

The Week That Was: 2010-10-23 (October 23, 2010)

Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

The Science and Environmental Policy Project

PLEASE NOTE: The complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the web site: <http://www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm>

Quote of the Week:

"The fact that an opinion is widely held is no evidence whatever that it is not utterly absurd; indeed in view of the silliness of the majority of mankind, a widespread belief is more likely to be foolish than sensible." Bertrand Russell [H/t Richard W. Rahn]

Number of the Week: 1 year

THIS WEEK:

By Ken Haapala, Executive Vice President Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP)

On Monday President Vaclav Klaus of the Czech Republic gave the inaugural lecture of the Global Warming Policy Foundation entitled "The Climate Change Doctrine is Part of Environmentalism, Not of Science." He stated that to him the claim that humans are causing dangerous global warming is not the central issue. That has long passed; man is not causing dangerous global warming. The major issue is the public policy debate of the role of man and society; that government, politicians, etc. seek to use the false claim of global warming to seize increasing power, thereby undermining democratic principles. The entire speech with end notes is reproduced as Article # 1. An article written by President Klaus summarizing the speech, which was published in the Financial Post, is referenced under Challenging the Orthodoxy.

Article #2 is an articulate review of many of the positions of global warming skeptics written by Warren Meyer and published in Forbes magazine. Of course, not all will agree with this review but it contains many of the major points frequently mentioned by skeptics.

On October 14, NASA-GISS issued a press release declaring "Carbon Dioxide Controls Earth's Temperature." This is based upon a modeling study published the next day in *Science Magazine* and a companion study that has been accepted for publication in the *Journal of Geophysical Research*. "The bottom line is that atmospheric carbon dioxide acts as a thermostat in regulating the temperature of Earth" and, of course, the IPCC asserts humans are responsible for increasing carbon dioxide.

The press release does not explain what caused the warm periods over the past 10,000 years, some warmer than today, during which time the IPCC asserts carbon dioxide concentrations were quite stable until the 20th Century.

Roy Spencer and Roger Pielke Sr. posted on their respective web sites rebuttals to these articles, both stating there is no new research but, as explained by Spencer, some clever manipulation of a model. Spencer recognizes his comments are only a blog post, not an article carried by *Science*. He has ceased even submitting articles to *Science*. Please see the first three referenced articles under Model Manipulation.

Adding to climate model controversy, the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR) announced that an ensemble of 22 computer climate models plus previously published studies indicates that major, heavily populated regions of the globe are threatened by drought resulting from climate change. Though not explicitly stated, the obvious villain is human carbon dioxide emissions.

Roger Pielke Sr. immediately commentary posted on his website questioning why the National Science Foundation continues to fund multi-decadal climate predictions using unverified models. Without the models being verified, the results may have some interest, but the conclusions are not scientific. Please see the fourth and fifth referenced articles under Model Manipulation.

Not to be outdone, NOAA announced that the Arctic has shifted to a new climate pattern from which it is unlikely to ever return. The North Pole will remain unusually warm, but the temperate regions where people live will get frequent, cold Arctic blasts. The cause is the recent melting of the Arctic ice which, however, is continuing to recover from its 2007 low.

Though he does not specifically address this most recent announcement, in two articles posed on his web site Joe D’Aleo discusses this past winter which was heavily influenced by the El Niño - La Niña shifts and the quiet sun. He raises the issue of whether more atmospheric CO2 helped us get through the long, hot summer without widespread crop losses.

No doubt Joe D’Aleo will have comments on NOAA’s most recent announcement in an upcoming post. Prior issues of TWTW referenced his more detailed explanations of last winter’s events.

NUMBER OF THE WEEK: 1 year. This appears to be the minimum number of years of observations NOAA requires before it makes an announcement of “permanent” climate change. Will we have permanent climate change yearly?

Book of the Week: *Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming* by Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway has received great praise in *Science Magazine* as well as other publications such as the German *Der Spiegel*. Naomi Oreskes was called “one of the world’s leading historians of science” during her book tour at Kansas State University.

One must note that the *Science Magazine* review of the book specifically names four “merchants of doubt” – Frederick Seitz, Fred Singer, Robert Jastrow and William Nierenberg. Fred Singer is the only one of the four still alive to rebut the claims. He promptly submitted a rebuttal to *Science Magazine*. The editors of *Science* rejected the rebuttal stating there was insufficient room to print it. Such is the status of *Science* today. The rebuttal is being published in an upcoming issue of *Energy and Environment*.

The dust jacket of the Oreskes and Conway work belies the adage that you cannot tell a book by its cover. The cover effectively states all. In the background of the title is a chimney billowing what appears gray smoke turning white as it rises. The time and location of the photograph in the background is not identified. The message is clear: “Merchants of Doubt” support pollution – guilty by false association.

However, as those who frequently observe an industrial plant or a coal fired utility in the US realize, such smoke is seldom seen. It appears only under certain atmospheric conditions such as during a cold morning. Most likely the “smoke” is condensing water vapor that appears dark when backlit. Such tricks are common practice in much of the popular media. For example, often an article discussing carbon dioxide emissions contains a similar photo even though carbon dioxide is invisible. That Oreskes and Conway use a misleading trick on the cover indicates the tenor of the book’s contents.

After he became President Emeritus of Rockefeller University, Fredrick Seitz provided advice on a multi-year, multi-million dollar grant from R.J. Reynolds for biomedical research at Rockefeller University. The program produced a Nobel Laureate and supports groundbreaking research in various diseases including neurological disorders.

Oreskes and Conway accuse Seitz of working with RJ Reynolds to deceive the public about the link between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. However, Oreskes and Conway fail to give any evidence in

the text of the book. They assert it is in the references. If they had the evidence they would state it. Instead they claim they have it but you cannot see it. As a substitute for evidence they emphasize the irrelevant, such as Seitz supported a strong military as if this had bearing on the issue of cigarette smoking and lung cancer.

The book continues in a similar vein through strategic defense, acid rain, ozone hole, second hand smoke [see the Science Editorial in the Oct 9 TWTW to learn how EPA misused the science], global warming, etc. For example, those who demand scientific rigor in epidemiological research, such as second hand smoke, are said to be in the pocket of tobacco companies. Of course, those challenging the declarations of the IPCC are in the pockets of the oil companies. They are guilty by false association with no evidence of guilt given.

Edward Bernays, called the father of modern advertising (public relations), praised these techniques in his 1928 classic *Propaganda*. Bernays believed that they were necessary so that the enlightened few can lead the masses into the actions the enlightened few desire. But he also cautioned against their abuse.

Bernays made a fortune designing advertising campaigns for cigarette companies. He frequently employed the opposite of guilty by false association – praising by false association. Dress an actor in a doctor’s white jacket complete with stethoscope and have him hawk a brand of cigarettes – very effective! Bernays dropped cigarette companies as clients when he realized they were slandering honest scientists who were establishing a rigorous link between cigarette smoking and lung cancer.

That “science historians” use the tricks of the cigarette companies reflects on their science. The number of people in the media, universities, and scientific publications, who consider themselves astute but have been taken in, illustrates the effectiveness of these techniques.

[*Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming* by Naomi Oreskes, Professor of History and Science Studies, University of California, San Diego and Erik M. Conway, 2010, Bloombury Press, ISBN 978-1-59691-610-4, 355 pp including extensive endnotes and 6 pp index. Available on US Amazon.com]

[Full disclosure: The late Fredrick Seitz was Chairman of the Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP) and S. Fred Singer is the founder and current Chairman of SEPP. Both founded the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC). The NIPCC report [2008] was the first to systematically challenge the last IPCC report [2007]. The author is the Executive Vice President of SEPP and had the privilege of meeting Fredrick Seitz and has the privilege of working with Fred Singer.]

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see: www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm.

1. President Vaclav Klaus: Inaugural Annual GWPF Lecture

The Climate Change Doctrine is Part of Environmentalism, Not of Science
GWPF, Oct 21, 2010

<http://thegwpf.org/news/1726-president-vaclav-klaus-inaugural-annual-gwpf-lecture.html>

2. Denying the Catastrophe: The Science of the Climate Skeptics Position

By Warren Meyer, Forbes, Oct 15, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

<http://blogs.forbes.com/warrenmeyer/2010/10/15/denying-the-catstrophe-the-science-of-the-climate-skeptics-position/?boxes=opinionschannellatest>

3. California’s Cap-and-Trade War

The battle to repeal a self-destructive climate change law

Editorial, WSJ, Oct 18, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703735804575535841904660332.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

4. Restore the balance between energy and environment

Editorial, Washington Examiner, Oct 21, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/Restore-the-balance-between-energy-and-environment-1294281-105481163.html>

5. WikiPropaganda

Wikipedia bars a global warming censor from editing its pages

Editorial, WSJ, Oct 21, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304410504575560630778483558.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_AboveLEFTTop

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Challenging the Orthodoxy

An anti-human ideology

Global warming may just be statistical fluctuations

By Vaclav Klaus, Financial Post, Oct 20, 2010

<http://opinion.financialpost.com/2010/10/20/vaclav-klaus-an-anti-human-ideology/>

Very Important New Paper “A Comparison Of Local And Aggregate Climate Model Outputs With Observed Data” By Anagnostopoulos, Et Al, 2010

By Roger Pielke Sr., Pielke Research Group, Oct 22, 2010

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2010/10/22/very-important-new-paper-a-comparison-of-local-and-aggregated-climate-model-outputs-with-observed-data-by-anagnostopoulos-et-al-2010/>

[“...we found that local projections do not correlate well with observed measurements. Furthermore, we found that the correlation at a large spatial scale, i.e. the contiguous USA, is worse than at the local scale.”

Pop Went the Climate Bubble

By Steve Milloy, Human Events, Oct 21, 2010

<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=39501>

Climatism: That Climate Change Chameleon

By Steve Goreham, American Thinker, Oct 20, 2010 [H/t A.J. Meyer]

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/10/climatism_that_climate_change.html

Defending the Orthodoxy

Science committee responds to Rep. Joe Barton

By Gerald North, Letters, Washington Post, Oct 17, 2010

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/16/AR2010101602798.html?referrer=emailarticle>

[SEPP Comment: “While knowledge of past climates fills in context, the arguments for anthropogenic global warming are mainly based upon the past 50 years of data, including temperatures, model simulations and numerous other indicators.” No physical evidence that the recent warming is different than the past. After spending tens of billions of dollars this is the best they can do?]

Letter from Health Organizations Claiming Warming Endangers Public Health

To President Obama, Sep 28, 2010 [H/t Steve Goreman]

<http://www.apha.org/NR/rdonlyres/2405CEFA-854D-4EE0-814E-86C8552A3CBB/0/PHgroupssignonclimatechange92810final.pdf>

[SEPP Comment: The leaders of these health organizations rely on the projections of unverified models that are inconsistent with observations, see “Very Important Paper...” above.]

Europe on track for Kyoto targets while emissions from imported goods rise

By Juliette Jowitz, Guardian, UK, Oct 13, 2010

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/oct/13/europe-kyoto-targets-emissions>

[SEPP Comment: Is off-shoring carbon emissions the same as exporting global warming?]

UK rail network ‘at risk’ from climate change

By Howard Falcon-Lang, BBC, Oct 21, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-11601014>

[SEPP Comment: Railroad building in England began in 1825; many of the early bridges are still in use. The world has warmed since then, now climate change is a risk?]

In Climate Denial, Again

Editorial, NYT, Oct 17, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/18/opinion/18mon1.html?ref=opinion>

[SEPP Comment: Those who believe climate change is normal and natural deny it exists?]

Model Manipulation

Carbon Dioxide Controls Earth’s Temperature

NASA GISS, Press Release, Oct 14, 2010

<http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/features/co2-temperature.html>

Does CO2 Drive the Earth’s Climate System? Comments on the Latest NASA GISS Paper

By Roy Spencer, drroyspencer.com, Oct 16 2010

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2010/10/does-co2-drive-the-earths-climate-system-comments-on-the-latest-nasa-giss-paper/>

Comment On The Science Paper “Atmospheric CO2: Principal Control Knob Governing Earth’s Temperature” By Lacic Et Al 2010 [H/t Charles Minning]

By Roger Pielke Sr, Oct 15, 2010

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2010/10/15/comment-on-the-science-paper-atmospheric-co2-principal-control-knob-governing-earth%E2%80%99s-temperature-by-lacic-et-al-2010/>

Climate change: Drought may threaten much of the globe within decades

By Aiguo Dai, Press Release, NCAR, Oct 19, 2010

<http://www2.ucar.edu/news/climate-change-drought-may-threaten-much-globe-within-decades>

The National Science Foundation Funds Multi-Decadal Climate Predictions Without An Ability To Verify Their Skill

By Roger Pielke Sr., Pielke Research Group, Oct 21, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2010/10/21/the-national-science-foundation-funds-multi-decadal-climate-predictions-without-an-ability-to-verify-their-skill/>

Weather Extremes

The Arctic Shifts to a New Climate Pattern in Which ‘Normal’ Becomes Obsolete

Editorial, NYT, Oct 22, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/10/22/22climatewire-the-arctic-shifts-to-a-new-climate-pattern-i-86771.html?ref=earth>

[SEPP Comment: The NOAA headline is “Return to previous Arctic conditions is unlikely.”]

2009/10 Winter El Nino Very Different than 1997/1998

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Oct 21, 2010

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/2009vs1997.pdf>

Hot Summers of 1988 and 2010 – Did CO2 help us get thru this time without major crop losses?

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Oct 21, 2010

http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Hot_Summers_of_1988_and_2010.pdf

[“When sun is quiet, the patterns tend to persist. That has been the case the last few years. The patterns in both the warm and cold seasons have tended to persist. This aggravates the seasonal anomalies and can allow extremes to build.”]

BP Oil Spill and Aftermath

Chevron to file for drilling permits in Gulf

By Associated Press, Washington Times, Oct 21, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/21/chevron-to-file-for-drilling-permits-in-gulf/>

Oil-drilling doublespeak

Weasel words expose iffy end to business moratorium

Editorial, Washington Times, Oct 15, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/15/oil-drilling-doublespeak/>

Energy Issues

U.S. to Investigate China’s Clean Energy Aid

By Sewell Chan and Keith Bradsher, NYT, Oct 15, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/16/business/16wind.html?th&emc=th>

China hits back over US green energy probe

AFP, Oct 18, 2010

<http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5jlpAHo8JOLb8DwZsAxlVah0gEMA?docId=CN9.39d86b87288610357aedef0bdb96a13e.8>

Spanish wind sector feels the pinch

Generous subsidies made Spain a world leader in wind power. But now Gamesa and Vestas are seeking government help as demand falters.

By Jason Deign, Wind Energy Update, Oct 18, 2010 [H/t Tony Jack]

http://social.windenergyupdate.com/industry-insight/spanish-wind-sector-feels-pinch?utm_source=WEU%2BNewsletter&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=Email

[SEPP Comment: Time to find some other country to subsidize Spanish wind.]

Spain’s Solar Deals on Edge of Bankruptcy as Subsidies Founder

By Ben Sills, Bloomberg, Oct 18, 2010 [H/t Tom Burch]

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-10-18/spanish-solar-projects-on-brink-of-bankruptcy-as-subsidy-policies-founder.html>

[SEPP Comment: And solar too!]

Millions in grants went to wind farms built before stimulus passed

By Russ Choma, American University, Investigative Reporting Workshop, Oct 21, 2010, [H/t Randy Randol]

<http://investigativereportingworkshop.org/investigations/wind-energy-funds-going-overseas/story/wind-farms-built-before-stimulus/>

[SEPP Comment: The wind industry association claims that many of these investments would have not been made if the stimulus bill was not about to be passed – it took less than two months from the 111th Congress convening to President Obama signing the bill.]

Severn barrage tidal energy scheme expected to be axed

BBC News, Oct 17, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-somerset-11560551>

[SEPP Comment: But the tides will still go on.]

Chris Huhne to announce eight sites for new generation of nuclear plants

By Patrick Hennessy, Telegraph, UK, Oct 16, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sponsored/business/businesstruth/energy_and_environment/8068460/Chris-Huhne-to-announce-eight-sites-for-new-generation-nuclear-plants.html

[Malcolm Ross's Comment: We put public money galore into lame horse wind and solar projects that can barely get out of the gate, let alone run the distance, yet invest no public subsidies into the one proven "green" and if you care, "zero carbon" technology capable of reliably powering a modern, industrial society]

Russia agrees to build nuclear plant in Venezuela

By Vladimir Isachenkov, Washington Times, Oct 15, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/15/russia-agrees-build-nuclear-plant-venezuela/>

Japan says Chinese rare earth exports halted

See retaliation for arrest of fishing boat captain

By Mari Yamaguchi, Washington Times, Oct 21, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/21/japan-says-chinese-rare-earth-exports-halted/>

[SEPP Comment: Rare earths are critical for wind turbines.]

Volt Fraud At Government Motors

Editorial, IBD, Oct 19, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/550957/201010191855/Volt-Fraud-At-Government-Motors.htm>

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Outsourcing Your Emissions

By Brian McGraw, Global Warming.org, Oct 18, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2010/10/18/outsourcing-your-emissions/>

[SEPP Comment: But it makes traders in carbon credits wealthy!]

Bingaman's Renewable Energy Standard: Another Proposed Energy Tax

By Daren Bakst, Master Resource, Oct 13, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/10/bingaman-res-problems/>

Renewable-energy standards are climate policy in disguise

By E. Calvin Beisner, Washington Times, Oct 14, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/14/just-when-you-thought-you-were-safe-from-economy-c/>

Biofuel or bust? Ethanol subsidies should be dropped

By Brian McGraw, Detroit News, Oct 21, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://detnews.com/article/20101021/OPINION01/10210343/1008/Biofuel-or-bust?-Ethanol-subsidies-should-be-dropped>

EPA and other Regulators On the March

The EPA's Odd View of 'Consumer Choice'

By Patrick Michaels, Richmond Times-Dispatch, Oct 17, 2010

http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=12480

E.P.A. Official Seeks to Block West Virginia Mine

By John Broder, NYT, Oct 15, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/16/science/earth/16westvirginia.html?th&emc=th>

EPA Ozone Standard Would Destroy 7.3 Million Jobs, Study Estimates

By Marlo Lewis, Open Market.org, Oct 18, 2010

<http://www.openmarket.org/2010/10/18/epa-ozone-standard-would-destroy-73-million-jobs-study-estimates/>

Can the Endangered Species Act Compel America to De-Industrialize?

By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming.org, Oct 22, 2010

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2010/10/22/can-the-endangered-species-act-compel-america-to-de-industrialize/>

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC - For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

The Impact of Climate Change on Typhoon Activity

Reference: Fan, D-D. and Liu, K-b. 2008. Perspectives on the linkage between typhoon activity and global warming from recent research advances in paleotempestology. *Chinese Science Bulletin* 53: 2907-2922.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/21oct2010a5.html>

Old Trees Growing in a CO₂ – Accreting Atmosphere

Reference: Phillips, N.G., Buckley, T.N. and Tissue, D.T. 2008. Capacity of old trees to respond to environmental change. *Journal of Integrative Plant Biology* 50: 1355-1364..

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/21oct2010a3.html>

Tropical Cyclones of the North Atlantic

Reference: Klotzbach, P.J. and Gray, W.M. 2008. Multidecadal variability in North Atlantic tropical cyclone activity. *Journal of Climate* 21: 3929-3935.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/20oct2010a2.html>

Warming Reduces Permafrost Thaw Rates???

Reference: Blok, D., Heijmans, M.M.P.D., Schaepman-Strub, G., Kononov, A.V., Maximov, T.C. and Berendse, F. 2010. Shrub expansion may reduce summer permafrost thaw in Siberian tundra. *Global Change Biology* 16: 1296-1305.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/20oct2010a4.html>

Human - Environmental Conflicts

The World Bank’s Palm Oil Mistake

By Thompson Ayodele, NYT, Oct 15, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/16/opinion/16ayodele.html?th&emc=th>

Other Scientific Issues

New deep-sea hot springs discovered in the Atlantic

Hydrothermal vents may contribute more to the thermal budget of the oceans than previously assumed

Press Release, Max Planck Society, Oct 7, 2010 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.mpg.de/english/illustrationsDocumentation/documentation/pressReleases/2010/pressRelease201010071/index.html>

By Reporting Bad Science As Fact, Biased Media Help Create Panics

By Henry Miller, IBD, Oct 18, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=550737>

More CO2 May Mean More Cooling Cloud Cover

Marine Biochemistry: Acidic oceans might be fertile grounds for plankton that emit cloud condensing gas

By Emily Gertz, C&EN, Oct 11, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

http://pubs.acs.org/cen/news/88/i42/8842news.html?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+cen_latestnews+%28Chemical+%26+Engineering+News%3A+Latest+News%29&utm_content=Google+Reader

[SEPP Comment: The headline writer does not understand the difference between alkaline and acid.]

Plants Play Larger Role Than Thought in Cleaning up Air Pollution

Chemicals known as oxygenated volatile organic compounds (oVOCs) affect environment, human health

Press Release, National Science Foundation, Oct 21, 2010 [H/t WUWT]

http://nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=117919&org=NSF&from=news

Miscellaneous Topics of Possible Interest

Moon Crater Contains Usable Water, NASA Says

By Kenneth Chang, NYT, Oct 21, 2010

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/22/science/space/22moon.html?_r=1&th&emc=th

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Go vegetarian to save planet scientists tell Government

By Andy Bloxham, Telegraph, UK, Oct 22, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/foodanddrink/foodanddrinknews/8079534/Go-vegetarian-to-save-planet-scientists-tell-Government.html>

Scientists learn why sex beats cloning

Tiny animals swing both ways, but prefer sex when on the move

By Wynne Parry, Live Science, Oct 13, 2010 [H/t Best on the Web]

http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/39655223/ns/technology_and_science-science/

#####

ARTICLES:

1. President Vaclav Klaus: Inaugural Annual GWPF Lecture

The Climate Change Doctrine is Part of Environmentalism, Not of Science
GWPF, Oct 21, 2010

<http://thegwpf.org/news/1726-president-vaclav-klaus-inaugural-annual-gwpf-lecture.html>

It is a great honor for me to be here tonight, getting a chance to deliver the inaugural lecture of the **Global Warming Policy Foundation** to such a distinguished audience.

Even though it may seem that there is a whole range of institutions both here and overseas which bring together and support those who openly express doubts about the currently prevailing dogma of man-made global warming and who dare to criticize it, it apparently is still not enough. **We are subject to a heavily biased and carefully organized propaganda** and a serious and highly qualified forum here, on this side of the Atlantic, that would stand for rationality, objectivity and fairness in public policy discussion is more than needed. That is why I consider the launching of the foundation an important step in the right direction.

We should keep saying very loudly that **the current debate about global warming** –and I agree with the Australian paleoclimatologist Prof. Carter that we should always speak about **“dangerous human caused global warming”** because it is not “warming per se that we are concerned with”[1] – **is in its substance not part of the scientific discourse about the relative role of a myriad of factors influencing swings in global temperature but part of public policy debate about man and society.** As R. M. Carter stresses in his recent book, “the global warming issue long ago ceased being a scientific problem.”[2]

The current debate **is a public policy debate with enormous implications.**[3] It is no longer about climate. It is about the government, the politicians, their scribes and the lobbyists who want to get more decision making and power for themselves. It seems to me that the widespread acceptance of the global warming dogma has become one of the main, most costly and most undemocratic public policy mistakes in generations. The previous one was communism.

The debate has, of course, its scientific dimension but this part of the debate doesn’t belong here. I also do not intend to play the role of an amateur climatologist.[4]

What belongs here is our insisting upon the undisputable fact that **there are respectable but highly conflicting scientific hypotheses** concerning this subject. What also belongs here is our resolute opposition to the attempts to shut down such a crucial public debate concerning us and our way of life on **the pretext that the overwhelming scientific consensus is there and that we have to act now.** This is not true. Being free to raise questions and oppose fashionable politically and “lobbystically” promoted ideas forms an important and irreplaceable part of our democratic society. Not being allowed to do so would be a proof that we have already moved to the “brave new world” of a postdemocratic order. (I am tempted to say that we are already very close to it).

We need a help from the scientists. They shouldn’t only try to maximize the number of peer-reviewed articles or grants but should help the politicians as well as the public to separate environmentalists’ myths from reality. They should present relevant scientific theories and findings in such a way that would make it possible for us to decide for ourselves what to accept and what to question. I have been trying to follow the published theories for a couple of years and am strongly on the side of those who say that “carbon dioxide is a minor player. It is not the primary cause of global warming and therefore humanity is not to blame”[5].

Looking back at geologic time, the 1998 Nobel Prize for Physics laureate Robert Laughlin[6] says that “climate change is something that the Earth routinely does on its own without asking anyone’s permission” and that “far from being responsible for damaging the Earth’s climate, civilization might not be able to forestall any of these changes once the Earth has decided to make them” (p. 11). He adds that “the geologic record suggests that climate ought not to concern us too much when we are gazing into the

energy future, not because it's unimportant, but because it's beyond our power to control" (p. 12). These formulations seem to me rather persuasive.

Most of us gathered here are not climatologists or scientists in related disciplines of natural sciences, but economists, lawyers, sociologists and perhaps also politicians or ex-politicians who have been for years or decades involved in public policy debates. This is the reason why we follow with such an interest and with an even greater concern the prevailing intellectual and political climate, its biases and misconceptions, as well as its dangerous public policy consequences.

Many of us came to the conclusion that **the case for the currently promoted anthropogenic global warming hypothesis is very weak**. We also know that it is always wrong to pick a simple, attractive, perhaps appealing scientific hypothesis, especially when it is not sufficiently tested and non-contentiously pushed forward, and to base ambitious, radical and far-reaching policies on it – without paying attention to all the arguments and to all the direct and indirect as well as opportunity costs associated with it. The feeling that this is exactly what we have been experiencing motivated me to write a book with the title *Blue Planet in Green Shackles*, which was published in May 2007 and in which I attempted to put the global warming debate into a broader perspective.[7] A year after its publication, I was extremely pleased to get a book *An Appeal to Reason, A Cool Look at Global Warming*,[8] in many respects similar to mine, written by Nigel Lawson.

We are not on the winning side, but looking back, we can afford to say that since the launching of the massive global warming propaganda at the UN Rio Summit in 1992 and since its subsequent acceptance worldwide, **several things happened that suggest some degree of optimism:**

- the global temperature ceased rising;
- new alternative hypotheses for the explanation of climate fluctuations have been formulated;
- the reputation of the “scientific standing” of some of the leading exponents of the global warming doctrine has been heavily undermined recently (the most scandalous example being the case of the “hockey stick”, which constituted the basis of the 2001 Third Assessment Report of the IPCC);[9]
- the Copenhagen Conference in December 2009 revealed to everyone willing to see the existing heterogeneity of views and the apparent contradictions of interests.

Yet the global warming alarmism and especially the public policy measures connected with it have been triumphantly marching on. Even the recent worldwide financial and economic crisis and the enormous confusion, fear, as well as indebtedness it created did not stop this victorious “long march.”

Let me repeat the **three simple facts** that most of us – I hope – are aware of. We can only wish our opponents, the global warming alarmists, accept that we do not question them. Otherwise, they would continue shooting at wrong targets, which is what they – probably intentionally – have been doing up until now.

Let's start with a long-term fact that **the global mean climate does change**. No one disputes that. It changes now, it was changing in the past and will – undoubtedly – be changing also in the future. **In spite of that, we have to add that over the last ten thousand years (the era of Holocene), the climate has been much the same as at present and the average surface temperature did not vary significantly.**[10] If there has been any long term trend there has been an overall gentle cooling trend.

Presenting the climate changes we've been experiencing in the last decades as a threat to the Planet and letting the global warming alarmists use this bizarre argument as a justification for their attempts to substantially change our way of life, to weaken and restrain our freedom, to control us, to dictate what it is we should and should not be doing is unacceptable.[11] Their success in influencing millions of quite rational people all around the world is rather surprising. How is it possible that they are so successful in

it? And so rapidly? For older doctrines and ideologies, it took usually much longer to get such an influential and widely shared position in society. Is this because of the specifics of our times? Is this because we are continuously “online”? Is this because religious and other metaphysical ideologies have become less attractive and less persuasive? Is this because of the need to promptly refill the existing spiritual emptiness – connected with “the end of history” theories – with a new **“noble cause,” such as saving the Planet?**

The environmentalists succeeded in discovering a new “noble cause.” They try **to limit human freedom in the name of “something” that is more important and more noble than our very down-to-earth lives.** For someone who spent most of his life in the “noble” era of communism this is impossible to accept.

The second undisputable fact is that – with all the well-known problems of measurement and data collection[12] – **over the last 150 years**, which is a medium-term time scale in climatology, **the average global temperature has shown warming-cooling rhythms superimposed on a small upward warming trend.** This trend has existed since the Earth (or rather its Northern Hemisphere because data from the Southern Hemisphere are not available) emerged from the Little Ice Age approximately two centuries ago.[13] We also know that this new trend was repeatedly interrupted, one important example being the period from the 1940s to the middle of the 1970s, another the period of the last 10 – 12 years. The warming in the last 150 years is modest and everything suggests that also the future warming and its consequences will be neither dramatic, nor catastrophic. It does not look like a threat we must respond to.

The third fact is that also the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere fluctuates in time, sometimes precedes, sometimes follows the temperature increase, and that – with all the problems of not fully compatible time series – in the last two centuries we witness **a mostly anthropogenically enhanced amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere.** Its concentration increased from 284.7 ppmv in the year 1850 to 310.7 in the year 1950, and to 387.3 in 2009.[14]

There is no need to dispute these facts. The dispute starts when we are confronted with a doctrine which claims that the rough coexistence of climate changes, of growing temperatures and of man-made increments of CO₂ in the atmosphere – and what is more, only in a relatively short period of time – is **a proof of a causal relationship between these phenomena.** To the best of my knowledge there is no such relationship between them.[15] **It is, nevertheless, this claim that forms the basis for the doctrine of environmentalism.**

It is not a new doctrine.[16] It has existed under various headings and in various forms and manifestations for centuries, always based on the idea that the starting point of our thinking should be the Earth, the Planet, or Nature, not Man or Mankind.[17] It has always been accompanied by the plan that we have to come back to the original state of the Earth, unspoiled by us, humans.[18] The adherents of this doctrine have always considered us, the people, a foreign element.[19] They forget that it doesn't make sense to speak about the world without people because there would be no one to speak. In my book, I noted that “if we take the reasoning of the environmentalists seriously, we find that theirs is an anti-human ideology” (p. 4).

To reduce the interpretation of the causality of all kinds of climate changes and of global warming to one variable, CO₂, or to a small proportion of one variable – human-induced CO₂ – is impossible to accept. Elementary rationality and my decades-long experience with econometric modeling and statistical testing of scientific hypotheses tell me that it is impossible to make strong conclusions based on mere correlation of two (or more) time series. In addition to this, it is relevant that in this case such a simple correlation does not exist. The rise of global temperature started approximately 150 years ago but man-made CO₂ emissions did not start to grow visibly before the 1940s. Temperature changes also repeatedly moved in the opposite direction than the CO₂emissions trend suggests.[20]

Theory is crucial and in this case it is missing. Pure statistical analysis does not explain or confirm anything. Two Chinese scientists, Guang Wu and Shaomin Yan, published a study,[21] in which they used the **random walk model** to analyze the global temperature fluctuations in the last 160 years. Their results – rather unpleasantly for the global warming alarmists – show that the random walk model perfectly fits the temperature changes. Because “the random walk model has a perfect fit for the recorded temperature ... there is no need to include various man-made factors such as CO₂, and non-human factors, such as Sun” to improve the quality of the model fit, they say. It is an important result. Do other models give a better fit? I have not seen any.[22]

The untenable argument that there exists **a simple causal nexus, a simple functional relationship, between temperature and man-made CO₂** is only one part of the whole story and only one tenet of environmentalism.[23] **The other, not less important aspect of this doctrine is the claim that there is a very strong and exclusively damaging relationship between temperature and its impact upon Nature**, upon the Earth and upon the Planet.

The original ambition probably used to be saving the Planet for human beings but we see now that this target has gradually become less and less important. Many environmentalists do not pay attention to the fate of the people. **They want to save the Planet, not mankind.** They speak about Nature, not about men.[24] For these people, the sophisticated economic reasoning we offer is irrelevant.

Only some of them look at the people. Only with them the debate about the intergenerational discrimination and solidarity and about the proper size of discount rates used in any intertemporal analysis comes into consideration, only here can the economists make use of some of their concepts.[25] The unjustifiably low rate of discount used by the environmentalists (notably in the Stern Review[26]) was for me the original motivation to enter the discussion.[27]

Chapter 4 of my book was devoted to the importance of proper discounting. Nigel Lawson did something very similar in his Chapter 7 with the title “**Discounting the Future: Ethics, Risk and Uncertainty.**” For him, “the choice of discount rate is critical in assessing which policies might make sense, and which clearly do not.” I agree with him that “with a higher discount rate, the argument for radical action over global warming now collapses completely” (p. 83).[28]

Many serious economists argue the same way and are in favor of using higher discount rates. University of Chicago Prof. Murphy[29] says quite strongly: “we should use the market rate as the discount rate because it is the opportunity cost of climate mitigation.” This is what N. Stern and others clearly do not want to do. They think in misconceived ethical terms, but it is wrong. We do not deny that if the existing trend continues, rising temperatures will have both its winners and losers. Even if the overall impact happens to be detrimental – which is something I am not convinced of – the appropriately defined discount for the future will ensure that the loss of value in the years to come will be too small for the present generation to worry about.

How is it possible that so many politicians, their huge bureaucracies, important groups in the scientific establishment, an important segment of business people and almost all journalists see it differently? The only reasonable explanation is that – without having paid sufficient attention to the arguments – they have already invested too much into global warming alarmism. Some of them are afraid that by losing this doctrine their political and professional pride would suffer. Others are earning a lot of money on it and are afraid of losing that source of income. Business people hope they will make a fortune out of it and are not ready to write it off. They all have a very tangible vested interest in it. We should say loudly: **this coalition of powerful special interests is endangering us.**

Our interest is, or should be, a free, democratic and prosperous society. That is the reason why we have to stand up against all attempts to undermine it. We should be prepared to adapt to all kinds of future climate changes (including cooling) but we should never accept losing our freedom.

Václav Klaus, The Global Warming Policy Foundation Annual Lecture, London, October 19, 2010.

I would like to thank Professors Carter and Kukla for their comments on an earlier draft of this lecture.

[1] Point made in a private correspondence, July 27, 2010.

[2] R. M. Carter, *Climate: The Counter Consensus*, Stacey International, London, 2010; p. 148.

[3] Gregory Melleuish is right when he says that “climate change has become an issue only because it has been seen to have practical policy implication” (p. 9). G. Melleuish, “The Dubious Future of History,” *Quadrant*, May 2010; www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2010/5/the-dubious-future-of-history.

[4] It is not that simple to tell who is and who is not a climatologist or an expert on climate change and global warming. Ross McKittrick once said that “there is no such thing as an ‘expert’ on global warming, because no one can master all the relevant subjects. On the subject of climate change everyone is an amateur on many if not most of the relevant topics.” (as quoted by R. M. Carter, “The Futile Quest for Climate Control,” *Quadrant*, November, 2008, p. 10; online at www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2008/451/the-futile-quest-for-climate-control). In his recently published book *Climate: The Counter Consensus* (2010), Prof. Carter suggests that “scientists who study climate change come from a wide range of disciplines” which he “groups into three main categories” (p. 22). He claims that “most of the scientific alarm about dangerous climate change is generated by scientists in the **meteorological** and **computer modeling** group, whereas many (though not all) **geological** scientists see no cause for alarm when modern climate change is compared with the climate history” (p. 23). This structuring seems to be useful.

[5] Einar Vikingur, “Carbon and Our Climate”, *Quadrant*, May 2010, p. 79; www.climatesceptics.com.au/documents/egv-climate-carbon.pdf.

[6] Robert B. Laughlin, “What the Earth Knows”, *The American Scholar*, Summer 2010.

[7] The original Czech version of the book: *Modrá, nikoli zelená planeta. Co je ohroženo: klima nebo svoboda?*, Dokořán, Prague, 2007. The English version: *Blue Planet in Green Shackles. What is Endangered: Climate or Freedom?* Competitive Enterprise Institute, Washington D.C., 2008. The book has until now been published in 16 countries in 16 different languages. Last year, I put together an additional collection of my texts devoted to this subject *Blue Planet Endangered*, Dokořán, Prague, 2009 (in Czech language).

[8] Duckworth Overlook, London, 2008. I wrote a preface to its subsequent Czech edition, released shortly after it was published in English (*Vrátme se k rozumu*, Dokořán, Prague, 2009), which is added to this text as an appendix.

[9] It was recently convincingly discussed by B. D. McCullough and Ross McKittrick (“The Hockey Stick Graph”, *Fraser Forum*, No. 2, 2010) and by John Dawson (“The Tree Ring Circus”, *Quadrant*, July-August 2010; www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2010/7-8/the-tree-ring-circus). John Dawson writes that “the Hockey Stick was the product of a pseudo-scientific mindset, faulty data selection, erroneous data identification, dubious statistical methodology, flawed mathematics, a perverted peer-review process, a frenzied propaganda campaign and unscrupulous defence mechanisms.” (p. 22).

[10] It is true especially for northern middle latitudes. There are not sufficient data for southern hemisphere and it is necessary to differentiate between the tropic and the polar regions.

[11] It is relevant that the environmentalists want to control not only us, they want to control also the climate. In its immodesty, arrogance and irrationality, the theory of climate control (the term coined by Ray Evans) reminds me of the ambitions of communist central planners to control the entire society. R. Evans, “The Chilling Costs of Climate Catastrophism,” *Quadrant*, June 2008 (online at www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2008/09/the-chilling-costs-of-climate-catastrophism), in which he argues that “the warmists” try to introduce such “degree of control over our lives which is

unprecedented, except in time of war” (p.12). The idea is further developed in his “Laputans in Retreat”, Quadrant, July-August 2010; www.quadrant.org.au/magazine/issue/2010/7-8/laputans-in-retreat). It might be useful to repeat what I said at a conference in Palm Beach, Florida, earlier this year: “There are plenty of arguments suggesting that the real threat for human society is not global warming itself. The real threat comes when politicians start manipulating the climate and all of us.” /“Global Warming Alarmism is a Grave Threat to our Liberty”, Club for Growth Economic Winter Conference, Palm Beach, Florida, March 5, 2010/.

[12] E.g. according to the World Meteorological Organization there are only 1311 weather stations providing ground data. It means there are 132 000 km² per one ground station, mostly in cities. Thermometers have existed for several centuries, weather balloons for half a century, satellite weather measurements for 30 years and the compatibility of data is very dubious. There has not been a chance to create “ceteris paribus” conditions.

[13] This cooler era of approximately four centuries followed after the Medieval Warm Period of the first part of the last millennium. This warm period was in the pre-industrial age, which is for us and our argumentation absolutely crucial. It makes the CO₂induced temperature increase of the current warm period difficult to defend.

[14] The CO₂ data come from the Physics Institute of the University of Bern, from the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization in Australia, and from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in the USA.

[15] The most comprehensive recent argumentation rejecting it is in S. F. Singer et al. (*Climate Change Reconsidered. The Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change*, The Heartland Institute, Chicago, 2009), in I. Plimer (*Heaven and Earth: Global Warming, The Missing Science*, Connor Court Publishing, Australia, 2009), in R. M. Carter (*Climate: The Counter Consensus*, Stacey International, London, 2010), in the Czech scientist M. Kutílek (*Racionálně o globálním oteplování /Rationally about Global Warming/*, Dokořán, Prague, 2008; and in his recently published *Facts About Global Warming: Rational or Emotional Issue?* Catena Verlag GmbH, Reiskirchen, September 2010), and in many other books, articles and studies.

[16] Environmentalism is something else than ecology. But even ecology is only a derivative science (R. Nelson) and may be considered a science only in a “classificatory sense.” Sometimes it is only a “scientific poetry” filled with mathematical equations.

[17] An excellent discussion of this aspect of the debate can be found in Robert H. Nelson “Ecological Science as a Creation Story”, *The Independent Review*, vol. 14, no. 4, Spring 2010, pp. 513-534.

[18] To believe in it, one must be a person with an almost metaphysical faith in the existence of the original Garden of Eden (the Earth unspoiled by men), in the fall of man from the Garden, in the final days of the world coming because of men who have spoiled it through their economic activities based on their insatiable demands, and in the necessity of spiritual renewal of all of us as the only way to save the Earth. This may be a possible and even respectable creed for an individual but an impossible and unrespectable position when it comes to public policy.

[19] Some authors (e.g. E. O. Wilson) went as far as to suggest that “humans are bringing about a holocaust for the Earth’s other species.”

[20] The environmentalists also succeeded in changing the customary scientific methodology. Whereas the null hypothesis should be that the climate changes we observe today are natural in origin, the global warming alarmists put it upside down. They force us to disprove their hypothesis that the climate changes are man-made (see Carter, 2010; Ch. 6). It is difficult to disprove the non-existent relationship.

[21] “Fitting of Global Temperature Change from 1850 to 2009 Using Random Walk Model,” *Guangxi Sciences*, Vol. 17, No. 2, May 2010, pp. 148-150.

[22] There is, again not surprisingly, a very good temperature forecast made by a naïve forecast model which is based upon the idea that the temperature next year will remain the same as that of the previous year (see Carter, pp. 128-129).

[23] The environmentalists, moreover, very often forget to mention that even their hypothetical relationship is not linear (or exponential), but logarithmic and that – and now I quote from the IPCC 2001 Report – “each incremental amount of extra carbon dioxide exerts a lesser heating effect.” It is not a statement of a global warming denier. It is a statement of the IPCC.

[24] The title of one of the bibles of environmentalism “Thinking like a Mountain” written more than six decades ago by the American author Aldo Leopold proves that quite convincingly.

[25] V. Klaus, D. Tříška, “Ke kritice používání konceptu solidarity a diskriminace v intertemporální analýze tzv. globálních problémů” (*To the Critique of Using the Concepts of Solidarity and Discrimination in the Intertemporal Analysis of so called Global Problems*), *Politická ekonomie*, No. 6, 2007. Document in Czech language is available [here](#). (pdf, 400kB)

[26] The Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change, October 30, 2006; available online at: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/> + www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/stern_review_report.htm

[27] Similar motivation was the debate about the rights of future generations, excellently summarized recently by O. M. Hartwich, “The Rights of the Future,” *Policy*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 2009; www.oliver-marc-hartwich.com/publications/the-rights-of-the-future. I agree with him that “the very idea that there are some resources that we have borrowed from the future leads us into a logical dead-end” (p. 7). The question he raises: “Do we owe the future generations a specific set of resources? Or do we simply owe them our best efforts to leave them a free and prosperous society in which they can make their own choices?” (p. 8) is very appropriate. It is, of course, not only about resources, it is about intertemporal decision-making in general. I am also convinced that the best thing we can do now is to leave our successors a free and democratic society.

[28] I especially like his reminding us of Charles Dickens’s *Bleak House* and Mrs. Jellyby, the so called “telescopic philanthropist” who tries to help at a distance, but neglects her own children. I also like his point that by asking for a higher discount rate “it is not that we do not care about distant generations. It is that we do care about the present generation and about our children’s generation” (p. 83).

[29] K. M. Murphy, “Some Simple Economics of Climate Change,” Paper at the Mont-Pelerin Society General Meeting, Tokyo, September 2008.

2. Denying the Catastrophe: The Science of the Climate Skeptics Position

By Warren Meyer, *Forbes*, Oct 15, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

<http://blogs.forbes.com/warrenmeyer/2010/10/15/denying-the-catastrophe-the-science-of-the-climate-skeptics-position/?boxes=opinionschannellatest>

[In last week’s column](#), I lamented the devolution of the climate debate into dueling ad hominem attacks, which has led in almost a straight line to the incredible totalitarian vision of the 10:10 climate group’s recent film showing school kids getting blown up for not adhering to the global warming alarmists’ position.

In writing that column, it struck me that it was not surprising that many average folks may be unfamiliar with the science behind the climate skeptic’s position, since it almost never appears anywhere in the press. This week I want to give a necessarily brief summary of the skeptic’s case. There is not space here to include all the charts and numbers; for those interested, [this video and slide presentation](#) provides much of the analytical backup.

It is important to begin by emphasizing that few skeptics doubt or deny that carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a greenhouse gas or that it and other greenhouse gasses (water vapor being the most important) help to warm the surface of the Earth. Further, few skeptics deny that man is probably contributing to higher CO₂ levels through his burning of fossil fuels, though remember we are talking about a maximum total change in atmospheric CO₂ concentration due to man of about 0.01% over the last 100 years.

What skeptics deny is the catastrophe, the notion that man's incremental contributions to CO₂ levels will create catastrophic warming and wildly adverse climate changes. To understand the skeptic's position requires understanding something about the alarmists' case that is seldom discussed in the press: the theory of catastrophic man-made global warming is actually comprised of two separate, linked theories, of which only the first is frequently discussed in the media.

The first theory is that a doubling of atmospheric CO₂ levels (approximately what we might see under the more extreme emission assumptions for the next century) will lead to about a degree Celsius of warming. Though some quibble over the number – it might be a half degree, it might be a degree and a half – most skeptics, alarmists and even the UN's IPCC are roughly in agreement on this fact.

But one degree due to the all the CO₂ emissions we might see over the next century is hardly a catastrophe. The catastrophe, then, comes from the second theory, that the climate is dominated by positive feedbacks (basically acceleration factors) that multiply the warming from CO₂ many fold. Thus one degree of warming from the greenhouse gas effect of CO₂ might be multiplied to five or eight or even more degrees.

This second theory is the source of most of the predicted warming – not greenhouse gas theory per se but the notion that the Earth's climate (unlike nearly every other natural system) is dominated by positive feedbacks. This is the main proposition that skeptics doubt, and it is by far the weakest part of the alarmist case. One can argue whether the one degree of warming from CO₂ is “settled science” (I think that is a crazy term to apply to any science this young), but the three, five, eight degrees from feedback are not at all settled. In fact, they are not even very well supported.

Of course, in the scientific method, even an incorrect hypothesis is useful, as it gives the scientific community a starting point in organizing observational data to confirm or disprove the hypothesis. This, however, turns out to be wickedly difficult in climate science, given the outrageously complex nature of the Earth's weather systems.

Our global temperature measurements over the last one hundred years show about 0.7C of warming since the early 1900s, though this increase has been anything but linear. Skeptics argue that, like a police department that locks on a single suspect early in a crime investigation and fails to adequately investigate any other suspects, many climate scientists locked in early on to CO₂ as the primary culprit for this warming, to the exclusion of many other possible causes.

When the UN IPCC published its fourth climate report several years ago, it focused its main attention on the Earth's warming after 1950 and in particular on the 20-year period between 1978 and 1998. The UN IPCC concluded that the warming in this 20-year period was too rapid to be due to natural causes, and almost certainly had to be due to man's CO₂. They reached this conclusion by running computer models that seemed to show that the warming in this period would have been far less without increased CO₂ levels.

Skeptics, however, point out that the computer models were built by scientists who have only a fragmented, immature understanding of complex climate systems. Moreover, these scientists approached the models with the pre-conceived notion that CO₂ is the main driver of temperatures, and so it is unsurprising that their models would show CO₂ as the dominant factor.

In fact, the period 1978 to 1998 featured a number of other suspects that should have been considered as potentially contributing to warming. For example, the warm phase of several critical ocean cycles that have a big effect on surface temperatures, including the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, coincided with this period. Further, the second half of the 20th century saw far greater solar activity, as measured by sunspot numbers, than the first half of the century. Neither ocean cycles nor solar effects, nor a myriad of other factors we probably don't even know enough to name, were built into the models. Even man's changing land use has an effect on measured temperatures, as survey efforts have shown urban areas, which have higher temperatures than surrounding rural locations, expanding around our temperature measurement points and biasing measured temperatures upwards.

If CO₂ is but one of several causes of warming over the past decades, then current climate models almost certainly have to be exaggerating future warming. Only by attributing all of the past warming to CO₂ can catastrophic future warming forecasts be justified. In fact, even the 0.7C of measured historic warming is well under what the climate models should have predicted for warming based on past CO₂ increases and their assumed high sensitivity of temperature to CO₂ levels. In other words, to believe a forecast of, say, 5C of warming over the next 100 years, we should have seen 2C or more of warming over the past century.

This is why the IPCC actually had to make the assumption that global temperatures would have fallen naturally and due to other manmade pollutants over the past several decades. By arguing that without man's CO₂ the climate would have cooled by, for example, 0.5C, then they can claim past warming from CO₂ as 1.2C (the measured 0.7C plus the imaginary 0.5C). Anyone familiar with [how the Obama administration has claimed large stimulus-related jobs creation](#) despite falling employment levels will recognize this approach immediately.

Despite these heroic efforts to try to find observational validation for their catastrophic warming forecasts, the evidence continues to accumulate that these forecasts are wildly overstated. The most famous forecast of all is perhaps NASA's James Hansen's forecast to Congress in 1988, a landmark in the history of global warming alarmism in this country. Despite the fact that 2010 may well turn out to be one of the couple warmest years in the past century (along with 1998, both of which are strong El Niño years), the overall trend in global temperatures has been generally flat for the last 10-15 years, and have remained well below Hansen's forecasts. In fact, Hansen's forecasts continue to diverge from reality more and more with each passing year.

Of course, as we all know, global warming has been rebranded by alarmist groups as "climate change" and then more recently as "climate disruption." This is in some sense inherently disingenuous, implying to lay people that somehow climate change can result directly from CO₂. In fact, no mechanism has ever been suggested wherein CO₂ can cause climate change in any way except through the intermediate step of warming. CO₂ causes warming, and then warming causes climate changes. So the question of warming and its degree still matters, no matter what branding is applied.

In fact, it is in the area of the knock-on effects of warming, from sea level increases to hurricanes, that some of the worst science is being pursued. Nowhere can we better see the effect of money on science than in climate change studies, as academics studying whatever natural phenomenon that interests them increasingly have the incentive to link that phenomenon to climate change to improve their chances at getting funding.

The craziness of climate scare stories is too broad and deep to deal with adequately here, as nearly every 3-sigma weather anomaly suddenly gets attributed to climate change. But let's look at a couple of the more well-worn examples. In an Inconvenient Truth, Al Gore warned of the world being battered by more and more Katrina style category 5 storms; in fact, 2009 and 2010 have seen record low levels of global cyclonic activity, despite relatively elevated temperatures. Or take the melting ice cap: on the same exact

day in 2007 when newspapers screamed that the Arctic had hit a 30-year low in sea ice extent, the Antarctic hit a 30-year high. The truth of the matter is that ice is indeed melting and sea levels are rising today – as they were in 1950, and 1900, and even 1850 (long before much man-made CO2). The world has warmed continuously since the end of the little ice age around 1820 (a worldwide cold spell generally linked to a very inactive period in the sun) and sea levels can be seen to follow an almost unbroken linear trend since that time.

Alarmists like to call climate skeptics “deniers,” usually in an attempt to equate climate skeptics with holocaust deniers. But skeptics do not deny that temperatures have warmed over the last century, or even that man (through CO2 as well as land use and other factors) has played some part in that warming. What skeptics deny, though, is the catastrophe. And even more, what skeptics deny is the need to drastically reduce fossil fuel use – a step that will likely be an expensive exercise in the developed west but an unmitigated disaster for the poor of Asia and Africa. These developing nations, who are just recently emerging from millennia of poverty, need to burn every hydrocarbon they can find to develop their economies.

Postscript: You will notice that I wrote this entire article without once mentioning either the words “hockey stick” or “Climategate.” I have never thought Michael Mann’s hockey stick to be a particularly compelling piece of evidence, even if it were correct. The analysis purports to show a rapid increase in world temperatures after centuries of stability, implying that man is likely the cause of current warming because, on Mann’s chart, recent temperature trends look so unusual. In the world of scientific proof, this is the weakest of circumstantial evidence.

As it turns out, however, there are a myriad of problems great and small with the hockey stick, from cherry-picking data to highly questionable statistical methods, which probably make the results incorrect. Studies that have avoided Mann’s mistakes have all tended to find the same thing – whether looking over a scale of a century, or millennia, or millions of years, climate changes absolutely naturally. Nothing about our current temperatures or CO2 levels is either unusual or unprecedented.

The best evidence that the problems identified with Mann’s analysis are probably real is how hard Mann and a small climate community fought to avoid releasing data and computer code that would allow outsiders to check and replicate their work. The “Climategate” emails include no smoking gun about the science, but do show how far the climate community has strayed from what is considered normal and open scientific process. No science should have to rely on an in-group saying “just trust us,” particularly one with trillions of dollars of public policy decisions on the line.

3. California’s Cap-and-Trade War

The battle to repeal a self-destructive climate change law

Editorial, WSJ, Oct 18, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703735804575535841904660332.html?mod=ITP_opinion_2

What happens when environmental fashion collides with a state's desperate need for jobs and economic growth? That question will be put to the test when Californians vote November 2 on a ballot measure that would suspend the Golden State's cap-and-trade law until its unemployment rate falls below 5.5%. Today the rate is 12.4%.

Proposition 23 is the number one national target of the green movement this election year. With the failure of cap and tax in Congress, the greens are trying to hold onto this remnant of their anticarbon crusade. Both sides are spending heavily, and the polls show a close vote.

California's climate change law (known as AB 32) mandates a 30% cut in carbon emissions from cars, trucks, utilities, agriculture and other businesses by 2020, with a web of new taxes and regulations that take effect in 2012. Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger sees AB 32 as his crowning achievement and is assailing supporters of Proposition 23 as "black oil hearts [who are] spending millions and millions of dollars" to promote their own "self-serving greed."

In reality, dozens of industries support the initiative, and Arnold never mentions that much of the money to defeat Proposition 23 also comes from energy companies. Alternative energy investors realize that without new taxes on carbon energy and mandates for "renewables" like wind and solar, so-called clean energy sources can't compete.

When AB 32 was signed in 2006, the California economy was flying high, the state unemployment rate was under 5%, and cap and trade seemed a fashionable luxury the state could afford. Not anymore. Today there are 2.5 million unemployed Californians and the state's finances are a wreck. AB 32 would make all of this worse.

A 2009 study commissioned by the California Small Business Roundtable found that when fully implemented AB 32 would cost the state more than one million jobs and "result in a higher cost to California households of \$3,857 per year." That's more than the typical California family pays each year in federal income tax. A new study by the Pacific Research Institute predicts job losses of 150,000 by 2012 and 1.3 million by 2020.

Environmentalists counter that "green jobs" will save the day, as if a million Californians will make windmills and solar panels. California already leads the nation in regulations and subsidies to boost alternative energy, and it still has the third highest jobless rate in the nation.

Voters are also told the law would reduce the state's carbon footprint and save the planet from global warming. Except it can't and it won't. No single state—even one the size of California—can reduce global emissions by unilaterally taxing and regulating.

Even the California Air Resources Board, which supports AB 32, acknowledged this when it said in March that "California acting alone cannot reduce emissions sufficiently to change the course of climate change worldwide." The real objective, they said, is to set an example to move federal and international climate change legislation. But given that so many *Democrats* are now campaigning against cap and tax around the country, it's highly unlikely that Congress or many states will follow California.

The state's own fiscal auditors admitted earlier this year that there will be economic "leakage" to other states and nations from AB 32, and that California's economy "will likely be adversely affected in the near term by implementing climate-related policies that are not adopted elsewhere."

Most of this economic pain will be borne, not by wealthy liberals in Santa Barbara and San Francisco, but by middle class and poor Californians who work in industries whose costs will rise. No wonder a recent poll by the Public Policy Institute of California found that Hispanics are the group most opposed to AB 32. They seem to understand they will be first in line to get laid off when the law starts to bite.

With so much at stake, Prop. 23 ought to be a major issue in this year's election campaign. Democratic candidates Jerry Brown (Governor) and Senator Barbara Boxer both oppose Prop. 23, but GOP gubernatorial candidate Meg Whitman is a fence-sitter. She calls cap and tax a job killer but favors only a one-year suspension. GOP Senate candidate Carly Fiorina is a full-throated supporter of the initiative. With her usual charm, Ms. Boxer accuses her of being "in the pocket of big oil" and "dirty coal."

Proposition 23 faces an uphill fight against green moneyed interests, but its passage would give California a regulatory reprieve and save tens of thousands of jobs. If it fails, Nevadans and Chinese will rejoice.

4. Restore the balance between energy and environment

Editorial, Washington Examiner, Oct 21, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/Restore-the-balance-between-energy-and-environment-1294281-105481163.html>

Imagine that the price of food in America was prone to volatile price increases of 50 percent or more in a given year. Now imagine that while people struggled to afford food, government bureaucrats went around setting limits on how much food some American farmers can grow, while radical anti-obesity crusaders sued other farmers across the country to seize their farmlands and declare them off-limits to crop production. Such an untenable situation would likely produce a popular revolt that dwarfed the Tea Party movement.

Yet that scenario is almost perfectly analogous to America's current energy and environmental policies. Ambitious professional politicians and federal bureaucrats are working hand-in-glove with an \$8 billion-a-year Big Green environmental lobby in an effort to reduce the consumption of fossil fuels. The result: lost jobs in the energy industry, skyrocketing utility costs, mind-numbing traffic jams, and a decline in critically needed domestic energy production.

Fixing this deplorable state of affairs will begin with some common sense reforms:

* Restore a human balance: Government policies must respect the long-standing public consensus that energy and environmental factors are equally important and that neither should be made subordinate to the other. Protecting the environment does not mean government should tell Americans how big their cars or homes must be, that they should pay energy prices maintained at artificially higher levels by government fiat to satisfy influential special interests, or that millions of acres of public land that teems with critically needed resources must be placed forever off-limits to protect an obscure insect, fish or animal. These things can be balanced.

* All-of-the-above: Renewable energy sources now generate 8 percent of America's total energy supply, while fossil fuels account for 84 percent (the balance comes from nuclear). This ratio won't change significantly for at least two decades. Encourage renewable energy sources, but not at the expense of fossil fuels. It's an all-of-the-above decision, not an either/or choice.

* Rein in the lawyers. The Supreme Court is currently considering a case that, if upheld, will encourage suits by anyone claiming to have been harmed by "climate change." That's nuts. Big Green environmental groups -- often funded by taxpayer dollars -- have long forced expensive and unnecessary litigation despite having suffered no demonstrable harm from the contested policies. Raise the bar for legal standing in environmental cases.

* Leverage more conventional energy production for more renewable development: California Rep. Devin Nunes' "Energy Roadmap" would allow more domestic energy exploration in places currently off-limits, plus a speedier approval process for up to 200 new nuclear plants. Portions of the resulting energy royalties would be used as incentives for renewable development via a "reverse auction" in which firms bid for the income in return for producing more energy at lower cost. New jobs would be created, needed energy infrastructure improvements funded, foreign oil dependence slashed, and carbon emissions cut.

5. WikiPropaganda

Wikipedia bars a global warming censor from editing its pages

Editorial, WSJ, Oct 21, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304410504575560630778483558.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_AboveLEFTTop

As the world saw in the Climategate emails last year, global warming advocates have a habit of demonizing anyone who disagrees with them. Now comes the Wikipedia version of this story. The influential online encyclopedia is written and edited by anyone with an Internet connection, and contributors are supposed to stick to a fair recitation of the facts. So it's news that last week Wikipedia acknowledged it had been hijacked by global warming alarmists who squelched dissenting science. A group of Wikipedia arbitrators banned British blogger William Connolley from participating in any article, discussion or forum dealing with global warming.

Mr. Connolley is a former Green Party candidate for local political office and until 2007 was a climate modeler for the British Antarctic Survey. He is also a missionary for the view that humans cause global warming, and over the years he used his power as an "administrator" on Wikipedia to rewrite the site's global warming articles. He celebrated such controversial scientists as Penn State's Michael Mann, of Climategate fame, and he presented even disputed global warming science as fact. He routinely deleted entries that presented competing views and barred contributors with whom he disagreed. He also smeared scientific skeptics by rewriting their online biographies.

All of this was an embarrassment for Wikipedia as it became more widely known, and last year it stripped Mr. Connolley of his administrator rights. He nonetheless continued his campaign, and last week Wikipedia's group of seven dispute arbitrators banned him from the topic entirely. They also banned other posters who had turned Wikipedia into their global warming propaganda outlet.

This is reminiscent of the Climategate emails, which showed global warming evangelicals using their academic positions to subvert peer review and close publications to dissenters. Wikipedia's 310 million unique visitors were also being fed only the Connolley-Mann line. That's not a scientific "consensus." It's censorship, and Wikipedia deserves credit for finally, if belatedly, stopping it.

#####

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.