

The Week That Was (January 2, 2010) **Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)**

#####

Kenneth A Haapala, Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of SEPP, has been a Guest Editor of TWTW for several weeks. He will take over as the Editor, effective Jan 1, 2010, succeeding SEPP Chairman S. Fred Singer

#####

Annual Report of the Science and Environmental Policy Project for 2009

The year 2009 was dominated by the subject of global warming. Although SEPP scientists also dealt with other topics (e.g., nuclear radiation, regulation at EPA, energy policy), climate change occupied the main stage, in terms of university seminars, presentations at scientific conferences, briefings both here and abroad, interviews for TV and radio, as well as publications in scientific and popular journals. In all instances, we promoted the results of **NIPCC** (Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change), which differ sharply from those of the UN-IPCC. [See NIPCC summary report “Nature, not human activity, rules the climate.”] www.nipccreport.org

Highlights

Publication of the full (880-pp) **NIPCC** report “Climate Change Reconsidered” (Idso and Singer)
Responses to CCSP Unified Synthesis Product (USP) (by Haapala and Singer)
Responses to Tech Support Document (TSD) of EPA’s Endangerment Finding (by Haapala and Singer)
Oral testimonies to EPA on Endangerment Finding (by Haapala and Singer)

Debate at Argonne Lab, Chicago
Seminars and round tables at U of Texas (Austin) and U of Miami
Invited talk at Science Museum (Leonardo da Vinci), Milan
Invited talks at European Geoscience Union Congress, Vienna, and at U of Vienna
Talks at Heartland’s Climate Skeptics conferences in NYC and Wash
Seminar at NOAA labs, Boulder, CO and lecture at DDP conference, Denver
NIPCC lecture at Minnesota Free Market Institute
“To the Point” conference, Williamsburg, VA (Haapala and Singer)
Capitol Hill briefing for Senate staff (Haapala, Singer, Spencer, Steward)
Princeton University seminar

Recent Activities in Europe

Nov 18 Talk on NIPCC results at Climate Conference, European Parliament, Brussels
Nov 21 Letter to British authorities re ClimateGate (with Lord Monckton)
 Discussion on Climate Sensitivity and atmospheric feedbacks
Nov 23 Climate debate, London – organized by Inst of Econ Affairs (IEA)
 Several interviews by BBC and newspapers
Nov 24 Talk in Zurich – organized by NIPCC-Suisse
Nov 25 Seminar lecture on NIPCC at DLR, Stuttgart
Nov 26 Climate science discussions at Univ of Heidelberg (Augusto Mangini)
Nov 27 Climate science discussion in Mainz (Horst Luedecke and Horst Borchert)
 Interview by Rhein-Zeitung
Dec 2 Discussion on exosphere science at BISA, Brussels
Dec 2 Press briefings on NIPCC at European Parliament (with Lord Monckton and Hans Labohm, Dutch economist)
Dec 4 Keynote talk at climate conference, Berlin, organized by EIKE

Dec 6 Keynote talk at climate conference at Danish Parliament, CPH
Dec 8 Discussions with Norwegian parliament members, drafting of Resolution, climate debate sponsored by Progress Party
Dec 9 Keynote talk on NIPCC and climate issues, CPH, organized by climate-sense.org
Dec 10 Climate science discussions at Univ of CPH (Jorgen-Peder Steffensen and Henrik Svensmark)
Dec 11 Keynote talk at Youth Conference, CPH, organized by CEPOS and C-Fact

APS (American Physical Society) Initiative

We organized a 6-man steering group of senior physicists to collect signatures (now about 250) and petitioned the APS Council to modify or cancel its present alarmist Statement on Climate Change. The Council agreed to consider the matter – the first breach in the solid wall of professional societies that endorse the IPCC. We announced this fact in a Letter in *Nature* (July 23, 2009).

SEEE-VA:

In June 2009, we organized a nonpartisan group called Virginia Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment, based on the 1000+ who signed the Oregon Petition (see Appendix of NIPCC report). Pres: Fred Singer; VPs Ken Haapala and Randy Randol. We established five Chapters (Northern VA, Richmond, Tidewater, Piedmont, and Shenandoah) and appointed five chapter presidents. Members continue to write letters to newspapers, give talks, etc. In Nov 2009, Virginians elected a Governor, Lt Gov, and Attorney-General who agree with our climate/energy objectives.

Outreach: SEPP does not lobby on behalf of political candidates or legislation. We do provide scientific information upon request in testimony to Congress or to other groups.

We expanded our web site. Readers, including students, journalists, and lawmakers, find it a good source of sound scientific information. Our weekly bulletin "The Week That Was" goes to nearly 4000 addressees: scientists, policymakers, the media, and reaches many more of the public. We spent much time replying to comments and questions and were guests at some dozen radio talk shows, TV interviews on CNN Headline News, Fox News, and BBC.

Financial: SEPP does not solicit support from government or industry. Major contributions came from charitable foundations and contributions from individuals. SEPP ended 2009 with a small surplus, due primarily to the assignment to SEPP of lecture fees and book royalties from "Unstoppable Global Warming," plus direct donations by the president of SEPP.

Governance: With the passing of SEPP chairman Prof Fredrick Seitz, we reconstituted the Board of Directors:

- Chairman: S. Fred Singer (and President)
- Vice Chairman: Kenneth A. Haapala (and Exec VP)
- Directors: Donna Fitzpatrick Bethell, former Under Secretary, US Dept of Energy
Mark Brandsdorfer, Esq
Thomas Sheahen, PhD (MIT, Physics)

Respectfully submitted S. Fred Singer, President, SEPP
#####

Quote of the Week

"In questions of science, the authority of a thousand is not worth the humble reasoning of a single individual." Galileo

THIS WEEK:

The BBC declared Copenhagen to be the most important meeting in the history of the world. Gordon Brown, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, declared an agreement was necessary to “Save the Planet.” The UN Conference of Parties (COP-15) in Copenhagen is over, with an agreement to continue meetings of international bureaucrats in Mexico next November where it no doubt will be warmer.

But as the Arctic cold continues its southern holiday throughout much of the Northern Hemisphere, many people are questioning if the planet really needs saving from global warming. The one hot spot is the continued disagreement over the importance of Climategate. Anthropogenic global warming advocates and Climategaters claim that it is a trifling issue. Some of those who reject the assertion that carbon dioxide is the principal driver of global warming and climate change claim Climategate is indicative of the IPCC process. Perhaps the term climate denier will take on a new meaning. Rather than it applying to those who reject the assertion that carbon dioxide is the principal driver of global warming, in the future it may apply to those who reject the assertion that Climategate is significant. Climategate is the topic of many of this week’s articles.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #1-2010 (Jan 2, 2010)

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

[Note: This is the third of a series of mini-editorials on the “junk science” influencing the global warming issue. Other topics will include the IPCC’s Assessment Report 4, the UN Environmental Program and some individuals heavily involved in these matters.]

Junk Science #3: IPCC’s Third Assessment Report (AR-3, 2001): Hockeystick and ClimateGate (CG)

Has the Climate Really Warmed in the Past 30 Years?

Around 1996-97, while writing my book *Hot Talk Cold Science*, I had a chance to study some published tree-ring data [by d’Arrigo and Jacoby] and ice-core data [Dahl-Jensen et al] that showed essentially no warming since 1940. At the same time, the available satellite data also showed essentially no warming since 1979. But all of the surface data did show a warming, and while US temperatures did not exceed those reached in the 1930s, the global temperatures were very much higher. Something didn’t quite fit. Could it be that the global data were contaminated by urban heat island effects? Or perhaps by the fact that rural stations worldwide had been closed down after 1970? Could it be that just airports were warming?

It seemed important to me to check out the available proxy data. The 1998 “hockey-stick” paper by Michael Mann et al. seemed like a good place to start. But I noticed that his analysis of proxy data stopped at 1979, just when things became interesting. I e-mailed him and asked him if post-1980 data were available and why he hadn’t included them. He replied brusquely that suitable data were not available. I suspected then and I am more certain now that the reason he didn’t use post-1980 data is that they would have showed no warming – and that would have destroyed his calibration and the rationale of the “hockey-stick.” I have saved this exchange of e-mails.

Of course, the hockeystick graph (with proxy data stopping in 1979 and instrumented data showing a steep rise after 1979) became the ‘clincher’ in IPCC-TAR (AR-3): “The 20th century was supposed to be the warmest in the past 1000 years.”—Baloney! The ice-core data of Dahl –Jensen and ocean-sediment data of Keigwin clearly showed the Medieval Warming Period and Little Ice Age. The CG mafia jumped on Soon and Baliunas who had collected many references showing a MWP and LIA. Besides, there was historical evidence supporting Soon-Baliunas. All that was attacked as being purely ‘local’ but not global warming and cooling.

Craig Loehle has now published a definitive temp record from proxy data (but omitting tree-ring data) that clearly shows a global warming 1000 years ago, exceeding current temperature. Of course, there was nothing ever magic about ‘1000 years.’ Everyone agrees that much warmer periods occurred during earlier periods of the Holocene.

The CG mafia also attacked the satellite data – even after the researchers made minor corrections that produced hardly any change in reported temperature trends. Things looked good for the Hockeystick, and Michael Mann soon became the IPCC’s poster boy.

I took up the matter again in 2003 when McIntyre and McKittrick started to publish their critiques of the hockeystick. [I served as a reviewer of their first paper in *Energy & Environment*.] I corresponded extensively with Steve McIntyre in the hope of getting post-1980 proxy data, but he didn’t seem very interested. In pursuing the matter further, I came across an e-mail message from Chick Keller claiming to have such proxy temperatures. When I asked for them, he replied that they were not his and he couldn’t release them. I understood that, but asked for the source of the data so I could contact the source directly. After repeated attempts to get a reply from him, I concluded that he really did not have such data.

Five years later I’m still looking to collect more proxy data that would give post-1980 surface temperatures and allow a comparison with instrumented values and with atmospheric temperatures from radiosondes and satellites. Once the CG investigations get underway, we may finally find out how a warming trend was ‘manufactured’ from data that showed no such trend. Truly, we have ‘manmade’ warming after all; except it may all be fake.

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

1. Climategate in Detail

By Vincent Gray, *NZ Newsletter*, Dec. 28, 2009, Posted on IceCap
<http://www.icecap.us/>

2. Scientific American’s Climate Lies

By The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, SPPI Blog, Dec 29, 2009 [only an excerpt]
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/commentaries/climate_lies.pdf

3. A Response to Michael Mann

By Paul Knappenberger, SPPI Blog, Dec 29, 2009 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]
<http://sppiblog.org/news/a-response-to-michael-mann>

4. The Temperature of Science

By James Hansen, [only the summary]
http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/mailings/2009/20091216_TemperatureOfScience.pdf

5. Predictions of climate

Posted by Oliver Morton on behalf of Kevin E. Trenberth, June 4, 2007 [H/t Bob Carter]
Nature.com, Climate Feedback [only an excerpt]
http://blogs.nature.com/climatefeedback/2007/06/predictions_of_climate.html

6. The New Climate Litigation

How about if we sue you for breathing

Wall Street Journal Editorial, Dec 28, 2009

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703478704574612150621257422.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

7. The questions Dr Pachauri still has to answer

By Christopher Booker, UK Telegraph, Dec 21, 2009

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/6890839/The-questions-Dr-Pachauri-still-has-to-answer.html>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

As Climategate was unfolding John Brignell of Numberwatch wrote a prescient article on what we can expect from the Climategaters. It is well worth reviewing as events are developing.

“Warmergate and all that”

By John Brignell Numberwatch.co.uk. Nov 22, 2009

<http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2009%20November.htm#warmergate>

Robert Watson, who was chairman of the IPCC when it produced the Summary for Policymakers featuring the “hockeystick,” proposes establishing a Global Methane Fund. Methane constitutes about 0.00017% of the atmosphere – less than helium, 0.0005%, neon, 0.0018%, and argon, 0.93%. Do we really want a cooler planet?

“A Fast, Cheap Way to Cool the Planet”

By Robert Watson and Mohamed El-Ashry, WSJ, Dec 29, 2009

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704039704574616130812043404.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

The failure to reach a binding resolution in Copenhagen created some uncertainty among businesses that had hoped to profit from an agreement.

“After Summit, ‘Cleantech’ Firms Reset Strategy”

By Spencer Swartz and Jim Carlton, WSJ, Dec 23, 2009

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704157304574612272401446280.html#mod=todays_us_section_b

On Dec 13, during the Copenhagen meeting, the Associated Press sent out a news story reporting that three independent scientists it had reviewed the Climategate emails dismissed or minimized any allegations of scientific fraud. The Washington Times independently contacted these scientists, and they gave a different impression. Strangely, none of the five reporters from the AP were available to be interviewed for the new story.

“Biased reporting on Climategate: Associated Press coverage raises eyebrows”

Washington Times Editorial, Dec 28, 2009

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/dec/28/biased-reporting-on-climategate/?source=newsletter_must-read-stories-today_top_stories

For a report on how the government of Australia foisted the burdens of Kyoto onto a few major property owners please see:

“‘Carbongate’ The Great Carbon Heist”

By Steve Truman, Cricky Group Blog, Dec 12, 2009 [H/t Deke Forbes & Barry Peterson]

<http://blogs.crikey.com.au/rooted/2009/12/12/carbongate-the-great-carbon-heist/>

The Carbon Sense Coalition is calling for the Australian Parliament to repudiate the promises made by the government in Copenhagen.

“Climate Crusaders Conned in Copenhagen”

Press Release by Mr. Viv Forbes, Chairman, The Carbon Sense Coalition, Australia

Dec 28, 2009, Posted on Icecap: <http://www.icecap.us/>

France’s constitutional court ruled against France’s tax on carbon dioxide emissions because it violated the principle of equality.

“French Constitutional Court Rejects Carbon Tax”

By Gregory Viscusi, Bloomberg.com, Dec 30, 2009 [H/t Thomas Burch]

<http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601092&sid=aY9Dhj8qZZZE>

For a well-balanced article on the differences between advocates of Anthropogenic Global Warming and those who doubt this view as well as a discussion of the NIPCC reports please see

“Global Warming and Climate Change”

Believers, deniers, and doubters view the scientific forecast from different angles

By Stephen K. Ritter, C&EN (Chemical & Engineering News), Dec 21, 2009

<http://pubs.acs.org/cen/coverstory/87/8751cover.html>

One way in which Climategaters have avoided complying with Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests is by claiming the data is not theirs and confidentiality agreements prevent them from releasing the data. Steve McIntyre explores the rigor with which Climategaters adhere to these agreements:

“Sent loads of station data to Scott”

By Steve McIntyre, Climate audit.org, Jan 1, 2010,

<http://climateaudit.org/2010/01/01/sent-loads-of-station-data-to-scott/>

Many carbon dioxide alarmists claim that increased carbon dioxide will destroy the oceans. In a novel twist, this author claims we must protect the oceans from other human activity so that the life in the oceans may consume increased carbon dioxide.

“To Save the Planet, Save the Seas”

By Dan Laffoley, NYT, Dec. 26, 2009

http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/27/opinion/27lafolley.html?_r=1&th&emc=th

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

Less than a month after what BBC called the most important meeting in the history of the world in Copenhagen, BBC correspondents predict the major news stories in 2010. Conspicuously absent is global warming-climate change. Perhaps COP-16 in Mexico will not be the most important meeting in history **H**.

“BBC correspondents look ahead to the big events of 2010”

BBC News Jan 1, 2010, [H/t Malcolm Ross]

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/8407948.stm

For yet another scheme to replace reliable coal, please see the article below and imagine what would be required to keep such a device stable at 24,000 feet with winds ranging from near zero to 300 miles per hour:

“The quest to find alternative sources of renewable energy is taking to the skies”

High altitude wind-power

By Make Harvey, TimesOnline, Nov 12, 2009 [H/t John Brignell Numberwatech.co.uk]

http://business.timesonline.co.uk/tol/business/industry_sectors/utilities/article6913119.ece

Last week TWTW referred to an article by Patrick Michaels in the WSJ “How to Manufacture a Climate Consensus.” This week Climategater Michael Mann struck back. First Mann wraps himself in the mantle of Objective Science, then he launches an *ad hominem* attack on Michaels – hardly what one would call objective.

“Science Journals Must Be Unpolluted by Politics”

By Michael Mann, Letters, Wall Street Journal, Dec 31, 2009

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703478704574612400823765102.html>

For a review of past predictions please see:

“Technology Predictions Are Mostly Bunk”

By L. Gordon Crovitz, WSJ, Dec 28, 2009

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704039704574616401913653862.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

#####

ARTICLES

1. Climategate in Detail

By Vincent Gray, NZ Newsletter, Dec. 28, 2009, Posted on IceCap

<http://www.icecap.us/>

I have just spent a whole day reading details of the Emails from the Hadley Centre that are contained in the vast package of material, known as Climategate. as portrayed on the website of Dr John P Costella [here](#).

They are really astonishing. Many are yet to be revealed generally. They display a network of conspiracy to defraud, manipulate, distort and intimidate which even I, who have been in the middle of it from the beginning, have difficulty in believing. Dr Costello even identified excerpts which are likely to be used in the trials of some of the participants,

The one where Phil Jones states that he has got to “hide the decline” shown by recent tree ring temperatures because they did not show the required global warming has already been pilloried. I also liked the one where Tom Wigley advocated putting in the data “Whether they are correct or not”.

It was interesting to read how they organized the dismissal of Chris de Freitas as an Editor of “Climate Science” for publishing a paper they did not like.

It is far too long to summarize, so let me just copy some of the most recent specimens, from Kevin Trenberth

“Well I have my own article on where the heck is global warming? We are asking that here in Boulder where we have broken records the past two days for the coldest days on record. The fact is that we can’t

account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't. The data published in the August [20]09 supplement on 2008 shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate.”

“How come you do not agree with a statement that says we are nowhere close to knowing where energy is going or whether clouds are changing to make the planet brighter[?] We are not close to balancing the energy budget. The fact that we can not account for what is happening in the climate system makes any consideration of geoengineering quite hopeless as we will never be able to tell if it is successful or not! It is a travesty! “

“Here are some of the issues as I see them: Saying it is natural variability is not an explanation. What are the physical processes? Where did the heat go?But the resulting evaporative cooling means the heat goes into atmosphere and should be radiated to space: so we should be able to track it with C[louds and the] E[arth's] R[adiant] E[nergy] S[ystem] data. Th[at] data are unfortunately w[a]nting and so too are the cloud data. The ocean data are also lacking although some of that may be related to the ocean current changes and burying heat at depth where it is not picked up. If it is sequestered at depth then it comes back to haunt us later and so we should know about it.”

From Mike Mann to Kevin Trenberth and others

“ that doesn't mean we can explain exactly what's going on”.

October 27, 2009: email 1256735067

“It is appropriate that the last word in Climategate go to Mike Mann, explaining what it's all about. Mike Mann to Phil Jones and Gavin Schmidt:

As we all know, this isn't about truth at all, its about plausibly deniable accusations[.]

And again: it's tough when even your allies are starting to turn:

[B]e a bit careful about what information you send to Andy [Revkin of the New York Times] and what emails you copy him in on. He's not as predictable as we'd like[.] “

[SEPP COMMENT]: Vincent Gray has been an indefatigable reviewer of the IPCC reports posting many objections and suggested changes. In his comments on the First Draft of the Second Report he pointed out that “the Title of the Chapter ‘Validation of Climate Models’ was inappropriate because no climate model has ever been ‘validated’. They agreed, to the extent that the Second Draft had changed the word ‘validate’ to ‘evaluate’ no less than fifty times, and they changed the word "prediction" to "projection" at the same time, a practice adopted for all subsequent Reports.” If the IPCC could validate the models they certainly would do so {from an email communication.}]

2. Scientific American's Climate Lies

By The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley, SPPI Blog, Dec 29, 2009

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/commentaries/climate_lies.pdf

The December 2009 issue of Scientific American featured an editorial that was less the complementary to global warming realists: “Within the community of scientists and others concerned about anthropogenic climate change, those whom Inhofe calls skeptics are more commonly termed contrarians, naysayers and denialists.”... “What distinguishes the true naysayers is an unwavering dedication to denying the need for

action on the problem, often with weak and long-disproved arguments about supposed weaknesses in the science behind global warming.”

This was followed by a series of logical straw men in which the Scientific American misrepresented the arguments of the skeptics. Of course the editorial easily knocked down the straw men.

On Dec. 29, Lord Monckton struck back with his comments that can be found as referenced above. Monckton started with uncomplimentary remarks about the Scientific American similar to those the journal made about the skeptics. Then, he dispensed with *ad hominem* suggesting Scientific American do the same and launched into a logical, scientific discussion of each of the straw men presented in the journal. He stated the position of the realists far more accurately than Scientific American did, and followed it with a discussion exposing the weakness of the Scientific American’s arguments. Throughout this logical tour de force Monckton emphasizes the uncertainties of the science which must be answered before any conclusions of human cause global warming can be established.

[Please note: when down loaded on Jan 1, 2010, there was a gap in the paper between pages 4 and 5]

3. A Response to Michael Mann

By Paul Knappenberger, SPPI Blog, Dec 29, 2009 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]
<http://sppiblog.org/news/a-response-to-michael-mann>

Back of December 18, 2009, the *Washington Post* ran an editorial (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/12/17/AR2009121703682.html>) by Penn State’s Dr. Michael Mann, who attempted to explain why the recent release of the Climategate emails “doesn’t alter evidence for climate change.” But Dr. Mann—a central figure in the released emails—is speaking only from one side of the issue—his side. While the contents of the Climategate emails may not alter the evidence of climate change *published in the scientific “peer-reviewed” literature*, it is an entirely different matter when it comes to evidence of climate change that may have been kept out of the peer-reviewed literature. And the Climategate emails illuminate continual efforts from Dr. Mann and colleagues to limit the contents of the peer-reviewed scientific literature to only those types of results and conclusions that they liked. As such, the extant scientific literature of the past 5 to 10 years cannot be considered to be a fair representation of what it would have been had it not been manipulated. Thus, it is impossible to judge whether or not the evidence for climate change has been altered by the Climategate emails, contrary to Dr. Mann’s claims.

Below is a letter-to-the editor of the *Washington Post* that I submitted in response to Dr. Mann’s December 18th op-ed. Since it has been more than 10 days since I submitted it, I’ll assume that the *Post* has decided not to run it (they did not run any letter-to-the-editor on this topic, despite having received 651 comments on-line, the majority of them quite negative). My letter is reproduced here:

In his December 18, 2009 op-ed, Dr. Michael Mann largely misses to point about the most important aspect of the contents of the climate emails. It is not so much what *has* appeared in the scientific literature after “decades of work by thousands of scientists around the world” regarding human-caused climate change, but what *has not* appeared in the literature. The emails reveal signs of manipulation of the peer-review process, and what’s worse, intimidation of individual researchers, from a group of prominent scientists who seek to closely guard their view of the evidence and who are largely intolerant of countervailing hypothesis or interpretations. The degree to which the extant scientific literature can be judged a fair representation of what our scientific understanding may have been like absent these tactics is impossible to ascertain. The unfortunate, but undeniable side effect, is that the foundation of state, national, and international assessments of the potential impacts of climate change and considerations of what actions may be necessary to mitigate them has been shaken—not by what our knowledge is, but by

what it should be. The latter of which, through the actions revealed in the emails, has been rendered largely unknowable.

Dr. Patrick Michaels, a close colleague of mine, expresses a similar sentiment (including some specific details) his recent op-ed published in the *Wall Street Journal* titled, “How to Manufacture a Climate Consensus (<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704398304574598230426037244.html>)

4. The Temperature of Science

By James Hansen, [only the summary]

http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/mailings/2009/20091216_TemperatureOfScience.pdf

Summary

The nature of messages that I receive from the public, and the fact that NASA Headquarters received more than 2500 inquiries in the past week about our possible “manipulation” of global temperature data, suggest that the concerns are more political than scientific. Perhaps the messages are intended as intimidation, expected to have a chilling effect on researchers in climate change.

The recent “success” of climate contrarians in using the pirated East Anglia e-mails to cast doubt on the reality of global warming* seems to have energized other deniers. I am now inundated with broad FOIA (Freedom of Information Act) requests for my correspondence, with substantial impact on my time and on others in my office. I believe these to be fishing expeditions, aimed at finding some statement(s), likely to be taken out of context, which they would attempt to use to discredit climate science.

There are lessons from our experience about care that must be taken with data before it is made publicly available. But there is too much interesting science to be done to allow intimidation tactics to reduce our scientific drive and output. We can take a lesson from my 5- year-old grandson who boldly says “I don’t quit, because I have never-give-up fighting spirit!”

http://www.columbia.edu/~jeh1/mailings/2009/20091130_FightingSpirit.pdf

There are other researchers who work more extensively on global temperature analyses than we do – our main work concerns global satellite observations and global modeling – but there are differences in perspectives, which, I suggest, make it useful to have more than one analysis. Besides, it is useful to combine experience working with observed temperature together with our work on satellite data and climate models. This combination of interests is likely to help provide some insights into what is happening with global climate and information on the data that are needed to understand what is happening. So we will be keeping at it.

*By “success” I refer to their successful character assassination and swift-boating. My interpretation of the e-mails is that some scientists probably became exasperated and frustrated by contrarians – which may have contributed to some questionable judgment. The way science works, we must make readily available the input data that we use, so that others can verify our analyses. Also, in my opinion, it is a mistake to be too concerned about contrarian publications –some bad papers will slip through the peer-review process, but overall assessments by the National Academies, the IPCC, and scientific organizations sort the wheat from the chaff.

The important point is that nothing was found in the East Anglia e-mails altering the reality and magnitude of global warming in the instrumental record. The input data for global temperature analyses are widely available, on our web site and elsewhere. If those input data could be made to yield a significantly different global temperature change, contrarians would certainly have done that – but they have not.

[SEPP Note: For years independent researchers such as Sherwood Idso have illustrated that the raw data from rural US stations indict that the 1930's was the hottest decade in US history, not the 1990's as NASA GISS has declared. Hansen has ignored repeated requests to release the raw data and the methods of manipulation. In 2007, Steve McIntyre found miscalculations in NASA GISS data and that 1934 was the hottest year in US history, not 1998 as NASA GISS declared. Yet, Hansen refuses to comply with the Freedom of Information Act, questioning the motives of those making the request. Motive has nothing to do with the law.

Richard Lindzen points out that the GISS and CRU temperature analysis show similar behavior as well as that from the National Climate Data Center (NCDC) headed by Tom Karl who was commonly involved in CRU emails.

We all would be better served if Mr. Hansen complied with FOIA rather than attacking the motives of those who make such requests.]

5. Predictions of climate

Posted by Oliver Morton on behalf of Kevin E. Trenberth, June 4, 2007 [H/t Bob Carter]

Nature.com, Climate Feedback [only an excerpt]

http://blogs.nature.com/climatefeedback/2007/06/predictions_of_climate.html

Last week TWTW referred to an editorial in the Journal *Nature* calling for advocates human caused global warming to communicate their findings better to convince politicians and the public of the dangers of global warming. Since IPCC pronouncements are accompanied by publicity unrivaled even by a 1960's Detroit launch of a New Model Year, it is difficult to imagine what more communication the advocates need. Perhaps *Nature* should have referred back to this 2007 article by Kevin Trenberth who is well known by followers of Climategate.

[Excerpt, for the full article see the referred web site.]

In fact there are no predictions by IPCC at all. And there never have been. The IPCC instead proffers "what if" projections of future climate that correspond to certain emissions scenarios. There are a number of assumptions that go into these emissions scenarios. They are intended to cover a range of possible self consistent "story lines" that then provide decision makers with information about which paths might be more desirable. But they do not consider many things like the recovery of the ozone layer, for instance, or observed trends in forcing agents. There is no estimate, even probabilistically, as to the likelihood of any emissions scenario and no best guess.

Even if there were, the projections are based on model results that provide differences of the future climate relative to that today. None of the models used by IPCC are initialized to the observed state and none of the climate states in the models correspond even remotely to the current observed climate. In particular, the state of the oceans, sea ice, and soil moisture has no relationship to the observed state at any recent time in any of the IPCC models. There is neither an El Niño sequence nor any Pacific Decadal Oscillation that replicates the recent past; yet these are critical modes of variability that affect Pacific rim countries and beyond. The Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, that may depend on the thermohaline circulation and thus ocean currents in the Atlantic, is not set up to match today's state, but it is a critical component of the Atlantic hurricanes and it undoubtedly affects forecasts for the next decade from Brazil to Europe. Moreover, the starting climate state in several of the models may depart significantly from the real climate owing to model errors. I postulate that regional climate change is impossible to deal with properly unless the models are initialized.

6. The New Climate Litigation

How about if we sue you for breathing

Wall Street Journal Editorial, Dec 28, 2009

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703478704574612150621257422.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

Fresh from the fiasco in Copenhagen and with a failure in the U.S. Senate looming this coming year, the climate-change lobby is already shifting to Plan B, or is it already Plan D? Meet the carbon tort.

Across the country, trial lawyers and green pressure groups—if that's not redundant—are teaming up to sue electric utilities for carbon emissions under "nuisance" laws.

A group of 12 Gulf Coast residents whose homes were damaged by Katrina are suing 33 energy companies for greenhouse gas emissions that allegedly contributed to the global warming that allegedly made the hurricane worse. Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal and seven state AG allies plus New York City are suing American Electric Power and other utilities for a host of supposed eco-maladies. A native village in Alaska is suing Exxon and 23 oil and energy companies for coastal erosion.

What unites these cases is the creativity of their legal chain of causation and their naked attempts at political intimidation. "My hope is that the court case will provide a powerful incentive for polluters to be reasonable and come to the table and seek affordable and reasonable reductions," Mr. Blumenthal told the trade publication Carbon Control News. "We're trying to compel measures that will stem global warming regardless of what happens in the legislature."

Mull over that one for a moment. Mr. Blumenthal isn't suing to right a wrong. He admits that he's suing to coerce a change in policy no matter what the public's elected representatives choose.

Cap and trade or a global treaty like the one that collapsed in Copenhagen would be destructive—but at least either would need the assent of a politically accountable Congress. The Obama Administration's antidemocratic decision to impose carbon regulation via the Environmental Protection Agency would be even more destructive—but at least it would be grounded in an existing law, the 1977 Clean Air Act, however misinterpreted. The nuisance suits ask the courts to make such fundamentally political decisions themselves, with judges substituting their views for those of the elected branches.

And now that you mention it, the U.S. appeals courts seem more than ready to arrogate to themselves this power. In September, the Second Circuit allowed Mr. Blumenthal's suit to proceed, while a three-judge panel of the Fifth Circuit reversed a lower court's dismissal of the Katrina case in October. An en banc hearing is now under consideration.

But global warming is, well, global: It doesn't matter whether ubiquitous CO₂ emissions come from American Electric Power or Exxon—or China. "There is no logical reason to draw the line at 30 defendants as opposed to 150, or 500, or even 10,000 defendants," says David Rivkin, an attorney at Baker Hostetler and a contributor to our pages, in an amicus brief in the Katrina case. "These plaintiffs—and any others alleging injury by climatic phenomena—would have standing to assert a damages claim against virtually every entity and individual on the planet, since each 'contributes' to global concentrations of carbon dioxide."

In other words, the courts would become a venue for a carbon war of all against all. Not only might businesses sue to shackle their competitors—could we sue the New York Times for deforestation?—but judges would decide the remedies against specific defendants. In practice this would mean ad hoc command-and-control regulation against any industries that happen to catch the green lobby's eye.

Carbon litigation without legislation is one more way to harm the economy, and the rule of law. We hope the Fifth Circuit will have the good sense to deflect this damaging legal theory before it crash-lands at the Supreme Court.

[SEPP COMMENT: A disturbing analysis of havoc that may come from the misguided Supreme Court decision that carbon dioxide is a pollutant and the outrageous EPA announcement that it is a hazard to human health.

7 The questions Dr Pachauri still has to answer

By Christopher Booker, UK Telegraph, Dec 26, 2009

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/6890839/The-questions-Dr-Pachauri-still-has-to-answer.html>

Last week TWTW referred to an article by Christopher Booker showing the multiple business connections of IPCC Chairman Rajendra Pachauri. He answered some but not all.

[Excerpt, please see the full article referenced above]

"Just how surreal the business of "carbon trading" has become is illustrated by another project, which has no direct connection with Dr Pachauri but which involves the plan by a Tata subsidiary to build one of the world's largest coal-fired power stations in the state of Gujarat. Nearly \$1 billion needed to build the 4 gigawatt Mundra plant is being supplied in cheap "green loans" by the World Bank and the Asia Development Bank (to both of which Dr Pachauri acts as an adviser), because the plant will emit CO2 at a "lower intensity" than older power stations in India. For the same reason, the plant will also qualify for a potential \$560 million in "carbon credits" under the UN's CDM scheme, which can then be sold on the world market.

If our own Government allows E.ON to build a similar but much smaller coal-fired power station at Kingsnorth in Kent, however, we shall have to pay out millions of pounds through our electricity bills to buy those same "credits" which in India the UN hands out free – to help Tata build a plant which will be responsible for emitting 26 million tonnes a year of CO2, well over twice as much as Kingsnorth."

#####