

The Week That Was 2010-05-01 (May 1, 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](#).

#####

As a co-sponsor, SEPP receives 20 free registrations to the IPCC and has 10 remaining. They are available to those who respond first to singer@sepp.org. Sorry, no free transportation or hotel room.

#####

Quote of the Week

*"Today's debate about global warming is essentially a debate about freedom. The environmentalists would like to mastermind each and every possible (and impossible) aspect of our lives." -- Vaclav Klaus, President, Czech Republic, *Blue Planet in Green Shackles**

THIS WEEK:

The Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) is launching a new web site, www.NIPCCreport.org. It is now going through its shakedown cruise. The objective will be to post the latest scientific literature that is of interest to the climate change community, particularly those who question IPCC claims.

This week, politics are tumultuous. Facing election, Prime Minister Rudd of Australia punted on "cap and tax" until 2013 showing that to him political survival is more important and the greatest moral imperative facing the world. New Zealand's Environmental Trading Scheme (cap and tax) is facing opposition with the business community up in arms. Germany's Chancellor Merkel is moving away from any binding international agreements on cap and tax.

The British government is in the middle of an election campaign and thus far the parties are all ignoring environmental schemes and their costs to the citizens. And at this moment, the Democrats in the US Senate are schizophrenic. Should they pass a sweeping immigration law giving citizenship to millions of illegal immigrants in hopes of picking up additional voters? Or should they address the cap and tax bill disguised under any other name? It appears that politicians are beginning to realize that the citizens, "the great unwashed," are becoming aware that the science is shoddy and the schemes are extremely costly.

ClimateGate continues but the great deference shown to those involved by the investigating organizations may be over. Virginia's Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli has demanded that the University of Virginia produce a swath of documents relating to Michael Mann's receipt of nearly half a million dollars in state grant-funded climate research conducted while Mann was at UVA between 1999 and 2005. To most, it may not be illegal to manipulate data thereby falsify science. However to receive Virginia taxpayer money by doing so may be a violation of the Virginia Fraud Against Taxpayer Act. The caterwauling by the academic community should be most interesting.

In the interim, the US EPA continues its relentless march to control the US economy by demanding control of carbon dioxide emissions. In the name of ocean acidification, EPA is insisting on regulations to further control the run-off of water from rain. The logic is incredible. According to EPA, increased atmospheric carbon dioxide will increase carbon dioxide in the oceans – thus lower the pH. Yet, EPA

claims that atmospheric carbon dioxide causes warming. As shown by the Vostok ice cores, warming results in increased atmospheric carbon dioxide, from ocean outgassing – warm water cannot hold as much dissolved gas as cold water. To EPA power and control take precedence over logical consistency.

A tour of the southwestern part of California's San Joaquin Valley, once some of the most productive farmland in the world, reveals the triumph of Federal policy by such agencies. Last year the Federal government cut off 90 percent of the irrigation water to about 500,000 acres, about the size of Rhode Island. This killed tens of thousands of acres of crops and thousands of acres of orchards. Unemployment in thriving farming communities went up to 40%. For thousands of years, a hallmark of civilizations has been irrigating arid lands to make them bountiful. These agencies are engaged in a campaign against civilization and the American citizen.

The leaking oil well and the resulting oil slick in the Gulf of Mexico are terrible news for those who have been supporting offshore drilling. No doubt, extremists will seize upon this unfortunate event to try to prevent drilling everywhere.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #14-2010 (May 1, 2010)

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

Some Serious Questions about Nuclear Energy

The White House has announced the termination of the Yucca Mountain project to provide a long-term and safe 'engineered disposal site' for spent nuclear reactor fuel (what many enviros refer to as a 'nuclear waste dump'). Presumably, the WH action will help Senator Harry Reid (Dem-Nevada) as he seeks re-election in November 2010 (or am I just being cynical?).

A 1983 law calls for such disposal by the US government, so here are some questions for Secretary of Energy Dr Steven Chu:

1. Is Yucca now irrevocably dead? Y/N
2. If YES, do you see another 20-yr search shaping up to qualify another site? Y/N
3. If NO, does DOE just ignore the law; can nuclear utilities stop paying fees to DOE, and claim a refund (approaching \$20 billion)?
4. Do you have any clue what this WH plans to do?
5. Do you see this EPA ever approving any kind of disposal of spent fuel (aside from the status quo of on-site storage) – in view of exaggerated fears of minute amounts of radioactivity?
6. Is this lack of a permanent disposal site likely to result in lawsuits that can stop nuclear energy --- or seriously delay it or drive up costs prohibitively?
7. In other words: Does cancelation of Yucca spell the end for a nuclear future for the US?

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

1. Oh, Mann: Cuccinelli targets UVA papers in Climategate salvo

By Courtney Stuart, The Hook, Apr 29, 2010

<http://www.readthehook.com/blog/index.php/2010/04/29/oh-mann-cuccinelli-targets-uva-papers-in-climategate-salvo/>

[SEPP Comments: "There is a good chance that Virginia's Attorney-General Ken Cuccinelli will come up with the "smoking gun" -- where other so-called investigations have only produced one whitewash after another.]

2. The Climategate Investigation

By Dexter Wright, American Thinker, Apr 29, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/04/the_climategate_investigation.html

3. The UK election: what about the environment?

The Scientific Alliance Newsletter, Apr 30, 2010

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

4. The \$10 Trillion Climate Fraud

IBD Editorials, Apr 28, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=531731>

5. California's Man-Made Drought

By Monica Showalter, IBD, Apr 28, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=531662>

6. Galileo Silenced Again, The American Geophysical Union is sending science back four hundred years.

By Willie Soon and David Legates, Nov 13, 2009

http://www.heartland.org/full/26365/Galileo_Silenced_Again_.html_WSJ_AGUresponse.shtml

7. Quote of the week #34: NASA doubts climate model certainty

By Anthony Watts, Watts Up With That, Apr 27, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/27/quote-of-the-week-34-nasa-doubts-climate-model-certainty/#more-18945>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

ClimateGate

Kiwigate is a Carbon Copy of Climategate

By John O'Sullivan, Suite 101, Apr 26, 2010, [H/t Icecap.us]

<http://climatology.suite101.com/article.cfm/kiwi-scientists-copy-data-trashing-technique-of-climategate#ixzz0mJkLtKzW>

[SEPP Comment: It appears that homogenizing data is somewhat like combining drinking water with bilge water.]

Krummholtz and the Yamal Chronology

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Apr 28, 2010

<http://climateaudit.org/>

[SEPP comment: A series of posts further questioning the credibility of the Briffa hockey stick used by the IPCC in its 2007 Assessment Report. Briffa's tree ring data was part of the ClimateGate emails called

“hide the decline.” The aerial photo of the Yamal larch “forest” illustrates what was excluded from the Briffa articles. A view from “google earth” of the region is consistent with the aerial photo.]

Cap and Tax – The Orthodoxy vs. Reality

World Rethinks Climate Legislation: Costly cap-and-trade system isn’t the political winner it once was

By Tom Switzer, WSJ Asia, Apr 30, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704423504575212991625192482.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopBucket

Cap and Trade Loses in Australia: The Rudd government bows to political reality.

WSJ, Opinion Asia, Apr 29, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704302304575213412292213950.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopBucket

[SEPP Comment: Political reality interferes with the “moral imperative.”]

ETS go-ahead risks business anger

By Ran O’Sullivan, NZ Herald, Apr 28, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

http://www.nzherald.co.nz/politics/news/article.cfm?c_id=280&objectid=10641266&pnum=0

Meltdown of the climate-change bill: Democrats recalibrate their agenda for Election Day

Washington Times Editorial, Apr 27, 2010

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/apr/27/meltdown-of-the-climate-change-bill/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today

Merkel Abandons Aim of Binding Climate Agreement

By Dirk Kurbjuweit, Christian Schwagerl and Gerald Traufetter, Spiegelonline, Apr 30, 2010

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,691194,00.html>

The Orthodoxy

Warmists desperate fightback

By Des Moore, Quadrant, AU, Apr 27, 2010

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2010/04/warmists-desperate-fightback>

Twenty Years of Advocacy, Not Journalism, on Global Warming: The media has forged a consensus around climate change.

By Rich Noyes, Media Research Center, WSJ, Apr 23, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703709804575202554026555656.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_RIGHTBelowPepperandSalt

On Earth Day, the environmental movements needs repairs

By Bill McKibben, Washington Post, Apr 23, 2010

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/22/AR2010042203178.html?referrer=emailarticle>

EPA Solicits Input on Ocean Acidification and Carbon Dioxide Limits Under Water Pollution Law

By Miyoko Sakashita, Center for Biological Diversity, Mar 22, 2010 [H/t Jeff Miller]
http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press_releases/2010/ocean-acidification-03-22-2010.html

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Scientist says Arctic getting colder

Science News, UPI, Apr 23, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]
http://www.upi.com/Science_News/2010/04/23/Scientist-says-Arctic-getting-colder/UPI-94431272034113/

The Wrong Way To Get to Green

Review of “Power Hungry” by Robert Bryce
By Trevor Butterworth, WSJ Bookshelf, Apr 27, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703465204575208132724528718.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

Sunset Looms for Global Warming Industry

By Viv Forbes, Carbon Sense Coalition Press Release, Apr 28, 2010
<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/sunset-global-warming.pdf>
[SEPP Comment: Calling for sunset laws on global warming legislation.]

EPA’s New CO2 Rules: Bad News For Blacks

By Deroy Murdock, Human Events, Apr 26, 2010 [H/t Warren Wetmore]
<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=36678>

IPCC’s River Of Lies

IBD Editorial, Apr 27, 2010
<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=531579>

Latest Global Warming Oops Moment, local yet,

By Mark Landsbaum, Orange County Register, Apr 27, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]
<http://orangepunch.freedomblogging.com/2010/04/27/latest-global-warming-oops-moment-locally-yet/25249/>

Energy Issues

The winds of climate-change

By Skyler Hype, Envirogy, Apr 15, 2010
<http://envirogy.wordpress.com/2010/04/15/the-winds-of-change/>
[SEPP Comment: This MIT analysis concludes that using wind turbines to meet 10% or more global energy demand by 2100 would: 1) Require about 13 million wind turbines, 2) Occupy a continental-size area, 3) Cause surface warming exceeding 1 C over land installations, 4) Cause alterations of the global distributions of rainfall and clouds, 5) Cause climatic perturbation well beyond the installation regions, 6) Reduce convective precipitation in the Northern Hemisphere, 7) Enhance convective precipitation in the Southern Hemisphere, 8) Cause higher energy costs and undesired environmental impacts and 9) Require backup generation, onsite energy storage, and costly, very long-distance power transmission lines, all of which require technological advances to accomplish.

Five myths about green energy

By Robert Bryce, Washington Post, Apr 23, 2010 [H/t Brad Veek]
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/23/AR2010042302220.html?sub=AR>

Cape Windbags: One approval down, only five more years to go

Wall Street Journal Editorial, Apr 30, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704302304575214621106961304.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_AboveLEFTTop

Once-hidden EU report reveals damage from biodiesel

By Pete Harrison, Reuters, Apr 21, 2010 [H/t Mark Duchamp]
<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE63K2CB20100421>

Drill, Barry, Drill

By Andrew Cline, The American Spectator, Apr 30, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]
<http://spectator.org/archives/2010/04/30/drill-barry-drill>

Miscellaneous Science

View of the Sun

New York Times Editorial, Apr 26, 2010
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/27/opinion/27tue4.html?th&emc=th>

Into the Deep

By Alison Hawkes, Astrobiology Magazine, Apr 28, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
http://www.astrobio.net/index.php?option=com_retrospection&task=detail&id=3478
[SEPP Comment: Two articles, one on a possible new way to measure ocean temperatures. The second is on glaciers melting in the tropics. “To put it bluntly, climate change is creating conditions in the Andes last seen more than 5,000 years ago.” It did not dawn on the writer to ask what caused the warming 5,000 years ago – auto exhausts? The IPCC denies that the Holocene Climate Optimum was global. Probably not realizing it, the writer is contradicting the IPCC. Also, recent Chinese studies contradict the 2007 paper cited in the article on glacier melt in Tibet. (See Below)]

The Medieval Warmth of China

Temperature variation through 2000 years in China
By Ge, et al. Geophysical Research Letters,
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/apr/28apr2010a3.html>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Whale droppings ‘combat global warming by allowing oceans to absorb more carbon dioxide’

By Daily Mail Reporter, Apr 23, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1268381/Whale-droppings-combat-global-warming-allowing-oceans-absorb-carbon-dioxide.html>

Report: Save the Whales and They’ll Save Us from Global Warming

By Marc Sheppard, American Thinker, Apr 27, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]
http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2010/04/report_save_the_whales_and_the.html

Another polar rescue must send chills down spines of alarmists

By Andres Bold, Herald Sun, AU, Apr 21, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/another-polar-rescue-must-send/story-e6frfhqf-1225856131380>

[SEPP Comment: Perhaps all alarmists should attempt to “prove global warming” in this way.]

Climate Crazyness of the Week – MSM jumps on alarming headline

By Anthony Watts, Watts Up With That? Apr 30, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/30/climate-crazyness-of-the-week-msm-jumps-on-alarming-headline/#more-19086>

Alarming News: Scientists say that melting icebergs will increase sea levels by one inch in 526 years!

Climate Scientist, Heated Up Over Satirical Video, Threatens Lawsuit

By Ed Barnes, Fox News, Apr 26, 2010

<http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2010/04/26/climate-scientist-heated-satire-threatens-lawsuit/?test=latestnews>

[SEPP Comment: Virginia Attorney General Cuccinelli will give Michael Mann something else of concern.]

Government Report Says Global Warming May Cause Cancer, Mental Illness

By Matt Cover, CNS News, Apr 28, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/64827>

#####

1.Oh, Mann: Cuccinelli targets UVA papers in Climategate salvo

By Courtney Stuart, The Hook, Apr 29, 2010

<http://www.readthehook.com/blog/index.php/2010/04/29/oh-mann-cuccinelli-targets-uva-papers-in-climategate-salvo/>

Response to this Article by Fred Singer (published 4/29/2010)

We know from the leaked e-mails of Climategate that Prof. Michael Mann was involved in the international conspiracy to “hide the decline” [in global temperatures], using what chief conspirator Dr Phil Jones refers to as “Mike [Mann]’s trick.” Now at last we may find out just how this was done.

A lot is at stake here. If the recent warming is based on faked data, then all attempts to influence the climate by controlling the emissions of the so-called “pollutant” carbon dioxide are useless –and very costly. This includes the UN Climate Treaty, the Kyoto Protocol, the Waxman-Markey Cap & Trade (Tax) bill, the EPA “Endangerment Finding” based on the UN’s IPCC conclusion, and the upcoming Kerry-Lieberman-Graham bill in the US Senate.

There go all the windfarms, both onshore and offshore, the wasteful ethanol projects, and the hydrogen economy. Maybe Al Gore will cough up some of his ill-gotten \$500 million, gained from scaring the public, from carbon trading, carbon footprints, and all the other scams.

So – good luck, Ken Cuccinelli. We are with you all the way.”

S. Fred Singer, PhD
Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia
Chairman, Virginia Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment

Article:

No one can accuse Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli of shying from controversy. In his first four months in office, Cuccinelli directed public universities to remove sexual orientation from their anti-discrimination policies, attacked the Environmental Protection Agency, and filed a lawsuit challenging federal health care reform. Now, it appears, he may be preparing a legal assault on an embattled proponent of global warming theory who used to teach at the University of Virginia, [Michael Mann](#). In papers sent to UVA April 23, Cuccinelli's office commands the university to produce a sweeping swath of documents relating to Mann's receipt of nearly half a million dollars in state grant-funded climate research conducted while Mann— now director of the Earth System Science Center at Penn State— was at UVA between 1999 and 2005.

If Cuccinelli succeeds in finding a smoking gun like the purloined emails that led to the international scandal dubbed [Climategate](#), Cuccinelli could seek the return of all the research money, legal fees, and trebled damages.

“Since it's public money, there's enough controversy to look in to the possible manipulation of data,” says Dr. Charles Battig, president of the nonprofit Piedmont Chapter Virginia Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment, a group that doubts the underpinnings of climate change theory.

Mann is one of the lead authors of the controversial “[hockey stick graph](#),” which contends that global temperatures have experienced a sudden and unprecedented upward spike (like the shape of a hockey stick).

Neither UVA spokesperson Carol Wood nor Mann returned a reporter's calls at posting time, but Mann— whose research remains under investigation at Penn State— recently defended his work in a [front page story in USA Today](#) saying while there could be “minor” errors in his work there's nothing that would amount to fraud or change his ultimate conclusions that the earth is warming as a result of human activities, particularly the burning of fossil fuels.

Last fall, the release of some emails by researchers caused turmoil in the climate science world and bolstered critics of the human-blaming scientific models. (Among Climategate's embarrassing revelations was that one researcher professed an [interest in punching](#) Charlottesville-based doubting climate scientist Patrick Michaels in the nose.”)

Among the documents Cuccinelli demands are any and all emailed or written correspondence between or relating to Mann and more than 40 climate scientists, documents supporting any of five applications for the \$484,875 in grants, and evidence of any documents that no longer exist along with proof of why, when, and how they were destroyed or disappeared.

The Attorney General has the right to make such demands for documents under the [Fraud Against Taxpayers Act](#), a 2002 [law](#) designed to keep government workers honest.

2. The Climategate Investigation

By Dexter Wright, American Thinker, Apr 29, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/04/the_climategate_investigation.html

[SEPP Comment: What prior investigations uncovered.]

Last month, while the American media were distracted by the health care vote in Congress, the [British Parliament](#) published the results of its investigation into East Anglia University's Climate Research Unit (CRU) that has been at the center of the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) controversy. It seems that

many were hoping that no one would read this report, at least not beyond the milquetoast executive summary.

Buried deep within the report is a compelling piece of evidence. In volume two, there is a memorandum submitted as evidence from Lord Lawson of Blaby, chairman of the Global Warming Policy Foundation, which was in response to four very significant questions from the investigating committee. This memo confirms the claims by many global warming skeptics that the scientists at CRU were trying to hide data and silence the skeptics. The questions asked by the investigative committee are as follows:

- (i) Have the CRU scientists been manipulating the raw surface temperature data in a way that is less than wholly objective and dispassionate?
- (ii) Have they refused dissenting scientists and/or other outsiders with a bona fide interest in global warming access to the raw data, contrary to the proper canons of scientific research and to the demands of scientific integrity?
- (iii) Have they been improperly seeking to avoid answering Freedom of information Act requests?
- (iv) Have they actively sought to prevent papers by dissenting scientists, statisticians, or other informed commentators from being peer-reviewed and/or published, again contrary to the proper canons of scientific research and to the demands of scientific integrity?

Lord Lawson's response to these questions is damning:

We believe that there is compelling evidence both independent of the leaked email exchanges and arising from those emails to suggest that the answers to (ii), (iii) and (iv) above are clearly 'yes'.

However, Lord Lawson chooses his words more carefully in answering the smoking-gun question at the top of the list:

Moreover, we are disturbed by the CRU scientists' treatment of the so-called divergence problem. That is the fact that, for that period of time where both a proxy global temperature series and a recorded global temperature series are available, the two series markedly diverge. This clearly suggests either that the proxy series is unreliable or that the recorded series is unreliable (or possibly both: the point is that they cannot both be true). The CRU scientists' attempt to hide the problem by concealing the divergence demonstrates, we believe, a lack of integrity.

Integrity is at the very heart of the AGW debate -- not just the integrity of the discredited scientists involved, but also the integrity of the data used by the CRU. For many years, the [global warming skeptics](#) have been citing that the differing data sets are not in agreement and have asked the simple question "why?" Their assertion has always been that until a scientific explanation for the differences is found, there can be no definitive conclusion concerning AGW. This question was always avoided by the now-discredited Dr. Jones, who headed up the CRU. But finally, some light has been shed onto the question of integrity of the data. In this same memo, Lord Lawson clarifies some of the confusion concerning the differing data sets:

[T]here are, in fact, four (not two) other international data sets, all based in the United States. Two of them - NASA and NOAA - are neither wholly independent of each other (unsurprisingly, since they are both US Government agencies) nor wholly independent of the CRU set, as indeed some of the leaked emails indicates. The third, and fourth, which -- unlike CRU, NASA and NOAA - use not surface weather stations but satellite observations, are compiled by the University of Alabama at **Huntsville** (UAH) and

Remote Sensing Systems (RSS). They are entirely independent of the CRU. They use the same satellite data as each other but different methodology and produce similar results to each other, which differ from those of the CRU.

It seems that the only reliable data sets are satellite-derived data. However, those data were not used in the Nobel Prize-winning U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) [Fourth Assessment Report](#) (AR4). So the Nobel Committee awarded the Peace Prize to a report which was compiled by discredited scientists using discredited data. Does this discredit the Nobel Committee?

In recent years, when the [International Olympic Committee](#) (IOC) has made an error by awarding a medal to an athlete who was found to have cheated, the IOC demands that the medal be returned. This is to assure that the integrity of the games is not tarnished.

Such an action has never been demanded of the Nobel Committee. When it was ruled by the [Supreme Court](#) that Nikola Tesla, not Guglielmo Marconi, had invented the radio, Marconi was not asked to return the Nobel Prize for physics. It is unlikely that the Nobel Committee will recall the Peace Prize from the IPCC. It is also just as unlikely that the integrity of the Nobel Committee can be restored.

3. The UK election: what about the environment?

The Scientific Alliance Newsletter, Apr 30, 2010

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

The UK election: what about the environment? Apologies to readers outside the UK this week. This newsletter is more parochial than usual, with the general election looming on May 6th. British politics can be a mystery, not just to citizens of other countries, but often to voters. This year, a deeply unpopular third-term Labour government would be expected, in normal circumstances, to be replaced by the Conservatives. But, despite a new leader who has determinedly repositioned the party as both caring and responsible seeking to dominate the middle ground on which elections are normally won they are struggling to convince the electorate to vote for them in sufficient numbers to give an overall majority. At least, that's what the opinion polls tell us; in a week we will know for sure. Of course, given the winner-takes-all nature of the electoral system, parties which would have significant numbers of MPs under any form of proportional representation play a very minor role in Westminster, if at all. The system naturally leads to government by one of two major parties.

Since the implosion of the Liberals early in the twentieth century British politics has been about changes of power between the Conservative and Labour parties at irregular intervals (barring the rather special circumstances of the 1930s and the Second World War). But after previous false starts, the Liberal Democrats now have a chance of replacing Labour in the duopoly, following the televised beauty contest of the leadership debates. This may have been reinforced by Gordon Brown's unfortunate remarks to his aides, made public by his failure to remember he was still wearing a radio mike. The fate of the Labour party may turn out to have hinged on two soundbites: the use of the word 'bigot' to describe a life-long Labour voter, and the repeated 'I agree with Nick' from the first TV debate. Nevertheless, and despite the increasingly presidential nature of elections, and the personalisation of politics, we should never forget that we are voting not just for a leader but for a set of policies.

Not surprisingly, the focus of campaigning is largely on how the contending parties would both reduce the large structural deficit in the UK economy and also significantly reduce the horrendous national debt. Cuts in public sector expenditure are inevitable, as are tax rises of one form or another. It is the details and timing which are at issue. Equally unsurprising is the reluctance of party leaders to spell out the details of how they will achieve their targets; according to the Institute of Fiscal Studies, the Lib Dems

have been the most forthcoming, but even though have only shown where 26% of their projected savings would be found.

Against this background, there has been little talk of environmental issues at national level. This could be read as sensible prioritisation: the economy must be repaired first, before the government can turn its attention to climate change policy (which will continue to dominate the environmental agenda). But current commitments mean that emissions reductions cannot simply be ignored. Chickens will quickly come home to roost as the new parliament begins to reflect on what drove their predecessors to vote overwhelmingly for the Climate Change Act, which introduces the only legally enforceable national emissions targets in the world. Not only does this commit the country to a reduction of 80% in carbon dioxide emissions (from 1990 levels) by 2050, but the first in a series of carbon budgets promises a target of 34% reductions by 2020. Since it is almost certain that the target will be missed, will we be witness to the interesting sight of the government prosecuting itself?

Perhaps politicians might use this as a cautionary tale when setting policies: they should avoid gesture politics, and not pluck figures out of thin air. But unfortunately, the contagion has already spread throughout the EU, with the whole bloc now being signed up to the glib target of 20% reduction in emissions and 20% of energy from renewable resources by 2020. The three main parties have very similar policies on climate change and energy. They will all be bound by the Climate Change Act, but Labour explicitly states in its manifesto the target of an 80% reduction in emissions by 2050; the Lib Dems trump this with a 100% target. All three are committed to the building of new coal-fired power stations only if carbon capture and storage is part of the package. Both Labour and Conservative parties are looking to facilitate the building of new nuclear power stations, while the Lib Dems remain opposed to nuclear power. All parties make some commitment to encouraging home insulation itself a worthwhile objective by providing grants which would then be repaid via the cost savings. This sounds fine, but it represents yet more public expenditure which would only be repaid over a long period. Only the Labour party promises 'green' jobs: 400,000 to be created by 2015. Presumably, many of these would be relatively short term, to insulate established homes or install small-scale renewable energy.

Overall, the experience of Spain might prove to be a lesson, with green jobs being expensive to create and replacing only a proportion of the conventional jobs lost. Other relevant policies cover transport, with the Lib Dems being the most pro-railway and anti-car, but only Labour supporting a third runway at Heathrow. There also remains an enthusiasm for electric cars, which can really only be seen as a demonstration project for many years to come. To make any sense, they not only have some way further to go in development terms, but they must also be charged from a low-carbon electricity generating network, which will be some time in coming. Overall, climate change policy will cost large amounts of money. However the instruments and mechanisms are dressed up emissions trading, Renewables Obligation, feed-in tariffs etc they come down to costs which ultimately will be borne by individual consumers, taxpayers and voters. That fact does not seem to have filtered down fully to the man or woman in the street.

But as the next government struggles to minimise damage to public services while making the necessary cost cuts, and tries to minimise voter upset with the taxes rises it introduces, it will find it increasingly difficult to make a convincing case that yet more pain is needed to meet emissions targets. There will be hard choices. A reliable power supply or low-carbon electricity generation? Meeting emissions reduction targets or maintaining funding for health and education? Ultimately, politicians will have to regard current commitments as negotiable rather than in set in stone. This would not be unprecedented. Already, Kevin Rudd's government in Australia has had to put on hold the introduction of its own emissions reduction scheme, following Senate opposition. A period of reflection on green policies would be appropriate for whoever wins the next election.

4. The \$10 Trillion Climate Fraud

IBD Editorials, Apr 28, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=531731>

Cap-And-Trade: While senators froth over Goldman Sachs and derivatives, a climate trading scheme being run out of the Chicago Climate Exchange would make Bernie Madoff blush. Its trail leads to the White House.

Lost in the recent headlines was Al Gore's appearance Monday in Denver at the annual meeting of the Council of Foundations, an association of the nation's philanthropic leaders.

"Time's running out (on climate change)," Gore told them. "We have to get our act together. You have a unique role in getting our act together."

Gore was right that foundations will play a key role in keeping the climate scam alive as evidence of outright climate fraud grows, just as they were critical in the beginning when the Joyce Foundation in 2000 and 2001 provided the seed money to start the Chicago Climate Exchange. It started trading in 2003, and what it trades is, essentially, air. More specifically perhaps, hot air.

The Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) advertises itself as "North America's only cap-and-trade system for all six greenhouse gases, with global affiliates and projects worldwide." Barack Obama served on the board of the Joyce Foundation from 1994 to 2002 when the CCX startup grants were issued. As president, pushing cap-and-trade is one of his highest priorities. Now isn't that special?

Few Americans have heard of either entity. The Joyce Foundation was originally the financial nest egg of a widow whose family had made millions in the now out-of-favor lumber industry.

After her death, the foundation was run by philanthropists who increasingly dedicated their giving to liberal causes, including gun control, environmentalism and school changes.

Currently, CCX members agree to a voluntary but legally binding agreement to regulate greenhouse gases.

The CCX provides the mechanism in trading the very pollution permits and carbon offsets the administration's cap-and-trade proposals would impose by government mandate.

Thanks to Fox News' Glenn Beck, we have learned a lot about CCX, not the least of which is that its founder, Richard Sandor, says he knew Obama well back in the day when the Joyce Foundation awarded money to the Kellogg Graduate School of Management at Northwestern University, where Sandor was a research professor.

Sandor estimates that climate trading could be "a \$10 trillion dollar market." It could very well be, if cap-and-trade measures like Waxman-Markey and Kerry-Boxer are signed into law, making energy prices skyrocket, and as companies buy and sell permits to emit those six "greenhouse" gases.

So lucrative does this market appear, it attracted the attention of London-based Generation Investment Management, which purchased a stake in CCX and is now the fifth-largest shareholder.

As we noted last year, Gore is co-founder of Generation Investment Management, which sells carbon offsets of dubious value that let rich polluters continue to pollute with a clear conscience.

Other founders include former Goldman Sachs partner David Blood, as well as Mark Ferguson and Peter Harris, also of Goldman Sachs. In 2006, CCX received a big boost when another investor bought a 10% stake on the prospect of making a great deal of money for itself. That investor was Goldman Sachs, now under the gun for selling financial instruments it knew were doomed to fail.

The actual mechanism for trading on the exchange was purchased and patented by none other than Franklin Raines, who was CEO of Fannie Mae at the time.

Raines profited handsomely to the tune of some \$90 million by buying and bundling bad mortgages that led to the collapse of the American economy. His interest in climate trading is curious until one realizes cap-and-trade would make housing costlier as well.

Amazingly, none of these facts came up at Senate hearings on Goldman Sachs' activities, which may be nothing more than Ross Perot's famous "gorilla dust," meant to distract us from the real issues.

The climate trading scheme being stitched together here will do more damage than Goldman Sachs, AIG and Fannie Mae combined. But it will bring power and money to its architects.

5. California's Man-Made Drought

By Monica Showalter, IBD, Apr 28, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=531662>

COALINGA, Calif. — Would France rip out its storied vineyards? Would Juan Valdez scorch Colombia's coffee crop? Sri Lanka its black pepper harvest? China its tea?

With global markets won by nations specializing in doing what they do best, and with regional reputations important enough to drive some nations to protectionism, it's almost unthinkable.

But then there's California.

On a springtime drive through the Central Valley, it's hard not to notice how federal and state governments are hell-bent on destroying the state's top export — almonds — and everything else in the nation's most productive farmland.

Instead of pink blossoms and green shoots along Highway 5 in April, vast spans from Bakersfield to Fresno sit bone-dry. Brown grass, dead orchards and lifeless grapevine skeletons stretch for miles for lack of water. For every fallow field, there's a sign that farmers have placed alongside the highway: "No Water = No Food," "No Water = No Jobs," "Congress Created Dust Bowl."

Locals say it's been like this for two years now, as Congress and bureaucrats cite "drought," "global warming" and "endangered species" to deny water to this \$37 billion breadbasket through arbitrary "environmental" quotas.

It started with a 2008 federal court order that stopped water flowing from northern tributaries on a supposed need to protect a small fish — the delta smelt — that was getting ground up in the turbines of pump stations that divert the water south. The court knew it was bad law, but Congress refused to exempt the fish from the Endangered Species Act and the diversion didn't help the fish.

After that, the water cutoff was blamed on "drought," though northern reservoirs are currently full. Now the cry is "save the salmon," a reference to water needs of the state's northern fisheries.

Whatever the excuse, 75% of the fresh water that has historically irrigated California is now being washed to the open sea. For farmers in the southwest part of the valley, last year's cutoff amounted to 90%.

"It's pretty hard to keep crops alive at 10%," says Jim Jasper, who runs a 62-year-old almond farm in Newman that employs 170. "That's one irrigation, and trees take 10 to 12 over the growing season from March to October." Almond trees cost \$8,000 per acre and take six years to start producing, so farmers reserved their 10% allocation for mature trees first.

The cutoff didn't kill just trees, however. It also devastated the area's economy. Unemployment in some valley towns has shot up to 45%. Mortgage defaults are on the rise, and food lines are lengthening. Call it what it is: a man-made drought.

Much like organized criminals in big-city fish markets who see to it that product spoils when kickbacks aren't forthcoming, Washington's pols are now using their ability to turn water on and off as a coercion tool.

Take the three congressmen who represent the valley and how they were pressured to vote for President Obama's health care bill. It didn't go without notice by farmers like Jasper that the 5% water allocations announced in February for all three congressional districts were lifted to 25% for the two whose Democratic representatives, Jim Costa of Fresno and Dennis Cardoza of Modesto, switched their votes on health reform from "no" to "aye."

Devin Nunes, a Republican from Tulare, wouldn't sell his vote, and parts of his district had to make do with the 5% allotment.

This isn't the only way water allocation is politicized. According to Jasper, water in federal districts is distributed by 30-year contracts that guarantee water but not the quantity. Older irrigation districts get more, and newer ones (such as Jasper's, which at 60 years in operation is considered new) get less. To win political points from time to time, federal officials announce short-term increases in allocations — most recently, to 30%. But these increments are so iffy and irregular that farmers can't plan their crops or arrange for bank loans.

Bureaucrats also do their part to ensure that drought conditions persist. Lake Shasta, which supplies the federal Central Valley Project through the Sacramento River, is so full that rice farmers upstream have plenty extra to sell. But Lake Oroville, which supplies California's State Water Project through the Feather River, while not in a drought state, is not full.

State regulations say that upstream farmers who get water from Shasta cannot sell their extra water to the Central Valley farmers because Feather River farmers along the state system must sell first. It matters not that there's a surplus on the Shasta side and a deficit on the Oroville side. Even with the orchards of about a third of the state's 6,000 almond farmers withering, state bureaucrats are hung up on pecking order.

There's no good reason to destroy California's most productive region, which turns out 85% of the world's almonds, or to coldly demonize its growers as "corporate agribusiness."

That's a favorite slur of leftist politicians, such as Bay Area Rep. George Miller, who write off the agricultural damage to global warming and drought while harming the very environment they claim they

want to preserve. The valley's water table, for example, is falling as desperate farmers try to retrieve whatever supplies they can.

"What they have done is try to create a green utopia in the San Joaquin Valley, and in the process they are ruining people's lives," Nunes said.

Higher food prices are also on the way, Jasper warns. "Our cost of water to production is 25% to 30%," he says. "About a third of California almonds are affected — 280,000 acres out of 800,000."

Another unintended consequence is that much of the food Californians consume will no longer be local. Some crops will move to Mexico and then must be imported. Meanwhile, Chile, Spain and Australia have begun to develop their own almond industries.

This was made painfully obvious in a news photo datelined Mendota, Calif., and showing farm workers standing in food lines. The laborers who once picked vegetables in California's world-renowned "salad bowl" were taking handouts not of California carrots, but of baby carrots grown in China.

- Showalter is an IBD editorial writer.

6. Galileo Silenced Again, The American Geophysical Union is sending science back four hundred years.

By Willie Soon and David Legates, Nov 13, 2009

http://www.heartland.org/full/26365/Galileo_Silenced_Again_.html_WSJ_AGUresponse.shtml

Four centuries ago, "heretics" who disagreed with religious orthodoxy risked being burned at the stake. Many were the dissenting views that could send offenders to a fiery end.

In 1633, the astronomer Galileo Galilei may have come within a singed whisker of the same fate, for insisting that the sun (and not the Earth) was at the center of the solar system. In the end, he agreed to recant his "heresy" (at least publicly) and submit to living under house arrest until the end of his days.

Growing evidence ultimately proved Galileo was right, and the controversy dissipated. Theology gave way to nature in determining the truth about nature.

We wish that were the case today. Unfortunately, lessons learned 400 years ago have yet to be adopted where the Church of Anthro-Climatism is involved. Burning dissenters at the stake may no longer be an option – perhaps because it would send prodigious quantities of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. However, many other ingenious punishments are often meted out, to ensure that dissent is kept within "acceptable" limits, or dissenters no longer dissent.

Just recently, as scientists who specialize in environmental science, climatology, and solar variability, we welcomed the acceptance of our scientific session, *Diverse Views from Galileo's Window: Researching Factors and Processes of Climate Change in the Age of Anthropogenic CO₂*. The session was to be hosted at the upcoming Fall 2009 Meeting of the American Geophysical Union (AGU) in San Francisco.

Our session was to focus on "knowledge that spans an extremely diverse range of expertise" and provides "an integrated assessment of the vast array of disciplines that affect and, in turn, are affected by the Earth's climate." Our ultimate goal was to stimulate discussion at this professional meeting, prior to the upcoming UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) fifth assessment report.

We developed this session to honor the great tradition of science and scientific inquiry, as exemplified by Galileo when, 400 years ago this year, he first pointed his telescope at the Earth's moon and at the moons of Jupiter, analyzed his findings, and subsequently challenged the orthodoxy of a geocentric universe. Our proposed session was accepted by the AGU.

In response to its acceptance, we were joined by a highly distinguished group of scientists – including members of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA, France and China, as well as recipients of the AGU's own William Bowie, Charles Whitten and James MacElwane medals. Our participants faithfully submitted abstracts for the session.

But by late September, several puzzling events left us wondering whether the AGU truly serves science and environmental scientists – or simply reflects, protects and advances the political agendas of those who espouse belief in manmade CO₂-induced catastrophic global warming.

On September 14, Dr. Nicola Scafetta of Duke University contacted us, to say the AGU had cancelled his previously-approved 12-paper session on Solar Variability and Its Effect on Climate Change, since it did not have enough papers. He asked if the papers from his session could be merged into our session; since they fit our theme well, we accepted his papers.

The merger was approved by the AGU Planning Committee. Thus our Galileo session now had grown to a total of 27 papers and was approved as a poster session at the Fall Meeting.

However, a few days later, after first approving our session and after we had assigned time slots for these new papers at AGU's request, the Planning Committee revoked its approval and summarily dissolved our session. Now the committee claimed our session was “thematically divergent,” and divided the papers in our original session among six different sessions.

To cover its tracks, the committee created a new session called Diverse Views from Galileo's Window: Solar Forcing of Climate Change with 15 papers – including the 12 from Dr. Scafetta's original session that it had cancelled. That reduced the focus of this session to just solar forcing of climate, and eliminated discussions of the impact of anthropogenic CO₂ that we had planned for our original session. The remaining papers from our cancelled session were moved to five other sessions, thereby undermining our original intent: comparing solar variability and manmade carbon dioxide as factors in planetary climate change.

In responding to us, the Planning Committee defended its actions by asserting: “none of [the papers in our session] have to do with the Galilean moons of Saturn [sic], which have to do with climate change or solar activity.” That claim reflects either a poor grasp of our purpose or a failure to read our proposal – and leads the question, Why wasn't this issue raised when they originally decided to accept our session?

Our session proposal had clearly intended to honor Galileo's observations of Jupiter's (not Saturn's) moons, which had led him to challenge the orthodoxy of the geocentric universe. We wanted to highlight how current research into the climatic effects of anthropogenic CO₂ is challenging the supposed “scientific consensus” that humans are causing catastrophic climate change.

This arbitrary dissolution of our original session has serious implications for proper scientific enquiry. Our request that the session be reinstated has gone unheeded, despite the fact that the AGU has reinstated at least one cancelled session in the past. We have repeatedly been told that the decisions of the Planning Committee are final, though it has made clearly contradictory decisions regarding our session.

Reduced sunspot activity and solar energy output, stable or even cooling planetary temperatures, concerns over the high cost of proposed cap-and-trade legislation, political developments in Washington and Copenhagen, and other factors have caused more people to question manmade global warming disaster claims. This has led to consternation among scientists and organizations that have supported those claims.

However, as scientists, we are profoundly concerned by this behavior from a professional society that is supposed to serve science and its members. The AGU certainly had the right to reject our proposed session at the outset or before the solar variability session was merged with it. But given the topic of our session and the good faith approach we have taken in accepting papers from the cancelled solar variability session, it seems odd (at the very least) that our session was summarily dissolved, and that the AGU refuses to discuss the matter.

The AGU action is hardly reasonable. Indeed, it is counter-productive to the scientific method and to promoting open scientific discussions. It smacks of censorship. Something is rotten in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Scientific inquiry has once again been silenced ... just as it was 400 years ago.

The AGU should be ashamed. Its members should be outraged.

Dr. Willie Soon is a scientist who studies solar and climate co-variability. Dr. David Legates is a scientist who studies climatology and hydrology. Both are members of the American Geophysical Union.

7. Quote of the week #34: NASA doubts climate model certainty

By Anthony Watts, Watts Up With That, Apr 27, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/04/27/quote-of-the-week-34-nasa-doubts-climate-model-certainty/#more-18945>

Amazingly, this one is from NASA, citing doubt in the climate models that have become the mainstay of the AGW issue. This is from a NASA publication.

“Global records of surface temperature over the last 100 years show a rise in global temperatures (about 0.5° C overall), but the rise is marked by periods when the temperature has dropped as well. If the models cannot explain these marked variations from the trend, then we cannot be completely certain that we can believe in their predictions of changes to come.”

#####

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.