

The Week That Was 2010-05-08 (May 8, 2010) **Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)**

#####

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

#####

Quote of the Week

"I do not feel obliged to believe that the same God who has endowed us with sense, reason, and intellect has intended us to forgo their use" Galileo

THIS WEEK:

When Ken Cuccinelli, the Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Virginia, filed a Civil Investigative Demand for documents from the University of Virginia relating to the work done by Michael Mann while he was at the University, SEPP expected that Cuccinelli would ignite a firestorm of protest. He has.

Probably the most reasoned protest came from Steve McIntyre. He strenuously objected to the demand by Cuccinelli and stated the target should be the National Science Foundation, which also funded Mann. However, Cuccinelli has a limited purview; he can only file in regard to those funds Mann received from the Commonwealth, and not those from the Federal Government.

More striking objections come 255 members of the National Academy of Sciences in the form of a letter published in Science, and from newspapers such as the Washington Post (Both are reproduced below.) Also, the Union of Concerned Scientists and the Virginia Conference of the American Association of University Professors are soliciting signatures for petitions urging the University to fight the Demand.

Since those objecting raise issues such as academic freedom and scientific advancement, it is important to recap a bit of history.

By the 1970's, HH Lamb, the pioneer of modern climate research, compiled extensive physical evidence showing that climate change is normal and that during the last 10,000 years there were periods colder than today and warmer than today. The first two assessment reports of the UN IPCC included charts showing temperature change for the last 1000 years that included the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age. The Summary for Policymakers of the 2001 Third Assessment Report eliminated these temperature changes and substituted Mann's now infamous "hockey stick" graph produced by statistical techniques that purport to show that temperatures were relatively stable for about 900 years then shot up in the 20th Century. The results of a computer model trumps physical evidence. The research was "peer reviewed" but not available for independent review.

In 2006, Professor Edward Wegman of George Mason University, chair of the National Academy of Sciences' Committee on Applied and Theoretical Statistics, headed a team of statisticians testing the methods used by Mr. Mann. Professor Wegman testified before Congress that Mann's faulty statistical techniques always produce the infamous hockey stick configuration, even from random data.

If Mr. Mann had been open with his research data and methods, and permitted their review by independent scientists, his errors may have been appropriately corrected in a scientific setting rather than

in a political one. Instead, he chose to withhold the information. It is imperative to understand the full extent to which Mann's now discredited study distorted the climate and energy policies of the US government – at great cost to the taxpayer and energy consumer.

Those who invoke “academic freedom” and “scientific freedom” would do well to ask themselves how are these noble goals served when research is kept secret? How is democracy served when government-funded research so critical to public policy is kept secret?

The blow-out of the BP oil well and the resulting oil slick in the Gulf of Mexico continue to produce articles by both alarmists and defenders of drilling. Some alarmists are using it to promote cap and tax saying we must reduce our dependence on oil. What they ignore is that the target of cap and tax is coal which produces about 50% of US electricity while oil produces less than 1%. Others are beginning to ask why it took so long for BP and the Federal Government to institute protective measures controlling the oil slick. Other articles are now suggesting that the alliance needed to pass cap and tax in the Senate no longer exists. SEPP has yet to find one article discussing BP's significant role in USCAP – the major, and well-financed lobbying group pushing for cap and tax. At least one Congressman who voted for the House version bragged that the House followed the blueprint proposed by USCAP.

On his web site <http://www.drroyspencer.com/>, Roy Spencer reports that the global temperature measurements from satellites for April were 0.5 degrees C above the 32 year norm but fell from March. This may indicate a weakening El Nino.

Two new papers suggesting that observations indicate IPCC models greatly overestimate warming from carbon dioxide are referenced below. Both indicated that the feedbacks from carbon dioxide warming are negative, not positive as assumed by the IPCC models. One paper is by Roy Spencer and the second is by William Gray and Barry Schwartz.

[SEPP amplification: Last week TWTW referenced an alarmist article on glacial ice melt in the tropics. TWTW pointed out that the claimed Himalayan melt is contradicted by Chinese studies (as well as Indian studies) and that the Andes melt indicates it was warmer 5000 years ago than today. However TWTW did not address the shrinking of the glacier on Mount Kilimanjaro. Some readers took us to task. There is no evidence of warming of Kilimanjaro, indeed satellite measurements indicate that the area may be cooling. However, the area may have become more arid with the glacier shrinking through sublimation – the process whereby ice evaporates directly into the atmosphere without melting first.]

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

1. Climate Change and the Integrity of Science

Lead Letter Published in *Science* magazine, May 7, 2010

From 255 members of the National Academy of Sciences:

Followed by Response by Fred Singer to the Revkin May 6 blog on the subject

2. The Wickedness of the Climate Change Deniers

By Roger Helmer, MEP, May 6, 2010

<http://rogerhelmermep.wordpress.com/2010/05/06/the-wickedness-of-the-climate-change-deniers/>

3. ‘Utter honesty’ needed from climate scientists

By Gordon Fulks, The Oregonian, May 1, 2010, [H/t ICECAP.US]

http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2010/05/utter_honesty_needed_from_clim.html

4. U-Va. Should fight Cuccinelli's faulty investigation of Michael Mann

Washington Post Editorial, May 7, 2010 [H/t David Manuta]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/06/AR2010050605936.html>

5. Just don't mention the fuel poor – why energy is a dirty word this election

By Rowena Mason, Telegraph, UK, Apr 29, 2010

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/finance/rowenamason/100005260/just-dont-mention-the-fuel-poor-why-energy-is-a-dirty-word-this-election/>

6. We shouldn't be the first lemming

By Susan Fraser, Letter, Dominion Post, NZ, May 4, 2010, [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/3653438/Letter-We-shouldn-t-be-the-first-lemming>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

CLIMATEGATE CONTINUED

Virginia Launches Investigation into Climategate's Michael Mann

By Lawrence Solomon, Financial Post, May 5, 2010 [H/t Ken Shock]

<http://network.nationalpost.com/NP/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2010/05/05/lawrence-solomon-virginia-launches-investigation-into-climategate-s-michael-mann.aspx>

State of Virginia to Investigate Global Warming Scientist Mann: A legal battle is heating up faster than the planet for embattled climatologist Michael Mann

Fox News [H/t Jim Boomer]

<http://www.foxnews.com/scitech/2010/04/30/virginia-attorney-general-global-warming-michael-mann/?test=latestnews>

Cuccinelli v. Mann

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, May 2, 2010 [H/t Charles Minning]

<http://climateaudit.org/2010/05/02/cuccinelli-v-mann/>

[SEPP Comment: Steve McIntyre severely criticizes the actions of Virginia's attorney general.]

DEFENDING THE ORTHODOXY

Scientists Lash at 'McCarthy-Like Threats'

By Andrew C. Revkin, NYT, May 6, 2010 [H/t

<http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/05/06/scientists-lash-at-mccarthy-like-threats/>

Scientists Pick Peers To Review U.N. Panel

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, May 4, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703612804575222341046911352.html#mod=todays_us_page_one

CHALLENGING THE ORTHODOXY

The Association of Outgoing Radiation with Variations of Precipitation – implications for Global Warming

By William M. Gray and Barry Schwartz, Colorado State University, [H/t ICECAP.US]
<http://climaterealists.com/attachments/ftp/AMS-Final5-10.pdf>

Strong Negative Feedback from the Latest CERES Radiation Budget Measurements Over the Global Oceans

By Roy Spencer, May 7, 2010

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2010/05/strong-negative-feedback-from-the-latest-ceres-radiation-budget-measurements-over-the-global-oceans/>

Whoops! CO2 has almost nothing to do with global warming, discovers top US meteorologist

By James Delingpole, Telegraph, UK, May 4, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/jamesdelingpole/100037784/whoops-co2-has-almost-nothing-to-do-with-global-warming-discovers-top-us-meteorologist/comment-page-1/#comment-100286845>

Testimony of The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley

Before Congress, 6 May 2010 ICECAP.US

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Monckton10-May6-HouseMarkeytestimony.pdf>

Climategate: Sensenbrenner Report Challenges EPA Greenhouse Finding

By Charlie Martin, Pajamas Media, May 6, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That]

<http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/sensenbrenner-report-challenges-epa-greenhouse-finding-pjm-exclusive/?singlepage=true>

Phil Jones & Keith Briffa Confirm Greenland's Medieval Temperatures Higher than Today, Sorry MM

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

<http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N16/C2.php>

[SEPP Comment: Many readers may find it implausible that Phil Jones and Keith Briffa of “hide the decline” fame would publish an article confirming Greenland was warmer during the Medieval Warm Period than today.]

Voters Could Chill Global Warming Law

Orange County Register, May 5, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

<http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/california-247431-costs-businesses.html>

The Missing Heat,

Roger Pielke Jr., Apr 19, 2010 [H/t Anne Debeil]

<http://rogerpielkejr.blogspot.com/2010/04/in-released-cru-emails-ncar-climate.html>

Name-calling fairy dust: Conspiracy Theorist: Ad hominem Unleashed on the ABC

By Joanne Nova, May 7, 2010

<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/05/name-calling-fairy-dust-conspiracy-theorist/#more-8397>

[SEPP Comment: To some skeptics are the same as conspiracy theorists.]

THE GREEN LOBBY AND THE OTHER GREEN

Crime Inc.” What the ‘Greening of America really Means

By Glenn Beck Team, Fox News, May 6, 2010 [H/t Jim Boomer]

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,592243,00.html>

How Cronyism Is Infesting Cap-And-Trade

IBD Editorials, May 5, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=532396>

ENERGY ISSUES

Unlocking The Promise Of Nuclear Energy

By William Johnson, IBD, May 4, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=532241>

American Fossil Fuels: The New Alternative Energy Source

By Ben Voth, American Thinker, May 7, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/05/american_fossil_fuels_the_new.html

Georgia Court: PSC Certification of Vogtle Reactors Is Illegal

PowerNews May 5, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/2684.html>

[SEPP Comment: Federal loan guarantees do not mean the plant can be built.]

ENERGY AND POLITICS

Turning Tragedy into triumph

By Richard Fulmer, Master Resource, May 3, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/05/turning-tragedy-into-triumph/>

Taking Advantage of an Oil Crisis

By Brain Sussman, American Thinker, May 4, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/05/taking_advantage_of_an_oil_cri.html

[SEPP Comment: Why the slow response?]

Meanwhile, In Nashville

IBD Editorials, May 7, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=532771>

Learn From the BP Disaster. Then Drill Again: There hasn't been an accident like this for 40 years

By Nansen Saleri, WSJ Editorial, May 7, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704370704575228210008668430.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion

A gush to judgment

By Iain Murray, The Examiner, May 5, 2010

<http://www.sfexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/Examiner-Opinion-Zone/a-gush-to-judgment-on-the-BP-gulf-oil-spill-and-Deepwater-Horizon-accident-92910374.html>

Disaster Dims Odds of Energy Bill Compromise

By Jonathan Weisman, WSJ, May 5, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704866204575224582701608508.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

CAP AND TAX BY ANY OTHER NAME

Lindsey Graham: “It’s not a global warming bill to me.”

By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming.org, May 7, 2010

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2010/05/07/lindsey-graham-“it’s-not-a-global-warming-bill-to-me”/>

Are we listening yet?

By Chris Horner, American Spectator Blog, May 7, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://spectator.org/blog/2010/05/07/are-we-listening-yet>

Europe’s Carbon Mafia, And Ours

IBD Editorials, May 6, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=532610>

ANY EXCUSE TO CLOSE DOWN COAL PLANTS

California Rules Restrict Power Plant’s Marine Water

By Cassandra Sweet, WSJ, May 5, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703961104575226041502104432.html?mod=WSJ_hps_sections_news

[SEPP Comment: Although there are more environmentally sensitive ways to cool plants than direct use of unscreened marine water, many older plants do not have enough space to implement them. California’s 12.5% unemployment is not an issue to some.]

EPA FOREVER!

The War on a Weed Killer

Wall Street Journal Editorial, May 3, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703630404575053510187558820.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

EPA: Deaths from heat waves

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP.US

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

[SEPP Comment: On April 28, EPA released a report claiming global warming will cause an increase in deaths. The above references Joe D’Aleo’s rebuttal]

EPA Staffers Were Forced to Ignore Science, Investigation Finds: *EPA staffers say they were forced to ignore scientific data and lacked crucial information needed to fully protect the public.*

By Sheila Kaplan, Investigative Fund at The Nation Institute, Apr 30, 2010, [H/t Westmiller]

<http://ad.vu/yumq>

[SEPP Comment: No mention on how under Carol Browner EPA trashed the standards for statistical epidemiology making a once powerful tool useless.]

MISCELLANEOUS SCIENCE TOPICS

Climate and the Origin and Decline of Species

By D.H. Erin, Reviewed by NIPCC

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/may/07may2010a1.html>

Forest growth Has Accelerated as the Air’s CO2 Content has Risen

McMahon and Miller, Reviewed by NIPCC

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/may/07may2010a4.html>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

(Desperately) Looking for Arctic warming

By Paul Driessen and Willie Soon, Townhall, May 1, 2010

http://townhall.com/columnists/PaulDriessen/2010/05/01/desperately_looking_for_arctic_warming

Sensitive side

By Rosemary Sullivant, Global Climate Change, NASA, May 5, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That]

<http://climate.nasa.gov/cuttingEdge/index.cfm?FuseAction=ShowCuttingEdge&CeID=312>

[SEPP Comment: IPCC Models underestimate influence of CO2? Does the study assume that atmospheric carbon dioxide is the primary driver of climate change?]

#####

1.Climate Change and the Integrity of Science

Lead Letter Published in *Science* magazine, May 7, 2010

From 255 members of the National Academy of Sciences:

Followed by Response by Fred Singer to Andrew Revkin May 6 blog on the subject

We are deeply disturbed by the recent escalation of political assaults on scientists in general and on climate scientists in particular. All citizens should understand some basic scientific facts. There is always some uncertainty associated with scientific conclusions; science never absolutely proves anything. When someone says that society should wait until scientists are absolutely certain before taking any action, it is the same as saying society should never take action. For a problem as potentially catastrophic as climate change, taking no action poses a dangerous risk for our planet.

Scientific conclusions derive from an understanding of basic laws supported by laboratory experiments, observations of nature, and mathematical and computer modeling. Like all human beings, scientists make mistakes, but the scientific process is designed to find and correct them. This process is inherently adversarial— scientists build reputations and gain recognition not only for supporting conventional wisdom, but even more so for demonstrating that the scientific consensus is wrong and that there is a better explanation. That's what Galileo, Pasteur, Darwin, and Einstein did. But when some conclusions have been thoroughly and deeply tested, questioned, and examined, they gain the status of "well-established theories" and are often spoken of as "facts."

For instance, there is compelling scientific evidence that our planet is about 4.5bn years old (the theory of the origin of Earth), that our universe was born from a single event about 14bn years ago (the Big Bang theory), and that today's organisms evolved from ones living in the past (the theory of evolution). Even as these are overwhelmingly accepted by the scientific community, fame still awaits anyone who could show these theories to be wrong. Climate change now falls into this category: there is compelling, comprehensive, and consistent objective evidence that humans are changing the climate in ways that threaten our societies and the ecosystems on which we depend.

Many recent assaults on climate science and, more disturbingly, on climate scientists by climate change deniers, are typically driven by special interests or dogma, not by an honest effort to provide an

alternative theory that credibly satisfies the evidence. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and other scientific assessments of climate change, which involve thousands of scientists producing massive and comprehensive reports, have, quite expectedly and normally, made some mistakes. When errors are pointed out, they are corrected.

But there is nothing remotely identified in the recent events that changes the fundamental conclusions about climate change:

- (i) The planet is warming due to increased concentrations of heat-trapping gases in our atmosphere. A snowy winter in Washington does not alter this fact.
- (ii) Most of the increase in the concentration of these gases over the last century is due to human activities, especially the burning of fossil fuels and deforestation.
- (iii) Natural causes always play a role in changing Earth's climate, but are now being overwhelmed by human-induced changes.
- (iv) Warming the planet will cause many other climatic patterns to change at speeds unprecedented in modern times, including increasing rates of sea-level rise and alterations in the hydrologic cycle. Rising concentrations of carbon dioxide are making the oceans more acidic
- (v) The combination of these complex climate changes threatens coastal communities and cities, our food and water supplies, marine and freshwater ecosystems, forests, high mountain environments, and far more.

Much more can be, and has been, said by the world's scientific societies, national academies, and individuals, but these conclusions should be enough to indicate why scientists are concerned about what future generations will face from business- as-usual practices. We urge our policymakers and the public to move forward immediately to address the causes of climate change, including the unrestrained burning of fossil fuels.

We also call for an end to McCarthy- like threats of criminal prosecution against our colleagues based on innuendo and guilt by association, the harassment of scientists by politicians seeking distractions to avoid taking action, and the outright lies being spread about them. Society has two choices: we can ignore the science and hide our heads in the sand and hope we are lucky, or we can act in the public interest to reduce the threat of global climate change quickly and substantively. The good news is that smart and effective actions are possible. But delay must not be an option.

The signatories are all members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences but are not speaking on its behalf or on behalf of their institutions:

RESPONSE BY FRED SINGER

1. Can you explain to me and cite any kind of evidence for *Science* deputy editor Brooks Hanson's claim in his editorial in 7 May *Science*: "*The IPCC reports have underestimated the pace of climate change ...*"?

2. The NAS Statement must be some kind of joke. The first two paragraphs make sense. But then we get: "... there is compelling, comprehensive, and consistent objective evidence that humans are changing the climate in ways that threaten our societies and the ecosystems on which we depend." That's just not true!

There is substantial evidence that falsifies their first claim: "(i) The planet is warming due to increased concentrations of heat-trapping gases in our atmosphere."

Claims (ii) and (iii) are not controversial, but claims (iv) and (v) are clearly contradicted by geological evidence. I wonder if Brooks Hanson, himself a geologist, has read the NAS Statement before writing his editorial.

Finally, we have the claim "... we can ... reduce the threat of global climate change quickly and substantively." That's complete nonsense. What have these guys been smoking? They should read Brooks Hanson's editorial, which argues that "*The IPCC reports have ...overestim[ed] societies' abilities to curb greenhouse gas emissions.*"

I cannot resist commenting on the NAS' "call for an end to McCarthy-like threats of criminal prosecution." What exquisite irony! Especially after recent calls of draconian laws against 'ecocide' and even calls to execute "deniers" (the word used in the NAS Statement to describe any scientist who even questions their dogma).

I rest my case.

Fred Singer 6 May 2010

2. The Wickedness of the Climate Change Deniers

By Roger Helmer, MEP, May 6, 2010

<http://rogerhelmermep.wordpress.com/2010/05/06/the-wickedness-of-the-climate-change-deniers/>

I have just been reading a [Reuter's report from India](#), about the suffering endured by poor, honest, hard-working climate scientists, as they seek to warn a careless world of looming climate disaster, only to be attacked, threatened and vilified by the "climate deniers". My heart bleeds.

Leave aside for a moment the fact that "climate deniers" do not exist — or if they do, I've yet to meet one. It is a self-evident fact that the earth's climate has changed, often rapidly and substantially, over geological time. It is well-known that we have had a series of warm and cool cycles over the last two thousand years. We have all seen the paintings of Ice Fairs on the frozen Thames in the seventeenth century, when oxen were roasted on great fires on the ice. Anyone who denies the clear fact that the climate changes is either ignorant or mad.

There is of course a legitimate debate to be had about *why* the climate changes. Until recent years, everyone understood that climate was multifactorial, and it was clear that the primary drivers were solar activity and astronomical cycles. It is only in recent years that the good and the great have decided we were wrong, and that the only significant cause of climate change is atmospheric CO₂ (which is merely a trace gas in the atmosphere, and is not even the most significant greenhouse gas — which is water vapour). They seem to have lost sight of the fact that there is almost zero correlation over time between atmospheric CO₂ levels and temperature, or that over geological time CO₂ levels have sometimes been well over ten times higher than today. Or that the highest concentrations of atmospheric CO₂ occurred during a major Ice Age.

Two lines from the Reuters report caught my eye. The first was from Michael Mann: "***The attacks against climate science represent the most highly coordinated, heavily financed, attack against science that we have ever witnessed***". Michael Mann was, of course, the progenitor of the infamous "Hockey Stick" graph, one of the most discredited artefacts in the history of science. He is the man who resisted scrutiny of his data and his methods, and fought tooth and nail against releasing details of his work, which might have enabled others to check it. He was the man who (in effect) relied on a few rather atypical trees in California to construct climate scenarios that defied reason. He was the man who grafted together two wholly unrelated data series to support his case, because neither series alone supported his hypothesis. But he failed to make it clear that he had done so. He was also a close associate of those

splendid guys at the University of East Anglia, those of the e-mails scandal, who worked so hard to “hide the decline” in late twentieth century data. Then he seems hurt when people challenge his findings.

But “heavily financed”? Reuters mention a Greenpeace report released last month, saying that *“ExxonMobil gave nearly \$9 million to entities linked to the climate denialist camp between 2005 and 2008”*. Wow. \$9 million. How does that compare to the literally Billions of dollars that have been poured into the Warmist cause? The research funding for people like Michael Mann, and the UEA’s CRU, from governments and foundations and institutions? The vast market created in trading carbon credits, which is being fraudulently used and abused to generate profits on the back of imaginary trades in a virtual commodity, and which is siphoning off vast sums from developed countries to Russia and China and India and developing countries through the UN’s “Clean Development Mechanism”? What about the millions that Al Gore has personally made through his espousal of the Warmist cause?

Look at the companies (including major oil companies) who are profiting from green hysteria, whether through emissions trading schemes, or by becoming rent seekers in heavily-subsidised green energy programmes. In the UK alone climate mitigation measures put in place by this Labour government (which pray heaven will be gone between my typing these words and publishing the piece) will cost tens of billions of pounds. Look at the businesses and scientists and researchers whose jobs depend on Warmism. Look at the environmental journalists, like the odious Geoffrey Lean at the Daily Telegraph, who depend on Warmism for their pay-cheque — never mind the Climate Change Managers and Global Warming Awareness Officers on every local council, that you pay for through your council tax, and the DEFRA advertising campaigns, and the massive propaganda programmes designed to terrify the children in our schools.

The truth is that climate alarmism has become the most expensive, and the most wasteful, project in the history of the world. It is junk economics built on junk science. It amounts to no more than hot air, yet it looks set to beggar our grandchildren.

3. ‘Utter honesty’ needed from climate scientists

By Gordon Fulks, The Oregonian, May 1, 2010, [H/t ICECAP.US]

http://www.oregonlive.com/opinion/index.ssf/2010/05/utter_honesty_needed_from_clim.html

Albert Einstein spoke for all who view science as a noble profession when he said he was "trying to understand the mind of God."

But I am concerned that many who promote the idea of catastrophic global warming reduce science to a political and economic game. Scare tactics and junk science are used to secure lucrative government contracts.

Consider first an example of what makes science so fascinating. The well-documented observation that the global temperature peaks every summer in July seems unremarkable to those of us living in the Northern Hemisphere.

But it is remarkable when you realize that the Earth's closest approach to the sun, when sunlight is strongest, occurs during the Southern Hemisphere summer in January. It is even more remarkable when you realize that the Earth was significantly warmer 10,000 years ago when its closest approach coincided with the Northern Hemisphere summer.

It is still more remarkable when you realize that we are now close to an orbital configuration for another ice age. The present warm Holocene interglacial period, during which human civilization has flourished,

may give way by the end of this millennium to 90,000 years of cold. Climate changes from orbital variations are called Milankovitch Cycles and are confirmed by Antarctic ice core data. Typically, good science is not particularly controversial because it has been tested by the scientific method involving theories validated by observations made by many scientists working independently.

The ClimateGate scandal revealed that this method can be easily scammed. In that case, prominent scientists with the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change were caught conspiring to circumvent normal checks and balances in their research. They were compensating for their lack of honest evidence linking man-made carbon dioxide to global warming by doctoring data, refusing to disclose analysis techniques, bullying any who questioned them and working to silence critics.

Early hints of the developing scandal surfaced when British researcher Keith Briffa was forced by the Royal Society to release his Siberian tree ring data purporting to show a dramatic temperature rise in the 20th century. Astonishingly, he substantially relied on a single tree, far different from all others. It was a clear case of selecting data to support his viewpoint. This may be acceptable politics, but to me, it is scientific fraud.

Subsequent disclosures confirmed widespread participation in data manipulation. Others are involved in touting climate models as substitutes for honest data and as predictors of catastrophe. These far-from-rigorous computer simulations are said to "prove" that carbon dioxide is the only explanation for recent short-term warming, despite substantial evidence that ocean and solar cycles are largely responsible.

The connection to an \$80 billion government gravy train should have alerted our media to conflicts of interest. But they were too dazzled by the so-called "experts" and too sold on the politics to realize that these scientists had been corrupted by the age-old problems of money and power.

A recent editorial in the journal Nature admits that implicated scientists are scared. They know that honest mistakes are typically forgiven but fraud is not. The editorial urges them to fight back with a war of words: "The core science supporting anthropogenic global warming has not changed." Such a bluff can succeed only if the public remains ignorant that the core is rotten.

The political and economic empire is already striking back. We are beginning to see blue ribbon commissions of carefully chosen "experts" whose job is to exonerate the guilty and get global warming hysteria back on track. A better approach is to embrace what the Nobel laureate in physics, Richard Feynman, called "utter honesty." Implicated scientists are aware of what honest data show. Increased carbon dioxide has, at most, a minor effect on global temperature and is highly beneficial to our green natural world.

All plants and animals owe their very existence to carbon dioxide. Scientific scandals inevitably require significant corrective measures to restore objectivity, including in this case, major revisions to the way we support scientific research.

Gordon J. Fulks of Corbett holds a doctorate in physics from the University of Chicago, Laboratory for Astrophysics and Space Research. Reach him at gordonfulks@hotmail.com.

4. U-Va. Should fight Cuccinelli's faulty investigation of Michael Mann

Washington Post Editorial, May 7, 2010 [H/t David Manuta]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/06/AR2010050605936.html>

[SEPP Comment: Apparently to the Washington Post hiding data that contradicts one's central assertion is just another way of presenting data to non-experts.]

WE KNEW Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli II (R) had declared war on reality. Now he has declared war on the freedom of academic inquiry as well. We hope that Gov. Robert F. McDonnell (R) and the University of Virginia have the spine to repudiate Mr. Cuccinelli's abuse of the legal code. If they do not, the quality of Virginia's universities will suffer for years to come.

In his ongoing campaign to wish away human-induced climate change, Mr. Cuccinelli has targeted Michael Mann, a climate scientist who used to teach at the University of Virginia, investigating him for allegedly defrauding taxpayers by obtaining grants from the commonwealth to conduct research on global temperatures. The attorney general is demanding that the university turn over astonishingly vast numbers of e-mails and other documents relating to Mr. Mann, including all correspondence with a long list of other reputable scientists.

As ammunition for this chilling assault, Mr. Cuccinelli twists beyond recognition a statute designed to punish government contractors who use fake receipts to claim taxpayer funds and those who commit other such frauds. For Mr. Cuccinelli's "investigation" to have any merit, the attorney general must suppose that Mr. Mann "knowingly" presented "a false or fraudulent claim for payment or approval." Mr. Cuccinelli's justification for this suspicion seems to be a series of e-mails that surfaced last year in which Mr. Mann wrote of a "trick" he used in one of his analyses, a term that referred to a method of presenting data to non-experts, not an effort to falsify results.

IN FACT, the scientific community, including a National Academy of Sciences panel, has pored over Mr. Mann's work for more than a decade, and though supporters and skeptics still disagree on much, it's clear that his conclusions are not obviously, premeditatedly fraudulent, particularly since they come with admissions about the uncertainties inherent to his work. Inquiries in Britain and one at Pennsylvania State University, Mr. Mann's current academic home, also absolved him of wrongdoing with regard to the e-mail controversy, the latter noting in particular that there is no evidence that he "suppressed or falsified data."

By equating controversial results with legal fraud, Mr. Cuccinelli demonstrates a dangerous disregard for scientific method and academic freedom. The remedy for unsatisfactory data or analysis is public criticism from peers and more data, not a politically tinged witch hunt or, worse, a civil penalty. Scientists and other academics inevitably will get things wrong, and they will use public funds in the process, because failure is as important to producing good scholarship as success. For the commonwealth to persecute scientists because one official or another dislikes their findings is the fastest way to cripple not only its stellar flagship university, but also its entire public higher education system.

That's why the university should immediately challenge the attorney general's "civil investigative demand" for documents, which the law allows, and which a university spokeswoman says it is considering. It's also why Mr. McDonnell should condemn the attorney general and aid the university, making it clear that Mr. Cuccinelli speaks only for himself.

WE KNEW Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli II (R) had declared war on reality. Now he has declared war on the freedom of academic inquiry as well. We hope that Gov. Robert F. McDonnell (R) and the University of Virginia have the spine to repudiate Mr. Cuccinelli's abuse of the legal code. If they do not, the quality of Virginia's universities will suffer for years to come.

In his ongoing campaign to wish away human-induced climate change, Mr. Cuccinelli has targeted Michael Mann, a climate scientist who used to teach at the University of Virginia, investigating him for allegedly defrauding taxpayers by obtaining grants from the commonwealth to conduct research on global temperatures. The attorney general is demanding that the university turn over astonishingly vast numbers

of e-mails and other documents relating to Mr. Mann, including all correspondence with a long list of other reputable scientists.

As ammunition for this chilling assault, Mr. Cuccinelli twists beyond recognition a statute designed to punish government contractors who use fake receipts to claim taxpayer funds and those who commit other such frauds. For Mr. Cuccinelli's "investigation" to have any merit, the attorney general must suppose that Mr. Mann "knowingly" presented "a false or fraudulent claim for payment or approval." Mr. Cuccinelli's justification for this suspicion seems to be a series of e-mails that surfaced last year in which Mr. Mann wrote of a "trick" he used in one of his analyses, a term that referred to a method of presenting data to non-experts, not an effort to falsify results.

IN FACT, the scientific community, including a National Academy of Sciences panel, has pored over Mr. Mann's work for more than a decade, and though supporters and skeptics still disagree on much, it's clear that his conclusions are not obviously, premeditatedly fraudulent, particularly since they come with admissions about the uncertainties inherent to his work. Inquiries in Britain and one at Pennsylvania State University, Mr. Mann's current academic home, also absolved him of wrongdoing with regard to the e-mail controversy, the latter noting in particular that there is no evidence that he "suppressed or falsified data."

By equating controversial results with legal fraud, Mr. Cuccinelli demonstrates a dangerous disregard for scientific method and academic freedom. The remedy for unsatisfactory data or analysis is public criticism from peers and more data, not a politically tinged witch hunt or, worse, a civil penalty. Scientists and other academics inevitably will get things wrong, and they will use public funds in the process, because failure is as important to producing good scholarship as success. For the commonwealth to persecute scientists because one official or another dislikes their findings is the fastest way to cripple not only its stellar flagship university, but also its entire public higher education system.

That's why the university should immediately challenge the attorney general's "civil investigative demand" for documents, which the law allows, and which a university spokeswoman says it is considering. It's also why Mr. McDonnell should condemn the attorney general and aid the university, making it clear that Mr. Cuccinelli speaks only for himself.

[SEPP Comment: A state attorney general has a right and even a duty to ensure that state funds are not misused. Given probable cause to believe that Mann has done so, this does not strike us as political harassment]

5. Just don't mention the fuel poor – why energy is a dirty word this election

By Rowena Mason, Telegraph, UK, Apr 29, 2010

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/finance/rowenamason/100005260/just-dont-mention-the-fuel-poor-why-energy-is-a-dirty-word-this-election/>

It's been almost five years since David Cameron embraced a husky dog at the North Pole in a carefully staged demonstration of his climate-aware fluffy side. It's been four since the **blue party** ditched its traditional torch logo for an eco friendly green oak tree. And three since a largely useless, financially nonsensical windmill was erected on the Tory leader's roof.

Since then, the problems of rising fuel bills and **petrol prices**, the cost of tackling global warming and the UK's decrepit gas and power infrastructure should have forced energy to the top of the political agenda. After all, this country needs to drum up at least £200bn in the next decade – the cost of two bank bail-outs – to address these pressing issues.

But therein lies the reason that **Cameron, Brown and Clegg** have been avoiding the subject of energy faster than they can dodge questions on the deficit. No one wants to talk about how bills are likely to increase by 60pc to pay for nuclear, clean coal, wind power and more gas through green taxes and higher commodity prices. It's obviously not clever to mention the number of **power stations (14) condemned by European pollution laws** that mean the UK is in danger of energy shortages from 2015 onwards. And who wants to have an open debate on the most economic way to tackle global warming when there's already a hefty great national debt to burn?

Quite obviously pylons and power stations are not going to trump the emotive clout of hospitals and schools when it comes to securing voter support. But the Institute of Directors is among the business groups rightly to point out that avoidance of this crucial dilemma is unfair to the electorate. It even called on the parties to prioritise infrastructure spending and associated jobs over protecting health and education spending.

Another explosive issue that has gone largely ignored is the Liberal Democrats' fervent opposition to nuclear power stations. The UK's energy security is far from certain even if the Government's planned raft of new nuclear power stations materialise from 2017 onwards. Industry experts warn that without this low-carbon form of power, it is inconceivable that the country will hit its targets on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the next ten years. What happens if this becomes a deal-breaker as the parties jostle to form coalition Governments – would either the Tories or Labour be willing to give ground on nuclear policy?

But most worrying is the potential indecision that could be born of a hung parliament. Industry leaders universally agree that what the UK energy industry needs most is political and regulatory certainty – allowing investors to make a decision about whether to put money in projects that will take an enormous amount of capital expenditure and time to build.

“Unfortunately, time is one thing that is not on the UK's side when it comes to updating a tired portfolio of generation and the debate caused by a hung Parliament would leave us vulnerable to surges in energy prices,” says Ian Parrett, an analyst at Inenco, the energy consultants.

It's a classic example – much like the taboo subject of the deficit – where politicians' refusal to talk about a sensitive issue means indecision, delay and prevarication that could lead to an even more damaging financial impact on the voters they are so desperate appease in the final week before polling day.

6. We shouldn't be the first lemming

By Susan Fraser, Letter, Dominion Post, NZ, May 4, 2010, [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.stuff.co.nz/dominion-post/opinion/letters-to-the-editor/3653438/Letter-We-shouldn-t-be-the-first-lemming>

The body of "manmade climate change" is so dead that it's starting to stink.

You can tell by the stampede of people moving away from it.

If Phil Jones, the father of anthropogenic global warming, admits there's been no global warming since 1995, then climate change is probably a normal thing. New Zealand shouldn't be the first lemming to jump off the cliff by taxing emissions.

#####

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.