

The Week That Was (February 13, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

Fred Singer will be on a lecture tour from Feb 11 to March 7, including the Technion (Haifa, Israel), National University of Singapore, and cities in India. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) has commissioned his essay "The End of IPCC?" He will not have regular access to e-mail and requests that no routine messages be sent. For high-priority mail, send a copy also to ken@haapala.com.

#####

Quote of the Week

"In my (perhaps too harsh) view, there have been a number of dishonest presentations of model results by individual authors and by IPCC." Tom Wigley in Climategate emails,

<http://www.eastangliaemails.com/emails.php?eid=1057&filename=1255553034.txt>

Wigley has argued that the IPCC has been too optimistic about the prospect of averting harmful climate change by reducing greenhouse emissions.

THIS WEEK:

Official Washington was closed this week for all but Friday as we experienced yet another snow with blizzard like conditions, though not as much snow as last weekend. Based on forecasts we can expect another 6 inch dusting on Monday. These snow storms have been accompanied by the usual chirping in Time Magazine, New York Times, and other places, that the storms are the result of global warming which they claim will cause more severe storms.

Had these authorities bothered to check records they would have discovered that precipitation is not unusual in Washington winters, but this winter's temperatures are. It has been colder than usual, thus snow rather than rain has been falling. Interestingly, US government publications on global warming state that snow will all but disappear in the Washington area. No doubt, many area residents wish the government publications are correct. Please see the article by Patrick J. Michaels below.

Least we commit the same logical fallacy as the warming advocates, hasty generalization; we should review the latest global temperatures from satellite measurements. Roy Spencer reports that January 2010 was the hottest January in the 32 years of satellite measurements. On their respective web sites, both Roy Spencer and Joseph D'Aleo explain what is occurring. References are given below.

NIPCC and SEPP have been preparing a petition to EPA requesting reconsideration of its finding that human carbon dioxide emissions endanger public health and welfare. After an early draft, Sam Kazman, General Council of the Competitive Enterprise Institute, suggested the CEI join. The offer was most welcome. Late Friday the three-party petition was filed with EPA.

Other, lengthier, petitions are being filed. Because reconsideration requires significant new evidence since June 2009, our joint petition focuses on the disintegrating veneer of science EPA uses to support its finding, particularly after the events of the past three months.

EPA establishes its finding on the three global surface datasets by Hadley-CRU, NOAA's National Climatic Data Center, and NASA's Goddard Institute of Space Studies and on the findings in reports by IPCC, US Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), and the National Research Council (NRC).

In October, after it was revealed that Hadley-CRU had discarded its original dataset, CEI petitioned EPA to reconsider its Endangerment Finding. EPA dismissed the petition by stating the datasets of NOAA and NASA produce similar warming trends. However, in December the Russian Institute of Economic Analysis (IEA) revealed that Hadley-CRU was ignoring reports from Russian stations. Earlier it was

assumed that the stations no longer existed which IEA revealed was not the case. The stations ignored tended to be in colder regions of Russia and IEA believes that Russian data do not support anthropogenic global-warming theory. Hadley-CRU's introduction of a likely strong warming bias appears deliberate.

The reports from Joseph D'Aleo and E. Michael Smith on John Coleman's TV special were of great use in addressing the NOAA and NASA datasets. The January 29, 2010 study by Joseph D'Aleo and Anthony Watts, *Surface Temperature records: Policy Driven Deception?*, was invaluable in arguing that, contrary to its claims, EPA has no scientifically verifiable dataset on which to base its Endangerment Finding. What type of scientific organizations would change part of its historic dataset 16 times in two and one-half years as NASA did?

As readers of TWTW realize, recent revelations demonstrate that many of the findings of the IPCC are not based on "peer reviewed" research as claimed but on questionable publications and personal speculation. The recent revelation about African agriculture was particularly damaging. The IPCC claim that up to 50% of rain based agriculture in many African countries will be destroyed by 2020 was based on a paper published by an advocacy group, not peer reviewed research. This claim was repeated in the IPCC Synthesis Report (a very short document for policy makers), in speeches by Rajendra Pachauri, Chairman of the IPCC, and Ban Ki-moon, the UN secretary-general, as well as in EPA's Technical Support Document used to justify the Endangerment Finding.

The reports by USGCRP and NRC used by EPA to buttress its Endangerment Finding assumed that IPCC findings were definitive, thus the reports suffered from the same scientific defects as the IPCC reports. For example, the NRC report *Potential Impacts of Climate Change on U.S. Transportation* not only used the unsubstantiated IPCC claim of a relationship between warming and storm severity, but also used untested, unverified IPCC models to project property losses into the future. The models have no predictive power.

Although we doubt EPA will reconsider its Endangerment Finding, and that the battle is still to be fought, it is imperative that government agencies be compelled to use solid empirical science, physical evidence, to substantiate their claims that expansions of government powers are necessary for public health and welfare.

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

1. The End of the IPCC

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Feb 10, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/02/the_end_of_the_ipcc.html

2. CEI, Science Groups Petition EPA to Reconsider Increasingly Dubious Global Warming "Endangerment" Finding

By Christine Hall, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Feb 12, 2010

<http://cei.org/news-release/2010/02/12/cei-science-groups-petition-epa-reconsider-increasingly-dubious-global-warmi>

3. A Blizzard of Global-Warming Hype

By Patrick J. Michaels, National Review Online, Feb 11, 2010

<http://planetgore.nationalreview.com/post/?q=OTY0YjUxMWU4ZmRkZGEzNDgyY2E4YzFiMjU0OWMyNjY>

3. Heated Blizzard

Investors Business Daily, Feb 11, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=520988>

4. How to reform the IPCC

By David Adam and Suzanne Goldenberg, Guardian, UK Feb 10, 2010

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/10/ipcc-reform>

Surprising questions from the Guardian. – unimaginable a few months ago.

"The Nobel prize was for peace not science ... government employees will use it to negotiate changes and a redistribution of resources. It is not a scientific analysis of climate change,"

5. Scientists say IPCC should be overhauled or scrapped

By Leigh Dayton, The Australian, Feb 11, 2010, [H/t Watts Up With That]

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/scientists-say-ipcc-should-be-overhauled-or-scrapped/story-e6frg6nf-1225828951315>

6. India Supports a Toothless IPCC: The less credibility the climate body has, the less it can do to block vital economic development

By Barun Mitra, WSJ, Opinion Asia, Feb 8, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203863204574346610120524166.html>

7. Arizona Quits Climate Pact

IBD, Feb 12, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=521142>

8. Stimulating Green Jobs for China

Investors Business Daily, Feb 11, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=520923>

Amazingly, many advocating “green jobs” apparently believe massive wind turbines can be built locally.

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

NASA Aqua Sea Surface Temperatures Support a Very Warm January, 2010

By Roy Spencer, Feb 4, 2010

<http://www.drroyspencer.com>

Sending A Message To Washington

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Feb 5, 2009

http://icecap.us/images/uploads/SENDING_A_MESSAGE_TO_WASHINGTON.pdf,

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

Now Record Snows in Dixie,

By Joseph D’Aleo, ICECAP, Feb 11, 2010

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

Global Warming: The Collapse of a Grand Narrative

Phillip Stott, Clamour of the Times, Jan 30, 2010 [H/t Geoffrey Luxford]

http://web.me.com/sinfonia1/Clamour_Of_The_Times/Clamour_Of_The_Times/Entries/2010/1/30_Global_Warming:_the_Collapse_of_a_Grand_Narrative.html

A month old yet an insightful overview

By the waters of denial they sit and weep,

By Melanie Phillips, Spectator, UK, Feb 2, 2010

<http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/5745566/by-the-waters-of-denial-they-sit-and-weep.shtml>

European global warming advocates are facing hard times/

The Great Global Warming Collapse – As the science scandals keep coming, the air has gone out of the climate-change movement

Margaret Wentz, The Globe and Mail Feb 5, 2010

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/opinions/the-great-global-warming-collapse/article1458206/>

Global warming snow job: Climate-change pseudoscience is fraught with fraud Washington Times Editorial, Feb 11, 2010

[http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/11/global-warming-snow-](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/11/global-warming-snow-job/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today)

[job/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/11/global-warming-snow-job/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today)

Good summary, rare in US media

And now for Africagate

Richard North, EUReferendum, Feb 7, 2010 [H/t Anthony Watts – Watts Up With That]

<http://eureferendum.blogspot.com/2010/02/and-now-for-africagate.html>

The science supporting IPCC's statement that yields from rain based agriculture will fall by 50% by 2020 are from an advocacy group on sustainable development. Claims repeated by Pachauri.

Africagate: top British scientist says UN panel is losing credibility.

By Jonathan Leake Environment Editor, The Sunday Times on line, Feb 7, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7017907.ece>

Robert Watson was the Chairman of the IPCC when it published the Third Assessment Report that featured the notorious “hockeystick”

Australiagate: Now NASA caught in trick over Aussie climate data

By John O'Sullivan, Climategate.com, Feb 10, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://www.climategate.com/australiagate-now-nasa-caught-in-trick-over-aussie-climate-data>

Climate Götterdämmerung

National Review Online, Feb 10, 2010, [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://article.nationalreview.com/424508/climate-gtterdmmerung/the-editors>

Has the mania run its course?

Climate-Change Debate Is Heating Up in Deep Freeze

By John Broder, NYT, Feb 10, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/11/science/earth/11climate.html?th&emc=th>

The Gray Lady cannot see the real storm for the snow

Disclosing the Real Risk on Climate Change

By Paul Driessen, Tonwhall.com Feb 6, 2010

http://townhall.com/columnists/PaulDriessen/2010/02/06/disclosing_the_real_risks_on_climate_change

The SEC has required that corporations disclose the risks of climate change. How far will it go?

Will Thomas Karl, who is head of NCDC, be asked what happened to the 94% of the Canadian weather stations that were dropped from the NCDC dataset?

New federal office for global warming: Initiative similar to weather service

By Jennifer Haberkorn, The Washington Times, Feb 9, 2010

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/09/new-federal-office-would-study-global-warming/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today

"This service will be a vital part of our growing body of knowledge on climate change, and will be held to the highest standards of scientific integrity and transparency," according to Rep. Edward J. Markey Thomas Karl, head of the National Climatic Data Center, will be first director.

NOAA’s Ministry of Propaganda

Investors Business Daily, Feb 9, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=520665>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Anti-warming scam at work in NY

By Paul Chesser, NY Post, Feb 9, 2010

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/anti_warming_scam_at_work_in_ny_YTgB4s0sKXxJlbqVdUBR9L

State governments are buying packaged anti-global warming advice.

Cyper-thieves skim \$5m in permits

By Rosslyn Beeby, The Canberra Times, Feb 5, 2010 [H/t Alan Barron]

<http://www.canberratimes.com.au/news/local/news/general/cyberthieves-skim-5m-in-permits/1743261.aspx>

RFK, Jr. 15 months ago: Global warming means no snow or cold in DC

By David Freddoso, Beltway Confidential, Dec 21, 2009

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/beltway-confidential/RFK-79834057.html>

News Flash!! Pavarotti a third rate tenor – American debut sponsored by Texaco Oil Company

Think-tanks take oil money and use it to fund climate deniers – ExxonMobil cash supported concerted campaign to undermine case for man-made warming.

By Jonathan Owen and Paul Bignell, Independent, UK, Feb 7, 2010

<http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/thinktanks-take-oil-money-and-use-it-to-fund-climate-deniers-1891747.html>

For years, independent scientists have been pointing out fallacies by the IPCC and other global warming advocates. Finally some media outlets are taking an interest. To Owen and Bignell it must be a big-oil conspiracy because they did not see it coming.

Will it be more than a postage stamp a day?

UK lawmakers call for EU carbon ‘floor price’

Euractiv.com, Feb 9, 2010

<http://www.euractiv.com/en/climate-environment/uk-lawmakers-call-eu-carbon-floor-price>

#####

1. The End of the IPCC

By S. Fred Singer, American Thinker, Feb 10, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/02/the_end_of_the_ipcc.html

Almost daily, we learn about new problems with the formerly respected UN [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) (IPCC): In their 2001 report, they claimed that the 20th century was "unusual" and blamed it on human-released [greenhouse gases](#). Their infamous temperature graph shown there, shaped like a hockey stick, did away with the well-established Medieval Warm Period (around 1000AD, when Vikings were able to settle in Southern Greenland and grow crops there) and the following Little Ice Age (around 1400 to 1800AD). Two Canadians exposed the bad data used by the IPCC and the statistical errors in their analysis.

The most recent IPCC report of 2007 predicted the disappearance of the Himalayan glaciers within 25 years; the imminent death of nearly half the Amazon rain forest; and major damage from stronger hurricanes -- all in contradiction to expert opinions offered by its appointed reviewers, but ignored by IPCC editors for mostly ideological reasons. More scandalous even, the IPCC based their lurid predictions on anecdotal, non-peer-reviewed sources -- not at all in accord with its solemnly announced principles and scientific standards.

These events showed not only a general sloppiness of IPCC procedures but also an extreme bias -- quite inappropriate to a supposedly impartial scientific survey. By themselves, they do not invalidate the basic IPCC conclusion -- that a warming in the latter half of the 20th century was human-caused, presumably by the rise of greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide. Yet all of these missteps pale in comparison to ClimateGate, which calls into question the very temperature data used by the IPCC's main policy result.

As the leaked e-mails from the University of East Anglia (UK) reveal, this IPCC conclusion -- that Global Warming is anthropogenic -- is based on manipulated data and therefore flawed -- as are demands for the control of CO2 emissions, like the Kyoto Protocol and the Copenhagen Accord. In my opinion, ClimateGate is a much more serious issue than simply sloppiness and ideological distortion; ClimateGate suggests conspiracy to commit fraud.

Let us recall: The e-mails leaked in the fall of 2009 allow us to trace the machinations of a small but influential band of British and US climate scientists who played the lead role in the IPCC reports. It appears that this group, which controlled access to basic temperature data, was able to produce a "warming" by manipulating the analysis of the data, but refused to share information on the basic data or details of their analysis with independent scientists who requested them -- in violation of Freedom of Information laws. In fact, they went so far as to keep any dissenting views from being published -- by monopolizing the peer-review process, aided by ideologically cooperative editors of prestigious journals, like *Science* and *Nature*.

Woe to these dissenting scientists, however. The younger ones were denied an opportunity to advance or receive academic tenure -- or were simply fired. The independent ones were maligned as "deniers" and ostracized. In many instances, commercially operated 'smear blogs' invented slurs; the most common ones being "tool of the oil industry" or "paid by the tobacco lobby." In my own case, my Wiki bio also carried additional malicious accusations; the most bizarre one was that I believed in the existence of Martians.

We learn from the e-mails that the ClimateGate gang was able to "hide the decline" [of global temperature] by applying what they termed as "tricks," and that they intimidated editors and forced out those judged to be "uncooperative." No doubt, thorough investigations, now in progress or planned, will disclose the full range of their nefarious activities. But it is clear that this small cabal was able to convince much of the world that climate disasters were impending -- unless drastic steps were taken. Not only were most of the media, public, and politicians misled, but so were many scientists, national academies of science, and professional organizations -- and even the Norwegian committee that awarded the 2007 Peace Prize to the IPCC and Al Gore, the chief apostle of climate alarmism.

In this enterprise, the group was aided not only by environmental zealots, anti-technology Luddites, utopian one-worlders, and population-control fanatics, but also by bureaucrats, businesses, brokers and bankers, who had learned how to game the system and profit from government grants and subsidies for exotic schemes to produce "carbon-free" energy and from the trading of carbon permits. Hundreds of billions have already been wasted -- most of this in transfers of tax revenues to a favored few.

These sums pale, however, in comparison to the trillions that would have been spent in future if some of the mitigation schemes had come to fruition -- such as an extension and major expansion of the 1997 Kyoto Protocol to control greenhouse-gas emissions. Fortunately for the world economy and for taxpayers in industrialized nations, these schemes collapsed at the Copenhagen climate conference in Dec 2009. Clearly, developing nations did not want to take on the sacrifices and restrictions on growth. There was little concern expressed about climate; Copenhagen was mostly about transfer of money from rich to poor countries - or more precisely, from the poor in rich countries to the rich in poor ones.

Of course, this breakdown in negotiating *global* controls does not stop unilateral actions. Major developing nations, like India and China, have already refused to act. Australia's parliament has so far turned down attempts to impose limits on the emission of greenhouse gases, which many still believe to cause significant global warming -- in spite of contrary evidence. The European Union is likely to persist in its misguided efforts to continue and expand the Kyoto restrictions. In the US, the House has (barely) passed the calamitous Waxman-Markey "Cap & Trade" bill; the US Senate likely will not pass a similar bill in 2010, an election year.

There is still the US-EPA's drive to extend the Clean Air Act to include carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases as "pollutants." But with the evidence of ClimateGate in hand, EPA's attempt to provide the necessary scientific justification for its "Endangerment Finding" will surely fail. Whoever leaked the incriminating e-mails deserves a medal for saving the US economy from certain ruin.

The writer, an atmospheric physicist, professor emeritus at the University of Virginia, and former director of the US Weather Satellite Service, is the organizer of NIPCC (Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change) and coauthor of its reports "Nature, not human activity, rules the climate" [2008] and "Climate Change Reconsidered" [2009].

2. CEI, Science Groups Petition EPA to Reconsider Increasingly Dubious Global Warming "Endangerment" Finding

By Christine Hall, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Feb 12, 2010

<http://cei.org/news-release/2010/02/12/cei-science-groups-petition-epa-reconsider-increasingly-dubious-global-warmi>

Regulation Would Bring Economy-Crushing Regulations Based on Shoddy Science

Washington, D.C., Feb. 12, 2009 - Two science groups joined with the Competitive Enterprise Institute on Friday to petition the Environmental Protection Agency to reconsider its December decision to regulate greenhouse gas emissions.

In the wake of new disclosures and studies, some as recent as last week, the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change and the Science and Environmental Policy Project joined with CEI to formally petition the agency to reconsider its rule.

EPA on December 7 issued its finding that greenhouse gas emissions endanger public health and welfare and therefore must be regulated under the Clean Air Act. The agency acted despite the revelations of Climategate. But even after Climategate, new disclosures and studies have shown, among other things,

that 1) the IPCC report, the major international study relied on by EPA, is an unscientific political document; and 2) the major data sets have undergone so much manipulation that they are totally unreliable.

“EPA’s Endangerment Finding is based on non-scientific reports by the IPCC and scientifically indefensible global temperature datasets,” the petitioners charge in the February 12 EPA filing.

In fact, “all three data sets used by the EPA to conclude that warming is unequivocal have been highly compromised, all three are likely to contain strong warming biases of unknown magnitude, and none of the three have been independently verified,” the petition charges.

Kenneth Haapala, Executive Vice President of SEPP, stated: “EPA refuses to recognize that the IPCC is a political organization, not a scientific one. EPA’s Endangerment Finding is based on politics, not science. It is time to see the rigorous physical science, rather than speculation from computer models.”

CEI General Counsel Sam Kazman stated: “As damaging as Climategate was, it has been followed by newer, equally damaging developments for global warming alarmists. EPA has a legal duty to get its head out of the sand and take account of what’s happening.”

If EPA proceeds with its plans, under the Clean Air Act it will automatically trigger costly and time-consuming permitting requirements for tens of thousands of previously unregulated small businesses.

On October 5, CEI petitioned EPA to reopen the Endangerment Proceeding because of a disclosure by the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia, now at the epicenter of Climategate, that it had destroyed the raw data for its data set of global surface temperatures.

3. A Blizzard of Global-Warming Hype

By Patrick J. Michaels, National Review Online, Feb 11, 2010

<http://planetgore.nationalreview.com/post/?q=OTY0YjUxMWU4ZmRkZGZGEzNDgyY2E4YzFiMjU0OWMyNjY>

It had to happen. In the midst of the record snowfall in the East, some mainstream [media outlet](#) had to try to link this season’s unusual weather events to global warming.

Time was the first news organization to take the plunge. It published such an article on February 10 — and that very day, Washington, D.C., broke its 1899 seasonal snow record of 54.5 inches with its third official blizzard of the winter. Today, the *New York Times* joined the party.

Like 2010, winter 1899 was characterized by multiple heavy snowstorms, especially in February. Sometimes the jet stream locks into a position where it is capable of creating such a string. As has been painfully obvious, this is one of those years.

Before 1942, D.C.’s official snow totals were taken downtown. The record since the measurement started being recorded at [Reagan National Airport](#), set in 1996, has been eclipsed by ten inches this year.

The big January 1996 storm put down 17.1 inches at Reagan. The January 22, 1996, *Newsweek* cover featured a man disappearing in a whiteout with the headline “Blizzards, Floods, and Hurricanes: Blame Global Warming.” The cover story, written by the voluble science populist Sharon Begley, claimed that global warming allows more moisture into the air so that snowstorms can become bigger. Her go-to scientist was NASA’s James Hansen — who more recently became famous for calling coal drags to your

local power plant “death trains” and advocating war-crime trials for the executives who daily force you to put gasoline in your [car](#). (So clearly we should expect no hyperbole from *that* camp.)

This winter, D.C. has placed *two* storms in the top ten: The 18.0 inches that fell on February 5–6 ranks number four, and the 16.4 on December 18–19 is number eight. *Time*’s Bryan Walsh, who has a difficult time with the concept that improbable events are not impossible, thought this sufficiently bizarre to root online for any source that could be used to blame it on dreaded greenhouse gases. (Walsh found it in a semi-obscure 2003 study in the *Journal of Climate*, though he did not actually link to it in his article.)

And so the argument was trotted out again that mid-Atlantic storms can hold more moisture in a warmer world, and therefore can produce more snow. Anyone who would claim this surely does not understand the climatology of snow in Washington, D.C.

There are plenty of storms, usually up to 20 per winter, that are moist enough to produce snow but instead drop rain, or the unaesthetic combination of sleet and freezing rain that I [call](#) “sleeze.” Why no snow? Because there is simply not enough cold air available. Why so many near-snow events, like sleeze storms? Because there’s often *almost* enough cold air for snow.

To simplify things somewhat, snow requires that the temperature at 5,000 feet be at freezing or below. When a low-pressure system moves up the Atlantic seaboard, warm winds ride on top of it, raising the temperature to the point that it cannot support snow. In order to counter this, there usually has to be a replenishing supply of cold air from New England, which comes in the form of the high-pressure systems that often form ahead of the storm.

Scientists have known for a long time that the modest greenhouse effect we have experienced will have a disproportionate effect on these cold-air masses. So, thanks to climate change, the cold air that’s needed for Washington snow is increasingly hard to come by. Moisture is not the problem: Snowflakes fear warm air.

The fact of the matter is that global warming simply hasn’t done a darned thing to Washington’s snow. The planet was nearly a degree (Celsius) cooler in 1899, when the previous record was set. If you plot out year-to-year snow around here, you’ll see no trend whatsoever through the entire history.

But of course, there are those who *insist* that it snowed more when they were little. That’s partially a matter of physical perspective, as 20 inches of snow on the ground looks a lot bigger to a three-foot child than to a six-foot adult. It’s also a matter of lack of historical perspective. The three winters from 1977 through 1979 are the coldest in the entire U.S. record, and 1979 included the third-ranking snowstorm, the so-called President’s Day Mess.

Did I mention that the popular press back then, including *Time* and *Newsweek*, did not hesitate to blame the winters on the climatic bogeyman of that era — global cooling?

— *Patrick J. Michaels is senior fellow in environmental studies at the Cato Institute and was state climatologist for Virginia from 1980 through 2007.*

3. Heated Blizzard

Investors Business Daily, Feb 11, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=520988>

Climate Change: Will global warm-mongers admit that this winter's heavy snow in the East weakens their position? Of course not. They insist the record flurries are confirmation of their bogus theory.

We've seen this before. In January 1996, when a nor'easter dumped 14 inches of snow in Hickory, N.C., and almost three feet in parts of Massachusetts, Jessica Mathews wrote in her Washington Post column that "blizzards like this one are part of what the experts tell us to expect of a warming climate."

The New York Times ("Blame Global Warming for the Blizzard") and Newsweek ("Blizzards, Floods and Hurricanes: Blame Global Warming") offered the same explanation.

The believers might be losing credibility, but they're consistent. In Thursday's New York Times, under the headline "Climate-Change Debate Is Heating Up in Deep Freeze," Joseph Romm, identified as "a climate-change expert and former Energy Department official who writes about climate issues at the liberal Center for American Progress," is allowed to resurrect the notion.

"Ideologues in the Senate," according to Romm, "keep pushing the anti-scientific disinformation that big snowstorms are evidence against human-caused global warming."

Earlier in the week, MSNBC's Dylan Ratigan said "these 'snowpocalypses' that have been going through D.C. and other extreme- weather events are precisely what climate scientists have been predicting, fearing and anticipating because of global warming."

What seems to be a counterintuitive argument is based on the theory that a warmer climate is a wetter and more volatile climate that will produce, well, bigger snowstorms and other "intense weather events," to use Mathews' words.

Making this all the more interesting are the complaints by Robert Kennedy Jr., who wrote in the Los Angeles Times in 2008 about the "anemic winters" in Virginia caused by global warming.

This year's deep snow is neither proof of global warming nor evidence that the whole concept is a fraud. It is nothing more than evidence of what we already know: Weather can do the unexpected.

Not unexpected, though, has been the response of the believers. We knew they'd say the snow proved their case because they'd done it before. In fact, they have a habit of blaming almost any event, from a bridge collapse in Minnesota to the Earth spinning faster to childhood insomnia, on global warming.

Most of us know better, and they probably do too. But they've made their statement of faith and are having a hard time walking away from it.

4. How to reform the IPCC

By David Adam and Suzanne Goldenberg, Guardian, UK Feb 10, 2010

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/10/ipcc-reform>

[SEPP Comment: Surprising questions from the Guardian – unimaginable a few months ago.]

"The Nobel prize was for peace not science ... government employees will use it to negotiate changes and a redistribution of resources. It is not a scientific analysis of climate change,"

The [IPCC](#) and its chairman, Rajendra Pachauri, have come under unprecedented pressure following a false claim that [all Himalayan glaciers could melt by 2035](#) and the controversy over the [hacked climate science emails at the University of East Anglia](#). Yet before that, the IPCC was credited with having settled the debate over whether human activity was causing global warming, sharing the 2007 Nobel peace prize with Al Gore. Here, the Guardian asks experts around the world what needs to change to enable the IPCC to continue to play a central and positive role in enabling the world's governments to take the right action against [climate change](#)

Political oversight

The IPCC says its reports are policy relevant, but not policy prescriptive. Perhaps unknown to many people, the process is started and finished not by scientists but by political officials, who steer the way the information is presented in so-called summary for policymakers [SPM] chapters. Is that right, the Guardian asked?

"The Nobel prize was for peace not science ... government employees will use it to negotiate changes and a redistribution of resources. It is not a scientific analysis of climate change," said Anton Imeson, a former IPCC lead author from the Netherlands. "For the media, the IPCC assessments have become an icon for something they are not. To make sure that it does not happen again, the IPCC should change its name and become part of something else. The IPCC should have never allowed itself to be branded as a scientific organisation. It provides a review of published scientific papers but none of this is much controlled by independent scientists."

William Connolley, a former climate modeller with the British Antarctic Survey, said: "I think it is inevitable that there will be enormous and pointless fighting over the exact wording of the SPM. And [that is] to some extent, desirable. The science is done by the scientists. The SPM headlines, that the politicians are going to have to act on, will have some political spin, and before the sceptics run wild, let me add that the spin so far has always been in the toning-things-down direction. [It would be better] written just by scientists, but too hard to manage to be worth wasting much time about."

Staff

The city of Southampton spends more than twice as much each year on street cleaning - £8m - than the world does on the IPCC - £3.6m. The reports rely on the unpaid work of thousands of researchers, but is there a case to make the process more professional? [Pachauri, IPCC chair, told the Guardian last week that the IPCC](#) was already moving to beef up the organisation with full-time staff, such as in communications. Chris Field, new head of one of the IPCC's working groups, said: "I do think that the 2035 [glacier melting] error could potentially have come out, just by having a stronger editorial component that was part of a professional staff. We need to really be training the authors. There is a huge emphasis on engaging authors from all over the world who have different scientific backgrounds and different training experience."

Joel Smith, of Stratus Consulting, a lead author on the 2007 report, said: "The questions IPCC will address should come from governments. However, once those questions are settled, the IPCC needs to run the process independent of the governments. This may require a larger permanent professional [staff] for the IPCC, as the US National Academy of Science has."

Structure

The IPCC was set up in 1988 to advise governments on the emerging problem of climate change. It produced its first report in 1990, and three more since. It is made up of three working groups (WG) which assess the science (WG1), impacts (WG2) and response to global warming (WG3) respectively. In yesterday's Guardian, scientists from WG1 blamed the [mistake over the Himalayan glaciers, on "sloppy" researchers](#) from other disciplines from WG2.

Connolley said: "While some of the WG2 is fine, it is clear that some sections have been edited by people who should not have been trusted with the job. It should be done more on merit. At the very least, get someone competent to review the edit comments for their sections."

Field, the new head of WG2, believed ensuring existing rules are implemented is key: "The IPCC needs to make 100% sure that the procedures that have served well in the past are applied."

A more radical suggestion came from John Robinson, professor of resources, environment and sustainability at the University of British Columbia. He said: "The IPCC should continue to improve its elaborate quality control processes, but perhaps make them more transparent. Few people know anything at all about the process works, or what the checks and balances are. Perhaps there should be journalists embedded in the process."

Others argue that the science report, which relies almost exclusively on peer-reviewed research, should be separated from the other reports which researchers say necessarily rely more on "grey" literature, ie, reports that have not been peer-reviewed.

Reports and timing

The IPCC reports are mammoth productions, taking up to six years to complete. The last one contained 900 pages. Is it still relevant for experts to produce such weighty volumes that wait several years to be updated? And should the emphasis of the reports be changed, given that the scientific evidence for anthropogenic global warming has been firmly established?

Robert Muir Wood, head of the research group at Risk Management Solutions, said the current IPCC report system was "fossilised" and that the organisation needed to move into the 21st century by setting up Wikipedia-style rolling publishing, that could be updated each month. Others suggested changes almost as radical. Connolley said the "useless" synthesis reports should be ditched, while Robinson said: "There needs to be continuous review of what the timing and topics should be."

But significant changes may have to wait until after the next assessment report, expected in 2013, said Mike Hulme, climate scientist at the University of East Anglia. "We can do lots of little tweaks but I can't see governments willingly going back to the drawing board."

Hulme wanted to see the social and cultural aspects of the impacts and response to climate change reflected in different ways in future reports, such as by drawing more on local knowledge, and distinguishing more between the way different societies may react.

5. Scientists say IPCC should be overhauled or scrapped

By Leigh Dayton, The Australian, Feb 11, 2010, [H/t Watts Up With That]

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/scientists-say-ipcc-should-be-overhauled-or-scrapped/story-e6frg6nf-1225828951315>

INTERNATIONAL scientists have called for the world's peak climate change body to be revamped or scrapped after damaging controversies that have dogged the expert panel in recent months.

The scientists suggest a range of options, from tightening the selection of lead authors and contributors to the International Panel on Climate Change, to dumping it in favour of a small permanent body, or even turning the whole climate science assessment process into a moderated "living" Wikipedia-IPCC.

Writing today in the journal *Nature*, five US, British, German and Swiss climate scientists - all contributing or lead IPCC report authors - agreed a mechanism for assessing the facts and impacts of climate change was critical.

But they acknowledged that calls for reform had intensified after what *Nature* called "recent furores". Last month, for instance, it was revealed that flawed communication between teams of scientists led to the IPCC's inaccurate claim that most Himalayan glaciers would melt almost 300 years earlier than forecast. In November, the release of hacked email messages between climate scientists triggered widespread media reports of scientific wrongdoing.

According to Mike Hulme, from Britain's University of East Anglia, the structure and process of the IPCC has passed its sell-by date. "The IPCC is no longer fit for the purpose," he wrote in *Nature*.

In Australia, Barry Brook, the director of climate change research at Adelaide University, agreed, saying: "I wouldn't be disturbed if there wasn't ever another IPCC report, provided we replaced it with something more timely, concise and relevant to policy makers," he said.

Professor Andy Pitman, co-director of the UNSW Climate Change Research Centre, disagreed. The "IPCC is the most rigorous program of assessing the state of (the) science. It's as near perfect as such a process can be".

Thomas Stocker, of the University of Bern in Switzerland, argued the "bottom-up" and peer-review principles of the IPCC were sound and should be carefully maintained. If so, he said, the panel could continue to be an "honest broker".

US-based director of climate change adaptation with the World Wide Fund for Nature, Jeff Price, went further, arguing the panel should improve its author and reviewer choice and produce annual reports, not taking four or more years as at present.

According to Dr Hulme, however, the IPCC should be broken into three panels, reflecting current working groups.

The University of Alabama's John Christy said the IPCC should be dismantled. Rotating groups of four to eight lead authors could manage a Wikipedia-style process that would reflect diverse scientific opinion.

6. India Supports a Toothless IPCC: The less credibility the climate body has, the less it can do to block vital economic development

By Barun Mitra, WSJ, Opinion Asia, Feb 8, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203863204574346610120524166.html>

Prime Minister Manmohan Singh expressed support for the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and its leader, Rajendra Pachauri, at a local energy conference in New Delhi Friday. The move has surprised many observers, but it may prove to be politically astute.

The IPCC's credibility is in tatters. From climategate to glaciergate, Amazongate, natural-disaster gate, and now Chinagate, the revelations of bad science keep coming. Given all that, plus the much-publicized flap between Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh and Mr. Pachauri over the science behind "melting" Himalayan glaciers weeks before the Copenhagen climate summit in December, superficially one might have expected the Indian government to jettison Mr. Pachauri as soon as possible.

But Delhi isn't just offering him and the organization rhetorical backing. At Friday's annual flagship event of the Energy and Resources Institute—which Mr. Pachauri has headed for almost 30 years—the prime minister offered to provide technical assistance through a newly established glacier research center. The government has also formed a network of scientific institutions to develop domestic science and research capacities on climate issues.

The explanation for this support is simple: It is in the Indian government's interest to perpetuate a weak IPCC and a toothless Mr. Pachauri at its helm. Given the recent scandals, the IPCC is hardly in a position to lobby India for carbon concessions. No one from the IPCC can again cavalierly dismiss their critics as promoting "voodoo" science or "vested interests," as was Mr. Pachauri's wont. By offering scientific support to the IPCC, the Indian government is actually confirming its lack of confidence in the U.N. body's scientific credentials.

Mr. Pachauri is now in his second term as the head of IPCC. He is not a climate scientist—or indeed a scientist at all. He is an able science administrator who built his institute from scratch. Influential governments in the rich world probably accepted Mr. Pachauri not just for his redoubtable skill in institution-building, but also in the hope that by placing an Indian like him at the head of IPCC, he might be able to influence Indian policy.

That's important because after all, if countries like China and India do not subscribe to any commitment to reducing emissions, developed countries' best efforts will not have any significant impact. Having bought the idea of man-made global warming, rich countries had to try and ensure that developing countries fell in line.

But in democratic India no leader can afford to ignore the developmental aspirations of the people. Even if some Indian elites want to sell the future of the country by agreeing to some form of restrictions on energy usage—and thus on economic growth—in the fiercely competitive world of Indian politics they stand no chance.

The IPCC was created as a way to make the world, particularly the poor, fall in line and support expensive climate-change initiatives by overwhelming them with the apparent authority of the world's leading technical body on the subject, backed by a supposed scientific consensus. This attempt was doomed to fail, because scientific inquiry does not respect consensus, and orthodoxy is anathema to scientific progress.

There is some poetic justice in this whole drama. Countries like India that were always apprehensive of institutions like the IPCC now prefer to keep it twisting in the wind. The rich countries that gave birth to the idea of the IPCC cannot afford to disown it without exposing their own underlying design. They could try to replace its head, in the hope that the new face might be able to rebuild the credibility of the institution. But having tasted blood, there is no reason why India and China should let the current advantage pass so easily.

The IPCC has been checkmated, as have so many other U.N. institutions before it. This is the inevitable consequence of the desire for global government under the misguided belief that ordinary people do not know what is in their own interest. With the deepening of democratic ideals, people power can no longer be overturned so easily. The failure of the IPCC shows that sovereignty still lies with the people, not with the aspirants for global government.

Mr. Mitra is director of the Liberty Institute, an independent think tank in New Delhi.

7. Arizona Quits Climate Pact

IBD, Feb 12, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=521142>

Cap-And-Trade: The Grand Canyon State avoids a big economic hole by suspending its participation in a multistate initiative to fight climate change. As climate fraud is exposed, economic reality sets in. Will California follow?

Not since King Canute have government officials engaged in an exercise as futile as in 2007, when seven U.S. states and four Canadian provinces got together to form something called the Western Regional Climate Action Initiative to reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions starting in 2012.

Leading the charge for the pact was California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, who insisted, "We cannot wait for the United States government to get its act together on the environment." At the time he said the regional agreement "sets the stage for a regional cap-and-trade program which will provide a powerful framework for developing a national cap-and-trade program."

Since then, the nation has slid into a recession, and the only thing man-made about climate change has been the manipulated and manufactured claims that we are doomed if we don't act to fight it.

Arizona Gov. Jan Brewer, seeing which way the snow is blowing, has issued an executive order saying her state will suspend its participation in the emission-control plan or any program that could raise costs for businesses and consumers.

Arizona joined the climate initiative under its previous governor, Janet Napolitano, now secretary of homeland security in the Obama administration.

All 50 states agreed to the cap-and-trade pact, but left implementation up to each state. Only California is ready to start its program in 2012.

Brewer also ordered Arizona's Environmental Quality Department to take another look at stricter vehicle emission rules, based on California's standards, set to take effect in 2012, fearing they would significantly raise new car costs. Slowly but surely, economic reality is trumping climate fantasy.

Rumblings of discontent are also being heard in California. Assemblyman Dan Logue is sponsoring an initiative for the November ballot that would halt implementation of the state's global-warming law, Assembly Bill 32, until the state unemployment rate drops to 5.5% from the current 12.4%.

"The state's greenhouse reduction program is not a freebie," Gino DiCaro, a spokesman for the California Manufacturers & Technology Association, said last month. "Large costs foisted on an unemployment-riddled state economy and increased electricity rates ... are not affordable at this time, if ever."

A 2009 study by economists at California State University, Sacramento, and commissioned by the California Small Business Roundtable found implementation costs for AB32 "could easily exceed \$100 billion" and that by 2020 the program would raise the cost of living by \$7,857 per household per year.

Even the most optimistic assessments of global pacts such as Copenhagen and Kyoto would have moderated at great cost the earth's temperature by an amount too small to measure. The impact of a regional pact by a handful of states would be futile, especially when they are downwind from the world's biggest polluter, the "developing" nation of China, which is exempt from such global pacts.

Not long ago, the New York Times reported that a new coal-fired power plant big enough to serve San Diego comes on line in China every seven to 10 days, exporting more pollution to California and the West than such draconian proposals would ever hope to curb. The pact also envisions strict emission limits on American cars at a time China has passed the U.S. as the world's largest auto market.

One of the supporters of the initiative to suspend AB32 is Ted Costa of the People's Advocate, a Sacramento-based anti-tax group. "Look at what happened in Massachusetts," said Costa, who was active in the successful 2003 effort to recall former Gov. Gray Davis. "I see that happening with AB32. Blue-collar workers think the government has gone too far. We're told we're somehow warming the planet. But they don't see the evidence."

As much of the nation lies under a blanket of snow, neither do we. But the political climate is about to change.

8. Stimulating Green Jobs for China

Investors Business Daily, Feb 11, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=520923>

[SEPP Comment: Amazingly, many advocating "green jobs" apparently believe massive wind turbines can be built locally.]

Energy: When even Chuck Schumer is upset with the White House, you know something's amiss. In this case, it's news that efforts to boost wind power with taxpayer stimulus dollars are filling foreign coffers and creating foreign jobs.

According to the Investigative Reporting Workshop at American University, nearly \$2 billion in money from the American Recovery and Investment Act has been spent on wind power. The goal was to further energy independence while creating American jobs. It has done neither.

Of the money spent, according to the report, nearly 80% has gone to foreign manufacturers of wind turbines.

"In all due respect, I remind (Energy Secretary Steven Chu) there is a four-letter word associated with the stimulus — J-O-B-S," Sen. Schumer, D-N.Y., told ABC News, which interviewed him for a report done in coordination with the workshop's investigation. "Very few jobs here, lots of jobs in China."

The only good thing one can say is that at least China is a real place, as opposed to the phantom ZIP codes and congressional districts in which the administration has claimed to have created jobs.

But how does buying wind turbines made in China create energy independence or create jobs?

Last October, on the day the workshop first reported on this story, a consortium of U.S. and Chinese companies announced a deal to build a \$1.5 billion wind farm in Texas, using imported Chinese turbines.

The project is expected to create some temporary construction jobs in America. Some 2,000 manufacturing jobs will be created in China. In a message posted on his Facebook page, Secretary Chu wrote that the point of the grant program was "ensuring America leads the world in creating jobs in manufacturing the parts that go into wind farms" and even export components to foreign wind farms. It hasn't worked out that way.

Of the 1,807 turbines erected on 28 wind farms receiving grants, foreign-owned manufacturers built 1,219, according to the workshop report. The installation of these turbines may have created as many as 6,838 manufacturing jobs overseas.

When the American Wind Energy Association released its 2009 year-end report on Jan. 26, CEO Denise Bode acknowledged that despite billions in stimulus spending, there had actually been a net loss in manufacturing jobs. Bode told USA Today she estimates the manufacturing job loss at 1,500.

Last March, a cargo of steel towers was unloaded at the port of Vancouver, Wash. They were made in Vietnam for a Danish wind company and destined for a Portuguese wind farm in Indiana that got a stimulus grant.

The towers arrived in Washington state after traveling 7,400 miles from Vietnam's Barra VANUATU province, where they were constructed by CS Wind — Vietnam's leading steel tower manufacturer.

We're all for free trade, but stimulus money was supposed to create jobs in America. As for helping us achieve energy independence, wind has failed miserably.

After decades of subsidies, wind provides only 1% of our electricity compared with 49% for coal, 22% for natural gas, 19% for nuclear power and 7% for hydroelectric. Wind turbines generally operate at only 20% efficiency vs. 85% for coal, gas and nuclear plants.

The irony is we leave vast reserves of job-creating domestic oil, coal and natural gas locked up as we sacrifice our economy to the Gaia, the goddess of climate change, something China has wisely refused to do.

#####