

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

#####

Fred Singer has returned from his lecture tour but will require time to catch up on his emails. For high-priority mail, send a copy to [ken@haapala.com](mailto:ken@haapala.com).

#####

### Quote of the Week

*“Affordable energy in ample quantities is the lifeblood of the industrial societies and a prerequisite for the economic development of the others.”* John P. Holdren, Science Adviser to President Obama, *Science* 9 February 2001 [H/t Frank Clemente, Jim Rust]

\*\*\*\*\*

### THIS WEEK:

In spite of recent revelations, the IPCC express is barreling along. There may be some form of inquiry, but will it be significant? The engineers and conductors are assuring the passengers they will do better next time. Some passengers are leaving, disturbed by issues such as the non-existent melt of the Himalayas, disappearance of the relationship between storm damage and warming, unfounded claims of elimination of fifty percent of rain-based agriculture in Africa and forty percent of the Amazon rainforest.

However the passengers in first class continue to insist that these are minor inconveniences and the main line is solid and clear. They ignore the three great train wrecks ahead – the datasets of NOAA-NCDC, NASA-GISS, and Hadley-CRU.

As stated in the Summary for Policymakers, the claim that it is at least ninety percent probable that humans caused the warming in the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century is based on several assumptions. One temperature trends are accurately determined, and two the natural causes of temperature change are known.

Of course, this methodology requires rigorously maintained measurements of temperature. As discussed in the science editorial below, these datasets are doubtful and before any policy on global warming is adapted, they must be verified. The second requirement of this methodology, complete knowledge of the natural causes of temperature change, will be discussed in next week’s TWTW.

As partially described in the *Nature* editorial reproduced below and in referenced articles, climate alarmists are claiming they are victims suffering from abuse by skeptics. Certainly *ad hominem* attacks have no place in science, but many of today’s “victims” had no issue with *ad hominem* when they were the perpetrators.

This leads to a somewhat amusing incident. On March 3, the web site of *Scientific American* posted a story on the satellite, Mars Express, fly by of the one of the moons of Mars, Phobos. The story was entitled “Probe flies by ‘alien space station.’” The author claimed that Fred Singer told President Eisenhower that the moon “might be an ancient abandoned spacecraft.” Of course, this was a complete fabrication and to their credit, when informed, the editors took down the posted article with apologies and a statement it was not done by their staff. However, there was no explanation of who was responsible.

More disturbing news is that the EPA is up to its old tricks of manipulating the court system to expand power at the exclusion of the public, the legislative process, and those most impacted by such expansion of power. According to the AP, EPA announced a legal settlement with the Center for Biological Diversity. The EPA is sued by the friendly special interest group demanding EPA must expand its powers to deal with a perceived, though often spurious harm, and then reaches a settlement which is sanctified by the courts. The EPA will promulgate more regulations, in this instance, considering “ways the states can

address rising acidity levels in oceans, which pose a serious threat to shellfish and other marine life.” The claim is that increased atmosphere carbon dioxide is responsible for the rising ocean acidity.

In his book *heaven+earth*, geologist Ian Plimer points out the science is a sham. The oceans are a base with a pH between 7.9 and 8.2. They have remained that way millions of years even when volcanoes greatly increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere many times beyond what it is today without any change in ocean pH. Even the terminology is scientifically incorrect, since the oceans are alkaline; the issue should be “reducing ocean alkalinity,” not increasing acidity. But reducing alkalinity would not have the same emotional appeal.

Of course, there will be a public hearing process on the rules, but as demonstrated in its endangerment finding, EPA will claim it is required to do so by the courts, and will ignore the science. As long as the courts defer to the EPA for scientific expertise, the public is not safe.

The AP article and a review of the experimental science by Sherwood, Keith, and Craig Idso are referenced below.

On another note, in a past issue TWTW pointed out there no scientific basis for EPA to intensify its regulations on ozone and it is likely that the new regulations will be economically harmful. The public comment period will close on March 22. For further information please see <http://www.environmentviews.com/>

Roy Spencer has posted the satellite temperature measurements for February. Due to the El Niño occurring in the Pacific, as with January, February is above the norm. Roy also is applying a new technique to estimate the Urban Heat Island effect [www.drroyspencer.com](http://www.drroyspencer.com).

Finally, starting this week in “News You Can Use” will have a slightly changed format to allow you to quickly scan for articles that may be of interest. They are grouped together according to topics.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **SCIENCE EDITORIAL #8-2010 (March 13, 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 #10 . ClimateGate (CG) and other’Gates’ undermine the credibility of the IPCC and of AGW**

If I were to submit comments to the British House of Commons panel on Climategate, I would focus on the science:

1. We have yet to discover just how Jones et al managed to produce a substantial surface warming [between 1979 and 1997] when satellites showed practically none in the troposphere -- in conflict with all GH models.
2. I suspect that it had to do both with the SELECTION of weather stations and with the applied CORRECTIONS to the trends
3. Further, I had noticed that the Mann analysis of proxy data [Nature 1998] conveniently stops in 1979. When I questioned him on this matter, I got the very unsatisfactory reply that there were no suitable data available -- suggesting to me that he was hiding such information.

4. Accordingly, one needs to procure and analyze post-1980 proxy data to see if they support CRU (and NCDC and GISS) or the MSU satellite results.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

**1. Are climate talks doomed?**

By Hardev Sanotra, Financial Chronicle, New Delhi, Mar 8, 2010

<http://www.mydigitalfc.com/leisure-writing/are-climate-talks-doomed-393>

An interview with Fred Singer

**2. West’s policy approach is wrong**

By Hardev Sanotra Mar, Financial Chronicle, New Delhi, Mar 8, 2010

<http://www.mydigitalfc.com/leisure-writing/west%E2%80%99s-policy-approach-wrong-392>

An interview with Benny Peisner

**3. Climate Change ‘Quagmire’**

By Mary Kissel, WSJ Asia, Mar 11, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703701004575113304086087516.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703701004575113304086087516.html#mod=todays_us_opinion)

“The climate world is divided into three: the climate atheists, the climate agnostics, and the climate evangelicals,” Jairam Ramesh, India’s Environment and Forests minister, told me on a recent evening. “I’m a climate agnostic.”

**4. Climate of fear**

Editorial, Nature, Mar 11, 2010

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v464/n7286/full/464141a.html>

[SEPP Comment: *Nature* carried the “peer reviewed” Mann hockey stick that used biased proxies and a discredited statistical technique to obfuscate decades of work by climate change pioneer HH Lamb.]

**5. Memorandum submitted by Stephen McIntyre (CRU 32)**

Science and Technology Committee, House of Commons, Parliament, UK

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3202.htm>

[Summary only, for the full submission, please see the above web site.]

**6. An Energy Head Fake**

Wall Street Journal Editorial, Mar 11, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704784904575112144130306052.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704784904575112144130306052.html#mod=todays_us_opinion)

**7. Wind power the worst kind of mirage**

By Henk Tennekes, Financial Post, Mar 3, 2010 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

<http://network.nationalpost.com/NP/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2010/03/03/wind-power-the-worst-kind-of-mirage.aspx>

\*\*\*\*\*

**NEWS YOU CAN USE:**

## **Global Warming has no impact on Himalayas claims Wadia Director**

By Ashwani Maindola, Hindustan Times, Mar 6, 2010 [H/t John Brignell, Numberwatch.co.uk]

<http://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/northindia/Global-Warming-has-no-impact-on-Himalayas-claims-Wadia-Director/Article1-515763.aspx>

[Further reasons why India is not buying IPCC orthodoxy.]

## **Graph of Temperature vs. Number of Stations**

By Ross McKittrick

<http://www.uoguelph.ca/~rmckitri/research/nvst.html>

[SEPP Comment: An important post with a graph of the raw NOAA data showing the relationship between reported average temperatures and the decline in stations. Although the work was completed some time ago, given the recent questions of datasets, it is worth repeating.]

## ***EPA to allow states address rising ocean acidity***

By Gene Johnson, AP, Mar 11, 2010 [H/t Tom Sheahen]

[http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100311/ap\\_on\\_bi\\_ge/us\\_epa\\_acid\\_oceans](http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100311/ap_on_bi_ge/us_epa_acid_oceans)

## **The Real Ocean Acidification Story**

Sherwood, Keith, and Craig Idso, CO2 Science.org, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.co2science.org/articles/V13/N9/EDIT.php>

## ***IPCC issues***

### **UN to review errors made by Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change**

By Ben Webster, The Times, Mar 10, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

[http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us\\_and\\_americas/article7055999.ece](http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/us_and_americas/article7055999.ece)

### **Climate Panel Details Its Review Plan**

U.N. Appoints Another Global Science Body to Investigate Problems in Now-Controversial 2007 Report on Warming Trend

By Jeffrey Ball, WSJ, Mar 11, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704655004575113820979573234.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_page\\_one](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704655004575113820979573234.html#mod=todays_us_page_one)

### **Review of U.N. panel's report on climate change won't reexamine errors**

By David Fahrenthold, Washington Post, Mar 11, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/10/AR2010031002891.html>

## ***Defenders of IPCC orthodoxy***

### **On global warming, the science is solid**

Houston Chronicle, Mar 6, 2010 [H/t Leighton Steward]

<http://www.chron.com/dispatch/story.mpl/editorial/outlook/6900556.html>

### **Climate Change debate grows heated**

By James Rainey, Los Angeles Times, Mar 6, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/news/la-et-onthemedi6-2010mar06,0,4556647.column>

## **Climate-change deniers take a lesson from anti-evolution activists**

By Stephen Stromberg, Washington Post Partisan, Mar 9, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

<http://voices.washingtonpost.com/postpartisan/2010/03/climate-change-deniers-take-a.html>

## ***Challenges to IPCC orthodoxy***

### **Climategate Reloaded – Plots, Politics, and Predetermined Outcomes**

By Richard Morrison, CEI, Mar 5, 2010

<http://cei.org/news-release/2010/03/05/climategate-reloaded>

### **Climategate Stunner: NASA Heads Knew NASA Data Was Poor, Then Used Data from CRU**

*New emails from James Hansen and Reto Ruedy (download PDF [here](#)) show that NASA's temperature data was doubted within NASA itself, and was not independent of CRU's embattled data, as has been claimed.*

By Charlie Martin, Pajamas Media, Mar 10, 2010 [H/t Francois Guillaumat]

<http://pajamasmedia.com/blog/climategate-stunner-nasa-heads-knew-nasa-data-was-poor-then-used-data-from-cru/?singlepage=true>

### **In Denial – The meltdown of the climate campaign**

By Steven Hayward, Weekly Standard, Mar 15, 2010

<http://weeklystandard.com/articles/denial>

[SEPP Comment: Important discussion of ClimateGate and its significance.]

### **Is there any unmassaged data out there?**

By Jo Nova, Mar, 13, 2010

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

[SEPP Comment: Another example from ‘down under’ on how rural data showing a slight warming trend is ‘corrected’ for the urban heat island effect to show a significant warming trend.]

### **Political Agendas Continue to Drive Climate Fiasco**

By Tim Ball, Canada Free Press, Mar 8, 2010

<http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/20782>

“The greatest scandal connected to global warming is not exaggeration, fraud or destruction of data to conceal the weakness of the argument. It is those who are personally profiting from promoting this fantasy at the expense of the rest of us.”

### **Those Climate Pugilists**

By Paul Chesser, American Spectator, Mar 12, 2010

<http://spectator.org/archives/2010/03/12/those-climate-pugilists>

## ***Let California Lead***

**Arguing global warming with Arnold**

By Mark Landsbaum, Orange County Register, Feb 26, 2010 [H/t Brad Veek]

<http://www.ocregister.com/opinion/-236562--.html?pic=1>

“Global warming alarmism never was about temperature. It's about control and money – their control and your money.”

**California Greening'**

Editorial, IBD, Mar 9, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=525874>

### ***Windy Issues***

#### **DOE E-Mails To Wind Energy Lobbyists Cast Cloud Over Green Jobs Proposals**

By Sean Higgins, IBD, Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526944>

#### **Questions swirl around wind-jobs studies**

By Jim Tankersley, Chicago Tribune, Mar 3, 2010 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

[http://www.swamppolitics.com/news/politics/blog/2010/03/questions\\_swirl\\_around\\_windjob.html](http://www.swamppolitics.com/news/politics/blog/2010/03/questions_swirl_around_windjob.html)

#### **Green jobs mirage**

By William Yeatman, Washington Times, Mar 9, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/09/green-jobs-mirage/>

#### **The wind-energy cover-up**

By Chris Horner, The Washington Times, Mar 9, 2010

[http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/09/covering-up-the-wind-energy-failure/?utm\\_source=newsletter&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=newsletter\\_must-read-stories-today](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/09/covering-up-the-wind-energy-failure/?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=newsletter_must-read-stories-today)

### ***Oil and Natural Gas Issues***

#### **Emissions Critical: Natural Gas Cos Pushing Use In Vehicles**

By Angel Gonzalez, WSJ, Mar 11, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20100311-712773.html?mod=WSJ\\_Energy\\_middleHeadlines](http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20100311-712773.html?mod=WSJ_Energy_middleHeadlines)

[SEPP Comment: Realizing that the refueling operations must be tightly supervised, SEPP has argued for Natural Gas in fleet use but not for the general public. The vehicles are considerably more expensive than diesel or gasoline. The considerably shorter fuel range of natural gas vehicles make natural gas unlikely for long haul trucking unless it is consistently between specific points.]

#### **Natural-Gas Group Opposes EPA Greenhouse Gas Rules**

By Siobhan Hughes, WSJ, Mar 10, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703625304575115803113375016.html>

#### **Exxon's Gains Present Margin Risks**

By Russell Gold, WSJ, Mar 11, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703625304575115893677463062.html?mod=WSJ\\_business\\_whatsNews](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703625304575115893677463062.html?mod=WSJ_business_whatsNews)

[This week SEPP was privileged to attend a briefing by Exxon on its 20 year forecast. Although "off the record" it would not break confidentially to say that Exxon forecasters believe there is plenty of liquid and natural gas in the ground.]

### ***Cap and Trade and Similar Issues***

#### **Empty Shell: The Unbearable Lightness of U.S. CAP (A critical look at Marvin Odum's Op-Ed.)**

By Marlo Lewis, Master Resource, Mar 11, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/03/empty-shell-quotations-from-chairman-odum/>

[A critique of Shell Oil's defense of the powerful lobbying group US CAP which strongly supported the US House Cap and Trade Bill passed last year]

### **For Full Disclosure of Climate-Change Risks**

By Paul Driessen, IBD, Mar 10, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=526842>

[A summary of some of the possible unintended consequences of the SEC requiring corporations to disclose climate change risks that was supported by eviros.]

### **Miscellaneous Articles**

#### **France To Host Countries Eager for Nuclear Energy**

The Tocqueville Connection, AFP, Mar 5, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

[http://www.adetocqueville.com/20100305023126\\_TII75.htm](http://www.adetocqueville.com/20100305023126_TII75.htm)

[Taking the lead on nuclear energy]

#### **Shellfish could supplant tree-ring climate data, Temperature records gleaned from clamshells reveal accuracy of Norse sagas.**

By Richard Lovett, Nature News, Mar 8, 2010, [H/t Norman MacLeod]

<http://www.nature.com/news/2010/100308/full/news.2010.110.html>

#### **A New Energy Source From the Common Pea**

By Staff Writers, Tel Aviv, Israel SPX, Mar 8, 2010

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/03/100304112237.htm>

\*\*\*\*\*

### **BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:**

#### **Aquatic 'Dead Zones' Contributing to Climate Change**

Science Daily, Mar 12, 2010

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/03/100311141213.htm>

[SEPP Comment: Dead zones are a significant concern, but the association with global warming is a stretch. Did the author miss any "buzz" words for solicitation of funding?]

#### **Carbon Emissions 'Outsourced' to Developing Countries**

Carnegie Institutions of Science Press Release, Mar 8, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

[http://www.ciw.edu/news/carbon\\_emissions\\_outsourced\\_developing\\_countries](http://www.ciw.edu/news/carbon_emissions_outsourced_developing_countries)

#### **Chemicals that eased one environmental problem may worsen another**

By Michael Bernstein, American Chemical Society [H/t Toshio Fujita]

[http://www.eurekalert.org/pub\\_releases/2010-03/acs-cte030310.php](http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2010-03/acs-cte030310.php)

#### **Climate change 'makes birds shrink' in North America**

By Matt Walker, Editor, Earth News, BBC, Mar 12, 2010

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/earth/hi/earth\\_news/newsid\\_8560000/8560694.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/earth/hi/earth_news/newsid_8560000/8560694.stm)

[SEPP Comment: Evidence that birds adapt quickly to climate change and may become more nimble rather than go extinct. No wonder visiting hawks have that lean and hungry look.]

#####

#### **1. Are climate talks doomed?**

By Hardev Sanotra, Financial Chronicle, New Delhi, Mar 8, 2010

<http://www.mydigitalfc.com/leisure-writing/are-climate-talks-doomed-393>

An interview with Fred Singer

*There has been a swing away from the upbeat mood before the Copenhagen summit. Even as countries prepare for climate change talks in Mexico City in December this year, it's not certain that an agreement would be possible among 192 nations. Some of it has to do with the battering the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has taken because of its shoddy and unsubstantiated conclusions in some parts of its fourth assessment report. Two investigations, one by the University of East Anglia and another by the science and technology committee of the House of Commons in the UK has shaken the public's firm belief in science. The university's climate research unit, which supplied much of climate change data to IPCC, was hit by a email leakage scandal that allegedly showed that scientists may have been involved in manipulation of data. That has come on heels of IPCC's acceptance that its conclusion on melting of Himalayan glaciers was faulty. All these have led analysts to believe that the United States senate is highly unlikely to pass the climate change bill under consideration. Without the US, climate change talks are doomed, say skeptics. One of the leading skeptics, professor emeritus of environment science at the University of Virginia **S Fred Singer** was in Delhi recently to talk about why an agreement was not possible. He spoke to **Hardev Sanotra**. Excerpts:*

**IPCC chairman R K Pachauri says there are hundreds of lobbyists in Washington trying to discredit the IPCC. Is that right?**

But most of those lobbyists are working for companies to get as much of the money that Congress can allocate for cap and trade. The law would raise the price of energy to be paid by consumers. Costs would rise by more than \$800 Billion dollars, if the law passes. [But it won't pass. Lobbyists "love" the IPCC because it gives rationale for congressional action – hence employment for lobbyists.]

**Why do you say that?**

The senate is not going to pass it. President Obama would be lucky if he is able to retain the House and Senate majority in November just before the next COP meeting in Mexico. It's possible he may lose his majority in Congress. Then it is finished. It will be all over.

**Are you suggesting that Mexico talks are doomed?**

Well, even though the world is waiting for the US to legislate, the Senate won't do it. Yet, really, no one cares. Mexico is going to be another big gabfest with developing countries trying to get money from the US and Europe. Nothing else is going to happen. No one is going to pass a successor to the Kyoto Protocol. The science of climate change, as enunciated by the IPCC, is discredited and the so-called consensus is disappearing.

**Apart from what is loosely called glaciergate, other questions have been raised about the IPCC report. What do you think is the impact of all this?**

It is a distraction from the real issue – which is that climate changes because of natural forces and not because of human impact. The melting of glaciers doesn't tell you anything about the cause. It could be natural, it could be because of humans. On the other hand, the public can understand questions like glaciergate and half a dozen other 'gates' which has already discredited the IPCC. Volume 2 of IPCC report which talks of the consequences of climate change has all sorts of problems with inadequate scientific back up, with Pachauri recipient of much of that criticism

**You have been criticising IPCC for years. Did you not anticipate this?**

I have been primarily working on Volume I of IPCC which deals with the science. Volume two is a different story because that deals with the consequences. These people no longer worry about what is causing climate change, because they take volume one conclusion as granted. I am not much interested in volume two. It's a useless exercise.

**What do these scandals mean for the next assessment report?**

They make them more cautious. It's clear IPCC has not lived up to its promise that it would use only peer reviewed sound science. They have used anecdotal information, written by environmental organisations or journalists.

**What would your message to Pachauri be?**

We are challenging the basis of scientific evidence. We don't see any evidence for any significant human contribution to climate change. All the evidence given by the IPCC for human induced action doesn't stand up to scrutiny. None of it is any good. Our message to Pachauri would be the same as that given by the Chinese vice minister of the National Development and Reform Commission Xie Zhenhua who said in Delhi that there's a legitimate body of science which is sceptical about climate change and it must be taken into consideration. If Pachauri wants the next assessment report to be balanced, he must incorporate the sceptical views of scientists, something like the report of the Non-governmental International Panel on Climate Change. They could say this contradicts the official view and let the public decide.

**But wouldn't that go against its charter?**

Yes, the IPCC charter says they are supposed to find evidence for human caused global warming and nothing else. That's why the Chinese suggestion is very radical and may even force a revision of the charter.

**If you say the science of climate change is not settled, why aren't more climate scientists coming out and objecting?**

Give them a little time and I think they will. Because they are much encouraged from what we are learning from climategate so far. This will encourage many scientists to speak up, who have otherwise kept quiet because of public pressure. Climate alarmism represented by the IPCC is losing its appeal. Just before the Copenhagen conference there was another conference where all sorts of alarmist predictions were made. Because of glaciergate and other revelations many more scientists will be speaking out, and I hope they speak out strongly.

**What do expect to be the outcome of investigations underway?**

We can only hope that there would be fair and honest investigation of climategate emails and other matters. The committee headed by Sir Muir Russel is looking into the University of East Anglia email leakage and the house of Commons committee on Science and Technology is also investigating. If the republicans win in the US in November, the Congress will also investigate. Because of public money involved, it's necessary to know how these organizations were handling climate data, including Goddard Institute of Space Studies of NASA and National Climate Data Centre of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

\*\*\*\*\*

**2. West's policy approach is wrong**

By Hardev Sanotra Mar, Financial Chronicle, New Delhi, Mar 8, 2010

<http://www.mydigitalfc.com/leisure-writing/west%E2%80%99s-policy-approach-wrong-392>

An interview with Benny Peisner

*Benny J Peiser is a social anthropologist and director of Global Warming Policy Foundation in the UK. He places his views “somewhere between climate alarmists and skeptics.” While in Delhi, he spoke to Financial Chronicle about the impact of climate change policies on the lives of people. Excerpts:*

### **Is there a change in the debate on climate change after Copenhagen?**

The whole political debate has shifted quite dramatically in Europe, partly as a result of the climategate scandal and partly as response to the Copenhagen fiascos. What used to be a very popular theme for politician who thought it would win them votes is turning into a liability. There’s a public backlash and a growing scepticism that Europe is burdening its own people and industry, while the world is not following.

### **Why did this happen?**

It’s a combination of factors. It started with the economic crisis. Job security, job creation and the economy became priorities number one, two and three. Environment concerns dropped down and became rock bottom. The second factor is that people realised they were paying a hefty price in their heating bills and energy bills for climate schemes which they don’t really like. And finally, you have all the scandals and blunders which led to a crisis of credibility at the IPCC. People have become very suspicious about the revelations in climategate.

### **How strong is the impact of the scandals?**

It has undermined the trust in reliability of official government sponsored science. We have been told for ten years that there’s no debate; it’s settled and there’s complete consensus among scientists. That argument is no longer accepted by people. They have lost trust in the predictions by climate modelers where they made up a lot of alarmist scenarios which is at the heart of some of the IPCC problems. Not the least because people also realised that the warming of eighties and early nineties has not continued. Even the British media – largely the BBC, The Guardian, The Times — which used to unanimously take an alarmist position and sing from the same climate hymn sheet have suddenly started asking questions. Can you believe it: Journalists asking questions? So there’s quite a significant change and politicians are scratching their heads and don’t know what to do.

### **What has been the impact of climate related taxes in Europe?**

The energy intensive companies which has energy as hefty chunk of their overheads are paying about 20 per cent of their energy bill as climate taxes or green taxes or renewable obligations. They are concerned because other companies outside the EU do not have to. May in the UK are worried whether they will be able to survive if Britain continued with its unilateral burden.

### **Suppose you accept IPCC and Kyoto Protocol what would this mean?**

The answer is fairly simple. Given that all the alternative energies currently available are two to three times more expensive than fossil fuels, energy prices would rise 50 to 100 per cent. The number of people living in fuel poverty in the UK is seven million. This would double. Fuel poverty is defined as one where a family spends ten per cent or more of its earnings on fuel bills. It would also make a lot of EU companies go bankrupt as they would no longer be able to compete with anyone outside. If India has to cap its emissions, it would have to replace its conventional energy with something else and anything else would be very expensive. Earlier we were told by a number of analysts, including economist Nick Stern, that decarbonisation would be fairly cheap, not a real burden. Today people realise it would be much more expensive.

### **But wouldn't fall in carbon intensity be a gain?**

When you have increase in energy efficiency, carbon intensity of production comes down. But this is cancelled out by the rising energy demand. So if you want emissions to be reduced, the only way is to swap conversion forms of electricity generation based on cheap fossil fuels with cleaner or greener energy which is more two to three times more expensive. That in turn makes everything else more expensive. That's why there's a backlash against cap and trade in the US and in Australia. Everyone is getting cold feet.

### **How do you reconcile climate needs with growth in India and China?**

The pressure on politicians in the EU is that why are you burdening us with taxes and price rise when China and India are not following. But the reality is that your and China's energy demand would rise because of population growth, a rising middle class and increasing expectations. That's why India and China would not sign a legally binding document. It has nothing to do with science, because the governments realise that they would not be able to achieve any of that. For 20-30 years your emissions will rise significantly and there's no alternate to that. When I met your minister of environment Jairam Ramesh, one of the officials remarked that in two or three years alternate energies sources would become economical. I said, yes, we have been hearing that for 30 years.

### **So what's the risk of not taking steps to decarbonise?**

First, even if the IPCC were right, that doesn't mean you have to decarbonise. The worst case scenario is that in one hundred years we won't be seven time richer but only six times. The long-term impact will diminish wealth creation to a manageable level. Even if you fully and squarely accept the science, the policy approach advocated by the West is not correct.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **3. Climate Change 'Quagmire'**

By Mary Kissel, WSJ Asia, Mar 11, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703701004575113304086087516.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748703701004575113304086087516.html#mod=todays_us_opinion)

"The climate world is divided into three: the climate atheists, the climate agnostics, and the climate evangelicals," Jairam Ramesh, India's Environment and Forests minister, told me on a recent evening. "I'm a climate agnostic."

Climate-change Cassandras are prone to warning that unless governments take draconian action to limit carbon emissions, the world will suffer grievously and the poor will be hardest hit. Yet here in India, home to more poor people than any other country, a left-of-center government is sounding less than convinced by these prophets of doom, to say nothing of their prescriptions for salvation.

"The climate world is divided into three: the climate atheists, the climate agnostics, and the climate evangelicals," Jairam Ramesh, India's Environment and Forests minister, told me on a recent evening. "I'm a climate agnostic."

Mr. Ramesh, a member of the Congress Party with close ties to the politically dominant Gandhi family, is hardly a household name in the U.S. But among people who follow climate debates closely, he is by turns admired and detested for his occasional outbursts about both the science and the politics of global warming.

Last year, he publicly dressed down Secretary of State Hillary Clinton when she pushed for India to adopt binding emissions targets. He was among the first to question the bogus claim by the U.N.'s

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that the Himalayan glaciers would melt by 2035. He has spearheaded an Indian climate-change research institute—an implicit vote of no-confidence in the IPCC's science. He has also "repeatedly" told his countryman and friend, IPCC chief Rajendra Pachauri, to "draw a line between climate science and climate advocacy. . . . Leave that to Al Gore . . . or Ban Ki Moon." Elsewhere in our interview, Mr. Ramesh dismisses Mr. Gore as an "evangelical."

Questions of science aside, Mr. Ramesh also pours scorn on what he sees as the hypocrisy, bad faith and the sheer impracticality of current political approaches to climate change. International negotiations on the subject are a "complete quagmire," he says. "We have a Kyoto Protocol in which the U.S. has not ratified. The Europeans are not going to be taking on commitments unless the Americans take it [on]. The Americans are saying we won't take something on until the Chinese take something on. So we are, frankly, headed nowhere."

Mr. Ramesh also sees "glaring deficiencies in the architecture of climate-change agreements," starting with the "lack of any graduation." As countries move up the "per-capita income ladder," he explains, they should "take on progressively higher levels of legally binding commitments." Randomly chosen emission targets become "a game of competitive one-upmanship." "Ten percent we will cut?" he asks, his voice rising. "Fifteen percent? It's not a lottery, you know."

What seems to rankle Mr. Ramesh the most about these kinds of demands is the idea that India should sign itself on to the rich world's environmental fads at the expense of its own poor people. Many Indians have long understood that the kind of climate interventions pushed by the likes of Mr. Gore—binding emissions targets, carbon taxes, cap-and-trade schemes and so on—all amount to giving up on cheap energy sources in exchange for sharply higher costs and economically unproven technologies. In India, that means consigning legions of the poor, many of whom don't even yet have access to electricity or gas, to perpetual life in the slums.

Other poor countries agree. China, South Africa, Brazil and India "bonded very well together at Copenhagen," Mr. Ramesh reports. "We are united in our desire not to have a binding agreement thrust upon us which will constrict our developmental options."

It's also far from clear that climate change is India's principal environmental concern. "To say that [climate change] is the defining issue, no, there are bread-and-butter environmental issues," he says. "There are pollution-control issues which are affecting the public health. You know, in many parts of India people are dying because of excess of pesticides in the water, or arsenic in water. That's more important and more urgent than climate change."

So what is the way forward? For all of his delightful bluntness, Mr. Ramesh the politician is himself often given to qualifying his statements and hedging his bets. He speaks of a need for an "international agreement" on climate change with "common but differentiated" responsibilities among nations, and just this week he announced India would back the Copenhagen Accord and its nonbinding emissions targets.

But he also acknowledges what the Danish "skeptical environmentalist" Bjorn Lomborg has described as a "third way" forward: Acknowledging that climate change is real, but pursuing an approach that would make cost-benefit assessments of all environmental challenges in order to do the most good for the greatest number of people. In Mr. Lomborg's analyses, climate change almost invariably comes in last behind real environmental needs like improving nutrition, providing access to clean water, or fighting scourges like AIDS and malaria.

"I don't think you should dismiss Lomborg the way climate evangelicals have dismissed him," Mr. Ramesh says. "He makes reasonable points. The spirit of science is the spirit of inquiry, of questioning."

That it should be left to a politician from a developing country to make that point—while his counterparts in the West push for Rube Goldberg solutions to a "crisis" that may not even exist—goes far toward explaining the state of the climate debate today.

*Ms. Kissel is the editorial page editor of the Wall Street Journal Asia.*

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **4. Climate of fear**

Editorial, *Nature*, Mar 11, 2010

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v464/n7286/full/464141a.html>

[SEPP Comment: *Nature* carried the “peer reviewed” Mann hockey stick that used biased proxies and a discredited statistical technique to obfuscate decades of work by climate change pioneer HH Lamb.]

The integrity of climate research has taken a very public battering in recent months. Scientists must now emphasize the science, while acknowledging that they are in a street fight.

Climate scientists are on the defensive, knocked off balance by a re-energized community of global-warming deniers who, by dominating the media agenda, are sowing doubts about the fundamental science. Most researchers find themselves completely out of their league in this kind of battle because it's only superficially about the science. The real goal is to stoke the angry fires of talk radio, cable news, the blogosphere and the like, all of which feed off of contrarian story lines and seldom make the time to assess facts and weigh evidence. Civility, honesty, fact and perspective are irrelevant.

Worse, the onslaught seems to be working: some polls in the United States and abroad suggest that it is eroding public confidence in climate science at a time when the fundamental understanding of the climate system, although far from complete, is stronger than ever. Ecologist Paul Ehrlich at Stanford University in California says that his climate colleagues are at a loss about how to counter the attacks. “Everyone is scared shitless, but they don't know what to do,” he says.

**“Scientists must not be so naive as to assume that the data speak for themselves.”**

Researchers should not despair. For all the public's confusion about climate science, polls consistently show that people trust scientists more than almost anybody else to give honest advice. Yes, scientists' reputations have taken a hit thanks to headlines about the leaked climate e-mails at the University of East Anglia (UEA), UK, and an acknowledged mistake about the retreat of Himalayan glaciers in a recent report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). But these wounds are not necessarily fatal.

To make sure they are not, scientists must acknowledge that they are in a street fight, and that their relationship with the media really matters. Anything strategic that can be done on that front would be useful, be it media training for scientists or building links with credible public-relations firms. In this light, there are lessons to be learned from the current spate of controversies. For example, the IPCC error was originally caught by scientists, not sceptics. Had it been promptly corrected and openly explained to the media, in full context with the underlying science, the story would have lasted days, not weeks. The IPCC must establish a formal process for rapidly investigating and, when necessary, correcting such errors.

The unguarded exchanges in the UEA e-mails speak for themselves. Although the scientific process seems to have worked as it should have in the end, the e-mails do raise concerns about scientific behaviour and must be fully investigated. Public trust in scientists is based not just on their competence, but also on their perceived objectivity and openness. Researchers would be wise to remember this at all times, even when casually e-mailing colleagues.

US scientists recently learned this lesson yet again when a private e-mail discussion between leading climate researchers on how to deal with sceptics went live on conservative websites, leading to charges that the scientific elite was conspiring to silence climate sceptics ([see page 149](#)). The discussion was spurred by a report last month from Senator James Inhofe (Republican, Oklahoma), the leading climate sceptic in the US Congress, who labelled several respected climate scientists as potential criminals — nonsense that was hardly a surprise considering the source. Some scientists have responded by calling for a unified public rebuttal to Inhofe, and they have a point. As a member of the minority party, Inhofe is powerless for now, but that may one day change. In the meantime, Inhofe's report is only as effective as the attention it receives, which is why scientists need to be careful about how they engage such critics.

The core science supporting anthropogenic global warming has not changed. This needs to be stated again and again, in as many contexts as possible. Scientists must not be so naive as to assume that the data speak for themselves. Nor should governments. Scientific agencies in the United States, Europe and beyond have been oddly silent over the recent controversies. In testimony on Capitol Hill last month, the head of the US Environmental Protection Agency, Lisa Jackson, offered at best a weak defence of the science while seeming to distance her agency's deliberations from a tarnished IPCC. Officials of her stature should be ready to defend scientists where necessary, and at all times give a credible explanation of the science.

These challenges are not new, and they won't go away any time soon. Even before the present controversies, climate legislation had hit a wall in the US Senate, where the poorly informed public debate often leaves one wondering whether science has any role at all. The IPCC's fourth assessment report had huge influence leading up to the climate conference in Copenhagen last year, but it was always clear that policy-makers were reluctant to commit to serious reductions in greenhouse-gas emissions. Scientists can't do much about that, but they can and must continue to inform policy-makers about the underlying science and the potential consequences of policy decisions — while making sure they are not bested in the court of public opinion.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **5. Memorandum submitted by Stephen McIntyre (CRU 32)**

Science and Technology Committee, House of Commons, Parliament, UK

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/memo/climatedata/uc3202.htm>

[Summary only, for the full submission, please see the above web site.]

#### **Summary:**

1. Reconstructions of temperature over the past 1000 years have been an highly visible part of IPCC presentations to the public. CRU has been extremely influential in IPCC reconstructions through: coauthorship, the use of CRU chronologies, peer review and IPCC participation. To my knowledge, there are no 1000-year reconstructions which are truly "independent" of CRU influence. In my opinion, CRU has manipulated and/or withheld data with an effect on the research record. The manipulation includes (but is not limited to) arbitrary adjustment ("bodging"), cherry picking and deletion of adverse data. The problem is deeply rooted in the sense that some forms of data manipulation and withholding are so embedded that the practitioners and peer reviewers in the specialty seem either to no longer notice or are unoffended by the practices. Specialists have fiercely resisted efforts by outside statisticians questioning these practices - the resistance being evident in the Climategate letters. These letters are rich in detail of individual incidents. My submission today will not comment on these individual incidents (some of which I've commented on already at Climate Audit), but to try to place the incidents into context and show why they matter to the research record. I will not comment in this submission on CRUTEM issues only for space reasons.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **6. An Energy Head Fake**

Wall Street Journal Editorial, Mar 11, 2010

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704784904575112144130306052.html#mod=todays\\_us\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704784904575112144130306052.html#mod=todays_us_opinion)

President Obama used his January State of the Union speech to promise "a new generation of safe, clean nuclear power plants" and "new offshore areas for oil and gas development." Judging by its recent decisions, we'd say his Cabinet hasn't received the memo.

Congress's ban on offshore drilling expired in September 2008, and a Bush Administration plan for leasing the energy-rich Outer Continental Shelf was due to begin this year. Yet within a month of taking office, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar halted leasing by extending the public comment period by six months. When that period ended last September, Interior said it would take "several weeks" to analyze the results. It has yet to release a summary.

Newt Gingrich's American Solutions group used the Freedom of Information Act to obtain Interior emails suggesting that the public comments ran 2-to-1 in favor of drilling. Instead of acknowledging this, Mr. Salazar last week informed Congress he was scrapping the Bush plan and that leasing will not begin for at least another two years.

The Administration failed to meet a deadline last month for submitting a court-ordered analysis of the environmental impact of new leases off the Alaskan coast. And in January, Mr. Salazar rebuffed Virginia's request—endorsed by its governor and legislature—to allow drilling offshore. Sensing a pattern?

Onshore, meanwhile, Interior canceled oil and gas leases on 77 parcels of federal land in Utah (a handful have since been reinstated). Mr. Salazar also yanked eight parcels from a lease sale in Wyoming. Several weeks ago a leaked Interior Department memo disclosed plans to have Mr. Obama use executive power—under the Antiquities Act—to designate 10 million acres of western land as "monuments," putting them off-limits to energy development as well as current timber or mining work.

As for nuclear power, Mr. Obama has promised an \$8.3 billion loan guarantee to build two nuclear reactors in Georgia. However, Mike Morris, the CEO of American Electric Power, explained at a recent Wall Street Journal energy conference that while loan guarantees were a "nice thing," they were meaningless in the absence of regulatory certainty.

Only five of 50 states have what Mr. Morris calls nuclear-friendly "enabling" legislation that might convince corporate boards to commit capital to a long-term project. The federal Nuclear Regulatory Commission, despite adopting a streamlined licensing process in 2005, hasn't issued key rules.

The Administration also sent mixed signals last week by putting the kibosh on Yucca Mountain for nuclear waste disposal. Energy Secretary Steven Chu has convened yet another "blue ribbon" panel on nuclear waste, which will probably have the half-life of uranium. Companies are already suing the feds for failing to meet legal obligations to collect waste, and the end of Yucca is one more reason for utilities to avoid making large capital bets amid uncertain government policy.

The President says he wants new supplies of home-grown energy, but the government's actions suggest continuing hostility to oil drilling and nuclear power. GOP Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina has been promoting a deal in which Republicans would endorse cap and trade in return for Democrats agreeing to more oil drilling and more nuclear plants. He appears to be selling a bridge to nowhere.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **7. Wind power the worst kind of mirage**

By Henk Tennekes, Financial Post, Mar 3, 2010 [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

<http://network.nationalpost.com/NP/blogs/fpcomment/archive/2010/03/03/wind-power-the-worst-kind-of-mirage.aspx>

Wind energy is an engineer's nightmare. To begin with, the energy density of flowing air is miserably low. Therefore, you need a massive contraption to catch one megawatt at best, and a thousand of these to equal a single gas- or coal-fired power plant.

If you design them for a wind speed of 34 miles per hour, they are useless at wind speeds below 22 mph and extremely dangerous at 44 mph, unless feathered in time. Remember, power is proportional to the cube of the wind speed. Old-fashioned Dutch windmills needed a two-man crew on 12-hour watch, seven days a week, because a runaway windmill first burnt its bearings, then its hardwood gears, then the entire superstructure.

This was the nightmare of millers everywhere in the "good" old days. And what did these beautiful antiques deliver? Fifteen horsepower at best, in favourable winds, about what a power lawn mower does these days. No wonder the Dutch switched to steam-powered pumping stations as soon as they could, in the late 19th century.

Since the power generated by modern wind turbines is so unpredictable, conventional power plants have to serve as back-ups. These run at less than half power most of the time. That is terribly uneconomical — only at full power do they have good thermal efficiency and minimal CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per kWh delivered.

Think also a moment of the cable networks needed: not only a fine-maze distribution network at the consumer end, but also one at the generator end. And what about servicing? How do you get a repair crew to a lonely hillside? Especially when you decided to put the wind park at sea? Use helicopters — now that is green!

For that matter, would you care to imagine what happens to rotor blades in freezing rain? Or how the efficiency of laminar-flow rotor blades decreases as bugs and dust accumulate on their leading edges?

Or what did happen in Germany more than once? German legislation gives wind power absolute priority, so all other forms of generating electricity have to back off when the wind starts blowing. This creates dangerous, almost uncontrollable instabilities in the high-voltage network. At those moments, power plant operators all over Europe sweat blood, almost literally. The synchronization of the system is also a scary job: alternating currents at 100,000 volts or more cannot be out of phase more than one degree or so, else circuit breakers pop everywhere and a brownout all over Europe starts.

One application might be attractive, though. Suppose you fill a water basin in the hills nearby using wind power when it blows, and turn the water turbines on when emergency power is needed for one reason or another (a power plant failure, a cold winter night).

Wind power is a green mirage of the worst kind. It looks green to simple souls but it is a technical nightmare. Nowhere I have been, be it Holland, Denmark, Germany, France or California, have I seen wind parks where all turbines were operating properly. Typically, 20% stand idle, out of commission, broken down. Use Google Videos to find examples of wind turbine crashes, start meditating and reach your own conclusions.

Why don't politicians listen to engineers? Why do engineers cave in to politically inspired financing? Merely to join the green daydreaming? I am an engineer; I want to be proud of my profession.

*Financial Post*

*Henk Tennekes is an aeronautical engineer and the former research director of KNMI, the Dutch National Weather Service. This article was published today by The Pielke Research Group at <http://cires.colorado.edu/science/groups/pielke/>*

**Comment from unidentified reader of the article:**

Thanks Mr. Tennekes, from another engineer, who wanted to be proud of his profession, and of his governing bodies, thinking that our duty to protect the public safety and well-being was paramount. Yet, sadly, current experience shows that protection of the public seems to have been replaced by other goals - making "big" money, and appeasing "feel-good" ideology.

Applying experience in risk assessment to the accident statistics from wind turbines, particularly the tall turbines being applied in Ontario, reveals a troubling trend. Data shows the wind speeds can vary significantly from the top of the blade circle to the bottom, applying a significant cyclical stress to the blades as they rotate, in a climate where temperature conditions can change significantly from day to day and season to season. Not surprisingly, blade failure rates in Ontario are higher than seen in Europe. Yet, when one presents this data to governing bodies in Ontario as a reason to increase "safety setbacks" it is dismissed.

Studying the reason for noise concerns expressed by people with homes in the vicinity of wind turbines (but further than government regulations allow) shows that wind profile conditions change from day to night, causing the wind turbines to produce more noise of a particularly noticeable cyclical nature and be more annoying at night. The government of the Netherlands cited research done in Ontario to change their wind farm noise regulations, but in Ontario, one cannot even get a reply from responsible bodies when the data is presented.

As Mr. Tennekes states, theoretically one could store the excess energy produced by wind turbines by pumping water uphill at night, to flow down in the daytime, but realistically, one learns that the amount of wind turbines planned for Ontario will be nearly the same as the amount of "hydro" water powered generation. This means to store excess wind energy at night could mean reversing the flow direction through all Ontario hydraulic generating stations at night - at incredible cost.

Why don't politicians listen to engineers? Maybe because engineers need to remember to protect the public, and to use the tools they have to assess the situation, starting as Mr. Tennekes did. Thank-you!

#####