowingly fell for the IPCC - their livelihoods (and reputations and egos) are at stake. That's not acceptable.

That many refused and are exposing the IPCC demonstrates human courage.

The IPCC's 4th Assessment Report (2007) claiming human activity caused global warming boils down to chapter 9 written and reviewed by a small, tight group of authors - many closely linked through just three organisations. Among hundreds of qualified organisations world-wide, three dominated the writing AND reviewing of chapter 9 (falsely) claiming manmade warming. IPCC data reveals this group's tight web.

Their claim is based on no sound scientific data - only output from flawed computer models repeatedly proven wrong.

Have you done your due diligence for Australia?

References:

McLean, J, 2007, August/September. An Analysis of the Review of the IPCC 4AR WG I Report. *Science & Public Policy Institute*
http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_review_updated_analysis.pdf [Accessed: June, 2009]

McLean, J, 2007, November. Why the IPCC Should be Disbanded
<http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/whytheipccshouldbedisbanded.html> [Accessed: June, 2009]

McLean, J, 2009. The IPCC Can't Count its Expert Scientists - Author and Reviewer Numbers are Wrong, International Climate and Environmental Change Assessment Project
http://mclean.ch/climate/docs/IPCC_numbers.pdf [Accessed: June, 2009]

McLean, J, 2008. Prejudiced Authors, Prejudiced Findings. Analysis of IPCC data on chapter authors and reviewers published through the Science and Public Policy Institute. Particularly pages 16-17.
http://www.heartland.org/policybot/results/23573/Prejudiced_Authors_Prejudiced_Findings.html
 [Accessed June, 2009]

McLean's reports cannot be sensibly refuted because three were made using IPCC data provided by the IPCC and where necessary McLean describes his data processing method. The fourth (November, 2007) contains McLean's conclusions from data provided the IPCC.

6. CHECKING THE FACTS

The Scientific Alliance, 19th June 2009

The IPCC's projections for the future effects of climate change are generated, as is well known, by an array of computer models which attempt to reproduce the highly complex inter-connected aspects of the Earth's atmosphere and climate. This approach has often been criticised because it places undue reliance on a set of assumptions and treats the output as though it represented reality. But, setting aside these concerns, what if some of the basic data used as inputs for the models was wrong? As the saying goes, "garbage in, garbage out".

Serious questions have previously been asked about the economic growth scenarios used. Broadly, these assume growth rates for developing countries which many economists regard as unrealistically high, leading to a modelled global economy which, by the end of the present century, would have a much greater energy demand than would be likely for more reasonable rates of growth. David Henderson and Ian Castles also pointed out in 2002 that economic growth was modelled on the basis of market exchange rates rather than the more meaningful purchasing power parity, again artificially inflating the size of many economies. Even the lowest growth scenario postulated a 70-fold increase in GDP/capita for developing countries in Asia from 1990 to 2100. Nothing close to this has ever been achieved before.

But there are other areas of concern. The IPCC "business as usual" baseline assumes limitless supplies of fossil fuels over the next century or more, such that the vast increase in energy needed to enable the enormous projected growth in the global economy would essentially all be supplied by oil, gas and coal. The underlying trend of reducing carbon intensity in growing economies does not seem to have been taken into account, but there is an even more basic issue regarding exploitable reserves of fossil fuels.

According to the 2009 BP Statistical Review of World Energy, proven reserves of oil stand at 1,258bn barrels (42 years at current consumption rate), of gas 185 trillion cubic metres (60.4 years) and coal 826bn tonnes (122 years). Total world energy consumption in 2008 was 11.3bn tonnes of oil equivalent (btoe), including nuclear, hydro and other forms of power.

Reserves are a flexible concept, since they increase not only as more discoveries are made but also as prices increase so as to make the more difficult-to-reach reserves economic to exploit. Thus, in the case of oil, the reserves-to-production ratio has risen with time (even as consumption has increased) and remained above 40 years for the last decade. Some economists therefore see fossil fuel resources as effectively infinite: as the price rises, so do exploitable reserves. Of course, once the price rises too far and remains there, the incentive to use other forms of energy increases greatly. So consumption of oil, gas or coal would be expected to fall steadily as it becomes more difficult to extract it at the same rate.

But there is another school of thought, which believes in the concept of Peak Oil. As a global concept, it is an extension of the (correct) prediction made by geophysicist King Hubbert in 1956 that US oil production would peak around 1970, even with the most optimistic view of likely reserves. Others have previously questioned the likelihood of IPCC assumptions on fossil fuel use being right, but Prof David Rutledge of Caltech has analysed the situation in some detail. (Readers can access Prof Rutledge's lecture and slides at <http://rutledge.caltech.edu/> and form their own opinion.)

Not only does he conclude that exploitable global oil reserves are finite, but he questions the prevailing view that there are sufficient coal reserves for well over a century (indeed, unlike oil, proven coal reserves have fallen over recent decades). He estimates total exploitable reserves of oil, gas and coal at 938 Gtoe (gigatonnes oil equivalent). On that basis, we have already used about 40% of the total, and 90% of total resources would be exhausted by 2068.

Compare this with the IPCC view from their Fourth Assessment Report (AR4). The scenario that

gives the lowest economic growth and energy usage figures still projects cumulative fossil fuel use by 2100 of more than the total reserves estimated by Prof Rutledge. Other scenarios project at least twice this figure, with usage still accelerating at the beginning of next century. But using the figure of 938 Gtoe, the projected peak for atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration is 450ppm, and calculated average temperatures would rise by 2C, assuming the IPCC figure of 3 rise for a doubling of CO₂ level.

If this view is right, all the effort currently aimed at drastically reducing carbon dioxide emissions is unnecessary, as peak atmospheric concentrations of the gas and the likely average temperature rise fall below what is considered to constitute "dangerous" climate change. If the conclusions are only part correct, and total reserves are underestimated, this work still calls into question the more extreme of the IPCC scenarios, under which fossil fuel use would still be growing strongly by the turn of the century.

Either way you look at it, this suggests that much of the output of the IPCC's models bears little relationship to the real world. With so much at stake, the least we can expect is for scientists and policymakers to make sure that they are using the right data. Garbage in, garbage out.

Ocean "acidification"

In what is increasingly looking like a fallback position for the carbon-control lobby, the issue of ocean acidification is getting a higher profile. The argument goes that, whatever happens to the air temperature, a higher level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will lead to greater concentrations in the oceans (which is unarguably true). However, CO₂ affects pH by forming a weak acid (carbonic acid) when it dissolves. Everything being equal, more carbon dioxide will move the pH in the acid direction and this, argue some, will ultimately be dangerous for sea life, since many creatures will find it increasingly difficult to use the calcium in seawater to produce their shells.

In practice, the situation is more complex than that. First, the oceans are actually slightly alkaline, with an average pH of 8.2 (although alkalinity varies by about 0.3 unit from area to area). To become acid, the pH must fall below 7 (neutrality). So far, in moving from the generally-accepted pre-industrial figure for atmospheric carbon dioxide concentration of 280ppm to the present roughly 380ppm, ocean pH has dropped on average by about 0.1 unit.

It has been projected that, by 2050 a doubling of carbon dioxide in the air to 560ppm would reduce ocean pH by over 0.2 unit, bringing it just below 8, and that this could go as low as 7.8 by 2100. The problem is that we are looking at the output of models once again, and no-one really knows how long it would take excess CO₂ to be taken up by the deeper ocean, or whether the buffering capacity of the complex mix of ions in seawater - and the seabed and shorelines they are in contact with - has been properly taken into account.

But, even more importantly, if fossil fuel reserves really are as constrained as Prof Rutledge suggests, atmospheric carbon dioxide levels would peak at 460ppm. The scope for ocean "acidification" could therefore be much less than assumed. The same garbage in, different garbage out.

7. MEDIA CREDIBILITY, NOT ICE CAPS, IN MELTDOWN

By Peter C Glover, American Thinker, February 23, 2009

http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/02/media_credibility_not_ice_caps_1.html

Eco-warriors and media hype aside, the fact is, as we head into 2009, that the world's ice mass has been expanding *not* contracting. Which will surprise evening news junkies fed a diet of polar bears floating about on ice floes and snow shelves falling into the oceans. But if a whole series of reports on ice growth in the Arctic, the Antarctic and among glaciers are right, then it is truth in the mainstream media (MSM) that's in meltdown not the polar ice caps.

The problem for the MSM is that it long ago nailed its colors to the climate alarmist mast. No ice cap meltdown, no rising waters. No disappearing islands, no reason for alarm. No alarm, no story. Worst of all having called *yet another* global apocalypse wrong: No credibility. So the MSM has a significant stake in running highly selective warm-mongering headlines. Not to mention disparaging those scientists who have the temerity to disagree as ['holocaust deniers'](#) and 'pseudo-scientists'.

There's nothing more the climate alarmist media loves than a 'melting Arctic' ice cap story. So why not stories from the far larger expanse of ice that is the 'melting' Antarctic? Well it might have something to do with the fact that the Antarctic ice *grew to [record levels](#) in 2007* - and continues to grow.

The Antarctic

Climate scientist Dr Ben Herman, past director of the Institute of Atmospheric Physics and former head of Atmospheric Sciences at the University of Arizona, notes that for the media, "What happens in the Arctic may be an indicator of what will happen in the rest of the world. How about what happens in the Antarctic then? Since its ice area has been increasing, is this also an indicator of what might be happening in the rest of the world?" The FACT is that the majority of Antarctica [has cooled](#) over the past 50 years and ice coverage has grown to record levels. Take the well-publicized collapse of a 160 square mile block of the Wilkins Ice Shelf in Antarctica in March 2008. For the alarmist media this was conclusive proof of the dramatic global warming effects. *The Los Angeles Times* ran, 'Antarctica Collapse' referring to the "rapid melt of the Wilkins Shelf". The *Sydney Morning Herald* ran ['Ice Shelf Hangs By a Thread'](#) and the *Salon* online news site had the absurd headline ['Bye-bye Antarctica?'](#) But Joseph D'Aleo, first Director of Meteorology at *The Weather Channel* and Chief Meteorologist at Weather Services International, was more prosaic. On his IceCap website, [D'Aleo wrote](#) that the collapse was the equivalent, given the enormity of Antarctica, of "an icicle falling from a snow and ice covered roof." He added, "The latest satellite images and reports suggest the ice has already refrozen around the broken pieces. In fact the ice is returning so fast, it is running an amazing 60 percent ahead of last year when it set a new record." Noting the ludicrous media hype, D'Aleo laments, "Yet the world is left with the false impression Antarctica's ice sheet is also starting to disappear."

Dr Herman adds an apposite footnote: "It is interesting that all of the AGW (anthropogenic global warming) stories concerning Antarctica are always about what's happening around the western peninsula, which seems to be the only place on Antarctica that has shown any warming." Herman asks, "How about the rest of the continent, which is probably about 95 percent of the land mass, not to mention the record sea ice coverage recently."

Former Colorado State Climatologist and current senior scientist at the University of Colorado in Boulder, Dr Roger Pielke Sr is [severely critical](#) of the "typical bias that many journalists have." Pielke notes, "The media has ignored the increase in Antarctica sea ice cover in recent years, with at present, a coverage that is one million square kilometres above average."

In December 2006, Dr Duncan Wingham, Professor of Climate Physics at University College London and Director for Polar Observation and Modelling, [presented evidence](#) that showed "Antarctic thinning was no more common than thickening". Wingham and his colleagues found that 72 percent of the Antarctica ice sheet was growing at the rate of 5 millimetres per year. Most significantly, Dr Wingham commits media heresy when he states: "That makes Antarctica a sink, not a source, of ocean water. According to their best estimates, Antarctica will 'lower global sea levels by 0.08 mm' per year." Sacrilege.

Statistician Dr Bjorn Lomborg, author of *The Skeptical Environmentalist* and professor at the Copenhagen Business School, [observes](#) the media covers only the "2 percent of Antarctica [that] is dramatically warming and ignores the 98 percent that has largely cooled over the past 35 years." Lomborg also rounds on Al Gore who "points to shrinking sea ice in the Northern Hemisphere, but doesn't mention that sea ice in the Southern Hemisphere is increasing."

And for those for whom the UN IPCC is the last word on all things climate, Dr Madhav L. Khandekar, retired Environment Canada scientist and an expert IPCC reviewer, [says](#), "In the Southern Hemisphere, the

land-sea mean temperature has slowly but surely declined in the last few years." He adds, "Several other locations in the Southern Hemisphere have experienced lower temperatures in the last few years" the result of "surface temperatures over world oceans slowly declining since mid-1998." Interestingly the very year the mean global temperature itself began a decline.

Fair enough. But *the Arctic* is melting, *right?* Sorry, it just *ain't* that simple. October 2008 saw the fastest Arctic sea ice extent growth ever recorded.

The Arctic

During October and November 2008 the extent of Arctic ice was 28.7 percent greater than during the same period in 2007. According to data published by the International Arctic Research Center (IARC/JAXA) October 2008 saw "the fastest ever growth" of Arctic Sea ice since records began. Not good news for doomsayers like Dr Mark Serreze of the National Snow and Ice Data Center. Dr Serreze had [predicted an ice-free North Pole](#) in the summer of 2008.

The Arctic has indeed undergone some warming in some areas, especially Greenland, a warming that culminated in a summer temperature high of 5 degrees C in 2007. The gradual melt has opened up the prospect of newly navigable seaways - and a rush for the Arctic's energy-rich deepwater reserves. The reality is, however, warming periods are nothing new to the Arctic. When the Vikings settled Greenland they grew crops in temperatures higher than those of today.

The media has also made much of the potential opening of the Northwest Passage. But it rarely mentions that similar weather patterns prevailed in the 1930s when two boats, the *Nascopie* and *Aklavik*, famously [met up](#) in the Passage in 1937. In October 2008, a study by Ohio University confirmed that current Arctic warming patterns mimic those in the 1920s-1940s. By July 2008 the Arctic ice had increased by nearly half a million square miles over the same first half year period in 2007. A NASA study published in the peer-reviewed *Geophysical Research Letters* in October 2007 had already noted that thinning Arctic ice was more likely the result of "unusual winds" that had blown "older thicker" ice into warmer southern waters. In other words, the Arctic warming experienced more recently could well be the result of the unusual strength of winds, not man-made warming.

According to the National Snow and Ice Data Center's own figures, world sea ice in April 2008 reached "unprecedented" levels for the month of April. The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) went [to declare](#) 2008 the coolest since 2000. Moreover, the WMO reports that the fall in the global mean temperature since 1998 is not just affecting the polar ice caps either, it is also affecting glaciers elsewhere.

The Glaciers

In October 2008, after a particularly bitterly cold Alaskan summer, glaciologists began reporting that Alaskan glaciers, particularly those at Glacier Bay where the shrinkage had mainly been had begun advancing for the first time in years. Glaciologist Bruce Molnia of the US Geological Survey [said](#), "In mid-June, I was surprised to see snow still at sea level in Prince William Sound." He adds "On the Juneau Ice field, there was still 20 feet of new snow on the surface in late July. At Bering Glacier, a landslide I am studying did not become snow free until early August." In short, 2008 was the first time since record began that Alaskan glaciers *did not* shrink during the summer months.

In late November 2008, reports from Norway showed that Alaska's glacier experience was [being replicated](#) there too. Hallgeir Elvehoy of the Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE) reported that the magnitude of glacial growth appears to have been underway for two years. Glacier growth has also been reported from Canada and New Zealand.

The facts adduced here represent just the tip of an under-reported iceberg (no pun intended). The fact that the world's ice mass is expanding *not* contracting is plainly of seismic importance in the climate debate. But, in many of its parts, the Western media appears to have a stake in freezing out the truth - having sold its journalistic soul for a mess of warm-mongering alarmist pottage.