

far-seeing program of universal, heavily nationalized health care; a cap-and-trade tax on energy; and a major federalization of education with universal access to college as the goal.

Amazing. As an explanation of our current economic difficulties, this is total fantasy. As a cure for rapidly growing joblessness, a massive destruction of wealth, a deepening worldwide recession, this is perhaps the greatest non sequitur ever foisted upon the American people, Krauthammer said.

Worse, Krauthammer says, is that Obama tries to have it both ways, with the alleged errors of deregulation being compounded into the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression by Americas failure to nationalize health care, shift our economy to alternative energy sources, and give everybody a free pass to college.

In other words, Obama is trying to make the cause and the cure synonymous. Clever politics, but intellectually dishonest to the core, Krauthammer said.

I would only disagree that the Obama deception represents a clever political strategy. The deception represents the fundamental flaw in the Obama strategy and indeed that of the Washington liberals who are racing to enact as much of their agenda as possible before the 2010 election.

SEPP Science Editorial #9-09 (3/7/09)

The sea-ice issue – a ‘tempest in a teapot.’ Conservative columnist George Will is under attack about alleged reporting ‘inaccuracies.’ See <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/26/AR2009022602906.html?sid=ST2009022702494>

The affair – as seen by the Columbia Journalism Review: But they are wrong; Will is correct. http://www.cjr.org/the_observatory/the_george_will_affair.php?page=all&print=true

SEPP Comments:

****George Will is a 'big boy' and can take care of himself. He certainly needs no help from me.**

****The whole affair seems contrived -- almost like a conspiracy by the AGW (anthropogenic GW) alarmists. By attacking a 'high-visibility' doubter *en masse*, they hope to intimidate not only Will but others who don't follow the IPCC gospel that preaches AGW.**

****I noticed, and so have many others, that the official source of sea-ice data changed their 'evidence' just after Will's article appeared. They discovered that one of their sensors had gone out of calibration. I don't doubt this fact, but I am curious about the timing of the discovery.**

****The funny thing is that the whole issue of the extent of Arctic sea ice is a 'nothing-burger' -- to use the immortal expression coined by a past EPA chief. No one seems to have commented on the fact that sea ice might tell you something about whether the air and ocean is warming or cooling but it cannot tell you anything about the CAUSE of warming/cooling. ANY kind of warming will melt ice. Simple logic. Personally, I prefer to look at thermometers and not at sea ice. And the thermometers (and also ice-core data) tell us that the Arctic is no warmer now than in the 1930s -- and much colder than centuries ago.**

****Finally, I want to emphasize that I know of no definitive evidence for AGW. None! But we have strong evidence against significant AGW. See the NIPCC report http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf I fully believe that science will win out in the end -- although it might be easier to convince the public -- and perhaps even politicians -- if the present cooling trend continues for another decade or more.**

A few years from now, when it becomes clear that “Nature, not human activity, rules the climate” a lot of Will’s critics are going to look pretty silly.

1. **Senate Democrats Critical Of Obama’s Cap-And-Trade Plans**
2. **The Real Price of Obama's Cap-and-Trade Plan**
3. **Nuking Clean Power**
4. **James Hansen's Political Science**
5. **Clinton Ranks Climate Change More Important Than Human Rights**
6. **Global Warming is not a Crisis, but it may be Creating a Crisis of Intellectual Integrity**
7. **The Ongoing CO2 Wars**
8. **Antarctic Warming and the Projected Disappearance of Emperor Penguins.**

NEWS YOU CAN USE

Climate Conference March 8-10 <http://www.heartland.org/events/NewYork09/newyork09.html>

Chris Horner on cap & trade <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?print=yes&id=30891>

=====

Fred Singer on CO2 Wars <http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=321228358224458>

=====

The George C. Marshall Institute report [*The Cost of Climate Regulation for American Households*](http://www.marshall.org/article.php?id=636) documents the economic burdens a cap-and-trade program to control greenhouse gas emissions will impose on American households. <http://www.marshall.org/article.php?id=636>

Richard Lindzen’s telling of the story gets better and better.
[http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/wpi.nsf/09133da7fb9a95db85256698006641d1/0e4e53113f856d848525751b0070e6d3/\\$FILE/Lindzen-12-9-08.pdf](http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/wpi.nsf/09133da7fb9a95db85256698006641d1/0e4e53113f856d848525751b0070e6d3/$FILE/Lindzen-12-9-08.pdf)

Adam Keiper’s thoughtful essay
<http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/science-and-the-obama-administration>

Will Happer, Princeton physicist: Serious doubts on CO2 as a climate driver
<http://www.capmag.com/article.asp?ID=5441>

<http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/8937>

Meteorologist John Coleman, founder of the Weather Channel, tells the real story behind Roger Revelle and Al Gore, winner of the Revelle award <http://www.kusi.com/weather/colemanscorner/38574742.html>

=====

An expose on WH science adviser John Holdren
<http://www.frontpagemag.com/Articles/Read.aspx?GUID=1FDD71E4-B9E4-4FAD-9868-2936193BF8F1>

EU trade ministers voted Tuesday to apply punitive tariffs to biodiesel imported from the U.S. The measure is supposed to level the playing field for European producers, who complain that U.S. subsidies for the crop-based fuel have led to a 25-fold increase in American biodiesel sales to Europe since 2006.

Like other renewable fuels, biodiesel isn't commercially viable without subsidies. But the combined power of the U.S. environmental and farming lobbies is enormous, so subsidies they receive. And it doesn't stop at taxpayer cash: Congress, in its wisdom, has also mandated ever-higher biofuel production quotas. The result is a glut of biofuel capacity. So long as oil prices are sky-high, as they were for much of 2008, alternative fuels such as biodiesel didn't look bad to consumers. But now that gasoline prices have dropped sharply, even biodiesel subsidized to the tune of \$1 a gallon won't sell.

Enter Europe, which claims U.S. biodiesel makers are dumping their excess fuel on EU markets, taking advantage of U.S. subsidies to undercut domestic firms. If EU environmental policies were really about the environment, this arguably would be a good thing. More green fuel for everyone, and on the cheap to boot.

Not so fast. It turns out that Europe -- which also isn't known for restraint in supporting farmers -- is more interested in protecting its own biodiesel industry than in seeing motorists fill their tanks with low-carbon fuel. Hence the new tariff, which comes out to \$400-\$500 per ton. Aside from the costs of all this subsidizing and penalizing, the EU's tariff makes things worse by encouraging its inefficient biodiesel producers to stay in the market. And all of this despite evidence that fuels like biodiesel increase CO2 emissions compared with fossil fuels. *And guess who pays for the subsidies?*

US climate negotiator Todd Stern has a habit of talking a big game. This is the guy who said, at his introductory press conference, "The time for denial, delay and dispute is over." But his ideas seem to have more bark than bite when it comes to his approach to climate-change policy. [WSJ]

<http://www.state.gov/g/oes/rls/remarks/2009/119983.htm>

Benny Peiser comments: It would appear that Mr Todd, despite all the rhetoric, realises that political decisions and climate treaties will not be made on the basis of "the science" after all, but on the "art of the possible", i.e. by those in the U.S. Administration whose priority is to safeguard national and economic interests above all. It's called 'Real Politik.' Which is why Mr Todd is keen to lower green expectations. He has therefore made clear that any Copenhagen agreement "will only be the start of our journey, not the end. It will provide a framework calling for ambitious actions." Note: 'ambitious actions', not Kyoto-style targets. I think China and India and the rest of the G77 might be willing to go along with this approach.

A dangerous development: Polar bears to limit CO2 emissions?

The recently passed budget by the U.S. House overturns a Bush administration regulation that forbade the use of the polar bear's listing as a threatened species to restrict carbon emissions under the Endangered Species Act. This is so far-reaching that Rep. Doc Hastings (R-WA), ranking member of the House Resources Committee, notes that this is a "dangerous policy rider that could seriously threaten new job creation and economic growth across our entire country. It was slipped into this bill behind closed doors by Democrat leaders as they wrote this massive piece of legislation. It empowers the Interior Department or a federal judge to limit potentially any carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gas emission in all fifty states, using the polar bear and Endangered Species Act as the regulatory vehicle."

Norm Rogers comments: Global warming is highly political and infested with vested interests. There is an establishment that has a lot to lose if global warming is discredited and a lot to gain if people become more alarmed and afraid. This is why there are well-financed advocacy web sites like www.realclimate.org. The establishment includes not only Al Gore, but scientists, research labs, and environmental organizations. Even though Al Gore is an obvious propagandist who distorts the science I saw him wildly applauded at the AGU meeting a few years ago. This is because his alarmist propaganda has greatly improved funding for scientists in the field. There are many embarrassing and unexplained facts in the field of global warming. Michael Mann's hockey stick curve that was exposed as bad propaganda was one. Another is the failure of the upper troposphere in the tropics to warm as the models predicted. Another is the 5-year failure of ocean

warming. The phony fit to 20th century temperatures by the IPCC multi-model ensembles was achieved by putting in arbitrary forcings differing for each model is truly shocking. All of these can be explained away because the complicated nature of the earth's climate provides plenty of ways to explain almost anything.

I've heard some of the biggest names in climate science admit that they don't know what caused the early 20th century warming or the mid 20th century cooling. Yet we 'know' that the late 20th century warming was caused by greenhouse gases?

UNDER THE BOTTOM LINE

Inside the Ivory Tower: An exclusive survey of international relations professors reveals they're worried about climate change, Russia's rise, and their own irrelevance – in that order.

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=4685&page=0

SEPP comment: Maybe they're right – about being irrelevant

<http://www.investors.com/editorial/editorialcontent.asp?secid=1501&status=article&id=320893446242107>

NASA's James Hansen leads a protest against a District of Columbia power plant in the middle of a snowstorm. Meanwhile, a scientist fired by Al Gore says we need to emit more carbon dioxide, not less. Speaking before Bill Clinton's Global Initiative in New York City last Nov. 2, Gore advocated civil disobedience to fight climate change. "I believe we have reached the stage where it is time for civil disobedience to prevent the construction of new coal plants that do not have carbon capture and sequestration," Gore said to loud applause. Following Gore's lead, a group called Capitol Climate Action organized a protest that took place March 2 at the 99-year-old Capitol Power Plant in southeast Washington, D.C. Its Web site invited fellow warm-mongers to "mass civil disobedience at the coal-fired" plant that heats and cools the hallowed halls of Congress. The site features Gore's quote as well as a video by Hansen.

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/03/01/hansens-coal-and-global-warming-protest-may-get-snowed-out/#comments> discusses the "Gore effect" -- a well-known but unexplained weather phenomenon.

"I hope they don't cancel the protest. I want to see these lunatics, schemers, and charlatans standing in the midst of a blizzard declaring that the Earth is dramatically warming." ~ Alan Caruba.

Obama's Cap and Trade program is a wealth redistribution program and has nothing to do with climate change or with helping the US gain Energy Independence. Jim Rogers of Duke Energy describes the concerns well in the following:

http://www.cnbc.com/id/15840232?play=1&video=1051238804&__source=yahoo%7Cheadline%7Cquote%7Cvideo%7Cpar=yahoo

Per Jim Rogers, President Obama is not in favor of Nuclear, not in favor of drilling for Natural Gas, and plans to take the Cap and Tax money and use it for wealth redistribution. As Rogers paints the picture: Electric rates will rise by 40% by 2012 and nothing about the plan helps the US to have more generation or cleaner generation.

=====

"At last, the tide seems to be turning. Businesses and consumers are coming to realize that the whole Emissions Industry is designed to deliver money and power to the government. There is nothing in it for taxpayers, consumers or the climate. Even some in the media are becoming sceptics." -- (Carbon Sense Coalition) <http://carbon-sense.com/2009/02/27/news-20090227/>

=====

Senior figures in the UK manufacturing industry do not accept that human activities are driving global warming or that action needs to be taken to prepare for its effects, the UK government's science minister said today. Lord Drayson said recent discussions with leaders in the car industry and other businesses had left him "shocked" at the number of climate change deniers among senior industrialists. Of those who acknowledged that global temperatures were rising, many blamed it on variations in the sun's activity.

--The Guardian, 4 March 2009. SEPP comments: *Sun's activity --eh? Maybe there's hope for Britain*
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/mar/04/manufacturing-climate-change>

"The 14th and 15th centuries were a period of great cooling in Europe. Witches were thought to control climate, and burning witches was a suggested means of returning to warming. Hundreds, if not thousands, were burned at the stake, and warming did reappear -- four hundred years later. Abandoning fossil fuels will be just as successful in modifying climate today." -- Prof James Rust (Georgia Tech)

<http://www.danielpipes.org/blog/2009/02/saudi-scholar-nixes-biofuels-as-un-islamic.html>

Ethanol fuels are not 'kosher' – Saudi cleric: Muhammad an-Najimi, a Saudi member of the prestigious Islamic Fiqh Academy of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, issued a tentative [personal opinion](#) (less binding than a *fatwa*) to Muslims that filling the gas tank with biofuels is sinful: "I warn Saudis who live abroad and who use alcohol instead of petrol that this case is related and falls within the parameters of what the prophet said." He refers here to a [hadith](#) in which Muhammad prohibited the buying, selling, transporting, drinking, or manufacturing of alcohol. *The Prophet (PBUH) should have included burning.*

#####

1. SENATE DEMOCRATS CRITICAL OF OBAMA'S CAP-&-TRADE PLANS

By S.A. Miller, *The Washington Times*, 2 March 2009

<http://washingtontimes.com/news/2009/mar/02/obamas-cap-trade-irk-some-in-party/>

Senate Democrats are breaking with President Obama over his plan for sweeping new climate-change laws that he says will rake in billions of dollars to help offset massive budget deficits. The dissenters, mostly Democrats from Rust Belt states likely to be hit hardest by the proposed environmental rules, question the economic impact of the program that would cap carbon-dioxide emissions and then sell to businesses the right to emit that carbon dioxide.

The senators also want their states to get a chunk of the windfall from selling the credits - \$646 billion over 10 years by Mr. Obama's estimate. "We should ensure that revenue generated by a cap-and-trade system goes back to the consumers, states and industries that are most affected by the changes," said Sen. Sherrod Brown, Ohio Democrat.

But Mr. Obama wants to spend about two-thirds of the money on tax cuts for low- and middle-income families to soften the bite of higher energy prices expected to result from the cap-and-trade law. He also wants to move fast, passing the legislation within the next year in order to start collecting by 2012 what the administration calls "climate revenue."

Sen. John D. Rockefeller IV, West Virginia Democrat, said the administration and Congress must not ignore other climate-change solutions, such as scientific research into capturing carbon dioxide and sequestering it in the ground. "The president's plan for a cap-and-trade system is ambitious, but the senator is not completely convinced that it is the best or only solution to curbing carbon emissions," Rockefeller spokesman Steven Broderick said. "We need to be sure we don't negatively impact the economy."

Similar concerns among a significant faction of Senate Democrats helped kill a somewhat less ambitious cap-and-trade bill last year. This time, however, the effort will benefit from White House support that was absent under President Bush.

But dissatisfaction among rank-and-file Senate Democrats is not the only potential pitfall. The plan's massive scope and high price, as well as a rapid implementation schedule, provide a large target for opponents and give pause to some would-be supporters.

"We want to thank the administration for killing all industry support for cap-and-trade," said William Kovacs, the top energy specialist at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. "President Obama has consolidated

the opposition."

Even the Edison Electric Institute, the utility lobby that bucked other energy lobbies to endorse last year's cap-and-trade bill, said Mr. Obama's proposal was too aggressive. "We much prefer the model that we have articulated," EEI spokesman James Owen said, because green technologies are still being developed and the company feels that moving too quickly into a full-blown cap-and-trade system will be a costly burden both for utilities and their customers.

The White House's allies shrug off such complaints, saying Mr. Obama is merely making good on his campaign promises. "The only way industry should be surprised by this is that they haven't paid attention for the last 18 months," said Daniel J. Weiss, director of climate strategy at the Center for American Progress, a liberal Washington think tank.

Sen. Barbara Boxer, California Democrat and chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, heralded the president for presenting "a clear path toward passage of a strong global-warming bill."

"With the latest science on global warming pointing to the need for urgent action [?!], this breakthrough comes not a moment too soon," Mrs. Boxer said. "This budget makes it clear that President Obama fully intends to keep his promise to prevent the ravages of global warming while investing in clean energy that will lead to a brighter economic future."

Still, 15 Senate Democrats have signed on to a letter stating principles for cap-and-trade legislation that would "ensure that consumers and workers in all regions of the U.S. are protected from undue hardship."

The signatories include Mr. Brown, Mr. Rockefeller, Sens. Debbie Stabenow and Carl Levin of Michigan, Blanche Lincoln and Mark Pryor of Arkansas, Jim Webb of Virginia, Evan Bayh of Indiana, Claire McCaskill of Missouri and Ben Nelson of Nebraska. They have been joined by Democratic Sens. Jeff Bingaman of New Mexico, Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, Kent Conrad and Byron L. Dorgan of North Dakota, and Tim Johnson of South Dakota.

The tenets, outlined in a June 2008 letter to Mrs. Boxer and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada, include demands for cost controls and prevention of economic hardship; equitable treatment of affected states; price relief for families facing higher energy bills; and protections for U.S. manufacturing jobs.

"Senator Webb believes that the U.S. must work in concert with the world community to achieve meaningful, long-term reductions in carbon dioxide emissions," said his spokeswoman, Jessica Smith. "As proposals are being debated in the Senate, he believes that scientific principles should be applied in a way that both preserves our environment and allows for sensible economic growth."

Satisfying both environmental and economic priorities with a cap-and-trade law is a daunting task. The White House hopes to gain leverage by using the new revenue to pay for Mr. Obama's signature "Making Work Pay" middle-class tax breaks. "Cap-and-trade system will have some effects on households," White House budget director Peter R. Orszag said last week. "That's one reason we are linking the cap-and-trade program to making work pay."

House Bill for a Carbon Tax to Cut Emissions Faces a Steep Climb

By [JOHN M. BRODER](#), NY Times, March 7, 2009

WASHINGTON Representative John B. Larson embarked again this week on his lonely quest to enact a national tax on carbon dioxide emissions. His idea is to set a modest price on a ton of emissions, gradually increasing it each year until the desired reduction in heat-trapping-gas pollution is achieved. Under the bill he introduced this week, virtually all the revenues from the tax would be returned to the public in lower

payroll taxes.

The American people want us to level with them, Mr. Larson, a moderate Democrat from Connecticut and a member of the House leadership, said in an interview. “We create price certainty without any new bureaucracies or complicated auction schemes.”

Many economists and academics, as well as a handful of Mr. Larson’s colleagues on both sides of the aisle and perhaps a few White House officials, if secretly, agree that a carbon tax is a simpler and more effective means of tackling [global warming](#) than the complex cap-and-trade scheme embraced by the Obama administration and most Democratic leaders in Congress. The supporters of a carbon tax have watched as the new European cap-and-trade system has failed to achieve its emissions goals while prices for carbon permits have gyrated. They see taxing as a more effective means of cutting emissions than cap-and-trade or other hybrid plans now under consideration.

But for a variety of political, environmental and economic reasons, a national carbon tax is probably going nowhere. Mr. Obama and Democratic leaders argue that cap-and-trade, in which polluters must either reduce emissions on their own or buy credits from more efficient companies, is a better system for assuring reductions, letting the market set the right to pollute.

But the main reason most in Washington recoil against a carbon tax is political: few are willing to openly advocate billions of dollars in new taxes at a time of economic distress, even though a cap-and-trade program also means higher energy prices.

Many Congressional Democrats were around in 1993 when President [Bill Clinton](#) and Vice President [Al Gore](#) pushed an energy tax and then abandoned it after it failed to generate any Republican support. Some noticed last fall when the Liberal Party in Canada suffered its worst loss ever running on a platform that included a national energy tax.

Representative [Edward J. Markey](#), Democrat of Massachusetts, is leading a special committee writing the House version of climate-change legislation. He voted for the 1993 energy tax bill, which is known not fondly as the B.T.U. tax, for British thermal unit, a measure of energy output. Mr. Markey has since become a faithful follower of the cap-and-trade school. “I am aware of the economic arguments for a carbon tax,” Mr. Markey said, “but politics is the art of the possible, and I think cap-and-trade is possible.”

He added: “Somebody once told me that a smart man learns from his mistakes but a wise man learns from others’ mistakes. We can learn from 1993 or Canada in 2008, but we should learn.”

Mr. Gore, who shared a [Nobel Prize](#) for his work on climate change, has long advocated a tax on carbon dioxide emissions as a substitute for taxes on income (“We should tax what we burn, not what we earn,” he says). But in an e-mail message this week, Mr. Gore said that passage of a tax on carbon appears to be beyond our reach for the foreseeable future and that he could accept a cap-and-trade program if it reduced emissions and provided relief for those most burdened by the costs.

”For more than 20 years, I have supported a CO2 tax offset by an equal reduction in taxes elsewhere,” Mr. Gore wrote. “However, a cap-and-trade system is also essential and actually offers a better prospect for a global agreement, in part because it is difficult to imagine a harmonized global CO2 tax. Moreover, I have long recognized that our political system has special difficulty in considering a CO2 tax even if it is revenue-neutral.”

Mr. Gore and others pointed out that the United States has had a largely successful experiment with cap-and-trade in the acid rain program set up under the 1990 [Clean Air Act](#) amendments. That system brought greater pollution reductions and lower costs than expected, although sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide pollution from a limited number of power plants was a far simpler problem than carbon emissions will be.

One of the arguments against cap-and-trade is that it requires a complex market for trading pollution permits that could be manipulated by speculators and energy companies. Mr. Larson said the last thing the

nation needed after its experience with the housing bubble and the banking collapse was a new market in carbon derivatives. His plan, he said, is simpler and fairer. But cap-and-trade advocates said a carbon tax could also be gamed, just as the Internal Revenue Code is.

The critical thing is to get the emissions you want, and a tax cannot do that without continually recalibrating the price, said Tim Profeta, director of the Nicholas Institute for Environmental Policy Solutions at [Duke University](#). Mr. Profeta helped Senator [Joseph I. Lieberman](#), independent of Connecticut, draft the first cap-and-trade bill to get serious consideration. Given the history of the carbon tax, Mr. Profeta said, there's a worry that it will poison and delay the debate.

Yvo de Boer, who directs the climate change program at the [United Nations](#), said he was agnostic as to how member states meet targets on the emission of heat-trapping gasses. But those who support a carbon tax, he said, are walking uphill. "If you were a pure economist, the most logical thing is taxation. It is the simplest," Mr. de Boer said in an interview. "But taxation is a word that makes people choke in normal times. And these are not normal times."

2. THE REAL PRICE OF OBAMA'S CAP-&-TRADE PLAN:

A carbon-emissions limit will raise energy prices unevenly.

By Kevin Bullis, March 4, 2009, MIT Technology Review 2009.

President Obama's [budget numbers](#) depend heavily on revenues from a proposed cap-and-trade program for reducing [carbon dioxide emissions](#). Under the plan, these revenues will come at the cost of higher energy prices, with some states being affected far more than others.

The cap-and-trade program does not yet exist: it will need to be established in future legislation. But the inclusion of future revenues in the budget, and a promise to pursue necessary legislation, is the strongest commitment yet that the administration will follow through with one of Obama's campaign promises and establish a cap-and-trade system for carbon dioxide emissions.

Under such a system, the government sets an annual cap on carbon dioxide emissions--the budget calls for a cap of 14 percent below 2005 emissions levels by 2020, and 83 percent below 2005 levels by 2050. The government then issues a set number of credits for the total emissions allowed under that cap. Under Obama's plan, those credits won't be given away, as they were in the initial version of a cap-and-trade system [employed in Europe](#). Instead, the credits will be auctioned off, and that money will be the source of government revenue. Polluters will be required to buy enough credits at the initial auction to cover their carbon dioxide emissions, or acquire more by trading with others at a later stage. Alternatively, they can reduce their emissions by investing in more efficient technologies. Either way, these costs will result in higher energy prices.

The budget includes \$78.7 billion in projected revenues from the cap-and-trade system in its first year, 2012, and \$525.7 billion total by 2019. According to [Point Carbon](#), an energy-market analysis firm based in Oslo, Norway, these numbers are based on the assumption that credits for a ton of carbon dioxide will sell for \$13.70 in 2012 and \$16.50 by 2020. These estimates are in line with carbon credits issued in Europe, says Veronique Bugnion, a managing director at Point Carbon. The 2012 price for carbon dioxide emissions will increase gasoline prices by 6 percent compared to current prices, she says. Average electricity prices will increase by 6.8 percent--perhaps more. According to calculations by [Gilbert Metcalf](#), an economist at Tufts University, the average electricity price increase would be 9.7 percent by 2012 and 11.7 percent by 2020.

What's more, the impact of the cap-and-trade system will vary by state. Electricity prices will rise more in states that rely heavily on coal, such as North Dakota, than in states that rely on sources of electricity that produce little carbon dioxide. According to Bugnion, prices could increase by 19.2 percent in North Dakota by 2012 but only 2.6 percent in Washington State, which relies heavily on hydroelectric power, over the same period.

To offset some of these price increases, the budget includes provisions to use some of the auction revenue for tax relief. From 2012 to 2019, \$15 billion a year from the carbon-emissions program will be used to pay for "vital investments in a clean energy future"--funding for clean energy technology. The remaining money from the auction is expected to be just enough to pay for a tax credit that is an extension of the "Making Work Pay" credit--a \$400-a-person credit included in the recently passed stimulus bill.

3. NUKING CLEAN POWER

Editorial, Investor's Business Daily, February 28, 2009

President Obama has virtually zeroed out the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository's budget in 2010, leaving only enough for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to handle current licensing requests. House and Senate Democrats have already cut funding for the remainder of fiscal 2009 to a paltry \$288 million, the lowest in recent years.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, who represents Nevada and is a longtime Yucca opponent, is ecstatic. The budget cut is "a critical first step toward fulfilling his promise to end the Yucca Mountain project," Reid said in a statement. "President Obama recognizes that the proposed dump threatens the health and safety of Nevadans and millions of Americans."

Yucca Mountain is not a "dump," and it is not unsafe, says Investor's Business Daily (IBD):

- o Situated about 100 miles northwest of Las Vegas, it is quite possibly the safest, most geologically stable and most studied place on the planet.
- o The Department of Energy has long studied the rock at the planned repository, assessing how the repository would perform over tens of thousands of years; after 20 years and \$9 billion, DOE has found Yucca Mountain to be quite stable and safe.

Reid may not want it in his back yard, but he doesn't mind keeping America's nuclear waste where it is right now -- in everybody else's back yard, says IBD:

- o Vast numbers of spent nuclear fuel rods are now stored at more than 130 above-ground facilities in 39 states.
- o About 161 million Americans live within 75 miles of these existing sites.

We need the jobs nuclear power can provide, and we need the energy, says IBD:

- o The Energy Information Agency projects that by 2030 U.S. electricity demand will increase by 45 percent.
- o Since nuclear power currently supplies 20 percent, the United States will need to have 35 additional nuclear power plants just to meet future demand.

<http://www.ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=320632440951707> [H/t NCPA]

4. JAMES HANSEN'S POLITICAL SCIENCE

By INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY, March 02, 2009

NASA's James Hansen leads a protest against a District of Columbia power plant in the middle of a snowstorm. Meanwhile, a scientist fired by Al Gore says we need to emit more carbon dioxide, not less.

Speaking before Bill Clinton's Global Initiative in New York City last Nov. 2, Gore advocated the concept of civil disobedience to fight climate change. "I believe we have reached the stage where it is time for civil

disobedience to prevent the construction of new coal plants that do not have carbon capture and sequestration," Gore said to loud applause.

Following Gore's lead, a group called Capitol Climate Action organized a protest that took place Monday at the 99-year-old Capitol Power Plant in southeast Washington, D.C. Its Web site invited fellow warm-mongers to "mass civil disobedience at the coal-fired" plant that heats and cools the hallowed halls of Congress.

The site features Gore's quote as well as a video by Hansen, head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies and a leading global-warming activist, urging attendance at the event. The storm that hit the Northeast and dropped upwards of three inches of snow on the nation's capitol should not discourage those attending the global- warming protest, he says on the video.

Hansen has called such coal-fired facilities "factories of death" and considers climate-change skeptics guilty of "high crimes against humanity and nature." In the video he says what "has become clear from the science is that we cannot burn all of the fossil fuels without creating a very different planet" and that the "only practical way to solve the problem is to phase out the biggest source of carbon — and that's coal."

What is clear is that Dr. Hansen has had problems with the facts. Last Nov. 10 he announced from his scientific perch that October had been the hottest on record, and we were doomed. Except that it wasn't true. Scores of temperature records used in the computations from Russia and elsewhere were not based on October readings at all. Figures from the previous month had simply been carried over and repeated two months running, something your high-school science teacher wouldn't allow.

Despite Dr. Hansen's hysterical animus toward carbon, the fact is that CO₂ is still a mere 0.038% of the gaseous layer that surrounds the Earth, and only 3% of that thin slice is released by man. According to Dr. William Happer, a professor of physics at Princeton University, current atmospheric CO₂ levels are inadequate in historical terms and even higher levels "will be good for mankind."

Happer, who was fired by Gore at the Department of Energy in 1993 for disagreeing with the vice president on the effects of ozone to humans and plant life, disagrees with both Gore and Hansen on the issue of the impact of man-made carbon emissions. He testified before the Senate's Environment and Public Works Committee (EPW) on Feb. 25 that CO₂ levels are in fact at a historical low.

"Many people don't realize that over geological time, we're really in a CO₂ famine now. Almost never has CO₂ . . . been as low as it has been in the Holocene (geologic epoch) — 280 (parts per million) — that's unheard of," said Happer. He notes the earth and humanity did just fine when CO₂ levels were much higher.

"You know, we evolved as a species in those times, when CO₂ levels were three to four times what they are now," Happer said. "And, the oceans were fine, plants grew, animals grew fine. So it's baffling to me that . . . we're so frightened of getting nowhere close to where we started."

"Jim Hansen has gone off the deep end here," one of Hansen's former supervisors, Dr. John Theon, said. Theon, a former senior NASA atmospheric scientist, rebuked Hansen last month in a letter to EPW. "Why he has not been fired, I do not understand," Theon said. Neither do we.

Critics contend that Hansen's involvement in the protests is a violation of the Hatch Act, which prohibits government employees from engaging in partisan political activity. If he wants to agitate for policy changes, let him do it on his own time and on his own dime. The science can speak for itself.

5. CLINTON RANKS CLIMATE CHANGE MORE IMPORTANT THAN HUMAN RIGHTS

*by E. Calvin Beisner, National Spokesman, Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation
February 25, 2009*

Secretary of State Hillary [Clinton told Chinese leaders](#) February 22 that human rights issues, such as China's oppression of Tibet, "can't interfere with the global economic crisis, the global climate change crisis and the security crisis." Climate change outranks human rights?

That's right. Ms. Clinton thinks climate change, which is filled with scientific, economic, and moral uncertainties, outranks human rights issues. So while Tibetans suffer Chinese tyranny, and Muslim women continue to suffer oppression from the Taliban, and Christian minorities continue to suffer violence and death in Darfur (partly [fueled by Chinese arms sales to and interest in oil production in Sudan](#)) and elsewhere, and millions of people continue to suffer as sex slaves all around the world, our Secretary of State is going to give priority to climate change.

6. GLOBAL WARMING IS NOT A CRISIS, BUT IT MAY BE CREATING A CRISIS OF INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY

By Jane S. Shaw, March 2, 2009

<http://popecenter.org/commentaries/article.html?id=2139>

Last month, college campuses held a National Teach-in on Global Warming Solutions. The thrust of the message was that there is a crisis because global temperatures are rising, endangering the world's future, and humans are to blame. I agree that there may be a crisis, but I don't believe that it is a crisis of impending heat; it is, rather, a crisis of intellectual integrity.

First, let me point out something that most people may not realize. Since 1998, there has been no trend in world temperatures, neither up nor down, in spite of population growth, greater resource use, and lots of carbon dioxide production. True, 1998, was the warmest year on record, and we are still in a warm period, but world temperatures are no higher than when today's college seniors began middle school. The likelihood of the catastrophic effects that gave Al Gore a Nobel Peace Prize is weak.

The crisis that concerns me stems from the way that scientists are addressing the issue. Ever since 1988, when James Hansen, head of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, alerted a congressional committee to global warming, climate change has been a political issue. Methods and standards that have stood the test of time since the Enlightenment have been shunted aside in order to promote a political objective. Climate experts are no longer expected to create hypotheses and test them but to assume that global warming threatens the planet and to use their expertise to justify this claim. Scientists who question aspects of the orthodoxy have been silenced or fired.

I have just read a lengthy compilation of many ways in which this compromise is occurring. The author is Richard Lindzen, a highly respected climate scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. From the early days of the environmental crusade over global warming, Lindzen raised questions about how well scientists understand climate change. At first, he couldn't be ignored because he was so prominent in the field of climatology. As time went on, however, the science establishment managed to give Lindzen's work less attention. Lindzen's commentary, available here, outlines the forces that have made science, in his words, vulnerable to corruption. Lindzen says that the science establishment gives priority to computer modeling of presumed climate forces and then tweaks the models, trying to make them conform to actual observations. Hand-in-hand with that tweaking is an effort to find and correct flaws in the empirical observations to make them conform to the simulations. Although science rightly seeks to make corrections, these are almost always in a single direction toward conformity. That is outright data corruption.

Compounding this tendency is government funding, which furthers bureaucratic and political goals. Professional societies make lobbying their chief activity. The American Meteorological Society is represented by a former staffer for Al Gore. John Holdren, the new science advisor to the president, is a professor in Harvard's government department, not a scientific department; his major job was with the Woods Hole Research Center, an environmental advocacy group that is often (and perhaps deliberately) confused with a scientific research center, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. He's not a climate scientist.

Even the Inter-Governmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) is political. Its key document, Summary for Policymakers, is written by a committee composed mostly of representatives of governments and advocacy groups. Few scientists have a role in crafting that paper, which is all that most policy-makers read.

Lindzen offers page after page of examples illustrating the distortion of scientific inquiry. For example, in 1999, Michael Mann and others revised the historical temperature record to eliminate the existence of a warm period during the Medieval era. The Mann et al. paper, which relied mostly on tree-ring records, featured a hockey-stick graph showing flat temperatures for hundreds of years followed by a dramatic increase in recent years, conveying the message that recent warming is unprecedented. Subsequent papers have challenged the findings, but the hockey-stick appears in the most recent IPCC report.

In 2001, Lindzen and two colleagues published a paper in the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society suggesting a strong cooling effect from clouds, which they called the 'iris effect.' Shortly after it was published, the journal published a paper challenging its existence. This would have been acceptable if, following the usual procedure, the editor had allowed Lindzen and his colleagues to rebut the criticism in the same issue of the publication. But they were not allowed to do so.

In 2007, Lindzen showed that independent data from satellites and weather balloons did not support the computer-model prediction that the greatest warming should occur the upper troposphere (a layer of the Earth's atmosphere). Rather than explore possible reasons why the difference occurred, two papers quickly tried to undermine the findings. One revised the satellite data to bring them closer to the predictions; another paper simply rejected the temperature data, proffering highly uncertain temperature estimates based on wind data.

Lindzen also speaks of a professor who spoke out and lost his job and another who expressed cautious support for skepticism and suffered *ad hominem* attacks as a result. And the views of scientists, such as the prominent physicist William Nierenberg, have been posthumously misrepresented.

Lindzen is not the only scientist to chronicle harassment of scientists who oppose current orthodoxy. In the preface to his new book written with Robert C. Balling, Jr., *Climate of Extremes*, Pat Michaels explains why he is resigning from the University of Virginia, where he serves as the state's climatologist. Virginia's governor, backed by the university's provost, told him that he could not identify himself as the state climatologist when talking about global warming. Michaels also reports that Oregon's state climatologist resigned when he was told to stop saying things that undermined the state's greenhouse-gas policies. Delaware's state climatologist is not allowed to speak about global warming. And the assistant state climatologist in Washington state was fired for providing snowfall information to journalists and others.

Some of us might look to the presidents of universities, the supposed bastions of free scientific inquiry, to sound an alarm about this kind of treatment of scholars. But that would be expecting too much. Indeed, 614 university and college chancellors and presidents have signed a statement saying that global warming is largely being caused by humans, and that they recognize the need to reduce the global emission of greenhouse gases by 80 percent by mid-century at the latest and to reestablish the more stable climatic conditions that have made human progress over the last 10,000 years possible. Having signed so strong a statement, will these presidents welcome -- or even allow scientists to objectively pursue knowledge about the climate? The evidence outlined by Lindzen and Michaels raises serious doubts.

In addition to heading the Pope Center, Jane S. Shaw is a senior fellow of the Property and Environment Research Center (PERC). She coauthored Facts Not Fear: Teaching Children about the Environment with Michael Sanera and is the author of Global Warming (Greenhaven Press).

7. THE ONGOING CO2 WARS

By Kenneth Haapala

Washington, DC, March 2, 2009: Today was to be a big day in the carbon wars. NASA's climate change guru, Jim Hansen, the science advisor to Al Gore, was to lead a love-in on Capitol Hill protesting what Hansen calls factories of death, coal fired electrical power plants. The snow continues to fall, the temperature is in the low 20s and the wind is in the high 20s. It is freezing. The city is in lock-down. Mother Nature can be one cold witch.

The carbon wars are upon us. Some years ago the believers in a new-age misanthropic, animist religion invented the concept that warmer weather will be destructive to humans. The claim is contrary to history, which shows that warm weather brings prosperity and cold weather brings famine, disease, and death. Never mind history, the real goal is control of energy and its primary sources that emit carbon dioxide. Energy gives Americans prosperity and great independence from governmental authority.

Fanatics in this religion now occupy positions of great power in government. Congress has spent over \$20 Billion dollars trying to scientifically prove that carbon dioxide emissions will cause unprecedented and dangerous global warming. It has failed.

Now the political stars are aligned in favor of the fanatics. We have a new-age faith healer in the White House running a revival: submit your liberties to government and you shall be free.

Two years ago the Supreme Court ruled that carbon dioxide is a pollutant that can be regulated by the EPA under the Clean Air Act. All green life requires carbon dioxide for food or it will die, and without green life virtually all other life will die, including humans. Life began and flourished in an atmosphere many times richer in CO₂ than today. The Supreme Court might as well declare sunlight to be a pollutant that can be regulated.

Armed with this political power, the new-age scientists of the EPA should be waxing in their glory. But the Court decision contained a caveat; the EPA must prove the warming caused by carbon dioxide endangers the health and welfare of American citizens.

The EPA and its allies are becoming desperate. They are having difficulty overcoming two major obstacles. One, a small band of heretics continues to insist upon the science of Galileo, Newton, and Einstein, in which proof comes from observations, not from government authority and computer models. The heretics publish reports such as "*Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate.*" This band of heretics is growing. And, two, that fickle lady, Mother Nature, is refusing to go with the flow and is demonstrating the hubris of those who claim humans control her. The globe is cooling.

Thus, the fanatics and their neo-scientists resort to desperate tricks. Does any part of your funding come from evil oil? As if the sponsorship by Texaco destroyed the Metropolitan Opera. In Opera as well as in science it is the quality of the work, not the sponsor, which must be the objective criterion. More disturbing are the personal attacks, one small mistake, immediately publicly admitted, is claimed to discredit a lifetime of work. Yet the great guru, Jim Hansen, frequently makes mistakes such as substituting September data from Siberia into October data, and then declaring October 2008 was the hottest October on record.

As NASA's chief scientist on climate change, Hansen is responsible the reporting of global temperatures for NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies. Yet the temperatures reported are from the surface. Apparently, NASA does not realize that the greenhouse effect takes place in the atmosphere, and that satellites measuring atmospheric temperature produce the most systematic, comprehensive measurements of global temperatures ever compiled.

The neo-scientists of the EPA are papering the world with studies that are more propaganda than science. They use predictions that, as one Japanese scientist commented, are more akin to astrology than science.

The public comment period for the latest CCSP report closed on February 27. Using the required procedure, this heretic submitted his comments, focused on four issues: 1) there is no compelling scientific theory supporting predictions that a doubling of CO₂ will cause significant warming; 2) the CCSP

procedures ascribe to human activity changes caused by natural forces; 3) the models used are unreliable and highly biased in overestimating the influence of CO₂ on temperature; and 4) the report ignores salient facts that directly contradict the claim that the recent warming is unusual such as a 3,000 year period in which temperatures were 5 degC warmer.

Who will win the carbon wars? The fanatics have the money and the political power. But that may not be sufficient. If the fanatics win, the American people will lose control of their lives and liberties as well as future prosperity. Perhaps from this war we will re-develop the healthy distrust of Big Government of the Founding Fathers.

8. ANTARCTIC WARMING AND THE PROJECTED DISAPPEARANCE OF EMPEROR PENGUINS.

From a letter to the BBC by Mr Rupert Wyndham of Somerset, UK

“It has taken no more than the briefest of examinations by reputable climate physicists to discover that both stories are, once again, the product not of observation but of presumptive computer modelling, the first by none other than that Titan of scientific rectitude and rigour, Dr. Michael Mann. Indeed, paraphrasing him slightly, one somewhat embarrassed and prominent AGW proponent (and thus basically an ally of Mann), namely Dr. Kevin Trenberth, has almost instantly noted that, “*You can't simply manufacture data where none exists!*” True, of course - which is to say, outside of AGW “science”, that is. Any mention of this by impartial news managers at the BBC? Not a peep. Well, well, quelle surprise! As I say in my letter to Ms. Thompson, standards of impartiality are breached not only by censoring well-sourced dissent but also by broadcasting ill-sourced items supportive of AGW orthodoxy.”