

The Week That Was (Oct 31, 2009) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

If you change your e-mail address or wish to unsubscribe, notify comments@sepp.org and please give your full name
#####

Quote of the Week:

"The greatest danger we face from global warming is that politicians pretend they KNOW something about it." -- *Ian McRoberts 2009*

THIS WEEK

A draft treaty prepared for the Copenhagen COP-15 conference calls not only for huge income transfers from developed (OECD) nations to LDCs (less developed countries), 'developing' nations (like China and India); it also calls for a system of global governance. If either or both of these policies are agreed to in CPH, even if signed by the US President, there is little chance of ratification by the US Senate. I would argue that, based on science, the LDCs should pay us for having raised the level of CO₂, the essential plant fertilizer; and we should all thank China for putting more CO₂ into the atmosphere.

The world's biggest economies agreed at a meeting last summer in D'Aquila, Italy, on a goal of limiting global temperature increases to 2 degrees Celsius, though they did not agree on the means to get there or on how to enforce it. I expect that they will announce such a goal also in Copenhagen and then go home – proudly pointing to this achievement. (It's like King Canute commanding the tides to stop – except he had no such illusions.)

It looks more and more that CPH, the 'Son of Kyoto,' will do nothing that conceivably impacts on climate – in spite of grandiose promises to cut emissions of GH gases. The EU and the LDCs will continue to press for such a Kyoto-like goal. But CPH is really all about money and power.

Meanwhile, the US Senate is tackling S-1733, its version of the Waxman-Markey Cap&Trade Bill, H.R. 2454, a bill that doesn't even mention 'climate' in its title. S-1733 is still in Committee and may be reported out in some form for a vote in the Senate. Unlike W-M, it does not enjoin EPA from regulating CO₂; but like W-M, it promises to be the largest tax bill ever considered, with huge income transfers from energy users (esp. low-income groups) to the favored few who have learned how to game the system. Washington lobbyists certainly seem to be earning their multi-million dollar fees.

As the NYT reports on October 25, 2009, Kerry and Boxer are still filling in the "blanks in a more detailed 923-page draft that spells out the formula for distributing pollution allowances [aka money] and other provisions."

"It's not unreasonable to demand that a committee, prior to legislative hearings, would actually have the bill in question with adequate time for review and analysis," said Senator James M. Inhofe, Republican of Oklahoma, the senior Republican on the Senate environment committee. On top of that, added Mr. Inhofe, who is a global warming skeptic, "one would think that, prior to legislative hearings, the committee would have a thorough, comprehensive economic analysis to understand how a 900-plus-page bill, designed to fundamentally reshape the American economy, affects consumers, small businesses, farmers and American families."

SEPP Science Editorial #34-2009 (10/31/09)

By S. Fred Singer, President, SEPP

The rebirth of the hockey-stick?

The hockeystick is attempting a comeback – and instead of relying on tree rings, it now relies on ancient midge larvae in lake sediments. It's all part of a determined effort to show that the 20th century is 'unusual' -- and therefore supports the IPCC claim of AGW. Here is the press release:

<http://www.spacedaily.com/2006/091019211717.zuui19g.html>

WASHINGTON (AFP) Oct 19, 2009: Sediment cores from a small Arctic lake in Canada stretching back 200,000 years show unprecedented gains in global warming since 1950, indicating human activity is the likely cause. "The past few decades have been unique in the past 200,000 years in terms of the changes we see in the biology and chemistry recorded in the cores," University of Colorado glaciologist Yarrow Axford said in the study by Canadian and US researchers. "We see clear evidence for warming in one of the most remote places on Earth at a time when the Arctic should be cooling because of natural processes," added the chief author of the study published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.

One suspicious item is the fact that the editors of PNAS, in their obvious desire to publish this paper, assigned its review to an editor [Mark Brenner, U of FL] of their own choosing. So the paper has not been peer reviewed in the usual sense; this depreciates its credibility and also that of the PNAS, particularly in a contentious area like climate science.

It is difficult for a non-specialist on midges like me to judge the quality of the data. But it would have been reassuring if similar results were to be published from other lakes in the Arctic, of which there are many thousands, rather than from just a single one. Obviously, even if there is a warming, one cannot identify its cause from the data presented. Actual temperature data of the Arctic, taken with thermometers, show a peak in 1935 followed by a cooling trend that reversed only in the 1970s.

Of course, there has been warming since 1950, a low point in temperature. First, we had the sudden temp jump in 1976-77 (certainly not caused by CO₂); then the large El Nino warming of 1998. How can the authors possibly claim a human influence? In addition, their claim that there should have been a significant 'cooling' trend over just 50 years from astronomical causes makes no sense either.

Of interest, below, is the abstract of what appears to be a very similar study (May 2004), complete with diatoms and chironomids (midge larvae), but with dissimilar results

<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1040618204000448>

Similarities and discrepancies between chironomid- and diatom-inferred temperature reconstructions through the Holocene at Lake 850, northern Sweden.

A quantitative temperature reconstruction using chironomids and diatoms has been attempted from a high-elevation lake in northern Sweden (Lake 850). Since 7000 cal. years BP, both chironomids and diatoms recorded similar temperatures (in the range of present-day estimates) but the correspondence between chironomid and diatom-inferred temperatures was highest in the recent Holocene (2500 cal. years BP to the present). Between ca. 9000 and 7000 cal. years BP, inferred temperatures from chironomids were warmer than today (ca. 12°C), in accord with other climate reconstruction using pollen, plant macrofossils and oxygen isotope analysis in lakes of northern Scandinavia. In contrast, diatom analysis did not infer warmer temperatures during this period. The insensitivity of diatoms to temperature in Lake 850 between 9000 and 7000 cal. years BP could be attributed to other environmental factors affecting the diatom assemblages through time, especially lake-water pH. Diatom-inferred pH showed a gradual decrease (0.5 pH units) between 9000 and 7000 cal. years BP, while it remained more

or less constant since 7000 cal. years BP. Changes in lake-water pH acting on diatoms seem to mask the effect of climate, leading to temperature reconstructions that are inaccurate. **Ways of disentangling climate and other environmental factors when attempting climate reconstruction should be further investigated.**

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

1. **Green World Government – *The Washington Times***
2. **The Second Battle of Copenhagen – *Patrick J. Buchanan***
3. **Renewable Energy: The Myth of Germany’s “Grün Energie” –*Patrick Tuohey***
4. **What’s Wrong With HR 3585 (Solar Technology Roadmap Act of 2009) – *McClintock***
5. **A Letter to the SEJ**
6. **Which industry will the trial lawyers go after next? – *IBD editorial***
7. **Cap-and-Trade Would Slow Economy, CBO Chief Says – *Juliet Eilperin***
8. **Cap&Trade For Babies? – *investors.com***

NEWS YOU CAN USE

Tom Sowell on smears and libel suits

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=509555>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/6389384/Lizards-and-tortoises-hampering-Californias-solar-energy-efforts.html>

Attempts to build solar energy plants in California are being threatened by efforts to protect rare species including desert tortoises, flat-tailed horned lizards and bighorn sheep. The state has a goal of meeting one third of its electricity needs from renewable energy by 2020, which has sparked a rush to erect giant solar mirrors which will be subsidised by federal funds. However, the arid area of south-east California where several companies want to build is already home to endangered animals. **SEPP says: *Good for the little critters! Go Green and fight subsidies!***

Volunteer Speakers Available Locally: From time to time, we will carry announcements about speakers who can be contacted directly.

Donn Dears, author of *Carbon Folly* (second edition now available; see www.carbonfolly.com) has been speaking at community meetings in the Chicago area. The subject of his talk: “Will the United States be the leading world economy in 2050? Or will the drive to cut CO2 emissions, because of alleged global warming, emasculate our energy production and cause our economy to fall behind China, India, Brazil and possibly Russia?”

Organizations in the Chicago area should contact him at ddears@tsaugust.org to arrange for him to speak.

There is no fee, unless transportation or hotel expenses are incurred.

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/10/25/bob-carter-with-a-down-under-view-of-climate-science/>

A good read: Bob Carter on "The science of deceit"

Also worth reading <http://www.drroyspencer.com/2009/10/an-expensive-urban-legend/>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

London Science Museums's Copenhagen Campaign Backfires. *The Sunday Telegraph*, 25 October 2009

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/6425738/Science-Museums-climate-change-poll-backfires>

The museum's Prove It! website, designed to influence politicians at the Copenhagen climate summit in December, allows members of the public to pledge their support to the environmentalist cause. But so far those backing the campaign are out-numbered nearly six-to-one by opponents. The website, which accompanies a major new exhibition at the venerable South Kensington (London) museum, claims to offer "all the evidence you need to believe in climate change".

Good news for the millions currently unemployed: New career paths for Green jobs: The U of Edinburgh now offers an **MSc degree in Carbon Management** http://www.geos.ed.ac.uk/masters/cman_info/

Can a PhD in emissions trading be far behind?

An example of the cult-like zealotry and stark raving madness of 'true believers': followers of the Gore 'Big Lie' http://www.dailybreeze.com/ci_13635913?source=rv

Keeping the best interests of the world in mind, James H. Rust, in a letter to Benny Peiser in CCNet, floats the idea of providing a financial reward for **climate alarmists who have a vasectomy**. This is just for discussion; he is not endorsing the idea.

"Carbon Dioxide 'May Improve Taste of Champagne' "--headline, *Daily Telegraph* (London), Oct. 15

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/foodanddrink/6337427/Carbon-dioxide-may-improve-taste-of-champagne.html>

#####

1. GREEN WORLD GOVERNMENT

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/oct/27/green-world-government/>

The Washington Times, October 27, 2009

Environmental alarmism is being exploited to chip away at national sovereignty. The latest threat to American liberties may be found in the innocuous-sounding Copenhagen Climate Treaty, which will be discussed at the United Nations climate-change conference in mid-December. The alert was sounded on the treaty in a talk given by British commentator Lord Christopher Monckton at Bethel College in St. Paul, Minn., on Oct. 14. Video of the talk has become an Internet sensation.

The treaty's text is not yet finalized but its principles are aimed at regulating all economic activity in the name of climate security, with a side effect that billions of dollars would be transferred from productive countries to the unproductive.

The control lever is the regulation of carbon emissions, which some purport are causing global warming. The Treaty would establish a Carbon Market Regulatory Agency and "global carbon budget" for each

country. In effect, this would allow the treaty's governing bodies to limit manufacturing, transportation, travel, agriculture, mining, energy production and anything else that emits carbon - like breathing.

Treaty supporters market the agreement through fear. Even though mean global temperatures have been on a downward spiral for several years after peaking in 1998, we are told that catastrophe is imminent. "The world has already crossed the threshold beyond which it is no longer possible to avoid negative impacts of anthropogenic climate change," says proposed treaty language being circulated by Greenpeace, the World Wildlife Fund and other groups. It is critical that they cultivate a sense of impending doom to justify the sweeping restrictions and new powers enshrined in the Treaty. The sky is falling and they want us to act now, act swiftly, act before it is too late -- but don't read the fine print.

The governing authority envisioned by the document reads like a bad George Orwell knockoff. The Treaty establishes a body called the Conference of the Parties (COP), which is given ultimate authority over administering and enforcing the Treaty. Its executive arm is something called the Adaptation Fund Board, under which is the Copenhagen Climate Facility, also known as "the Facility." The Facility is necessary because in order to save the planet, "the way society is structured will need to change fundamentally." This change would be impossible under the "fragmented set of existing institutions," so the Facility will step in with "such legal capacity as is necessary for the exercise of its functions and the protection of its interests." That's the Facility's interests, not yours.

The Facility will be run by an executive committee, the membership of which "may include representation from relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental stakeholders." So left-wing pressure groups, animal rights fanatics, tree-huggers, Al Gore or any other part of the environmentalist fringe would be eligible for executive committee membership. Naturally, global-warming skeptics like Lord Monckton need not apply.

A "massive scaling up of financial resources" will be required to fund the COP's activities. The United States and others will be required to transfer \$800 billion over five years, with additional funding requirements assessed on an as-needed basis. The COP will have taxing authority "including, but not limited to, a levy on aviation and maritime transport." The ability to tax aircraft and shipping is bad enough, but as careful readers of the elastic clauses of the U.S. Constitution know, the phrase "including but not limited to" authorizes any tax they can imagine.

Signatories of the Treaty will be required to file reports to the Committee for Reporting and Review ("the Committee"), and if found not in compliance with the Treaty's terms, they may have to face "the Facilitative Branch." If this branch finds that a country is violating the terms of the agreement, it will "undertake the measures necessary" to bring the country back into compliance.

The Treaty language would be farcical but for the fanaticism of its proponents. The environmental movement is driven by a millenarian determination to save humanity from itself, regardless of its impact on real people. President Obama reportedly will skip the Copenhagen meeting unless the treaty language is finalized. We urge him to resist the urge to pander to the international community at the expense of the United States.

We look forward to headlines about record cold temperatures during the December climate summit, and to hearing desperate speeches about stopping irresistible global warming during the signing ceremony, held during a blizzard.

=====
Lord Monckton warns of Copenhagen Treaty

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703574604574500580285679074.html?mod=googlenews_wsj#printMode

Noted climate change skeptic Lord Christopher Monckton issued a dire warning to all Americans Wednesday during a presentation at Bethel University in St. Paul, Minn. Specifically, he warned that the

United Nations Climate Change Treaty, scheduled to be signed in Copenhagen in December, contains specific language about the formation of a “world government.”

=====

<http://bobmccarty.com/2009/10/17/noted-climate-change-skeptic-warns-of-treaty/>

Below is a transcript of the 4-minute excerpt of Lord Monckton’s presentation captured in the video above:

“At Copenhagen, this December, weeks away, a treaty will be signed — Your president will sign it. Most of the third-world countries will sign it because they think they’re going to get money out of it. Most of the left-wing regimes around the world, like the European Union, will rubber-stamp it. Virtually nobody won’t sign it.

“I have read that treaty and what it says is this: ‘That a world government is going to be created. The word, government, actually appears as the first of three purposes of the new entity.

“The second purpose is the transfer of wealth from the countries of the West to third-world countries in satisfaction of what is called, coyly, a ‘climate debt,’ because we’ve been burning CO2 and they haven’t - and we’ve been screwing up the climate. We haven’t been screwing up the climate, but that’s the line.

“And the third purpose of this new entity, this government, is enforcement.

“How many of you think that the word election or democracy or vote or ballot occurs anywhere in the 200 pages of that treaty? Quite right. It doesn’t appear once.

“So, at last, the communists who piled out of the Berlin Wall and into the environmental movement and took over Greenpeace so that my friends who founded it left within a year because they’d captured it. Now the apotheosis is at hand.

“They are about to impose a communist world government on the world. You have a president who has very strong sympathies with that point of view. He’s going to sign. He’ll sign anything. He’s a Nobel Peace Laureate. Of course, he’ll sign it.

“And the trouble is this: If that treaty is signed, your Constitution says that it takes precedence over your Constitution. And you can’t resign from that treaty unless you get the agreement from all the other states, parties. And because you’ll be the biggest paying country, they’re not going to let you out.”

“So thank you America. You were the beacon of freedom to the world. It is a privilege merely to stand on this soil of freedom while it is still free. But, in the next few weeks, unless you stop it, your president will sign your freedom, your democracy and your prosperity away forever and neither you nor any subsequent government you may elect will have any power whatsoever to take it back again.

“That is how serious it is. I have read the treaty. I have seen the stuff about government and climate debt and enforcement. They are going to do this to you whether you like it or no.

“But I think it is here, here in your great nation which I so love and I so admire. It is here that, perhaps — at this 11th hour, at the 59th minute and 59th second — you will rise up and you will stop your president from signing that dreadful treaty. That purposeless treaty for there is no trouble with the climate — and even if there were, economically speaking, there’s nothing we can do about it.”

“So I end by saying to you the words that Winston Churchill addressed to your president in the darkest hour before the dawn of freedom in the Second World War. He quoted from your great poet, Longfellow: ‘Sail on, oh Ship of State. Sail on, oh Union, strong and great. Humanity, with all it’s fears, with all the hopes of future years, is hanging, breathless, on thy fate.’ Thank you.”

Lord Monckton served as a policy adviser to Margaret Thatcher and has repeatedly challenged Al Gore to debate the issue of climate change. He sued to stop Gore’s film “An Inconvenient Truth” from being shown in British schools due to its inaccuracies. The British judge found in favor of Monckton, ordering nine serious errors in the film to be corrected. Lord Monckton travels internationally to educate the public about the myth of global warming

SEPP comments: The Treaty can go into effect only if the US Senate ratifies it. Even a Presidential signature is insufficient to make it the ‘Law of the Land.’

2. THE SECOND BATTLE OF COPENHAGEN

by Patrick J. Buchanan, October 17, 2009

<http://www.lewrockwell.com/buchanan/buchanan118.html>

Before President Obama even landed at Andrews Air Force Base, returning from his mission to Copenhagen to win the 2016 Olympic Games, Chicago had been voted off the island. Many shared the lamentation of Indiana Gov. Mitch Daniels, "What has become of America, when Chicago can't steal an election?"

A second and more serious battle of Copenhagen is shaping up, in mid-December, when a world conference gathers to impose limits on greenhouse gases to stop "global warming." Primary purpose: Rope in the Americans who refused to submit to the Kyoto Protocols that Al Gore brought home in the Clinton era.

The long campaign to bring the United States under another global regime – the newest piece in the architecture of world government – has been flagging since 2008. Then, it seemed a lock with the election of Obama and a veto-proof Democratic Senate. Why has the campaign stalled? Because global warming has stalled. The hottest year of modern times, 1998, came and went a decade ago.

As BBC climate correspondent Paul Hudson writes: "For the last 11 years, we have not observed any increase in global temperatures. And our climate models did not forecast it, even though manmade carbon dioxide, the gas thought to be responsible for warming our planet, has continued to rise."

What this powerfully suggests is that what man does and does not do is far less responsible for climate change, if it is responsible at all, than other factors over which he has no control.

Consider. Though the emissions of carbon dioxide rose constantly throughout the 20th century – with the industrialization of the West, Japan, Southeast Asia and, finally, China and India – global temperatures have not risen steadily at all. They have fluctuated. John Sununu, writing in the St. Croix Review, says the Earth underwent "cooling in the 1920s, heating in the 1930s and 1940s, cooling in the 1950s and 1960s and 1970s, warming in the 1980s and 1990s, and cooling in the past decade."

But if there is no crisis, why are we even going to Copenhagen? And if there is no causal connection between carbon dioxide and global warming, what is the true cause of climate change?

Some scientists say that 98 percent of the Earth's temperature can be explained by the sun. When the sun's energy increases, a matter over which man has zero control, the Earth's temperature rises. When the sun's energy diminishes, the Earth's temperature falls. One solar scientist, Piers Corbyn, claims to have found a link between solar charged particles hitting the Earth and global warming and cooling.

Others, like professor Don Easterbrook of Western Washington University, contend that the oceans explain climate change. As they heat and cool cyclically, the Earth heats and cools. And where the oceans were cooling for 40 years before the 1990s, they have lately been heating up. Easterbrook says these cycles tend to last for 30 years.

As Hudson notes, there are scientists who claim they have taken all these factors into consideration and insist that the Earth, over the long haul, is warming. But Hudson cites Mojib Latif of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, who says we are in the first stage of a long-term cooling trend that will last another 10 to 20 years.

The anecdotal evidence almost daily contradicts Al Gore and the end-of-times environmentalists. Lately, there have been record-breaking cold spells in the Midwest and West. Snow came to Colorado this October, postponing a baseball playoff game. The hurricane season turned out to be among the mildest on record. Contrary to predictions, the polar bear population seems to be doing fine.

While the ice cap at the North Pole is receding, the Antarctic ice cap, which contains 90 percent of the world's ice, is expanding. Moreover, receding ice in the Arctic is opening up a northwest passage from Europe to Asia. The Russians believe the immense mineral resources of the Arctic may soon be accessible. While we wring our hands, they are rushing to get them.

The mounting evidence that global warming has halted and man is not responsible for climate change has thrown the Kyoto II lobby into something of a panic. Barbara Boxer and John Kerry are re-branding the Senate cap-and-trade bill as a national security measure.

If, however, cap-and-trade, which the Congressional Budget Office says will be another blow to economic growth, can be stopped before the Copenhagen summit in December, the republic may have dodged another bullet. And the goal of the globalists – an end to the independence and sovereignty of the United States, and the creation of a world government – will have sustained yet another welcome postponement.

Patrick J. Buchanan is co-founder and editor of The American Conservative. He is also the author of seven books, including Where the Right Went Wrong, and A Republic Not An Empire.

3. RENEWABLE ENERGY: THE MYTH OF GERMANY'S "GRÜN ENERGIE"

Posted By Patrick Tuohey, October 19, 2009 –

<http://biggovernment.com/2009/10/19/renewable-energy-the-myth-of-germanys-grun-energie/>

On May 27, President Obama remarked to an audience gathered at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada that Americans, "pioneered solar technology, but we've fallen behind countries like Germany and Japan in generating it, even though they get less sun than we do. They certainly get less sun than Nevada." Today, Vice President Biden and a handful of Cabinet secretaries release the 'Recovery through Retrofit' report that will extol the virtues of green jobs and energy savings to be had if only the government had its way.

Observers of national policy may want to look at other countries' experiences to see how they have fared with efforts to improve environmental policies. Previous research on green jobs policies in Spain [1] showed that costs were high and benefits short-lived. But what of the President's example of Germany?

The Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung [2] (RWI), an independent German economic policy think tank founded in 1926, has released its report on the matter entitled, "Economic impacts from the promotion of renewable energies: The German experience." To readers hoping for a government solution to energy problems, page 4 delivers a devastating indictment of the German model:

German renewable energy policy, and in particular the adopted feed-in tariff scheme, has failed to harness the market incentives needed to ensure a viable and cost-effective introduction of renewable energies into the country's energy portfolio. To the contrary, the government's support mechanisms have in many respects subverted these incentives, resulting in massive expenditures that show little long-term promise for stimulating the economy, protecting the environment, or increasing energy security.

The German experience has resulted in plenty of government spending with little to show for it. Here are some of my schadenfreude favorites:

- "The amount of electricity produced through solar photovoltaics [or PV, which are solar panels] was a negligible 0.6% despite being the most subsidized renewable energy, with a net cost of about 8.4 Bn €(US \$12.4 Bn) for 2008? (page 5).
- "The real net cost for all [solar panel] modules installed between 2000 and 2008 account for about 35 Bn €(US \$ 48 Bn) (in prices of 2007). Future PV installations in 2009 and 2010 may cause further real cost worth 18.3 Bn €(US \$ 25.5 Bn) (Table 4). Adding both figures yields a total of 53.3 Bn €(US \$ 73.2 Bn) for PV alone" (page 15).
- Nobody said adopting a new energy model would be cheap, and Americans have certainly taken on large and expensive new endeavors because of the subsequent economic payoff (e.g. the Interstate Highway System [3]). Even if the cost is no object, the RWI study indicates that the benefit is no incentive. The report tells us that, "currently, the feed-in tariff for PV is more than eight times higher than the wholesale electricity price at the power exchange" (page 5). This is after years of government support of the solar power industry. "Even on-shore wind [energy], widely regarded as a mature technology, requires feed-in tariffs that exceed the per-kWh cost of conventional electricity by up to 300% to remain competitive" (page 5). In other words, even when green energy industries are up and running for a while, their costs remain several times higher than conventionally produced energy.

Page 9 of the RWI report addresses the German experience as far as it relates to job creation:

- In the end, Germany's PV promotion has become a subsidization regime that, on a per-worker basis, has reached a level that far exceeds average wages, with per worker subsidies as high as 175,000 €(US \$ 240,000).
- It is most likely that whatever jobs are created by renewable energy promotion would vanish as soon as government support is terminated, leaving only Germany's export sector to benefit from the possible continuation of renewables support in other countries such as the US.
- Furthermore, the report states that estimates of green job creation due to the German energy regime are flawed because they fail to account for any job losses at less-favored (and likely cheaper) forms of energy.

As Chinese manufacturers produce PV cells cheaper than Germans can, the subsidies end up as a giant transfer of wealth from German taxpayers to Chinese companies [4]. Because of this, even Germany's

leading PV manufacturer is calling for the subsidies to be cut, both to make the industry more efficient and to reduce energy costs to consumers. That's right, the Germans are concluding that reduced subsidies mean greater efficiencies and lower costs!

Lastly, die-hard environmentalists may say that green energy production is more important than the cost of energy or number of jobs it creates (or destroys). But even on its own merits as an environmental energy, solar is a failure. The report states on page 19:

- PV is among the most expensive greenhouse gas abatement options: Given the net cost of 41.82 Cents (Cents 63.00 US \$) per kWh for modules installed in 2008 (Table 4), and assuming that PV displaces conventional electricity generated from a mixture of gas and hard coal with an emissions factor of 0.584 kg carbon dioxide (CO₂) per kWh (Nitsch et al. 2005:66), then dividing the two figures yields abatement costs that are as high as 716 €(1,050 US\$) per tonne.
- The European Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) is about 13.4€/per ton, or 53 times less than those for solar production. In other words, if you're looking to be green with your greenback, solar energy production is the worst way to go.

Notwithstanding the current climate, the United States is by far the largest economy in the world. The choices we make have far greater global impact than any other economy. While it is right to look to other countries for examples of policies that work, the fact remains that so-called green energy production is a failed experiment. Even those who pioneered it are looking for a way out. There is simply no reason to think that even US Rep Peter Hoekstra's magic bureaucrats [5] in Washington, DC can deliver efficient and economic energy from solar power.

[1] Previous research on green jobs policies in Spain:
<http://www.missourirecord.com/news/index.asp?article=10008>

[2] Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung: <http://www.rwi-essen.de/>

[3] Interstate Highway System: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interstate_Highway_System

[4] a giant transfer of wealth from German taxpayers to Chinese companies:
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125383541153239329.html>

[5] magic bureaucrats: <http://www.c-spanarchives.org/congress/?q=node/77531&id=6909470>

[4. WHAT'S WRONG WITH HR 3585 \(Solar Technology Roadmap Act of 2009\)](http://mcclintock.house.gov/2009/10/hr-3585-solar-technology-roadmap-act-of-2009.shtml) <http://mcclintock.house.gov/2009/10/hr-3585-solar-technology-roadmap-act-of-2009.shtml>

House Chamber, Washington, D.C. October 22, 2009. M. Speaker: I rise in opposition to the rule and in opposition to the underlying bill. And to explain why, I'd like to walk through a little history and a little math.

Let's begin with history and two important years: 1978 and 1839.

In 1978, the Wall Street Journal carried this headline: Solar Power Seen Meeting 20 percent of Needs by 2000; Carter May Seek Outlay Boost. Oddly, the same paper carried a headline in 2006 making the same promise this time for all renewable fuels -- only this time by 2025; but I digress.

Billions of dollars were poured into research and development for solar technology, and an entire solar industry solely supported by massive subsidies arose to grab those dollars.

And what was the result of all of this plunder of taxpayers and ratepayers? More than 30 years after that promise was made in 1978, solar power accounts for just one percent of electricity generation. That's not for lack of subsidies; it's because despite billions of dollars of subsidies, the technology remains immensely inefficient and expensive.

And that brings me to the second year: 1839. This is not a new technology. Photovoltaic electricity was first discovered by French physicist Alexandre Edmond Becquerel in the year 1839.

This technology has existed for 170 years. And in those 170 years of scientific discovery and progress, and despite billions of dollars of subsidies to the solar industry, we have yet to discover a more expensive way of generating electricity!

When the state of California was squandering its wealth on subsidizing this industry a few years ago, I asked the California Energy Commission what is the price range of various forms of electricity generation. And here is what they reported:

- The cheapest form of electricity generation is hydroelectric. It ranges from a quarter cent to 2.7 cents per kilowatt hour average around 1.5 cents.
- Then comes nuclear power, with a midrange around 1.7 cents.
- After that, coal, about 1.9 cents.
- Then wind at 4.6 cents, and then natural gas at 10.6 cents. And finally, we get to the most expensive way to produce electricity, solar, between 13.5 cents and 42.7 cents per kilowatt hour, with a mid-range of 28.1 cents.

It gets worse.

In a day, a solid acre of state-of-the-art solar panels can produce 2.2 megawatt hours of electricity, assuming an average of 5 hours of peak sunlight: 2.2 megawatt hours per day. Compare that to the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant that produces 49,000 megawatt hours of electricity each day.

In order to duplicate that single nuclear power plant, it would require 22,000 acres of solid solar panels or 34 square miles. By comparison, the Diablo Canyon Power Plant sits on one square mile.

So this technology, after 170 years and countless billions of dollars of research and development, is roughly 17 times more expensive than nuclear power and consumes 32 times the land area of a comparable nuclear facility.

But don't worry, say the proponents of this bill. It just needs a few billion dollars more to become competitive. I'm sorry, but we've heard that song before.

I suppose hope springs eternal. For decades the federal government and gullible states like California have kept the solar industry afloat, pumping billions of dollars into subsidized loans, credits to consumers who buy solar panels and, of course, Research and Development (\$166 million last year and \$175 million this year by the Department of Energy alone).

This is an industry that exists solely of the dole, by the dole and for the dole. It is now clamoring for billions of dollars more. And if this rule is passed and the bill is taken up, they're going to get it directly out of the shrinking savings accounts of American taxpayers.

The Solar Technology Roadmap Act of 2009. You've heard of the 'Bridge to Nowhere?' This is the roadmap that will get us there.

5. A LETTER TO THE SEJ (Society of Environmental Journalists)

TO: Robert McClure, Journalist,

FROM: S. Fred Singer

SUBJECT: SEJ didn't single out journo who questioned Al Gore,

<http://invw.org/2009/10/sej-didnt-single-out-journo-who-questioned-al-gore/>

Dear Mr. McClure,

Since my name has been mentioned frequently, permit me to enter this discussion.

First, a comment about you. From all I can tell, you are trying to do an honest job of reporting, but you are also very busy and therefore do not have time to check all of the details. I don't blame you; no one has enough time to check every fact. That is why the adversarial process is so useful. Every good journo tries to present both sides of an issue –even in the face of great pressure to abandon this principle.

You state that in 1997 you concluded “the science was being proved out” – i.e., that global warming was anthropogenic –AGW, just like the IPCC claimed. In fact, the satellite data, unaffected by urban heat islands and other instrumental problems, showed only a minor warming trend by 1997, compatible with a *zero* trend. (The big temperature rise occurred in 1998 and was caused by El Nino, not by CO2.)

Comment #2 [by Eddy Aruda] cites a fairly complete list of undisputed facts that all contradict the AGW hypothesis of the IPCC. But you do not respond to any of these. Why not?

[For detailed references about such facts, please see the NIPCC summary report “*Nature – Not Human Activity – Rules the Climate*” http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf. For an even shorter version, see “NIPCC findings: CO2 is not a pollutant:” http://sepp.org/Archive/NewSEPP/NIPCC_Findings.pdf]

You refer to a “growing agreement [about AGW] by climate scientists.” My impression, based on several polls, is exactly the reverse: that the percentage of *skeptics* is growing.

You also question George Taylor's climate credentials, since his degree is in meteorology. I don't think that's a valid argument. Jim Hansen is an astronomer-physicist, Steve Schneider received his Ph.D. in mechanical engineering and plasma physics, and Michael Oppenheimer is a chemist. The chairman of the IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri, is an engineer-economist with no appreciable climate credentials or publications. To anticipate your question, I am an atmospheric physicist with a publication record of more than 50 years. I also coauthored climate books in 2007, 2008, and 2009. Yet you state (in Comment #7) that “Singer is no longer credible.” What is the basis of your opinion?

I don't think the *ad hominem* smears by Gelbspan are worth responding to. In any case, Russell Cook has ably dealt with them in his several comments.

One more point: In Comment #4 you state that Singer has acknowledged that “industrialization has affected the *atmosphere*.” That is correct; the evidence we have shows that the rise in atmospheric CO2 (and other greenhouse gases) is mainly anthropogenic. But this does not prove that the general increase in atmospheric *temperature* in the 20th century is human-caused; there is no temperature increase in the 21st century. On the contrary: not only is there no evidence in support of a significant AGW but the empirical data show that natural forcings have dominated any human effects. And natural climate change is essentially unstoppable.

Sincerely,

S. Fred Singer

6. TORT LAWYERS' NEXT VICTIM: WHICH INDUSTRY WILL THE TRIAL LAWYERS GO AFTER NEXT? A suit filed by Mississippi property owners who had losses from Hurricane Katrina might provide a glimpse of the mischief to come.

IBD editorial, Oct 20, 2009

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=509682>

In less than a month, two federal appeals courts have reversed trial court decisions to throw out global warming lawsuits.

Last week, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans ruled that a class-action suit against energy companies can proceed. In *Comer v. Murphy Oil USA*, the plaintiffs are alleging that 30 oil, electric and coal companies are liable because they have made products that contributed to the global warming that intensified the effects of Katrina. The plaintiffs are Mississippians whose property was damaged in the 2005 storm.

On Sept. 21, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York City reinstated *Connecticut v. AEP*. In this suit, eight states, the city of New York and three land trusts are seeking an injunction that would order six power companies to cut their greenhouse gas emissions.

Both cases are alarming. Courts shouldn't let plaintiffs sue over global warming when it's nothing more than speculation. But the *Comer* case is cause for greater concern.

"It is a private class action for compensatory and punitive damages, not a suit brought by states or municipalities for injunctive relief," professor and defense attorney Russell Jackson explains on his legal blog *Consumer Class Actions & Mass Torts*. "And that means contingency fees. And thus the promise of copycat lawsuits."

Despite the shrieks and roars from global warm-mongers who firmly believe man is causing the planet to heat up with the carbon dioxide he is emitting, there's no way to prove that that is the case. As the lower courts ruled in both suits, the issue is nonjusticiable, meaning that it is inappropriate for judicial review.

But that won't matter to acquisitive plaintiffs, rapacious trial lawyers, politically minded judges and gullible jurors. They'll plow right through the science to shake down corporate victims out of spite and greed.

Through frequent filings of abusive medical malpractice lawsuits, trial lawyers have already contributed to rising health care expenses. They would be happy to do the same to energy costs, invoking *Comer v. Murphy Oil USA* as their inspiration. Unless future courts make better rulings than the Second and Fifth circuits have, or lawmakers address the problem, trouble lies ahead.

7. CAP-AND-TRADE WOULD SLOW ECONOMY, CBO CHIEF SAYS

By Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post, October 15, 2009

A House-passed bill that targets climate change through a cap-and-trade system of pollution credits would slow the nation's economic growth slightly over the next few decades and would create "significant" job losses from fossil fuel industries as the country shifts to renewable energy, the head of the Congressional Budget Office told a Senate energy panel Wednesday.

CBO Director Douglas W. Elmendorf emphasized that his estimates contained significant uncertainties and "do not include any benefits from averting climate change," but his message nevertheless contrasted sharply with those of President Obama and congressional Democratic leaders, who have suggested that a cap on carbon emissions would help revive the U.S. economy.

Elmendorf testified before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee that the cap-and-trade provisions of the House bill -- in which emitters of greenhouse gases would be able to buy and sell pollution credits -- would cut the nation's gross domestic product by 0.25 to 0.75 percent in 2020 compared with "what it would otherwise have been," and by 1 to 3.5 percent in 2050.

Elmendorf also pointed to disruptions that would occur as Americans sought employment with industries that would benefit under a carbon cap, such as solar and wind power.

"The shifts will be significant," the CBO director said. "We want to leave no misunderstanding that aggregate performance -- the fact that jobs turn up somewhere else for some people -- does not mean that there are not substantial costs borne by people, communities, firms in affected industries and affected areas. You saw that in manufacturing, and we would see that in response to changes that this legislation would produce."

Opponents of climate-change legislation seized on Elmendorf's comments, suggesting they meant the United States would be better off not curbing greenhouse gas emissions linked to climate change. Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kan.), who described himself as "a skeptic" on the issue, detailed how Kansans would likely face higher energy prices under a cap-and-trade system. "Because while we're projecting these things, people are having to deal with their basic lives on it, and this is going to be very expensive," Brownback said.

But Elmendorf, who called the economic downside to the House climate bill "comparatively modest," noted that climate change could impose costs on Brownback's home state in other ways, by harming agriculture. In light of those potential risks, the CBO director said, "many economists believe that the right response to that kind of uncertainty is to take out some insurance, if you will, against some of the worst outcomes."

Rep. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.), co-author of the House bill with Rep. Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif.), said that several independent analyses, including one by the CBO, had found their bill "would only cost about a postage stamp a day, and that's before you include thousands of dollars in savings from energy-efficiency gains. The harsh reality is that America's global warming and energy challenges are just too important for us to keep mailing it in by not enacting a comprehensive energy and global warming bill."

8. CAP-AND-TRADE FOR BABIES?

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=509554>

An environmental writer mainstreams an idea floating around the green fringe — save the earth by population control and give carbon credits to one-child families. Are we threatened by the patter of little carbon footprints?

It's long been a mantra on the left that people are a plague on the earth, ravaging its surface for food and resources, polluting its atmosphere and endangering its species. Now we are endangering its very climate to the point of extinction. Even the result of our breathing — carbon dioxide — has been declared by the EPA to be a dangerous pollutant.

Treaties like Kyoto and the upcoming economic suicide pact to be forged in Copenhagen have focused on the instruments and byproducts of our civilization. Now the focus is shifting increasingly to the people who built it.

New York Times environmental writer Andrew Revkin participated in an Oct. 14 panel discussion on climate change with other media pundits titled "Covering Climate: What's Population Got To Do With It?" People who need people they are not.

Participating via Web cam, Revkin volunteered that in allocating carbon credits as part of any cap-and-trade scheme, "if you can measurably somehow divert fertility rate, say toward accelerating decline in a place with a high fertility rate, shouldn't there be a carbon value to that?"

He went on to say that "probably the single most concrete and substantive thing an American, young American, could do to lower our carbon footprint is not turning off the light or driving a Prius, it's having fewer kids, having fewer children."

"More children equal more carbon dioxide emissions," Revkin has blogged, wondering "whether this means we'll soon see a market in baby-avoidance carbon credits similar to efforts to sell CO2 credits for avoiding deforestation." Save the trees, not the children.

Revkin's views are unfortunately shared by people with power and influence. Jonathon Porritt, chairman of Britain's Sustainable Development Commission, believes that "having more than two children is irresponsible" and that people should "connect up their own responsibility for their total environmental footprint."

Earlier this year, Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi defended federal contraceptive initiatives as an effort to "reduce costs to the states and to the federal government." For Pelosi, mother of five, the fewer the merrier.

Would this proposed carbon-credit carrot turn someday into a large stick? Would child exemptions disappear after the first child or worse? After all, we have a White House communications director, Anita Dunn, who considers mass murderer Mao Zedong her favorite philosopher. China has its one-child policy, which it vigorously enforces.

This brave new world is not too far-fetched for science adviser John Holdren, who has advised taking population control to quite another level. He has at various times advocated forced abortion and sterilization and views people as a burden, not as the ultimate resource, as we do.

In a recently rediscovered book, "Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment," co-authored with Malthus fans Paul and Anne Ehrlich, Holdren wrote that families "contribute to general social deterioration by overproducing children" and "can be required by law to exercise reproductive responsibility." Holdren envisions that a "Planetary Regime might be given responsibility for determining the optimum population for the world and for each region and for arbitrating various countries' shares within their regional limits ... the Regime would have some power to enforce the agreed limits." In other words, China on steroids.

The view that human beings are inexorably outstripping the globe's capacity to sustain them is one of the most vivid, powerful and enduring economic myths of the modern era because the Chicken Littles who spread it forget one simple fact — with bodies come minds.

We are not cattle that graze until there's no grass. Our species, unlike all others, can consciously apply problem-solving techniques to the project of expanding its resource base and providing new and cleaner sources of energy. Minds matter economically as much as hands and mouths. And minds arrive only in company with bodies.

Be fruitful and multiply — while you can.