

The Week That Was (Nov 14, 2009) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

Ken Haapala will host TWTW while Fred Singer lectures/briefs/debates in Europe. Come by if you are close. Get detailed schedule and contacts from Ken@Haapala.com Brussels (EU Parliament) Nov 18-19. London (IEA) Nov 20-24. Zurich Nov 25. Stuttgart (DLR) Nov 26. Heidelberg, Mainz Nov 27-28. Brussels Nov 30-Dec 2. Berlin Dec 4. CPH Dec 6-11.

#####

Quote of the Week:

Collective fear stimulates herd instinct, and tends to produce ferocity toward those who are not regarded as members of the herd. -- *Bertrand Russell*

THIS WEEK

The Council of the American Physical Society (APS) on Nov 8 turned down a petition signed by 200+ members to fundamentally change its Statement on Global Warming. Instead of acting as an independent scientific society, the APS relied on the flawed summary report of the IPCC and referred the Statement to its public policy committee for what may turn out to be only cosmetic adjustments.

Key Senate Democrats said it is unlikely there will be any more major committee action on climate-change legislation this year, the strongest indication yet that a comprehensive bill to cut greenhouse-gas emissions won't be voted on until at least next year (*WSJ Nov 11*). Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D., Mich.), who is leading an effort by moderate, heartland Democrats to protect manufacturing and agriculture industries, said committees were no longer under any timetables to produce legislation. Sen. Blanche Lincoln (D., Ark.), who chairs the Agriculture Committee, is facing a tough re-election campaign next year, and handling a highly controversial climate-change bill in her panel may risk alienating voters.

The last United Nations negotiating session before next month's Copenhagen summit on climate change has ended in Spain, with rich and poor nations still deeply divided – mainly over money. A draft treaty prepared for the CPH COP-15 conference calls for huge income transfers to 'atone' for 'climate guilt.' **[SEPP Comment: The increase in CO2 has likely benefited agricultural yields globally. Maybe the developing countries owe us -- and maybe we should all thank China for putting more CO2 into the atmosphere.]**

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has said world leaders are unlikely to agree on a comprehensive treaty in Copenhagen. He said it was more likely there would only be agreement on principles. UN officials have also recently declared there is no chance of agreeing on all elements of a new legally-binding UN treaty before the end of the year. Even Al Gore said it wouldn't be a disaster if the conference produced only a framework agreement, and not a binding deal.

The admission that no treaty will be signed at Copenhagen marks the failure of the process agreed at a UN meeting in Bali in December 2007, when industrialized countries agreed to deliver a binding climate-change agreement within two years. The delay has angered developing countries, which say they are already suffering from man-made climate change. No matter, Copenhagen will be presented as a great success, like all the other global environmental conferences before: Climate will not be permitted to warm by more than 2 degC. But no plan on how to accomplish this goal.

SEPP Science Editorial #36-2009 (11/14/09)

By S. Fred Singer, President SEPP

More about 'Scientific Consensus'

According to the UK Met Office <http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/climatechange/guide/quick/doubts.html>

the core climate science from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was written by 152 scientists from more than 30 countries and contributed to and/or reviewed by some 600 experts. Not mentioned, however, is the fact that many of the reviewers disagreed with the IPCC conclusion that most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is “very likely” (>90% sure) due to the observed increase in man-made greenhouse gas concentrations.

Also unmentioned is the fact that most of the science of the IPCC report is not controversial. The only crucial chapter is Chapter 9 (on “Attribution”), in which the IPCC attempts to show that 20th century warming was anthropogenic. It was written by only 9 scientists and is dominated by a tightly controlled clique whose members referee each others' papers and consider ‘attribution studies’ as their private fiefdom.

The NIPCC was set up to break down this monopoly. The NIPCC Summary (2008) and full report (2009) demonstrate that there is no real evidence backing the IPCC conclusion www.NIPCCreport.org.

The following letter, signed by senior physicists, was sent to all 100 U.S. senators on October 29, 2009:

A GAGGLE IS NOT A CONSENSUS

You have recently received a letter from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), purporting to convey a “consensus” of the scientific community that immediate and drastic action is needed to avert a climatic catastrophe.

We do not seek to make the scientific arguments here (we did that in [an earlier letter](#), sent a couple of months ago), but simply note that the claim of consensus is fake, designed to stampede you into actions that will cripple our economy, and which you will regret for many years. There is no consensus, and even if there were, consensus is not the test of scientific validity. Theories that disagree with the facts are wrong, consensus or no.

We know of no evidence that any of the “leaders” of the scientific community who signed the [AAAS] letter to you ever asked their memberships for their opinions, before claiming to represent them on this important matter.

We also note that the American Physical Society (APS, and we are physicists) did not sign the letter, though the scientific issues at stake are fundamentally matters of applied physics. You can do physics without climatology, but you can't do climatology without physics.

The APS is at this moment reviewing its stance on so-called global warming, having received a petition from its membership to do so. That petition was signed by 160 [by now well over 200] distinguished members and fellows of the Society, including one Nobelist and 12 members of the National Academies. Indeed a score of the signers are Members and Fellows of the AAAS, none of whom were consulted before the AAAS letter to you.

ARTICLES [For the numbered articles below please see the attached pdf]

- 1. Global Warming Hype – *Dennis Byrne, Chicago Tribune***
- 2. Waxman-Markey and Housing Regulation**
- 3. Key Democrat Cites Concerns on Climate Bill –*Siobhan Hughes and Ian Talley***
- 4. Save the Planet? Even the Indians Have Reservations – *Wall Street Journal***
- 5. The Dark Side of Green: Gaming the global-warming fight – *Stefan Theil***
- 6. Save the planet? Kill cap-and-trade – *Washington Examiner***

7. Sir David King condemns green scaremongering; Herod condemns child abuse; Osama Bin Laden condemns Islamist terrorism; etc –James Delingpole

8. Right Climate for Big Bucks – Andrew Bolt

9. Gullible eager-beaver planet savers –Mark Steyn

10. Panic, Little Ones, It's The Carbon Monster - Brendan O'Neill,

NEWS YOU CAN USE

An insightful study about the European experience with Cap and Trade [H/t to John Droz, Jr]
<http://www.masterresource.org/2009/11/the-expensive-failure-of-europes-emissions-trading-scheme-a-summary/#more-5535>

Canadian multi-millionaire Maurice Strong, the gray eminence of climate hysteria, said this in 1990:

“What if a small group of these world leaders were to conclude that the principal risk to the earth comes from the actions of the rich countries? And if the world is to survive, those rich countries would have to sign an agreement reducing their impact on the environment? Will they do it? Will the rich countries agree to reduce their impact on the environment? Will they agree to save the earth?

“The group’s conclusion is ‘no.’ The rich countries won’t do it. They won’t change. So, in order to save the planet, the group decides: **Isn’t the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn’t it our responsibility to bring that about?**”

Wabaunsee County commissioners can **bar the construction of wind farms** in their community, a unanimous Kansas Supreme Court ruled on Friday.

"Today's ruling on the issues is the first in Kansas and perhaps in the country where the construction of commercial wind farms as an alternative energy source is being pitted against landowners seeking undisturbed vistas of their wind-swept countryside," Supreme Court spokesman Ron Keefover said in a news release.

In its ruling, the court did express concern that the county ordinance banning commercial wind systems does not extend to smaller wind generators for personal use.

The court will hear arguments in January on whether the ordinance constitutes an illegal "taking" without just compensation

(http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5gc2_YZHb9t3a3jSD0gj6zmLx341wD9BLMGHG0)

And as far as Green jobs are concerned, the WSJ (Oct 30) reports that a Chinese wind-turbine company will become the exclusive supplier to one of the largest US wind-farms, a 36,000-acre development in West Texas with 240 2.5-megawatt turbines. What makes all this possible are huge subsidies, courtesy of the US taxpayer.

Read John Christy on AGW: http://blog.al.com/breaking/2009/11/global_warming_skeptic_tells_g.html

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

Italian finance police, mounting an operation code named "Gone with the wind," have arrested two of the country's most prominent businessmen in the wind energy sector. The president of Italy's National Association of Wind Energy, was arrested on Tuesday in Naples. Police said the charges related to fraud involved in obtaining public subsidies to construct wind farms. [*Financial Times, Nov 12*]

Al Gore, who art in thy fully offset private jet; Nobel-prized be thy name; thy carbon-free kingdom come; on planet Earth (otherwise known as Gaia) as it should be after Copenhagen; give us this day our daily meat-free diet; and forgive us our emissions, though we don't forgive any other big fat Americans who emit against us; lead us not into exotic holiday flights; and deliver us from climate denial; for the science is settled. Amen. --*Dominic Lawson, The Sunday Times, 8 November 2009* [H/t to CCNet]



1. GLOBAL WARMING HYPE

By Dennis Byrne, *Chicago Tribune, November 10, 2009*

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/chi-oped1110byrnenov10,0,3012538.column>

In the next few weeks we'll be relentlessly scrubbed with eyewash, brainwash and hogwash, all designed to cleanse us of any doubts that global warming is a proven menace to Mother Earth.

First, there's the global warming legislation rushing through Congress with a denouement expected soon. Second, the rush to pass the legislation is fueled by the upcoming United Nations meeting on global warming next month in Copenhagen. President Barack Obama and Democrats want to be able to go there with a goody basket of economy-busting measures that will show the world that America is with it.

Too bad, because the alleged "scientific" evidence of a coming man-made apocalypse is incomplete at best and, more likely, manipulated for political reasons.

That's obviously not the conventional wisdom. According to climate alarmists, only "skeptics" or "deniers" would ignore the "scientific consensus" that the planet is doomed without draconian acts of economic self-immolation. We know this because Al Gore, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, and European smarties have told us so.

That's also the view of the United Nations-sponsored Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Working Group-1 -- the climate alarmist's bible. It contains, they allege, all the evidence you need to justify their frenzy.

Is that so?

Inconveniently, that study itself has been studied by an independent group of scientists who concluded that the IPCC bible is wrong. They said the IPCC document "is marred by errors and misstatements, ignores scientific data that were available but were inconsistent with the authors' pre-conceived conclusions, and has already been contradicted in important parts by research published since May 2006, the IPCC's cutoff date."

To back up the conclusion, the independent group, called the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC), published its own analysis in a tome called "Climate Change Reconsidered."

The 856-page, nearly two-inch-thick volume did what all good science requires: check the work of fellow scientists to see if it stands up to a rigorous review of the available research, data and conclusions.

What they found is stunning. For example, the IPCC claimed that "most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely (at least 90 percent certain) due to the increase in anthropogenic (man-made) greenhouse gas concentrations" Wrong; the opposite is true. Blame it on natural causes, the NIPCC said.

The IPCC claims that global warming will wreck humanity and the Earth. Wrong. The NIPCC concludes -- using the data and science available to the IPCC -- that a "warmer world would be a safer and healthier world for humans and wildlife alike."

The IPCC relies on complicated computer climate models to reach its dour conclusions; the NIPCC rips the methodology, challenging the reliability of models to make such cosmic predictions. The NIPCC reveals that the IPCC failed to consider naturally occurring "feedback" factors that reduce the impact of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Reviewing the empirical data, the NIPCC finds no evidence that climate change in the last century is unprecedented. Nor do the data demonstrate an anthropogenic effect on climate change. Nor is there evidence that anthropogenic factors are melting glaciers, raising sea levels or precipitating other catastrophic weather or climate changes. The IPCC ignored research probing solar activity as a cause of climate change. It ignored research showing that rising carbon dioxide levels actually increase plant growth to the benefit of all mankind and the planet. It ignored research that global warming will improve, not harm, human health and increase, not decrease, biodiversity.

Climate change alarmists will condemn these findings as unspeakable and unthinkable. They will point to who is doing the research or who is paying for it, while ignoring the substance of the research. They won't bother contacting Chicago-based Heartland Institute, the report's publisher, to get their own copy.

An honest examination of the science will reveal perhaps the only indisputable fact in this entire argument: The science is not settled and claims of a scientific consensus are an exaggeration, if not a deception. A scientific consensus -- if such a thing even exists -- would be surprising for any issue that is as complicated as this, involving so many different branches of science. As a layman struggling to comprehend this avalanche of science, I was struck by one truth: Beware of any "science" that claims to fully describe in single theory any phenomenon as complex as global climate change. Trying to tie it all up in such a neat package, as climate alarmists do, is a trap for the simple-minded.

Dennis Byrne is a Chicago-area writer and consultant. He blogs at [chicagonow](http://chicagonow.com).

2. WAXMAN-MARKEY AND HOUSING REGULATION

By Julie Walsh

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2009/10/19/cooler-heads-digest-16-october-2009/>

The House-passed Waxman-Markey energy-rationing bill, H.R. 2454, [sets specific federal housing standards \\$4,000 to \\$10,000](#) and would price more than 1,000,000 people out of the market, according to Bill Killmer, a vice president of the National Association of Home Builders. In 2014 for new residential buildings and 2015 for new commercial buildings, a 50 percent increase in energy efficiency is required (relative to the baseline code), increasing each year thereafter. Waxman-Markey also adopts California's portable lighting fixture standard as the national standard. And it mandates efficiency improvements for many new appliances, including spas, water dispensers, and dishwashers.

But the Senate's Kerry-Boxer energy-rationing bill, S. 1733, goes much further; it gives an unelected federal official a regulatory blank check: *The (EPA) Administrator, or such other agency head or heads as may be designated by the President, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall promulgate regulations establishing building-code energy-efficiency targets for the national average percentage improvement of buildings energy performance. And, The Administrator, or such other agency head or heads as may be designated by the President, shall promulgate regulations establishing national energy efficiency building codes for residential and commercial buildings. Pp. 173-174*

Federal building codes would be in the hands of the EPA.

California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger [this week signed into law S.B. 32](#), which establishes a feed-in tariff that forces utilities to pay for surplus electricity generated by solar roof-top panels. Previously, California ratepayers subsidized the purchase of solar panels; now, they must pay above-market prices for power generated by those panels. The upshot is that the preponderance of ratepayers [will pay more for electricity](#) in order to subsidize the green-lifestyle of Californians wealthy enough to afford solar panels. *H/t Cooler Heads Digest Oct 16, 2009*

3. KEY DEMOCRAT CITES CONCERNS ON CLIMATE BILL

By Siobhan Hughes and Ian Talley

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125665131444310307.html>

WASHINGTON -- Sen. Max Baucus said Tuesday he has "serious reservations" about climate legislation unveiled by his Democratic colleagues, signaling trouble for a proposal that is stronger in certain respects than a bill passed by the House.

Mr. Baucus made his comments at a hearing of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, which took up climate legislation written by Sens. John Kerry (D., Mass.) and Barbara Boxer (D., Calif.). The bill calls for reducing greenhouse-gas emissions 20% below 2005 levels by 2020. That is tougher than a House-passed version, which calls for a reduction of 17%.

The Senate bill also protects the authority of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to regulate greenhouse-gas emissions using the Clean Air Act, powers that were stripped by the House.

Mr. Baucus, a Montana Democrat who is chairman of the Finance Committee, will be a key player in shaping any final bill, as that panel also has jurisdiction over some elements of climate legislation. His views are closer to those of other Democrats from heartland and coal-dependent states whose support will be essential to passing a climate bill.

"I have some concerns about the overall direction of the bill," Mr. Baucus said at the start of hearings Tuesday. "I have serious reservations with the depth of the midterm reduction target...and the lack of pre-emption of the Clean Air Act."

As proposed, the bill risks moving legislators "further away from that achievable consensus on common-sense climate-change [legislation]," Mr. Baucus said.

Ms. Boxer said Mr. Baucus might adjust his position when she explains that the 20% target is easier to achieve since U.S. greenhouse-gas levels have fallen in recent years. "We're going to be talking with him about that," she said.

Other Democratic members of the committee also hinted they would like to see a more moderate bill. Sen. Arlen Specter (D., Pa.) expressed concern that emission-intensive industries such as oil refining or coal-production might be hurt. Pennsylvania industry relies heavily on coal-generated power.

Supporters of the climate proposal can ill afford to lose any Democratic votes in the Senate, given stiff Republican opposition. GOP panel members have said they will try to keep the bill from passing out of committee if there isn't a comprehensive review of costs by the EPA and the Congressional Budget Office. Republicans say the Kerry-Boxer bill as drafted could hurt the economy.

Several cabinet officials appeared at the hearing to encourage passage of a bill to curb greenhouse-gas emissions. The Senate bill, like the House measure, would require companies across the economy to hold government-issued permits to emit greenhouse gases -- including carbon dioxide -- which scientists have linked to a long-term rise in global temperatures.

Like the House measure, the Senate bill aims to ease costs to industry by initially giving away for free permits to certain industries, such as electric utilities and makers of steel and cement. Over time, the government would reduce the number of permits issued, bringing down emissions, while letting companies trade the valuable permits among themselves. [SEPP comment: the remarks by Senator Boxer are revealing. It is easier to cut emissions to 20% of prior levels when the unemployment rate is 10% than it is to cut them to 17% of prior levels when the unemployment rate is 5%.]

4. SAVE THE PLANET? EVEN THE INDIANS HAVE RESERVATIONS

By ERIC FELTEN — ericfelten@wsjtaste.com.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703363704574503480121623964.html>

For a moment there, it looked as if the bitter, decade-long feud over building a "wind farm" in federal waters off Cape Cod was finally over. The plan to put 130 giant wind turbines out on a shoal in Nantucket Sound was never met with the enthusiasm one would expect for such a grand green energy project. Though some environmentalists actually supported the scheme, including Greenpeace and the Sierra Club, the elites of Nantucket, Martha's Vineyard and the Cape have tilted at the windmills, deriding them as "visual pollution." The complaints, feints, objections and lawsuits, the regulatory tangles and legislative brickbats, have succeeded in delaying construction for years.

But after it seemed that the last of the hurdles had been cleared a new objection has suddenly surfaced, putting the wind farm on hold yet again: The local Aquinnah and Mashpee Wampanoag Indian tribes are claiming that the Nantucket Sound is sacred ground. They say that they will no longer be able to practice the religious ritual of greeting the morning sun if distant turbines litter the horizon.

Don't scoff—Native Americans have had some luck with claims that cluttered sightlines violate their religious freedom. Last year, the U.S. Army abandoned construction of a warehouse near the Medicine Bluffs in Oklahoma. The Comanche Nation had sued, saying that the land is sacred. A federal judge decided in its favor, ruling "an unobstructed view of all four bluffs is central to the spiritual experience of the Comanche people." The fiasco cost the Army some \$650,000.

The Supreme Court put limits on the sacred-ground gambit in 1988, finding that the Constitution's guarantee of religious freedom does not require cordoning off every acre of land that someone claims to have spiritual significance. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor wrote that even if "government action would interfere significantly with private persons' ability to pursue spiritual fulfillment according to their own religious beliefs," that didn't amount to a prohibition of religion.

Still, the lawsuits keep coming. Just this summer, the Supreme Court put an end to five years of litigation over fake snow at an Arizona ski resort. The Snowbowl slopes have never enjoyed reliably robust powder. The owners came up with a plan to pump recycled wastewater from nearby Flagstaff up the mountain and then use it to manufacture snow, as many resorts do. The Hopi, Navajo, Apache, Havasupai and Hualapai tribes objected that the plan would desecrate the mountain. The high court declined to hear their complaint, perhaps because of its expansive implications: The tribes believe that the entire San Francisco Peaks mountain range is central to their religious traditions.

One active litigant of sacred spaces has been Bobby C. Billie, the spiritual leader of a small group of Native Americans who call themselves the Independent Traditional Seminole Nation of Florida (not to be confused with officially recognized Seminole Tribe of Florida). Mr. Billie has worked with the Sierra Club to object to developments that, he says, impinge on burial grounds and other sacred spaces. Which could be just about any building south of Disney World, since he has claimed all of southern Florida to be sacred ground.

Non-indigenous peoples aren't the only threat to hallowed places. The Ute Indian Tribe is trying to build a fish-hatchery using water from Big Springs, Utah; a dissident group of Ute spiritual leaders has been protesting that "the springs are a traditional religious site that must flow naturally without being tapped into a pipeline." Protesters trying to block construction that they consider "a sacrilege" were arrested at Big Springs last month. According to the local newspaper, the Vernal Express, the tribal court has leaned toward letting the hatchery be completed but still hasn't figured out how to resolve the complaint that the tribe itself is defiling sacred ground.

The alliance of Native Americans and Anglos opposing construction also has its limits. Their interests may be aligned off Cape Cod for the moment, but just a month ago, out in the Southwest, the Navajo and Hopi tribes told environmental groups to get lost. The Navajo Nation is trying to build a new coal-fired power plant, and they've tired of outsiders' pesky intrusions. Tribal president Joe Shirley Jr. complained that environmentalists "put the welfare of fish and insects above the survival of the Navajo people."

On the Cape, affluent locals have paired with Indian tribes to thwart environmentalists; in Florida and elsewhere, Native Americans have paired with environmentalists to thwart affluent local developers; and when the tribes are themselves the local developers, they find themselves at odds with all their old allies. It gets awfully messy but makes for a vivid picture of the complications to come as more oxen get Gored. As the outside obligations of going green proliferate, they may no longer fit so comfortably with the way that even the enlightened like to live.

The *Boston Globe* has editorialized that "of all the gimmicks that opponents of Cape Wind have resorted to, working with the Wampanoag tribes to protect all of Nantucket Sound for cultural reasons wins the prize for sheer cynicism." True enough. But the Cape Wind affair isn't just another case of NIMBYism run amok; it is a good test of just how durable fashionable environmental convictions are. Wind turbines whirring on the scenic horizon might seem a small price to pay for the cause, but they have proved to be a big headache. The controversy suggests that even the eco-friendliest may start to have second thoughts when fidelity to green principles entails giving up hot showers in the morning or air-conditioning in the summer. We may find that the "truth" is a bit too inconvenient after all.

5. THE DARK SIDE OF GREEN: GAMING THE GLOBAL-WARMING FIGHT

By [Stefan Theil](#) | Newsweek Oct 24 Berlin, From the magazine issue dated Nov 2, 2009
<http://www.newsweek.com/id/219295?from=rss>

Climate change is the greatest new public-spending project in decades. Each year as much as \$100 billion is spent by governments and consumers around the world on green subsidies designed to encourage wind, solar, and other -renewable-energy markets. The goals are worthy: reduce emissions, promote new sources of energy, and help create jobs in a growing industry.

Yet this epic effort of lawmaking and spending has, naturally, also created an epic scramble for subsidies and regulatory favors. Witness the 1,150 lobbying groups that spent more than \$20 million to lobby the U.S. Congress as it was writing the Clean Energy bill (which would create a \$60 billion annual market for emission permits by 2012). Government has often had a hand in jump--starting a new -industry—both the computer chip and the Internet got their start in American defense research. But it's hard to think of any non-military industry that has been so completely and utterly driven by regulation and subsidies from the start.

It's a genetic defect that not only guarantees great waste, but opens the door to manipulation and often demonstrably contravenes the objectives that climate policy is supposed to achieve. Thanks to effective lobbying by American and European farmers, the more cost--efficient and environmentally effective Brazilian sugar-cane ethanol is locked out of U.S. and EU markets. Even within Europe, most countries have their own "technical standard" for biofuels to better keep out competing products—even if they are cheaper or produce a greater cut in emissions. Because the subsidies are tied to feedstocks, there is zero incentive to develop better technology.

Both the International Energy Agency and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development have asked Germany to end its ludicrous solar subsidies that will total \$115.5 billion by 2013. In theory, these subsidies are designed to create viable markets for climate-friendly technology by bringing down production costs, after which subsidies could be phased out.

But Germany's solar program has been a textbook case of how subsidies achieve the opposite of their stated intention. As the share of renewable power has jumped from 3 percent in 2001 to 15 percent now, subsidies per -kilowatt-hour of renewable power aren't going down but up, meaning that clean energy is getting more expensive. Energy economist Manuel Frondel of Germany's RWI Institute says the country's lavish subsidies have blocked innovation and delayed the advent of cost-competitive solar power worldwide.

For several years solar-module costs stagnated because German subsidies sucked up global production at virtually any price. Only when Spain decided in 2008 to scrap a similar subsidy scheme it had copied from the Germans did the global solar bubble collapse and costs fall. The German solar case also defies the green-jobs model. The idea is that subsidies create a new industry and a lot of high-tech jobs. Yet Germany's solar producers are downsizing. With little pressure to become efficient and cost-competitive, they are now getting crowded out by Chinese producers.

In truth, green tech is no longer the tender niche industry the public debate makes it out to be. Global wind-turbine production alone is already a \$50 billion annual market. And just as the bulk of farm subsidies don't go to farmers, but to agro-conglomerates and food giants, it's not small green-tech ventures but big corporations that are getting the best seats on the green gravy train. DuPont, Siemens, power companies, and investment banks are hungry for a slice of the subsidy pie or the new -carbon-trading market.

Defenders rightly point out that fossil fuels get a staggering \$500 billion in subsidies each year. Yet 80 percent of these are consumer subsidies in a handful of developing countries such as China, Russia, and Iran, and pale in significance when you account for fossil fuels' much higher share of the energy supply.

No one denies the necessary role of governments in environmental policy. But of the 10 most cost-effective and measurable ways for the world to cut emissions, for example, subsidies for renewables don't even make it onto the list. Much more effective is putting a price on emissions, or finding other ways to mandate reductions and letting the market decide which technologies are the best. Here's hoping governments take the point soon.

Theil is NEWSWEEK's correspondent in Berlin.

6. SAVE THE PLANET? KILL CAP-AND-TRADE

Editorial, "Save the planet? Kill cap-and-trade," Wash Examiner, Oct 30, 2009; Timothy D. Searchinger et al., "Fixing a Critical Climate Accounting Error," Science, 326, Oct 23, 2009. [H/t NCPA]
http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/Save-the-planet_-Kill-cap-and-trade-8456687-67288577.html

If members of Congress need yet another reason to kill the Waxman-Markey bill, the Obama administration's economy-suffocating, job-destroying energy program, Princeton University's Tim Searchinger and his colleagues have a humdinger: Carbon reduction laws encourage widespread deforestation as trees and other vegetation are harvested to produce energy from biomass to replace oil and gas. The problem is that in the long run, this process actually increases greenhouse gas emissions, which cap-and-trade is meant to reduce, according to Searchinger.

The Princeton researcher's paper, published Oct. 23 in *Science*, points out that almost all prior global warming studies failed to take into account the carbon emissions that result from converting cropland and forests to energy production. This accounting error treats all bio-energy as carbon-neutral, the authors say, despite the fact that burning wood and clearing land actually releases quite a large quantity of carbon into the atmosphere.

According to Searchinger:

- o By using a worldwide agricultural model to estimate emissions from land-use change, the researchers found that corn-based ethanol, instead of producing a 20 percent savings, nearly doubles greenhouse emissions over 30 years and increases greenhouse gases for 167 years.
- o Biofuels from switchgrass, if grown on U.S. corn lands, increase emissions by 50 percent.
- o Neither the Kyoto Protocol, the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, nor existing European cap-and-trade programs have taken into account widespread deforestation as farmers worldwide respond to the new economic incentives.

Those figures might actually underestimate the growth of greenhouse gas production caused by reliance on energy produced from bio-mass sources because cap-and-trade includes \$30 billion in subsidies for alternative energy research, development, and commercialization, including bio-mass. In other words: A vote for the House version of cap-and-trade or the companion legislation sponsored in the Senate by Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), and Sen. John Kerry (D-Mass.), actually means a vote for even more greenhouse gases. Who knew? Now, it's the opponents of cap-and-trade bills who can honestly say they are just trying to save the planet from the ravages of greenhouse gases, says the *Washington Examiner*.

7. SIR DAVID KING CONDEMNS GREEN SCAREMONGERING; HEROD CONDEMNS CHILD ABUSE; OSAMA BIN LADEN CONDEMNS ISLAMIST TERRORISM; ETC

By James Delingpole *The Telegraph*: October 31st, 2009

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100015354/sir-david-king-condemns-green-scaremongering-herod-condemns-child-abuse-osama-bin-laden-condemns-islamist-terrorism-etc/>

Professor Sir David King – Tony Blair’s former chief scientific advisor and foot-and-mouth massacre guru – has spoken out against climate change alarmism. He has told the *Times*:

“When people overstate happenings that aren’t necessarily climate change-related, or set up as almost certainties, things that are difficult to establish scientifically, it distracts from the science we do understand. The danger is they can be accused of scaremongering. Also, we can all become described as kind of left-wing greens.”

Presumably, he is no relation of the Sir David King who claimed in January 2004 in *Science* magazine that climate change is “the most severe problem we are facing today” and “a far greater threat to the world than international terrorism.”

Nor of the Sir David King who was reported thus in May 2004:

Antarctica is likely to be the world’s only habitable continent by the end of this century if global warming remains unchecked, the government’s chief scientist, Professor Sir David King said last week. He said the Earth was entering the ‘first hot period’ for 60 million years when there was no ice on the planet and “the rest of the globe could not sustain human life”.

Nor of the Sir David King who made the following claim as recently as June 2008:

If all the ice on Greenland were to melt, sea level would rise by seven metres. Is that likely to happen? Well I was saying six years ago unlikely [but] I’m afraid that that’s having to be revised... 80 percent of our human population lives within less than a one metre rise of sea level, so imagine the destabilisation of our geopolitical system with a sea level rise of the order of one or two metres. And that is on the cards I’m afraid.

Nor, one hopes, is he any relation of the Sir David King who led the British delegation to a science conference in Moscow in 2004, whose performance prompted the following disgusted after-action report by the conference chairman Andrei Illarionov: “*In our opinion the reputation of British science, the reputation of the British government and the reputation of the title “Sir” has sustained heavy damage.*”

If I were sensible, moderate Professor Sir David King, I would have stern words with this sound-alike character: otherwise some people might be in danger of mistaking him for an hysterical fool.

James Delingpole is a writer, journalist and broadcaster who is right about everything. He is the author of numerous fantastically entertaining books including “Welcome To Obamaland: I’ve Seen Your Future And It Doesn’t Work”

=====
Blog comment: “If all the ice on Greenland were to melt, sea level would rise by seven metres.”
And if my auntie had testicles, she’d be my uncle.

8. RIGHT CLIMATE FOR BIG BUCKS

by Andrew Bolt, *Herald Sun (Australia)*, October 30, 2009

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/right-climate-for-big-bucks/story-e6frfhqf-1225792625832>

Want a surefire way to get a grant - maybe \$300,000, or even more - for your university research? Then gather around, my dear professors, and say these magic words. "Climate change". You scoff? You say it's too crazy to work, given that your expertise is actually in Bible studies, Aboriginal history, ceramics or sorghum? More fool you.

Just check the 1136 grants of the Australian Research Council that were approved this week by Science Minister Senator Kim Carr. That's \$392 million Carr has splashed out in this year's funding round for university research into everything from history and anthropology to physics and genetic engineering. Yet with so much to choose from, an astonishing 10 per cent of that entire budget for ARC Discovery and Linkage grants went on projects submitted by academics who'd squeezed in some reference to "climate change", no matter how preposterous. Ten per cent! Oh, those cunning academics. Those wind-sniffers.

How well they understand the far-Left fierce need to have all scientists sing the Rudd Government's hymn of global warming doom. How closely they heeded his decision to make climate change research this year a "priority". Still, I must laugh at the inventiveness some showed to scramble on to this greatest of gravy trains. My favourite? It's the proposal from two Australian Catholic University academics to study "Crisis management in late antiquity: the evidence of Episcopal letters". Their plan is to read the letters of the bishops of the early Christian church to see how they dealt back then with massacres, turmoil, poverty, disasters and ... yes, "climate change". This, the academics added innocently, would help us form "appropriate responses to environmental and social crises" today. Ker-ching! That's \$262,000 for you, dear priests of this new taxpayer-funded Church of Global Warming.

But some academics were as artless as they were brazen. Take the ones from Wollongong who plan to ask Australians what they know about their food, and then claimed "this research may also enable citizens to deal with the changes caused by climate change". You laugh, but it worked. They got \$160,000. Or how about the Macquarie researchers who won almost \$300,000 to study how early humans learned to co-operate, after they cooed that this might help us to now "deal with problems such as global warming". How often just saying "climate change" turned some standard research into a must-have project for these apocalyptic times. Observe.

Four researchers into "artificial intelligence and signal and image processing" added that this "extensible leading edge technological platform" could help us explore the "critical problems of climate change adaptation". Take \$280,000, boys. A Queensland researcher into the spread of invasive species said his work would "massively facilitate ... climate change". Er, OK. Here's \$300,000, son. Four academics devoted to the normally thankless task of checking how plant roots defend against diseases suggested hopefully that such bugs could "worsen with climate change". Bingo! Collect \$495,000. Workers in the even lonelier field of sorghum, wondering how to remove the cyanide in the leaves, coughed that the problem "will get worse with climate change". They got \$270,000.

But truly the cheekiest submission came from Deakin scientists who are actually working out how to analyse traces of hydrocarbons so petroleum explorers can find more oil deposits. Yes, oil deposits - the stuff that gets turned into petrol and then into the emissions that global warming alarmists scream are killing the planet. But get this: the scientists sweetly added that this technology could also "improve our ability to forecast climate change". Brilliant! That's \$450,000 in their kick, for promising to help predict the global warming that their technology can only make worse. It's a joy to see such masters at work.

On it goes. An academic studying democracy movements in Asia got \$613,000 after saying "the financial crises and climate change pose new challenges". Three admirers of the "iconic superb fairy wren" got

more than \$600,000 when they claimed their study of the bird's genealogy could be "a model for the study of climate change". Researchers working on an anglers' map of where the big game fish bite promised to "extend" their findings "in the context of climate change". They've now got \$450,000. And, of course, the social engineers didn't need to be asked twice to hop on this latest chance to ride to Paradise. Carr's grants include \$217,000 for four Melbourne University academics working out "egalitarian responses to climate change", and \$652,000 to La Trobe researchers who want to get "traditional tribal groups" from the Willandra Lakes to help them understand how Aborigines survived "past global climate change".

What becomes mistakable after reading dozens of such project descriptions is that almost every one assumes what actually needs to be questioned: that man is heating the world, and dangerously. Almost all these 102 projects claim to be helping us to prepare for the ghastly consequences of global warming, and not one of the academics behind them openly says to the Government: hang on, what warming? Not one says he or she would first like to check just why the world isn't warming like the climate models predicted. Not one seeks to check why the warming stopped in 2001, why the oceans are again cooling, or why hurricane activity has actually fallen. How strange, given that thousands of scientists have signed several petitions warning there is still no proof of any dangerous man-made global warming.

Indeed, only four of Carr's funded projects seem to me even remotely connected with helping us to better understand if the world really is warming today, and whether what warming we've seen lately is caused by man - which is the very first thing we should know before spending billions on grand schemes to save ourselves. Those four projects are to see how much changes in the ocean influence Australia's climate; to work out new numerical methods to predict the weather; to study how the actions of waves influence climate change and to help post-grad students study "observable atmospheric indicators of climate change".

Curiously, that last project, which got just \$95,000, is titled "The coldest region on Earth gets even colder" - the one tiny hint of scepticism in the 102 project summaries. For the rest, this year's lucky academics - few of whom have trained in climate science or a related discipline - just sing the Government's song. "The biggest threat facing life now is climate change due to carbon dioxide emissions," says a civil engineer, who got \$530,000. "The global climate changes ... endanger the Australian population," intone four experts in ceramic composites who now share \$280,000.

True, I have no doubt these academics genuinely believe what they say, and are not influenced by their funding. I'd even add that many of these projects seem worth supporting, even if global warming is a crock. But what might less fussy folk conclude from this farce, as they figure how to get a piece of the action, too? And how about you? Are you surprised, now, that sceptical scientists can seem hard to find? Are you at last wondering what's in the carpetbags of those less rebuttable followers of the warming faith - the pay-per-speech preachers, the carbon traders, the windfarm moguls, the insurance salesmen, the offsets merchants, the solar panel makers, the Prius peddlers; the bio-fuel farmers and the whole hooting, hollering and repent-repent! gimme-cash crowd?

9. GULLIBLE EAGER-BEAVER PLANET SAVERS

by Mark Steyn, in MacLeans (Canada), Oct 29, 2009

<http://www2.macleans.ca/2009/10/29/gullible-eager-beaver-planet-savers/>

I'm always appreciative when a fellow says what he really means. Tim Flannery, the jet-setting doomsaying global warm-monger from down under, was in Ottawa the other day promoting his latest eco-tract, and offered a few thoughts on "Copenhagen"—which is transnational-speak for December's UN Convention on Climate Change. "We all too often mistake the nature of those negotiations in Copenhagen," remarked professor Flannery. "We think of them as being concerned with some sort of environmental treaty. That is far from the case. The negotiations now ongoing toward the Copenhagen

agreement are in effect diplomacy at the most profound global level. They deal with every aspect of our life and they will influence every aspect of our life, our economy, our society.”

Hold that thought: “They deal with every aspect of our life.” Did you know every aspect of your life was being negotiated at Copenhagen? But in a good way! So no need to worry. After all, we all care about the environment, don’t we? So we ought to do something about it, right? And, since “the environment” isn’t just in your town or county but spreads across the entire planet, we can only really do something at the planetary level. But what to do? According to paragraph 38 on page 18 of the latest negotiating text, the convention will set up a “government” to manage the “new funds” and the “related facilitative processes.”

Tim Flannery’s disarmingly honest characterization passed almost without notice, reported as far as I can tell only by Brian Lilley of CFRB Toronto and CJAD Montreal. But professor Flannery has it right. Government transport policy is about transport, and government education policy is about education, but environmental policy is about everything, because everything’s part of “the environment”: your town, your county, your planet—and you. “We are the environment. There is no distinction,” declared another renowned expert, David Suzuki, last year. And just as the government now monitors air and water quality so it’s increasingly happy to regulate your quality.

In the name of “the environment,” the state gets to regulate everything you do. The cap-and-trade bill recently passed by the U.S. House of Representatives, for example, is a bold assault on property rights: in order to sell your home—whether built in 2006 or 1772—you would have to bring it into compliance with whimsical, eternally evolving national energy efficiency standards, starting with a 50 per cent reduction in energy use by 2018. Fail to do so and it would be illegal for you to enter into a private contract with a willing buyer.

Hey, but who would ever find out?

Don’t be so sure. In 2006, to comply with the ‘European Landfill Directive,’ various municipal councils in England, Scotland and Northern Ireland introduced ‘smart’ trash cans—‘wheelie bins’ with a penny-sized electronic chip embedded within that helpfully monitors and records your garbage as it’s tossed into the truck. Once upon a time, you had to be a double-0 agent with Her Majesty’s Secret Service to be able to install that level of high-tech spy gadgetry. But now any old low-level apparatchik from the municipal council can do it, all in the cause of a sustainable planet. So where’s the harm?

And once Big Brother’s in your trash can, why stop there? Our wheelie-bin sensors are detecting an awful lot of junk-food packaging in your garbage. Maybe you should be eating healthier. In Tokyo, Matsushita engineers have created a “smart toilet”: you sit down, and the seat sends a mild electric charge through your bottom that calculates your body/fat ratio, and then transmits the information to your doctors. Japan has a fast-aging population imposing unsustainable costs on its health system, so the state has an interest in tracking your looming health problems, and nipping them in the butt. In England, meanwhile, Twyford’s, whose founder invented the modern ceramic toilet in the 19th century, has developed an advanced model – the VIP (Versatile Interactive Pan)—that examines your urine and stools for medical problems and dietary content: if you’re not getting enough roughage, it automatically sends a signal to the nearest supermarket requesting a delivery of beans. All you have to do is sit there as your VIP toilet orders a la carte and prescribes your medication.

But think of the environmental benefits: readers may recall Sheryl Crow’s brief campaign to get people to use only one sheet of toilet paper (I recommended an all-star consciousness-raising single— “All we are saying is give one piece a chance”). Last month, the Washington Post reported a new front in this war. Two-ply bathroom tissue, according to Allen Hershkowitz of the Natural Resources Defense Council, “is the Hummer of the paper industry.” Oh, and blame Canada, as that’s where most American two-ply comes from: this decadent Dominion is apparently the House of Saud of toilet paper. In Britain, where

closed-circuit cameras monitor you to check you're not eating a sandwich while driving, is it such a stretch to foresee those toilet sensors that wire your stool analysis to the government health centre also snitching on your two-ply Cottonelle? Or perhaps, if it's a Matsushita toilet, a few extra volts from the buttock-zapper will be enough of a warning.

"The environment" is the most ingenious cover story for Big Government ever devised. You float a rumour that George W. Bush is checking up on what library books you're reading, and everyone goes bananas. But announce that a government monitoring device has been placed in every citizen's trash can in the cause of "saving the planet," and the world loves you.

In 1785, the British philosopher Jeremy Bentham began working on his famous "Pan-opticon"—a radial prison in which a central "inspector" could see all the prisoners, but they could never see him. In the computer age, we now have not merely panopticon buildings, but panopticon societies, like modern London—and soon perhaps, excepting a few redoubts such as Waziristan and the livelier precincts of the Horn of Africa, a panopticon planet.

Yet high-tech statism still needs an overarching narrative. In the new school of panoptic fiction—such as John Twelve Hawks' recently completed Fourth Realm trilogy—the justification for round-the-clock surveillance is usually "security." But the "security state" is a tough sell: if you tell people the government is compiling data on them for national security purposes, the left instinctively recoils. But, if you explain that you're doing it to "lower emissions," starry-eyed coeds across the land will coo their approval. And the middle-class masochists of the developed world will whimper in orgasmic ecstasy as you tighten the screws, pausing only to demand that you do it to them harder and faster.

Consider a recent British plan for each citizen to be given an official travel allowance. If you take one flight a year, you'll pay just the standard amount of tax on the journey. But, if you travel more frequently, if you take a second or third flight, you'll be subject to additional levies—all in the interest of saving the planet for Al Gore's polar bear documentaries and that carbon-offset palace he lives in Tennessee. The Soviets restricted freedom of movement through the bureaucratic apparatus of "exit visas." The British favoured the bureaucratic apparatus of exit taxes: the movement's still free; it's just that there'll be a government processing fee of £412.95. And, in a revealing glimpse of the universal belief in enviro-statism, this proposal came not from Gordon Brown's Labour Party but from the allegedly Conservative Party.

At their Monday night poker game in hell, I'll bet Stalin, Hitler and Mao are kicking themselves: "It's about leaving a better planet to our children? Why didn't I think of that?" This is Two-Ply Totalitarianism—no jackboots, no goose steps, just soft and gentle all the way. Nevertheless, occasionally the mask drops and the totalitarian underpinnings become explicit. Take Elizabeth May's latest promotional poster: "Your parents f*cked up the planet. It's time to do something about it. Live Green. Vote Green." As Saskatchewan blogger Kate McMillan pointed out, the tactic of "convincing youth to reject their parents in favour of The Party" is a time-honoured tradition.

The problem, alas, is that, for the moment, there's still more than one party. But why? Last year, David Suzuki suggested that denialist politicians should be thrown in jail. And only last month the New York Times's Great Thinker Thomas Friedman channeled his inner Walter Duranty and decided that democracy has f*cked up the planet. Why, in Beijing, where they don't have that disadvantage, they banned the environmentally destructive plastic bag! In one day! Just like that! "One-party autocracy certainly has its drawbacks," wrote Friedman. "But when it is led by a reasonably enlightened group of people, as China is today, it can also have great advantages. That one party can just impose the politically difficult but critically important policies needed to move a society forward in the 21st century."

Forward to where? Well, fortunately the Copenhagen convention's embryo "government" appears immune to such outmoded concepts as democratic accountability. Don't take my word. Listen to what the activists are saying: it's about every aspect of your life.

PS: Just to be safe, after reading this column, tear into pieces and flush down your toilet.

Oh, no, wait, don't...

10. PANIC, LITTLE ONES, IT'S THE CARBON MONSTER

By Brendan O'Neill, The Australian, 2 November 2009

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/panic-little-ones-its-the-carbon-monster/story-e6frg6zo-1225793333509>

IF you don't reduce your carbon footprint, then puppies will drown and bunny rabbits will die. And a terrifying, jagged-toothed monster with crazy hooked hands will descend from the clouds to eat you up.

Believe it or not, that is the message being delivered by the British government to children, in a pound stg. 6 million (\$10.7m) advertising campaign designed to scare the next generation witless about the alleged horrors of global warming.

Taking environmentalist propaganda to a new low, the TV ad shows a father reading a nightmarish bedtime story to his perturbed-looking young daughter.

He tells her of a land where the "weather is very, very strange". There are "awful heatwaves" and "terrible storms and floods". A cartoon bunny is shown crying as it starves on the dried, cracked earth, while elsewhere a puppy drowns in floodwaters.

Above it all, a sooty, blackened monster - CO2 made hideous flesh - surveys the horrors with a grotesque grin on its face.

And just in case the little girl, and the millions of children that the TV ad is aimed at, thinks this is merely a twisted fairytale, her father makes clear that it is reality.

It is the "horrible consequence", he says, of human beings using too much CO2, much of which comes from "everyday things like keeping houses warm and driving cars".

In short? Children who live in warm houses and who get lifts to school or football practice should feel guilty, because their evil antics are causing dogs to die and cute rabbits to go hungry.

Not surprisingly, the ad has caused a storm. Nearly 400 people have complained to Britain's Advertising Standards Authority. Some are disturbed by the ad's scientific illiteracy (how one gets from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's relatively sober reports about changing weather patterns to a cartoon dog drowning in a flooded city is anybody's guess).

Others have slammed the government for knowingly and deliberately - and with taxpayers' money - scaring kids.

Yet the ad is only an extreme version of what has become mainstream environmentalist policy in recent years: terrifying children.

The environmentalist ethos, whether it is spouted by official bodies or radical, dreadlock-sporting campaigners, presents itself as caring and considerate, yet it is shot through with the politics of fear.

In place of grown-up, adult debate about the future, environmentalists continually use scaremongering - conjuring up horrid, squalid future scenarios based more on their fantastic imaginations than scientific fact - to try to force people to lower their horizons and change their behaviour.

And this green politics of fear is starting to have a detrimental effect on children.

As popular culture bombards kids with messages about a fiery, bunny-hostile future, and as many schools in Britain and elsewhere rebrand themselves as "eco schools", devoted to reducing children's carbon footprints as much as expanding their minds, so children are becoming paralysed by fear.

In 2007, a survey of 1150 seven to 11-year-olds in Britain found that more than half had lost sleep as a result of worrying about climate change.

"It's making me and my friends go mad," said a 12-year-old girl.

The children were most likely to be kept awake thinking about "the possible submergence of entire countries" and the "welfare of animals", indicating that hysterical, fact-lite, The Day After Tomorrow-style scare stories about worldwide flooding or the wiping out of polar bears have hit children where it hurts.

Worryingly, the survey also found that one in seven children blamed their own parents for the coming climate doom. This suggests that environmentalists' emphasis on the destructiveness of people's everyday behaviour - their driving habits, their food choices, their holidays - has successfully convinced kids that all adults, even mummy and daddy, are dirty and dangerous.

Indeed, environmentalist activists now cynically exploit children's fears to try to get them to snitch on their parents. A book called *How To Turn Your Parents Green*, by James Russell, encourages children to "nag, pester, bug, torment and punish the people who are merrily wrecking our world", that is, grown-ups, or "Groans".

It tells kids to become "Guardians of a Glorious Green Future" and to get their parents to sign up to a "Glorious Green Charter". Traditionally, it has only been the most authoritarian regimes on Earth - think Mao's China or Stalin's Soviet Union - that encouraged children to spy on and squeal on their parents. Now environmentalists do it, too, though with a Little Green Book rather than a little red one.

When I was a child in the 1980s, the spectre of nuclear war was used to keep children in a permanent state of panic; today climate change plays that role. We should be wary indeed of any campaign that makes children feel scared and guilty and even drives them mad, and which turns them against their own parents.

Brendan O'Neill is the editor of Spiked Online. [H/t CCNet] Copyright 2009, The Australian
