

The Week That Was (April 3, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

The Heartland Institute's Fourth International Conference on Climate Change will be held in Chicago, Illinois on May 16-18, 2010 at the Chicago Marriott Magnificent Mile Hotel, 540 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago. It will call attention to new scientific research on the causes and consequences of climate change, and to economic analyses of the cost and effectiveness of proposals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. To register, click [here](#).

#####

Quote of the Week

"The only thing more dangerous than ignorance is arrogance."—Albert Einstein [H/t Ken Reed]

THIS WEEK:

One of the remarkable changes over the past few months is the extent to which public skepticism of global warming science has grown. The sloppiness and gross errors of the IPCC reports have been far more widely reported in Europe than in the US and some of the strongest advocates of human-caused global warming are backing down from their prior positions. Various opinion surveys reflect this change.

Perhaps, even a better indication of the change than opinion polls is a major change in editorial policy of various newspapers that previously accepted human-caused global warming unquestionably. One newspaper that has undergone a major shift is the German, *Der Spiegel*. The online version now carries an eight-part series entitled "A Superstorm for Global Warming Research." The first part is reproduced below and the other seven parts can be found on the referenced web site.

However, politicians and bureaucrats still act as if nothing has happened. No doubt it will take some time, and voter anger, before these politicians and bureaucrats realize what is happening. The arrogance they exhibit is staggering. The British Prime Minister is now attempting to develop a scheme whereby western nations send \$100 Billion a year to third - world dictators so they will do what many of them do best – suppress the economic opportunities of their citizens.

In other news, President Obama announced a plan for off-shore drilling on the southeastern US continental shelf. After initial praise, some commentators began to express concern. Prior to this administration assuming power, most bans on drilling had been removed. The new plan bans drilling off the coasts of western US and much of Alaska. It also delays drilling off Virginia and other states that desire to permit drilling. A recent action by the Interior Department to place greater regulations on drilling in the Rocky Mountains should give many enthusiasts of off-shore drilling pause. Similar actions for off-shore drilling may be in store one or two years from now.

The EPA continues to move forward in its efforts to control the American economy. It has unilaterally announced increased automobile mileage standards, citing its finding that carbon dioxide endangers public health and welfare gives it the power to do so. If this is not rigorously contested, no doubt EPA will aggressively move into other areas.

On Thursday, EPA released two "scientific reports" claiming they show that mountain top removal for coal mining destroys water quality in the regions where such mining activities take place. The same day, EPA announced new guidelines for issuing permits for such activities. Mountain top removal is a contentious issue. But the EPA actions were done in secret and there was no opportunity for public comment on the reports or the guidelines. Apparently, EPA confuses transparency with opaqueness.

Global Warming Science: In the past two TWTW's it was pointed out that IPCC's claim that human emissions of greenhouse gases are the principal driver of global warming rests on two crucial

assumptions. The first assumption is that the three datasets used to calculate average global surface-air temperatures have been rigorously maintained. Climategate, the Russian Institute of Economic Analysis, the work of Joseph D'Aleo, Anthony Watts, et al, revealed that this critical assumption is false. Hadley-CRU, NOAA-NCDC, and NASA-GISS have failed to rigorously maintain their datasets. It is likely that the datasets contain a significant warming bias of an unknown magnitude.

The second assumption required for IPCC's claim is that the IPCC has a virtually complete understanding of the natural causes of temperature change. The failure of the earth to warm over the past ten years even as carbon dioxide emissions increased demonstrates the failure of this assumption.

Figure SPM-2 in the Technical Summary for Policymakers of IPCC's Assessment Report 4 (2007) shows the natural and human forcings on climate considered by the IPCC. There is only one natural warming influence considered – changes in solar irradiance. There are three major human warming influences considered (for purposes here, cooling influences are ignored). The human warming influences are carbon dioxide emissions, other greenhouse gases, and tropospheric ozone. The sum of the coefficients given to the human warming influences is 25 times that of the coefficient for the only natural warming influence considered. With calculated human warming influence 25 times that of natural warming influence, no wonder the IPCC considers it necessary to bury the Medieval Warm Period.

Also, Figure SPM-1 in the same report gives changes in greenhouse gases from ice cores over the past 10,000 years. It shows gradual rise since 5,000 years ago and exponential increase over the last century. When comparing this with temperatures from Greenland ice cores for the past 10,000 years [Figure 2.B, NIPCC 2008 p. 4] one realizes that changes in greenhouse cases cannot begin to explain past changes in temperatures.

An upcoming TWTW will discuss how the IPCC reports dismiss the physical evidence showing significant changes in temperatures over the past 10,000 years.

SCIENCE EDITORIAL #10-2010 (April 3, 2010)

By S. Fred Singer, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project

ClimateGate Whitewash

There is now a desperate effort afoot by assorted climate alarmists to explain away the revelations of the incriminating e-mails leaked last year from the University of East Anglia (UEA). But the ongoing investigations so far have avoided the real problem, namely whether the reported warming is genuine or simply the manufactured result of manipulation of temperature data by scientists in England and the United States.

The latest report is by the British House of Commons' Science and Technology Committee, which largely absolved Philip Jones, head of UEA's Climate Research Unit and author of most of the e-mails. How can we tell that it's a whitewash? Here are some telltale signs:

- It refers to the e-mails as “stolen”
- It did not take direct testimony from scientifically competent skeptics
- Yet it derives the conclusion that there is nothing wrong with the basic science and that warming is human caused – essentially endorsing the IPCC

None of the investigations have gone into any detail on how the data might have been manipulated. But this is really the most important task for any investigation, since it deals directly with the central issue: Is there an appreciable human influence on climate change in the past decades?

Instead, much of the attention of newspapers, and of the public, has focused on secondary issues: the melting of Himalayan glaciers, the possible inundation of the Netherlands, deforestation of the Amazon, crop failures in Africa, etc. While these issues demonstrate the sloppiness of the IPCC process, they don't tell anything about the cause of the warming: natural or anthropogenic.

So what do the e-mails really reveal? We know that Jones and his gang tried and largely succeeded in "hiding the decline" of temperature by using what he termed "Mike's [Mann] *Nature* trick." Most people think it refers to CRU tree ring data after 1960, which do show a decline in temperature. However, I believe that it refers to Michael Mann's "trick" in hiding the fact that his multi-proxy data did not show the expected warming after 1979. So he abruptly cut off his analysis in 1979 and simply inserted the thermometer data supplied by Jones, which do claim a strong temperature increase. Hence the hockey-stick, suggesting a sudden major warming during the past century.

Only a thorough *scientific* investigation will be able to document that there was no strong warming after 1979, that the instrumented warming record is based on data manipulation, involving the selection of certain weather stations, [and the de-selection of others that showed no warming], plus applying insufficient corrections for local heating.

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

1. A Superstorm for Global Warming Research -- Part 1 of an 8 Part Series

By Marco Evers, Olaf Stampf and Gerald Traufetter, Spiegel Online [H/t Toshio Fujita, Charles Minning]
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,686697,00.html>

2. Environmental 'Crisis' and Government Power

By Barun Mitra, WSJ Asia, Mar 23, 2010
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703775504575136733707732628.html>

3. How to tell sceptics from deniers

The Scientific Alliance, Apr 1, 2010
<http://scientific-alliance.org/>
[Excerpt]

4. America's New Nuclear Option

By Steven Chu, WSJ, Mar 23, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704231304575092130239999278.html#mod=todays_us_opinion
[SEPP Comment: Unless the government is willing to relax regulations the approval process could be a lawyer's dream]

5. The President's Oil Drilling Bait and Switch

By Steve Milloy, IBD, Mar 31, 2010
<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=528997>

6. Warming Is Just Latest Misuse of Science

By Thomas Sowell, IBD, Mar 30, 2010
<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=528852>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Survey of Weathercasters and Other Weather Stories

Among Weathercasters, Doubt on Warming

By Leslie Kaufman, NYT, Mar 29, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/30/science/earth/30warming.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: The New York Times version.]

AMS/NWA sponsored survey of TV weathercasters: 63% Believe Global Warming is Mostly Natural

Only 4% trust politicians on climate change information

George Mason University Center for Climate Change

Watts Up With That Mar 29, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/03/29/ams-sponsored-survey-of-tv-weathercasters-63-of-tv-weathercasters-believe-global-warming-is-mostly-natural/>

[SEPP Comment: The released version.]

Russia's top weatherman's blow to climate change lobby as he says winter in Siberia may be COLDEST on record

By Will Stewart, Daily Mail, Mar 24 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1260132/Russian-weatherman-strikes-blow-climate-change-lobby-announcing-winter-Siberia-coldest-record.html>

Wikipedia Article on the 2009-2010 Winter in Europe, storm by storm

H/t Joseph D'Aleo,

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Winter_of_2009%E2%80%932010_in_Europe

Energy and Energy Policy

Pity the poor grid controller

By John Brignell, Number Watch, Mar 28, 2010

<http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2010%20March.htm>

[SEPP Comment: An excellent overview of why microgeneration of electric power is a **bad** idea.]

BP Begins Big Push To Revive Iraq's Oil

By Russell Gold, WSJ, Mar 31, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702303601504575154030706013588.html#mod=todays_us_page_one

U.S. Nuclear News: Where There's Smoke

Power News, Mar 31, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/2611.html>

[Fires and other news on nuclear power plants.]

Christie Takes Down Global Warming Paranoia

By Paul Chesser, American Spectator, Mar 25, 2010

<http://spectator.org/blog/2010/03/25/christie-takes-down-global-war>

[SEPP Comment: Quiet actions by New Jersey's new governor]

France abandons plans to introduce carbon fuel tax over competition fears

By Peter Allen, Daily Mail, Mar 24, 2010

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1260121/France-abandons-plans-introduce-carbon-fuel-tax-competition-fears.html>

‘Cap and Trade’ Loses Its Standing as Energy Policy of Choice

By John Broder, NYT, Mar 25, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/26/science/earth/26climate.html?ref=science>

Cap and Trade Tax

IBD Editorial, Mar 30, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=528912>

Renewables Top 140 Billion Dollars In Global Revenues

By Staff Writers, Bio Fuel Daily, Mar 23, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.biofueldaily.com/reports/Renewables_Top_140_Billion_Dollars_In_Global_Revenues_999.html

[SEPP Comment: With the wind industry taking in \$63.5 Billion world-wide, why does it need cash subsidies? In the US, the subsidies include 30% up-front cash.]

State preservation chief cites wind farm impact

By Beth Daley, Boston Globe, Mar 23, 2010 [H/t Thomas Burch]

http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2010/03/23/state_preservation_chief_cites_wind_farm_impact/

[SEPP Comment: According to Massachusetts historic preservation official, building a wind farm in Nantucket Sound will cause an impact unparalleled in state history.]

Administration Policy on Drilling

Drill, Mr. President, Drill

Investors Business Daily, Mar 31, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=529012>

Drilling Bits

Editorial, WSJ, Apr 1, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702304252704575156232874752288.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

New Obama plan will NOT increase U.S. energy supplies

By Daniel Kish, Washington Examiner, Apr 1, 2010 [H/t Robert Bradley]

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/OpEd-Contributor/Dan-Kish-New-Obama-plan-will-NOT-increase-US-energy-supplies--89675262.html>

Obama Energy Announcement: More Imported Oil, Less Domestic Production, Fewer Jobs

Editorial, Institute for Energy Research, Mar 31, 2010 [H/t Randy Randol]

<http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2010/03/31/obama-energy-announcement-more-imported-oil-less-domestic-production-fewer-jobs/>

Settlement Reached Over Rocky Mountains Drilling

WSJ, AP, Mar 31, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304252704575156143708629692.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

[SEPP Comment: Using a favorite EPA ploy of taking advantage of litigation to an out of court settlement to expand power, the Interior Department agreed to intensify regulatory restrictions on drilling for oil and gas in the Rocky Mountains. Will it do the same for off-shore drilling?]

Climate and Other Gates

NASA Data Worse Than Climate-Gate Data, Space Agency Admits

By Blake Snow, Fox News, Mar 30 2010

<http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2010/03/30/nasa-data-worse-than-climategate-data/>

‘Gulf Stream isn’t slowing down’, finds research

By Tom Peck, Independent, UK, Mar 30, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/gulf-stream-isnt-slowing-down-finds-research-1930657.html>

End-phase of the Climate Wars?

By Barry Bill, Quadrant, Mar 21, 2010

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2010/03/end-phase-of-the-climate-wars>

“History may see the interview of CRU’s Professor Phil Jones by the BBC’s Roger Harrabin on 12 February 2010 as the opening of the end-phase of the long-running “alarmists versus sceptics” debate.”

The mystery deepens: Where did that decline go?

How the 1970’s kept getting warmer for the next 30 years

Joanne Nova

<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/03/the-mystery-deepens-where-did-that-decline-go/>

[SEPP Comment: Hiding the decline the old fashion way, fudge.]

Public skepticism prompts Science Museum to rename climate exhibition

By Ben Webster, Times, Mar 24, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7073272.ece>

‘I’m not quitting’ says under-fire UN climate boss

By Michael McCarthy, The Independent, Mar 27, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/im-not-quitting-says-underfire-un-climate-boss-1928872.html>

Rajendra Pachauri: Climate scientists face ‘new form of persecution’

By David Adam, Guardian, UK, Mar 26, 2010, [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/mar/26/rajendra-pachauri-climate-science-persecution>

[SEPP Comment: For decades the IPCC has luxuriated in the claim that it is “The Authority” in climate change. Pachauri arrogantly dismissed a rigorous study of Himalayan glaciers as “voodoo science.” Now that the IPCC’s absurd claims are being challenged, it is being “persecuted.”]

Climategate Inquiry by the House of Commons

Can we trust the ‘Climategate’ inquiry?

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Mar 27, 2010

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/7530961/Can-we-trust-the-Climategate-inquiry.html>

Hacked climate emails inquiry cleared Jones but serious questions remain

By Fred Pearce, Guardian, UK, Mar 31, 2010

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/cif-green/2010/mar/31/hacked-climate-email-inquiry-phil-jones>

Winners and Losers

The trillion-dollar question is: who will now lead the climate battle?

Political and business leaders gather this week in an attempt to revive the world's faltering challenge to global warming. But they face a battle to lift the cloud of scepticism that has descended over climate science and chart a new way forward

By Paul Harris, John Vidal, Robin McKie, Guardian, UK, Mar 28, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/mar/28/un-climate-change-meeting-london>

UK PM Wants Climate Finance Group Meeting To Signal Progress

By Selina Williams, Dow Jones Newswires, Apr 1, 2010

[http://www.nasdaq.com/asp/stock-market-news-](http://www.nasdaq.com/asp/stock-market-news-story.aspx?storyid=201003311243dowjonesdjonline000575&title=uk-pm-wants-climate-finance-group-meeting-to-signal-progress)

[story.aspx?storyid=201003311243dowjonesdjonline000575&title=uk-pm-wants-climate-finance-group-meeting-to-signal-progress](http://www.nasdaq.com/asp/stock-market-news-story.aspx?storyid=201003311243dowjonesdjonline000575&title=uk-pm-wants-climate-finance-group-meeting-to-signal-progress)

[SEPP Comment: Western 'leaders' agreeing to send \$100 Billion a year to third world tyrants to impoverish the population of their nations is progress? See "It's Always "Earth Hour" in North Korea" below.]

WWF hopes to find \$60 billion growing on trees

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Mar 20, 2010

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7488629/WWF-hopes-to-find-60-billion-growing-on-trees.html>

[How to cash in on carbon credits.]

US EPA On the March

Endangerment Findings

By Patrick J. Michaels, National Review, Mar 24, 2010

<http://article.nationalreview.com/428969/endangered-findings/patrick-j-michaels>

E.P.A. Delays Plants' Pollution Permits

By John M. Broder, NYT, Mar 29, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/30/science/earth/30emissions.html?th&emc=th>

U.S. EPA Goes Unconstitutional: Time to Rein in a Rogue Agency

By Marlo Lewis, Master Resource, Mar 30, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/03/u-s-epa-goes-unconstitutional/>

EPA Limits on Greenhouse Gases Will Shift U.S. Production Overseas

By William O'Keefe, IBD, Mar 30, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=528848>

E.P.A. to Limit Water Pollution From Mining

By Tom Zeller, NYT, Apr 1, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/02/science/earth/02coal.html?th&emc=th>

Miscellaneous Articles

A Second Big Bang In Geneva?

By Michio Kaku, WSJ, Apr 1, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702304252704575155710695957900.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

NASA plans big boost to climate research budget

By Marc Kaufman, Washington Post, Apr 1, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/31/AR2010033104062.html>

LockMart Selected to Advance Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion Utility Power Plants

By Staff Writers, Energy Daily, Mar 22, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/LockMart_Selected_To_Advance_Ocean_Thermal_Energy_Conversion_UTILITY_Power_Plans_999.html

‘Cold fusion’ moves closer to mainstream acceptance

Physorg.com Mar 21, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.physorg.com/news188377829.html>

It’s Always “Earth Hour” in North Korea

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, Mar 26, 2010

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2010/03/its-always-earth-hour-in-north-korea.html>

[SEPP Comment: A somber thought to consider when Western “leaders” scheme to send \$100 Billion a year to third world tyrants.]

Shake, Rattle, Seattle

By Peter Yanev, NYT, Mar 27, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/28/opinion/28yanev.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: Something real to worry about.]

The Plural of ‘junk science’ is still junk

By Jeff Stier, ACSH, NY Post, Mar 31, 2010

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/the_plural_of_junk_science_is_still_8tVYDd7IKMV7EQCh5zgPUK#ixzz0jW9BJEo

[Comments on studies purporting to show workers at “ground zero” were subject to unusual toxins.]

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Meat, dairy diet not tied to global warming

By Jennifer Harper, The Washington Times, Mar 23, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/23/meat-dairy-diet-not-tied-to-global-warming/>

“Forget all that indecorous talk of animal flatulence, cow burps, vegetarianism and global warming. Welcome to Cowgate.”

When Nature Creates It Then Takes Away; Blame Mankind!

Disputed isle in Bay of Bengal disappears into sea

By Nirmala George, WALB news, (AP), Mar 27, 2010

<http://www.walb.com/Global/story.asp?S=12194057>

The Birth and Death of an Island in the Bay of Bengal

By Nils-Axel Mörner, SPPI Blog, [H/t Rancois Guillaumat]

<http://sppiblog.org/news/the-birth-and-death-of-an-island-in-the-bay-of-bengal>

[SEPP Comment: In the previous AP version this temporary island became a rock.]

Would a rose by any other climate smell as sweet?

Flowers losing scent due to climate change: A rose may soon stop smelling like a rose

New Straits Times, Mar 22, 2010

<http://news.asiaone.com/print/News/AsiaOne%2BNews/Malaysia/Story/A1Story20100322-206015.html>

#####

1. A Superstorm for Global Warming Research -- Part 1 of an 8 Part Series

By Marco Evers, Olaf Stampf and Gerald Traufetter Spiegel Online [H/t Toshio Fujita, Charles Minning]
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,686697,00.html>

Plagued by reports of sloppy work, falsifications and exaggerations, climate research is facing a crisis of confidence. How reliable are the predictions about global warming and its consequences? And would it really be the end of the world if temperatures rose by more than the much-quoted limit of two degrees Celsius?

Life has become "awful" for Phil Jones. Just a few months ago, he was a man with an enviable reputation: the head of the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England, an expert in his field and the father of an alarming global temperature curve that apparently showed how the Earth was heating up as a result of anthropogenic global warming.

Those days are now gone.

Nowadays, Jones, who is at the center of the "Climategate" affair involving hacked CRU emails, needs medication to fall sleep. He feels a constant tightness in his chest. He takes beta-blockers to help him get through the day. He is gaunt and his skin is pallid. He is 57, but he looks much older. He was at the center of a research scandal that hit him as unexpectedly as a rear-end collision on the highway.

His days are now shaped by investigative commissions at the university and in the British Parliament. He sits on his chair at the hearings, looking miserable, sometimes even trembling. The Internet is full of derisive remarks about him, as well as insults and death threats. "We know where you live," his detractors taunt.

Jones is finished: emotionally, physically and professionally. He has contemplated suicide several times recently, and he says that one of the only things that have kept him from doing it is the desire to watch his five-year-old granddaughter grow up.

'100 Percent Confident'

One of the conclusions of his famous statistical analysis of the world's climate is that the average temperature on Earth rose by 0.166 degrees Celsius per decade between 1975 and 1998. This, according to Jones, was the clear result of his research and that of many other scientists. [SEPP Comment: This is an exact copy from the article.]

"I am 100 percent confident that the climate has warmed," Jones says imploringly. "I did not manipulate or fabricate any data."

His problem is that the public doesn't trust him anymore. Since unknown hackers secretly copied 1,073 private emails between members of his research team and published them on the Internet, his credibility has been destroyed -- and so has that of an entire profession that had based much of its work on his research until now.

Those who have always viewed global warming as a global conspiracy now feel a sense of satisfaction. The so-called climate skeptics feel vindicated, because Jones, in his written correspondence with colleagues, all of them leading members of the climate research community, does not come across as an objective scientist, but rather as an activist or missionary who views "his" data as his personal shrine and is intent on protecting it from the critical eyes of his detractors.

An Entire Branch of Science in Crisis

The Climategate affair is grist for the mills of skeptics, who have gained growing support for their cause, particularly in English-speaking countries. What began with hacked emails in the United Kingdom has mushroomed into a crisis affecting an entire scientific discipline. At its center is an elite and highly influential scientific group, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Working on behalf of the United Nations, the scientists organized under IPCC's umbrella -- including Phil Jones -- regularly prepare prognoses on the Earth's looming greenhouse climate. Without the IPCC reports, governments would not be embroiled in such passionate debate about phasing out the age of oil and coal.

In late 2007, the IPCC was even awarded the Nobel Peace Prize jointly with former US Vice President Al Gore. IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri, as the personification of the world's conscience, accepted the award on behalf of his organization. "Climate change poses novel risks," Pachauri told his audience, saying that the decision to award the prize to the IPCC was "a clarion call for the protection of the earth as it faces the widespread impacts of climate change." He also warned of the risk of not taking action: "Every year of delay implies a commitment to greater climate change in the future."

Sloppy Work

Since then, the IPCC has experienced a dramatic fall from grace. Less than three years after this triumph, more and more mistakes, evidence of sloppy work and exaggerations in the current IPCC report are appearing. They include Jones' disputed temperature curve, the prediction that all Himalayan glaciers would disappear by 2035 -- which was the result of a simple transposition of numbers -- and the supposed increase in natural disasters, for which no source was given.

In mid-March, UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon slammed on the brakes and appointed a watchdog for the IPCC. The InterAcademy Council, a coalition of 15 national academies of science, will review the work of the IPCC by this fall.

There is already a consensus today that deep-seated reforms are needed at the IPCC. The selection of its authors and reviewers was not sufficiently nonpartisan, there was not enough communication among the working groups, and there were no mechanisms on how to handle errors.

Offering the Skeptics an 'Unprotected Flank'

Also at issue is the position of IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri, who is praised as a "leading global thinker" in his official biography. A railroad engineer by trade, Pachauri wrote an erotic novel and recommended that people reduce their meat consumption while traveling around the world to save the climate. He has cut a miserable figure during the current crisis. The climate guru summarily dismissed justified objections to the IPCC report as "voodoo science."

Germany's Leibniz Association, an umbrella group which includes several climate research institutions as its members, is the first professional organization to call for Pachauri's resignation. Leibniz President Ernst Rietschel believes that climate research is now "in a difficult situation" because the skeptics have been "offered an unprotected flank." Rietschel told SPIEGEL: "Rajendra Pachauri should take the responsibility for this and should resign."

On balance, the entire profession has been seriously harmed by the scandal. "We are currently suffering a massive erosion of trust," concludes German climatologist Hans von Storch. "Climate research has been

corrupted by politicization, just as nuclear physics was in the pre-Chernobyl days, when we were led to believe that nuclear power plants were completely safe."

2. Environmental 'Crisis' and Government Power

By Barun Mitra, WSJ Asia, Mar 23, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703775504575136733707732628.html>

The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change admitted for the first time last month that it is facing a crisis of confidence. But the IPCC's failings go far beyond the recent spate of errors identified in its reports. The problem began with the global political climate that led to the formation of the IPCC two decades ago.

Contrary to popular perception, the IPCC is not a scientific organization. It does no research of its own. Composed of scientists nominated by different governments, its key function is to collate evidence of human-induced climate change, not just changes in climate.

It is hardly surprising that with such an inherently biased objective the scientists lost their objectivity. Many of them went on a crusade to support the political goal of proving anthropogenic global warming. Concerns about scientific objectivity and critical discourse were thrown overboard.

Why did political masters set such a nonscientific mandate for their scientists at the IPCC? Because over the past half century, governments have often ridden the green bandwagon to justify public-sector expansion.

Almost every decade we have witnessed the birth of a new green scare, apparently based on new scientific findings. First came the campaign against the pesticide DDT in the 1960s, followed by the population bomb in the 1970s. Then we had the campaign to protect forests and species in the 1980s, the ozone hole in the 1990s, and most recently the crescendo over climate change leading up to last year's Copenhagen summit.

Each time, the scare was shown to be false or overhyped. For instance, millions of people in the developing world died of malaria because DDT was wrongly vilified. It took decades to overcome the blanket ban of the chemical, and now it is once again being used to control mosquitoes in Africa.

Predictions of a rising population depleting the world's resources have proven equally false and destructive. India today is enjoying the demographic dividend of a young workforce, while China is getting worried at the prospect that it may become the first society in history to grow old before it becomes rich. Likewise, forests are making a surprising comeback in many parts of the world, as the rise in agricultural productivity and economic growth are lowering demand for agricultural land.

Clearly, the track record of green prophecies has been pathetic. And with the collapse of the Soviet empire, and periodic economic turmoil, (such as the Asian economic crisis in 1997, and the dot-com bust in 2000), the public's confidence in their leaders' capacity to make effective economic policies has been shaken. It is in this context that climate change provided a new opportunity for many governments to legitimize their role, and expand their scope.

The formation of the IPCC and its apparent focus on the science of climate change allowed the political establishments to claim science as the basis for proposed climate policies that increased the power of government and curtailed the private sector. The time frame of the projected climate change was longer than earlier green crusades, typically from 50 to 100 years. This allowed policy makers to escape

accountability for their misguided policies since they would be out of office by the time the consequences became apparent.

The relationship between a section of political leaders and scientists turned out to be mutually reinforcing. Policy makers justified their empire building on the basis of "scientific consensus," and scientists found a very profitable avenue for political influence and access to funding.

To sell this climate strategy, political leaders and scientists adopted the classic carrot-and-stick approach. The rich countries offered money to the poor ones in an attempt to buy support for the climate policies. More recently there is the threat of trade sanctions, which reflect the stick.

This approach was apparent in the build-up to the Copenhagen summit last December. The distinction between scientists and activists virtually disappeared as the scaremongering reached a new depth. The rich countries' carrots virtually broke the Group of 77 developing-world nations, as some of the poorest countries found the lure of easy money in hand more attractive than the fruits of economic growth in the future.

The grand design failed on three counts, and the world was saved from the onslaught of the climate crusade. Copenhagen coincided with the global economic slowdown, and therefore the promise of money seemed more like a mirage. Second, the scientific authority of the IPCC collapsed. And finally, deepening developmental aspirations in some of the major developing countries, such as Brazil, China, India and South Africa, meant that the leadership in these countries could not afford to barter their economic future for the sake of some small change today.

The current crisis in the environmental movement is not limited to a few leading climate scientists; its root lies in the political shifts taking place in many countries. Leaders are being forced to take their responsibilities more seriously, and not to outsource it to scientists. And scientists will have to regain public confidence by returning to their traditional values of objectivity and intellectual rigor.

Mr. Mitra is director of the Liberty Institute, an independent think tank in New Delhi, and a columnist for WSJ.com.

3. How to tell sceptics from deniers

The Scientific Alliance, Apr 1, 2010

<http://scientific-alliance.org/>

[Excerpt]

Scientists should, by nature, be sceptics. They should take nothing for granted and form judgements only on the basis of evidence. And they should be prepared to change their minds if different evidence conflicts with their opinion. But there is a big difference between what is desirable and what happens in practice. The debate continues to rage about what does and does not constitute true scientific scepticism, and the main focus of this debate is, hardly surprisingly, climate change.

According to an opinion article by three authors from the University of Edinburgh published in Nature (Vol 464; page 673), 'sceptics and deniers of climate change should not be confused'. The trouble is, the distinction is not an absolute, objective one; one man's rational scepticism is another's rampant denialism. The authors of this particular article (Jeremy Kemp, Richard Milne and Dave S Reay) nail their colours firmly to the mast in their opening paragraph:

'Climate-change denial could have disastrous consequences, if it delays global action to cut carbon emissions. Denialism is gaining popularity because people have difficulty differentiating deniers' twisted

arguments from the legitimate concerns of genuine sceptics. We must stop deniers presenting themselves as the rightful regulators of scientific debate.'

What, we might ask, constitutes a 'twisted argument'? In the authors' words: *'Deniers use strategies that invoke conspiracies, quote fake experts, denigrate genuine experts, deploy evidence selectively and create impossible expectations of what research can deliver. . . By contrast, scepticism starts with an open mind, weighs evidence objectively and demands convincing evidence before accepting any claim.'*

Put like that, who could disagree? But implicit in this article is the understanding that the evidence is compelling enough to attempt to rejig the global economy and remove the human influence on natural systems as far as possible. Scepticism is acceptable as long as it relates to details, but anything which might lead to doubt about the central tenets of belief is beyond the pale and must be suppressed.

In this highly polarised debate, both extremes have been guilty of the sins of supposed deniers. Conspiracy theories? On one hand, the 'denial industry' is said to be funded by Big Oil, with no credence given to the reality that there are plenty of independent (and unpaid) thinkers who question the orthodoxy, on the other, the 'climate change industry' is the purview of a clique of politically motivated activist scientists, despite the evidence that large numbers of perfectly rational academic scientists also subscribe to the broad picture of AGW. Deploy evidence selectively? Is pointing out the poor correlation between temperature of the upper troposphere with the predictions of the GHG hypothesis worse than seizing on any evidence of warming and using it to repeat the message that only humans can be to blame?

Far healthier would be a proper dialogue between those with legitimate, evidence-based criticisms of mainstream science (and, despite the attempts at marginalisation, there are plenty of them) and those who are persuaded by the evidence for AGW but who are prepared to be open-minded. Unfortunately, the media headlines have tended to be captured by those who shout the loudest and this can only increase the polarisation.

In the meantime, opinions such as that in the Nature article seem to be part of a counter-offensive by the global warming lobby. Having been unable to steamroller critics into submission, they now recognise that they have to engage to some degree. But this has largely (and unsurprisingly) taken the form of acknowledgement that minor mistakes have been made coupled with renewed assertions that the enhanced greenhouse effect has been shown beyond reasonable doubt to be causing an upward trend in average global temperature. The article by Kemp et al seems to be an attempt at appearing sweetly reasonable - by distinguishing between sceptics (good) and 'deniers' (bad) - while actually implicitly branding anyone outside the mainstream as a 'denier'. Perhaps we should be surprised that Nature should print something like this, at least without a counter-balancing viewpoint, but unfortunately the leading journals seem also to classify all who have rational doubts about AGW as 'deniers'.

The warfare seems set to continue, but there seems to be no sign of public opinion firming in support of the IPCC view on climate change. Without that, it is going to be almost impossible for democratic governments to do anything very meaningful to cut carbon dioxide emissions apart from investing in nuclear power and R&D projects on a range of power-generation and energy-saving options. But that will not stop them continuing to levy new 'green' taxes while they can.

4. America's New Nuclear Option

By Steven Chu, WSJ, Mar 23, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704231304575092130239999278.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

[SEPP Comment: Unless the government is willing to relax regulations the approval process could be a lawyer's dream]

America is on the cusp of reviving its nuclear power industry. Last month President Obama pledged more than \$8 billion in conditional loan guarantees for what will be the first U.S. nuclear power plant to break ground in nearly three decades. And with the new authority granted by the president's 2011 budget request, the Department of Energy will be able to support between six and nine new reactors.

What does all of this mean for the country? This investment will provide enough clean energy to power more than six million American homes. It will also create tens of thousands of jobs in the years ahead.

Perhaps most importantly, investing in nuclear energy will position America to lead in a growing industry. World-wide electricity generation is projected to rise 77% by 2030. If we are serious about cutting carbon pollution then nuclear power must be part of the solution. Countries such as China, South Korea and India have recognized this and are making investments in nuclear power that are driving demand for nuclear technologies. Our choice is clear: Develop these technologies today or import them tomorrow.

That is why—even as we build a new generation of clean and safe nuclear plants—we are constantly looking ahead to the future of nuclear power. As this paper recently reported, one of the most promising areas is small modular reactors (SMRs). If we can develop this technology in the U.S. and build these reactors with American workers, we will have a key competitive edge.

Small modular reactors would be less than one-third the size of current plants. They have compact designs and could be made in factories and transported to sites by truck or rail. SMRs would be ready to "plug and play" upon arrival.

If commercially successful, SMRs would significantly expand the options for nuclear power and its applications. Their small size makes them suitable to small electric grids so they are a good option for locations that cannot accommodate large-scale plants. The modular construction process would make them more affordable by reducing capital costs and construction times.

Their size would also increase flexibility for utilities since they could add units as demand changes, or use them for on-site replacement of aging fossil fuel plants. Some of the designs for SMRs use little or no water for cooling, which would reduce their environmental impact. Finally, some advanced concepts could potentially burn used fuel or nuclear waste, eliminating the plutonium that critics say could be used for nuclear weapons.

In his 2011 budget request, President Obama requested \$39 million for a new program specifically for small modular reactors. Although the Department of Energy has supported advanced reactor technologies for years, this is the first time funding has been requested to help get SMR designs licensed for widespread commercial use.

Right now we are exploring a partnership with industry to obtain design certification from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for one or two designs. These SMRs are based on proven light-water reactor technologies and could be deployed in about 10 years.

We are also accelerating our R&D efforts into other innovative reactor technologies. This includes developing high-temperature gas reactors that can provide carbon-free heat for industrial applications, as well as advanced reactor designs that will harness much more of the energy from uranium.

Just as advanced computer modeling has revolutionized aircraft design—predicting how any slight adjustment to a wing design will affect the overall performance of the airplane, for example—we are working to apply modeling and simulation technologies to accelerate nuclear R&D. Scientists and

engineers will be able to stand in the center of a virtual reactor, observing coolant flow, nuclear fuel performance, and even the reactor's response to changes in operating conditions. To achieve this potential, we are bringing together some of our nation's brightest minds to work under one roof in a new research center called the Nuclear Energy Modeling and Simulation Hub.

These efforts are restarting the nuclear power industry in the U.S. But to truly promote nuclear power and other forms of carbon-free electricity, we need long-term incentives. The single most effective step we could take is to put a price on carbon by passing comprehensive energy and climate legislation. Requiring a gradual reduction in carbon emissions will make clean energy profitable—and will fuel investment in nuclear power.

Mr. Chu is the U.S. Secretary of Energy.

5. The President's Oil Drilling Bait and Switch

By Steve Milloy, IBD, Mar 31, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=528997>

So President Obama says he's for more offshore oil drilling. Does he really mean it? Would it matter if he did?

Addressing the latter question first, consider President George W. Bush called for offshore drilling in June 2008, when gasoline prices hit \$4 per gallon and Congress was less Democrat-controlled than today.

Nothing happened — well, that's not exactly true.

Offshore drilling advocates were ecstatic in July 2008 when they thought a deal had been reached with green groups to permit drilling off Santa Barbara, Calif. — the first since the January 1969 oil spill there.

New Hampshire Union Leader editor Andrew Cline gushed in a July 2008 Wall Street Journal op-ed: "When an environmental group formed for the sole purpose of opposing offshore oil drilling warmly embraces a plan to drill off its own coast, you know something important has changed in our culture; Americans have recognized that offshore drilling is largely safe."

But less than a week later, the greens wrote the Journal to correct the record: "(T)o be accurate, the (op-ed's) title should have read 'Environmentalists Secure End to Oil Development' ... The agreement struck ... is remarkable because it sets a fixed date for the termination of existing offshore and onshore oil production facilities in Santa Barbara County. We see this agreement as a direct complement to our support for the federal oil moratorium. Just as we need to say 'no' to new oil development, we must put an end to existing development if we are to protect our coast from the risks of offshore oil and gas development, and protect society from climate change."

Despite the "agreement" and approval of offshore drilling by the Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors, the greens subsequently got the California State Lands Commission to deny the offshore leases and then, in July 2009, got the California Assembly to block Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's proposal to revive offshore drilling.

Last December, the Obama administration actually granted Shell Oil leases to drill three exploratory wells in Alaska's Chukchi Sea. But claiming a shoddy approval process, the leases are being challenged by green groups in the enviro-friendly 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. Without wondering whether the Obama administration set Shell up for frustration, my money is on the greens in that venue.

The lesson here is that the greens oppose, and will use every tactic possible on the local, state and federal level to prevent, offshore drilling, regardless of what emanates from the Oval Office.

But then, there are many reasons to question the sincerity of Obama's rhetoric in the first place.

Despite campaign rhetoric about supporting more drilling, last fall the Obama administration canceled drilling leases in Utah previously granted by President Bush.

The leases were denied for the flimsiest reasons, including possible damage to the habitat of the sage grouse and avoiding the dust and noise pollution from drilling.

Next, and most important, President Obama needs both Republican and moderate Democrat support to get a much sought after cap-and-trade bill through the Senate.

Right now, South Carolina's Lindsey Graham is the only Republican interested in cap-and-trade. He wants to include increased oil and gas production and nuclear power.

President Obama no doubt hopes pro-oil drilling rhetoric will also help him win the support of other Senate swing votes, including Lisa Murkowski, R-Alaska, and Mary "Louisiana Purchase" Landrieu, D-La.

Finally, while announcing his drilling proposal, Obama spent the bulk of his time talking about how we need to use less oil and wean ourselves off oil altogether.

He spent little time talking about producing more oil. He limited his remarks to a proposal merely for more oil "exploration" — not to increasing production and supply.

Talk is cheap and President Obama knows that. Let's hope Senate Republicans and moderate Democrats know that too.

False promises about supporting oil drilling are bad enough, but it would be a travesty if they brought cap-and-trade.

• Milloy publishes JunkScience.com and is the author of "Green Hell: How Environmentalists Plan to Control Your Life and What You Can Do to Stop Them."

6. Warming Is Just Latest Misuse of Science

By Thomas Sowell, IBD, Mar 30, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=528852>

When ancient fossils of creatures that live on the ocean floor have been found in rock formations at the summit of Mount Everest, that ought to give us a clue that big changes in the earth are nothing new, and that huge changes have been going on long before human beings appeared on the scene.

The recent statement that the earth was warmer in the Middle Ages than it is today, made by the climate scientist who is at the heart of the recent scandal about "global warming" statistics, ought to at least give pause to those who are determined to believe that human beings must be the reason for "climate change."

Other climate scientists have pointed out before now that the earth has warmed and cooled many times over the centuries. Contrary to the impression created in much of the media and in politics, no one has denied that temperatures change, sometimes more than they are changing today.

Three years ago, a book by Singer and Avery was published with a title that says it all: "Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1500 Years."

Contrary to clever political spin that likened those who refused to join the "global warming" hysteria to people who denied the Holocaust, no one denied that climates change. Indeed, some of the climate scientists who have been the biggest critics of the current hysteria have pointed out that climates had changed back and forth, long before human beings created industrial societies or drove SUVs.

It is those who have been pushing the hysteria who have been playing fast and loose with the facts, wanting to keep crucial data from becoming public, and even "losing" some of that data that supposedly proved the most dire consequences. It has not been facts but computer models at the heart of the "global warming" crusade.

Nothing is easier than coming up with computer models that prove almost anything. Back during the 1970s, there were computer models predicting mass starvation and global cooling. The utter failure of those predictions ought to make us at least skeptical of computer models, especially computer models based on data that advocates want to keep from public view or even "lose" when investigators start closing in.

On climate issues, as on many other issues, the biggest argument of the left has been that there is no argument. The word "science" has been used as a magic mantra to shut up critics, even when those critics have been scientists with international reputations as specialists in climate science.

Stealing the aura of science for political purposes is nothing new for the left. Karl Marx called his brand of Utopianism "scientific socialism." Even earlier, in the 18th century, the Marquis de Condorcet referred to "engineering" society. In the 20th century, H.G. Wells referred to the creation of a lasting peace as a heavy and complex "piece of mental engineering."

Genuine science is the opposite of dogmatism, but that does not keep dogmatists from invoking the name of science in order to shut off debate. Science is a method of analysis, rather than simply a set of conclusions. In fact, much of the history of science is a history of having to abandon the prevailing conclusions among scientists, in light of new evidence or new methods of analysis.

When the scientists in England who were promoting "global warming" hysteria sent e-mails out to colleagues, urging them not to reveal certain data and not to let the fact become widely known that there was a freedom-of-information act in Britain, they were behaving like politicians, rather than scientists.

The huge political, financial and ideological investment of many individuals and institutions in the "global warming" hysteria makes it virtually impossible for many of the climate crusaders to gamble it all on a roll of the dice, which is what empirical verification is. It is far safer to dogmatize and to demonize those who think otherwise.

Educators who turn schools into indoctrination centers have been going all out to propagandize a whole generation with Al Gore's movie, "An Inconvenient Truth" — which has in fact carried a message that has been very convenient for Al Gore financially, producing millions of dollars from his "green" activities.

#####