

The Week That Was 2010-07-24 (July 24, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

Quote of the Week

“The best protection we have against offshore accidents is to end our dependence on oil.” Frances Beineke, President of Natural Resources Defense Council and member of the special presidential commission on the Gulf Oil Spill, (NRDC blog, [5/4/10](#)) [H/t Institute for Energy Research]

#####

FORUM: SEPP and VA-SEEE will conduct an open forum on Saturday, September 25 at 10:30 am. It will be held at Ernst Cultural Center on the Annandale Campus of the Northern Virginia Community College about one mile outside the Beltway on Little River Turnpike, Annandale, Virginia

#####

Number of the Week: \$2.1 Trillion -- \$2,100,000,000.00

THIS WEEK:

By Ken Haapala, Executive Vice President, Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP)

In what appears to be a significant change of events, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) announced that he is dropping cap and tax for now because he does not have enough votes to pass the legislation. Even an editorial in the Las Vegas Review Journal expressed relief that the nation has been spared of this destructive energy tax that would accomplish nothing for climate change. Is it that Senator Reid actually recognizes he does not have the votes? Is it that he is in a tight race to keep his Senate seat? Or is it something more devious?

Given the propensity of the leaders of the 111th Congress to develop thousands of pages of legislation behind closed doors and quickly dump it onto an unsuspecting public, one must be suspicious. Further, corporations and special interest groups have spent millions of dollars on mobilizing one of the greatest lobbying efforts ever. Some, such as Duke Energy and Exelon, have promised their shareholders that they would get Billions of US dollars in profits from this lobbying “investment.” The massive volumes of money that would change hands with cap and tax have attracted many organizations that demand special government “favors.” They will not be pleased.

As mentioned in TWTW last week, some commentators have suggested that after the election a lamb duck Congress will pass some version of cap and tax. The Wall Street Journal suggests that it may be a Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS) which would require utilities to obtain mandatory percentages of their total electricity from renewable generating sources such as solar and wind. Until practical electricity storage is commercially available at a reasonable cost, solar and wind generated electricity is sub-prime energy. Even with government subsidies, the sub-prime energy market will eventually implode as did the sub-prime mortgage market that was driven by government dictates. An implosion of the sub-prime energy market may have greater destructive economic consequences. (Please see “Son of Cap and Tax” under Articles.)

Number of the Week: is \$2.1 Trillion \$2,100,000,000.00. As discussed in last week’s TWTW, that is the rough estimate by Chamberlain Economics of the value of carbon allowances that will

be distributed free under the Kerry-Lieberman cap and tax bill. As our founding fathers recognized, power attracts the ambitious – and so does huge amounts of money.

The Climategate non-inquiry appears to have unintended consequences. Some traditional allies of the orthodoxy, including *New Scientist*, are questioning the lack of candor in the inquiries.

Comments by hockey stick buster, Steve McIntyre, on CRU’s lack of quality control of temperature data may be of interest to many, including those litigating against the EPA endangerment finding. (Please see below under “ClimateGate”)

The peer reviewed paper which is part of the basis for Roy Spencer’s new book **The Great Global Warming Blunder**, reviewed in TWTW July 3 and 10, has been challenged. As all too typical today, the *Journal of Climate* did not bother informing Spencer so that he could review the challenge and respond. According to Spencer, had the Journal done so he could have corrected some errors and misrepresentations. Spencer points out the challenge offers some new insights, but the major “issues” were corrected in a later paper that is in press. (Please see “Can Climate Feedbacks be Diagnosed from Satellite Data?”)

Joe D’Aleo has discovered that NASA-GISS is playing games with historic data yet again – call it Creative Enhancement. (Please see his article under “Challenging the Orthodoxy.”) Also, Anthony Watts has discovered missing data in NOAA’s latest heat advisory. More stunning is the sudden cold snap that froze to death thousands of head of cattle in central Brazil. (Please see articles under “Heat Wave.”)

The BP Oil Spill has been capped, at least for now, but the true cost to the oil industry in general and the nation as a whole is yet to be determined. No doubt, many in the US government would like to use it as an excuse to stop all offshore drilling. The House Energy and Commerce Committee headed by Rep. Waxman passed legislation that will do exactly that. (Please see “Blowout Prevention Act”)

To their credit, four major oil companies are forming a disaster-response system to quickly shut-off deep water blow-outs in the Gulf of Mexico. It is unknown if this would be sufficient address the new Waxman anti-drilling bill. Given the anti-energy attitude in Washington (except for sub-prime energy), some may suggest that the Department of Justice investigates the disaster-response system as unlawful collusion under the Sherman Anti-trust Act.

BOOK OF THE WEEK

Coming climate crisis? By Claire L. Parkinson
Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham MD. 2010. 412 pp.

Reviewed by S. Fred Singer

This is an unusual book. Parkinson is a distinguished climatologist with a specialty of polar sea ice and a strong interest in the history and philosophy of science. She clearly believes that humans are responsible for past warming and that continued emissions of greenhouse gases will lead to further warming in the 21st century, yet she is one of the few AGW supporters who is respectful of contrary opinions. It is interesting that the Foreword, written by Lonnie Thompson, while praising her book, faults her for ascribing “nearly equivalent validity to the contributions of climate skeptics or contrarians.” But Parkinson is unapologetic and explains her position well throughout the book.

Her main theme is to argue effectively against the current craze for “geo-engineering.” I share her view that many of the schemes suggested lack proper evaluation and are likely to cause more harm than good. However, I also doubt the necessity for carrying out large-scale modifications of the global environment since I do not believe that the human emission of greenhouse gases is causing significant climate changes.

Full disclosure: About 40 years ago, I was quite intrigued by the idea of large-scale modifications of the earth’s environment and included it in discussions in a symposium which I organized for the AAAS, entitled “Global Effects of Environmental Pollution.” After publishing a book on this symposium, I worked with the National Research Council on producing a report on geo-engineering, which described the various schemes that were then under consideration. Since this was long before there was any widespread discussion of greenhouse warming, our report dealt with different topics.

The Parkinson book has some very attractive features. A well-written Introduction presents an overview of the Earth System and a descriptive outline of the book itself. Part I describes very well the history of climate change since the earth was created 4.6 billion years ago. There’s also a nice summary of abrupt climate changes.

After this discussion of natural changes, there’s a short history of past human impacts and a chapter on the future, with the intriguing title “Why Some People are So Concerned While Others Aren’t.” While I don’t agree with everything the author says, I do feel she has given adequate space to skeptics like Patrick Michaels and Roy Spencer. She also gives much space to Bjorn Lomborg, who seems to accept the scientific conclusions of the IPCC, but as an economist/statistician does not accept any of their recommendations for action.

And on this point, I agree most emphatically.

#####

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

1. A Climate Absolution?

The alarmists still won’t separate science from politics

Editorial, WSJ, July 16, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703394204575367483847033948.html?mod=djemEditorialPage_t

2. Global warming’s unscientific attitude

Peddlers of phony scare stories are afraid to release data

Editorial Washington Times, July 21, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jul/21/global-warmings-unscientific-attitude/>

3. Son of Cap and Tax

The destructive fine print in Harry Reid's energy bill

Editorial, WSJ, July 22, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704682604575369002958553516.html?mod=WSJ_hps_sections_opinion

4. Global Warming's Golden Moment Has Passed

By Daniel Flynn, Human Events, July 17, 2010

<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=38093>

5. Not Warming-Up to War?

World Climate Report, July 22, 2010 [Excerpt]

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

[SEPP Comment: The 11 retired generals and admirals who reported global warming will lead to war failed in their most basic duty as strategic planners – know your enemy. They accepted the speculation of the IPCC as definitive intelligence without bothering to test the assumptions. They apparently did not examine the history of warfare as articulated by historians: generally, in non-developed areas cooling leads to war (crops fail) and warming does not.]

6. Oil Majors Building Disaster-Response System

By Angel Gonzalez, WSJ, July 21, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704684604575381422950478384.html?mod=djemalertNEWS>

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

ClimateGate

'The Inquiry Reports Are Lousy' – An Interview with Steve McIntyre

By Alex Reichmuth, Die Weltwoche, July 22, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/climategate/1294-the-inquiry-reports-are-lousy-an-interview-with-steve-mcintyre.html>

Climategate inquiry glosses over the facts

By Iain Murray, Examiner, July 20, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/Climategate-inquiry-glosses-over-the-facts-1001765-98788514.html>

Inquiry Disinformation about CRUTEM

By Steve McIntyre, July 21, 2010

<http://climateaudit.org/2010/07/21/inquiry-disinformation-about-crutem/#more-11505>

["My long-standing position on CRUTEM was that CRU's obstruction of data requests was most likely due to its desire to conceal that it did so little work on quality control; that the CRU result could be derived so trivially that, in effect, CRU no longer served any useful function in this field."]

US Government Halts Funds For Climate Unit

By Jonathan Leake, Sunday Times, July 18, 2010

<http://www.thegwpf.org/climategate/1262-us-government-halts-funds-for-climate-research-unit-cru.html>

[SEPP Comment: Uncertainty exists as to how much CRU received from the US. Anthony Watts estimates it is well into the millions. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/>]

Without candour, we can't trust climate science

Editorial, New Scientist, July 18, 2010

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

Does New Scientist Foresee Paradigm Shift on Climate Theory?

By John 'Sullivan, Suite 101, July 20, 2010

<http://news.suite101.com/article.cfm/does-new-scientist-see-paradigm-shift-on-greenhouse-gas-theory-a263695>

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Our Readers conduct Part 2 of the interview with John Christy

By Thomas Fuller, Examiner, July 16, 2010

<http://www.examiner.com/x-9111-Environmental-Policy-Examiner~y2010m7d16-Global-warming-Our-Readers-conduct-Part-2-of-the-interview-with-John-Christy?cid=examiner-email>

Progressive Enhancement of Global Temperature Trends

By Joseph D'Aleo, ICECAP

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

http://icecap.us/images/uploads/Creative_Enhancement_of_Global_Temperature_Trends.pdf

[SEPP Comment: When the data doesn't fit your premise, adjust it.]

Can Climate Feedbacks be Diagnosed from Satellite Data?

Comments on the Murphy & Forster (2010) Critique of Spencer & Braswell (2008)

By Roy Spencer, July 19, 2010

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

[SEPP Comment: Scroll down to the article. Highly recommended.]

Please remain calm: The Earth will heal itself

If the planet determines Canada should freeze again, the best response would be to sell your Canadian real estate

By Neil Reynolds, Globe and Mail, July 19, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/please-remain-calm-the-earth-will-heal-itself/article1642767/?utm_source=emailalerts&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Environment

Washington State's Climate Executive Order Challenged

By Paul Chesser, American Spectator, July 21, 2010

<http://spectator.org/blog/2010/07/21/washington-states-endangerment>

Heat Wave

Historical Cold Snap Freezes South America

By Alexandre Aguiar / MetSul Weather Center [H/t Joe D'Aleo, ICECAP]

<http://icecap.us/images/uploads/HISTORICALCOLDSNAPFREEZESSOUTHAMERICA.pdf>

[SEPP Comment: Freezing in South America is no more an indication of global cooling than the heat wave in the US Northeast is an indication of global warming. But it does balance certain outrageous AGW claims.]

NOAA's Jan-Jun 2010 Warmest Ever: Missing Data, False Impressions

By Anthony Watts, Watts Up With That, July 17, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/07/17/noaas-jan-jun-2010-warmest-ever-missing-data-false-impressions/>
[SEPP Comment: The Watts team digs deep into NOAA claims – “There seems to be an inverse correlation between the number of stations and warming –more stations in a 5 X 5 degree grid and less warming is observed.”]

Cap and Tax

Cap-and-trade bites the dust –for now

Editorial, Las Vegas Review Journal, July 24, 2010

<http://www.lvrj.com/opinion/energy-policy-99163499.html?ref=499>

Senate Democrats abandon comprehensive climate bill

By Perry Bacon, Washington Post, July 22, 2010 [H/t Joe Bast]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/22/AR2010072203614.html>

Reid to Senate Dems: Climate change bill will wait until fall

By Darren Goode, The Hill, July 22, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/677-e2-wire/110323-reid-to-advance-limited-oil-spill-and-energy-bill-delaying-climate-action>

Green Dreams Die Ugly On Capitol Hill

By Walter Russell Mead, American Interest, July 20, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/07/20/green-dreams-die-ugly-on-capitol-hill/?utm_source=emailalerts&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Environment

BP Spill and Aftermath

Feds haven't treated spill like national disaster

By James Carafano, Washington Examiner, July 19, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/Stop-devaluing-our-relationship-with-Britain-1001459-98709714.html>

Blowout Prevention Act – Will Rs Get Buyer's Remorse? (Modified July 18, 2010)

By Marlo Lewis, Open Market, July 16, 2010

<http://www.openmarket.org/2010/07/16/blowout-prevention-act-will-rs-get-buyers-remorse/>

[SEPP Comment: What this nation needs – Allowing the Environmental Industry to define energy policy through the courts.]

U.S. Drills Deep Into BP as Spill Drama Drags On

By Monica Langley, WSJ, July 21, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704720004575377110647505300.html?mod=WSJ_hps_InDepthCarousel_1

U.S. Approves Shallow-Water Well in Gulf

By Siobhan Hughes, WSJ, July 20, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703720504575377322984605424.html?mod=ITP_pageone_2

[SEPP Comment: One is not a trend.]

Experts Ask Why BP Delayed Cap

By Guy Chazan, WSJ, July 22, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703954804575381241624701892.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

Taking Lessons From What Went Wrong

By William Broad, NYT, July 19, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/20/science/20lesson.html?th&emc=th>

One Person's Oil Addict is Another's Intelligent Consumer

By Michael Lynch, Master Resource, July 21, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/07/oil-addiction-lynch/>

Energy Issues

GAO Report: Carbon Capture Increases Power Costs up to 80%

By Connie Hair, Human Events, July 16, 2010

<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=38115>

[SEPP Comment: If it works on a commercial scale.]

Britain faces years of blackouts and soaring energy bills: Expert warns a banking-style collapse in power industry

By Daily Mail Reporter, Daily Mail, July 19, 2010

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1295837/Britain-faces-years-blackouts-soaring-energy-bills.html>

Obama appeals to a higher power

The O Force keeps nuclear energy on a blue-ribbon coke chain

Editorial, Washington Times, July 20, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jul/20/obama-appeals-to-a-higher-power/>

US Leads World in Greenhouse Gas Reductions

By Wendell Cox, Newgeography, July 20, 2010 [H/t Joe Bast]

<http://www.newgeography.com/content/001682-us-leads-world-greenhouse-gas-reduction>

[SEPP Comment: Unfortunately much of this reduction is due to the recession. However, US emissions per unit of GDP declined significantly for years before the recession.]

Bill Would Make Half of All Cars Electric By 2030

By Jonathan Welsh, WSJ, July 22, 2010

<http://blogs.wsj.com/drivers-seat/2010/07/22/bill-would-make-half-of-all-cars-electric-by-2030/>

[SEPP Comment: With over One Billion US dollars (\$1,000,000,000.00) committed in loans and subsidies to two newly created car manufacturers that plan to sell electric sports cars for \$90,000 plus, the government needs to create a market.]

Communicate Better With the Public – Exaggerate

Example of Media Overstatement

By Roger Pielke, Sr., Climate Science, July 21, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That]

<http://pielkeclimatesci.wordpress.com/2010/07/21/example-of-media-overstatement/>

NIPCC Review of Recent Science Articles

For the full scope of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

Ocean Mass Trends (and Sea Level Estimates) from GRACE

Quinn, K.J. and Ponte, R.M. 2010. Uncertainty in ocean mass trends from GRACE. *Geophysical Journal International* **181**: 762-768.
Archived, July 22, 2010
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/jul/22jul2010a7.html>

A Holocene History of Floodplain Occupation on the Upper Reaches of the Zapadnaya Dvina and Volga Rivers

Panin, A.V. and Nefedov, V.S. 2010. Analysis of variations in the regime of rivers and lakes in the Upper Volga and Upper Zapadnaya Dvina based on archaeological-geomorphological data. *Water Resources* **37**: 16-32.
Archived July 22, 2010
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/jul/22jul2010a5.html>

Solar-Precipitation Connections on the Tibetan Plateau

Zhao, C., Yu, Z., Zhao, Y. and Ito, E. 2009. Possible orographic and solar controls of Late Holocene centennial-scale moisture oscillations in the northeastern Tibetan Plateau. *Geophysical Research Letters* **36**: 10.1029/2009GL040951.
Archived July 21, 2010
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/jul/21jul2010a2.html>

Coherent Detection of the Medieval Warm Period in Multiple Data Sets

Dergachev, V.A., Raspopov, O.M. 2010a. Reconstruction of the Earth's surface temperature based on data of deep boreholes, global warming in the last millennium, and long-term solar cyclicity. Part 1. Experimental data. *Geomagnetism and Aeronomy* **50**: 383-392.
Dergachev, V.A., Raspopov, O.M. 2010b. Reconstruction of the Earth's surface temperature based on data of deep boreholes, global warming in the last millennium, and long-term solar cyclicity. Part 2. Experimental data analysis. *Geomagnetism and Aeronomy* **50**: 393-402.
Archived, July 21, 2010
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/jul/21jul2010a4.html>

Miscellaneous Topics That May Be of Interest

Beautiful 'lost' insect turns up anew in UK
By Richard Black, BBC News, July 21, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-10718550>
[SEPP Comment: *Is this proof of global warming?*]

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Sen. Kerry Predicts 'Ice-Free Arctic' in '5 or 10 Years'

By Penny Starr, CNS News, July 23, 2010 [H/t Brad Veek]
<http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/69845>
[SEPP Comment: *More Kerry claims and NOAA "predictions."*]

#####

ARTICLES

1. A Climate Absolution?

The alarmists still won't separate science from politics
Editorial, WSJ, July 16, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703394204575367483847033948.html?mod=djemEditorialPage_t

The latest study purporting to absolve the scientists involved in November's Climategate scandal was published this month. On predictable cue, we received a letter from our admirers at the United Nations Foundation and the Natural Resources Defense Council urging us to "set the record straight" on "these bogus scandals." Having devoted considerable space to Climategate, we're happy to do that, though not perhaps as our admirers would want.

Climategate is media shorthand for the debate over the content of thousands of emails and documents that were released without authorization from the University of East Anglia's Climatic Research Unit (CRU). At its core, the scandal was as much about the integrity of the scientific process as it was about the quality of the science. Leading climate scientists were caught advising each other to delete potentially compromising emails, stonewall freedom of information requests and game the peer review process to exclude contributions from skeptical colleagues.

The Climategate emails also revealed a habit among climate scientists of trimming their scientific sails to the political winds, sometimes by emphasizing temperature and environmental trends at the alarmist end of the spectrum.

"I tried hard to balance the needs of the science with the IPCC, which were not always the same," wrote East Anglia climatologist Keith Briffa to Penn State's Michael Mann in April 2007. The IPCC, or Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is the U.N. body whose lengthy reports are supposed to be the gold standard for what the world knows about climate change.

For anyone who believes that science benefits from transparency, Climategate was a very good thing. The scandal prompted reporters, bloggers, independent scientists and parliamentary committees to take a closer look at the "settled science." A widely cited claim by the IPCC that Himalayan glaciers would all but vanish by 2035 was debunked. Another stunner about a potential 40% decline in the Amazonian rainforest "appears to have absolutely no scientific basis at all," according to Roger Pielke, Jr., an environmental studies professor at the University of Colorado. Other attention-getting IPCC assertions turn out to have been based on the work of environmental pressure groups and popular magazines.

At a minimum, then, Climategate ought to have prompted some soul-searching among climate scientists about the need for greater openness, less politics and a more balanced treatment of the data. Which makes it all the more unfortunate that last week's "Independent Climate Change Email Review," commissioned and funded by the University of East Anglia and chaired by Muir Russell, the former Vice Chancellor of the University of Glasgow, amounts to a 160-page evasion of the real issues.

One such evasion concerns the science of climate change itself. The review insists that it found nothing "that might undermine the conclusions" of the 2007 IPCC report, to which the CRU was a significant contributor. But that's only because it explicitly refused to look. The review says its "concern is not with science, whether data has been validated or whether the hypotheses have survived testing," but rather with "the honesty, rigor and openness with which the CRU scientists have acted."

In other words, the review assumes the validity of the global warming "consensus" while purporting to reaffirm that consensus. Since a statement cannot prove itself, the review merely demonstrates a weakness for circular logic.

Nearly the only significant scientific judgment cast by the review is that some versions of the notorious "hockey stick" graph—which purports to show relatively stable global temperatures until the last century—were "misleading" because the attempt, in the words of CRU director Phil Jones, to "hide the decline" in some of the data had not been made clear to readers.

Then there is the evasion—or maybe absolution is the better word—as it concerns the professional standards of the CRU scientists. The review does acknowledge that it found "evidence that emails might have been deleted in order to make them unavailable." And it faults the CRU staff for "[failing] to recognize . . . the significance of statutory requirements" concerning freedom of information requests. The review puts this down to a kind of naiveté by the CRU scientists.

Yet it's hard to understand how researchers who were nothing if not meticulous in avoiding the FOI requests could have been unaware of their importance. In one now famous 2008 email, Mr. Jones wrote Penn State's Michael Mann as follows: "Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith [Briffa] re AR4 [the 2007 IPCC report]? Keith will do likewise." Good thing for these gentlemen that they didn't work for, say, Enron.

Perhaps the most significant evasion is the report's claim to be genuinely independent. Of its four panelists, one of them, Geoffrey Boulton, was a member of the University of East Anglia's faculty of environmental studies for 18 years and signed a petition last December insisting that climate researchers "adhere to the highest levels of professional integrity." Given that one of the problems exposed by the emails was a tendency for self-dealing, it's hard to see how this review will put suspicions to rest.

We realize that, for climate change true believers, last week's report will be waved about as proof that the science of climate change is as "settled" as the case for action. It's never hard to convince yourself of what you're already disposed to believe. But if their goal is to persuade an increasingly skeptical public about the science of global warming, and the need to restructure the world economy to ameliorate it, they need to start taking the politics out of the science.

2. Global warming's unscientific attitude

Peddlers of phony scare stories are afraid to release data

Editorial Washington Times, July 21, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jul/21/global-warmings-unscientific-attitude/>

What separates a scientific claim from mere opinion is its ability to be tested by experiment. No true scientist objects to having his theories verified; the charlatan is the one with something to hide. Not surprisingly, purveyors of global warming have proved anything but open.

In the current issue of the peer-reviewed journal *Environmental Law and Management*, Australian researchers evaluated the community of so-called climate scientists and found them to be "antagonistic toward the disclosure of information." [Professor John Abbot](#) of [Central Queensland University](#), a chemist and lawyer, and biologist [Jennifer Marohasy](#) studied the response of the [Climatic Research Unit](#) at the [University of East Anglia \(CRU\)](#) and the [Met Office - Britain's](#) national weather service - to various information requests. The most noteworthy of these was [United Kingdom](#) resident [David Holland's](#) demand for the raw data underlying the infamous "hockey stick" graph that was published in the [United Nations](#) Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) assessment reports. This chart was the centerpiece of the claim that the 20th century was the hottest in a thousand years. The stir that [Mr. Holland's](#) request triggered among the scientists who worked on the report was captured in the Climategate e-mails.

"If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the [UK](#), I think I'll delete the file rather than send to anyone," [CRU](#) scientist [Phil Jones](#) wrote in a February 2005 e-mail. "We think we've found a way around this." So much for transparency.

Under the British Freedom of Information law, like the similar [U.S.](#) statute, information created at the public expense must - with limited exceptions - be made available to the public that paid for it. At first,

the [Met Office](#) answered [Mr. Holland](#)'s request for data regarding a relatively uncontroversial chapter in the IPCC report. When he asked them for similar details regarding the hockey stick, the [Met Office](#) got around the law by claiming the data were "personal information" generated in the free time of the scientists involved. When this dodge failed to hold up, the [Met Office](#) began claiming that the records had been deleted.

"Of concern is evidence of a predisposition towards uncooperativeness on the part of the [Met Office](#), which also used spurious claims of deleted correspondence and personal information in attempts to block the release of information," [Mr. Abbot](#) and [Ms. Marohasy](#) wrote. The attitude isn't limited to [Britain](#). The Washington Times asked the White House Council on Environmental Quality for its oldest pending FOIA requests. Among the top five was an August 26 letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce seeking documents related to its work on climate-change legislation and the Environmental Protection Agency's so-called greenhouse gas ruling.

None of these simple requests should have been denied or delayed. Many of those involved in purported climate science seem more preoccupied with advancing a leftist, anti-business legislative agenda than respecting the integrity of the scientific method. It's obvious why. Their cataclysmic scare stories are unable to withstand scrutiny. By deleting e-mails and using tricks to hide the inconvenient decline in global temperatures, the climate alarmists prove to be not men of science, but ordinary frauds.

3. Son of Cap and Tax

The destructive fine print in Harry Reid's energy bill

Editorial, WSJ, July 22, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704682604575369002958553516.html?mod=WSJ_hps_sections_opinion

In the Mad Mad Mad Mad World that is Senate energy politics, Democrats want a climate bill, really they do, even as they deny that they favor a climate bill at all. "Those words are not in my vocabulary," Majority Leader Harry Reid said last week when asked about cap and trade. Meanwhile, the White House, green groups and industry will continue their closed-door negotiations until the moment the bill comes to the floor as early as Monday.

If all goes according to plan, ObamaCare and financial regulation may end up looking like models of thoughtful deliberation.

Amid this fire drill, cap and tax seems unlikely to obtain 60 votes, even with the truncated debate Mr. Reid has scheduled before Congress adjourns in August. The fallback is an energy bill focused on tax credits and other honest-to-Gia priorities like home weatherization. This is marginally less harmful than a full-dress climate bill, though it would include something known as a "renewable portfolio standard," or RPS, which might be nearly as destructive.

An RPS is a mandate that power companies generate a minimum percentage of electricity from sources like wind or solar that account for about 3% of U.S. net generation today. (Nuclear does not qualify.) The targets are arbitrary—20% by 2020, 25% by 2025, etc. Consumers already subsidize these energy sources as taxpayers, and RPS would force them to subsidize it as ratepayers too.

Some 29 states and the District of Columbia have some version of an RPS today. Democrats want to preempt this federalist arrangement in favor of a more rigid national standard because most states include an escape clause, or "off ramp," to protect consumers if costs rise too quickly. Liberals say that the flexibility that states now enjoy inhibits the quasi-market for energy sources that are not competitive on their own.

Various federal agencies estimate that retail electricity prices would increase by percentages somewhere in the single digits as utilities switched from lower-cost fossil fuels and were forced to build more

baseload capacity to compensate for the unreliability of wind and solar. In a paper last year, the University of Nevada economist Constant Tra studied state electricity markets between 1990 and 2006 and found that the mandate increases prices by about 4% annually.

The RPS mandate that Democrats are trying to sneak in would be far more ambitious and rigid than most states have imposed, however. A study by the Heritage Foundation's Center for Data Analysis estimates that retail electricity prices will increase by as much as 36%, while GDP would drop by some \$50 billion in 2012 and \$5.3 trillion by 2035 in constant dollars. Depending on how the RPS is structured, it could even "lead to losses of the same order of magnitude as the more comprehensive cap-and-trade regulations."

These costs won't be evenly distributed, as with most plans for a "new energy economy." The states with the most wind, sun and available land—the Great Plains and Texas-area mesas—will find it easiest to comply. But all states will be hindered by other regulations that make it difficult to approve alternative projects, or to build transmission lines for sending power to other parts of the country. Witness the decade-long saga to build a wind farm off Nantucket. Even California, the politically greenest state west of Vermont, is nowhere close to meeting the 20% RPS that it said it would meet this year.

Senate Republicans are more than eager to debate and oppose a cap and tax bill going into the August recess. It polls badly when voters learn it is a vast new energy tax that will hit every sector of the economy. With unemployment at 9.5%, the public will settle for normal jobs in lieu of speculative "green jobs."

The danger is that some GOP Senators may relent on a "compromise" bill that includes the cap and tax Plan B of RPS. Democrats know an RPS might be palatable if it were expanded to include nuclear power, a Republican fixation. Democrats will also portray any bill as a response to the Gulf oil spill, and the press corps will ignore the boring details.

The potential for GOP panic was on display last week, as Henry Waxman's House energy committee unanimously passed the Blowout Prevention Act of 2010. Every committee Republican voted for industry tax increases and a federal takeover of the oil-and-gas permitting process for all drilling, even on state or private property. Never mind that the country's main source of carbon emissions—coal-fired power plants—had nothing to do with the spill.

Democrats are determined to pass something before their clock runs out in November, or even after the election in a lame duck session as Senator John Kerry told Politico.com yesterday. The GOP can serve the public and itself by just saying no. Opposing any kind of new tax on energy won't cost Republicans a single seat in Congress, but letting Democrats win another huge liberal victory would demoralize potential GOP voters. The best Republican strategy now is to wait for this madhouse to collapse of its own destructive weight.

4. Global Warming's Golden Moment Has Passed

By Daniel Flynn, Human Events, July 17, 2010

<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=38093>

Just three years ago the politics of global warming was enjoying its golden moment,"

Newsweek's Stefan Theil writes. "Now, almost everywhere, green politics has fallen from its lofty heights." Culprits include reality, "two of the harshest winters on record in the Northern Hemisphere;" utility, "an epic economic crisis;" and credibility, "last November's 'climategate' affair over irregularities in the report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change."

The green golden age, Theil's "A Green Retreat" points out, coincided with an Academy Award for Al Gore's *Inconvenient Truth* and Australia's Kevin Rudd becoming the world's first environmentalist elected leader. But *Newsweek* conspicuously omits a key component of 2007's global-warming zeitgeist: the magazine's own propagandistic "The Truth about Denial" cover story whose verbiage implicitly likened skeptics of man-made climate change to Holocaust deniers. "Since the late 1980s, this well-coordinated, well-funded campaign by contrarian scientists, free-market think tanks and industry has created a paralyzing fog of doubt around climate change," the article lamented.

Three summers ago, the crusading article by Sharon Begley, which used the ominous phrase "the denial machine" more than a dozen times, caused such a stir within *Newsweek* that one of its longest serving writers subsequently took to its pages to denounce the piece. Robert J. Samuelson wrote in *Newsweek* that *Newsweek* had provided a case study of how "self-righteous indignation can undermine good journalism." The piece, Samuelson wrote, was "a highly contrived story." And that's just what the friends of the weekly thought.

Environmental fads falling out of fashion are nothing new. Overpopulation yielded to acid rain, which yielded to saving the ozone layer, which yielded to preserving the rain forest, which yielded to global warming. Each succeeding cause provided its advocates a redemptive, world-saving mission, and tautologically, depicted its opponents as devil figures bent on allowing the destruction of the planet. The self-flattery inherent in the causes, more so than the science behind them, explains their widespread popularity.

What has separated global warming from its trendy antecedents has been its staying power. Global warming became the subject of congressional hearings and magazine cover stories in the late 1980s. Whereas proponents of the green cause of the moment, once it had been sufficiently discredited, could quickly move on to the next fleeting cause without losing face, global warming, because of its multi-decade endurance, is different. The likes of former Vice President Al Gore, NASA's James Hansen, and Hollywood's Laurie David, as they say in poker, are "all in." Evidence against the theory becomes an acid test calcifying the commitment of the true believers.

But that doesn't seem the case with the mercurial *Newsweek*. Even though the piece, in its acknowledgment of the issue's low poll numbers and the costly tradeoffs involved, is more realpolitik than renunciation of global warming, the magazine's so-soon change of tune is significant. "A Green Retreat" is just the latest *Newsweek* retreat on climate change. Years before global-warming became the de rigueur cause, global cooling was touted as consensus science in its pages.

"The central fact is that after three quarters of a century of extraordinarily mild conditions, the Earth's climate seems to be cooling down," *Newsweek* claimed in its April 28, 1975 issue. The piece noted that some scientists believed that the Earth was headed for an ice age. The preventative measures discussed ranged from melting the North Pole with a blanket of soot to stockpiling massive amounts of food. Regarding the expected drop in temperature, and the resulting drop off in agricultural production, *Newsweek* declared, "The evidence in support of these predictions has now begun to accumulate so massively that meteorologists are hard-pressed to keep up with it."

Put another way, "the denial machine" of 1975 were skeptics of the idea of global cooling. How quickly the winds change.

5. Not Warming-Up to War?

World Climate Report, July 22, 2010 [Excerpt]

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

[SEPP Comment: The 11 retired generals and admirals who reported global warming will lead to war failed in their most basic duty as strategic planners – know your enemy. They accepted the speculation of

the IPCC as definitive intelligence without bothering to test the assumptions. They apparently did not examine the history of warfare as articulated by historians: generally, in non-developed areas cooling leads to war (crops fail) and warming does not.]

Literally thousands of websites pound home the idea that global warming is a threat to our national security and that violent conflicts will result from disruptions caused by climate change. Many of the websites point to a study released several years ago by the CNA Corporation which is a nonprofit institution that conducts in-depth, independent research on complex public interest challenges. Their study entitled “National Security and the Threat of Climate Change” was prepared with 11 retired generals and admirals, and it is widely quoted by those insisting global warming will increase the threat of war. The executive summary of the report states “Projected climate change poses a serious threat to America’s national security. The predicted effects of climate change over the coming decades include extreme weather events, drought, flooding, sea level rise, retreating glaciers, habitat shifts, and the increased spread of life-threatening diseases. These conditions have the potential to disrupt our way of life and to force changes in the way we keep ourselves safe and secure.”

The executive summary also states “Climate change acts as a threat multiplier for instability in some of the most volatile regions of the world. Projected climate change will seriously exacerbate already marginal living standards in many Asian, African, and Middle Eastern nations, causing widespread political instability and the likelihood of failed states.” And at home they claim “Projected climate change will add to tensions even in stable regions of the world. The U.S. and Europe may experience mounting pressure to accept large numbers of immigrant and refugee populations as drought increases and food production declines in Latin America and Africa.”

Before you enlist in the military or start shining up combat boots, there is a recent article in the journal *Climatic Change* that might change your mind about global warming and war. The research was conducted by Richard Tol and Sebastian Wagner from The Netherlands and Germany, respectively. The last sentence of their abstract caught our attention as they conclude “it appears that global warming would not lead to an increase in violent conflict” in mid-latitude locations such as China or Europe. We don’t see this study getting a lot of press coverage, so we decided to feature it on *World Climate Report* – just as we did an earlier study which contradicted the global warming=more war claims.

[Please see the URL referenced above for the full article.]

6. Oil Majors Building Disaster-Response System

By Angel Gonzalez, WSJ, July 21, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704684604575381422950478384.html?mod=djemalertNEWS>

Four of the world's largest oil companies are creating a strike force to staunch oil spills in the deep waters of the Gulf of Mexico in a billion-dollar bid to regain the confidence of the White House after [BP](#) PLC's Deepwater Horizon disaster.

[Exxon Mobil](#) Corp., [Chevron](#) Corp., [Royal Dutch Shell](#) PLC and ConocoPhillips are expected to announce Thursday that they are forming a joint venture to design, build and operate a rapid-response system to capture and contain up to 100,000 barrels of oil flowing 10,000 feet below the surface of the sea.

The system, consisting of several oil collection ships and an array of subsurface containment equipment, resembles the one developed by BP during three months of trial and error after the Deepwater Horizon exploded April 20.

BP, which is still engaged in its prolonged effort to stop the resulting oil spill and clean it up, was not asked to join the strike-force consortium. "We don't want to distract them at all," said Rex Tillerson, chief executive of Exxon, which is leading the engineering and construction of the new system.

But BP, along with other companies operating in the Gulf, may be able to use the strike force.

The companies will make an initial investment of \$1 billion in the non-profit venture, which they are calling the Marine Well Containment Company. But the tab to build the system and have crews on perennial alert for years could run in the billions of dollars.

The containment system is expected to be ready within 18 months, Exxon said. The primary aim of the system will be to keep oil from gushing into the ocean in the event of a catastrophic blow-out.

The response team should be able to start mobilizing within 24 hours of an oil spill, and be fully in place within weeks, said Sara Ortwein, vice president of engineering for Exxon Mobil Development Company, who heads the design and construction effort.

The new plan aims to placate the intense official and public criticism of the oil industry. Despite significant technological breakthroughs that led to the exploitation of oil and gas thousands trapped of feet below sea level, the industry was caught without an effective response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill.

Last June, the chief executives of Exxon, Shell, Chevron, ConocoPhillips and BP were grilled by lawmakers who accused them of using "cookie cutter" plans for responding to large-scale oil spills. And Mr. Tillerson acknowledged that the industry had been caught unprepared for a disaster.

On July 12, U.S. authorities reimposed a deepwater drilling moratorium, which was vehemently opposed by the oil industry but which the government says is necessary to ensure safe drilling practices.

The new system "clearly would address" concerns about the industry's capability to deal with massive spills, even though Exxon and the oil industry maintains that such events are preventable, Mr. Tillerson said in an interview.

"We're going to build this and my view is, we've never going to use it," Mr. Tillerson said. But "it's fair for the American people and it's fair for the regulator to expect us to have some mechanical capability to deal with an event in the future that is more readily available for deployment," as opposed to having to improvise a response, he said.

The oil giants' joint-venture is modeled after the Marine Spill Response Corporation, a national oil spill response company funded by the oil and shipping industry in 1990, after the Exxon Valdez oil spill prompted a major overhaul in petroleum pollution legislation.

Mr. Tillerson said that while the system is being designed specifically for the Gulf of Mexico, he expected regulators in other parts of the world to "take an interest in what we're doing here."

About 40 engineers with the four companies involved have been working in the project "around the clock" for more than a month, Ms. Ortwein said.

It took BP three months of progressively ambitious plans and numerous failed attempts to contain the flow from the current spill, a feat finally achieved last Thursday. During that time, millions of barrels of oil gushed into the Gulf of Mexico, creating one of the worst environmental and economic disasters ever to afflict the region.

The system proposed by the new companies is somewhat similar to BP's painstakingly assembled fleet, but it would be adaptable to different conditions, Ms. Ortwein said.

First, responders would install a sealing cap that would have the ability to connect to the diverse systems of valves and casings in use in the deepwater Gulf. That cap would keep oil from escaping into the ocean, redirecting it towards flexible pipes or to a fixed riser located at an unspecified distance from the broken well.

The pipes would connect it to ships modified to process large quantities of crude. One of the advantages of the system is that only two ships would be required to capture up to 100,000 barrels of oil, which would be offloaded onto shuttle tankers.

In the case of a hurricane, the fleet would rapidly disconnect and let the oil flow, but dispersant could be applied to diminish the environmental impact of the oil, Ms. Ortwein said. The system would also seek to avoid problems that have marred BP's efforts, such as the formation of an ice-like mix of water and hydrocarbons that impeded the placement of an early containment cap.

The four companies are evenly contributing to the initial funding.

#####

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.