

The Week That Was: 2010-11-20 (November 20, 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:

"Every single great idea that has marked the 21st century, the 20th century and the 19th century has required government vision and government incentive." - Joe Biden, Oct. 26 Quoted by George Will

Number of the Week: 4.7 GWe to 8.5 GWe

THIS WEEK:

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

This week the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment of the US House of Representatives held a hearing entitled: "A Rational Discussion of Climate Change: the Science, the Evidence, and the Response." We attended the first two panels of three panels of this almost 4 hour long hearing. A video of the entire hearing can be found at: <http://www.c-span.org/Watch/Media/2010/11/17/HP/A/40918/House+Science+Technology+Subcommittee+Hearing+on+Climate+Change+Science.aspx> and the submitted testimony at http://science.house.gov/publications/hearings_markup_details.aspx?newsid=2947.

Since the new Congress does not convene until January, the hearing was held under a House controlled by the Democratic Party. The following are a few impressions of the proceedings.

Several members commented how unusual it was to have one dissenter on each panel. The usual practice has been one dissenter for the entire hearing. This change, no doubt, was in response to the elections. Chairman Brian Baird (D) of Washington chose not to run again in a contested district and Ranking Member Bob Inglis (R) of South Carolina lost his primary election to a tea party candidate. Both Baird and Inglis expressed great concern over ocean acidification from increased carbon dioxide.

Returning Rep. Roscoe Bartlett (R) from Maryland advocates electricity from alternative sources. Among other reasons he believes in "peak oil" and that a Renewable Electricity Standard (RES) is needed to compete with China as well as for national security. Apparently, he is unaware that only 1% of electricity is generated from oil and RES will do virtually nothing to lessen dependence on foreign oil.

Also returning are Rep. Ralph Hall (R, Texas) and Rep Dana Rohrabacher (R, CA). Hall read into the record a statement questioning global warming claims and supporting industry. Rohrabacher stayed for much of the portion we attended, asking questions from the witnesses and submitting into the record President Eisenhower's farewell address to the nation in which he cautions the public of the dangers of a military-industrial complex and a scientific-technological elite controlling public policy.

On the first panel the advocates were represented by Ralph Cicerone, President of the National Academy of Sciences, Gerald Meehl of National Center for Atmospheric Research (NACR), and Heidi Cullen of Climate Central. The dissident was Richard Lindzen of MIT.

In the oral testimony and the Q & A Cicerone and Meehl were typical, both relying heavily on models and authority. Both asserted that warming causes changes in cloud cover (clouds are a feedback). Cicerone claimed sea level rise is increasing. Meehl asserted increases in climate extremes and

temperature extremes in the past decade. He ignored the 1930s. Politely described, Heidi's comments are forgettable.

In the oral testimony and the Q & A, Lindzen was exceptional. He asserted that the wrong question is being asked – the key consideration is climate sensitivity. He outlined areas of general agreement, for example, that the calculated effect of a doubling of CO2 will likely result in an increase in temperatures of about 1 deg. C and observations indicate one half that. He pointed out that the different models use different values for aerosols [values which are not empirically determined] but are adjusted by the modelers. Lindzen asserted the influence of clouds is some 20 times the influence of CO2. When asked how much cooler would the earth be without CO2, Lindzen said about 2.5 deg. C. The others questioned this estimate but gave no meaningful rationale for their doubt.

The advocates on the second panel were Benjamin Santer of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Richard Alley of Penn State, and Richard Feely of NOAA. The dissident was Patrick Michaels of Cato. The Q & A during the second panel was quite interesting. Michaels held his own against Santer, who obviously believes that anyone who disagrees with him is absolutely, totally, undeniably wrong.

No doubt some of the committee members were disturbed by the testimony and comments by Richard Feely of NOAA. He claimed ocean acidification has increased 20% which is resulting in dire coral die off, and if it continues, millions of species will become extinct. Feely claimed sea organisms are already becoming smaller. During the Q & A he asserted that a pH of 7.7 [a base] will cause the Arctic and Antarctic oceans to become corrosive from top to bottom. No doubt under the current administration, "ocean acidification" is becoming a big push from NOAA as one of the scary consequences of increasing CO2.

[Fortunately, the website CO2 Science continues to compile the largest online database on ocean acidification. Craig Idso states: "for the degree of pH decline that is projected, we do not find the disaster that is promulgated by the alarmists." Populations of some organisms may decline, but populations of many others will likely grow. See <http://www.co2science.org/data/acidification/acidification.php>]

Evidently, Rep. Inglis is so taken by the term "ocean acidification" that he produced an egg in which the shell had been dissolved by a combination of water and vinegar, which is an acid. Apparently, he believes oceans will become an acid rather than become less alkaline.

The advocates repeated the slogan: multiple lines of evidence. What is meant by lines of evidence is not clear.

November 20, 2010 marks the one-year anniversary of the appearance of the Climategate emails. Thus far, there are no official announcements of who did the deed – a leaker or a hacker. Over the year, the transformation is remarkable. A year ago it appeared likely that an international agreement would be reached whereby Western nations, at least, would permit an international organization to control the use of fossil fuels. Today it appears unlikely for many of these nations. A year ago the slogan was Climate Justice, which is rapidly disappearing. As importantly, after two decades of propaganda a monolithic belief has been cracked and, in many circles, open questioning of this belief is permitted. Please see the articles referenced under Climategate

Of course there are some organizations in which the monolithic belief continues, including *Science Magazine*, which reviewed a defamation of character of those who questioned this belief as a serious work of history and refused to publish the rebuttal by the only surviving member of those defamed. Please see Article # 1.

Scientific American conducted a poll of its readers and is discovering that many of its readers are not thoroughly indoctrinated in the belief that humans are causing unprecedented and dangerous global warming. Please see Article # 2

The efforts to conduct a thorough investigation of some of the legal issues raised by the Climategate emails continue. Please see Article #3.

The US EPA continues its march to impose highly restrictive regulations on a nation that is suffering from high unemployment. One new effort is the issuance of a Best Available Control Technology (BACT) policy guidance to state agencies for issuing permits power plants and other stationary sources of greenhouse gases.

By issuing vague guidance rather than clear rules, the EPA cleverly manipulates the system. First, the comment period is very short. Second, it allows the EPA arbitrary power to what complies with the guidelines and what does not. Third, it may allow-third party green industry groups to sue to develop friendly out-of-court settlements that ignore the affected parties. The last is common in environmental regulations such as “wetlands.” It appears that Texas is refusing to go along. Please see articles under EPA on the March.

THE NUMBER OF THE WEEK is 4.7 GWe to 8.5 GWe, or the nominal electrical generating capacity of wind installed in China in 2008 as compared to that installed in the US. So much for the claim that China is leading in wind – at least in installed capacity. (For wind generation, installed capacity is not a particularly meaningful measure because nature, not human operators, controls the amount of electricity generated at a specific time. Thus, wind is unreliable and requires expensive and inefficient back-up.)

Summarizing the actual electricity capacity being installed in China as compared to the US:

- Nuclear power plants under construction: China 24, US 1.
- Hydroelectricity capacity added in 2008: China 20.1 GWe, US ZERO.
- Coal fired electricity capacity added in 2008: China 65.8 GWe, US 0.7 GWe.
- Wind generated electricity capacity added in 2008: China 4.7 GWe, US 8.5 GWe.

Contrary to what politicians and alternative energy promoters claim, China is not in a race with the US to build alternative sources of electricity. It is in a race to build all the affordable, reliable electricity-generating capacity it can from traditional sources for the benefit of its citizens, their children, and grandchildren.

The sources for the above are the Department of Energy and the World Nuclear Association.

#####

ARTICLES:

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

1. A Response to “The Climate Change Debates”

By S. Fred Singer, Energy & Environment, Vol. 21. Num. 7, Dec 2010

[http://multi-](http://multi-science.metapress.com/content/6n21260101173248/?p=986945affdf64abc9d44f8e9aa14f092&pi=8)

[science.metapress.com/content/6n21260101173248/?p=986945affdf64abc9d44f8e9aa14f092&pi=8](http://multi-science.metapress.com/content/6n21260101173248/?p=986945affdf64abc9d44f8e9aa14f092&pi=8)

[SEPP Comment: *The rebuttal Science Magazine refused to print.*]

2. A New Consensus

Editorial, IBD, Nov 12, 2010 [H/t Tom Sheahan]

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/553695/201011121850/A-New-Consensus.htm>

3 The Global Warming Court Battle

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Nov 14, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/11/the_global_warming_court_battl.html

4. An Energy Drink for the GOP

The Republicans have yet to make the billions wasted on job-killing subsidies to green energy projects a top issue

By Kimberley Strassel, WSJ, Nov 19, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704104104575623010297791010.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop

5. Obama Plays 3-Card Monte In Gulf

Editorial, IBD, Nov 18, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/554288/201011181855/Obama-Plays-3-Card-Monte-In-Gulf.htm>

6. The Renewable Electricity Standard Con

By Kenneth Haapala, American Thinker, Nov 13, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/11/the_renewable_electricity_stan_1.html

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Climategate Continued

November 20, 2009: The Day “Global Warming” Ended

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, Nov 17, 2010

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2010/11/day-global-warming-ended.html>

Climategate – still the issue

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Nov 20, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/11/20/climategate-still-the-issue/#more-28083>

Climategate: One Year and Sixty House Seats Later

By Marc Sheppard, American Thinker, Nov 20, 2010 [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/11/climategate_one_year_and_sixty_house_seats_later.html

The year climate science was redefined

The 12 months since the leaking of emails written by climate-change scientists have seen major shifts in environmental debate

By Mike Hulme, Guardian, Nov 16, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/nov/15/year-climate-science-was-redefined>

What Does Climategate Say About Science?

By Terence Kealey, GWPF, Nov 19, 2010

<http://thegwpf.org/opinion-pros-a-cons/1886-terence-kealey-what-does-climategate-say-about-science.html>

Challenging the Orthodoxy

From Global Warming To Global Climate Disruption

The Scientific Alliance, Nov 19, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

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

Kracked Up Over Krakatoa: Models Have It All Wrong

By Patrick Michaels, World Climate Report, Nov 17, 2010

<http://www.worldclimatereport.com/index.php/2010/11/17/kracked-up-over-krakatoa-models-have-it-all-wrong/#more-455>

Another AGW argument bites the er, dust

By Ed Morrissey, Nov 12, 2010, Hot Air

<http://hotair.com/archives/2010/11/12/another-agw-argument-bites-the-er-dust/>

Canada dodges carbon suicide

By Peter Foster, Financial Post, Nov 18, 2010 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2010/11/18/peter-foster-canada-dodges-carbon-suicide/>

Dependence on borrowed research has cost us, says Jairam Ramesh

The Hindu, Nov 18, 2010 [H/t Tom Sheahen]

<http://www.allvoices.com/s/event-7363076/aHR0cDovL3d3dy50aGVoaW5kdS5jb20vbmV3cy9uYXRpb25hbC9hcnRpY2xlODkyMzYzLmVjZQ==>

Defending the Orthodoxy

ABC admits it's a propaganda arm of government

By Joanne Nova, Nov 20, 2010

<http://joannenova.com.au/>

Carbon price now or we'll pay later

By Julia Gillard [Prime Minister] Sydney Morning Herald, Nov 17, 2010 [H/t Des Moore]

<http://www.smh.com.au/opinion/politics/carbon-price-now-or-well-pay-later-20101116-17vti.html>

[SEPP Comment: Raising electricity costs is the path to prosperity –for whom? Since businesses do not know if Australia will tax electricity from coal, it is imperative to do it now. Will businesses then know taxes will not be raised in the future?]

As Kyoto plan collapses, Plan B emerges

By Dalibor Rohac, Washington Times, Nov 12, 2010

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/nov/12/as-kyoto-plan-collapses-plan-b-emerges/>

IPCC Official: “Climate Policy Is Redistributing The World’s Wealth”

Climate policy has almost nothing to do anymore with environmental protection, says the German economist and IPCC official Ottmar Edenhofer. The next world climate summit in Cancun is actually an economy summit during which the distribution of the world's resources will be negotiated.

By Bernard Potter, Neue Zurcher Zeitung, Transl. Philipp Mueller, Nov 14, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano Climate Depot]

<http://thegwpf.org/ipcc-news/1877-ipcc-official-climate-policy-is-redistributing-the-worlds-wealth.html>

Climate Wars: Nick Stern Threatens U.S. With Trade Boycott

By Ben Webster, The Times, Nov 19, 2010 [GWPF]

<http://www.thegwpf.org/uk-news/1883-nick-stern-threatens-us-with-trade-boycott.html>

Deutsche Bank, Al Gore And The \$10 Billion Climate Fund

By Christian Hiller, Transl. Philipp Mueller, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Nov 10, 2010 [<http://thegwpf.org/international-news/1860-deutsche-bank-al-gore-and-the-10-billion-climate-fund.html>]
[SEPP Comment: What's wrong with making money when we're saving the planet?]

Cost-effective ways to address climate change

By Bjorn Lomborg, Washington Post, Nov 17, 2010 [H/t Donna Bethell]
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/16/AR2010111604973.html>
[SEPP Comment: Assume the most extreme claims are probable; then less extreme claims are rational.]

Seeking a Common Ground

Soul searching enviro-journalists admit they look duped and should have talked to skeptics

By Joanne Nova, Nov 9, 2010
<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/11/soul-searching-enviro-journalists-admit-they-look-duped-and-should-have-talked-to-sceptics/#more-11489>

BP Oil Spill and Aftermath

The ecological monster who said ... peep

Why the Gulf oil spill didn't spread to the voting booths
By Ben Lieberman, Washington Times, Nov 18, 2010
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/nov/18/the-ecological-monster-who-said-peep/>

White House edits stain its reliance on science

By Dina Cappiello, AP, Nov 10, 2010
http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20101110/ap_on_bi_ge/us_gulf_oil_spill

Energy Issues

Disarmament In America's Energy Security Battles

By Larry Bell, Forbes, Nov 18, 2010
<http://www.forbes.com/2010/11/18/energy-nuclear-climate-change-opinions-contributors-larry-bell.html>

Report: Energy Storage Technology Development Critical for National RES

Power News, Nov 17, 2010
http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3185.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2089900&hq_l=10&hq_v=5e660500d0

[SEPP Comment: A report from the American Physical Society supports RES while recognizing that commercially viable storage and a better grid are necessary.]

US wants China to reciprocate green energy subsidies

By Staff Writers, Energy Daily, APF, Nov 15, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/US_wants_China_to_reciprocate_green_energy_subsidies_999.html

Let Ethanol Subsidies Die

By Ronald Bailey, Reason, Nov 16, 2010
<http://reason.com/archives/2010/11/16/congress-let-ethanol-subsidies>

Clean energy: Economic key to 21st century

By US Senators Debbie Stabenow, Kay Hagan, and Mark Udall, Politico, Nov 17, 2010
<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1110/45261.html>

Leaking underground CO2 storage could contaminate drinking water

By Tim Lucas, EurekAlert, Nov 11, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2010-11/du-luc111110.php

[SEPP Comment: No matter how much is spent, Carbon Capture and Storage may go the way of Yucca Mountain.]

EPA and other Regulators On the March

EPA is offended by Texas' successful permit rules

By Katheleen Hartnet White and Mario Loyola, Washington Examiner, Nov 17, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/OpEd-Contributor/EPA-is-offended-by-Texas-successful-permit-rules-1586290-108598184.html>

[SEPP Comment: EPA and Texas are headed for a showdown as EPA attempts to exceed its regulatory powers. First of three parts with other parts referenced in the article.]

Cap-and-tax is dead but Kyotoism is alive and well at the EPA

By Marlo Lewis, Washington Examiner, Nov 15, 2010

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/Cap-and-tax-is-dead-but-Kyotoism-is-alive-and-well-at-the-EPA-108152744.html>

EPA Issues GHG BACT Guidance

Power News, Nov 17, 2010

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3180.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2089900&hq_l=4&hq_v=5e660500d0

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

DOI Approves 500-MW Solar Plant

Power News, Nov 17, 2010

http://www.powermag.com/POWERnews/3184.html?hq_e=el&hq_m=2089900&hq_l=9&hq_v=5e660500d0

[SEPP Comment: A German firm gets \$1 Billion in tax credits, which may be cash, for providing 180 to 200 permanent jobs, or \$5,000,000 per job. This does not include other subsidies such as loan guarantees and higher rates through RES.]

California Dreaming

California's Destructive Green Jobs Lobby

Silicon Valley, once synonymous with productivity-enhancing innovation, is now looking to make money on feel-good government handouts.

By George Gilder, WSJ, Nov 16, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703305404575610402116987146.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

Biological Effects of "Ocean Acidification"

Reference: Vézina, A.F. and Hoegh-Guldberg, O. 2008. Effects of ocean acidification on marine ecosystems. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 373: 199-201.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/17nov2010a5.html>

Intensified El Ninos in the Central Equatorial Pacific

Reference: Lee, T. and McPhaden, M.J. 2010. Increasing intensity of El Niño in the central-equatorial Pacific. *Geophysical Research Letters* **37**: 10.1029/2010GL044007.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/17nov2010a4.html>

ENSO Activity and Climate Change

Reference: Langton, S.J., Linsley, B.K., Robinson, R.S., Rosenthal, Y., Oppo, D.W., Eglinton, T.I., Howe, S.S., Djajadihardja, Y.S. and Syamsudin, F. 2008. 3500 yr record of centennial-scale climate variability from the Western Pacific Warm Pool. *Geology* **36**: 795-798.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/17nov2010a1.html>

Tropical Cyclone Intensity Discrepancies

Reference: Song, J.-J., Wang, Y. and Wu, L. 2010. Trend discrepancies among three best track data sets of western North Pacific tropical cyclones. *Journal of Geophysical Research* **115**: 10.1029/2009JD013058.
<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/nov/16nov2010a1.html>

Other Scientific Subjects

Human brain has more switches than all computers on Earth

By Elizabeth Armstrong Moore, Cnet, Nov 17, 2010 [H/t A. J. Meyer]
http://news.cnet.com/8301-27083_3-20023112-247.html#ixzz15bCPG3j8

Scientists isolate ‘anti-atom’ for study

Looking for first antimatter
By Frank Jones, Washington Times, Nov 18, 2010
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/nov/18/scientists-isolate-anti-atom-for-study/>

Other Issues that May Be Of Interest

What’s driving Obama’s subsidies of Chevy Volt

By George Will, Washington Post, Nov 14, 2010 [H/t Randy Randol]
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/12/AR2010111204494.html>

Cap-and-Trade Exchange Calls It Quits

By John Collins Rudolf, NYT, Nov 17, 2010
<http://green.blogs.nytimes.com/2010/11/17/climate-futures-exchange-calls-it-quits/?ref=science>
#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

As Glaciers Melt, Science Seeks Data on Rising Seas

By Justin Gillis, NYT, Nov 13, 2010 [H/t David Manuta]
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/14/science/earth/14ice.html?emc=eta1>

US PV Market Has Incredible Upside To Growth Potential

By Jose Ignacio Briano, SPX Eclareon, Nov 17, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]
http://www.solardaily.com/reports/US_PV_Market_Has_Incredible_Upside_To_Growth_Potential_999.html
#####

ARTICLES:

1. A Response to “The Climate Change Debates”

By S. Fred Singer, Energy & Environment, Vol. 21. Num. 7, Dec 2010

<http://multi-science.metapress.com/content/6n21260101173248/?p=986945affdf64abc9d44f8e9aa14f092&pi=8>
[SEPP Comment: The rebuttal Science Magazine refused to print.]

“In questions of science, the authority of a thousand is not worth the humble reasoning of a single individual.” -- Galileo Galilei

Philip Kitcher, a philosophy professor at Columbia University, has written a 5-page book review, entitled “The Climate Change Debates” (*Science*, vol 328, 4 June, 2010, pp. 1230-34). His recipe for an “open discussion and debate” (his words) about climate change seems to be a one-sided coverage by an elitist, self-chosen group. “Genuine democratic participation” is out, in favor of “reliance on expert opinion.” And who might these ‘experts’ be? No surprise there; Kitcher knows – and shapes his review accordingly. Making his point, Kitcher then juxtaposes “aging” scientists to “serious” scientists.

It’s all downhill from there. To emphasize his recommendation to deny a platform to “deniers” (his term), consider his choice of books for review. All eight books are basically polemics for Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW), with precious little science in them. Assuming a rough balance of such books on both sides of the AGW debate, the probability of such a choice by pure chance is about 0.39 percent. So much for balance.

To make matters even worse, he plugs the very worst of the eight books selected – *Merchants of Doubt*, written by ‘science historians’ Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway. It attempts to smear mainly four scientists, all physicists with long records of publications, public service, and honors. In defense of three of these (recently deceased), who were founders of the George C. Marshall Institute (GMI), the GMI has published a reply to this attack on the integrity of the Institute and its founders. The reply is available at <http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/894.pdf> and worth quoting from:

“Replete with half-truths and mischaracterizations, Naomi Oreskes and Erik Conway's book besmirches the reputations of three great American scientists to silence dissent within the ranks of scientists and stifle debate among policy makers about how to respond to global warming. Their message is both anti-science and anti-democratic. Whether the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions is desirable or not is irrelevant, the merits of their scholarship and its implications are clear.

Predictably, they create a tobacco strawman and knock it down to set the tone of a grand conspiracy to harm the public. Specifically, the work overstates the linkage between Dr. Seitz, a past president of the National Academy of Science - the nation's most senior scientific establishment, and a past president of a leading biomedical institution, the Rockefeller University in New York City, and R.J. Reynolds. Yes, Seitz helped establish an advisory committee to direct a research and development program upon his retirement as president of Rockefeller. Why? Because Reynolds and Rockefeller University (as well as the Rockefeller family) had a long-standing relationship and it was an opportunity to provide input into a multi-million dollar program in basic medical and human health research. Seitz assembled a team of eminent health scientists to provide insight and advice. What did the research contribute? A Nobel Prize, for one, while others included studies of the effect of renin on blood pressure, factors affecting cell development, and contributors to arterial sclerosis.

The very documents Oreskes and Conway cite to build the tobacco strawman reveal that Seitz and his colleagues did nothing more than direct an advanced research program. The underlying citations state the Seitz-led research program was independent of Reynolds and conducted by scientists and scientific institutions of the highest regard. Other than asserting guilt by association, Oreskes and Conway present no evidence that Seitz and his many colleagues were participants in some grand conspiracy. That conspiracy exists only in their minds.

Next, Oreskes and Conway claim Seitz and the George C. Marshall Institute wrongly defended the creation of a ballistic missile defense. Yes, Seitz and his colleagues, Dr. Robert Jastrow and Dr. William Nierenberg, believed it was morally repugnant to allow citizens to stand defenseless before the prospect of nuclear annihilation as an intentional U.S. government policy. Construction of a defense was technically possible and would enhance the security of the United States, they believed. Others didn't and the debates across the foreign policy and scientific establishments were as charged and vociferous as any seen before or since. The facts are: the Soviet Union fell; President Reagan's advocacy of missile defense was part of the equation contributing to their fall; the emerging missile defense offers the prospect of security against rogue states and terrorists for whom traditional deterrence likely fails; and a world where nuclear weapons were rendered obsolete (Dr. Jastrow's 1983 book outlines steps toward this end) remains a goal of presidents of both political parties.

Next comes the charge that Seitz et al engaged in personal attacks on prominent climate scientists in hopes of fostering doubt about whether humans were causing global warming. If Oreskes or Conway had bothered to speak with anyone who actually knew or worked with these men, they would have quickly learned that they were men of principle, motivated by concerns about the erosion of scientific literacy and dangers of manipulation of science for political ends arising from that erosion. What caused them to look at climate change science? Curiosity about the scientific basis of claims of apocalyptic global warming and worry about the implications that political leaders would draw from potentially inflated claims. Each had decorated scientific careers and each had been leaders of world-class scientific institutions and participants on government-sponsored scientific panels. Jastrow was a professor of Earth Sciences at Dartmouth and founder of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies; and Nierenberg was the head of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography. Each had considerable experience working at the nexus of science and public policy and understood the role that scientific information played in shaping policy and political outcomes.

Oreskes and Conway claim an opposition to government regulation motivated the Institute's founders' positions on climate change. Speculating about what Drs. Jastrow, Seitz, and Nierenberg felt about global warming is unnecessary as they clearly described their concerns, "If the changes in our atmosphere are likely to cause consequences, we must understand the problems and promote sensible policies to remedy them. What would be unwise is to lapse into apocalyptic thinking or ostrich-like denial. We believe ourselves far more sophisticated, more enlightened, than preceding generations. Until we can calmly and objectively approach our environmental challenges without promoting public hysteria and exciting short-sighted, self-interested reaction, we cannot claim that we are." (Scientific Perspectives on the Greenhouse Problem, Jameson Books, 1990: 92-93).

In fact, their work is remarkably prescient. Writing 20 years ago, Seitz, Jastrow and Nierenberg identified the critical variables affecting estimates of temperature and man's impact of climate that remain the central focus of the scientific debate today. They were: adjustments for uncertainty in the temperature observations (the quality of the surface temperature record has been shown to be in question); the effect of the ocean thermal lag (the role of the oceans and the movement of heat and carbon dioxide in the oceans remains an area of active study); adjustments for natural variability (our understanding of the natural patterns of Earth's climate is still under development); and procedures for estimating 21st century warming (a process based entirely on computer models and forecasts which have known limitations).

For its part, the Marshall Institute is not a "merchant of doubt." Our long-held position is simple - take action on climate change commensurate with the state of knowledge, and have that action be flexible so it can adjust as our understanding of man's impact on the climate changes. Do we

oppose cap-and-trade or Kyoto Protocol-like policies? Yes. They are expensive and will yield little environmental return. Do we propose actions to take? Yes. Did Oreskes and Conway bother to inquire about them? No.

Oreskes and Conway's work is the latest in a long line of one-sided, fearmongering pseudo-exposes whose purpose is to incite and intimidate. Readers are left with a clear message --Doubt and dissent are dangerous and scientists that question the conventional view of climate change are corrupt charlatans in the pocket of industry. Doubt and dissent are cornerstones of the advancement of knowledge and the scientific process."

It is quite clear that Kitcher doesn't have a clue about climate science or its history. There are a few facts he should learn first about scientists he lists:

* Roger Revelle was indeed a "prominent climate scientist," but he was also a skeptic, as evident from his many on-record publications. Full disclosure: He coauthored a skeptical article with me, which caused a lot of grief for Al Gore and led to a libel suit, in which I prevailed. [For details, see "*Politicizing Science: The Alchemy of Policymaking*" (Michael Gough, ed.) Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, 2003.]

* Ben Santer is "prominent" for quite a different reason. He altered the text and doctored a graph in the 1996 IPCC report, to promote the impression that "the balance of evidence" favored AGW. When these changes were discovered, he could not deny them but instead assumed the role of victim from unjust persecution. [For details, see "*Climate Policy from Rio to Kyoto: A political issue for 2000 and beyond*" by S. Fred Singer. Hoover Essay in Public Policy No. 102. 2000.]

* Kitcher evidently admires Naomi Oreskes. But does he know that in her zeal she claimed (and perhaps still does) that there are no publications that contradict AGW? In her sloppy research, published in 2004 *Science*, she had overlooked more than 90% of listed publications, and later published a quiet correction to her paper that had enshrined a phony "scientific consensus" which never existed.

* Kitcher also admires Jim Hansen – he of failed catastrophic climate predictions. Starting with his temperature forecasts of 1988, he now holds the world record for predicting a 20-foot rise in sea level by 2100. Al Gore loves that number, which is about 20 times the value given by the IPCC 'consensus.' Question: Does this make Hansen a 'contrarian' – and perhaps even a 'denier'?

* And then we come to Steven Schneider – who has admitted quite candidly that sometimes one has to doctor the science (shades of Ben Santer) and invent disasters -- if it will help to persuade the public. All for the greater good, y'know. His honesty was admirable; his science was not.**

Unfortunately, Kitcher lacks any insight into science. So there is little point in trying to tell him that current research shows the human contribution to climate change to be minor and well below IPCC model calculations – while the evidence for natural influences is becoming ever stronger. [For detail, see the NIPCC summary report "*Nature – Not Human Activity – Rules the Climate*" http://www.sepp.org/publications/NIPCC_final.pdf]

Perhaps he does not realize that respected economists and historians consider a warmer climate to be beneficial overall. Certainly, all agriculturists know that higher levels of carbon dioxide promote the growth of crops and forests. So much for the 'danger' of global warming – no matter what the cause.

And the IPCC agrees (and has said so for 20 years) that even severe emission controls will have negligible effects on future levels of atmospheric greenhouse gases – and even less on temperatures.

Elsewhere, Kitcher doesn't seem to distinguish between the health effects of smoking and second-hand smoke (SHS). Yes, smoking leads to lung cancer; but on SHS he should read Congressional Research

Service report CRS-95-1115 and assorted academic studies to learn how EPA fudged statistical analysis to come up, in 1993, with their scary conclusion of 3000 annual deaths from lung cancer. [To discredit my work on climate science, and because I agree that EPA misused statistics, I have been falsely accused to be “in the pay of the tobacco lobby.” Not only untrue, but I have never smoked, find SHS irritating, and serve on the advisory board of an anti-smoking organization.]

He also mixes up (purposely?) the revelations of the Climategate e-mails with various errors in the IPCC report. Yes, Prof. Kitcher, the conspiracy to “hide the decline [of global temperature]” by using “[Michael] Mann’s *Nature* trick” is a far more serious matter than getting a wrong date for the melting of Himalayan glaciers. And so are the other conspiracies that the leaked e-mails have uncovered: Keeping dissenting scientists from publishing in refereed journals; intimidating editors; perverting the peer-review process, etc. Why this effort to conflate obvious and inconsequential IPCC errors with conspiracies aimed to affect major public policies?

So, Kitcher should disqualify himself for his lack of science, his extreme bias (as shown by his choice of books and his comments), and his inflammatory language. It reflects poorly on the editors of *Science* magazine that they would permit this kind of article to be published and then refer to it as a “debate.”

But perhaps one should take the long-range view. The AGW alarmists are losing the scientific debate – and they are becoming desperate. It’s not just that the current domestic economic problems make some future climate change seem unimportant; it’s the changes in climate science itself: the rapidly disappearing evidence for any significant AGW. These people are destructive to the normal process of scientific debate, replacing argument by reason and fact with the politics of personal attack and libel. In so doing, they are eroding the trust the public has invested in science and scientists, who are coming to view scientists as just another special-interest group. You can see it in the polls. Works like Oreskes/Conway and their ideological supporters are accelerating this process. It is time to return to a focus on the science (which the AGW alarmists seem to be incapable of doing).

***FTNT Dr Steve Schneider just passed away quite suddenly at age 65. We knew each other from the time he worked at NCAR. I used to visit his house in Boulder; Colorado; he had a young family then. In spite of our scientific differences -- and there were many -- we remained good friends. I once wrote a favorable review of his book “The co-evolution of climate and life” -- which he appreciated. We did agree on the 'nuclear winter' hoax. Unlike many others, I never quoted his famous remark that one had to exaggerate the science in order to persuade the public that the apocalypse is near. He was just being painfully honest.*

I last saw him when I gave a seminar talk at the Hoover Institution at Stanford. He came by just to say hello. -- SFS 7/21/2010

2. A New Consensus

Editorial, IBD, Nov 12, 2010 [H/t Tom Sheahen]

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/553695/201011121850/A-New-Consensus.htm>

Global Warming: Wouldn't the followers of Scientific American have a pretty good understanding of what's really going on with the climate? If a reader poll is any indication, they're skeptical man is heating the planet.

For years we've heard that scientists have reached a "consensus" that the earth is warming due to a greenhouse effect caused by carbon dioxide emissions resulting from man's use of fossil fuels. No use in discussing it further, Al Gore and others have said. It's happening.

Not every reader of Scientific American magazine is a scientist. But the responses of the 7,000 readers (6,767 as of Friday morning) who've taken the magazine's online poll strongly suggest that claims of a consensus are, at best, an exaggeration.

More than three-fourths (77.7%) say natural processes are causing climate change and almost a third (31.9%) blame solar variation. Only 26.6% believe man is the cause. (The percentages exceed 100 because respondents were allowed to choose more than one cause on this question.)

Whether climate change is man-caused or natural, most respondents don't believe there's anything that can be done about it anyway. Nearly seven in 10 (69.2%) agree "we are powerless to stop it." A mere one in four (25.7%) recommend switching "to carbon-free energy sources as much as possible and adapt to changes already under way."

It seems even some of those who would endorse changing energy sources don't believe the benefits are worth the costs (which indicates they aren't taking the alarmists' claims seriously). Almost eight in 10 (79.4%) answer "nothing" to the question: "How much would you be willing to pay to forestall the risk of catastrophic climate change?"

A small but apparently hard-core 12.3% say they'd be OK with spending "whatever it takes." Only 4.9% choose "a doubling of gasoline prices" while 3.4% don't mind paying "a 50% increase in electricity bills."

That small, but hard, core likely makes up most of the 15.7% who think "the IPCC, or Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is an effective group of government representatives, scientists and other experts." These holdouts are overwhelmed, though, by the 83.6% who agree the IPCC "is a corrupt organization, prone to groupthink, with a political agenda."

This isn't what we expected from the readers of a magazine that Cato's Patrick Michaels says "has been shilling for the climate apocalypse for years." Yet we're not shocked. A new consensus is emerging as the unraveling of the global warming tale picks up speed.

3. The Global Warming Court Battle

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Nov 14, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/11/the_global_warming_court_battl.html

Kenneth Cuccinelli II, elected as the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Virginia in November 2009, has demanded from the University of Virginia (my university) the e-mails and other information of Dr. Michael Mann, who was an assistant professor of environmental sciences there from 1995 to 2005.

From the e-mails leaked from the University of East Anglia (UEA) in the so-called Climategate affair, we know that Professor Phil Jones was at the center of a conspiracy to manipulate temperature data. His American analogue was Michael Mann. Even though Jones recommended deletion of all e-mails, it is possible that many e-mails will still be found on the UVA server and furnish the "smoking gun" that can tell us just how the temperature data had been manipulated.

The UEA e-mails tell us of attempts to "hide the decline" (of temperature) using "Mike [Mann]'s *Nature* trick." It is important now to discover the truth, either from e-mail evidence or by direct testimony. Unfortunately, none of the investigations so far have delved into this matter, but instead have produced what amounts to a series of whitewashes.

The University of Virginia is fighting the demand for the data using outside lawyers and claiming "academic freedom" among other such excuses. I cannot comment on the legal implications of the AG's

investigation. It should be noted, however, that UVA was quite willing to deliver up the e-mails of Professor Pat Michaels when Greenpeace asked for them in December 2009. It makes the UVA protestations sound rather hypocritical.

We live in an Orwellian world where myth and propaganda have replaced science and reason, even at the highest levels of discourse. In May 2010, Science ran a letter signed by 255 members of the National Academy of Sciences attacking Cuccinelli. The letter contained numerous spurious assertions as if they were scientific fact. Lacking expertise and ignorant of the actual data, the signers simply accepted a story that matched their ideological convictions.

Then, on May 13, [Nature ran an editorial](#) ("[Science subpoenaed](#)") attacking Cuccinelli, and in the process labeled those who dared question Mann's science as "climate-change deniers." That term would seem to include all of us who recognize that for the past two million years, the climate has been changing, dominated by ice ages, interrupted only by brief warm periods; that for the past ten thousand years, the earth has been both warmer and colder than today; and that there was a Medieval Warm Period (MWP) and a Little Ice Age (LIA). Who indeed can deny that climate changes?

The Nature editorial refers to Michael Mann as "internationally respected." I would use more neutral language, like "prominently mentioned in the UEA e-mails, aka Climategate." The editorial states, correctly, that "no evidence was given of wrongdoing [by Mann]." But isn't that the purpose of the AG's investigation? Certainly, the references in the e-mails to "Mike's *Nature* trick" in order to "hide the decline" might lead one to think that there has been some skullduggery.

The editorial then identifies Mann with the infamous hockey stick graph (published first in Nature, 1998), which did away with the Medieval Warm Period and also the Little Ice Age from which the global climate is just now recovering. It may have escaped notice that Mann has now discovered the existence of the MWP and LIA (PNAS 2008), which has bent the shaft of the hockey stick all out of shape. Well, who says that the age of miracles has passed?

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

The editorial then states that the UEA e-mails were "stolen." Perhaps they were; but until one has evidence, one may be accusing an unknown whistle-blower who resented what was being done to the climate data *and* to science. I won't even mention what the resulting climate scares are doing to the economies of nations and the living standards of their populations.

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

The Washington Post weighed in with an editorial on October 6, 2010 ("Cuccinelli seems determined to embarrass Virginia"). Among many misstatements of fact, it cites a 2006 inquiry from the National Academy of Sciences on reconstructing historical temperature data and then claims that Mann's "basic conclusions appear sound." But the NAS inquiry into Prof. Mann's "hockey stick" did *not* support his basic conclusion -- that the 20th century was the warmest in the past thousand years.

Beyond this, the "Climategate" e-mails released in November 2009 put Mann at the center of an international conspiracy to manipulate the temperature data that form the basis of worldwide political action (including by the U.S. Congress) to "combat climate change." We also learned that the same group of scientists actively urged the deletion of any e-mails that might implicate them in this conspiracy to "hide the decline" of temperatures that were supposed to be rising. Unfortunately, the Post editorial ignores these relevant facts.

As if by pre-arrangement, on October 8, the Post carried an op-ed by Mann which attacked preemptively [Rep. Darrell Issa](#) (R-CA), the potential chairman of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, who will likely launch an investigation of Climategate. [Rep. James Sensenbrenner](#) (R-WI) may do the same if he takes over a Committee on Climate Change and Energy Security. Mann asks, what could Issa, Sensenbrenner, and Cuccinelli possibly think they might uncover now, a year after the e-mails were published? He claims that he has been fully exonerated by several internal investigations of Penn State (his present employer), UEA, and the EPA and again appeals to the failed science of the IPCC (which, however, no longer gives any credence to his hockey stick result).

Rep Joe Barton (R-TX), in a letter to the Post (October 12) reminds that his public hearings in 2006 "made it clear that Mr. Mann's global warming projections were rooted in fundamental errors of methodology that had been cemented in place as 'consensus' by a closed network of friends."

In responding to Barton's letter of October 12, the chairman of the National Academy panel Prof. Gerald North (Letter, October 17) then claims that "we have not found any evidence that his [Mann's] results were incorrect or even out of line with other works published since his original papers." North's statement is factually incorrect: There are numerous papers, published in peer-reviewed journals, which show clearly that the 20th century was *not* the warmest in the past thousand years (as claimed by Mann). Medieval temperatures were substantially greater -- and so were temperatures during the earlier Roman Warm Period. All of this is in addition to the valid criticism of Mann's statistical methodology. Tellingly, Canadian Prof. Steven McIntyre and Ross McKittrick (M&M) showed that even random data fed into the Mann algorithm would always yield a warmest 20th century.

Some final thoughts: Being charitable, I will assume that Mann made honest statistical and other errors in his 1998 and 1999 papers. But after these errors were published widely by M&M, Mann's behavior has been unethical to say the least. He has not replied to the critiques, nor even referenced them. He has just ignored them and tried to muddle the situation. (The National Academy report did the same.)

Is Mann guilty of fraud? I don't know; much depends on what Cuccinelli uncovers. But I am of the opinion that Mann should formally withdraw his flawed papers and no longer refer to them in his bibliography or in grant applications without at least a footnote. Formal withdrawal could create a storm, however, since the 2001 IPCC report built its case for man-made global warming on the validity of the hockey stick. There may be interesting times ahead.

4. An Energy Drink for the GOP

The Republicans have yet to make the billions wasted on job-killing subsidies to green energy projects a top issue

By Kimberley Strassel, WSJ, Nov 19, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704104104575623010297791010.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop

Ask Republicans what parts of the Obama agenda they hope to block or roll back, and the list is as long as Santa's—ObamaCare, financial regulation, tax hikes, cap and trade, unspent stimulus dollars.

One item you won't find: The White House's stated ambition to "transform" the, ahem, entire U.S. economy. It is kind of a big deal; the president calls his remolding of America into a high-cost, low-job "green economy" a top priority, an Apollo Project. Curious, then, it hasn't made the GOP list.

All the more curious, given that Republicans are engaged in an internal fight that directly relates to this. The GOP is scrapping over who will run the mighty House Energy and Commerce Committee, the body to serve as counterweight to the president's energy takeover. Yet the leadership debate has barely touched on Mr. Obama's work to replace the free market with billions in wasteful subsidies directed at companies of Washington's choosing.

For sure, the men battling over the Energy Committee are all promising action against those parts of the Obama plan they know the public rejects: cap and trade and EPA regulations. Texas's Joe Barton, officially term-limited out, is seeking a waiver to continue as chairman. He's not likely to get it. Those vying to replace him include Michigan's Fred Upton, Florida's Cliff Stearns and Illinois's John Shimkus.

The war has been primarily over who will be tougher—who will push back hardest on the EPA, who will call White House energy czar Carol Browner in for more hearings. Outside groups are digging through voting records, picking sides. Carbon regulations are the crux of the Obama plan, and would devastate the economy—so some of this makes sense. Then again, after this election, opposition to carbon restrictions ought to be baseline for an energy chairman—not value-added.

The value-add would be a leader who has a conservative vision for U.S. energy policy. This doesn't mean just allowing more oil drilling and coal mining, or root-and-branch nuclear reform—that's also baseline. It means stepping back a federal energy apparatus that is flushing taxpayer dollars down ethanol, wind and battery projects while crowding out cheaper fuels and killing jobs.

The Department of Energy's stimulus-tracking spreadsheet shows it has already awarded \$33 billion to 5,137 entities—to states, to General Electric, to no-name start-ups. This is Soviet central planning under the guise of "investing" in America's future. And the breakthroughs, and jobs? Europe has proven these subsidies destroy traditional employment, are permanent drains on state funds, and raise energy prices.

Still, green sounds good. And that explains the GOP's philosophical confusion. Republicans quake at being labeled "anti- environment." Rather than sell a principled energy position, they've found it easier to adopt "all of the above." They're for oil drilling and also for government-funded renewable energy. The latter is at odds with everything they claim to believe—smaller government, freer markets—but it's "green."

Add to this that plenty of Republicans helped create—and love—this subsidy factory. It keeps their corn farmers and wind-turbine producers in business. The grants will prove more valuable now that earmarks are gone. There's a reason so many Republicans list an energy bill as a top item on which to cooperate with Mr. Obama. Everyone gets to spend money.

The candidate for Energy chairman who could articulate a cheaper, market-based energy vision would have a claim on those incoming freshmen and outside groups focused on wasteful spending. He could inoculate the GOP by calling for an end to fossil-fuel subsidies, too. There exist some reform proposals to build on; California Rep. Devin Nunes earlier this year released an intriguing energy road-map.

Calls to the candidates' offices threw up mixed views. Mr. Shimkus's office, and Mr. Upton, vowed tough oversight of Mr. Obama's green money. "They need to be hauled in, let's get an accounting," said Mr. Upton. The conversations got hazier on broad subsidy policy; both men are professed all-of-the-abovers. Mr. Stearns by contrast rejected that approach, saying "it doesn't get us anywhere." He adds that we've got to be "careful" when it comes to "government stepping into this" and "mandating energy policy, for

ethanol, green jobs." He'd comb through Obama green spending, return Energy Department funding to 2007 levels, and work to sunset programs.

This week also saw an unexpected turn in this fight. Washington Rep. Doc Hastings called for shifting the energy portfolio to the Resources Committee—which he'll lead. The argument: Energy and Commerce is giant and overburdened. A shift would free the chairman to focus on the other all-important issue: ObamaCare. It would also move energy to the committee that actually oversees federal energy reserves. The idea sent Energy and Commerce folks into meltdown, but it's something John Boehner should consider.

Whoever takes the energy lead, he's got a giant opportunity—and obligation. With this election over, the GOP needs to start proving that it can not only block but lead. The conservative energy position is a study in confusion. The field's wide open for some clarity and direction.

5. Obama Plays 3-Card Monte In Gulf

Editorial, IBD, Nov 18, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article/554288/201011181855/Obama-Plays-3-Card-Monte-In-Gulf.htm>

Just as the ban on offshore drilling in the Gulf ends, U.S. energy producers now learn that regulators are preparing to shut down exploration for yet another environmental impact study. Do we see a pattern here?

It's hard not to wonder whether the Obama administration is so beholden to environmental lobbies and its own bureaucrats that it won't be happy until all Gulf energy production is ended.

Not that it would say as much, of course. But its actions suggest that if it can't end Gulf production at once, it'll do it through serial maneuvers, one after another, to achieve the same result.

The latest of its moves came on Nov. 4 when the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (formerly Minerals Management Service) announced it suddenly needed to conduct a supplemental environmental impact study for the three remaining offshore blocs up for auction. Despite decades of drilling in the Gulf, the new study would take at least six months and could go on for a year. Its effect would be to grind new U.S. production to a halt until a new delay could be cooked up.

The American Petroleum Institute says the announcement means that long-awaited auctions of drilling blocs coming in March and August will probably be canceled. If that happens, it will mark the first year since 1965 without auctions. Auctions occurred even when Hurricane Katrina ripped through the Gulf in 2005, but in a sudden wave of bureaucratic scruples, now they won't.

For oil industry people, that's another moratorium piled on less than a month after President Obama's disastrous six-month moratorium on all deep-water drilling in the Gulf in the wake of the BP Deepwater Horizon spill was lifted.

That executive order cost thousands of jobs at a time when the nation's economy was hurting. It also triggered an exodus of U.S. rigs to places with more hospitable investment climates — such as, we kid you not, Egypt and the Republic of Congo. Rig companies sign up for multi-year contracts, so even if the oil business climate in the U.S. changes, it would be a while before these rigs can come back to U.S. waters. Net loser, U.S. jobs.

Now with a moratorium on auctions, the cycle will be repeated with perhaps even worse effects.

Auctions are the starting point for production, so a delay would affect oil production down the line. API, which represents 400 energy producers, warns that a delay could cost 100,000 American jobs.

6. The Renewable Electricity Standard Con

By Kenneth Haapala, American Thinker, Nov 13, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/11/the_renewable_electricity_standard.html

On November 2, many voters expressed their displeasure with the 111th Congress and its efforts to control personal lives by passing massive legislation few members of Congress bothered to read, much less understand. Some of these bills have future costs which are now coming to light. By its actions, the 111th Congress abrogated a basic principle of representative democracy: that legislation be freely and openly discussed so that the public has the opportunity to understand its consequences.

As the 111th Congress is entering a "lame duck" session, some members are proposing additional legislation, the consequences of which are shrouded by myths and half-truths -- the Renewable Electricity Standard (RES). Using government coercion, RES will force Americans to purchase a product few want and most can ill-afford -- electricity generated by wind and solar. Coupled with renewable energy tax credits (tax breaks for the rich), this legislation will advance the interests of a few at the expense of the many.

Repeated economic studies of the experiences in other countries show that electricity from renewable sources, namely solar and wind, is expensive and unreliable. Electricity rates are skyrocketing in Spain, Germany, and Denmark, where these efforts have been tried. Although some companies profit greatly, once the mandates and subsidies are removed, the industry fails. Economic prosperity requires [reliable](#), affordable electricity, not quick fixes that benefit only the promoters.

RES is heavily promoted by wind and solar interests using myths and half truths, such as:

- *RES will reduce U.S. dependence on foreign oil.* According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), in 2008, the U.S. generated only 1.1% of its electricity from oil, generally on-site at refineries, etc. RES will do little to reduce U.S. oil dependency.
- *Solar and wind need the same subsidies as oil.* Countries such as Iran, Saudi Arabia, and China sell gasoline to their citizens at below-market prices, thereby subsidizing it. The U.S. does not. It taxes gasoline and other oil products. U.S. energy policies should not be determined by other countries.
- *Solar and wind need tax and regulatory subsidies as oil did.* The Rockefellers and others did not build the oil industry with subsidies and protective tariffs. They built it by offering a superior product at an affordable price. Kerosene was far superior to candles and less expensive than whale oil. Tax breaks did not come until the U.S. implemented high taxes to pay for WWI, which it needed oil to win.
- *Wind power will reduce carbon dioxide emissions.* The wind industry has failed to produce a single compelling [study](#) based on experience to support the claim. If it had one, it would flaunt it.
- *Megawatt capacity compares the capability of solar and wind with other sources.* Megawatt nameplate capacity is grossly misleading. All sources of electricity need some downtime for maintenance. In the U.S., nuclear produces over 90% of megawatt capacity, base load coal exceeds 70%. Operators control the downtime for nuclear and coal. However, nature controls

most of the downtime for solar and wind. The frequently cited figure for wind is usually 30% of megawatt capacity, but that is also misleading. The most useful statistic is dispatchable capacity - what the producer can guarantee for, say, New York City at 4 pm on August 7. For nuclear and coal, it is almost 100%. For wind it is less than 10% and may approach zero! There are few facts available for solar.

- *Once built, electricity from wind and solar are low-cost.* Wind and solar power are highly unreliable. To prevent blackouts, wind and solar require costly backup that must be immediately available, which is expensive and inefficient. They are a waste of resources.
- *Dependability of wind and solar can be raised by building more and with the smart grid.* Germany thought so, but experience shows the reverse. Germany discovered that the greater the number of wind turbines, and solar panels, the more susceptible the grid system is to failure. Thus, to prevent blackouts, the greater the use of wind and solar, the greater is the need for backup.
- *RES will provide high-paying green jobs.* If jobs are the issue, it is better to build pyramids in the desert. At least once the [construction](#) stops, we will not saddle our children and grandchildren with high utility bills.
- *We need RES to win the race with China in these new forms of energy.* Solar and wind have been used for thousands of years and still remain unreliable. China is in a totally different race -- a race to build the greatest possible capacity of affordable, dependable electricity for the benefit of its citizens. A brief examination of what China is actually building, as compared to what is "planned" or what RES promoters claim, demonstrates China's goal:

- Today, China is constructing 24 nuclear power plants -- the U.S., only one.
- In 2008, China added 20.1 GWe of hydro capacity -- the U.S., zero GWe.
- In 2008, China added 65.8 GWe of coal-fired capacity (net increase, while closing 26 GWe of old, inefficient coal-fired capacity) -- the U.S., 0.7 GWe.
- In 2008, China added 4.7 GWe of wind -- the U.S., 8.5 GWe (nameplate) of wind.

The one U.S. bright spot not reflected in the above statistics is the falling prices of natural gas, which is now competitive in many places with coal for generation of electricity. This change came from new techniques for extraction of gas from deeply buried dense shale thanks to [innovative](#) private enterprise, not government mandates or subsidies.

When one looks at facts rather than "plans," clearly, the U.S. is winning the wind race in which China is not even running. China is winning the race for affordable, dependable electricity for the prosperity of its citizens -- a race the federal government refuses to recognize.

Are the leaders of Communist China more concerned for the future of Chinese citizens, their children, and their grandchildren than the leaders of the 111th Congress are concerned for Americans, their children, and their grandchildren?

A vote for RES will tell!

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.