

The Week That Was 2010-05-15 (May 15, 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](#). Fred will be speaking on the 17th: "Climategate- 'Hide the Decline.'"

Some of the events will be covered on Pajama TV: <http://www.pjtv.com/?cmd=mpg&mpid=144>

#####

At 10am June 19, SEPP and Virginia Scientists and Engineers for Energy and Environment are conducting a forum in the Auditorium of the Ernst Community Cultural Center of the Annandale Campus of Northern Virginia Community College at 8333 Little River Turnpike, Annandale. Topics will include some of the latest developments in global warming issues. All are welcome. To defray the costs of the auditorium, a donation of \$5.00 per person is suggested.

#####

Quote of the Week

"I can calculate the motion of heavenly bodies, but not the madness of people." – attributed to Newton

THIS WEEK:

We live in an Orwellian world where myth and propaganda have replaced science and reason even at the highest levels of discourse. As reproduced in TWTW last week *Science* ran a letter signed by 255 members of the National Academy of Sciences attacking Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli for requesting documents relating to the work of Michael Mann while at the University of Virginia. The letter contained numerous spurious assertions as if they were scientific fact to include carbon dioxide emissions are making the oceans more acidic. As expressed below, if anything, emissions are making the oceans less alkaline.

This week, *Nature* ran an editorial attacking Ken Cuccinelli and in the process labeled those who dare question Mr. Mann's science as climate change deniers. That is, those who recognize that for the past million years the dominate climate has been ice ages interrupted by brief warm periods, that for the past 10,000 years the earth has been warmer and colder than today, and that there was a Medieval Warm Period and a Little Ice Age **deny climate change?**

The *Nature* editorial and Fred Singer's comments to *Nature* can be found below under "Articles."

On Wednesday of this week, Senators Kerry and Lieberman released their long anticipated cap and tax bill with the Orwellian title of the *American Power Act*. Among other claims, supposedly, the American Power Act will reduce American dependence on oil; but, the principal target is the coal industry. On May 5, the Congressional Budget Office reported that that coal industry will suffer the greatest job loss from such a bill. The US has massive reserves of coal and most coal burned in the US is used to generate electricity.

Electricity is the miracle of the late 19th and the 20th Centuries. Prosperity grows with it and depends upon it. In his book **Power Hungry**, Robert Bryce gives a table ranking nations according to Gross Domestic

Product and electricity generation. The relationship is unmistakable. Those countries that generate the most electricity have the greatest GNP. This has long been known by anyone who has studied the issue: electricity helps create prosperity.

In the US, coal is the major source of affordable, reliable electric power, generating about 50% of US electric power; oil generates about 1%. Contrary to claims, the American Power Act has little to do with reducing oil dependency and everything to do with destroying coal generation of electric power. Of course, the bill has great allowances for selected industries, called “crony capitalism,” and great subsidies to “alternative energy and green jobs.”

However, even the poster child of “alternative energy and green jobs,” Spain, has backed off. It has found “alternative energy and green jobs” are luxury goods too expensive for the nation and is now attempting to renegotiate prior “deals.”

Yet, during a severe and prolonged recession, our Senators would have us believe that government can create prosperity by requiring Americans to replace affordable and dependable electricity from coal with expensive and unreliable electricity from solar and wind. They might as well declare that families undergoing financial hardship will become more prosperous by replacing their dependable car or SUV with a notoriously expensive and temperamental sports car.

To fully comprehend the perverse nature of the American Power Act one only needs to go to the web site of Senator Kerry and review the summary of the bill presented there:

“First: Consumers will come out on top. The American Power Act sends two-thirds of all revenues **not dedicated to reducing our nation’s deficit back to consumers from day one. The rest is spent ensuring a smooth transition for American businesses and investing in projects and technologies to reduce emissions and advance our energy security. In the later years of the program, **every penny not spent to reduce the deficit will go directly back to consumers.**”** [Emphasis added]

<http://kerry.senate.gov/americanpoweract/intro.cfm>

All Federal budget projections show a great black hole of Federal deficits as far as calculations are made. Except for earmarks, all revenues will go to reducing the deficit and the average consumer will never see a penny. This is a tax bill by another name. Few Wall Street “sharpies” would be as blatant with “bait and switch” as this.

The American Power Act is a pernicious tax bill that is highly regressive, hitting lower income groups the hardest. It seeks to destroy the very commodity our prosperity depends upon – reliable, affordable electricity.

If passed, the American Power Act may become as destructive to the American economy as the infamous “Smoot-Hawley Tariff Bill” of 1930 which contributed mightily in turning the severe recession of 1929-30 into the Great Depression.

Also this week, EPA continued its march on carbon dioxide by announcing its new emissions standards while declaring how lenient it is. In addition, public comment on EPA claims that increased atmospheric carbon dioxide causes “ocean acidification” will close on May 21. Those considering submitting comments may consider the testimony by John Everett, an excerpt of which is reproduced under “Articles” with the full testimony referenced. The claim that increased atmospheric carbon dioxide is acidifying the oceans by reducing the pH of the oceans from about 8.0 to 7.9 is Orwellian at best. But the highly questionable, scanty evidence behind the EPA claim is stunning.

In experiments, some researchers added hydrochloric acid into an aquarium to attempt to duplicate what increased dissolved carbon dioxide would do. Perhaps unknown to these researchers, hydrochloric acid kills life and carbon dioxide promotes it. All green plants, whether in the oceans or on the land, require carbon dioxide. The oceans themselves suggest that life increases where surface carbon dioxide is richest.

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #15-2010 (May 15, 2010)

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

Foreword to **Energy Primer for Kids** by Vladislav Bevc

We are fortunate to live at a time when energy is plentiful and relatively cheap. A century ago, electric power was just becoming available, and what a difference it has made in our lives. A hundred years from now, many of our supplies of fossil fuels, and especially oil, will be near depletion and very costly. But we will never really run out of energy itself, thanks to nuclear reactors.

Getting energy is risky business. Coal miners die in accidents, gas explosions kill people, oil spills cause environmental damage. But it's a price worth paying. Thanks to energy, we live longer, healthier, and more comfortable lives – and not only in the developed countries.

Unfortunately, there are those who would make energy more costly and even ration it – in the mistaken belief that this would avert an imagined climate disaster. I have no doubt that the world will soon overcome this mistaken notion; but in the meantime it will cause much economic harm. There is no need to invest in costly and unreliable energy sources, such as wind and solar, which have to be heavily subsidized. Certainly, the “hydrogen economy” is a huge boondoggle, and so are most biofuel schemes.

I am confident that nuclear energy, in one form or other, will sustain our civilization indefinitely – if we can overcome the opposition, which is based on unreasonable and unrealistic fears.

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

1.Science subpoenaed

Nature Editorial, May 12, 2010

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v465/n7295/full/465135b.html#/>

2. Comments to *Nature* by Fred Singer

3. Kerry's Powerless America Act

IBD Editorials, May 12, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=533800>

4. A Bad Bet on Carbon

By Robert Bryce, NYT, May 12, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/13/opinion/13bryce.html?emc=eta1>

5. Comparing Apples and Orangutans

By John Droz, Jr, American Spectator, May 14, 2010

<http://spectator.org/archives/2010/05/14/comparing-apples-and-orangutan>

6. Subcommittee on Oversight and Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife joint hearing entitled “EPA’s Role in Protecting Ocean Health”

Testimony by John T. Everett, President, Ocean Associates, Inc., May 11, 2010 [H/t Randy Randol] [Excerpt]

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore_id=db302137-13f6-40cc-8968-3c9aac133b16

7. Global Warming’s \$64 Trillion Question

By Roy Spencer, May 13, 2010

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Cap and Tax

Kerry-(Graham)-Lieberman Bill a Huge Payoff to Big Business

Will BP and Goldman Sachs Be at Kerry’s Press Conference?

By Richard Morrison, Competitive Enterprise Institute, May 11, 2010

<http://cei.org/news-release/2010/05/11/kerry-graham-lieberman-bill-huge-payoff-big-business>

Senate Climate Bill Dangles Carrots For Nukes, Coal, Gas

By Chris Holly, Energy Daily, May 13, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.theenergydaily.com/hottopics/climate/Senate-Climate-Bill-Dangles-Carrots-For-Nukes-Coal-Gas_4390.html

[SEPP Comment: Something for everyone except the citizen and the consumer who pays dearly.]

Questions posed for Kerry Lieberman on new climate-energy bill

By Paul Driessen and Willie Soon, May 15, 2010, ICECAP, US

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

Enron Applauds Senate Cap and Trade Proposal

By Robert Bradley, Jr, Master Resource, May 12, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/05/enron-applauds-senate-cap-and-tax-proposal/>

Senate energy bill faces job-creation doubts: CBO study questions predictions of a boost to the economy

By Sean Lenggell, Washington Times, May 13, 2010

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/13/senate-energy-bill-faces-job-creation-doubts/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today

Challenging the Orthodoxy

“Understand Climate Science Before Making Climate Policy”

By William Happer and Roger Cohen, Presentations sponsored by George Marshall Institute, May 14, 2010

<http://www.marshall.org/article.php?id=875>

What priority for climate change at a time of European crisis

The Scientific Alliance, May 14, 2010

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

More cod in warmer Barents Sea

The Research Council of Norway, May 5, 2010 [H/t Giacomo Valentini & Bob Reinstein]

By Bard Amundsen/Else Lie, Translation: Darren McKellep/Carol Eckmann

[SEPP Comment: Don't tell the polar bears it was warm in the Barents Sea in the 1920's and 30's. Warmer waters result in more fish and, perhaps, more seals.]

The Carbon Recession: Co2 emissions plunge, along with the economy, Washington rejoices

Wall Street Journal Editorial, May 10, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704370704575228311111072860.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

The Bootleggers are the Baptists' last hope for passing of global warming bill

By Iain Murray, Washington Examiner, May 12, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/Examiner-Opinion-Zone/The-Bootleggers-are-the-Baptists-last-hope-for-passge-of-global-warming-bill-93604189.html#ixzz0nl4KisPf>

Welfare Wagons

By Holman Jenkins, WSJ, May 12, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703880304575236692175987752.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

Defending the Orthodoxy

IPCC's Pachauri says climate body must 'listen and learn'

By Richard Black, BBC News, May 14, 2010, [H/t Malcolm Ross]

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science_and_environment/10112136.stm

Climate change could make half the world uninhabitable

By Louis Gray, Telegraph, UK, May 12, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7710229/Climate-change-could-make-half-the-world-uninhabitable.html>

[SEPP Comment: The greater the evidence of very limited warming, the more extreme the claims]

Climate change deniers accused of McCarthyism

By Louis Gray, Telegraph UK, May 6, 2010

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthnews/7686079/Climate-change-deniers-accused-of-McCarthyism.html>

[SEPP Comment: If a publically funded building collapsed, it is entirely appropriate for an attorney general to investigate what went wrong. The climate science of Mr. Mann collapsed and it should be investigated why.]

The E.P.A. Announces a New Rule on Polluters

By Sindya Bhano, NYT, May 13, 2010

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/14/science/earth/14permit.html?ref=todaypaper&utm_source=Newsletter&utm_medium=Email&utm_campaign=Morning%2BBell

The Fear Du Jour

“Ocean Acidification” is New Climate Scare, Says SPPI

Transworld News, May 12, 2010

<http://www.transworldnews.com/NewsStory.aspx?id=349476>

Energy Issues

Cape Wind rate shock: Electricity will cost twice as much as power plants

By Jay Fitzgerald, Boston Herald, May 8, 2010 [H/t Warren Wetmore]

<http://www.bostonherald.com/business/general/view.bg?articleid=1253263>

[SEPP Comment: Why is anyone surprised? This is after a Federal cash payment of some \$600 million. Wait until the maintenance bills after the sea water spray corrodes the bearings in the turbines.]

The Price of Wind: The ‘clean energy revolution’ is expensive

Opinion, WSJ, May 12, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703880304575236453005869966.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

Spanish Cloud Over European Renewables

By Matthew Curtin, WSJ, May 14, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703460404575244411609653340.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

BP's Oil Spill

For BP, a History of Spills and Safety Lapses

By Jad Mouawad, WSJ, May 8, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/09/business/09bp.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: The obvious failure of BP to have well rehearsed emergency plans with necessary equipment in place is deplorable. It should have devoted more resources on environmental protection and less on attempting to become the darling oil company of the environmental industry. Now, BP's negligence will probably damage all oil companies.]

BP Execs Show Crude Lack Of Accountability

By Dana Milbank, IBD, May 12, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=533803>

[SEPP Comment: The author makes some very good points, but claiming this is a result of failure to develop alternative energy sources is absurd. It paints BP's failure as typical of the oil industry. Land based oil spills are easier to control than ones deep off shore, why aren't we drilling on the north slope of Alaska?]

Science Developments that May Be of Interest

Jupiter loses one of its stripes and scientists are stumped as to why

By Clair Bates, Daily Mail, UK, May 12, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1277734/Jupiter-loses-stripes-scientists-idea-why.html#comments>

High Northern Latitude Carbon Balance Over the 21st Century

By Quian, et al, Global Change Biology 16, 641-656, NIPCCreport.org, May 12, 2010

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/may/12may2010a5.html>

Alaskan and Northwest Canadian Glaciers

By Berthier, et al. Nature Geoscience 3, 92-95, NIPCC report.org, May 12, 2010

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/may/12may2010a2.html>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Activists Protest Gore’s Honorary Degree at University of Tennessee

FOX News, May 14, 2010

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/05/14/activists-protest-gores-honorary-degree-university-tennessee/>

Congressman Says Climate Science Should Be Simplified to ‘Sixth Grade Level’ Because Americans ‘Don’t Get’ It

By Christopher Neefus, CNS News, May 10, 2010 [H/t Paul Pekarek]

<http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/65515>

[SEPP Comment: Wasn’t this what Al Gore’s film did – and got wrong?]

Department of Hot Air Costing \$90 million

By Simon Benson, The Daily Telegraph, Apr 29, 2010 [H/t John Cribbs]

<http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/departments-of-hot-air-costing-90-million/story-e6freuy9-1225859616207>

[SEPP Comment: Prime Minister Rudd punted on the carbon reduction scheme but the bureaucracy lives on continuing to cost the taxpayers.]

Global warming blamed for pattern of lizard deaths

By David Brown, Washington Post, May 14, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/13/AR2010051303521.html>

[SEPP Comment: Did they check the temperature readings from local weather stations?]

Warmer Climate Gives Cheer to Makers of British Bubbly

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, May 11, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052702304604204575182083589336038.html#mod=todays_us_page_one

[SEPP Comment: Following the Norman Invasion of 1066 a compellation of all the land in England was made – called the “Doomsday Book.” There were many vineyards. All were wiped out during the Little Ice Age. Modern techniques graft traditional vines on American rootstock which is more resistant to and certain diseases, and cold, than traditional rootstock.]

1.Science subpoenaed

Nature Editorial, May 12, 2010

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v465/n7295/full/465135b.html#/>

The University of Virginia should fight a witch-hunt by the state's attorney general.

Climate science is under scrutiny once again, this time over a modest half-a-million dollars — the collective sum of five federal and state grants being investigated by Kenneth Cuccinelli, a firebrand conservative who was elected late last year as attorney general of Virginia. The grants had multiple recipients, but the official target of the probe is Michael Mann, an internationally respected climate scientist who was an investigator on all five grants while working at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville between 1999 and 2005.

On 23 April, Cuccinelli filed what amounts to a subpoena ordering the University of Virginia to hand over, by 26 July, all available documents, computer code and data relating to Mann's research on the five grants. He also demanded all correspondence, including e-mails — from 1999 to the present — between Mann, now at Pennsylvania State University in University Park, and dozens of climate scientists worldwide, as well as some climate sceptics. The order stated that Cuccinelli was investigating Mann's possible violation of the 2002 Virginia Fraud Against Taxpayers Act — although no evidence of wrongdoing was given to explain invoking the law, which is intended to prosecute individuals who make false claims in order to access government funds.

Mann is the co-author of the famous 'hockey stick' graph, which shows estimated global temperatures over the last millennium to have been relatively constant until a drastic rise in the twentieth century. Mann has long been a target of climate-change deniers, and the scrutiny intensified last autumn when his e-mails were among those stolen from the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia, UK. But Mann's research has been upheld by the US National Academy of Sciences, and an investigation by Pennsylvania State University into the e-mails also cleared Mann of any misconduct. Given the lack of any evidence of wrongdoing, it's hard to see Cuccinelli's subpoena — and similar threats of legal action against climate scientists in a February report by climate-change denier Senator James Inhofe (Republican, Oklahoma) — as anything more than an ideologically motivated inquisition that harasses and intimidates climate scientists.

Certainly Cuccinelli has lost no time in burnishing his credentials with far-right 'Tea Party' activists, many of whom hail him as a hero. In March, he instructed Virginia's state university presidents that they had no legal authority to protect homosexuals under their non-discrimination policies. He has also filed lawsuits challenging health-care reform and the Environmental Protection Agency's authority to issue greenhouse-gas regulations.

Cuccinelli's actions against Mann hark back to an era when tobacco companies smeared researchers as part of a sophisticated public relations strategy to raise doubts over the science showing that tobacco caused cancer, and delayed the introduction of smoking curbs for decades. Researchers found themselves bogged down in responding to subpoenas and legal challenges, which deterred others from the field. Climate-change deniers have adopted similar strategies with alacrity and, unfortunately, considerable success.

Cuccinelli has insisted that he is not “targeting scientific conclusions”. But even several climate sceptics who count themselves among Mann's fiercest critics have publicly condemned the attorney general's move. Thankfully, so have many academic bodies. One of them was the University of Virginia's faculty senate, which on 5 May declared that Cuccinelli's “action and the potential threat of legal prosecution of scientific endeavor that has satisfied peer-review standards send a chilling message to scientists engaged in basic research involving Earth's climate and indeed to scholars in any discipline.”

Well said. Scientific organizations must respond quickly and forcefully any time political machinations threaten to undercut academic freedom. And, rather than complying, the University of Virginia should explore every avenue to challenge the subpoena.

2. Comments to *Nature* by Fred Singer

Yr editorial (“Science subpoenaed” May 13) about Attorney-General Cuccinelli of Virginia (my home state) demanding documents and e-mails relating to Prof. Michael Mann from the University of Virginia (my university) has raised my interest. I note first of all your choice of words. You refer to Michael Mann as “internationally respected;” I would use more neutral language, like “prominently mentioned in the EAU e-mails, aka as Climategate.”

You state, correctly, that “no evidence was given of wrongdoing [by Mann].” But isn’t that the purpose of the investigation; certainly the references in the UEA e-mails to “Mike [Mann]’s *Nature* trick” in order to “hide the decline [of temperature]” might lead one to think that there has been some skullduggery. It even suggests that you might have a conflict of interest, which has produced a certain amount of bias. Of course, I would never accuse you of that, Heaven forefend.

You then identify Mann with the “famous” hockeystick graph [Nature 1998], which did away with the Medieval Warm Period and also the Little Ice Age, from which the global climate is just now recovering. It may have escaped your notice that Mann has now discovered the existence of the MWP and LIA (PNAS 2008), which has bent the shaft of the hockeystick all out of shape. Well, who says that the age of miracles has passed?

Fortunately, the blade of the Hockeystick is still there, showing rapidly rising temperatures in the past 30 years, thanks to the valiant efforts of Prof. Phil Jones. We are breathlessly waiting for expert scrutiny of his methods of selecting data from thousands of weather stations to arrive at a single number for “global temperature.” Perhaps he will reveal the algorithms he devised to “adjust and correct” the raw data. But unfortunately, he did not save the original temperature records; as the saying goes: “The dog ate them.”

You then state that the UEA e-mails were “stolen.” Perhaps they were; but until you have evidence you may be accusing an unknown whistleblower who resented what was being done to the climate data – and to science. I won’t even mention what the resulting climate scares are doing to the economies of nations and the living standards of their populations. We will soon become more aware of these consequences.

I was wondering just how long it would take the editorial to suggest a parallel between climate skepticism and the tobacco lobby. Well done! It’s too bad that global warming cannot be shown to cause lung cancer – not yet, at any rate. But more research money may yet uncover such a connection. There’s still hope.

S. Fred Singer, Prof Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia

3. Kerry’s Powerless America Act

IBD Editorials, May 12, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=533800>

Regulations: Call it cap-and-trade or bait-and-switch, but John Kerry and Joe Lieberman continue to tilt at windmills with a bill to restrain energy growth in the name of saving the planet.

The bill introduced Wednesday and sponsored by the two senators is called the American Power Act, an Orwellian phrase if ever there was one. Like President Obama’s offshore drilling program, for every “incentive” there is a restriction. It’s as if Hamlet were to be appointed Secretary of Energy.

The legislation has little to do with developing America’s vast domestic energy supply. It’s cap-and-trade meets pork-barrel spending. It’s about regulations, restrictions and research. It does not deal with exploiting America’s vast energy reserves but with finding ways to mitigate their alleged harmful effect.

To that end, the bill creates some 60 new agencies and projects to eat up our tax dollars and buy support (see list alongside).

According to a leaked draft summary, there is "\$7 billion annually to improve our transportation infrastructure and efficiency" to be paid for by a gas tax that is not called a tax but a "linked fee." There is "\$2 billion per year for researching and developing effective carbon capture and sequestration methods and devices." There is even "a new multibillion-dollar revenue stream for agriculture through a domestic offset program." Tilling the soil releases carbon dioxide, don't you know?

Ironically, the draft summary acknowledges the bill will cause energy prices to necessarily skyrocket by promising to "provide assistance to those Americans who may be disproportionately affected by potential increases in energy prices." How about lowering prices and creating jobs by increasing domestic supply?

Somewhere Sen. Lindsey Graham fell off the wagon, disillusioned perhaps by the politics of shifting priorities, and possibly not impressed, as we are not, by the bill's promise to expedite licensing for nuclear reactors "in a way that is guided by sound science and engineering while remaining fully mindful of safety and environmental concerns." That's liberal-speak for study forever, build never.

After coal-mine disasters and oil rig explosions, one would think nuclear power would be celebrated as a non-polluting power source whose casualty rate is zero. According to the Energy Information Administration, electricity from nukes eliminated 26 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions in 2009. Split atoms, baby, split atoms. Enough already with the research.

The proposed legislation mandates reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from fossil fuels via a cap-and-trade system for power plants and, eventually, factories — with strict curbs on the types of trading that could be done. It would require oil companies, for example, to obtain emission permits at a set price not determined by the trading market.

While allegedly providing some incentives to domestic energy development, it would also allow California to implement its draconian energy efficiency standards and other provisions of its signature global warming law, AB 32. "We will not undermine California," Kerry said. Oh, good.

"This bill is a compilation of just about every bad idea that has emerged in the energy debate," said Patrick Creighton, spokesman for the Institute for Energy Research, a free-market think tank. "Two things are certain if this bill becomes law: Energy prices will skyrocket, and jobs will be shipped overseas."

It is a scam built upon a scam, introduced just as the mercury in Chicopee, Mass., dropped to 26 degrees at about 5 a.m., beating the previous record for the chilliest May 11 set back in 1962.

In testimony before Congress on May 6, Britain's Lord Christopher Monckton, a global warming expert, noted that "neither global mean surface temperature nor its rates of change in recent decades have been exceptional, unusual, inexplicable or unprecedented."

Monckton also advised: "There are many urgent priorities that need the attention of Congress, and it is not for me as an invited guest in your country to say what they are. Yet I can say this much: on any view, 'global warming' is not one of them."

We agree. Jobs, energy development and economic growth come first.

4. A Bad Bet on Carbon

By Robert Bryce, NYT, May 12, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/13/opinion/13bryce.html?emc=eta1>

ON Wednesday, John Kerry and Joseph Lieberman [introduced their long-awaited Senate energy bill](#), which includes incentives of \$2 billion per year for carbon capture and sequestration, the technology that removes carbon dioxide from the smokestack at power plants and forces it into underground storage. This significant allocation would come on top of the \$2.4 billion for carbon capture projects that appeared in last year's stimulus package.

That's a lot of money for a technology whose adoption faces three potentially insurmountable hurdles: it greatly reduces the output of power plants; pipeline capacity to move the newly captured carbon dioxide is woefully insufficient; and the volume of waste material is staggering. Lawmakers should stop perpetuating the hope that the technology can help make huge cuts in the United States' carbon dioxide emissions.

Let's take the first problem. Capturing carbon dioxide from the flue gas of a coal-fired electric generation plant is an energy-intensive process. Analysts estimate that capturing the carbon dioxide cuts the output of a typical plant by as much as 28 percent.

Given that the global energy sector is already straining to meet booming demand for electricity, it's hard to believe that the United States, or any other country that relies on coal-fired generation, will agree to reduce the output of its coal-fired plants by almost a third in order to attempt carbon capture and sequestration.

Here's the second problem. The Pacific Northwest National Laboratory has estimated that up to 23,000 miles of new pipeline will be needed to carry the captured carbon dioxide to the still-undesignated underground sequestration sites. That doesn't sound like much when you consider that America's gas pipeline system sprawls over some 2.3 million miles. But those natural gas pipelines carry a valuable, marketable, useful commodity.

By contrast, carbon dioxide is a worthless waste product, so taxpayers would likely end up shouldering most of the cost. Yes, some of that waste gas could be used for enhanced oil recovery projects; flooding depleted oil reservoirs with carbon dioxide is a proven technology that can increase production and extend the life of existing oilfields. But the process would be useful in only a limited number of oilfields — probably less than 10 percent of the waste carbon dioxide captured from coal-fired power plants could actually be injected into American oilfields.

The third, and most vexing, problem has to do with scale. In 2009, carbon dioxide emissions in the United States totaled 5.4 billion tons. Let's assume that policymakers want to use carbon capture to get rid of half of those emissions — say, 3 billion tons per year. That works out to about 8.2 million tons of carbon dioxide per day, which would have to be collected and compressed to about 1,000 pounds per square inch (that compressed volume of carbon dioxide would be roughly equivalent to the volume of daily global oil production).

In other words, we would need to find an underground location (or locations) able to swallow a volume equal to the contents of 41 oil supertankers each day, 365 days a year.

There will also be considerable public resistance to carbon dioxide pipelines and sequestration projects — local outcry has already stalled proposed carbon capture projects in Germany and Denmark. The fact is, few landowners are eager to have pipelines built across their property. And because of the possibility of deadly leaks, few people will want to live near a pipeline or an underground storage cavern. This leads

to the obvious question: which members of the House and Senate are going to volunteer their states to be dumping grounds for all that carbon dioxide?

For some, carbon capture and sequestration will remain the Holy Grail of carbon-reduction strategies. But before Congress throws yet more money at the procedure, lawmakers need to take a closer look at the issues that hamstringing nearly every new energy-related technology: cost and scale.

Robert Bryce, a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, is the author, most recently, of "Power Hungry: The Myths of 'Green' Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future."

5. Comparing Apples and Orangutans

By John Droz, Jr, American Spectator, May 14, 2010

<http://spectator.org/archives/2010/05/14/comparing-apples-and-orangutan>

One of the most important energy matters to understand is that popular "renewable" electrical energy sources are not even remotely equivalent to our conventional energy sources.

Of course lobbyists don't want consumers and politicians to think about that fact, so they go to great lengths to disguise it. Everything they propagate is based on an "equivalency" between "renewables" and conventional power sources that does not exist in the real world.

Even generally objective sources like the Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration (EIA) seriously err when they show such things as levelized cost charts that have wind energy and nuclear power in contiguous columns.

The first problem encountered here is the term "renewables." This is bantered about as if it were: 1) a scientific definition, and 2) a homogeneous group of energy sources. This is lobbyist sleight of hand, as neither is true. It isn't my purpose here to go into the details of this charade but suffice it to say that the definition is very subjective, *and* there are extraordinary differences between various "renewables." (See [here](#) and [here](#).)

After you've grasped those details, the heavy lifting begins. The trick here is to get our heads around the fundamental difference between something like wind energy and nuclear power.

I'm just a physicist and not a professional communicator, so wordology doesn't come naturally to me. However, what I have learned is that most people have a better chance of understanding complex matters when an analogy is used. Let's try that here.

My suggested comparison is to look at two types of transportation (a parallel energy sector), using concepts we are all familiar with.

Let's say that we have a business that repeatedly needs to get 50,000 pounds of goods from New York City to Denver, in two days, and cost is quite important. (In the electricity business this translates to satisfying a demand [load], through dispatchable energy, reliably and economically.)

So who do we subcontract this job to? A good option is to put this merchandise on an 18-wheeler and send it on its way. Will it always get there 100% of the time without fail? No, flukes do happen. However, if this experiment were repeated 100 times, the truck would arrive well over 90% of the time, on schedule and within budget. This is equivalent to using a conventional energy source, like nuclear power.

Now let's say greenologists are introduced into the equation, and they arbitrarily add a new requirement that *no fossil fuel can be used*. Oops. Our options are now severely restricted.

The parallel choice to using wind energy is to send the merchandise with golf carts (battery powered so no fossil fuel will be consumed during transport). The question is: how many golf carts will it take to dependably replicate the performance of one Mack truck?

Let's say a golf cart can carry 500 pounds (two golfers with sticks). To transport 50,000 pounds that would work out to 100 golf carts.

This is essentially the message that the lobbyists want you to buy: *that approximately 100 golf carts* (wind turbines) *will do the job of one 18-wheeler* (conventional source: e.g. a coal facility). They want you to blink and move on. Do *not* look behind the curtain! But wait! Can the golf carts get really there in two days? Of course not. The lobbyists answer is to add more vehicles: *use 1,000 carts!*

Does this "solution" really solve anything? No, but it further confuses politicians not used to critical thinking. What it also does is to insure more profit for the cart industry -- which is the *only* concern of the lobbyists.

What if the load is a hundred 500 pound pianos? Even though (on paper) a golf cart can carry 500 pounds, can a golf cart transport a piano across country? The lobbyists' answer: *disassemble the load and use more carts*. (Yes, they are slick.)

And will the cost of the golf cart option be comparable to the truck choice? Just to begin with there are 100+ drivers vs. one -- so I think you know the answer, right?

And what else will be needed to support this "alternative" source of transportation? A lot: like battery recharge stations throughout the country. And who will pay for that? Duh.

And what is the source of the electricity used to charge the cart batteries? Mostly fossil fuels. Oops.

In the face of this evidence, the lobbyists and their academic coconspirators distractingly wave their hands and say such non-sequiturs as "Don't worry about these details. give us a huge subsidy and we'll do a great job. Everything will make more sense *mañana*."

This isn't how science works. *Before* we pay them to run this route, these promoters should tell us exactly how many golf carts it will take, and then *prove it* by actually running this route dozens of times. We would then have real-world evidence of the reliability and cost of their proposal. This is exactly what we have *not* done with wind energy.

They have not only skipped right over the proof stage, right now the golf cart lobbyists are working on convincing our politicians that since businesses have been "resistive" to using their transportation product, that they need a law *mandating* that 20% of all goods from NYC to Denver go the golf cart route! Senators Kerry & Lieberman are now agents of these lobbyists, and have now introduced such legislation!

And the claimed benefit of all of this? *Economic recovery*. There will be lots of new jobs in the golf cart business! What about the economic loss due to the higher shipping cost, or the slower transportation? Don't worry about it. Come back *mañana*.

Hopefully this analogy makes things clearer, as this is the insane path we are now on. (For a more thorough discussion of this situation, go [here](#).)

6. Subcommittee on Oversight and Subcommittee on Water and Wildlife joint hearing entitled “EPA’s Role in Protecting Ocean Health”

Testimony by John T. Everett, President, Ocean Associates, Inc., May 11, 2010 [H/t Randy Randol] http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore_id=db302137-13f6-40cc-8968-3c9aac133b16

[Excerpt]

New science shows the Earth’s ability to absorb the same proportion of new CO₂ each year has not been diminished, removing a key assumption that underpins “acceleration”. Importantly, oceans are alkaline - not acidic, so use of the term “acidification” unnecessarily promotes fear. If all the CO₂ in the air were put into the ocean, the oceans would still be alkaline. With all this talk of acidification, we need to reassure bathers that their feet will not dissolve when they step into the ocean. Ocean water at the surface generally has a pH over 8 and neutral is 7.0 (pure water) while a puddle of rain water (pH 5.6) is 100 times more acidic after having picked up CO₂ in its fall through the air. Many of our recreation lakes and drinking water reservoirs (such as most of those in some states; (e. g., 70% in Maine) have pH values so low that they are truly acidic (pH<7). There is nothing wrong with the fish and the water in these lakes. It is often just that the lakes have less limestone and more granite on their bottoms. Technically, we should say the oceans could become less alkaline, rather than more acidic. In any case, unlike rainwater, the oceans will never become acidic.

Whether or not laboratory studies provide the answers we think are reasonable, we need to look more broadly. The Russian academicians (of their Academy of Sciences) I worked with in IPCC taught me to look at how the Earth responded in past ages when conditions were like those projected, and to get up from the computer and look around. They gravely distrusted computer models. So, what can we learn from the past and what do we see around us? The oceans and coastal zones have been far warmer and colder and much more acidic than is projected. Marine life has been in the oceans nearly since when they were formed. During the millennia life endured and responded to CO₂ many times higher than present, and to temperatures that put tropical plants at the poles or covered our land by ice a mile thick. The memory of these events is built into the genetic plasticity of the species on this planet. Impacts will be determined by this plasticity from past experiences. If we open our eyes, we see that nearly all of our ponds and lakes are often more acidic than the oceans (pH 8.1), yet they team with most of the kinds of life that are in the oceans. This is important.

7. Global Warming’s \$64 Trillion Question

By Roy Spencer, May 13, 2010

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/>

Despite its relative simplicity, I continue to find myself [trying to explain](#) to experts and lay persons alike how scientists made the [Great Global Warming Blunder](#) when it comes to predictions of global warming.

On the bright side, this morning I received an e-mail from a chemist who looked at the math of the problem after reading my new book, and then came to the understanding on his own. And that’s great!

For the most part, though, the climate community continues to suffer from a mental block when it comes to the true role of clouds in global warming. All climate models now change clouds with CO₂ warming in ways that amplify that warming, some by a catastrophic amount.

As my latest book describes, I contend that they have been fooled by Mother Nature, and that in fact warming alters clouds in ways that mitigate – not amplify — the small amount of direct warming caused by increasing atmospheric CO₂.

The difference between clouds magnifying versus mitigating warming could be the difference between global warming being little more than an academic curiosity...or a disaster for life on Earth.

So, once again I find myself trying to explain a concept that I find the public understands better than the climate experts do: *when it comes to clouds and temperature, the direction of causation really does matter.*

Why Are There Fewer Clouds when it is Warm?

The “scientific consensus” has been that, because unusually warm conditions are observed to be accompanied by less cloud cover, warming obviously causes cloud cover to decrease. This would be bad news, since decreasing cloud cover in response to warming would let more sunlight in, and amplify the initial warming. That’s called positive cloud feedback.

But what they have difficulty understanding is that causation in the opposite direction (cloud changes causing temperature changes) gives the ILLUSION of positive cloud feedback. It turns out that, when less cloud cover causes warmer temperatures, the cloud feedback in response to that warming is almost totally obscured.

Believe it, the experts have not accounted for this effect. I find it bizarre that most are not even aware it is an issue! As far as I know, I am the only one actively researching the issue.

As a result, the experts have fooled themselves into believing cloud feedbacks are positive. We have demonstrated theoretically in our [new paper](#) now accepted for publication in JGR that, even if strong negative cloud feedback exists, cloud changes causing temperature change will make it LOOK like positive cloud feedback.

And this indeed happens in the real climate system. The only time cloud feedback can be clearly seen in the real climate system is when temperature changes are caused by something *other than* clouds. And in those cases, we find that the net feedback is strongly negative (around 6 Watts per sq. meter of extra energy lost by the Earth per deg. C of global-average warming).

Unfortunately, those events only occur on relatively short climate time scales: 1 month or so. Whether this negative feedback also exists for long-term climate warming is less certain.

Do Climate Models Agree With Satellite Observations of Clouds and Temperature?

The fact that all the climate models which produce substantial global warming also approximate what we measure from satellites is NOT a validation of the feedbacks in those models. So far, after analyzing thousands of years of climate model runs, I have found no convincing way to validate the climate models’ long-term feedbacks with short-term (approx. 10 years or so) satellite observations. The reason is the same: all models have cloud variations causing temperature variations, which then obscures the feedback we are trying to measure.

But there’s another test that could be made. The modelers’ case would be stronger if they could demonstrate that 20 *additional* climate models, all with various amounts of *negative* – rather than positive

— cloud feedback, are less consistent with our satellite observations than the current crop of models, all of which had positive cloud feedback.

I suspect they do not spend much time on that possibility. A climate model that does not produce much climate change is going to have difficult time getting continued funding for its support.

Trivia Question to Illustrate the Point: Assume continually increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere is the only source of climate variability, and we experience continuous slow warming as a result. Will the outgoing longwave radiation (OLR, or infrared) being emitted by the Earth increase...or decrease...during this process?

ANSWER: If warming is the result of increasing CO₂ in the atmosphere, then the outgoing longwave radiation (OLR) from the Earth will DECREASE over time. As scientists already know, it is this decrease in OLR that causes the warming in the first place. But because the climate system cannot warm instantly in response (there is a time lag due to the heat capacity of land, ocean, and atmosphere), the increased OLR from warming can never fully make up for the decrease in OLR causing the warming. That warming-induced increase represents the FEEDBACK RESPONSE. But it is forever more than offset by the FORCING from increasing CO₂. Now, If we know the time-history of the forcing, it can be subtracted from the OLR to get the feedback. Indeed, this is how feedbacks are diagnosed from climate model experiments involving transient CO₂ forcing. The “blunder” I talk about refers to the fact that climate researchers have not accounted for natural sources of radiative forcing (cloud variations) in their attempts to diagnose feedback in the real climate system.

Technical Note: We have found from modeling studies that if the natural cloud variations were truly random in time, the error in diagnosed feedback would be random, not biased toward positive feedback, and would average out to near zero in the long term. But in the real climate system, these cloud variations have preferred time scales...in other words, they have some degree of autocorrelation in time. When that happens, there ends up being a bias in the direction of positive feedback.

#####

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.