The Week That Was (Feb 28, 2009) brought to you by SEPP

$$

We will be speaking at Heartland's International Climate Change Conference (ICCC) in NYC (Marriott Marquis hotel, March 8-10). To register: www.heartland.org Then at Yale U (New Haven, CT) on March 11 and at Harvard on March 12 and 13. Details in TWTW of March 7

$$$

Quote of the Week:

"How inappropriate to call this Planet Earth when it is quite clearly ocean" -- *Arthur C. Clarke*
****

THIS WEEK

Less than a month into the job, Lisa Jackson, the new administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, has already pledged to reverse or review three Bush administration directives, the NYT reports. This sea change would not have been possible, of course, without White House backing. Indeed, it was President Obama who announced the first big change in Bush policy. This was a decision to reconsider (and almost certainly approve) California's request to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks, which the Bush administration had denied. Ms. Jackson moved quickly to carry out that directive, meanwhile forecasting further policy shifts. In a memo to her employees last month, she indicated that it was only a matter of time before she complied with the Supreme Court's nearly two-year-old decision ordering the EPA. to address the effects of greenhouse gases from vehicles and regulate them if necessary.

Then, last week, Ms. Jackson said she would reconsider a Bush administration declaration that the law did not allow it to regulate carbon-dioxide emissions from new coal power plants. Just as obeying the Supreme Court decision could lead to the first nationwide limits on carbon dioxide from vehicles, this latest decision could lead to the first greenhouse gas limits on utilities. These major changes in regulatory policy could affect more than half the greenhouse gas emissions emitted in this country.
The NYT editorial pointed out that "no single agency, EPA. included, can hope to address climate change in all its complexity. Congress will eventually have to take command of the issue."

EPA announced that Jackson would grant a petition from the Sierra Club, Environmental Defense Fund, and Natural Resources Defense Council to re-consider a memo from her Bush Administration predecessor Stephen Johnson that stated that federal officials could not consider greenhouse gas emissions when deciding whether to permit new coal-fired power plants.

Jackson also told the New York Times in an interview published Wednesday that she has directed EPA staff to prepare the paperwork for a finding that carbon dioxide emissions endanger public health and safety and therefore must be regulated under the Clean Air Act.

Press reports suggest that she will make the endangerment finding by early April. As Marlo Lewis and Chris Horner (CEI) noted in their official comments submitted to EPA last fall, regulating carbon dioxide emissions under the Clean Air Act would be a regulatory nightmare that would cause an economic train wreck.

At the end of the week, Greenwire reported that EPA has sent to the Office of Management and Budget for review a draft rule that would create a *mandatory* registry of greenhouse gas emissions. The Bush Administration failed to finalize a rule before it left office that would have improved and expanded the current *voluntary* registry. See Marlo Lewis, Globalwarming.org, 19 February 2009
http://www.globalwarming.org/2009/02/19/will-lisa-jackson-turn-the-clean-air-act-into-a-gigantic-de-stimulus-package/
****

Paul Krugman in NYT http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/27/opinion/27krugman.html?th&emc=th
"The budget projects $645 billion in revenues from the sale of emission allowances. After years of denial and delay by its predecessor, the Obama administration is signaling that it's ready to take on climate change. Budget looks very, very good"

"So if Mr. Obama gets us out of Iraq (without bogging us down in an equally expensive Afghan quagmire) and manages to engineer a solid economic recovery — two big ifs, to be sure — getting the deficit down to around $500 billion by 2013 shouldn't be at all difficult."

SEPP Comments:

1. ***Sale of emission allowances constitutes just another regressive (energy) tax on the poorest of the poor***
2. ***The projected revenues of $645 billion form nearly 40% of the projected deficit of $1.75 trillion in a budget of nearly $3.6 trillion.***
3. ***Finally, in testimony to Congress (Sept 2008), Peter Orszag, currently Obama's budget director, estimated that revenue from a cap-and-trade scheme could reach 112 billion dollars by 2012. Hmm***

According to Orszag, who at the time was director of the Congressional Budget Office, the program -- which would force companies to buy permits if they exceed pollution emission limits -- could generate between 50 and 300 billion dollars a year by 2020. The New York Times also reported that the projected revenues would subsidize research and development of alternative energy sources.

Great for lobbyists and Green entrepreneurs but no great help to the poor!

****

SEPP Science Editorial #8-09 (2/28/09)

Why don't we see any Anthropogenic Greenhouse Warming (AGW) in the Climate record?

After all, CO2 is a GH gas whose level is increasing because of fossil-fuel burning. So where is AGW?
Using a number of lines of evidence, we suggest that there has been little if any warming after 1940 that can be assigned to the anthropogenic increase in GH gases. Nor is there any significant AGW pre-1940. We have used proxy data such as ice-core bore holes, tree rings, corals, etc. as well as instrumented data from the surface and satellites and have tried to explain the reported SST increases as an artifact of the observational method.

Much of the confusion has come about from drawing straight-line trends through data sets that showed clear evidence of sudden 'jumps' that had nothing to do with GH gases. Other statistical problems involved selective use of data and inappropriate 'data-smoothing' procedures.

Our conclusion is that because of negative feedbacks the Climate Sensitivity is quite small, well below 0.5 degC for doubling of CO2 – in line with the conclusions of several other investigations.

****

1. Inhofe Comments on Obama's State of the Union Address

2. US Climate Czar: CO2 regulation ruling to come soon

3. War over climate heats up even as climate itself cools down

4. Greens see the light on nuclear power

5. Japanese Commission challenges UN: Global Warming not man-made

6. Copenhagen Protocol will not succeed unless China and India sign up

7. In Global Warming we trust

8. The importance of Carbon Dioxide to your health

****

NEWS YOU CAN USE

Politics in the Guise of Pure Science -- by JOHN TIERNEY

http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/24/science/24tier.html?_r=1

****

Steve Hayward A long but important essay All the Leaves are Brown
www.claremont.org/publications/crb/id.1588/article_detail.asp

****

Center for Biological Diversity Declares Legal War on Global Warming U.S. Economy, Self-Governance [by Marlo Lewis] The CBD, the folks who successfully petitioned and sued the Fish & Wildlife Service to list the polar bear as a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), announced last week the opening of a new Climate Law Institute (CLI) that will "use existing laws and work to establish new state and federal laws that will eliminate energy generation by the burning of fossil fuels — particularly coal and oil shale.." CBD says it has dedicated an "initial $17 million" to the project.
****

Huffington Post (Feb 24, 2009): Gore Should Apologize for Spreading Climate Hysteria

Did you ever in your wildest dreams imagine seeing an article at this liberal website that not only refuted the anthropogenic global warming myth, but also asked Nobel Laureate Al Gore to apologize for the climate hysteria he's caused?

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/harold-ambler/mr-gore-apology-accepted_b_154982.html

For the Huffington Post to publish this piece anywhere within its confines is remarkable. It also shows you how incredibly bogus and transparent the whole Al Gore Traveling Road Show truly is. One cannot imagine a more damning indictment of the shallow and misstated science that Gore has used to con America and the world than what you will find in this Huffington Post criticism. Recent polls show that the global climate change juggernaut has stalled and the wheels are beginning to fall off .... When the cap-and-trade results begins hitting the average Joe on the street in his wallet - via higher gasoline, heating oil and electric prices - all Hell might break loose and the politicians who promoted C&T just might be held accountable for promoting one of history's greatest scams.
****

From Steve Milloy and Tom Borelli (February 25, 2009):

Last night President Obama renewed his commitment to regulate carbon dioxide emissions:

"But to truly transform our economy, protect our security, and save our planet from the ravages of climate change... So I ask this Congress to send me legislation that places a market-based cap on carbon pollution and drives the production of more renewable energy in America."

Let's keep in mind that the goal of cap-and-trade is to reduce the use of carbon-based fuels such as coal, natural gas and gasoline by making the cost of driving and heating/cooling our homes higher. Raising energy prices during a severe recession makes as much sense as providing up to $ 2 billion for ACORN - the community activist group - in the so called "stimulus bill."

Obama's vision can only be made reality if corporate America supports this initiative and that's why we are focusing our attention on the CEOs that are partnering with the president and environmental activists to lobby for this regulatory scheme.

To solidify corporate support Obama nominated GE CEO Jeff Immelt and Caterpillar CEO Jim Owens to his economic advisory panel. Both CEOs are members of the United States Climate Action Partnership - a coalition of corporations and environmental activists that are lobbying for a federal cap-and-trade law. With Immelt, Obama gets access to GE's NBC media network that can promote his green agenda through its programming, news and business coverage.

Just this week part of CNBC's popular "Squawk Box" was broadcasted from an Energy Summit sponsored by the Center for American Progress - a think tank run by John Podesta, former chief of staff to President Bill Clinton. At the conference, CNBC delivered Obama's green message by interviewing T. Boone

Pickens, Harry Reid and Bill Clinton.

We are doing our part to expose the corporate role in advancing cap-and-trade. This is a huge undertaking and we need all the moral and financial support we can muster. ***Support the Free Enterprise Project***

http://www.freeenterpriseactionfund.com/
****

Australia: The Lavoisier Society has released *Thank God for Carbon*, the latest booklet by Ray Evans. See: ***http://www.lavoisier.com.au/index.php***
This is a critical year in the battle for Carbon Sense. All over the world the Warmists are becoming desperate as skepticism grows and voters are diverted to real problems like jobs and financial security.

Also in **Australia**, a new political party has been formed to represent climate sceptics. Called "The Climate Sceptics" http://www.climatesceptics.com.au the party has a nice cartoon of "Skeppy" the sceptical kangaroo and a no-nonsense message:

"Anthropogenic or man-made Global Warming (AGW) alarmism is the biggest con, fraud, hoax, swindle, deception and mass hysteria in the history of modern civilization, because climate changes naturally. The Climate Sceptics support all practical measures to prevent environmental degradation. We support the development of cleaner and more efficient sources of energy. Unfortunately governmental taxes to stop climate change are a colossal diversion of funds from core obligations, and Emission Trading Schemes (ETS) will do absolutely nothing for the Murray-Darling basin, the Great Barrier Reef, or land degradation - just as it will do absolutely nothing to stop climate change. The Climate Sceptics are here to demand rational debate and responsible leadership. We reject the extremist views that now threaten what Australians have sacrificed to achieve in living standards, rights and freedoms."
****

Canada: The reason the oil sands optical illusion exists is the government of Alberta has never signed off on any of the reclamation over the past 30 years of mining. How can a Company reclaim if the government (held to ransom by irresponsible environmental lobby groups) has the power to make them redo it on a political agenda? As it stands now after 30 years of mining, there has been about 30% reclamation by Syncrude. The total mined so far amounts to a gob-smacking 0.047% of the Province. Ultimately, it could cover 0.1% of Alberta. However, with reclamation, industry would clean up the largest natural oil spill in North America to great economic benefit to Canada. Moreover, the CO2 emissions are approximately 4% of Canada's 2% of global. 2% = 0.04 x 0.02 x 0.02 = 0.000016% of global emissions. That is not much. It is de minimis in legal terms (Google it). I got my numbers from the Pembina Institute.
****

New Zealand: CO2 and Health: http://www.nzcpr.com/soapbox.htm#RobertC
Excerpt: *The majority of us will experience breathing problems at some time in our lives and will find relief when given enhanced levels of carbon dioxide. Present levels (380 ppm) are only slightly recovered from the lowest level during our evolution. Nature has evolved plants to function best at approximately 1,500 ppm. Since plants and animals evolved together, it's reasonable to expect that we also evolved to function best at some higher level. Now scientific studies and medical practice leave no doubt that this is so.*

UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

Say what? Arctic could lose the WINTER sea ice suggests Obama's Science Advisor John Holdren! -
Excerpt: At the 18:54 mark at the CBC "Climate Wars" podcast here [MP3], John Holdren says this:
...if you lose the summer sea ice, there are phenomena that could lead you not so very long thereafter to lose the winter sea ice as well. And if you lost that sea ice year round, it's going to mean drastic climatic change all over the hemisphere.
http://tomnelson.blogspot.com/2009/02/complete-barking-madness-from-john.html

##########

1. INHOFE COMMENTS ON OBAMA'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

WASHINGTON, D.C. U.S. Senator James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Ranking Member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, commented on President Obama's State of the Union Address. "President Obama committed to the largest annual tax increase in the history of America, through the implementation of a global warming cap-and-trade system," Senator Inhofe said. "The range of the tax increase that would be brought on by this cap-and-trade legislation is somewhere between $300-$330 billion per year. As bad as the stimulus spending bill was, this would be much worse because instead of being one-time spending, the cap-and-trade tax increase would keep occurring year after year. During times of economic turmoil it is folly to impose more pain on families by intentionally raising their energy costs through cap-and-trade. The American people will be outraged when they realize that any so-called global warming solutions will not have a detectable impact on temperatures but will have very painful and real impacts on their family budgets.

"Climate proposals should not be concealed under the guise of a deficit reduction tool. We learned last year during the Lieberman-Warner global warming cap-and-trade debate that the massive proposal represented the largest redistribution of wealth in the government's history and predetermined winners and losers. I believe environmentalists and other special interests that were bought off in the last climate bill would oppose any legislation that attempts to reduce their earmarks. Special interest will oppose any bill that depletes funding for pet programs because the revenue is being held hostage as a deficit reduction tool.

"I was sitting near Sen. Barbara Boxer during the inauguration and she was stunned that the President didn't address Global Warming in his speech. Unfortunately, it seems that the President is finally folding to the pressure from his special interest constituency. Thankfully, I believe we can still defeat these misguided climate efforts here in Congress."
****

2. US CLIMATE CZAR: CO2 REGULATION RULING TO COME SOON

By Ian Talley, Dow Jones Newswires, 202-862-9285; ian.talley@dowjones.com Feb 22, 2009

(Updates with more details, comments and adds background) WASHINGTON -(Dow Jones)- President Barack Obama's climate czar said Sunday the Environmental Protection Agency will soon issue a rule on the regulation of carbon dioxide, finding that it represents a danger to the public.

The White House is pressing Congress to draft and pass legislation that would cut greenhouse gases by 80% of 1990 levels by 2050, threatening to use authority under the Clean Air Act if legislators don't move fast enough or create strong enough provisions.

Carol Browner, Obama's special advisor on climate change and energy, also said the administration is seeking to establish a national standard for auto emissions that could mean tougher efficiency mandates for auto makers. The new standard could be fashioned after strict proposals developed in California that would limit greenhouse gas emissions - initiatives that car makers have vigorously fought. The comments - the first by the administration on the topic - could lead to another blow for beleaguered car companies such as General Motors (GM) and Ford (F) that are already tottering.

"EPA's going to look at Mass. Vs. EPA and will make an endangerment finding," Browner told Dow Jones Newswires in an interview. The Supreme Court ordered the EPA in the Mass. Vs. EPA case to determine if carbon dioxide endangered public health or welfare. "The next step is a notice of proposed rulemaking" for new regulations on CO2 emissions, Browner said on the sidelines of the National Governors Association meeting, one of her first public appearances since the inauguration. Browner declined to say exactly when the EPA would issue the finding or rulemaking, but EPA chief Lisa Jackson has indicated it could be on April 2, the anniversary of Mass Vs. EPA.

Obama EPA chief Lisa Jackson said earlier in the month that her office would soon begin drafting rules for regulating CO2. The agency has been intensely reviewing and updating an existing endangerment finding made last year by agency officials - but blocked by the previous administration - that found carbon dioxide threatened human welfare. Officially recognizing that carbon dioxide is a danger to the public would trigger regulation of the greenhouse gas emissions from coal-fired power plants, refineries, chemical plants, cement firms, vehicles and any other emitting sectors across the economy. Industry fears it could shut down the economy, not only preventing plants from operating and spurring a dramatic retooling of the energy sector but also pushing up costs and hurting the international competitiveness for a raft of sectors.

Environmentalists, meanwhile, say action by the administration is required by law and need to pressure lawmakers to act. But Browner said the administration prefers that Congress draft legislation rather than CO2 to be regulated under the Clean Air Act because lawmakers could develop a bill that could more deftly regulate the greenhouse gas through a cap- and-trade system. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said Friday he aims to pass a climate change bill by the end of the summer, and Rep. Henry Waxman, D-Calif., head of the panel responsible for drafting a CO2 bill, said he wanted a bill approved by the Memorial Day holiday in May. Browner also declined to say what the administration's target date for Congress to pass a climate bill before accelerating the Clean Air Act rulemaking, but she called Waxman's schedule an "aggressive" one. "In the next several weeks we will begin to see the shape of legislation... (and) we will work with Congress as they shape it," she later told a group of Western Governors.

The climate czar dismissed critics of fast, stringent climate change laws who have said that the existing financial crisis would only be exacerbated by putting a premium on emitting carbon dioxide. She said businesses hoping to invest in CO2 mitigation projects needed more certain policy signals to plow cash into projects and companies, and that the rulemaking process would create a buffer for action and compliance.

Critics of putting an expensive premium on carbon say that such a schedule may be overly optimistic given the global financial crisis and the ramifications that putting a cap on greenhouse gases would have across nearly every sector of the economy. Tough action too fast, they say, not only could curb manufacturing and create an energy crisis by halting new power plant construction, but also could force a rapid migration of businesses overseas to cheaper energy climes.

Specifically, Obama wants an economy-wide law - instead of just some major emitting sectors - and to auction off 100% of the emission credits, which analysts say could exponentially increase the cost of emitting, as well as the pay-off for low-carbon projects. Browner also said the administration had directed the EPA and the Department of Transportation to develop a national policy for auto emissions. The DOT is currently developing new auto efficiency standards, but the White House and the EPA are currently considering a request from California to implement their own much stricter standards, which consider greenhouse gas emissions rather than just fuel efficiency and are likely to be followed in a more that a dozen other states.

The administration could seek to implement the California standards or a negotiated version of them across the country, however, Browner indicated. "We need a unified national policy when it comes to clean vehicles," Browner told the governors, adding that the Department of Transportation and EPA needed to cooperate and determine the impact of both conventional pollution and greenhouse gas emissions and give auto makers the time and policy direction necessary to re-tool their plants. "Both agencies have to meet their responsibilities...we're just trying to figure out how do you do it in a way that the car companies have a clear (mandate)," Browner told reporters after the event. Car makers have expressed concern not only about the costs of meeting the tough new standards, but also having to make cars that have to meet two different mandates.

Separately, Browner said the administration was also going to create an inter- agency task force to site a new national electricity transmission grid to meet both growing demand and the President's planned renewable energy expansion. Siting has been a major bottleneck to renewable growth, and lawmakers and administration officials have said they're likely to seek greater federal powers that would give expanded eminent domain authorities.

****

3. WAR OVER THE CLIMATE HEATS UP EVEN AS CLIMATE ITSELF COOLS DOWN

By S. FRED SINGER, Investors Business Daily, Feb 19, 2009

President Obama will be hard put to satisfy his several campaign promises: to restore prosperity and jobs, to conduct a foreign policy backed by a strong economy and to satisfy environmental demands to "save the planet." His job will be much easier if he listens to independent advice on climate science.

Get ready for a three-ring circus. In one corner you find those concerned with the recovery of the economy, in the second corner those concerned about threats to national security and in the third corner global warmers who agonize about catastrophic climate change.

The battle between these three factions will revolve about the use of energy and will play out in the White House and in Congress, but also in the public arena:

• Obama's economic advisers at Treasury and the Budget Office will try to delay any major climate policies that could adversely impact economic recovery.

• The National Security Council and Defense Department, and to a lesser extent the State Department, will be concerned with maintaining a strong U.S. economy to be able to act forcefully when foreign problems arise.

• The global warmers will be led by energy-climate czarina Carol Browner, EPA chief during the Clinton years, and by science adviser John Holdren, who testified that a billion people might die by 2020 unless greenhouse-gas emissions are sharply reduced.

Using all the powers of the Clean Air Act, the EPA may try to impose severe regulations on carbon dioxide, which they would like to label as a pollutant. If successful, it would bring economic activity to a halt.

The outcome of such internal battles is never certain. In Germany, the minister for industry has just stepped down because he opposed the drastic climate actions demanded by Chancellor Angela Merkel. On the other hand, Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd has walked away from the commitments of his Labor Party to institute a "cap and trade" scheme.

As these disputes continue, keep in mind three facts:

1. Nothing can be achieved by way of controlling atmospheric levels of CO2 without the active participation of China, India and other developing nations. It is a global issue, and the U.S. cannot make a significant impact, even if it were to adopt extreme measures. By now, China has become the largest emitter of CO2.

Obama may still seem committed to his campaign promise to reduce emissions by 20% by 2020 and 60% by 2050 (or was it 80% — and does it matter?). But remember that the U.S. Senate voted unanimously against anything like the Kyoto Protocol, which calls for a reduction of only 5%. And note that European nations and Japan, which signed up for Kyoto, will not come close to achieving even this modest goal by 2012, when Kyoto expires.

Despite this, politicians are making grand promises for the far future as they approach the crucial Copenhagen 2009 negotiations to define the "son of Kyoto."

2. Remember also that global warming, whether natural or human-induced, may be good for you. Economists tell us that a modest warming would improve agriculture and forestry and increase GNP. And historical evidence backs their studies.

In any case, the climate has been mildly cooling for the past decade and may continue to cool for another decade or more — even while CO2 levels keep rising — causing much suffering around the world.

3. Finally, be aware that carbon dioxide may not have as much of an impact on temperatures as projected by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). While their 2007 Report asserts a better-than-90% certainty that the average temperature increase over the last 50 years is human-caused, they have produced no credible evidence to back this up. None!

On the contrary, an independent assessment of the same published information by the Non-Governmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) reaches exactly the opposite result: Nature, not human activity, rules the climate.

Apparently, the ongoing scientific debate hasn't yet made much impact on politicians or the public. I would blame the media, which seem to give more play to the catastrophic scenarios advanced by the global warmers.

But even Al Gore no longer claims that there are only one or two climate skeptics. Their number has been growing steadily.

Last year, 100 prominent climate scientists signed a letter to the U.N. secretary general, warning against accepting the IPCC results. So far, 650 climate scientists have expressed their skepticism about anthropogenic global warming. And 31,000 scientists, about one-third of them with PhD degrees, have signed the Oregon Petition against the Kyoto Protocol.

In the U.S., the "cooler heads" seem to be gaining ground. But nothing is ever sure. So stay tuned.

Singer, an atmospheric physicist, is president of the Science and Environmental Policy Project and professor emeritus of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia. He also served as the founding director of the U.S. Weather Satellite Service. His latest book is "Unstoppable Global Warming — Every 1,500 Years" (Rowman & Littlefield, 2007). He and other experts discuss major issues facing the Obama administration in IBD's "Testing Obama" series.

****

4. GREENS SEE THE LIGHT ON NUCLEAR POWER

The Daily Telegraph, 23 February 2009 H/t to CCNet
http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/telegraph-view/4786835/Greens-see-the-light-on-nuclear-power.html

The resistance of the green movement to nuclear energy has always been a puzzle. It is by far the cleanest method of dependable large-scale power generation (renewables tend to be both small-scale and unreliable) yet environmentalists have been implacably opposed to its use.

They tend to cite safety considerations - yet nuclear generation has proved astonishingly safe over the half century it has been used commercially. There have been two major incidents at Three Mile Island in 1979 (no casualties) and Chernobyl in 1986 (a total of 56 fatalities by 2004).

But the green lobby or at least an important part of it appears to have had an epiphany. Four prominent environmentalists, led by the former Cabinet minister Lord Smith of Finsbury, the chairman of the Environment Agency, have today "come out" as lobbyists for nuclear power.

They argue that a new generation of nuclear reactors is essential if Britain is to meet its carbon emission targets. Indeed, so zealous are these converts that they insist there should be no unnecessary delays imposed on this programme through lengthy planning inquiries or legal challenges.
****

5. JAPANESE COMMISSION CHALLENGES UN: GLOBAL WARMING NOT MAN-MADE

By Noel Sheppard (Newsbusters.org), 25 Feb 09

A Japanese energy commission released a report last month challenging the supposed international consensus that man is responsible for warming the planet while claiming that climate modeling -- the questionably accurate process of predicting the future so key to Nobel Laureate Al Gore's myth -- is immature and akin to ancient astrology.
The study also called the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's conclusion that global temperatures are likely to continue to rise "an unprovable hypothesis," while castigating "the paucity of the US ground temperature data set used to support the hypothesis."
The Japan Society of Energy and Resources was founded in 1980 to "promote the science and technology concerning energy and resources and thus to facilitate cooperation among industry academia and governmental sectors for coping with the problems in this field."
On Wednesday, the UK Register published a translation of the Society's January report which for some reason America's global warming-obsessed press chose to ignore:

Japan's boffins: Global warming isn't man-made
Climate science is 'ancient astrology', claims report
By Andrew Orlowski, Environment, 25th Feb 2009

Exclusive: Japanese scientists have made a dramatic break with the UN and Western-backed hypothesis of climate change in a new report from its Energy Commission.
Three of the five researchers disagree with the UN's IPCC view that recent warming is primarily the consequence of man-made industrial emissions of greenhouse gases. Remarkably, the subtle and nuanced language typical in such reports has been set aside.

One of the five contributors compares computer climate modelling to ancient astrology. Others castigate the paucity of the US ground temperature data set used to support the hypothesis, and declare that the unambiguous warming trend from the mid-part of the 20th Century has ceased.

The report by Japan Society of Energy and Resources (JSER) is astonishing rebuke to international pressure, and a vote of confidence in Japan's native marine and astronomical research. Publicly-funded science in the West uniformly backs the hypothesis that industrial influence is primarily responsible for climate change, although fissures have appeared recently. Only one of the five top Japanese scientists commissioned here concurs with the man-made global warming hypothesis.

JSER is the academic society representing scientists from the energy and resource fields, and acts as a government advisory panel. The report appeared last month but has received curiously little attention. So *The Register* commissioned a translation of the document - the first to appear in the West in any form. Below you'll find some of the key findings - but first, a summary.

Summary
Three of the five leading scientists contend that recent climate change is driven by natural cycles, not human industrial activity, as political activists argue.
Kanya Kusano is Program Director and Group Leader for the Earth Simulator at the Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science & Technology (JAMSTEC). He focuses on the immaturity of simulation work cited in support of the theory of anthropogenic climate change. Using undiplomatic language, Kusano compares them to ancient astrology. After listing many faults, and the IPCC's own conclusion that natural causes of climate are poorly understood, Kusano concludes:
"[The IPCC's] conclusion that from now on atmospheric temperatures are likely to show a continuous, monotonic increase, should be perceived as an unprovable hypothesis," he writes.
Shunichi Akasofu, head of the International Arctic Research Center in Alaska, has expressed criticism of the theory before. Akasofu uses historical data to challenge the claim that very recent temperatures represent an anomaly:
"We should be cautious, IPCC's theory that atmospheric temperature has risen since 2000 in

correspondence with CO2 is nothing but a hypothesis. "
Akasofu calls the post-2000 warming trend hypothetical. His harshest words are reserved for advocates who give conjecture the authority of fact.
"Before anyone noticed, this hypothesis has been substituted for truth... The opinion that great disaster will really happen must be broken."
****

6. THE COPENHAGEN PROTOCOL WILL NOT SUCCEED UNLESS CHINA AND INDIA SIGN UP, BUT BRIBING THESE NATIONS TO TAKE PART IS COUNTERPRODUCTIVE

By Bjorn Lomborg, guardian.co.uk, 15 February 2009

This December, global leaders will meet in Copenhagen to negotiate a new climate change pact to reduce carbon emissions. Yet, the way that it has been set up, it will inevitably fail. The best hope is that we use this lesson finally to deal with this issue in a smarter fashion.

The United States has made it clear that developing countries must sign up to substantial reductions in carbon emissions in Copenhagen. Developing nations especially China and India will be the main greenhouse gas emitters of the 21st century but were exempted from the Kyoto protocol because they emitted so little during the west's industrialisation period. Europe, too, has grudgingly accepted that without developing nations' participation, rich nations' cuts will have little impact.

Some would have us believe that getting China and India on board will be easy. According to former US vice president Al Gore, developing countries that were once reluctant to join in the first phases of a global response to the climate crisis have themselves now become leaders in demanding action and in taking bold steps on their own initiatives.

But Gore's fellow Nobel laureate, Rajendra Pachauri, the chair of the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is not so sure. He recently told an Indian audience, "of course, the developing countries will be exempted from any such restrictions, but the developed countries will certainly have to cut down on emissions".

It is likely that Pachauri is right and Gore is wrong: neither China nor India will commit to significant cuts without a massive payoff.

Their reasons are entirely understandable. The biggest factor is the massive cost and the tiny reward. Reducing emissions is the only response to climate change that environmental campaigners talk about, despite the fact that repeated attempts to do so in Rio in 1992 and in Kyoto in 1997 failed to make a dent in emission levels.

Some believe that past agreements did not go far enough, but Kyoto actually turned out to be overly ambitious. Ninety-five per cent of its envisioned cuts never happened. Yet, even if Kyoto were fully implemented throughout this century, it would reduce temperatures by an insignificant 0.3F (0.2C), at an annual cost of $180bn.

China and India are enjoying swift growth that is helping millions of people lift themselves out of poverty. India's external affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee recently said, "India is very concerned about climate change, but we have to see the issue in the perspective of our imperative to remove poverty so that all Indians can live a life of dignity."

And Chinese premier Wen Jiabao recently said, "it's difficult for China to take quantified emission reduction quotas at the Copenhagen conference, because this country is still at an early stage of development. Europe started its industrialisation several hundred years ago, but for China, it has only been dozens of years."

Some environmental campaigners argue that, given the effects of global warming, every nation must act.

But if one takes a closer look at China, this argument disintegrates.

Climate models show that for at least the rest of this century, China will actually benefit from global warming. Warmer temperatures will boost agricultural production and improve health. The number of lives lost in heat waves will increase, but the number of deaths saved in winter will grow much more rapidly: warming will have a more dramatic effect on minimum temperatures in winter than on maximum temperatures in summer. There are few arguments for China and India to commit to carbon caps and compelling reasons for them to resist pressure to do so.

Kyoto's successor will not be successful unless China and India are somehow included. To achieve that, the EU has made the inevitable, almost ridiculous, proposal of bribing developing nations to take part at a cost of 175bn annually by 2020.

In the midst of a financial crisis, it seems unbelievable that European citizens will bear the financial burden of paying off China and India. The sadder thing, though, is that this money would be spent on methane collection from waste dumps in developing nations, instead of on helping those countries' citizens deal with more pressing concerns like health and education.

There is an alternative to spending so much to achieve so little. Cutting carbon still costs a lot more than the good that it produces. We need to make emission cuts much cheaper so that countries like China and India can afford to help the environment. This means that we need to invest much more in research and development aimed at developing low-carbon energy.

If every country committed to spending 0.05% of its GDP exploring non-carbon-emitting energy technologies, this would translate into $25bn per year, or 10 times more than what the world spends now. Yet, the total also would be seven times cheaper than the Kyoto protocol, and many times cheaper than the Copenhagen protocol is likely to be. It would ensure that richer nations pay more, taking much of the political heat from the debate. Decades of talks have failed to make any impact on carbon emissions. Expecting China and India to make massive emission cuts for little benefit puts the Copenhagen meeting on a sure path to being another lost opportunity. Yet, at the same time, the Chinese and Indian challenge could be the impetus we need to change direction, end our obsession with reducing emissions, and focus instead on research and development, which would be smarter and cheaper and would actually make a difference.

Bjorn Lomborg, the director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, is an adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, and author of The Skeptical Environmentalist and Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist's Guide to Global Warming.

****

7. IN GLOBAL WARMING WE TRUST

Anthony Sadar and Susan Cammarata, February 23, 2009

COMMENTARY:

Today, we are urged to believe that within the next few decades the globe will become intolerably warmer. The world as we know it will be drastically altered unless we act now to reverse our wayward lifestyles, especially our wasteful energy practices.

But wait. Aren't we all just essentially being pressured to believe in a long-range climate forecast? And isn't this pressure largely being applied by politicians and political organizations no less? Who today would bet serious money on a weather prediction made a month in advance let alone decades ahead? Yet the developed nations of the world are under the gun to invest hundreds of billions of dollars on a climate prophecy when worldwide financial stability is tottering. Doesn't President Barack Obama have enough global headaches to buffer to worry about a trillion-dollar climate prescription?

Many in the environmental profession have come to an epiphany like the one the late Michael Crichton had - that contemporary environmentalism, with its authoritative, unchallengeable proclamations and rigid tenets, is analogous to organized religion. This environmental religion is headed by politicians (or former

politicians) as the high priests and an established political cathedral (read Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change).

These adored figureheads have selected verses from a collection of scientific data and climate effects to write their global-warming scriptures. Their holy writ includes a reworking of the Book of Revelation with planetary disasters as frightening as those alluded to in the authentic account.

Salvation comes from giving the priests control over our daily lives to redeem us from our carbonaceous sins. Penance and indulgence take the form of "offsets" to carbon-spewing offenses like frivolous exotic vacations, meaty outdoor barbecues, incandescent-bulb burning, and driving a Hummer (a mortal sin!).

Not to worry though, there is mercy in environmentalism. For the ability to continue trespasses-like economic expansion in industrialized nations while enjoying a guilt-free contemporary lifestyle, the offsets are invoked to spare those in Third World countries from the modern burdens of ominous power plants, dirty cement kilns, egregious chemical factories, heartless pharmaceutical industries, sterile medical clinics, gluttonous harvests and gushing purified water. At least those with guilt-assuaged consciences can relax as they vicariously enjoy the back-to-nature lifestyles of loin-clothed aboriginals foraging for food to feed their gaunt families in a lush rain forest (while annually a million natives worldwide drop dead from malaria alone).

How have we come to universally accept this new religion based on dubious prophecy that condemns so many poor souls to a living hell and will greatly limit the salvation offered by free economies? That's where the missionaries come in. These missionaries, a k a "teachers" and "professors," have gone out into the fields of the education system to disseminate the depressing gospel that the Earth is forever in big trouble. Thus, with sustained indoctrination from grade school through graduate school, proselytes have been harvested.

No wonder today's scientists, let alone society, so quickly succumb to any doomed-Earth theory. Our scientific community has been primed to accept that a forecast of calamity for our atmosphere is as good as a reality.

Everyone has been conditioned to believe that an extremely complex climate system is largely controlled by a single simple gas - carbon dioxide - even though the biggest single climate regulator on Earth is most likely water. The global atmospheric temperature is substantially controlled by water in all its forms, as invisible vapor in air, as liquid in oceans and clouds, and as solid ice crystals, snow cover, and glaciers. Besides, could other uncontrollable factors like variation in incoming solar radiation and cosmic rays, as some atmospheric scientists have proposed, have a dominant influence over climate?

So, before we all surrender to a calamitous climate change scenario, let's put it into perspective with the very real present-day calamities of mass starvation, disease, ethnic cleansing, potential economic collapses, and the like. With these exceptionally serious challenges at hand and based on the enormous complexity of the Earth-climate system and the relative paucity of knowledge scientists have about the systems operation, we sincerely hope to encourage a return to humility in environmental research and activism and education about our biosphere. We hope politicians and scientists once again embrace the basics of science including the idea that all "theories" consist of assumptions and limitations - and this goes double for "forecasts"! However, we expect our motivational efforts at reformation will just end up getting us burned at the stake (in a carbon-neutral fashion of course) for environmental heresy.

Anthony J. Sadar is a certified consulting meteorologist and co-author of "Environmental Risk Communication: Principles and Practices for Industry" (CRC Press/Lewis Publishers, 2000). Susan T. Cammarata is an independent environmental lawyer practicing in Pittsburgh.

****

8. THE IMPORTANCE OF CARBON DIOXIDE TO YOUR HEALTH

By Robert Chouinard, 24 Feb 09 http://www.nzcpr.com/soapbox.htm#RobertC

First, do you know that carbon dioxide (CO_2) in our atmosphere is

- only slightly more than 1/3rd of 1/10th of 1 percent?
- just recovering from the lowest level in the history of the earth?
- the source of carbon for all life forms, on land or in the sea?
- only slightly above the suffocation level for green plants?
- a fraction of the level for which evolution designed plants?
- so low as to cause some people breathing problems?
- increased by 130 times and more when administered to sick patients?
- considered, thanks to Al Gore, a pollutant by the U.S. Supreme Court?
- now a commodity to be traded on Al Gore's Carbon Exchange? (See lawsuit against Al Gore for fraud)

It's common knowledge that when we breathe we take in oxygen and give off carbon dioxide but what is not generally known is that we are greatly affected by the level of carbon dioxide in the air we breathe as well as the way we breathe. Because many people with a wide range of health problems find relief when given enhanced levels of carbon dioxide, it follows that these people would benefit from any rise in the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The importance of CO_2 and proper breathing is nicely covered in the following audio lecture and followed with scientific references.
Audio lecture: http://www.aetherin.com/audio/03_carbondioxide.mp3

What are safe levels of Carbon Dioxide?
Source: http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/pns/faq_othr.html

Levels of carbon dioxide (CO_2), a colorless, odorless gas, have been known to reach 3,000 parts per million (ppm) in homes, schools, and offices with no ill effects. The maximum recommended by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) for an 8-hour occupation is 5,000 ppm (13 times the current level of 380 ppm). The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) also use 5,000 ppm as their threshold for occupational safety.

But 5,000 ppm appears to be a very conservative estimate of safe levels because other sources claim we can tolerate up to 1.5% of it in air, 15,000 parts per million.

Consider: people with respiratory problems are given medical gas typically consisting of 95 percent oxygen and 50,000 ppm (5 percent) carbon dioxide. This gas can also be obtained with CO_2 ranging from 1% to as high as 10% for treating people who have been asphyxiated.

Also consider: we would die if we did not breathe in such a way as to retain very close to 65,000 ppm (6.5%) of CO_2 in the alveoli (tiny air sacs) of our lungs.

And finally, the American Industrial Hygiene Association (AIHA) reports that 100,000 ppm (10%) of CO_2 is the atmospheric concentration immediately dangerous to life.

Scientific studies on higher levels of CO2

Altitude sickness is caused by hyperventilation, which results in increased oxygen (O_2) in the blood but decreased CO_2. (Note: oxygen (O) occurs as a molecule in nature, hence the symbol O_2) The lowered CO_2 will not allow the increased O_2 to be utilized. Adjusting to this condition is called "ventilatory acclimatization". While it is not completely understood all that happens during this process, it has been observed by experimentation that supplementing CO_2 prevents this acclimatization as well as preventing the sickness. It appears that respiratory distress due to lower levels of O_2 (requiring ventilatory acclimatization) can be relieved or eliminated by the application of a higher level of CO_2.

This might be a good time to ask: since we exhale CO_2, why do we need it to be present in the air we inhale? Good question, but apparently, we do as demonstrated by the above experiment. Other experiments found that simply circulating CO_2 up one nostril and out the other while the subject held their breath cured migraine headaches as well as allergic symptoms. Other researchers propose administering CO_2 to people who suffer from epilepsy, Parkinson's, and autism as well. Clearly, we are affected by low

levels of CO_2 in the air we breathe and need to acclimatize to these low levels, if we can, but not everyone can. Consider:

 People who experience periodic breathing as well as apnea (cessation of breathing) during sleep benefit from higher levels of CO_2. These conditions affect a lot of older people.

 Increased levels of CO_2 can improve the sleep of young people as well. One study found that healthy young men on a submarine slept well when CO_2 levels rose but not as well when the levels dropped.

 Furthermore it's administered in the form of medical gas (1% to 10%) for many medical conditions to stimulate respiration. For example, people with asthma require from 3% to 5% for therapeutic effect. Studies suggest that a lower level than this but somewhat higher than present atmospheric levels would prevent the attacks in the first place and prevent subclinical symptoms associated with asthma such as anxiety, insomnia, immune dysfunction and excessive sensitivity to pain. CO_2 levels higher than 5 per cent are used for extreme cases such as for treating victims of asphyxiation and to stimulate breathing of newborn infants as well as speeding recovery of patients who have been anesthetized.

 The majority of us have some degree of lung impairment, which affects the more critical function of the lungs in regulating the proper level of CO_2 in the alveoli (tiny air sacs). Metabolic syndrome alone includes approximately 20 – 30 % of adults in the U.S. and Europe. Then there are smokers, asthmatics, and people with miner's lung, emphysema and scarred lungs due to previous bouts of pneumonia, old people, and many more conditions. Furthermore, a wide range of medical conditions and infectious diseases manifest in pulmonary symptoms. All these conditions can require medical gas because the present atmospheric level is not optimum and appears to lack a safety margin for people with lung impairment. Breathing is a tricky business. We have to breathe fast and deep enough to get the O_2 we need but not so fast as to hyperventilate and lose control of our blood's CO_2 balance (pH). Over the last 50 million years the O_2 level and CO_2 level have both dropped as well as atmospheric density, which puts us into the same predicament as the mountain climber who must acclimatize to a higher altitude. Even healthy mountain climbers reach a level at which they cannot further adapt. People with lung impairment are like the climber who has reached that level. Either an increase in the O_2 level or an increase in the CO_2 level would be a benefit. It is for good reason that people hospitalized are fitted with air tubes to their nostrils providing them very high levels of oxygen and carbon dioxide. (Typically, 4.5 times the oxygen but, more importantly, 130 times the carbon dioxide that is in the atmosphere)

 Experiments have shown that even healthy people have different tolerances (or sensitivity) to CO_2 levels. However, we can all acclimatize to much higher levels simply by constant exposure to those levels. Physiological changes occur as well as adaptive breathing changes. There is a curious variation in these physiological changes noted in studies of people who live at higher altitudes, which seem to be a result of genetics. The natural experiment of human colonization of high-altitude plateaus on three continents has resulted in two—perhaps three—quantitatively different arterial-oxygen-content phenotypes among Andean, Tibetan and Ethiopian high-altitude populations. The dominance of Ethiopian (and neighboring Kenyan) athletes in endurance marathon running events would appear to be a result of their unique evolutionary adaptation in this regard.

Making Sense of it all while keeping it simple

The two most immediate concerns when treating patients in intensive care are their blood gasses and their blood electrolytes. Marathon runners frequently pass out and can even die because they did not replenish their electrolytes that were depleted through excessive sweating. One of these electrolytes (bicarbonate) acts as a buffer in the blood to regulate the blood's pH but can be depleted in an attempt to compensate for blood gases. (The reverse can also happen as respiration can change and become distressed in an attempt to compensate for bicarbonate.) Consider the mountain climber who has to acclimatize to a higher altitude over a one or two day period (ventilatory acclimatization). It is a slow change in his body chemistry using his available bicarbonate that makes this possible. To a lesser degree, we all depend on these electrolytes on a daily basis; a proper diet is essential to replenish them.

Our blood gasses (O_2 & CO_2) depend on the efficiency of our respiration, which consist of two phases: oxygenation (intake of O_2) and ventilation (exhalation of CO_2). The audio clip nicely explains the ventilatory phase and what happens when we breathe too fast and lose control of our CO_2 but what it fails to address are the problems we can encounter when we don't get enough oxygen. These problems are the result of the ventilatory phase being much more efficient than the oxygenation phase due to various factors. Here are three: (1) ease of exchange of CO_2 is normally 20X the ease with which O_2 can be exchanged; (2) swelling and/or scarring of the lung tissue will impede O_2 transfer more than CO_2; (3) the impulse to take another breath is determined by the CO_2 content of our blood, not the O_2 content. Here is how a higher CO_2 level helps: it decreases the CO_2 rate of exchange during the ventilatory phase causing the need for more vigorous breathing to maintain a CO_2 balance and this helps our uptake of oxygen. In other words, it stimulates our breathing and better balances the oxygenation phase with the ventilatory phase.

Conclusion

Over the last 350 million years CO_2 has varied by 10 fold, approximately 250 ppm to 2,500 ppm with an average level of 1,500 ppm. This average level happens to be the optimum level for plants, it seems by evolutionary design, and is the reason that this level of CO_2 is used in greenhouses Since plants and animals evolved together it's likely that humans also evolved to function best at some higher level. However, at 380 ppm we are not far from the lower end of that 10-fold range. Because so many people benefit from enhanced levels of CO_2, it appears that our present atmosphere is already lower than the minimum to which some people can adapt. Scientific studies and established medical practices leave no doubt that increased levels of CO_2 help people with respiratory problems and, some time in our lives, that will include nearly every one of us.