

The Week That Was: 2010-11-13 (November 13, 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:

“...but OMB and Treasury found severe problems with ‘the economic integrity of government support for renewables.’” – WSJ Report on an internal White House Memo

Number of the Week: 65.8 GWe to 0.7 GWe

THIS WEEK:

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

Distinguished physicist Hal Lewis caused a furor when he submitted his letter of resignation to the American Physical Society (APS). The response from APS was more typical of an authoritarian organization than a scientific society. This week, Hal Lewis sent his response to APS which was posted, at his request, on Anthony Watts’ web site Watts Up With That. Lewis insists the statement by APS embracing the IPCC version of global warming must be retracted and proposes two reforms to the society. Please see Article # 1.

The American Thinker published a piece by Fred Singer demonstrating that the biases in *New York Times* editorials lead to ludicrous assertions such as the newspaper accusing those who do not subscribe to Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) as denying climate change – something that has been taking place for millions of years. Such claims are the result of the failure by the newspaper to listen to the assertions those who challenge the IPCC and AGW advocates. Please see Article # 2.

When the IPCC insisted that its 2007 Assessment Report was correct and the glaciers of the Himalayan Mountains will melt by 2035, the government of India engaged Indian Himalayan expert V.K. Raina to make an independent report. The independent report noted that some glaciers are receding and others are advancing. Sometimes different tongues of the same glacier are moving in opposite directions, one receding while another is advancing. There is no general trend. To double check this work, the government of India engaged Australian ice expert Cliff Ollier who described the work of V.K. Rina as splendid and found the IPCC claims are “unsupported, unscientific, and wrong.”

The Global Warming Policy Forum published an exceptional article by Cliff Ollier on the ice sheets in Greenland and Antarctica. Ollier devastates the naiveté displayed by alarmists in making their assertions. Apparently, many of these alarmists do not understand difference in the movement of ice if it is in a bowl that is right side up, or on a bowl that is upside down. Please see Article #3.

On Monday, the Tribune Newspapers, to include the Chicago Tribune and the Los Angeles Times, carried an article announcing that several groups, including the American Geophysical Union (AGU), are preparing scientists to speak out against those who question that humans are causing unprecedented and dangerous global warming. This effort is apparently in response to polls showing that fewer people believe the AGW claim. The mantra of AGW enthusiasts is that the “deniers” are engaged in a well-funded, effective, and professionally run disinformation campaign in which AGW climate scientists cannot compete. They claim that this disinformation campaign supposedly creates confusion among the populace causing many people to think climate science is unreliable or controversial.

Roy Spencer quickly posted an effective rebuttal pointing out that it is the alarmists who have received billions of dollars for their work and have spent large sums on advertising campaigns. [The 2007 grand announcement of the Fourth IPCC Summary for Policymakers comes to mind, which was complete with glorious fireworks near the Eiffel Tower in Paris.] Please see Article # 4.

AGU quickly announced a qualifying statement saying it would enlist 700 climate scientists to respond to questions from journalists. Needless to say, skeptics need not apply. Please see referenced articles under Defending the Orthodoxy.

If scientific organizations are truly interested in communicating the science of AGW to the public, they would disavow the propaganda that has infected the entire issue for decades. Necessary steps include stopping the use of scientifically meaningless slogans such as climate change, disruptive climate change, or climate protection as substitutes for the real issue: are humans causing unprecedented and dangerous global warming?

Those who wish to communicate science to the public should object to propaganda photos that commonly accompany articles on carbon dioxide. These ubiquitous photos show emissions from smokestacks at power plants blackening the sky. Carbon dioxide is invisible. What appears to be blackening the sky is water vapor condensing under certain atmospheric conditions and exceptional lighting conditions. Several examples appear in the articles referenced below including the article by Tribune Newspapers.

Those organizations claiming to be scientific should recognize *ad hominem* propaganda attacks, such the recent book by Oreskes and Conway, for what they are, and denounce those attacks rather than treat them as scientific works. And, of course, objective scientific organizations should proclaim the results of the IPCC models are sophisticated speculation from unverified models rather than scientifically supported predictions.

A Wall Street Journal article on a leaked White House memo contained the Quote of the Week. Apparently the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Treasury question the wisdom of huge subsidies for wind farms, thus are delaying approvals for massive amounts of subsidies under the stimulus bill. According to the article, a wind farm at Shepherds Flat, Oregon will receive a total of \$1.2 Billion in Federal, state, and ratepayer subsidies. According to another article, the total permanent jobs created will be 35. This works out to over \$34 Million per job. Please see Article #5.

The 16th Conference of Parties (COP-16) under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change will be held in Cancun, Mexico, starting November 29. It may be a dud. The original concept was to have nations commit to treaty far stronger than the Kyoto Protocol. In Article # 6, Bjorn Lomborg expresses why he thinks COP-16 may be a failure and then pleads for massive funds to support a technological fix to the non-problem of global warming. The skeptical environmentalist should become a skeptical economist, or physicist.

Even though sustained US unemployment is the highest since the Great Depression, the EPA announced additional restrictive measures that will throttle economic growth. Please see articles referenced under EPA and Other Regulators On the March.

THE NUMBER OF THE WEEK is 65.8 GWe to 0.7 GWe. This is the NET increase in capacity from coal-fired electrical generation for 2008 in China and in the US, respectively. According to the World Nuclear Association, referenced in an earlier TWTW, in 2008 China added 91.8 GWe of capacity in new coal-fired plants while closing 26 GWe in old coal-fired plants. According to the US Energy Information Administration the US added 1.5 GWe in new coal-fired plants while closing 0.8 GWe in old coal-fired plants. The additions were on existing sites.

Solar and wind advocates claim the US is losing the race with China for so - called 21st Century energy. Once again, it appears China is in a different race.

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below please see: www.haapala.com/sepp/the-week-that-was.cfm.

1. Another letter from Hal Lewis to the American Physical Society

By Hal Lewis, WUWT, Nov 6, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/11/06/another-letter-from-hal-lewis-to-the-american-physical-society/#more-27526>

2. Climate Alarmism at the New York Times

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Nov 7, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2010/11/climate_alarmism_at_the_new_yo.html

3. No Cause For Alarm Over Sea Level Or Ice Sheets

By Cliff Ollier, School of Earth and Environment, University of Western Australia, Nov 11, 2010 [H/t John Cribbs]

<http://thegwpf.org/science-news/1837-no-cause-for-alarm-over-sea-level-or-ice-sheets.html>

4. Climate Scientists Plan Campaign Against global Warming Skeptics

By Roy Spencer, Nov 8, 2010

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

5. Wind Jammers at the White House

A Larry Summers memo exposes the high cost of energy corporate welfare

Editorial, WSJ, Nov 11, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704635704575604502103371986.html?mod=djemEditorialPage_h

6. Can Anything Serious Happen in Cancun?

The upcoming climate summit promises more proposals that ignore economic reality.

By Bjorn Lomborg, WSJ, Nov 12, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703848204575608311276024450.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

[SEPP Comment: Another appeal for an expensive technological fix to a non-problem.]

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Climategate Continued

Environmentalists ‘exaggerated’ threat to tropical rainforests from global warming

By David Derbyshire, Mail Online, Nov 12, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-1328853/Environmentalists-exaggerated-threat-tropical-rainforests-global-warming.html?ito=feeds-newsxml>

Challenging the Orthodoxy

Branding of Dissenters Has Begun – Clearing The Path To A Climate Science Pogrom

By P. Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Nov 11, 2010 [H/t WUWT]

<http://notrickszone.com/2010/11/11/branding-of-science-dissenters-has-begun-clearing-the-path-to-a-climate-science-pogrom/>

[SEPP Comment: Fred Singer's talk to the German Parliament created a hostile reaction from the Green Industry.]

McKittrick Rebuts Deutsche Bank

By Steve McIntyre, Climate Audit, Nov 9, 2010

<http://climateaudit.org/2010/11/09/mckittrick-rebuts-deutsche-bank/>

[SEPP Comment: As noted in a prior TWTW, Deutsche Bank has a multi-billion dollar portfolio for Green investment. It engaged the Columbia Climate Center to justify such investments. The subsequent DB report incorrectly stated the conclusions of the 2006 reports by NAS and by Wegman et al. regarding the 'hockey stick.' The referenced paper further addresses such misstatements.]

Inconvenient nonsense infiltrates the classroom

By Bob Carter, The Australian, Nov 11, 2010

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/inconvenient-nonsense-infiltrates-the-classroom/story-e6frg6zo-1225951336015>

Defending the Orthodoxy

Climate scientists plan campaign against global warming skeptics

The American Geophysical Union plans to announce that 700 researchers have agreed to speak out on the issue. Other scientists plan a pushback against congressional conservatives who have vowed to kill regulations on greenhouse gas emissions.

By Neela Banerjee, Chicago Tribune, Nov 8, 2010

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/la-na-climate-scientists-20101108,0,3784003.story>

[SEPP Comment: Typical propaganda photo of smokestack emissions darkening the skies with condensing water vapor?]

AGU Manufacturing Climate Consensus

By Anne Jolie, WSJ Political Diary, Nov 12, 2010

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

Desperate Days For Global Warm-ongers

Editorial, IBD, Nov 11, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/553263/201011091902/Desperate-Days-For-Global-Warm-ongers.htm>

'No climate talks in future if Cancun fails'

Chetan Chauhan, Hindustan Times, Nov 10, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano, Climate Depot]

<http://www.hindustantimes.com/rssfeed/newdelhi/No-climate-talks-in-future-if-Cancun-fails/Article1-624546.aspx>

[SEPP Comment: Is this bad news?]

A Novel Tactic in Climate Fight Gains Some traction

By John Broder, NYT, Nov 8, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/09/science/earth/09montreal.html?ref=science>

[SEPP Comment: Distort the language of the Ozone Treaty to cover global warming.]

Bank Tax, CO2 Auctions Recommended by Soros Panel to Help Climate Efforts

By Alex Morales and Jim Efstathiou, Bloomberg, Nov 5, 2010 [H/t Patrick Quirk]

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-11-05/soros-panel-draft-says-bank-taxes-co2-auctions-can-fund-climate-aid.html>

Seeking a Common Ground

Is this the start of a proper, open debate on climate change?

By the Scientific Alliance, Nov 12, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

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

[SEPP Comment: Thoughtful questions concerning those who are considered part of the orthodoxy but question its tactics and some of its conclusions.]

BP Oil Spill and Aftermath

Interior inspector general: White House skewed drilling-ban report

Dan Berman, Politico, Nov 9, 2010

<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1110/44921.html>

Anger overflows on drilling halt report

IG: Scientists didn't back ban

By Kara Rowland, Washington Times, Nov 10, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/nov/10/anger-overflows-on-drilling-halt-report/>

Offshore Drilling Commission Convenes: Same Attacks, Still Missing The Facts

By Thomas Pyle, IBD, Nov 5, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/552869/201011051822/Offshore-Drilling-Commission-Convenes-Same-Old-Attacks-Still-Missing-The-Facts.aspx>

Energy Issues

The Great Transmission Heist

The latest scheme to subsidize solar and wind power to the detriment of rate payers

Editorial, WSJ, Nov 7, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304772804575558400606672006.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

Food industry faces off against EPA over ethanol ruling

By P.J. Huffstutter, Los Angeles Times, Nov 11, 2010

http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/money_co/2010/11/epa-ethanol-grocery-lawsuit-e15-corn-fuel-commodities.html

EU biofuel policy will increase CO2 emissions, study says

By Andrew Willis, EU Observer, Nov 8, 2010 [H/t Catherine French]

<http://euobserver.com/9/31210/?rk=1>

Cost of Green Power Makes Projects Tougher Sell

By Matthew Wald and Tom Zeller, NYT, Nov 7, 2010

http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/08/science/earth/08fossil.html?_r=1&nl=todaysheadlines&emc=tha24

Ethanol subsidies pose early test for the GOP

By Timothy Carney, Washington Examiner, Nov 5, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/Ethanol-subsidies-pose-early-test-for-the-GOP-1465907-106781458.html>

IEA expects 'golden age' for gas industry

By Stefan Nicola, UPI, Nov 9, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.upi.com/Science_News/Resource-Wars/2010/11/09/IEA-expects-golden-age-for-gas-industry/UPI-56511289313518/

Global gas glut threatens alternative power sources: EIA

By Robin Pagnamenta, Times, AU, Nov 10, 2010

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/mining-energy/global-gas-glut-threatens-alternative-power-sources-warns-iea/story-e6frg9ef-1225950688234>

[SEPP Comment: Apparently alternative energy sources cannot compete with natural gas in many parts of the world.]

Green jobs cut despite government subsidy

Editorial, Orange County Register, Nov 10, 2010 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/solyndra-275413-government-jobs.html>

[SEPP Comment: Even with \$535 Million in loan guarantees to this Spanish company to build in the US, it could not compete with the Chinese.]

IET: Wind turbines and solar panels are not the best way for homes to reduce carbon emissions

Politics. UK. Oct 7, 2010

[http://www.politics.co.uk/opinion-formers/press-releases/business-and-industry/iet-wind-turbines-and-solar-panels-are-not-the-best-way-for-homes-to-reduce-carbon-emissions-\\$21384582\\$21384356.htm](http://www.politics.co.uk/opinion-formers/press-releases/business-and-industry/iet-wind-turbines-and-solar-panels-are-not-the-best-way-for-homes-to-reduce-carbon-emissions-$21384582$21384356.htm)

EPA and other Regulators On the March

EPA's Permitting Guidance for Greenhouse Gases – Does It Endanger Coal?

By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming. Org, Nov 11, 2010

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2010/11/11/can-best-available-control-technology-bact-require-fuel-switching/>

E.P.A. Issues Guidance on New Emissions Rules

By John Broder, NYT, Nov 10, 2010

<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/11/10/e-p-a-issues-guidance-on-new-emissions-rules/?ref=science>

[SEPP Comment: Great propaganda photo of smokestack emissions from a coal-fired power plant near Emmitt, Kan. darkening the sky with – condensing water vapor?]

How EPA could destroy 7.3 million jobs

By William Shughart II, Washington Examiner, Nov 12, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/-William-F-Shughart-II-How-EPA-could-destroy-73-million-jobs-107504388.html>

Bay cleanup could cost billions, require tax hikes

By Ben Giles, Washington Examiner, Nov 5, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/local/Bay-cleanup-could-cost-billions-require-tax-hikes-1444010-106796513.html>

Agency Pushes Halliburton to Hand Over Drilling Data

By Stephen Power and Siobhan Hughes, WSJ, Nov 10, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704635704575604552987616976.html?mod=ITP_pageone_1

[SEPP Comment: Preparing to regulate hydraulic fracturing – the one bright spot in the energy picture?]

California Dreaming

California Dreaming: Missing America's Wake-Up Call

By Larry Bell, Forbes.com, Nov 10, 2010

<http://www.forbes.com/2010/11/10/california-texas-climate-change-law-opinions-contributors-larry-bell.html>

Calif.'s Little-Noticed Prop 26 Squeaks Through in Dead of Night

By Colin Sullivan, NYT, Nov 3, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2010/11/03/03greenwire-califs-little-noticed-prop-26-squeaks-through-59912.html>

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

A Century of Parana River Streamflow Data

Reference: Mauas, P.J.D., Flamenco, E. and Buccino, A.P. 2008. Solar forcing of the stream flow of a continental scale South American river. *Physical Review Letters* 101: 168501.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/11nov2010a6.html>

Floods of the Mississippi River System

Reference: Pinter, N., Jemberie, A.A., Remo, J.W.F., Heine, R.A. and Ickes, B.S. 2008. Flood trends and river engineering on the Mississippi River system. *Geophysical Research Letters* 35: 10.1029/2008GL035987.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/10nov2010a5.html>

Coral Reefs and Climate Change: Unproved Assumptions

Reference: Maynard, J.A., Baird, A.H. and Pratchett, M.S. 2008b. Revisiting the Cassandra syndrome; the changing climate of coral reef research. *Coral Reefs* 27: 745-749..

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/10nov2010a3.html>

Global Warming and the Biodiversity of Small temperate Ponds

Reference: Rosset, V., Lehmann, A. and Oertli, B. 2010. Warmer and richer? Predicting the impact of climate warming on species richness in small temperate waterbodies. *Global Change Biology* 16: 2376-2387.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/10nov2010a4.html>

Other Issues that May Be Of Interest

What the Green Movement Got Wrong: Greens come to see the error of their ways

By Charles Moore, Telegraph, UK, Nov 11, 2010 [H/t Joe Bast]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/charlesmoore/8116595/What-the-Green-Movement-Got-Wrong-Greens-come-to-see-the-error-of-their-ways.html>

The Crash Of The Climate Exchange

Editorial, IBD, Nov 9, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/553236/201011091851/The-Crash-Of-The-Climate-Exchange.htm>

[SEPP Comment: Only after the original promoters made a bundle.]

Can the U.S. Compete on Rare Earths?

Editorial, NYT, Nov 9, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2010/11/08/can-the-us-compete-on-rare-earths?nl=todaysheadlines&emc=ab1>

Mining the Seafloor for Rare-Earth Minerals

By William Broad, NYT, Nov 8, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/09/science/09seafloor.html?ref=science>

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Current Global Warming May Reverse Circulation in Atlantic Ocean, as It Did 20,000 Years Ago

Science Daily, Nov 4, 2010 [H/t Eric Gottshall]

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/11/101103141541.htm>

[SEPP Comment: At least according to the headline writer, a reversal of circulation in the Atlantic caused the global warming that ended the ice age. Now global warming will cause another reversal of circulation that will bring on a new ice age?]

Oil will run dry before substitutes roll out: study

At the current pace of research and development, global oil will run out 90 years before replacement technologies are ready, says a new University of California, Davis, study based on stock market expectations.

Physorg, Nov 9 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.physorg.com/news/2010-11-oil-substitutes.html>

[SEPP Comment: Poor concepts from economics come to engineering and physics.]

Flashback 2005: UN warns of 50 MILLION climate Refugees a year – by 2010

ICECAP, Nov 12, 2010

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

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Another letter from Hal Lewis to the American Physical Society

By Hal Lewis, WUWT, Nov 6, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/11/06/another-letter-from-hal-lewis-to-the-american-physical-society/#more-27526>

Dear Curt: (Callen)

When on October 6 I sent you my letter of resignation from APS , I of course expected the Empire to strike back in one way or another. It pleased me however, when I read your response, to find a very minimum of ad hominem attacks, confined mostly to apparently irresistible eruptions of “Lewis is a liar.” (“His statements are all false” is the equivalent.) So I thank you for that courtesy.

What took me by surprise was the pusillanimous, almost puerile, tone of the comment, which reads more like an ad for a used-car lot than as a declaration of a great scientific society. All our products have passed a complete inspection by our factory-trained mechanics. We’re making no money on this, take it and be thankful. Etc. Not a single major issue confronted in any substantive way. Yet everyone knows about the sloppy handling of the 2007 statement; everyone knows about the financial investments of many of the major players; there is plenty of dirt in the public domain, yet you continue to pretend it is all in a different universe.

Curt, you cannot have written such a shabby document.

Roger Cohen has written an incisive deconstruction of your response, and I can add little, so let me turn to the repair options. For the record, though my resignation from APS gives me no standing, my objective

here is to help slow the APS rush toward the cliff. This is what I think must be done at the proximate meeting of the Council.

1. The 2007 statement should be simply withdrawn. No excuses, no caveats, no unnecessary embarrassment, no statement of principles, no references to future research, simply withdrawn. It was a mistake. This is the sine qua non for restoring the honor of APS.

2. The Council should promulgate a transparent conflict-of-interest policy, comparable to those used by the government. Those offended by this might even serve under reasonable constraints. Others should not serve. Many know how to do this. It is insane to have people with millions of dollars at stake determining APS policy on such matters.

3. The APS management has become a conglomerate force in itself. This is largely through neglect, because the Council is drawn too specifically through its major fields, and in all too many cases the policies are drawn by very few members, often with an axe to grind. It is too easy to push them through the Council, the members of which are in the dark. There is a wise observation (not due to Archimedes) that if any organization is left alone, the lightweights will rise to the top.

Cheers,

Hal

2. Climate Alarmism at the New York Times

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Nov 7, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2010/11/climate_alarmism_at_the_new_yo.html

The *New York Times* editorial page has been persistent in publishing alarmist editorials on climate change. The latest one appearing shortly before the November elections accused politicians of being in "denial" about climate change. What nonsense! Climate is changing all the time; it has been doing it for millions of years -- without any human intervention. And politicians are simply trying to stay in step with the public.

There is no credible evidence at all that human activities have had any appreciable influence on global climate changes during the last century. While many scientists still believe in a major human contribution, the number of skeptical scientists has been growing steadily as the evidence against AGW [anthropogenic global warming] becomes ever more apparent.

Just ask yourself: what evidence is there to indicate that any warming over the last century is due to human influences? Not even the UN- supported IPCC has been able to point to any solid facts in favor of AGW. The latest science debate revolves around "finger prints" in the climate record. Do the observations of temperature change in the atmosphere show a certain pattern, which is characteristic of greenhouse warming? The answer is a resounding No.

Without any scientific evidence to support AGW, it is wasteful, counterproductive -- and foolish -- to institute regulations that limit the emissions of CO₂, restrict the use of energy, and misdirect energy policy into such areas wind farms, solar projects, and biofuels like ethanol. For economic survival, all of these require huge subsidies. which are paid for by citizens twice over: first as taxpayers, then as energy users.

The mid-term elections have pointed up the public skepticism about AGW. Supporters of misguided policies to control emissions of carbon dioxide, through "cap and trade" and fuel standards, went down to defeat almost everywhere. California provided the big exception and now faces an economic disaster.

As reported by *Cooler Heads Digest*: "... the new Republican majority in the House is largely skeptical of the claim that global warming is a potential crisis and is close to unanimously opposed to cap-and-trade and other energy-rationing measures. Not only is cap-and-trade dead, but there is a good chance that the House next year will move legislation to block or delay the EPA from using the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gas emissions.

The question is, can such a measure pass the Democratic-controlled Senate? There is certainly a majority in the Senate for blocking EPA, but sixty votes will be needed. My guess is that there will be more than sixty votes. As EPA regulations start to bite next year, Senators will start to hear complaints from their constituents. And a large number of Democratic Senators are up for re-election in 2012 and will want to avoid the fate of so many of their colleagues this year.

The *NY Times* may be seriously out of step with its own readers, At least that's how I would judge the results of a survey of readers of *Scientific American*, a magazine that has been just as alarmist about AGW as the *Times*:

- **77% believe that current climate change is caused by natural processes
- **68% think we should do nothing about climate change, are powerless to stop it
- **90% approve of climate scientists debating the issue in public forums
- **83% believe that the UN-IPCC is corrupt, prone to groupthink, and has a political agenda.

The *New York Times* is doing a disservice to its readers and to the US public in stoking unreasonable fears not based on solid science.

3. No Cause For Alarm Over Sea Level Or Ice Sheets

By Cliff Ollier, School of Earth and Environment, University of Western Australia, Nov 11, 2010 [H/t John Cribbs]

<http://thegwpc.org/science-news/1837-no-cause-for-alarm-over-sea-level-or-ice-sheets.html>

John Le Mesurier's recent article in On Line Opinion, "[The Creeping Menace](#)", re-hashes the alarmism about rising sea levels. Much has happened, however, since Al Gore scared the world with visions of metre high seas flooding New York.

First, there is still no proof the Earth is experiencing "dangerous" warming. Temperatures have levelled off since 1998. Many measuring locations are also located in unsuitable areas. Furthermore, the methodologies of averaging temperature are inconsistent and full of problems. This is why "Global Warming" was replaced as a slogan by "Climate Change" (nobody denies that climate changes), and more recently by "Climate Disruption" (which is impossible define or prove).

Second, the increased temperature is supposed to increase sea level mainly by melting the ice-caps, which is impossible. Thermal expansion of the oceans seems to be of little consequence at present because the satellite measurements show the oceans are cooling. Le Mesurier gilds his picture with a few asides on "extreme climatic events" in general and hurricanes in particular. Recent studies, however, show no increase in hurricane activity in the last 40 years.

With regard to sea level, I have come to the view the IPCC and Australian Bureau of Meteorology, run by CSIRO, are unreliable sources of data after critically assessing their statements on this subject for some time. Direct studies of sea level are showing only small rises. You can [see the sea level data for yourself](#) for the United States and a few other countries here. Most stations show a rise of sea level of about 2mm per year, but note the considerable variation even within a single state.

Models depend on what is put into them. For example, a 2009 report by the CSIRO for the Victorian Government's Future Coasts Program on The Effect of Climate Change on Extreme Sea Levels in Port Phillip Bay based its model on temperature projections to 2100 of up to 6.4 degrees. That is the most extreme, fuel intensive, scenario of the IPCC and implies unbelievable CO2 concentration levels in 2100 of approximately 1550 parts per million (expressed in CO2 equivalent). Usage of all known fossil fuel reserves would only achieve half of this and continuation of the current rate of increase in concentration levels would result in only 550ppm by 2100.

In terms of sea levels, the result is a CSIRO predicted rise for Port Phillip Bay by 2100 of 82cm and, with the help of the Bureau of Meteorology, an increase due to wind to 98cm. That is not only well above even the top level projected by the latest IPCC report but is also well above any projections from the last 20 to 100 years.

Two favourites of sea level alarmists are Tuvalu and the Maldives. Sea level measurements for Tuvalu (and 10 other stations) between 1992 and 2006 are available on Fig. 13 on the [Australian Bureau of Meteorology website \(PDF 1.97MB\)](#). For about the past eight years the sea level seems to be virtually constant.

Vincent Gray has reviewed the evidence and finds virtually stable sea levels in the South West Pacific, and he also discusses how the data have been manipulated to suggest rising sea level.

Sea level in the Maldives was studied in enormous detail by the doyen of sea level scientists, Niklas Axel-Mörner. His team determined the sea level curve over the past 5,000 years based on evidence of morphology, stratigraphy, biology and archaeology supported by extensive C14 dating, and found that "All over the Maldives there is evidence of a sub-recent sea level some 20cm higher than the present one. In the 1970s, *sea level fell to its present position.*" (My italics.)

Incidentally a recent study of coral islands in the Pacific by Webb and Kench showed the islands are actually growing larger despite any possible sea level rise.

Holland is very low and would be particularly vulnerable to any large rise of sea level. It is also a world leader in coastal study and engineering, and the Dutch are not alarmed. In the December 11, 2008, issue of NRC/Handelsblad (Rotterdam's counterpart to The Australian or The Age) Wilco Hazeleger, a senior scientist in the global climate research group at the Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute wrote:

In the past century the sea level has risen twenty centimetres. There is no evidence for accelerated sea-level rise. It is my opinion that there is no need for drastic measures. Fortunately, the time rate of climate change is slow compared to the life span of the defense structures along our coast. There is enough time for adaptation.

What about the alleged cause of most of the scary sea level rise – the melting of ice-caps? This idea of rapid loss of ice is based on the concept of an ice sheet sliding down an inclined plane on a base lubricated by meltwater, which is itself increasing because of global warming.

In reality the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets occupy kilometre-deep basins. If sliding were operative they could only slide into the basin. Virtually all the studies on which alarmist conclusions are based are on the outflowing glaciers around the edges of Greenland where glaciers can flow downhill, and where there is some melting. There is no melting in the interior of ice sheets - it is far too cold.

Glaciers have a budget, with accumulation of snow, conversion to ice, flow of ice, and eventual destruction by melting, ablation or collapse. The centres of the ice sheets, occupying basins, flow only at the base, warmed by geothermal heat and driven by the weight of the overlying ice. There is no direct flow of the near-surface ice in the centre of an ice sheet to the outflow glaciers.

The accumulation of kilometres of undisturbed ice in cores in Greenland and Antarctica show hundreds of thousands of years of accumulation with no gaps in the record caused by melting. The existence of such layers, youngest at the top and oldest at the bottom, enables the glacial ice to be studied through time, a basic source of data on temperature and carbon dioxide in the past.

In the Greenland ice sheet several cores have more than 3km of undisturbed ice which go back in time for over 105,000 years (much less than the Antarctic equivalent). The Vostok cores in Antarctica provide data for the past 414,000 years before the ice starts to be deformed by flow (induced by the weight of the overlying ice and geothermal heat). The Epica core in Antarctica goes back to 760,000 years. The cores show there have been many times when the climate was much warmer than today (e.g. Mediaeval Warm Period). It is fanciful to conclude kilometres of ice can suddenly melt when the records show no melting whatsoever in the ice sheet accumulation areas.

After considering the evidence of three quarters of a million years of documented continuous accumulation, how can we rationally accept that right now the world's ice sheets are collapsing?

The idea of a glacier sliding downhill on a base lubricated by meltwater seemed a good idea when first presented by de Saussure in 1779, but a lot has been learned since then. Not even alpine valley glaciers or the outflow glaciers of Greenland move this way, but by a process called creep, best known from metallurgy. This process explains why the crystals of ice in the snout of a glacier are about a thousand times bigger than the first crystals in the snowfall. Sliding cannot account for this.

Collapse of ice sheets is commonly shown to stir fears of rising sea levels. Yet wherever ice sheets or glaciers reach the sea, the ice floats and eventually breaks off to form icebergs. It is part of the glacial budget: the glaciers never did flow on to the equator. Icebergs have always been with us. Captain Cook saw them on his search for the Great South Land.

Observers frequently seem surprised by the size and suddenness of what they see. In 2007, when a piece of the Greenland ice shelf broke away, the scientists who were interviewed said they were surprised at how suddenly it happened. How else but suddenly would a piece of ice shelf break off? The actual break is inevitably a sudden event - but one that can easily be built into a global warming horror scenario. The point to remember is that the release of icebergs at the edge of an ice cap does not in any way reflect present-day temperature. It takes thousands of years for the ice to move from accumulation area to ice front.

The Hubbard Glacier in Alaska has long been a favourite place for tourists to witness the collapse of an ice front, 10km long and 27m high, sometimes producing icebergs the size of ten-storey buildings. One tourist wrote "Hubbard Glacier is very active and we didn't have long to wait for it to calve". Yet the Hubbard Glacier is advancing at 25 metres per year, and has been doing so at least since its discovery in 1895.

Variations in melting or calving around the edges of ice sheets are no indication that they are collapsing, but reflect past rates of snow and ice accumulation in their interior.

Despite alarmist propaganda there is much evidence to suggest that the ice sheets are in good health.

For example, one recent paper is entitled "A doubling in snow accumulation in the western Antarctic Peninsula since 1850" (Thomas et al. 2008).

Another reports that "The East Antarctic ice-sheet north of 81.60S increased in mass by 45 ± 7 billion metric tons per year from 1992 to 2003 ... enough to slow sea-level rise by 0.12 ± 0.002 millimetres per year" (Davis et al. 2005).

Wingham et al. (2006) wrote: “We show that 72 per cent of the Antarctic ice sheet is gaining 27 ± 29 Gt yr⁻¹, a sink of ocean mass sufficient to lower global sea levels by 0.08 mm yr⁻¹.”

Johannessen and colleagues analysed satellite data on the Greenland Ice Sheet from 1992 to 2003. They found an increase of 6.4 ± 0.2 centimetres per year in the vast interior areas above 1500 metres, in contrast to previous reports of high-elevation balance. Below 1500 metres, the elevation-change rate is -2.0 ± 0.9 cm/year.

Of course even if we believe global sea level is rising, it takes another leap of faith to accept that it is caused by minuscule increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide caused by human activity.

4. Climate Scientists Plan Campaign Against global Warming Skeptics

By Roy Spencer, Nov 8, 2010

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

The American Geophysical Union plans to announce that 700 researchers have agreed to speak out on the issue. Other scientists plan a pushback against congressional conservatives who have vowed to kill regulations on greenhouse gas emissions.”

A new article in the LA Times says that the American Geophysical Union (AGU) is enlisting the help of 700 scientists to fight back against a new congress that is viewed as a bunch of backwoods global warming deniers who are standing in the way of greenhouse gas regulations and laws required to save humanity from itself.

Scientific truth, after all, must prevail. And these scientists apparently believe they have been endowed with the truth of what has caused recent warming.

The message just hasn't gotten across.

We skeptics are not smart enough to understand the science. We and the citizens of America, and the representatives we have just elected to go to Washington, just need to listen to them and let them tell us how we should be allowed to live.

OK, so, let me see if I understand this.

After 20 years, billions of dollars in scientific research and advertising campaigns, cooperation from the public schools, TV specials and concerts by a gaggle of entertainers, end-of-the-world movies, our 'best' politicians, heads of state, presidents, the United Nations, and complicity by most of the news media, it has been decided that the American public is not getting the message on global warming!?

Are they serious!?

Americans — hell, most of humanity — have already heard the 20 different ways we will all die miserable deaths from our emissions of that life giving — er, I mean poisonous —gas, carbon dioxide, that we are adding to the atmosphere every day.

So, NOW it no more mister nice guy? Give me a break.

Finally Time for a REAL Debate?

Actually, this announcement is a good thing. There has been a persistent refusal on the part of the elitist, group-think, left-leaning class of climate scientists to even debate the global warming issue in public.

Maybe they have considered it beneath themselves to debate those of us who are clearly wrong on the global warming issue.

A complaint many of us skeptics have had for years is that those who constitute the “scientific consensus” (whatever that means) will not engage in public debates on global warming. Al Gore won’t even answer questions from the press.

This is why you will mostly hear only politicians and U.N. bureaucrats give pronouncements on the science. They are already adept at weaving a good story with carefully selected facts and figures.

Why has the global warming message been presented mostly by politicians and bureaucrats up until now? Probably because it is too dangerous to put their scientists out there.

Scientists might admit to something counterproductive — like uncertainty — which would jeopardize what the politicians have been trying to accomplish for decades — control over energy, which is necessary for everything that humans do.

Scientists Ready to Enter the Lion’s Den

The LA Times article goes on to explain how there will be “scientists prepared to go before what they consider potentially hostile audiences on conservative talk radio and television shows.”

Gee, how brave of them.

Kind of like when I went up against Henry Waxman? Or Barbara Boxer?

I can sympathize with Republican’s desire to have hearings to investigate how your tax dollars have been spent on this issue. But I will guarantee that if such hearings are held, the news media will make it sound like Galileo is being tried all over again.

As if climate scientists are objective seekers of the truth. I hate to break it to you, but scientists are human. Well..most of us are, anyway.

Most have strong personal, quasi-religious views of the role of humans in the natural world, and this inevitably guides how they interpret measurements of the climate system. Especially the young ones who have been indoctrinated on the subject.

Those few of us who are publishing climate researchers and who are willing to take the risk of speaking out on the biased science on this issue are now late in our careers, and we have seen the climate research field be transformed from one where “climate change” used to necessarily imply *natural* climate change, to one where nature does not have the power to cause its own change — only mankind does.

I have repeatedly pointed out how virtually all global warming research funds either (1) build the case for humanity as the primary cause of recent warming, or (2) simply assume humans are the cause.

Virtually NO funding has supported research into the possibility that warming might be mostly part of a natural climate cycle. And if you give scientists enough money to find something, they will do their best to find it.

Politicians have orchestrated and guided this effort from the outset, and scientists like to believe they are helping to Save the Earth when they participate in global warming research.

Anthropogenic Global Warming is a Hypothesis, Nothing More

What the big-government funded climate science community has come up with is a plausible hypothesis which is being passed off as a proven explanation.

Science advances primarily by searching for new and better explanations (hypotheses) for how nature works. Unfortunately, this basic task of science has been abandoned when it comes to explaining climate change.

About the only alternative explanation they have mostly ruled out is an increase in the total output of the sun.

The possibility that small changes in ocean circulation have caused clouds to let in more sunlight is just one of many alternative explanations which are being ignored.

Not only have natural, internal climate cycles been ignored as a potential explanation, some researchers have done their best to revise climate history to do away with events such as the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age. This is how the 'hockey stick' controversy got started.

If you can get rid of all evidence for natural climate change in Earth's history, you can make it look like no climate changes happened until humans (and cows) came on the scene.

Bring It On

I look forward to the opportunity to debate a scientist from the other side who actually knows what they are talking about. I've gone one-on-one with some speakers who so mangled the consensus explanation of global warming that I had to use up half my speaking time cleaning up the mess they made.

Those few I have debated in a public forum who know what they are talking about are actually much more reserved in their judgment on the subject than those who the pop culture presents to us.

But for those newbie's who want to enter the fray, I have a couple of pieces of advice on preparation.

First, we skeptics already know your arguments ...it would do you well to study up a little on ours.

And second, those of us who have been at this a long time actually knew Galileo. Galileo was a good friend of ours. And you are no Galileo.

5. Wind Jammers at the White House

A Larry Summers memo exposes the high cost of energy corporate welfare

Editorial, WSJ, Nov 11, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704635704575604502103371986.html?mod=djemEditorialPage_h

President Obama continues to advertise the \$814 billion stimulus and its green energy subsidy programs in particular as unqualified successes. But a remarkable memo from Mr. Obama's own advisers tells the real story, neatly illustrating what happens when his anticarbon agenda meets the political allocation of capital.

The eight-page October 25 memorandum to the President was written by soon-to-depart chief economic aide Larry Summers and senior policy aides Carol Browner and Ron Klain, and it's been kicking around Capitol Hill and industry circles for the last week. The trio walks through an interagency dispute about Energy Department subsidies for wind, solar and other forms of "renewable" power, which DOE claimed were being held up by the joint Treasury and White House budget office (OMB) reviews.

Recall that the stimulus transformed the government into the world's largest private equity firm. The many tools now at DOE's disposal include \$6 billion to guarantee loans and another dispensation so that the department can convert an energy investment tax credit equal to 30% of a project's cost into a direct cash grant to green developers.

The Summers memo notes that these two provisions alone reduce "the cost of a new wind farm by about 55% and solar technologies by about half relative to a no-subsidy case." So taxpayers are more than majority partners in these private projects, except they get no upside.

DOE wanted the White House to cut OMB and Treasury out of deal-by-deal approval oversight so it could get the money out the door quicker. The department was coming under political attack "from Hill supporters and stakeholders for slow implementation," according to the memo, and impatient Democrats had already raided the \$6 billion fund to pay for cash for clunkers.

But OMB and Treasury found severe problems with "the economic integrity of government support for renewables." Developers had almost no "skin in the game," meaning that their equity in projects was well below ordinary standards in the private market. They were also "double dipping," obtaining loan guarantees for projects that "would appear likely to move forward without the credit support" in the stimulus because of *other* subsidy programs. The reason for the roadblock was "an insufficient number of financially and technically viable projects."

Treasury and OMB singled out an 845-megawatt wind farm that the Energy Department had guaranteed in Oregon called Shepherds Flat, a \$1.9 billion installation of 338 General Electric turbines. Combining the stimulus and other federal and state subsidies, the total taxpayer cost is about \$1.2 billion, while sponsors GE and Caithness Energy LLC had invested equity of merely about 11%. The memo also notes the wind farm could sell power at "above-market rates" because of Oregon's renewable portfolio standard mandate, which requires utilities to buy a certain annual amount of wind, solar, etc.

But then GE said it was considering "going to the private market for financing out of frustration with the review process." Anything but that. The memo dryly observes that "the alternative of private financing would not make the project financially non-viable."

Oh, and while Shepherds Flat might result in about 18 million fewer tons of carbon through 2033, "reductions would have to be valued at nearly \$130 per ton CO2 for the climate benefits to equal the subsidies (more than 6 times the primary estimate used by the government in evaluating rules)."

So here we have the government already paying for 65% of a project that doesn't even meet its normal cost-benefit test, and then the White House has to referee when one of the largest corporations in the world (GE) importunes the Administration to move faster by threatening to find a private financial substitute like any other business. Remind us again why taxpayers should pay for this kind of corporate welfare?

The memo's tone suggests that Messrs. Summers and Klain and Ms. Browner are on the side of the adults at Treasury and the budget office, and they propose several reforms. But they also say that "Failing to make progress on renewables loan guarantees could upset the Hill ([New Mexico] Sen. [Jeff] Bingaman, Speaker Pelosi)" and changes could "signal the failure of a Recovery Act program that has been featured prominently by the Administration."

Well, that answers our question. Meanwhile, the loan guarantee program continues apace.

6. Can Anything Serious Happen in Cancun?

The upcoming climate summit promises more proposals that ignore economic reality.

By Bjorn Lomborg, WSJ, Nov 12, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703848204575608311276024450.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

[SEPP Comment: Another appeal for an expensive technological fix to a non-problem.]

This time a year ago, passionate climate activists told us that we had just weeks left to save the planet. The looming Copenhagen climate change summit in December 2009 was, they claimed, our "last chance" to avert catastrophic global warming.

How things change. We are now just weeks ahead of this year's United Nations climate change summit in Cancun, Mexico, yet few people would be presumptuous enough to believe that the gathering will make any real difference to rising temperatures. Copenhagen's failure dashed hopes of any comprehensive agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions. After flocking to last year's meeting and being embarrassed, most global leaders will steer clear of Cancun.

Yet, some things stay depressingly the same. Attendees in Cancun will be singing the same tune that they did last year: Nations must commit themselves to drastic, immediate carbon cuts. This ignores both economic reality and 20 years of experience that tell us that this policy choice is incredibly expensive, utterly ineffective and ultimately politically unsellable.

How did we get to the point where we have fixated on a response to climate change that would do so little good for such a high cost? This goes back much further than last year's summit in Copenhagen.

Many environmental activists blame so-called "deniers" for halting action on global warming. It is true that the heated discussion about the reality of global warming has created more heat than illumination—and that it has distracted us from having a constructive discussion about the best policy response to global warming.

But environmental activists themselves must accept responsibility for helping block sensible solutions to global warming. They have engaged in alarmist rhetoric and ignored the economic science that shows that carbon cuts are a deeply flawed policy response.

Nearly 20 years after the so-called Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro (which produced the first international agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions), no leading industrialized power will find the political will to impose the draconian carbon taxes or order the substantial carbon cuts it would take to markedly lower carbon emissions. This is for a very good reason.

Fully implementing the Kyoto Protocol—the last comprehensive carbon cut treaty that the world had—would have cost hundreds of billions every year in lost economic growth. And even if it had been fully implemented across the century—a far shot from what has actually happened—it would only have reduced temperatures by less than one-third of one degree Fahrenheit in 100 years.

The reason for this is that alternative energy technologies are far from ready to take over from fossil fuels. If green technology is not ready to take up the slack, then forcing carbon cuts through taxes will simply hurt growth and development—particularly painful to developing nations.

World-wide public spending on research and development for clean energy technologies is a paltry \$2 billion a year. Increasing this to \$100 billion a year could be a game-changer. Not only would it be almost twice as cheap as the \$180 billion a year cost of fully implementing Kyoto, but the effect of this kind of spending would be hundreds of times greater. But this should not be our only response to global warming. We should also invest considerably more in adaptation to global warming's effects, and research geo-engineering technologies as a potential backstop.

I was hopeful a year ago that Copenhagen's failure might be a blessing in disguise, because policy makers might wake up to reality. Instead, it turns out that the chief lesson that they learned 12 months ago was to send bureaucrats rather than global leaders to Cancun in order to avoid another PR fiasco.

Mr. Lomborg is director of the Copenhagen Consensus, a think tank, and author of "Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist's Guide to Global Warming" (Knopf, 2007). His new film, "Cool It," opens in U.S. theaters nationwide today.

#####

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.