

The Week That Was (February 27, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

#####

Fred Singer is 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 Nature's infinite book of secrecy A little I can read." Soothsayer in *Antony and Cleopatra*, William Shakespeare

THIS WEEK:

As the winter weather continues to rage in much of the Northern Hemisphere in ways not expected, this week we have not witnessed any new, remarkable revelations on ClimateGates we saw over the past few months, but the internal turmoil these revelations created continues. Even the New York Times appears to be resigned that it is unlikely the interested parties will have a grand climate change treaty ready for the December Conference of Parties meeting in Mexico. Three months ago many thought such a treaty was inevitable by then if not before. If only the New York Times will tell its readers exactly why.

The UN chief negotiator for a treaty has resigned, IPCC Chairman R.K. Pachauri is under fire, surface temperature data are being investigated, and exaggerations in the IPCC reports are coming to the fore. Of course IPCC defenders dismiss the issues as exaggerations from a few dissident skeptics or, as US Senator Bernie Sanders claims, Nazi deniers.

The leaders of the UN Environmental Program (EP), made up of delegates from 58 countries, are weathering the storms huddled up in Bali with special interest groups scheming Plan B. Early reports indicate EP is making a major effort to be ready for the 2012 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro which is timed to be the 20th Anniversary of the "Earth Summit" in Rio that led to the Kyoto Protocol which will expire that year. No doubt more news will follow.

The US EPA has thus far responded to the petitions for reconsideration of its finding that carbon dioxide emissions endanger human health and welfare as expected: with a resounding NO! "The science is settled." Or as the headline of one article puts it: "Fifteen Years With No Global Warming Doesn't Mean There's No Global Warming, Says EPA Chief." No doubt this story will also develop further.

One characteristic that is common to the advocates is their scientific certainty and how appalled they act should anyone should question them. Thus, they dismiss any major errors of fact, data, or conclusions as only a few misplaced words in some 3,000 pages of text.

The "News You Can Use" begins with meteorologist Joseph D'Aleo's [ICECAP.us] explanation of the wild winter then continues with three articles on polar ice caps. After this are a collection of articles on current UN IPCC and EP activities as well as EPA issues. Following this are more articles on climate change and other topics.

Several articles deserve special mention. One is the article on the Vermont Senate voting to not extend the operating license of a nuclear power plant that provides one-third of the state's electricity. The license expires in 2012. The issue is tritium leakage (tritium is an isotope of hydrogen). The second article of

special mention is astronaut Buzz Aldrin's defense of abandoning a mission to the Moon in favor of going to Mars.

Science editorial #7-2010 (Feb 27, 2010)

By S. Fred Singer, President, Science and Environmental Policy Project

[Note: This is another of a series of mini-editorials on the "junk science" influencing the global warming issue. Other topics will include the UN Environmental Program, and some individuals heavily involved in these matters.]

Junkscience #9. ClimateGate (CG) and other 'Gates' undermine the credibility of the IPCC and of AGW

The reports of the UN-IPCC have long provided the basis of the so-called 'scientific consensus.' Climate statements of assorted national academies of sciences, including the venerable Royal Society, turned out to be nothing more than rehash of the IPCC conclusions, rather than independent assessments. Similarly, the statements issued by various professional societies simply relied on the IPCC – without adding any analyses of their own.

In turn, this apparent consensus misled not only the media and the public but also the wider scientific community, which had remained largely unaware of the ongoing debate and of the work of the many reputable climate experts who disagreed with the IPCC. Thanks to the e-mails of ClimateGate (CG), we now know of the efforts by a small clique to suppress publication of such dissenting views by subverting the scientific peer-review process – often with the connivance of the editors of leading professional journals.

All this is now changing. The e-mails leaked from the University of East Anglia server strongly suggest that the basic temperature data had been manipulated, yielding the reported strong surface warming of the past 30 years. Again, we had long suspected this, because the data from weather satellites showed little warming trend of the atmosphere since 1979. Available proxy data seemed to confirm this result (see "Hot Talk Cold Science" [1997] -- HTCS Fig 16). But according to theory – and every greenhouse climate model -- tropospheric trends should be substantially greater than surface trends.

This disparity between the trends derived from weather station data and from satellite data was already apparent in 1996 (see HTCS Fig 9), and was amply confirmed in a special study of the US National Academy of Sciences ["Reconciling observations of global temperature change" 2000].

The NAS report could not reconcile the disparity and never explained its cause. But it has become evident now that the cause may be a greatly exaggerated surface trend – brought about by the CG cabal. We will learn the details once we unravel just how the data were manipulated.

The 'manufacture' of a 'man-made' warming trend, when there is none, likely involved (i) selection of stations that showed a trend, and (ii) inadequate correction for purely local warming influences such as the 'urban heat island' effect (see HTCS Figs 7 and 8; and the recent extensive publications of Joe D'Aleo and Anthony Watts).

In a sense then, the other 'Gates' discovered since CG – GlacierGate and all the rest – are a distraction from the main story. They were all found in IPCC Volume 2, which deals with climate impacts, i.e. with the consequences of global warming. They indicate a general sloppiness and make a mockery of the much touted IPCC standards and procedures. They have severely shaken the public's and the media's faith in the IPCC. But the main story is still CG – because it impacts directly on IPCC Volume 1, which deals with climate science and the causes of climate change rather than with climate impacts. To sum up: CG demonstrates just how the IPCC [2007] arrived at its erroneous conclusion about anthropogenic

global warming (AGW) in the latter half of the 20th century. They used bad data. It's no surprise then that none of the evidence the IPCC put forth in support of AGW can stand up to scrutiny – as already shown in the reports of the NIPCC (“Nature, not human activity, rules the climate” and “Climate change reconsidered”) [2008 and 2009].

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

1. The sound of alarm

By Richard Lindzen, Boston Globe Letter, Feb 19, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/letters/articles/2010/02/19/the_sound_of_alarm/

2. £60m bill for the CO2 of our political class

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Feb 20, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7280348/60m-bill-for-the-CO2-of-our-political-class.html>

[SEPP Comment: A look at the money-flow for buying carbon dioxide indulgences.]

3. Climate Change

New York Times, Feb 21, 2010,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/22/opinion/22mon1.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: The Gray Lady recognizes the signs do not bode well for a great treaty in December in Mexico. But it apparently fails to understand why.]

4. Climate Change Debate Over? It's Just Begun!

By Ken Balckwell, Feb 21, 2010, American Thinker

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

[SEPP Correction: Fred earned his Ph.D. at Princeton]

5. Blinded by Science

By George Will, TownHall, Feb 21, 2010

http://townhall.com/columnists/GeorgeWill/2010/02/21/blinded_by_science

6. Climate Change and Open Science

By L. Gordon Crovitz, WSJ, Feb 22, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704757904575077741687226602.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Record Setting Arctic Oscillation (AO) and Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) Creates Wild Winter

By Joe D'Aleo, ICECAP.US Feb 19, 2010

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

Antarctic ice shelf collapse possibly triggered by ocean waves, Scripps-led study finds

E! Science News, Feb 11, 2010

<http://esciencenews.com/articles/2010/02/11/antarctic.ice.shelf.collapse.possibly.triggered.ocean.waves.scripps.led.study.finds>

Arctic ice melt alarms scientists

By Bruce Owen, Winnipeg Free Press, Feb 6, 2010 [H/t Mark Johnson, ICECAP]
<http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/local/arctic-ice-melt-alarms-scientists-83704042.html>

[SEPP Comment: A vessel able to move in the Arctic during the winter may be more a reflection of modern technology than unprecedented warming.]

Missing ice in 2007 drained out the Nares strait – pushed south by wind where it melted far away from the Arctic

By Anthony Watts, Watts Up With That, Feb 19, 2010

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/02/19/jpl-missing-ice-in-2007-drained-out-the-nares-straight-pushed-south-by-wind-where-it-melted-far-away-from-the-arctic/>

[SEPP Comment: The great Arctic ice melt of 2007 may not have been a actual melt caused by warming but a random event – the failure of a natural ice dam to form.]

Bali-Hoo: U.N. Still Pushing for Global Environmental Control

By George Russell, Fox News, Feb 23, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,587426,00.html>

Reject sceptics' attempts to derail global climate deal, UN chief urges Ban Ki-moon urges environment ministers to reject attempts by sceptics to undermine negotiations by exaggerating shortcomings in Himalayan glaciers report

Associated Press, Guardian, UK, Feb 24, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/feb/24/ban-ki-moon-un-reject-sceptics>

[SEPP Comment: Deliberate distortion of data and scientific inquiry are more than shortcomings.]

Climate scientists hope independent reviews will reverse public's loss of trust

By Ben Webster, Environment Editor, The Times, Feb 25, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article7039264.ece>

Climate change data will now face independent scrutiny

By Nicholas Kravey, Washington Times, Feb 26, 2010

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/26/warming-put-to-new-grand-challenge/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today

[SEPP Comment: The surface data are inadequate, yes. But worse, they have been manipulated.]

IPCC chief Rajendra Pachauri to face independent inquiry

By Geoffrey Lean, Telegraph, UK, Feb 26, 2010

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7316758/IPCC-chief-Rajendra-Pachauri-to-face-independent-inquiry.html>

Push to Oversimplify at Climate Panel

By Jeffrey Ball and Keith Johnson, WSJ, Feb 26, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704188104575083681319834978.html>

[SEPP Comment to WSJ: Over simplification is not the issue. The issue is failure to rigorously evaluate the science. The hockey-stick replaced historic knowledge with a mathematical model, the data are compromised, the methodology is wrong, and the models have been falsified rendering any projections scientifically meaningless.

Carbon dioxide is invisible to humans and your photos of smoking chimneys do not show carbon dioxide.]

[Virginia Attorney General] Cuccinelli fights the EPA

The Washington Times, Feb 21, 2010

http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/feb/21/cuccinelli-fights-the-epa/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today

EPA, Countering Critics of Greenhouse Gas Findings, Says ‘Science Is Settled’

By Molly Heneberg, FoxNews.com, Feb 19, 2010 [H/t Debbie Wetlaufer]

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/02/19/epa-countering-critics-greenhouse-gas-findings-says-science-settled/>

EPA lays out timetable for regulating greenhouse gas emissions

By Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post, Feb 21, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/22/AR2010022204829.html>

Fifteen Years With No Global Warming Doesn’t Mean There’s No Global Warming, Says EPA Chief

By Karen Schuberg, CNSNews, Feb 24, 2010 [H/t Brad Veek]

<http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/61804>

EPA: “we need to move aggressively” to pass energy regulation legislation.

Global Warming? LOL!

By Deroy Murdock, National Review Online, Feb 18, 2010

<http://article.nationalreview.com/425200/global-warming-lol/deroy-murdock?page=1>

[SEPP Comment: Good summary showing deception has long been a tactic of the alarmists.]

How Al Gore Wrecked Planet Earth

By Walter Russell Mead, American Interest Online, Feb 19, 2010

<http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/02/19/how-al-gore-wrecked-planet-earth/>

[SEPP Comment: Ignoring the lack of supporting science, an interesting look at why the movement is failing.]

Investigate Climate Crimes

Investor’s Business Daily Editorial, Feb 24, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=522120>

If climate science is dubious, shouldn’t governments give carmakers a break?

By Neil Winton, European Perspective Detroit News, Feb 19, 2010

<http://www.detnews.com/article/20100219/OPINION03/2190437/1148/AUTO01/If-climate-science-is-dubious--shouldn-t-governments-give-carmakers-a-break>

[SEPP Comment: A question European governments will not find humorous.]

More on NCDC Temperature Data “Adjustments”

Science and Public Policy Institute, Feb 25, 2010

<http://sppiblog.org/news/more-on-ncdc-temperature-data-%E2%80%9Cadjustments%E2%80%9D-reports-sppi>

[SEPP Comment: The data manipulation may have been as bad as some feared.]

Vermont Scuttles Plans for Reactor

By Rebecca Smith, WSJ, Feb 25, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704240004575085771093093364.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

[SEPP Comment: The Vermont Senate voted to not extend the existing operating license the nuclear reactor that provides one-third of the state's electricity. The license expires in 2012. A caution to all who hope nuclear power is a solution to future electricity.]

Oil Industry Booms – in North Dakota,

By Ben Casselman, WSJ, Feb 26, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703795004575087623756596514.html?mod=WSJ_US_News_3

Start-Up Bloom Claims Fuel-Cell Breakthrough

By Jim Carlton, WSJ, Feb 25, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703510204575085890835444302.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_leftHeadlines

Teasing Vaccines From Tobacco

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, Feb 24, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703503804575083611168442980.html#mod=todays_us_page_one

[SEPP Comment: Imagine the resistance to a useful vaccine from tobacco.]

Trading the Moon for Mars

By Buzz Aldrin, WSJ, Feb 25, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704479404575087553665710176.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFTTopOpinion

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

From the World's Greatest Deliberative Body

[US Senator from Vermont] Bernie Sanders compares climate skeptics to Nazi deniers

By Marin Cogan, Politico, Feb 23, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0210/33371.html>

309,000,000 Americans Uninsured against global warming – Buy Now!!

Climate insurance

Washington Post Editorial, Feb 22

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/21/AR2010022102917.html?referrer=emailarticle>

When Reason Fails Use “Ad Hominem”

Climate skeptics are recycled critics of controls on tobacco and acid rain

By Jeffrey Sachs, Guardian, UK, Feb 19, 2010

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/cif-green/2010/feb/19/climate-change-sceptics-science>

[SEPP Comment: *Ad hominem* is such a comforting technique. It allows one to believe he has demolished the rational arguments of another without having to think.]

#####

1. The sound of alarm

By Richard Lindzen, Boston Globe Letter, Feb 19, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/letters/articles/2010/02/19/the_sound_of_alarm/

KERRY EMANUEL’S Feb. 15 op-ed “[Climate changes are proven fact](#)” is more advocacy than assessment. Vague terms such as “consistent with,” “probably,” and “potentially” hardly change this. Certainly climate change is real; it occurs all the time. To claim that the little we’ve seen is larger than any change we “have been able to discern” for a thousand years is disingenuous. Panels of the National Academy of Sciences and Congress have concluded that the methods used to claim this cannot be used for more than 400 years, if at all. Even the head of the deservedly maligned Climatic Research Unit acknowledges that the medieval period may well have been warmer than the present.

The claim that everything other than models represents “mere opinion and speculation” is also peculiar. Despite their faults, models show that projections of significant warming depend critically on clouds and water vapor, and the physics of these processes can be observationally tested (the normal scientific approach); at this point, the models seem to be failing.

Finally, given a generation of environmental propaganda, a presidential science adviser (John Holdren) who has promoted alarm since the 1970s, and a government that proposes funding levels for climate research about 20 times the levels in 1991, courage seems hardly the appropriate description - at least for scientists supporting such alarm.

Richard S. Lindzen

Cambridge

The writer is Alfred P. Sloan professor of atmospheric sciences at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.■

2. £60m bill for the CO2 of our political class

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Feb 20, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7280348/60m-bill-for-the-CO2-of-our-political-class.html>

[SEPP Comment: A look at the money-flow for buying carbon dioxide indulgences.]

One could not want a better vignette of the gulf that has opened up between our “political class” and the rest of us than a bizarre little item which emerged last week on an obscure part of the European Commission’s website. The British Government, as revealed by the EU’s Official Journal, has allocated £60 million of taxpayers’ money to be spent on buying carbon credits from the Third World for the use of government buildings and other official purposes – so that our civil servants can continue to benefit from the CO2 emissions needed to keep their offices warm and lit.

The Government has contracted to buy these credits, mainly available from China and India, through 10 British and foreign companies, including Barclays Bank and a branch of JP Morgan rather oddly situated in a back street in Oxford.

Our entire Government machine – politicians and civil servants alike – is now obsessively dedicated to the proposition that we must drastically cut our “carbon emissions” to save the planet, at virtually unlimited cost. But when it comes to the officials and politicians themselves having to make sacrifices, as

our own fuel bills soar, they have quietly arranged for the rest of us to shell out £60 million to allow them to carry on much as before.

The story then becomes even more bizarre. The contracts with Barclays, JP Morgan and co – who will retain up to £9 million in commissions – will be used to buy Certified Emissions Reduction (CER) credits under the UN’s Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) set up under the 1997 Kyoto Protocol.

Easily the largest beneficiaries of this curious system are firms in China and India which receive the credits for showing that they have at least nominally cut back on their own greenhouse gas emissions. They can then sell their CERs through intermediaries, to allow organisations in the West, such as the British Government, to continue pumping out greenhouse gases such as CO2.

The largest and easily the most lucrative component of the CDM market, administered under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), is a peculiar racket centred on the manufacture of CFCs (chlorofluorocarbons), classified under Kyoto as greenhouse gases infinitely more potent than CO2. The way the racket works is that Chinese and Indian firms are permitted to carry on producing the refrigerant gas known as HCFC-22 until 2030. But a by-product of this process is HCFC-23, 11,700 times more powerful as a greenhouse gas than CO2. The firms can then destroy the HCFC-23, claiming allocations of carbon credits worth billions for doing so (while much of the useful HCFC-22 is then sold on to the international black market).

According to the UN Environment Programme – a body set up in 1972 by a Canadian businessman, Maurice Strong, who was its first chairman and also father of the UNFCCC – destruction of CFCs as of last year accounted for more than half the CDM credits issued, in a market which will eventually be worth an estimated \$17 billion. Less than 1 per cent of the 1,390 CDM projects so far approved accounts for 36 per cent of their total value.

Thus we pay billions of dollars to the Asian countries for the right to continue emitting CO2 and other greenhouse gases here in the West, including the £60 million contributed by British taxpayers to keep our civil servants warm. As a result we enrich a small number of people in China and India, including Maurice Strong, who now lives in exile in Beijing, having been caught out in 2005 for illicitly receiving \$1 million from Saddam Hussein in the “Oil for Food” scandal. He played a key part in setting up China’s carbon exchange, to buy and sell the CDM credits administered by the UNFCCC – of which Strong himself was the chief architect.

The net result of all this trading and jiggery-pokery is that, after billions of pounds and dollars have changed hands, with a hefty commission for those bankers and other carbon traders along the way, there is no reduction in greenhouse gas emissions whatever. But at least our political class can continue to work in warm offices and fly righteously round the world on our behalf – while the rest of us foot the bill.

3. Climate Change

New York Times, Feb 21, 2010,

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/22/opinion/22mon1.html?th&emc=th>

[SEPP Comment: The Gray Lady recognizes the signs do not bode well for a great treaty in December in Mexico. But it apparently fails to understand why.]

Yvo de Boer’s resignation on Thursday after nearly four tumultuous years as chief steward of the United Nations’ climate change negotiations has deepened a sense of pessimism about whether the world can ever get its act together on global warming. Mr. de Boer was plainly exhausted by endless bickering among nations and frustrated by the failure of December’s talks in Copenhagen to deliver the prize he had

worked so hard for: a legally binding treaty committing nations to mandatory reductions in greenhouse gases.

His resignation comes at a fragile moment in the campaign to combat climate change. The Senate is stalemated over a climate change bill. The disclosure of apparently trivial errors in the U.N.'s 2007 climate report has given Senate critics fresh ammunition. And without Mr. de Boer, the slim chances of forging a binding agreement at the next round of talks in December in Cancún, Mexico, seem slimmer still.

Yet his departure is hardly the death knell for international negotiations. It is not proof that such talks are of no value or that the U.N. negotiating framework in place since 1992 should be abandoned. Even Copenhagen, messy as it was, brought rich and poor nations closer together than they had been. And more than 90 countries representing 83 percent of the world's greenhouse gases promised, at least notionally, to reduce their emissions.

But his resignation does remind us that the U.N. process is tiring, cumbersome and slow. It reinforces the notion that some parallel negotiating track will be necessary if the world is to have any hope of achieving the reductions scientists believe are necessary to avert the worst consequences of climate change.

The Copenhagen pledges, even if all of them are met, will merely stabilize global emissions by 2020. What really matters is what happens after 2020, whether the world can achieve reductions of at least 50 percent by midcentury. That won't happen without big cuts by big emitters like the United States, the European Union, China, India and Brazil.

Even before Copenhagen, global leaders were exploring parallel tracks. Former President George W. Bush brought together some of the big emitters, and President Obama has expanded on this idea with the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate, a group of 17 countries that plans to meet regularly. The Group of 20 has put climate change high on its agenda, and bilateral efforts — technology exchanges between China and the United States, for instance — are under discussion.

The underlying thought is that the ultimate goal is a safe planet, and that absent a top-down global treaty, that goal is probably best achieved by aggressive, bottom-up national strategies to reduce emissions. Not that these are a sure thing; the United States, embarrassingly, has no national strategy. Until it gets one, it can hardly lecture anyone else. Nor will the world stand a ghost of a chance of bringing emissions under control.

4. Climate Change Debate Over? It's Just Begun!

By Ken Balckwell, Feb 21, 2010, American Thinker

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

[SEPP Correction: Fred earned his Ph.D. at Princeton]

Ronald Reagan used to say of the Soviets that they liked the arms race a whole lot better when they were the only ones in it. The same could be said of Al Gore and global warming -- oops, excuse me: [climate change](#). Mr. Gore was much happier to dash around the world in his water-vapor-powered personal jet to preach the green gospel of environmentalism. He would tell us which truths were *inconvenient*. Any dissenters were shouted down as "deniers." No pope would ever make claims as far-reaching, as extravagant, or as all-embracing as Saint Al did.

But now comes the pushback. Just before the World Summit on Climate Change at Copenhagen last December, several hundred e-mails from the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia were leaked. It appeared that Dr. Phil Jones had urged colleagues, including some at Penn State University, to "hide the decline" in world temperatures and encouraged others to do some of their usual

"tricks" to get the right result from ambiguous data. A huge scandal erupted, instantly dubbed "Climategate."

Jones stepped down as director of CRU and even went so far, he confessed to the *Times of London*, as to contemplate suicide. God forbid. Truly, these are serious questions, and we have serious objections to what Dr. Jones and his colleagues were caught doing, but we want no one involved in this affair to become so despondent as to take his own life. Dr. Jones says his hope for his five-year-old granddaughter is what helped him to banish thoughts of self-destruction. "I wanted to see her grow up." Dr. Jones, I pray that you will.

If Al Gore has not become any humbler, it's at least good to see Dr. Jones somewhat chastened by the revelations that some of his data may not be as reliable as we have been led to believe. And it is not only the reading public that may have been misled. Dr. Jones' CRU is one of the primary institutions responsible for feeding data to the U.N.'s [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](#) (IPCC). It was this IPCC that shared with Al Gore the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize. (Note: They did not win the Nobel Prize for *Science*.)

The Left is wringing its hands over the "failure" of the World Climate Summit at Copenhagen to approve a binding treaty. But perhaps they should thank God (or Gore) for that fact. That's because the mere threat of job-killing [cap-and-trade legislation](#) has been enough for independent voters in the U.S. to abandon left-leaning politicians in droves.

Along with stiff carbon [taxes](#) and straitjacket regulations inevitably comes population control. At Copenhagen, China's Peggy Liu, chair of the Joint U.S.-China Collaboration on Clean Energy, bragged about Beijing's brutal one-child policy. That policy, said this winner of *Time* Magazine's "Hero of the Environment" award, "reduces energy demand and is arguably the most effective way the country can mitigate climate change."

Soviet Communist Party boss Joe Stalin would be proud. "You have a problem with a man. If you get rid of the man, you get rid of the problem," said the top Communist of the Twentieth Century. (Come to think of it, Uncle Joe Stalin even topped Peggy Liu. He was named *Time's* Man of the Year not once, but twice -- 1939 and 1942.)

Thomas Friedman of the *New York Times* hails China's [one-child policy](#) as "reasonably enlightened." He likes the fact that Beijing's rulers -- unburdened by those pesky voters voting out their betters -- can "impose the politically difficult but critically important policies needed to move a society forward in the 21st century." Friedman's bestselling book is titled *The World is Flat*. (And liberals accuse *us* of being the Flat Earth Society?)

Isn't it really funny how all the "errors" made by the climate scientists seem to fall on one side of the debate? If the glaciers of the Himalayas are all going to melt by 2035, that's a real problem. But if they're not expected to melt until 2350, it's another matter. Guess which date the IPCC chose to publish? Just a typo?

What if the globe is indeed warming, but the warming is part of a cyclical pattern of warming and cooling? That's the thesis of Dr. S. Fred Singer. Dr. Singer and co-author Dennis Avery write in *Unstoppable Global Warming* that "evidence from North Atlantic deep-sea cores reveals that abrupt shifts punctuated what is conventionally thought to have been a relatively stable Holocene [interglacial] climate. During each of these episodes, cool, ice-bearing waters from north of Iceland were advected as far south as the latitude of Britain. At about the same times, the atmospheric circulation above Greenland changed abruptly.... Together, they make up a series of climatic shifts with a cyclicity close to 1470 years (plus or minus 500 years). The Holocene events, therefore, appear to be the most recent manifestation of a

pervasive millennial-scale climatic cycle *operating independently of the glacial-interglacial climate state* (emphasis added)."

Dr. Singer has been abused by Left-wing bloggers, called a denier, and denounced as a tool of industry. He earned his Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University, worked with NASA for decades, and is thoroughly conversant with satellite measurements of earth's climate. And he taught environmental sciences at the University of Virginia for twenty-five years. Dr. Singer might be wrong. He might be seriously in error. But so far, no one has demonstrated that *his* arguments are wrong. Reviling him, calling him names, trying to shut him up and close him down -- none of this constitutes a reasoned argument. It is nothing more than (in the words of Al Gore) *an assault on reason*. Stay tuned, folks. The earth may be warming -- but not as fast as the debate over climate is heating up.

Ken Blackwell is a senior fellow at the Family Research Council. He serves on the board of directors of the Club for Growth, National Taxpayers Union and National Rifle Association.

5. Blinded by Science

By George Will, TownHall, Feb 21, 2010

http://townhall.com/columnists/GeorgeWill/2010/02/21/blinded_by_science

WASHINGTON -- Science, many scientists say, has been restored to her rightful throne because progressives have regained power. Progressives, say progressives, emulate the cool detachment of scientific discourse. So hear now the calm, collected voice of a scientist lavishly honored by progressives, Rajendra Pachauri.

He is chairman of the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which shared the 2007 version of the increasingly weird Nobel Peace Prize. Denouncing persons skeptical about the shrill certitudes of those who say global warming poses an imminent threat to the planet, he says:

"They are the same people who deny the link between smoking and cancer. They are people who say that asbestos is as good as talcum powder -- and I hope they put it on their faces every day."

Do not judge him as harshly as he speaks of others. Nothing prepared him for the unnerving horror of encountering disagreement. Global warming alarmists, long cosseted by echoing media, manifest an interesting incongruity -- hysteria and name calling accompanying serene assertions about the "settled science" of climate change. Were it settled, we would be spared the hyperbole that amounts to Ring Lardner's "Shut up, he explained."

The global warming industry, like Alexander in the famous children's story, is having a terrible, horrible, no good, very bad day. Actually, a bad three months, which began Nov. 19 with the publication of e-mails indicating attempts by scientists to massage data and suppress dissent in order to strengthen "evidence" of global warming.

But there already supposedly was a broad, deep and unassailable consensus. Strange.

Next came the failure of The World's Last -- We Really, Really Mean It -- Chance, aka the Copenhagen climate change summit. It was a nullity, and since then things have been getting worse for those trying to stampede the world into a spasm of prophylactic statism.

In 2007, before the economic downturn began enforcing seriousness and discouraging grandstanding, seven Western U.S. states (and four Canadian provinces) decided to fix the planet on their own. California's Arnold Schwarzenegger intoned, "We cannot wait for the United States government to get its

act together on the environment." The 11 jurisdictions formed what is now called the Western Climate Initiative to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, starting in 2012.

Or not. Arizona's Gov. Jan Brewer recently suspended her state's participation in what has not yet begun, and some Utah legislators are reportedly considering a similar action. She worries, sensibly, that it would impose costs on businesses and consumers. She also ordered reconsideration of Arizona's strict vehicle emission rules, modeled on incorrigible California's, lest they raise the cost of new cars.

Last week, BP America, ConocoPhillips and Caterpillar, three early members of the 31-member U.S. Climate Action Partnership, said: Oh, never mind. They withdrew from USCAP. It is a coalition of corporations and global warming alarm groups that was formed in 2007 when carbon rationing legislation seemed inevitable and collaboration with the rationers seemed prudent. A spokesman for Conoco said: "We need to spend time addressing the issues that impact our shareholders and consumers." What a concept.

Global warming skeptics, too, have erred. They have said there has been no statistically significant warming for 10 years. Phil Jones, former director of Britain's Climatic Research Unit, source of the leaked documents, admits it has been 15 years. Small wonder that support for radical remedial action, sacrificing wealth and freedom to combat warming, is melting faster than the Himalayan glaciers that an IPCC report asserted, without serious scientific support, could disappear by 2035.

Jones also says that if during what is called the Medieval Warm Period (circa 800-1300) global temperatures may have been warmer than today's, that would change the debate. Indeed it would. It would complicate the task of indicting contemporary civilization for today's supposedly unprecedented temperatures.

Last week, Todd Stern, America's Special Envoy for Climate Change -- yes, there is one; and people wonder where to begin cutting government -- warned that those interested in "undermining action on climate change" will seize on "whatever tidbit they can find." Tidbits like specious science, and the absence of warming?

It is tempting to say, only half in jest, that Stern's portfolio violates the First Amendment, which forbids government from undertaking the establishment of religion. A religion is what the faith in catastrophic man-made global warming has become. It is now a tissue of assertions impervious to evidence, assertions which everything, including a historic blizzard, supposedly confirms and nothing, not even the absence of warming, can falsify.

6. Climate Change and Open Science

By L. Gordon Crovitz, WSJ, Feb 22, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704757904575077741687226602.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

'Unequivocal.' That's quite a claim in this skeptical era, so it's been enlightening to watch the unraveling of the absolute certainty of global warming caused by man. Now even authors of the 2007 United Nations report that "warming of the climate system is unequivocal" have backed off its key assumptions and dire warnings.

Science is having its Walter Cronkite moment. Back when news was delivered by just three television networks, Walter Cronkite could end his evening broadcast by declaring, "And that's the way it is." The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report likewise purported to proclaim the final word,

in 3,000 pages that now turn out to be less scientific truth than political cover for sweeping economic regulations.

Equivocation has replaced "unequivocal" even among some of the scientists whose "Climategate" emails discussed how to suppress dissenting views via peer review and avoid complying with freedom-of-information requests for data.

Phil Jones, the University of East Anglia scientist at the center of the emails, last week acknowledged to the BBC that there hasn't been statistically significant warming since 1995. He said there was more warming in the medieval period, before today's allegedly man-made effects. He also said "the vast majority of climate scientists" do not believe the debate over climate change is settled. Mr. Jones continues to believe in global warming but acknowledges there's no consensus.

Some journalistic digging into the 2007 U.N. climate change report revealed that its most quoted predictions were based on dubious sources. The IPCC now admits that its prediction that the Himalayan glaciers might disappear by 2035 was a mistake, based on an inaccurate citation to the World Wildlife Foundation. This advocacy group was also the basis for a claim the IPCC has backed away from—that up to 40% of the Amazon is endangered.

The IPCC report mistakenly doubled the percentage of the Netherlands currently below sea level. John Christy, a former lead author of the IPCC report, now says the "temperature records cannot be relied on as indicators of global change." As the case collapsed, the top U.N. climate-change bureaucrat, Yvo de Boer, announced his resignation last week.

The climate topic is important in itself, but it is also a leading indicator of how our expectation of full access to information makes us deeply skeptical when we're instead given faulty or partial information. In just three years since the report was issued, we have gone from purported unanimity among scientists to a breakdown in any consensus. Opinion polls reflect this U-turn, with growing public skepticism.

Skeptics don't doubt science—they doubt unscientific claims cloaked in the authority of science. The scientific method is a foundation of our information age, with its approach of a clearly stated hypothesis tested through a transparent process with open data, subject to review.

The IPCC report was instead crafted by scientists hand-picked by governments when leading politicians were committed to global warming. Unsurprisingly, the report claimed enough certainty to justify massive new spending and regulations.

Some in the scientific community are now trying to restore integrity to climate science. "The truth, and this is frustrating for policymakers, is that scientists' ignorance of the climate system is enormous," Mr. Christy wrote in the current issue of *Nature*. "There is still much messy, contentious, snail-paced and now, hopefully, transparent, work to do."

Mr. Christy also makes the good point that groupthink—technically known as "informational cascades"—is a particular risk for scientists. He proposes a Wikipedia-like approach in which scientists could openly contribute and debate theories and data in real time.

The unraveling of the case for global warming has left laymen uncertain about what to believe and whom to trust. Experts usually know more than amateurs, but increasingly they get the benefit of the doubt only if they operate openly, without political or other biases.

We need scientists who apply scientific objectivity, or the closest approximation of it, and then present their information with enough transparency that people can weigh the evidence. Instead of a group of scientists anointed by the U.N. telling us what to think, the spirit of the age is that scientists need to provide open access to information on which others can make policy decisions.

The lesson of the chill of the global-warming consensus is this: Those who want to persuade others of the truth as they see it need to make their case as transparently as possible. Technology enables access to information and leads us to expect open debates, conducted honestly and in full view. This is inconvenient for those who want to claim unequivocal truth without having the evidence. But that's the way it is.

#####