

The Week That Was (June 13, 2009) brought to you by SEPP

Quote of the Week:

"To kill an error is as good a service as, and sometimes better than, the establishing of a new truth or fact"
Charles Darwin

THIS WEEK

Myron Ebell (Cooler Heads Coalition) reports on June 12: "House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-San Francisco) and Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Henry Waxman (D-Beverly Hills) are making mighty efforts to get the Waxman-Markey energy-rationing bill to the House floor before the Fourth-of-July recess, which is scheduled to begin on 26th June. The main obstacle to passage appears to be a group of moderate Democrats centered in the Agriculture Committee and led by Collin Peterson (D-Minn.), the Committee's Chairman. Peterson claimed to have forty-five votes as he started horse trading with Pelosi and Waxman. I expect that the Democratic leadership will come up with enough votes to pass H. R. 2454 narrowly, and with only a handful of Republican votes. They are rushing because they realize that the bill could implode at any time. Should you care to tell your Representative whether to vote Yes or No on H. R. 2454, the Capitol switchboard number is (202) 225-3121. Live operators will connect you to your Member even if you don't know his name -- if you give your zip code."

"California, the world leader in energy rationing (after North Korea, Cuba, etc.), now looks likely to go bankrupt by end of July. Californians Pelosi, Waxman, and Boxer are actively promoting at the federal level the policies that are contributing to the decline of the once-Golden State."

Congressional Budget Office cost estimates for HR 2454 <http://www.cbo.gov/doc.cfm?index=10262> are likely too low. Independent analyses by **Charles River Associates Inc.** and the National Association of Manufacturers predict the Waxman-Markey bill will cost millions of domestic jobs as manufacturers relocate plants to countries with less draconian environmental regulations. Meanwhile, electricity rates under a 'cap-and-tax' system would, as President Barack Obama said in January 2008, "necessarily skyrocket," -- by some estimates up to \$4,300 each year.

The Waxman-Markey climate bill amounts to a \$9 trillion tax that will reduce personal consumption by up to \$2 trillion by mid-century, according to an analysis presented yesterday by the left-leaning **Brookings Institution**. Implementing a cap-and-trade system similar to the one being considered by Congress will likely decrease U.S. gross domestic product more than 2 percent by mid-century and increase unemployment. No effort was made to estimate the benefits of the bill, apparently because of the difficulty of such an estimation, according to a report in <http://www.carboncontrolnews.com/> of June 9, 2009.

Meanwhile, US climate negotiator Todd Stern traveled to **China**, with WH science adviser John Holdren in tow. Their 'Mission Impossible': persuade China to cut CO2 emissions and economic growth. But "Modern China cares about as much about 'anthropogenic global warming' as Chairman Mao did about providing his population with five-course steak dinners. AGW's only use, as far as the Chinese are concerned, is as an ingenious device to suck up money and power from the gullible West. And this isn't meant to be an insult to the Chinese, by the way. I mean it wholly as a compliment to their far-sightedness, shrewdness and pragmatism. [James Delingpole, The Daily Telegraph, 10 June 2009]

Japan has announced a target of cutting greenhouse gas emissions by 15% over the next 11 years - a figure derided by environmentalists as "appalling". The target equates to a cut of about 8% from 1990 levels, the commonly used baseline. By comparison, the EU plans a 20% reduction over the same period. [BBC reports <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8092866.stm>]

As things look ominously grim for the upcoming (Dec 2009) **Copenhagen** gabfest, we can expect AGWAs (AGW activists), including some scientists, to become more and more aggressive in their use of 'evidence'

to support a case for drastic policies. A number of (formerly) respected national science academies (incl the US-NAS) have joined in issuing statements that are blatantly untrue. All this will lead to more pious declarations by politicians before and during Copenhagen – but no real action.

SEPP Science Editorial #17-2009 (6/13/09)

Climate Sensitivity (CS), Negative Feedback (NF), and all that

Based on empirical evidence, various researchers have concluded that CS is much smaller than the model-derived values quoted by the IPCC. Some of the empirical studies compare observed temperature trends over time with IPCC values [Schwartz, Monckton, etc]; others [Douglass, Singer, NIPCC] compare observed and modeled *patterns* of temperature trends (“fingerprints”)

CS is conventionally defined as the equilibrium temp rise caused by a doubled forcing of GH gases; it is often taken to be just a doubling of CO2 levels. The ‘canonical’ CS values of the IPCC range from 1.5 to 4.5 C, with a median of 3.0 C. Many model calculations show higher values, depending on assumptions about cloud parameters; for example, Stainforth et al [2005] quote as high as 11.5 C.

The empirical values for CS are all well below the IPCC’s; some are 0.5 C or even less, corresponding to a trend of Global Mean Sfc Temp (GMST) of only about 0.05 C/decade and a tropical troposphere trend of about 0.1 C/decade. These trends are at or below the limit of detection, because of the interfering effects of aerosol emissions (both natural and anthropogenic), volcanic eruptions, El Niños and other, less dramatic atmosphere-ocean interactions.

The ‘fingerprint’ method can only conclude that anthropogenic effects are not detected [NIPCC], and yields no values for CS – only an upper limit of perhaps 0.3 C, an order of magnitude smaller than the IPCC’s median value.

How to account for the huge discrepancy between IPCC and NIPCC? In principle, one can invoke natural forcings, both external (solar) and internal, as well as aerosols that affect the optical properties of the atmosphere. It is tempting, however, to first investigate the possibility of **negative feedbacks** within the climate system itself, principally the various effects of water in the atmosphere.

Atmospheric water can occur in three different forms: as a gas -- water vapor (WV), as liquid cloud droplets, and as solid ice particles. In principle, one can measure the climate effects of each component, as we shall discuss below.

1. **Liquid:** The negative feedback effects of water droplets are easiest to visualize [Singer WSJ 1988]. As the oceans warm, increased evaporation can increase cloudiness, increasing optical albedo, and reducing the incidence of solar radiation at the surface – thus reducing any warming caused by increasing GH gases. But measuring such an albedo change is difficult, requiring accuracies of a fraction of a percent and exceptional stability over a number of years.

2. **WV:** Models all assume a constant relative humidity with altitude; thus WV in the cold upper troposphere (UT) will radiate at a low temperature and contribute little to OLR (outgoing long-wave radiation), with the remainder therefore coming from the warm surface. (Total OLR is fixed and must equal absorbed solar energy.) However, if atmospheric processes manage to achieve a drying of the UT (as GH gases increase) [Ellsaesser, Gray, Lindzen], then WV will radiate at the higher temperature of the boundary layer, contribute the bulk of the OLR, and leave less IR emission from the surface.

Satellite measurements, such as by the AIRS instrument, can resolve the WV bands in the OLR and determine the source temperature. Data would be required versus latitude, and over a number of years.

3. **Ice:** Convective activity in the tropics can transport moisture to heights near the tropopause where ice crystals would form cirrus clouds, often invisible but having strong absorption properties over the entire

effective IR region. A reduction of the area covered by cirrus (“iris effect” – Lindzen) would permit more escape of IR from the surface and thus produce a cooling -- a negative feedback.

Again, AIRS data could obtain the necessary confirming data by observing long-term trends.

NF is not a sure thing; aerosols and/or natural forcings can reduce and even overcome GH warming. At present, one cannot tell which of the possible NF effects is dominant; but the right kind of data could help settle the issue. Establishing the magnitude of NF would independently confirm the low values of CS.

1. The GOP's energy alternative

2. Climate sceptics beat Labour in EU elections

3. As wind power grows, a push to tear down dams

4. Courting China

5. ‘Carbon Cops’: Australian police to prosecute a new range of 'climate offenses'

6. Denouncing false claims about wind energy

7. Burger King franchisee strikes back at global warming ‘sheeple’

NEWS YOU CAN USE

In a joint statement, the science academies of the G8 countries, plus Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and South Africa, called on their leaders to "seize all opportunities" to address global climate change that "**is happening even faster than previously estimated.**" The signers, which include NAS President Ralph J. Cicerone, urged nations at the upcoming Copenhagen climate talks to adopt goals aimed at reducing global emissions by 50 percent by 2050.

SEPP says: So ‘previous estimates’ are wrong. But we knew that: Global climate is cooling

BP Group chief executive, Tony Hayward, describing its annual Statistical Review of World Energy: “Our data confirms that the world has enough proved reserves of oil, natural gas and coal to meet the worlds needs for decades to come. The challenges the world faces in growing supplies to meet future demand are not below ground, they are above ground. They are human, not geological.” *SEPP says: Hmm. We wonder which humans he is talking about? Could they be in the US Congress?*

As evidence for AGW vanishes and the public (and even some media) becomes increasingly skeptical, GW fanatics are becoming increasingly shrill and bloodthirsty. They are being egged on by the likes of James Hansen, Robert F Kennedy, Jr, David Suzuki, and Nancy Pelosi – who should be held responsible and charged with ‘incitement’ if there is real violence and murder http://www.sfexaminer.com/opinion/columns/mark_tapscott/Beware-of-blood-lust-on-the-Left-47733932.html

WINNIPEG, Manitoba (Reuters 9 June 2009) - The multiple frosts that have blanketed Western Canada in the last week are the most widespread in the top canola-growing province of Saskatchewan in at least five years, the Canola Council of Canada said on Tuesday. That new

growth is slow to appear with generally cool temperatures **holding crop development behind schedule.**

Scientists' best conjecture regarding the conditions that signal the start of a new glacial period are cool, wet summers. Is this the beginning of Little Ice Age II, the sequel? **If so, we will look back fondly on the time we were all so concerned about global warming.** Remember, in the words of SF author Orson Scott Card, 'global warming' is just another term for 'good weather.'

<http://theresilientearth.com/?q=content/little-ice-age-ii-sequel>

"Opening Pandora's Box" <http://www.frontpagemag.com/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=35146>

A good read, as are many other essays by Prof Mark **Hendrickson** of Grove City College, PA

UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

HR 2454: Waxman-Turkey? Cap'nTax? or RAT Scheme (CO2 Ration and Tax Scheme)? [Hat tip to Viv Forbes, Chm, The Carbon Sense Coalition (Australia)]

http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/11/us/11recycle.html?_r=1&ref=science

"People will embrace composting just like they embraced recycling, said [spokesman for SF Mayor [Gavin Newsom](#)], who himself began composting kitchen scraps six months ago. Here in San Francisco people are crazy about recycling. Composting is the next frontier."

"Smart chemists. Innovative thinking. That's the key to solving global challenges of the 21st Century"

http://portal.acs.org/portal/acs/corg/content?nfpb=true&pageLabel=PP_ARTICLEMAIN&node_id=2101&content_id=WPCP_012714&use_sec=true&sec_url_var=region1&uuid=bdfd8977-5daa-4132-9d68-c2fe83bd5404

Chemists suggest a brilliant 'solution' to sequestering carbon. Bury agricultural wastes in deep-sea sediments. *SEPP says: But why not just use it as a biofuel? Or even turn it into ethanol or methanol?*

Another 'energy expert' ready to solve our GW problem: Rep. Nancy **Pelosi** on NBC's "Meet the Press"

"I believe in natural gas as a clean, cheap alternative to fossil fuels.... clean compared to fossil fuels."

<http://blogs.wsj.com/environmentalcapital/2008/08/25/fuel-for-debate-pelosi-suggests-natural-gas-isnt-a-fossil-fuel/>

#####

1. THE GOP'S ENERGY ALTERNATIVE

Mike Pence, John Shimkus and Fred Upton, WSJ June 11, 2009.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124467604217304035.html>

H/t NCPA

Independent analyses predict the Waxman-Markey bill will cost millions of domestic jobs as manufacturers relocate plants to countries with less draconian environmental regulations.

Meanwhile, the electricity rates under a cap-and-trade system would "necessarily skyrocket," by some estimates up to \$4,300 per household each year. This is not the way to go, say Congressmen Pence, Shimkus, and Upton, Republicans from Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan, resp.

Instead, House Republicans have unveiled legislation that will lead to lower prices, more jobs, a cleaner environment and greater energy independence: the **American Energy Act** -- which establishes a national goal of licensing 100 new nuclear reactors over the next 20 years:

- o With 31 announced reactor applications already in the pipeline, this goal can be achieved -- and it will revitalize an entire manufacturing sector, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs.

o The bill also streamlines a cumbersome regulatory process by offering a two-year, fast-track approval program for power-plant applications that employ safe reactor designs already approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

o The NRC will also be allowed to finish its review of a national repository without political interference, and the federal government will be prevented from blocking other storage facilities if a state and locality chose to contract with a private company for that purpose.

America also needs to develop more of its own natural resources such as oil and natural gas, and the American Energy Act allows for exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and for environmentally sound leasing of oil and natural gas fields in the outer continental shelf, and on federally owned lands with oil shale in the West, say the Congressmen.

Finally, the American Energy Act encourages personal responsibility through conservation. The bill offers tax incentives for the purchase of energy-efficient vehicles and rewards homeowners for making their homes more energy efficient, say the Congressmen.

2. CLIMATE SCEPTICS BEAT LABOUR IN EU ELECTIONS [H/t CCNet]

Labour was slaughtered in the European polls - pushed into third place behind the Tories and the UK Independence Party. Labour's 15.3% share - the lowest for a party in power since 1918 - was even worse than party chiefs feared following the expenses scandal and the start of a Cabinet rebellion. That will spark another bid to oust Mr Brown by ex-ministers and Labour backbenchers following last week's near wipe-out in the council elections.

--*Liverpool Echo*, 8 June 2009

All over Europe, the centre-left has been haemorrhaging core voters. The fact that UKIP, an openly climate-sceptical party, has beaten Labour to second place is a clear signal. It suggests that any party promoting unpopular climate policies and green taxes that will further increase the cost of energy, transport and travel for ordinary families risks being punished in future elections. As far as Britain is concerned, the Labour government and its green agenda is finished. Let that be a warning to President Obama and other would-be salvationists.

--*Benny Peiser*, 8 June 2009

The UK Independence Party has finished second in the European elections, ahead of Labour, on an impressive night for the Eurosceptic party. It performed strongly in the East of England, where it won two seats and its total vote went up, and also picked up seats in Yorkshire and London. It gained 17.4% of the vote and increased its number of MEPs to 13, one more than it achieved in 2004.

--*BBC News*, 8 June 2009

The UK Independence Party believes that global warming is a recognisable phenomenon, but that there is insufficient proof that this is generated by carbon emissions. The over-reaction by other parties to global warming borders on the hysterical, and risks damaging Britain's economy and its people's way of life. By inappropriate taxation, ill-judged Government intervention and misguided diversion of funding, 'gesture environmentalism' will harm Britain's ability to respond effectively to environmental challenges both in the present and the future.

--*UKIP Programme on Climate and Energy*

Analysts last night said the climate talks were most likely to stall over money. Developing countries, backed by the UN, argue that they will need hundreds of billions of dollars a year to adapt themselves to climate-related disasters, loss of crops and water supplies, which they are already experiencing as temperatures rise. Yet so far, as a Guardian investigation revealed in February, rich countries have pledged only a few billion dollars and have provided only a few hundred million.

--*John Vidal*, *The Guardian*, 8 June 2009

3. AS WIND POWER GROWS, A PUSH TO TEAR DOWN DAMS

Now, with the focus in Washington on clean power, some dam agencies are starting to go green, embracing wind power and energy conservation. The most aggressive is the Bonneville Power Administration, whose power lines carry much of the electricity in the Pacific Northwest. The agency also provides a third of the regions power supply, drawn mostly from generators inside big dams.

The amount of wind power on the Bonneville transmission system quadrupled in the last three years and is expected to double again in another two. The turbines are making an electricity system with low carbon emissions even greener; already, in Seattle, more than 90 percent of the power comes from renewable sources.

Yet the shift of emphasis at the dam agencies is proving far from simple. It could end up pitting one environmental goal against another, a tension that is emerging in renewable-power projects across the country.

Environmental groups contend that the Bonneville Power Administrations shift to [wind turbines](#) buttresses their case for tearing down dams in the agency's territory, particularly four along the lower Snake River in Washington State that helped decimate one of North Americas great runs of wild salmon.

Bonneville wants to keep all the dams, arguing that they not only provide cheap power but they also make an ideal complement to large-scale installation of wind power. When the wind slows and power production drops, the agency argues, it can compensate quickly by telling the [Army Corps of Engineers](#) and the Bureau of Reclamation, which operate the dams, to release more water from reservoirs to turn the huge generators. When the wind picks up, dam operations can be slowed.

The dams help alleviate a need for natural-gas-fired power plants, which are used in other regions as a backup power source when the wind stops blowing, but which release carbon dioxide that contributes to [global warming](#).

By balancing wind power with hydropower, the Bonneville Power Administration says it believes it can limit the use of natural gas and coal plants across the West, even as the regions demand for electricity rises. Around the country, dams provide 6 percent of electricity generation -- double the amount from other renewable sources like wind, [solar power](#) and biomass -- and much of that is concentrated in the West.

The influx of wind on Bonneville's system has come as a result of renewable power goals set by governments in the Western states, which aim to reduce their output of greenhouse gases. Bonneville says that when the wind is blowing most strongly, 18 percent of the power in its control area now comes from wind, and that number may rise to 30 percent next year. (Not all of that is consumed in the Pacific Northwest; some is sold to California.)

The rise in wind power means that the dam agency has emerged as a national test case for how to integrate large amounts of intermittent wind power into a regional electric grid. "I've described this as a grand experiment," said Stephen J. Wright, the administrator of the 72-year-old Bonneville Power Administration.

The agency stresses the challenge it faces, making sure the lights stay on despite the ups and downs of the wind. Many new wind farms lie along the gusty Columbia River corridor, and their concentration means that changes in the wind can bring sudden dips and spikes in the power they generate. "We can have periods that go from full, maximum wind output to zero across an hour," Mr. Wright said.

MORE at <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/12/business/energy-environment/12bonneville.html?pagewanted=1&r=1&ref=science>

4. COURTING CHINA

<<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6452183.ece>>
Tim Reid in Washington, The Times, 8 June 2009

America's leading climate change negotiator will urge China to make a commitment to cutting greenhouse gas emissions during meetings in Beijing this week, as the US seeks to avoid the collapse of the next global warming treaty.

Todd Stern and a number of the Obama Administration's senior climate experts traveling with him are intent on boosting co-operation between the US and China to convince developing countries to back a new global climate treaty due to be approved in Copenhagen in December. More than 180 nations are working to endorse a successor to the Kyoto Protocol, which expires in 2012.

Mr Stern traveled to Beijing with the White House science adviser John Holdren and David Sandalow, the Assistant Energy Secretary. Last week Mr Stern said that he did not expect a written agreement from the trip, but he wanted the visit to help to set the tone with the developing world.

Together, China and the US are responsible for 40 per cent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. China's contribution has skyrocketed in the past two decades and is expected to be twice that of the US by 2030. During a visit to China last month, John Kerry, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that "Copenhagen will be defined by what the US and China agree on in the next few weeks".

China has avoided setting targets or timetables for limiting emissions, but it has some of the most stringent vehicle emission standards in the world and is investing heavily in alternative and renewable energy sources. In the past decade, it has become the world's largest generator of wind energy. The US Congress is looking at legislation to cut emissions by 17 per cent, from 2005 levels, by 2020 - but Mr Stern said that such action by the US would be futile without firm commitments from China.

Two gorillas walk into a UN climate meeting.

http://blogs.nature.com/news/thegreatbeyond/2009/06/two_gorillas_walk_into_a_un_cl_1.html

Do they wind up in a standoff, beating their chests as the other primates stand by angry and embarrassed? Or might they initiate an inspiring public display of mutual respect and cooperation, if not affection?

The United States' lead climate negotiator, Todd Stern, is hoping for the latter and will depart for China on Saturday in search of ways to make it happen. "We're the two gorillas in the room," Stern **told a crowd** gathered at the Center for American Progress in Washington this week. "If we can join hands, it will truly change the world."

Among those accompanying Stern will be White House Science Adviser John Holdren and David Sandalow, assistant secretary for policy and international affairs at the Energy Department. It is only the latest in a string of delegations shuttling back and forth between the two countries, and it comes at a potentially revealing time.

The rest of the international climate community will be focusing on Bonn, where the United Nations is currently holding the latest round of **global warming talks**. With 184 days before Copenhagen, where the talks are scheduled to come to a close, the two countries appear to be seeking a little quiet time together.

The US-China relationship has sparked a fair bit of speculation as of late, spurred in part by an [article](#) about "secret" bilateral talks in the Guardian last month. In truth, the talks [weren't all that secret](#), and in any case it would have been surprising if such talks weren't underway. But the sense of optimism raised plenty of eyebrows.

The China question is critical in Washington, where many lawmakers are loath to commit to a new regulatory regime without assurances that China will follow. Things are a little harder to gauge in Beijing, where the government's primary mandate remains economic development for its 1.3 billion people, most of whom remain locked in poverty. Many experts, however, believe China understands the problem, is already taking action, and will do its part if the United States can get the ball rolling.

=====

CHINA DOESN'T GIVE A STUFF ABOUT GLOBAL WARMING: THANK GOD!

James Delingpole, The Daily Telegraph, 10 June 2009

http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/james_delingpole/blog/2009/06/10/china_doesnt_give_a_stuff_about_global_warming_thank_god

"China launches green power revolution to catch up on west" [sic] shrieks the front-page headline in today's *Guardian*. It's a nonsense, of course. Modern China cares about as much about "anthropogenic global warming" as Chairman Mao did about providing his population with five-course steak dinners. AGW's only use, as far as the Chinese are concerned, is as an ingenious device to suck up money and power from the gullible west.

And this isn't meant to be an insult to the Chinese, by the way. I mean it wholly as a compliment to their far-sightedness, shrewdness and pragmatism. Over the last ten days, delegation after US delegation has gone to China in a vain bid to persuade its leadership to believe in - or at least pay lip-service to - the mythical beast they call ManBearPig.

How has China responded? Why, with exactly the mix of incredulity, scorn and cynicism you'd expect of a hungry, fast-industrialising nation whose priority is economic growth rather than, say, assuaging breast-beating liberal guilt about how we've sinned against Mother Gaia and must now flagellate ourselves for our sins with swingeing new eco taxes and punitive regulation.

Here is what Li Gao, China's chief climate change negotiator has to say on the subject:

"Developed countries have neither enough active responses to proposals from developing countries about emission-cut target by 2020, nor interests in providing funds and technologies to help developing countries adapt to climate change."

This is diplomatic hardball speak for: "If you in the West wish us to play your silly carbon emissions-cutting game, you must not only bribe us with large sums of money but you must also place your industries at an even greater competitive disadvantage by crippling them with CO2 legislation from which we, in developing countries like China, Brazil and India, shall remain happily exempt."

To anyone who understands China, this is all so obvious as scarcely to be worth stating. As one of my contacts, a Shanghai-based US industrialist put it at the time of Nancy Pelosi's cap-in-hand begging mission to Beijing:

"The idea of looking to China for any sort of environmental leadership or effective environmental cooperation is simply preposterous. China currently appears to be operating under a triad of very basic principles:

- 1) No policies shall be enacted which would interfere with China's economic growth
- 2) China shall increase its energy production and security by any and all means possible, as quickly as possible.

3) International agreements shall transfer massive amounts of capital, industry, and technology from the West to fund China's energy development."

What beggars belief is that the whole of the current US administration thinks that China is in fact gullible and pliable. First, came the deeply humiliating visit by Nancy "Waterboarding? What waterboarding?" Pelosi, in which she determinedly avoided mentioning China's human rights record, the better to sell America's interests down the river on green issues.

So desperate was Pelosi to secure a climate change deal that, somewhat chillingly, she even appeared ready to treat Americans in future not unlike citizens of communist China, saying: "Every aspect of our lives must be subjected to an inventory ... of how we are taking responsibility."

This week it has been the turn of Todd D Stern, Hillary Clinton's envoy on climate change to have the Chinese flip him the bird in Beijing. Reports the *Washington Post*:

"On Monday, Vice Premier Li Keqiang told Stern that China would 'actively' participate in climate talks but only on the basis of a 'common but differentiated responsibility' to reduce emissions, according to a transcript of his comments published on the official Web site of China's State Council."

i.e. - "Sell us your souls and, er, hey, how does 'zilch' sound as a reasonable trade-off?"

All this is, of course, absolutely disastrous news for the environmentalist extremists who play such a large and terrifying role in the Obama administration. But for anyone in the West, in the US especially, who cares about liberty, the state of the economy, or the free citizen's inalienable right not to have his every hard-earned cent sucked into the gaping maw of eco tax and eco regulation in order to solve a problem that doesn't even exist, China's hard-headed realism may well be our only hope of salvation.

5. CARBON COPS': AUSTRALIAN POLICE TO PROSECUTE A NEW RANGE OF 'CLIMATE OFFENSES'

Excerpt: FRONTLINE police will be forced to become "carbon cops" under the Government's blueprint to cut greenhouse emissions. The *Herald Sun* can reveal Australian Federal Police agents will have to prosecute a new range of climate offences. But they are yet to be offered extra resources, stretching the thin blue line to breaking point. **"The Government is effectively saying to us, 'Ignore other crime types',"** Australian Federal Police Association chief Jim Torr said. The group had been trying for months, without success, to discuss the issue with Climate Change Minister Penny Wong, he said. **Interpol has warned the carbon market will be irresistible to criminal gangs because of the vast amounts of cash to be made.** Possible rorts include under-reporting of carbon emissions by firms and bogus carbon-offset schemes. "If someone is rorting it by even 1 per cent a year, we're talking about many, many millions of dollars," Mr Torr said.

<http://www.news.com.au/heraldsun/story/0,21985,25623185-661,00.html> H/t ClimateDepot.com

6. DENOUNCING FALSE CLAIMS ABOUT WIND ENERGY.

Mark Duchamp, Director, Climate Change and Alternative Energies, Iberica 2000
PRESS RELEASE from IBERICA 2000, June 8th 2009

The wind-power lobby, speaking through their international network of wind energy associations, have been claiming that wind farms lower the cost of electricity. They insist on the fact that wind is free, but forget to say that capital costs are so high that the kilowatts produced are three times

more expensive than their market price. This is why we pay huge subsidies to wind-farm owners. But there is more.

Lobbyists claim that wind power displaces electricity produced at high cost by "low merit", "peaking" plants. What they forget to say is that wind blows more strongly at night, which means that much of the production being displaced by wind farms is that of base-load generation, which is mainly cheap coal, or clean and cheap nuclear energy. This would tend to increase the average price of electricity, not reduce it.

And when demand is so low that electricity produced by wind farms at night cannot be used (or exported), wind farms are shut off, as it occurred several times in Spain this year. How is that for waste ?

Another hidden cost often overlooked is that of back-up : When wind is blowing during the day, ideally during peak hours when millions of people arrive at their homes and switch on lights and appliances, the electricity production of expensive "peak load" generating units may be displaced by wind farm production. But the devil is in the detail: if some plants may be shut off entirely, others may be kept spinning in standby, synchronized to the Grid, burning fuel for nothing. They are kept in this mode to be ready to resume production instantly if the wind drops.

And other power plants will see their production only partially displaced: they will operate at part load. In this mode they work less efficiently, burning more fuel per KWh produced. This too increases cost, and causes more emissions of a variety of gases. They will also have to ramp their production up and down frequently, following the vagaries of the wind. If they didn't "load-follow" this way, there would be blackouts at every variation in wind speed. This frequent ramping causes more fuel to be burned and more gases to be released, just like a car in city traffic. And there is more wear and tear, which also bears on the overall cost of electricity.

But the main cost of back-up, which consumers will end up paying in the end, is the construction of conventional power plants duplicating the installed capacity of wind farms. For electricity cannot be stored in sufficient quantities at an acceptable cost: it must be produced in real time, dovetailing demand by the minute. So when there is no wind at all, we must rely entirely on conventional generation. It is as if wind farms did not exist.

In effect we must have two plants instead of one: the wind farm, and the fossil fuel plant to take its place when there is no wind. The cost of this duplication of investment is never mentioned by governments or by the wind lobby. In addition, it is wasteful to build power plants that will only generate electricity when there is no wind, or at part load when it blows below optimal speed. Fixed costs cannot be amortized, and the consumer must pick up the bill.

Oh, I forgot : back up plants will also produce electricity when the wind blows too strongly, for wind turbines automatically shut off when wind speed exceeds ~100 km/h. Thermal plants are thus kept spinning in standby, waiting for it to happen on some windy days, burning fuel but not producing any electricity. Another waste, another cost.

So when the wind lobby claims that wind power lowers the cost of electricity, it would be naive to take their word for it. We'd have to forget: 1) - the subsidies that double the market price of wind-produced electricity, 2) - the capital costs of duplicating generation capacity for the days without wind, 3) - the fuel burnt inefficiently or wastefully to back-up the wind farms (and the emissions of gases resulting from this activity), 4) - the added wear and tear of conventional power plants.

And even more fuel will be burned, and more gases will be emitted during the production and transportation of wind turbines, during the construction and maintenance of wind farms, and during their decommissioning. This will be additional to the fuel burned and the gases released during the construction of conventional plants, which are needed anyway for the days without wind. - So much for saving the planet!

Incidentally, the wind lobby is also misrepresenting when it claims that the 10% drop in the market price of Spanish electricity in the early months of 2009 was caused by wind power. The real cause was a drop in electricity consumption due to the recession, a drop that reached 13.5% in April.

Moral of the story: Goliath (the wind industry) has billions in hard cash to produce misleading reports. David (Iberica 2000) can't compete, relying as it does on benevolent work.

But the truth only needs a keyboard to be told, and as long as the press remains free to publish it, there will be hope.

7. BURGER KING FRANCHISEE STRIKES BACK AT GLOBAL WARMING SHEEPLE*

By Gretchen Randall, WINNINGGREEN, June 8, 2009

Issue: A Memphis owner of 40 Burger King restaurants, Mirabile Investment Corporation (MIC), displayed "**Global warming is baloney**" on the signs in front of many of its stores scattered throughout Tennessee. Burger King corporate headquarters has said the franchise owner does not speak for the entire company and has told the franchisee to remove the signs, which it says, are in violation of its franchise agreement.

However, J.J. McNelis, MIC Marketing president, told the *UK Guardian*, "Burger King can bluster all they want about what they can tell the franchisee to do, but we have free-speech rights in this country so I don't think there's any concerns."

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/05/burger-king-global-warming-us>

Meanwhile, Keith Olberman of MSNBC named the franchisee owner as the worst person in the world on his show after reading about the signs.

** (From Wikipedia) Sheeple is a term of disparagement, a play on the words "sheep" and "people." It is often used to denote persons who voluntarily acquiesce to a perceived authority or suggestion, without sufficient research to understand fully the scope of the ramifications involved in that decision, and thus undermine their own human individuality or in other cases give up certain rights. The implication of sheeple is that as a collective, people believe whatever they are told, especially if told so by a perceived authority figure believed to be trustworthy, without processing it or doing adequate research to be sure that it is an accurate representation of the real world around them.*