

The Week That Was: 2010-10-09 (October 9, 2010)

Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

The Science and Environmental Policy Project

#####

PLEASE NOTE: The complete TWTW, including the articles, can be downloaded in an easily printable form at the web site:

<http://www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm>

#####

Quote of the Week: *Science is what you know. Philosophy is what you don't know.* Bertrand Russell

#####

Number of the Week: 1100 x 10⁴ knots² (approximately)

#####

THIS WEEK:

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

The blanket endorsement of the IPCC reports being the embodiment of climate science is showing additional cracks. Those involved in the run up to the great Cancun conference, called the Conference of Parties 16 (COP 16), in December are demonstrating a distinct lack of enthusiasm, which even the *New York Times* recognizes. "Should the next so-called 'conference of parties' be the last?" Of course, the Times suggests that the process, not the science, is flawed. Please see articles under "Decreasing Influence of IPCC?"

In a public letter to the President of the American Physical Society, Professor Hal Lewis lucidly explains why he is resigning from the society of which he has been an outstanding member for 67 years – the society's statement on Climate Change is appalling tendentious and the leadership of the society acted contrary to the Constitution of the society. Please see item # 1 under Articles.

Virginia Attorney General Ken Cuccinelli has issued a revised demand for documents regarding Professor Michael Mann from the University of Virginia. Also, Cuccinelli has appealed the decision of a local judge that limited the scope of his prior demand. Of course, the usual claims of a "chilling effect on academic freedom" were immediately repeated as well as citing that Professor Mann was cleared by his present employer Penn State University, which has no legal standing. In Virginia, the Office of Attorney General is the only one empowered to investigate misuse of State funds as the Office routinely does for Medicare and Medicaid fraud. Contrary to claims in newspapers, an investigation really does not start until the requested documents are released.

The *Washington Post* has come strongly to the defense of Professor Mann, including running an op-ed by him. This brings up the question, why the stonewalling? Please see the articles under "Oh Mann!"

The US Congress is in recess, with many members of Congress seeking reelection, but government agencies are busy as usual. The EPA and the Transportation Department have suggested raising the average gas mileage required by automobile manufactures to as high as 62 mpg. With Chrysler and General Motors largely owned by the Federal Government, Detroit will not fight such an idea. In addition, EPA is planning to release fuel standards for medium and heavy duty trucks.

The proposed regulations are well received by the environmental industry, but how well they will be received by the consumers (and voters) is another issue.

The legal authority of EPA to declare such edicts are is a major constitutional issue.

In California, one of the major political issues is a proposal to delay implementing of strict controls on carbon dioxide emissions under a statute called AB 32 until after unemployment drops to 5.5%. As

mentioned in a previous TWTW, the estimate of job losses and gains from AB 32 by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) was highly suspect. CARB appeared to greatly overestimate the potential increase in green jobs and underestimate the loss of traditional jobs.

In a similar regulatory matter, CARB studies were instrumental in enacting regulations for expensive emission control devices on off-road vehicles, such as construction and mining equipment. The regulations were based on CARB estimates of emissions from such vehicles. Now, it appears that some of CARB's emissions estimates may have been over 300% too high. The immediate excuse is that the recession caused the over estimate. It is difficult to understand how a recession would cause such estimates to be off by a factor of 3. Please see the referenced articles under "California Dreaming."

The prophecies of extreme weather for the upcoming year continue. As consulting meteorologist Joe D'Aleo explained on his web site, ICECAP.US, and in a note to SEPP:

The Russian heat wave and other extremes (including coldest ever winter in parts of Russia/Siberia last winter) are the result of blocked jet streams characteristic of a quiet solar period and strong La Ninas and El Ninos. That is why the temperatures in the last several years in winter and summer have been so persistent. Depending on location, the low variability means larger and more consistent anomalies.

Roy Spencer reports, drroyspencer.com, that, as measured by satellites, the September global temperature remains abnormally high at + 0.60 C even though satellite measured sea surface temperatures are falling rapidly with the La Nina. As he states, given Mother Nature's sense of humor, he has given up predicting when the atmospheric temperatures will start to fall.

The Number of the Week is $1100 \times 10^4 \text{ knots}^2$ (approximate). This is the global Accumulated Cyclone Energy (ACE) over the past 24 months as reported by Ryan Maue (September 30, 2010). This estimate includes the energy of all cyclones including Atlantic Ocean hurricanes. **It is the lowest in 30 years.** For the Northern Hemisphere, the flurry of hurricanes in the Atlantic in September was counterbalanced by the lack of activity in the Pacific. According to IPCC, this is not supposed to happen. Please see the referenced article by Ryan Maue under "Extreme Weather."

#####

SEPP SCIENCE EDITORIAL #30-2010 (Oct. 9, 2010)

S Fred Singer Chairman, and President, Science and Environmental Policy Project (SEPP)

Some uncertainties in climate models

One may distinguish three types of uncertainties in deriving a temperature 'trend' from climate models (to compare with observed trends):

- Statistical uncertainty, which depends on the length of the run (i.e., number of years, conditioned by possible autocorrelation)
- Structural uncertainty: Determined by modeler's choice of forcings (esp. of aerosols) and parameterizations (esp. of cloud microphysics). This may include forcings currently poorly defined or unknown.
- "Chaotic" uncertainty: Many modelers make several "runs" (typically 2 to 5 "simulations") of the same model but report only the "Ensemble-Mean" (EM) rather than the individual trend values. [These EMs are then listed by the IPCC, together with the number of runs] The different trend

values result from the fact that each run has slightly different initial conditions and that the models are based on non-linear equations.

Only rarely will a modeler show the individual runs and trend values. For example, the Japanese Meteorological Research Institute (MRI) model shows the results for each of its five runs, before forming the ensemble-mean. The individual trend values range from 0.042 deg/decade to 0.371 – a range of nearly an order of magnitude. [Had they done more runs, the range would likely have been even greater].

The question now is: Which of the five trends should be compared with observations? OR: **How many runs need to be averaged to get a reliable trend value?**

I have tried to tackle this problem empirically and can send the draft of a short paper for comments to anyone interested.

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see:

www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm.

1. My Resignation from The American Physical Society

By Hal Lewis, University of California, Santa Barbara, Oct 8, 2010

<http://thegwpc.org/ipcc-news/1670-hal-lewis-my-resignation-from-the-american-physical-society.html>

With comments by Fred Singer

2. Americans (Sort of) Love Fracking

By Holman Jenkins, WSJ, Oct 6, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704469004575533911349588020.html?mod=ITP_opinion_0

3. Disingenuous EPA statement of the day

By Steve Milloy, Green Hell Blog, Oct 6, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://greenhellblog.com/2010/10/06/disingenuous-epa-statement-of-the-day/>

4. The Green Agenda

Editorial, IBD, Oct 4, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=549347>

5. Washington's New War on the West

By Ben Lieberman, Open Market, Oct 4, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://www.openmarket.org/2010/10/04/washingtons-new-war-on-the-west/>

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Challenging the Orthodoxy

On Wegman – Who will guard the guards themselves?

By Thomas Fuller, Watts Up With That, Oct 8, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/10/08/on-wegman-who-will-guard-the-guards-themselves/#more-26153>

Defending the Orthodoxy

Europe can join hands with Beijing on emissions

By John Gummer, Financial Times, Oct 6, 2010

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/45d3d994-d17a-11df-96d1-00144feabdc0.html>

[“America’s stall comes despite **upwards of \$100m in lobbying**, the alignment of a Democrat-controlled Congress and presidency, and the biggest oil disaster to hit the US.” ... “... we must accept that climate change doesn’t cut it in a country where suspicion of science, special interests wedded to status quo and constitutional ‘checks and balances’ all produce paralysis.” **Boldface added.**]

Decreasing Influence of IPCC?

Campaigning explodes as climate process risks disintegration

By Richard Black, BBC News, Oct 4, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/thereporters/richardblack/2010/10/this_week_marks_a_first.html

Progress limited in U.N. climate talks in China

Expectations, goals lowered

By Tini Tran, Washington Times, Oct 6, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/6/progress-limited-in-un-climate-talks-in-china/>

The Last U.N. Climate Extravaganza?

By John Broder, NYT, Oct 8, 2010

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/10/08/the-last-u-n-climate-extravaganza/?ref=science>

Weather Extremes

Dr. Ryan N. Maue's 2010 Global Tropical Cyclone Activity Update

By Ryan Maue, FSU, Oct 9, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.coaps.fsu.edu/~maue/tropical/>

Crop failures set to increase under climate change

By Hannah Isom, University of Leeds, Oct 7, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That]

http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2010-10/uol-cfs100710.php

[SEPP Comment: Did the authors ever hear of the great dust bowl?]

Coldest winter in 1,000 years on its way

Prime Time Russia, Oct 6, 2010 [H/t Thomas Burch]

<http://rt.com/prime-time/2010-10-04/coldest-winter-emergency-measures.html?fullstory>

[SEPP Comment: Considering the Little Ice Age, this is as speculative as hottest summer ever.]

The Curious History of ‘Global Climate Disruption’

By Russell Cook, American Thinker, Oct 4, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/10/the_curious_history_of_global.html

BP Oil Spill and Aftermath

Report Slams Administration for Underestimating Gulf Spill

By John Broder, NYT, Oct 6, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/07/science/earth/07spill.html?src=un&feedurl=http%3A%2F%2Fjson8.nytimes.com%2Fpages%2Fscience%2Findex.jsonp>

EU stops short of offshore drilling ban

UPI, Oct 8 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

http://www.upi.com/Science_News/Resource-Wars/2010/10/08/EU-stops-short-of-offshore-drilling-ban/UPI-30451286550361/

Energy Issues

United States Lags in Critical “Investment Race” to Develop World’s Future Energy Supply

Source of investment capital needed to meet energy demand growth remains a key question for the energy future

By David Hobbs & Daniel Yergin, IHSCERA, Sep, 2010

http://press.ihs.com/article_display.cfm?article_id=4297

For Those Near, the Miserable Hum of Clean Energy

By Tom Zeller, NYT, Oct 5, 2010

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/06/business/energy-environment/06noise.html?_r=1&th&emc=th

Households face £769-a-year rise in power bills to ‘rewire the nation’ for green energy

By Sean Poulter, Mail Online, Oct 5, 2010 [H/t Randy Randol]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1317600/769-year-rise-power-bills-rewire-nation-green-energy.html>

Solar boom drives up German power price

By Stefan Nicola, UPI, Oct 5, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.upi.com/Science_News/Resource-Wars/2010/10/05/Solar-boom-drives-up-German-power-price/UPI-74351286299555/

Obama opens land – and White House – to solar

By Shaun Tandon, AFP, Oct 5, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5j_GxX2IUs0K1SDJU_P-nihHWwwTA?docId=CNG.5cb7ef236c63dc32da7a98f3cefc25f2.e71

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

Sen. Bingaman’s Insidious National “Renewable Electricity Standard” (S.3813)

By Glenn Schleede, Master Resource, Oct 6, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/10/bingamans-national-res/>

Behind the Meltdown of the Climate-Change Bill

By Debra Saunders, Real Clear Politics, Oct 7, 2010

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2010/10/07/behind_the_meltdown_of_the_climate-change_bill_107470.html

EPA and other Regulators On the March

EPA to drain \$1 trillion from economy

Editorial, Washington Times, Oct 7, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/7/epa-to-drain-1-trillion-from-economy/>

Government looking at 62 mpg goal for 2025 autos

By Ken Thomas, Washington Times, Oct 1, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/oct/1/government-looking-62-mpg-goal-2025-autos/>

West Virginia Sues Over Mountaintop Mining Limits

By Erik Eckholm, NYT, Oct 6, 2010

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/10/06/west-virginia-sues-over-mountaintop-mining-limits/?ref=science>

Greens Shackle National Security – and Renewable Energy

By Paul Driessen, Townhall, Oct 2, 2010

http://townhall.com/columnists/PaulDriessen/2010/10/02/greens_shackle_national_security_-_and_renewable_energy/page/full/

California Dreaming

Overestimate fueled state's landmark diesel law

By Wyatt Buchanan, San Francisco Chronicle, Oct 8, 2010 [H/t Thomas Burch]

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/10/08/MNOF1FDMRV.DTL>

Escape clause from global warming law

By Mark Landsbaum, Orange County Register, Oct 1, 2010 [H/t Real Clear Politics]

<http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/-269159--.html>

Proposition 23 and the damage it would do to California

By Daniel Farber and Richard Frank, LA Times, Oct 4, 2010

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-farber-prop23-20101004,0,551916.story>

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

For a full list of articles see www.NIPCCreport.org

The Impact of Global Warming on Frog Populations

Reference: McCaffery R.M. and Maxell, B.A. 2010. Decreased winter severity increases viability of a montane frog population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* **107**: 8644-8649.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/06oct2010a1.html>

Life in Alpine Regions in a Warming World

Reference: Kullman, L. 2010. A richer, greener and smaller alpine world: Review and projection of warming-induced plant cover change in the Swedish Scandes. *Ambio* **39**: 159-169.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/06oct2010a6.html>

Climate Envelope Models of Plants and Animals

Reference: Nogues-Bravo, D. 2009. Predicting the past distribution of species climatic niches. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **18**: 521-531.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/07oct2010a2.html>

The Medieval Warm Period in Kyoto, Japan

Reference: Aono, Y. and Saito, S. 2010. Clarifying springtime temperature reconstructions of the medieval period by gap-filling the cherry blossom phenological data series at Kyoto, Japan. *International Journal of Biometeorology* **54**: 211-219.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/07oct2010a5.html>

Oh Mann!

Cuccinelli reissues global warming subpoena to U-VA

By Rosalind Helderman, Washington Post, Oct 4, 2010 [H/t David Manuta]

http://voices.washingtonpost.com/virginiapolitics/2010/10/virginia_attorney_general_ken_4.html?referrer=emaillink

Ken Cuccinelli seems determined to embarrass Virginia

Editorial, Washington Post, Oct 6, 2010

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/05/AR2010100504908.html?referrer=emailarticle>

Get the anti-science bent out of politics

By Michael Mann, Washington Post, Oct 8, 2010 [H/t David Manuta]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/07/AR2010100705484.html?referrer=emailarticle>

[SEPP Comment: Demanding integrity in scientific research is now playing politics?]

Advancing Climate Science

Multivariate ENSO Index (MEI) Personal views

By Klaus Wolter, NOAA Earth System Research Laboratory, Oct 7, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/people/klaus.wolter/MEI/>

[“El Niño/Southern Oscillation (ENSO) is the most important coupled ocean-atmosphere phenomenon to cause global climate variability on interannual time scales.”]

Solar Speculation

Sun’s Surprise: Even As It Relaxes, It May Heat the Earth’s Climate

By Denise Chow, Space.com, Oct 6, 2010 [H/t Larry Millstein]

<http://www.space.com/scienceastronomy/solar-cycle-impacts-earth-weather-101006.html>

Solar Speculation

By David Whitehouse, The Observatory, Oct 8, 2010 [H/t Tom Sheahen]

<http://thegwfpf.org/the-observatory/1662-solar-speculation.html>

Other Science Topics

Physics Nobel Honors Work on Ultra-Thin Carbon

By Dennis Overbye, NYT, Oct 5, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/06/science/06nobel.html?ref=technology>

3 Share Nobel in Chemistry for Work on Synthesizing Molecules

By Kenneth Change, NYT, Oct 6, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/07/science/07nobel.html?ref=science>

Census Uncovers Ocean’s Deep Secrets

Survey Names More Than a Thousand New Species, but Scientists Are Most Surprised by Huge Variety at Microbial Level

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, Oct 5, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704847104575532031662747228.html?mod=ITP_pageone_1

Scientists and Soldiers Solve a Bee Mystery

By Kirk Johnson, NYT, Oct 6, 2010

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/07/science/07bees.html?_r=1&th&emc=th

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Kill a schoolchild. How hilarious!

Richard Curtis will have his latest film hanging around his neck like a stinking fish for as long as he is successful enough to be worth mocking

By Dominic Lawson, The Independent, Oct 5, 2010 [H/t Joanne Nova]

<http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/dominic-lawson/dominic-lawson-kill-a-schoolchild-how-hilarious-2097680.html>

As another freezing winter looms, council hands out 2,000 shovels and tells residents ‘Dig yourselves out when it snows’

By Daily Mail Reporter, Daily Mail, Oct 9, 2010 [H/t Watts Up With That]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1318765/As-Arctic-winter-looms-council-hands-2-000-shovels-tells-residents-dig-snows.html>

Postcards from the future: illustrators imagine how London could be affected by climate change

Telegraph, UK, Oct 4, 2010 [H/t Malcolm Ross]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthpicturegalleries/8044199/Postcards-from-the-future-illustrators-imagine-how-London-could-be-affected-by-climate-change.html>

Osama bin Laden embraces his inner Al Gore

By Greg Miller, Washington Post, Oct 1, 2010 [H/t Joe Bast]

http://voices.washingtonpost.com/checkpoint-washington/2010/10/osama_bin_laden_embraces_his_i.html?referrer=emailink

#####

ARTICLES:

1. My Resignation from The American Physical Society

By Hal Lewis, University of California, Santa Barbara, Oct 8, 2010

<http://thegwpc.org/ipcc-news/1670-hal-lewis-my-resignation-from-the-american-physical-society.html>

With Comments by Fred Singer

To: Curtis G. Callan, Jr., Princeton University, President of the American Physical Society

6 October 2010

Dear Curt:

When I first joined the American Physical Society sixty-seven years ago it was much smaller, much gentler, and as yet uncorrupted by the money flood (a threat against which Dwight Eisenhower warned a half-century ago). Indeed, the choice of physics as a profession was then a guarantor of a life of poverty and abstinence---it was World War II that changed all that. The prospect of worldly gain drove few physicists. As recently as thirty-five years ago, when I chaired the first APS study of a contentious social/scientific issue, The Reactor Safety Study, though there were zealots aplenty on the outside there was no hint of inordinate pressure on us as physicists. We were therefore able to produce what I believe was and is an honest appraisal of the situation at that time. We were further enabled by the presence of an oversight committee consisting of Pief Panofsky, Vicki Weisskopf, and Hans Bethe, all towering physicists beyond reproach. I was proud of what we did in a charged atmosphere. In the end the oversight committee, in its report to the APS President, noted the complete independence in which we did the job, and predicted that the report would be attacked from both sides. What greater tribute could there be?

How different it is now. The giants no longer walk the earth, and the money flood has become the raison d'être of much physics research, the vital sustenance of much more, and it provides the support for untold numbers of professional jobs. For reasons that will soon become clear my former pride at being an APS Fellow all these years has been turned into shame, and I am forced, with no pleasure at all, to offer you my resignation from the Society.

It is of course, the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most

successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist. Anyone who has the faintest doubt that this is so should force himself to read the ClimateGate documents, which lay it bare. (Montford's book organizes the facts very well.) I don't believe that any real physicist, nay scientist, can read that stuff without revulsion. I would almost make that revulsion a definition of the word scientist.

So what has the APS, as an organization, done in the face of this challenge? It has accepted the corruption as the norm, and gone along with it. For example:

1. About a year ago a few of us sent an e-mail on the subject to a fraction of the membership. APS ignored the issues, but the then President immediately launched a hostile investigation of where we got the e-mail addresses. In its better days, APS used to encourage discussion of important issues, and indeed the Constitution cites that as its principal purpose. No more. Everything that has been done in the last year has been designed to silence debate

2. The appallingly tendentious APS statement on Climate Change was apparently written in a hurry by a few people over lunch, and is certainly not representative of the talents of APS members as I have long known them. So a few of us petitioned the Council to reconsider it. One of the outstanding marks of (in)distinction in the Statement was the poison word incontrovertible, which describes few items in physics, certainly not this one. In response APS appointed a secret committee that never met, never troubled to speak to any skeptics, yet endorsed the Statement in its entirety. (They did admit that the tone was a bit strong, but amazingly kept the poison word incontrovertible to describe the evidence, a position supported by no one.) In the end, the Council kept the original statement, word for word, but approved a far longer "explanatory" screed, admitting that there were uncertainties, but brushing them aside to give blanket approval to the original. The original Statement, which still stands as the APS position, also contains what I consider pompous and asinine advice to all world governments, as if the APS were master of the universe. It is not, and I am embarrassed that our leaders seem to think it is. This is not fun and games, these are serious matters involving vast fractions of our national substance, and the reputation of the Society as a scientific society is at stake.

3. In the interim the ClimateGate scandal broke into the news, and the machinations of the principal alarmists were revealed to the world. It was a fraud on a scale I have never seen, and I lack the words to describe its enormity. Effect on the APS position: none. None at all. This is not science; other forces are at work.

4. So a few of us tried to bring science into the act (that is, after all, the alleged and historic purpose of APS), and collected the necessary 200+ signatures to bring to the Council a proposal for a Topical Group on Climate Science, thinking that open discussion of the scientific issues, in the best tradition of physics, would be beneficial to all, and also a contribution to the nation. I might note that it was not easy to collect the signatures, since you denied us the use of the APS membership list. We conformed in every way with the requirements of the APS Constitution, and described in great detail what we had in mind---simply to bring the subject into the open.

5. To our amazement, Constitution be damned, you declined to accept our petition, but instead used your own control of the mailing list to run a poll on the members' interest in a TG on Climate and the Environment. You did ask the members if they would sign a petition to form a TG on your yet-to-be-defined subject, but provided no petition, and got lots of affirmative responses. (If you had asked about sex you would have gotten more expressions of interest.) There was of course no such petition or proposal, and you have now dropped the Environment part, so the whole matter is moot. (Any lawyer will tell you that you cannot collect signatures on a vague petition, and then fill in whatever you like.) The entire purpose of this exercise was to avoid your constitutional responsibility to take our petition to the Council.

6. As of now you have formed still another secret and stacked committee to organize your own TG, simply ignoring our lawful petition.

APS management has gamed the problem from the beginning, to suppress serious conversation about the merits of the climate change claims. Do you wonder that I have lost confidence in the organization?

I do feel the need to add one note, and this is conjecture, since it is always risky to discuss other people's motives. This scheming at APS HQ is so bizarre that there cannot be a simple explanation for it. Some have held that the physicists of today are not as smart as they used to be, but I don't think that is an issue. I think it is the money, exactly what Eisenhower warned about a half-century ago. There are indeed trillions of dollars involved, to say nothing of the fame and glory (and frequent trips to exotic islands) that go with being a member of the club. Your own Physics Department (of which you are chairman) would lose millions a year if the global warming bubble burst. When Penn State absolved Mike Mann of wrongdoing, and the University of East Anglia did the same for Phil Jones, they cannot have been unaware of the financial penalty for doing otherwise. As the old saying goes, you don't have to be a weatherman to know which way the wind is blowing. Since I am no philosopher, I'm not going to explore at just which point enlightened self-interest crosses the line into corruption, but a careful reading of the ClimateGate releases makes it clear that this is not an academic question.

I want no part of it, so please accept my resignation. APS no longer represents me, but I hope we are still friends.

Hal

Harold Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, former Chairman; Former member Defense Science Board, chmn of Technology panel; Chairman DSB study on Nuclear Winter; Former member Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Former member, President's Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee; Chairman APS study on Nuclear Reactor Safety Chairman Risk Assessment Review Group; Co-founder and former Chairman of JASON; Former member USAF Scientific Advisory Board; Served in US Navy in WW II; books: Technological Risk (about, surprise, technological risk) and Why Flip a Coin (about decision making)

COMMENTS by Fred Singer

I am immensely proud of Hal Lewis and of the cogent and literate way in which he has phrased his letter of resignation from APS. I would join him in a minute -- except I am no longer an APS member, though still an elected Fellow of the Society.

What a shame that the APS will lose someone with unique experience and wisdom -- just when such talents are needed. I am afraid that many others, true scientists who value search for truth and open discussion, will join Hal -- leaving APS much poorer.

From personal experience I can testify that the current president of the APS and certain others have avoided any discussion of the physical evidence about climate change -- and specifically, the lack of evidence for supporting the IPCC claim of anthropogenic global warming. Thus the APS policy statement on GW remains and will constitute a stain on the good name of the APS -- and unfortunately, also on its members.

Again, I salute Hal Lewis for his courage and his willingness to speak the truth as he sees it. He will be proven right -- and hopefully, soon.

S. Fred Singer

Fellow APS, AGU, AAAS, AIAA. Prof Emeritus, Univ of Virginia. Formerly: Director, US Weather Satellite Service; Deputy Asst Secretary of Interior, Deputy Asst Administrator of EPA, Chief Scientist of US Dept of Transportation; Vice Chm of National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere. Served in US Navy in WW II. Books: Unstoppable Global Warming (2007); Nature, not human activity, rules the Climate (2008); Climate Change Reconsidered (2009)

2. Americans (Sort of) Love Fracking

By Holman Jenkins, WSJ, Oct 6, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704469004575533911349588020.html?mod=ITP_opini_on_0

Folks who've been hanging on in places like upstate New York and Pennsylvania for 100 years waiting for another economic boom have finally got one, thanks to the Marcellus Shale.

Hydraulic fracturing combined with horizontal drilling has given energy producers an economical way to release natural gas in this massive, dense formation. So stupendous is the potential, it could transform global energy politics and economics.

Listen closely to the resulting "environmental" debate and the real question is: Do the locals want a boom?

Fracking divides neighbor from neighbor, roughly speaking the penurious locals from the weekend residents and gentleman farmers. It has fired up environmental groups who have a nose for saleable controversy to raise donations.

The EPA is moving in, keen to regulate fracking under the Safe Drinking Water Act. Even Hollywood has decided it can't miss this train to controversy and self regard, financing a couple of anti-fracking movies.

All are clamoring to mix it up in the anti-fracking fight, which will certainly mislead any local opponents who think the fracking boom will now be stopped in its tracks.

As a report from the Houston investment firm of Tudor Pickering shrewdly predicted in June, there will be no fracking ban. Too much money, too many jobs, too much revenue for state government is at stake. Instead: "The gold-rush-like endeavor called shale drilling will morph from trial-and-error into a more institutionalized affair. . . . Bigger companies will have a growing advantage, because they can better afford to prevent spills and leaks and correct them when they happen."

Yep, the sound and fury of the fracking debate is really just the noise of the fracking phenomenon being domesticated.

In three short years, the technique has turned the U.S. from a declining producer of gas into a rising one. Trucks rumble down rural roads, kicking up dust and shaking the foundations of century-old farmhouses. Large industrial operations are springing up overnight. Some place the value of Marcellus gas at an awesome \$2 trillion.

Those who value pastoral poverty and bucolic quietude over all this grubby commercialism will just have to adjust, as the fishermen and sportsmen and sun bathers of the Gulf Coast have learned to live with oil drillers (and vice versa). As residents of every city have adjusted to waves of decay and gentrification. As everyone everywhere takes the good and bad of economic change.

Not that their cries of pain and dislocation are unnoticed by the political system. In the tight Pennsylvania senate race, Democrat Joe Sestak has ventured a call for a moratorium, hoping it will do him more good in the 'burbs than harm in the boonies. His opponent, Pat Toomey, says a moratorium would be an attack on jobs, jobs, jobs.

Tellingly, neither party's Pennsylvania gubernatorial candidate wants to stop fracking. And current Democratic Gov. Ed Rendell has been busy opening up state forestland to fracking and trying to enact a state "severance tax" to enlarge the commonwealth's share of the spoils.

Clearer than ever too is that landowners who benefit from leasing their property to drillers greatly outnumber the active opponents. One company, Chesapeake Energy, claims alone to have contracted with one million American households.

The political fight is now mutating into a battle of the cities, especially New York and Philadelphia, against their upstate watersheds. Water is the key to most of fracking's environmental worries. Fracking involves injecting water, sand and chemicals deep underground to create fissures in gas-bearing rock. Though fracking itself takes place thousands of feet below the water table, surface spills of fracking fluid and migration of shallow gas into aquifers are real concerns—though fixable with careful well design and scrupulous management of surface activities.

Technology is advancing. Schlumberger and Trican, two oil-field technology firms, have come out with greener fracking fluids. Regulation or the threat of it is squeezing out the bad or undercapitalized actors (or the politically unconnected ones). Exxon recently bought XTO Energy. Shell bought East Resources Inc. Already 1,800 wells are working in the Keystone state, with 30,000 expected. That number will change the scenery in a big way.

An entire region of the country is unexpectedly being transformed by a new industry. Toes are being stepped on, but money and politics will slop around in ways designed to reduce the opposition to manageable proportions. That's what politics is for.

3. Disingenuous EPA statement of the day

By Steve Milloy, Green Hell Blog, Oct 6, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://greenhellblog.com/2010/10/06/disingenuous-epa-statement-of-the-day/>

In an [interview](#) with Politico.com about her damn-the-critics approach to greenhouse gas (GHG) regulation, EPA administrator Lisa Jackson said,

“The Clean Air Act is a tool. It’s not the optimal tool. But it can be used. **And, in fact, I’m legally obligated now to use it.** And so we’ve laid a lot of groundwork on that and we’ll continue.” [Emphasis added]

But EPA is not, in fact, legally obligated to regulate GHGs under the Clean Air Act.

In its March 2007 decision *Massachusetts v. EPA*, the Supreme Court ruled only that the EPA may — not that it had to — regulate GHGs. And the Bush administration subsequently declined to regulate GHGs.

It wasn’t until December 2009 that the Obama EPA got around to declaring greenhouse gases to be a threat to the public welfare (the so-called “endangerment” finding), an optional pronouncement that enabled the EPA to move toward regulating greenhouse gases.

But just as the EPA opted to make the endangerment finding, it could opt to reverse it, thereby relieving the agency of any obligation to regulate GHGs under the Clean Air Act.

Lisa Jackson knows full well that the EPA does [not] (sic) have to regulate GHGs, yet she plays to the media like her hands are tied to following an economically-suicidal and environmentally-futile course.

4. The Green Agenda

Editorial, IBD, Oct 4, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=549347>

Regulation: When Democrats lecture us about lower-cost clean energy and planet-friendly conservation, what are they actually talking about? Beware. Their proposals are not as virtuous as they sound.

In keeping with President Obama's promise to slow the rise of the oceans and heal the planet, the Energy Department has set new efficiency standards for 26 appliances and household products. The list ranges from microwaves, to washing machines and dryers, to residential water heaters and dishwashers.

The department reportedly claims the new standards will save consumers from \$250 billion to \$300 billion on their energy costs through 2030. But that's what Democrats always say about their green schemes: "We're doing this to clean up the Earth, and we're going to save you money while we do it."

Don't believe it.

"If past experience is any guide, these regulations will raise the purchase price of appliances — in some cases more than is ever likely to be earned back in the form of energy savings," Ben Lieberman, an environmental policy analyst at the Competitive Enterprise Institute, wrote recently at openmarkets.org, a CEI blog.

"Worse, several may adversely impact product performance and reliability. There are potentially problematic regulations on the way for virtually every room in the house."

Why do we believe Lieberman over the federal government? Because government spending projections and savings estimates are consistently wrong. With little if any exceptions, programs cost more than the experts say they will, and the savings just don't materialize. As Lieberman says, "If past experience is any guide . . ."

Providing more of a public service than the Energy Department, Lieberman has listed how the new rules will affect every room in the house.

The problems start in the basement, where price increases for water heaters that comply with federal rules range "from \$67 to \$974 depending on size and type."

They're also found in the laundry room, where the money-losing effects of the last round of washer-dryer regulations "managed to ... raise the cost of many models by hundreds of dollars while compromising cleaning ability." Another round, Lieberman writes, has the potential to "make things worse."

Every room in between is also subject to the costs forced by the new standards and busybody bureaucrats still trying to limit the amount of water that paying customers use in their bathrooms.

While the administration has settled on these new rules, it's considering a fresh set of mandates that will increase Americans' costs beyond the home. If the White House's proposed auto mileage standards are

enshrined into the regulatory framework, car prices will be artificially inflated in the same way appliance prices are being pushed higher by nonmarket forces.

Fuel efficiency comes at a price. The new corporate-average fuel economy standard of 34.1 mpg that takes effect in 2016 will force the price of cars up \$1,100, according to the administration's own estimates. The cost might be higher. A study by Global Insight of California's planned standards, which might be adopted federally, found that due to a 50% to 70% increase in power-train costs, the price for large, luxury vehicles could increase by \$5,000.

Though the administration knows its mandates will make cars less affordable, it continues to push even deeper into irrational territory. Last week, it floated a plan to jack the CAFE standard to as much as 62 mpg by 2025. If the intent is to make cars unaffordable, the White House's master planners are doing their job, though somebody seems to have forgotten that forcing new-car prices higher will guarantee that older, dirtier cars stay on the road longer.

Given all this, isn't it clear what those on the left are up to? Platitudes about cleansing the environment and saving the planet may sound reasonable, even noble. But there's a dark side with painful, unseen costs and fewer freedoms.

Don't trust the rhetoric.

5. Washington's New War on the West

By Ben Lieberman, Open Market, Oct 4, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://www.openmarket.org/2010/10/04/washingtons-new-war-on-the-west/>

The economic track record of the current administration and Congress is not a good one. Unemployment remains stubbornly high at nearly 10 percent, and many believe federal missteps prolonged the recession and are weakening the recovery. While things like ill-advised spending, Obamacare, and looming tax hikes are doing damage nationwide, a number of other federal measures have particularly burdened the American West, the region suffering with the highest unemployment rate in the country. The Senate and House Western Caucuses' recent study, "The War on Western Jobs ^[1]," documents the host of environmental policies that have targeted the sectors crucial to the economies of Western states — especially energy production but also mining, logging, farming, and ranching.

It is important to note that the federal government controls the economic fate of western states to a greater extent than any other part of the country. The lands comprising 12 western states (Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska) are nearly half owned by the federal government. More so than other regions, job losses in the West can be traced to federal policies.

The Obama administration's attack on Western energy jobs began within weeks of taking power when the Department of the Interior revoked 77 oil and gas leases in Utah and halted new oil shale projects in Colorado. By the end of 2009, the administration had issued fewer onshore energy leases than in any year under Bush or Clinton, and the pace thus far in 2010 is no better. Throughout the West, vast energy-containing federal lands are currently off-limits, and the administration and Congress have sought to restrict access to millions of additional acres. Even where energy leasing is not explicitly prohibited, Obama's regulators have imposed red tape and bureaucratic delays that have substantially limited it.

Beyond oil and gas, the administration has all but declared war on coal mining, which is particularly vital to Wyoming and Montana. The Environmental Protection Agency's global warming regulations as well as many other anti-coal measures (including Boiler MACT, combustion byproducts, new National Ambient Air Quality Standards, others) bode ill for the future of western coal.

The threat of new energy taxes has only added to the chilling effect on Western investment in energy projects.

In addition to the impact on energy production, the federal government's excessive ownership of land — as well as intrusive measures like the Endangered Species Act that target private property — is posing growing problems for other industries. Despite the West's mineral wealth, mining jobs continue to decline. The same is true of logging. Farmers and ranchers also face a host of costly hurdles.

Instead of providing regulatory relief that could turn the region's economy around, Congress has proposed new constraints like the sweeping Clean Water Restoration Act. This bill would essentially federalize land-use decisions on any property containing wetlands, and compounds the threat by defining wetlands so expansively so as to include almost everywhere. And the Obama Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture's Forest Service have issued new agency guidance for federal lands, which under the name of addressing global warming would further restrict access.

Granted, Washington's control over western lands and the misuse of that control to curtail economic activity is not a new phenomenon, but the current administration and Congress have taken it to a new level.

The West's economic pain has not been justified by environmental gain. Quite the contrary, Uncle Sam turns out to be a lousy landlord. For example, the forest fires that have become common in Western lands in recent years have mostly originated on federal lands, and not on privately-held forests which tend to be better managed against such risks. A less-intrusive federal approach could deliver both economic and environmental benefits.

The next Congress should have a long list of reforms on its agenda. The Western Caucuses' report spells out what needs to be addressed to get the American West back on the path to prosperity.

#####

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.