

The Week That Was (March 20, 2010) Brought to you by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)

There will be no TWTW for the week of March 27. Ken Haapala is attending and giving a lecture at the Capital Science 2010 Conference hosted by the National Science Foundation. The topic of his lecture is: "Nature Rules the Climate: The Physical Evidence."
#####

Quote of the Week

"On the one hand is the global scientific consensus, and on the other – given equal weight – are the crackpot theories of industry-financed deniers." Al Gore, *Our Choice*, p. 363 center page in special large type emphasis.

THIS WEEK:

Last week TWTW discussed part of the IPCC's methodology as presented in the Summary for Policymakers (SPM) of the 2007 Assessment Report (AR4). The IPCC conclusion that it is 90% probable that humans caused the warming in the last 50 years (precise dates not given) requires two key assumptions: 1) the surface datasets relied upon have been rigorously maintained, and 2) all the natural causes of warming are known and included in the models. As readers of TWTW realize, it is likely the datasets have been highly compromised, rendering the IPCC's conclusions indefensible until the datasets are independently verified.

As to natural causes of temperature increases in the past 50 years, the SPM claims that:

"The observed widespread warming of the atmosphere and ocean, together with ice mass loss, support the conclusion that it is *extremely unlikely* that global climate change of the past 50 years can be explained without external forcing, and *very likely* that it is not due to known natural causes alone. {4.8, 5.2, 9.4, 9.5, 9.7}(SPM 1-30-07 p 10).

Put differently, it is only 5% probable that the surface temperature increases can be explained by changes within the earth and its internal climate system, and only 10% probable that they can be explained by all natural changes including changes in solar activity, etc.

This leads to one of nature's delicious ironies. This winter when much of the inhabited part of the Northern Hemisphere was suffering from extreme cold and snow, as referenced in prior TWTW's, satellite measurements show that the atmosphere was unusually warm due to a strong El Niño. Yet, the IPCC excludes natural influences for warming, specifically mentioning El Niños, which it considers too short to have an influence. It also excludes the established oscillations of the oceans such as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation and the Atlantic Multi-decadal Oscillation.

Adding to the irony, on March 6 the Houston Chronicle published an op-ed written by climate scientists, referenced in last week's TWTW, titled "On global warming, the science is solid." The scientists claim that the January high temperatures (now February as well) support the IPCC science. Others have made similar claims. Thus, to defend IPCC science some advocates are reduced to attacking IPCC's scientific findings!

In the next TWTW we will address some of the other contradictions created by the IPCC methodology.

TWTW Clarification and Amplification : Last week, TWTW addressed what has been called "global warming's evil twin" – ocean acidification – by pointing out the correct term would be declining ocean

alkalinity. Not expert in paleoclimate, TWTW referenced the work of Ian Plimer with the statement that carbon dioxide levels have been many times beyond what they are today without any change in ocean pH.

Delightfully, Kenneth Towe challenged the statement and suggested the study: *Nature* **461**, 1110-1113 (22 October 2009) *Atmospheric carbon dioxide through the Eocene–Oligocene climate transition* by Paul N. Pearson, Gavin L. Foster, Bridget S. Wade which reports that during this period, about 45 to 60 million year ago, atmospheric carbon dioxide ranged between 450 to 1500 ppm (compared to today's approximately 387 ppm) and for part of this period oceans surfaces had a lower pH – less alkaline than today (<http://paleolands.com/pdf/cenozoicCO2.pdf>).

TWTW thanks Ken Towe for this clarification and amplification.

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

1. Regarding the American Chemical Society Public Policy Statement On Climate Change:
An Open Letter to Board of Directors of the American Chemical Society
Signed by over 150 past and current members of the Society

2. Letter to the Institute of Physics, UK on its Submission to Parliament regarding Climategate
By S. Fred Singer

3. Climategate Was an Academic Disaster Waiting to Happen
By Peter Berkowitz, WSJ, Mar 13, 2010
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704131404575117314262655160.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

4. Climate Change: both sides dig in
The Scientific Alliance, UK, Mar 19, 2010
<http://www.gaia-technology.com/sa/newsletters/newsletters.cfm>

5. Climategate: the IPCC's whitewash 'review' is the AGW camp's biggest mistake yet
By Gerald Warner, Telegraph, UK, Mar 12, 2010, [H/t Bob Kay]
<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/geraldwarner/100029630/climategate-the-ipccs-whitewash-review-is-the-agw-camps-biggest-mistake-yet/>

6. Something Worse Than Inaction
Editorial, NYT, Mar 12, 2010
<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/13/opinion/13sat2.html?th&emc=th>

7. The climate industry wall of money
By Joanne Nova, JoaneNova.com, Mar 10, 2010
<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/03/the-climate-industry-wall-of-money/>
[Excerpt, balance available on the web site]

8. The Heretics: A Legacy of Independence
By Richard Trzuppek, Front Page, Mar 12, 2010 [H/t Don Veazey]
<http://frontpagemag.com/2010/03/12/the-heretics-a-legacy-of-independence/>

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

IT'S BACK! The Swamp Creature Returns!

Cap-and-trade in Congress is like a zombie in a bad horror movie: It won't stay dead

By William Yeatman, A Line of Sight, Mar 16, 2010, [H/t Cooler Heads Digest]

<http://www.bobbeauprez.com/policy/cap-and-trade-congress-zombie-bad-horror-movie-it-won%E2%80%99t-stay-dead>

Climate change's Hail Mary

By Steve Hargreaves, CNN Money, Mar 17, 2010 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

http://money.cnn.com/2010/03/17/news/economy/cap_and_hybrid/index.htm

CHALLENGING THE ORTHODOXY

IOP fires back over criticism of their submission to Parliament

By Michael Banks, Physics World, Mar 13, 2010 [Watts Up With That]

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/03/13/iop-fires-back-over-criticism-of-their-submission-to-parliament/#more-17293>

What Real Scientists Do: Global Warming Science vs. Global Whining Scientists

By David Schnare, Master Resource, Mar 16, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/03/what-real-scientists-do-global-warming-science-vs-global-whining-scientists/>

[SEPP Comment: This article asks key questions that many on both sides of the debate ignore.]

Global Warming on Trial

By Dexter Wright, American Thinker, Mar 19, 2010

http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/03/global_warming_on_trial.html

An Inconvenient Fraud

By Gerard Van der Leun, Penthouse Magazine, Mar 15, 2010

<http://penthousemagazine.com/features/an-inconvenient-fraud/>

“Al Gore and his pals in the science establishment want us to totally change our lives because of a theory that might not even be true. Have the sacred cows of global warming been gored beyond repair?”

[SEPP Comment: AGW defenders claim the scientists need to communicate better. Clearly they need to do something better when Penthouse Magazine carries a good article on the scientific failings.]

UN climate change claims on rainforests were wrong, study suggests

The United Nations' climate change panel is facing fresh criticism after new research contradicted the organisation's claims about the devastating effect climate change could have on the Amazon rainforest.

By Richard Gray, Telegraph, UK, Mar 13, 2010 [Bob Kay]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7437016/UN-climate-change-claims-on-rainforests-were-wrong-study-suggests.html>

Carbon Dioxide Unlikely to Cause Higher Temperatures

By Martin Mangino, Guest Columnist, Richmond Times Dispatch, Mar 14, 2010

http://www2.timesdispatch.com/rtd/news/opinion/commentary/article/ED-MANG14_20100312-204009/330040/

Doctor of Lies

Investors Business Daily, Mar 15, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=527378>

“Vice President Gore's career has been marked by visionary leadership, and his work has quite literally changed our planet for the better,” UT Knoxville Chancellor Jimmy G. Cheek said in a prepared statement.”

Government rebuked over global warming nursery rhyme adverts

Two nursery rhyme adverts commissioned by the UK Government to raise awareness of climate change have been banned for overstating the risks.

By Matthew Moore, Telegraph, UK, Mar 14, 2010 [H/t Thomas Burch]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/7440664/Government-rebuked-over-global-warming-nursery-rhyme-adverts.html>

DEFENDERS OF THE ORTHODOXY

Granddaddy of green, James Lovelock, warms to eco-sceptics

By Charles Clover, Sunday Times, Mar 14, 2010 [H/t Mark Morano]

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article7061020.ece

We climate scientists are not ecofanatics

If the IPCC has a fault, it is that its reports have been too cautious, not alarmist

John Houghton, The Times, Mar 15, 2010 [H/t Bob Kay]

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article7061646.ece

It's still real and it's still a problem

By Lord Chris Smith, BBC News, Mar 16, 2010

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8568377.stm>

“But we cannot allow a few errors to undermine the overwhelming strength of evidence that has been painstakingly accumulated, peer-reviewed, tested and tested again.”

[SEPP Comment: Why were the datasets, tested and tested again, held secret? If they had not been, the flaws would have been exposed years ago.]

ISSUES OVER THE EPA'S ENDANGERMENT FINDING

State suing for responsible scientific conclusions

By Greg Abbott, Houston Chronicle, Mar 13, 2010

<http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/editorial/outlook/6912011.html>

[SEPP Comment: Response from the Texas Attorney General for his actions in the EPA's endangerment finding.]

Reconsidering the Dessler/North Op-Ed on Settled Alarm, Climategate-as-Distraction (Part III in a series)

By Robert Bradley Jr. Master Resources, Mar 19, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/03/reconsidering-the-desslernorth-op-ed/>

[SEPP Comment: Further comments on the Op-Ed in the Houston Chronicle referenced in last week's TWTW criticizing the response of the Texas Attorney General in challenging the EPA endangerment finding. The prior two parts of the series can be accessed through this one.]

RENEWABLES AND EMISSIONS TRADING

EU to exceed green energy target

UPI.com, Mar 12, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.upi.com/Science_News/Resource-Wars/2010/03/12/EU-to-exceed-green-energy-target/UPI-65531268417481/

[SEPP Comment: Will 20% energy from renewables result in significant reductions in carbon dioxide emissions? Studies indicate it will not. See below especially, Not All Megawatts Are Created Equal.]

European emission trading rocked by scandal over recycled carbon permits

By Carl Mortished, The Times, Mar 18, 2010 [H/t Geoffrey Brown]

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/news/european-emission-trading-rocked-by-scandal-over-recycled-carbon-permits/story-e6frg90o-1225842148852>

Wind turbines: ‘Eco-friendly’ – but not to eagles

The same hills that provide lift for soaring birds offer heavily subsidized profits for wind farm developers.

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Mar 13, 2010 [H/t Mark Duchamp]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/7437040/Eco-friendly-but-not-to-eagles.html>

[SEPP Comment: One of the more objective articles on an emotional issue.]

NOT ALL MEGAWATTS ARE CREATED EQUAL

Understanding the Limits of Wind Power: Key Industry terms

By Glenn Schleede, Master Resource, Mar 14, 2010

<http://www.masterresource.org/2010/03/the-limitations-of-electricity-from-wind-energy-understanding-key-terms/>

Integrating Renewables: Have Policymakers Faced Realities

By Kent Hawkins, USAEE Dialogue, [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

http://dialogue.usaee.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=95&Itemid=113

[SEPP Comment: A more technical report than the above.]

ENERGY POLICY ISSUES

Nuclear Power: For the Sake of Mankind

By Staff Writers, Xinhua New Agency, Mar 11, 2010 [H/t Toshio Fujita]

http://www.nuclearpowerdaily.com/reports/Nuclear_Power_For_The_Sake_Of_Mankind_999.html

[SEPP Comment: China’s goal to go nuclear.]

Obama’s EPA stifles new energy gains

Editorial, Washington Examiner, Mar 19, 2010

http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/Obama_s-EPA-stifles-new-energy-gains-88472457.html

Chortling At Chu

IBD Editorials, Mar 12, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=527216>

Obama’s a pain at the pump – The president’s energy policy is sticking it to Americans

Editorial, Washington Times, Mar 9, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/mar/09/obama-to-inflict-pain-at-the-pump/>

[SEPP Comment: Possibly for the first time in American history, without a war or an embargo, gas prices are going up during a recession.]

Gas pain needed to meet emission targets, Harvard study says

By Marlo Lewis, Open Market .org, Mar 19, 2010

<http://www.openmarket.org/2010/03/19/gas-pain-needed-to-meet-emission-targets-harvard-study-says/>

The Big Wind-Power Cover-Up

IBD Editorial, Mar 12, 2010

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=527214>

[SEPP Comment: SEPP prepared a brief analysis of both the Spanish study and its critique by the US National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). The Spanish study has limitations that are common to such studies. Those who use the numbers should recognize the limitations and that the numbers, though precisely calculated, are only guides. However, NREL failed to successfully challenge the general conclusions.]

U.K. Tries to Catch a Wave

By Selina Williams, WSJ, Mar 15, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704416904575121400715695686.html>

[SEPP Comment: Huge commitment to harness ocean tides and waves. The tender was completed but this article gave more interesting detail]

MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES OF SCIENTIFIC INTEREST

Cold Mid-Latitude Winter May have Implications on Hurricane Season

By Joseph D'Aleo, ICECAP, Mar 13, 2010

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

New Discovery about How Water Moves Through Soil

Some of the most fundamental assumptions of water movement might be incorrect

Geology.com, [H/t John Droz, Jr.]

<http://geology.com/press-release/how-water-moves-through-soil/>

Problems with the Permafrost?

World Climate Report, Mar 17, 2010

<http://www.worldclimatereport.com/index.php/2010/03/17/problems-with-the-permafrost/>

Feeding the Propaganda of Anti-Technology Activists

By Henry Miller, MD, ASCH, WSJ Letters, Mar 17, 2010

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704416904575121942096732482.html#articleTabs=article>

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Cocaine users 'making global warming worse'

By Bob Roberts, Mirror.UK Mar 3, 2010

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/top-stories/2010/03/03/cocaine-users-making-global-warming-worse-115875-22081755/>

Learning from Nature: Scientists Break Down Carbon Dioxide Into Carbon Monoxide Using Visible Light

Science Daily, Mar 10, 2010 [H/t Deke Forbes]

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/03/100308095840.htm>

[SEPP Comment: Converting nontoxic carbon dioxide into toxic carbon monoxide to eliminate that threat of AGW is progress!]

Miami Waterworld? It Could Happen

World's top Arctic scientists meeting in Miami: Ground Zero for sea level rise

By Jeff Burnside, NBC Miami, Mar 17, 2010 [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.nbcmiami.com/news/local-beat/Rising-seas-keeping-pace-with-rising-public-skepticism-over-climate-change-88008527.html>

[SEPP Comment: It's all a conspiracy of real estate speculators to depress the condo market in Miami so they can snap up the properties for pennies on the dollar. They are just following Al Gore's lead in purchasing a Bay front condo in San Francisco.]

'Pervasive, wide-ranging' climate impacts in US, White House task force finds

By Frances Beineke, Reuters alertnet.org, Mar 18, 2010, [H/t Marc Morano]

<http://www.alertnet.org/db/blogs/63671/2010/02/18-112703-1.htm>

"Climate change is already having "pervasive, wide-ranging" effects on "nearly every aspect of our society," a task force representing more than 20 federal agencies reported Tuesday."

[SEPP Comment: This is in response to: "the raft of climate change deniers who have been having a field day of late trying to rally an assault on science with a handful of stolen e-mails and a couple of minor errors in a 2,800-page report by the International Panel on Climate Change."]

#####

1. Regarding the American Chemical Society Public Policy Statement On Climate Change: An Open Letter to Board of Directors of the American Chemical Society Signed by over 150 past and current members of the Society

As chemists and engineers who are familiar with the science issues, and as current and past members of the American Chemical Society, we the undersigned urge the ACS Board of Directors to appoint a group of senior scientists, without vested interest, to revisit the science behind climate change in light of new scientific findings instead of relying on the report of the IPCC.

This group would share their conclusions with the members of the ACS in open forums, discussions and submit majority and minority reports (if so needed) to revise the current statement of the ACS on climate change. As counterpoint to the current statement, we recommend the change to as follows, so as to more accurately represent the current state of the science:

Greenhouse gas emissions, such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide, accompany human industrial and agricultural activity. While substantial concern has been expressed that emissions may cause significant climate change, measured or reconstructed temperature records indicate that 20th -21st century changes are neither exceptional nor persistent, and the historical and geological records show many periods warmer than today. In addition, there is an extensive scientific literature that examines beneficial effects of increased levels of carbon dioxide for both plants and animals.

Studies of a variety of natural processes, including ocean cycles and solar variability, indicate that they can account for variations in the Earth's climate on the time scale of decades and centuries. Current climate models appear insufficiently reliable to properly account for natural and anthropogenic contributions to past climate change, much less project future climate.

The American Chemical Society supports an objective scientific effort to understand the effects of all processes – natural and human -- on the Earth's climate and the biosphere's response to climatic

processes. The Society promotes technological options for meeting environmental challenges, regardless of cause.

We also are willing to accept a new statement that is based on the independent assessment being requested.

Due diligence by the ACS Board of Directors on this issue is timely and important given the discovery of substantial scientific misconduct by senior practitioners of climate science and IPCC members, both in the UK and US which were uncovered in the past few weeks.

2. Letter to the Institute of Physics, UK on its Submission to Parliament regarding Climategate

By S. Fred Singer

I am an elected Fellow of the American Physical Society and a co-organizer of a Petition drive to the APS Council to modify or withdraw the published APS Statement on Climate Change [see *Nature* **460**:457, 23 July 2009]. Some 250 members and Fellows of the APS have now joined in signing this Petition, including members of the US National Academy of Sciences, a Nobelist, and many other prize winners.

I urge you to ignore all of the insubstantial criticisms leveled against your submission to the House of Commons' inquiry into ClimateGate. All scientists should applaud your call for openness and sharing of data – even without the legal requirements of the Freedom of Information Act, and regardless of one's position on the causes of global warming. To echo Margaret Thatcher's admonition to President George Bush: "Don't go wobbly!"

It is strange that such fierce criticism of the IOP submission has come mainly from avowed promoters of the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) myth, who have attacked the IOP as "misinformed and misguided." (Some have even advocated breaking the law by ignoring the "Freedom of Information Act.") But why should there be any connection between the sharing of scientific information and the cause of GW?

Your submission criticized the practices of the climate scientists at the center of the Parliamentary inquiry. These include primarily Dr Philip Jones, director of the Climate Research Unit (CRU) of the University of East Anglia (UEA) and Dr Michael Mann of Pennsylvania State University. The submission of the Royal Society of Chemistry says "that a lack of willingness to disseminate scientific information may infer that the scientific results or methods used are not robust enough to face scrutiny." So what are they trying to hide? 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 no tropospheric warming – a disparity which is in conflict with every greenhouse climate model.

You state that the Institute "has long had a clear position on global warming, namely that there is no doubt that climate change is happening, that it is linked to man-made emissions of greenhouse gases, and that we should be taking action to address it now." However, I know of no valid evidence to support such a position and would urge you to carry out an independent investigation. In due course we may learn how the temperature data underlying the IPCC conclusions have been manipulated. In the meantime, I would caution you against relying on the IPCC.

I am aware that the UK Meteorological Office has published a review of the latest climate-change science. Their report says it is "very likely" that man-made greenhouse-gas emissions are causing the climate to change and that the changes bear the "fingerprint" of human influence. But as far as I know, the fingerprints point the other way and suggest that the human contribution is only minor. In other

words, the empirical evidence contradicts both the IPCC and the Met Office. [See here the reports of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, 2008 and 2009, at www.NIPCCreport.org]

The most direct way to resolve this obvious disagreement might be for the IOP Science Board to arrange one or more debates and scrutinize the evidence presented by both sides. I have no doubt whatsoever that they will agree that Nature rules the climate, not human activity.

Sincerely yours,

S. Fred Singer
Professor Emeritus, University of Virginia
Former director of the US Weather Satellite Service

NOTE: Quotes from IOP are from an article in *Physics World* displayed in <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2010/03/13/iop-fires-back-over-criticism-of-their-submission-to-parliament/#more-17293>

3. Climategate Was an Academic Disaster Waiting to Happen

By Peter Berkowitz, WSJ, Mar 13, 2010

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB20001424052748704131404575117314262655160.html#mod=todays_us_opinion

Last fall, emails revealed that scientists at the Climatic Research Unit at the University of East Anglia in England and colleagues in the U.S. and around the globe deliberately distorted data to support dire global warming scenarios and sought to block scholars with a different view from getting published. What does this scandal say generally about the intellectual habits and norms at our universities?

This is a legitimate question, because our universities, which above all should be cultivating intellectual virtue, are in their day-to-day operations fostering the opposite. Fashionable ideas, the convenience of professors, and the bureaucratic structures of academic life combine to encourage students and faculty alike to defend arguments for which they lack vital information. They pretend to knowledge they don't possess and invoke the authority of rank and status instead of reasoned debate.

Consider the undergraduate curriculum. Over the last several decades, departments have watered down the requirements needed to complete a major, while core curricula have been hollowed out or abandoned. Only a handful of the nation's leading universities—Columbia and the University of Chicago at the forefront—insist that all undergraduates must read a common set of books and become conversant with the main ideas and events that shaped Western history and the larger world.

There are no good pedagogical reasons for abandoning the core. Professors and administrators argue that students need and deserve the freedom to shape their own course of study. But how can students who do not know the basics make intelligent decisions about the books they should read and the perspectives they should master?

The real reasons for releasing students from rigorous departmental requirements and fixed core courses are quite different. One is that professors prefer to teach boutique classes focusing on their narrow areas of specialization. In addition, they believe that dropping requirements will lure more students to their departments, which translates into more faculty slots for like-minded colleagues. By far, though, the most important reason is that faculty generally reject the common sense idea that there is a basic body of knowledge that all students should learn. This is consistent with the popular campus dogma that all morals and cultures are relative and that objective knowledge is impossible.

The deplorable but predictable result is that professors constantly call upon students to engage in discussions and write papers in the absence of fundamental background knowledge. Good students quickly absorb the curriculum's unwritten lesson—cutting corners and vigorously pressing strong but unsubstantiated opinions is the path to intellectual achievement.

The production of scholarship also fosters intellectual vice. Take the peer review process, which because of its supposed impartiality and objectivity is intended to distinguish the work of scholars from that of journalists and commercial authors.

Academic journals typically adopt a double blind system, concealing the names of both authors and reviewers. But any competent scholar can determine an article's approach or analytical framework within the first few paragraphs. Scholars are likely to have colleagues and graduate students they support and whose careers they wish to advance. A few may even have colleagues whose careers, along with those of their graduate students, they would like to tarnish or destroy. There is no check to prevent them from benefiting their friends by providing preferential treatment for their orientation and similarly punishing their enemies.

That's because the peer review process violates a fundamental principle of fairness. We don't allow judges to be parties to a controversy they are adjudicating, and don't permit athletes to umpire games in which they are playing. In both cases the concern is that their interest in the outcome will bias their judgment and corrupt their integrity. So why should we expect scholars, especially operating under the cloak of anonymity, to fairly and honorably evaluate the work of allies and rivals?

Some university presses exacerbate the problem. Harvard University Press tells a reviewer the name of a book manuscript's author but withholds the reviewer's identity from the author. It would be hard to design a system that provided reviewers more opportunity to reward friends and punish enemies.

Harvard Press assumes that its editors will detect and avoid conflicts of interest. But if reviewers are in the same scholarly field as, or in a field related to that of, the author—and why would they be asked for an evaluation if they weren't?—then the reviewer will always have a conflict of interest.

Then there is the abuse of confidentiality and the overreliance on arguments from authority in hiring, promotion and tenure decisions. Owing to the premium the academy places on specialization, most university departments today contain several fields, and within them several subfields. Thus departmental colleagues are regularly asked to evaluate scholarly work in which they have little more expertise than the man or woman on the street.

Often unable to form independent professional judgments—but unwilling to recuse themselves from important personnel decisions—faculty members routinely rely on confidential letters of evaluation from scholars at other universities. Once again, these letters are written—and solicited—by scholars who are irreducibly interested parties.

There are no easy fixes to this state of affairs. Worse, our universities don't recognize they have a problem. Instead, professors and university administrators are inclined to indignantly dismiss concerns about the curriculum, peer review, and hiring, promotion and tenure decisions as cynically calling into question their good character. But these concerns are actually rooted in the democratic conviction that professors and university administrators are not cut from finer cloth than their fellow citizens.

Our universities shape young men's and women's sensibilities, and our professors are supposed to serve as guardians of authoritative knowledge and exemplars of serious and systematic inquiry. Yet our campuses are home today to a toxic confluence of fashionable ideas that undermine the very notion of intellectual

virtue, and to flawed educational practices and procedures that give intellectual vice ample room to flourish.

Just look at Climategate.

Mr. Berkowitz is a senior fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution.

4. Climate Change: both sides dig in

The Scientific Alliance, UK, Mar 19, 2010

<http://www.gaia-technology.com/sa/newsletters/newsletters.cfm>

Where the climate change debate is concerned, the temptation to use military metaphors is sometimes irresistible. Until recently, the vastly superior forces of the IPCC and its allies in the scientific establishment have prevailed against the guerrilla warfare of the sceptics, who have sometimes done localised damage but never threatened the monolith. However, as a series of weaknesses in their campaign have become increasingly public, those who are currently in the scientific mainstream are being forced to conduct a more vigorous defence of their position. But the various groups of dissenting and sceptical irregulars, though they have gained ground, are far from having won the war. Both camps are now digging in for the long haul. Whether there will ever be a decisive victory for one side or the other is doubtful, but for now the battlefield is at least more even.

Without belabouring the metaphor any further, what has reduced the seemingly unstoppable impetus of the climate change policy brigade? The answer is really two-fold: a failure to achieve meaningful agreement in Copenhagen, which had been billed as the make-or-break summit, and a series of revelations about the workings of the IPCC panel which raise serious questions about credibility. Taken together, the resultant loss in policy-making momentum may never be regained. The consequence is likely to be that any meaningful post-Kyoto agreement might have to be negotiated in light of considerably more evidence than we currently have, which is surely no bad thing.

When faced with criticism – much of it both legitimate and measured, although it must be admitted that some of it became quite personal and vitriolic – the climate change establishment closed ranks and condescendingly dismissed all the points raised. Dissenters were routinely said to be in the pay of the oil industry (despite the fact that companies have little to fear from the policies mooted) or disparaged as flat-Earthers or even village idiots. They framed the debate (while seeking to close it down) as between "scientists" on one hand and "sceptics" on the other (fortunately, the term "denier" is now less frequently heard), with the implicit assumption that no scientist could possibly disagree with the mainstream view. *Ad hominem* slurs were common.

Human nature being what it is, this failure to acknowledge the credibility of any criticism riled many sceptics so much that, when evidence of sloppiness, closed-mindedness and downright obstruction among key climate scientists started to appear, quite a few went straight for the jugular. Claims that the various revelations totally discredit the AGW (Anthropogenic Global Warming) hypothesis and the work of the IPCC are wide of the mark but, in such a highly partisan and polarised debate, understandable.

In fact, the various "gates" paint an unflattering picture of arrogance and unscientific behaviour within the influential clique of scientists and policymakers central to the IPCC process. A little humility and acceptance of the faults would not be amiss and would very likely enhance the

IPCC's reputation. Instead, there are the beginnings of a full-blown counterattack and the setting up of an "independent" enquiry which promises to be anything but.

The problems (or faults, or mistakes, call them what you will) which have been publicised do not in themselves undermine the AGW hypothesis, but taken together they do call into question the supposedly objective nature of the massive assessment reports which the IPCC publishes periodically (the fourth, and most recent, AR4, in 2007). Discounting for now evidence which either conflicts with AGW or supports alternative hypotheses, climategate and its ilk hint at a process where scientific open-mindedness comes a distant second to the search for evidence which supports what has come to be seen as a self-evident truth, that humans are disrupting climate.

The leaking of emails from the University of East Anglia's Climate Research Unit, which will inevitably continue to be referred to as climategate, showed the defensiveness of the key scientists responsible for collating the global temperature record. While we should not place too much weight on particular words or expressions (after all, who does not at some time or another regret committing some things to email?) there appears to have been a clear attempt to withhold data, together with non-compliance with the Freedom of Information Act.

While requests for data from people known to be critical of your work must be very annoying, good science has nothing to fear from open questioning of results. But the exact temperature record is not really the key issue, average temperature being sensitive to the means used to derive it. Nevertheless, hiding the raw data can only give rise to suspicions about how selectively it might have been used.

In many ways a more worrying incident was the inclusion of a statement in AR4 that Himalayan glaciers were set to disappear by 2035. This conclusion was questioned, in particular by the Indian government, which published an independent report coming to very different conclusions (and which was dismissed as "voodoo science" by Rajendra Pachauri, current head of the IPCC).

It turned out that the quote had come from a non-peer reviewed WWF report and had no basis in reality. In itself a small thing, but it gives cause for concern that the authors of the chapter in question could include such a reference. Were they simply slapdash, or were they happy to include anything, however tenuous, which supported their case?

There was too much publicity for these and other concerns (including being selective with cut-off dates to ensure inclusion of the 'right' papers and exclusion of the 'wrong' ones) simply to be ignored. The UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-Moon, has asked the InterAcademy Council (comprising various national academies of science) "to conduct an independent review of the IPCC's processes and procedures to further strengthen the quality of the Panel's reports on climate change".

Doubtless there will be a few minor slaps on the wrist over procedure. Pachauri himself may be sacrificed, given his rather intemperate way with critics. But the IPCC juggernaut itself will lumber on unchanged, with the same mission: to assemble evidence that our species is the major driver of climate change.

The IAC investigation is the defensive part of the campaign, but the climate establishment is also back on the offensive. Take, for example, a recent article in the UK Times ([We climate scientist are not ecofanatics](#)) by Sir John Houghton, first head of IPCC's working group 1, in which he said that the IPCC was actually being too cautious in its conclusions. It is worthwhile looking at a few quotes:

"The IPCC is too big an organisation to be captured by an ideological cabal or fall foul of group-think", which simply shows a staggering lack of understanding of human behaviour.

"The IPCC process also makes it impossible for green propaganda to be slipped in". Such as a WWF report?

"But scientists are now faced by powerful lobbies who are working to distort and discredit the science behind climate change". The belief that if people do not believe you, they cannot be honest.

Quite frankly, if that is going to be the nature of the debate, we are in for a long period of trench warfare. Time to invent the rhetorical equivalent of the tank.

5. Climategate: the IPCC's whitewash 'review' is the AGW camp's biggest mistake yet

By Gerald Warner, Telegraph, UK, Mar 12, 2010, [H/t Bob Kay]

<http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/news/geraldwarner/100029630/climategate-the-ipccs-whitewash-review-is-the-agw-camps-biggest-mistake-yet/>

It looks as if the tottering IPCC has just made its biggest mistake yet. Twenty-four hours after the announcement of an "independent" inquiry into certain aspects of its activities it is possible to make a considered assessment of its significance. By any reasoned analysis, it is not only a whitewash but one in which the paint is spread so thinly as to be transparent.

First, who appointed this review body? Those two iconic standard bearers of climate science objectivity, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and IPCC head (still!) Rajendra Pachauri. There is nothing like being judge in your own cause – it secures a less damaging verdict. Ban Ki-moon is the clown who, on a visit to the Arctic last September, despairingly proclaimed that "100 billion tons" of polar ice were melting each year, when the sea-ice around him had just extended itself by half a million square kilometres more than at the same time the previous year. Pachauri, among many other solecisms, is also the buffoon who denounced criticism of the IPCC's absurd claims about melting Himalayan glaciers as "voodoo science".

Then there is the review's terms of reference. It has four remits: to analyse the IPCC process, including links with other UN agencies; to review use of non-peer reviewed sources and data quality control; to assess how procedures handle "the full range of scientific views; and to review IPCC communications with the public and the media. So, most of its activity will relate to reorganisation of the IPCC's propaganda operation and how it can be beefed up.

Nowhere are there proposals for it to revisit, in depth, the IPCC's 3,000-page 2007 report and repudiate the vast range of inaccuracies and downright fabrications it contains. Instead, the review panel has to report by August so that its meaningless conclusions on a variety of irrelevant issues can be used to sanitise the IPCC's next report, to be prepared at a meeting in October.

As for the personnel, the review will be conducted by the Inter-Academy Council and headed by its co-chairman Professor Robbert Dijkgraaf, who recently broadcast on Dutch radio a complacent statement about the "consensus" on climate science. The Inter-Academy Council is a representative body for a number of national academies of science, most of which are committed to the climate change cause.

So, a very obvious whitewash and presumably very satisfactory to the IPCC camp. Nevertheless, I repeat, it is probably the most serious mistake the AGW fanatics have so far made. This is because they have seriously underestimated the amount of trouble they are in. Any competent political spin doctor (and the AGW scam is pure politics, not science) would have told them that, as things stand in 2010, they had one last chance – and only one chance – to salvage their bogus crusade.

That was to allow a genuinely independent investigation, including highly qualified sceptics, to analyse the 2007 report and expose all its fallacies – which are already in the public domain in any case. They could then have apologised, sacked Pachauri (which they will probably do anyway) and prepared an equally mendacious but more sophisticated report, jettisoning the more extravagant scare-mongering for the time being, and so clawed back wavering support among the public.

Instead, they have opted for a very obvious whitewash, discredited from the day of its launch, that will provoke hilarity and increased scepticism when it reports. After that, there will be no road back. We should be grateful that the arrogance and over-confidence engendered by their longstanding immunity from challenge (but not any more) prompted the AGW fraudsters to create so inadequate a smokescreen.

This investigation is very good news for sceptics – not because it will denounce any significant flaws in the AGW imposture, but because it will not. AGW credulity is already a minority faith; but there is a further constituency of waverers, ready to break off like a melting iceberg from the main floe, whose final defection will mean the AGW movement is deprived of critical mass. This pathetic attempt at a cover-up could well be the catalyst for that decisive departure. Think about it and be glad.

6. Something Worse Than Inaction

Editorial, NYT, Mar 12, 2010

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/13/opinion/13sat2.html?th&emc=th>

The Obama administration has always had a backup plan in case Congress failed to pass a broad climate change bill. The Environmental Protection Agency would use its Clean Air Act authority to regulate greenhouse gases. Regulation, or the threat of it, would goad Congress to act or provide a backstop if it did not.

The House passed a bill last year seeking an economy-wide cap on emissions, but there has been no progress in the Senate. Now some senators seem determined to undercut the E.P.A.'s regulatory authority. These include not only Republicans who panic at any regulation, but also Democrats who say they worry about climate change but insist that the executive branch stand aside until Congress gets around to dealing with it.

The most destructive idea is a “resolution of disapproval” concocted by Lisa Murkowski, a Republican from Alaska. It would reject the E.P.A.'s recent scientific finding that greenhouse gases are a danger to public health and welfare, effectively repudiating the agency's authority — granted to it by the Supreme Court — to regulate these gases. As a practical matter, it would also stop last year's widely applauded agreement to limit greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks.

Ms. Murkowski has temporarily set aside her amendment while the Senate mulls a seemingly more benign bill from Jay Rockefeller, a West Virginia Democrat. His bill does not tamper with the new rules on vehicle emissions or deny the E.P.A.'s legal authority to regulate greenhouse gases. But it would severely narrow the agency's reach by blocking it from proposing, or even doing much work on, regulations on emissions from stationary sources like power plants, for two years while Congress worked on broader legislation.

Industrial emissions account for a third of this country's greenhouses gases, and freezing the government's ability to regulate them makes no sense. There is no guarantee that Congress will produce a broad bill. And even if it does, what is the harm in requiring power plants and other industrial facilities to make near-term improvements in efficiency, or switch to less-polluting fuels?

These senators seem to have bought the hype, spun by industry, that the E.P.A. will run amok. This is not the way we read the intentions of the E.P.A. administrator, Lisa Jackson, who has promised that whatever regulations she proposes will be gradual, cost-effective and affect only the largest facilities.

Nor is it the way we read Congress's responsibility to the country. That is to address the very real danger of climate change, not deny the government the tools it needs — and legally has — to fight it.

7. The climate industry wall of money

By Joanne Nova, JoaneNova.com, Mar 10, 2010

<http://joannenova.com.au/2010/03/the-climate-industry-wall-of-money/>

[Excerpt, balance available on the web site]

Somehow the tables have turned. For all the smears of big money funding the “deniers”, the numbers reveal that the sceptics are actually the true grassroots campaigners, while Greenpeace defends Wall St. How times have changed. Sceptics are fighting a billion dollar industry aligned with a trillion dollar trading scheme. Big Oil's supposed evil influence has been vastly outdone by Big Government, and even *those* taxpayer billions are trumped by Big-Banking.

The big-money side of this debate has fostered a myth that sceptics write what they write because they are funded by oil profits. They say, *follow the money?* So I did and it's chilling. Greens and environmentalists need to be aware each time they smear with an ad hominem attack they are unwittingly helping giant finance houses.

Follow the money

Money for Sceptics: Greenpeace has searched for funding for sceptics and found \$23 million dollars paid by Exxon over ten years (which has stopped). Perhaps Greenpeace missed funding from other fossil fuel companies, but you can be sure that they *searched*. I wrote the [Climate Money](#) paper in July last year, and since then no one has claimed a larger figure. Big-Oil may well prefer it if emissions are not traded, but it's not make-or-break for them. If all fossil fuels are in effect “taxed”, consumers will pay the tax anyhow, and past price rises in crude oil suggest consumers will not consume much less fuel, so profits won't actually fall that much.

But in the end, everyone spends more on carbon friendly initiatives than on sceptics— even Exxon: (how about \$100 million for Stanford's [Global Climate and Energy Project](#), and [\\$600 million for Biofuels](#) research). Some will complain that Exxon is massive and their green commitment was a tiny part of their profits, but the point is, what they spent on skeptics *was even less*.

Money for the Climate Industry: The US government spent \$79 billion on climate research and technology since 1989 – to be sure, this funding paid for things like satellites and studies, but it's 3,500 times as much as anything offered to sceptics. It buys a bandwagon of support, a repetitive rain of press releases, and includes PR departments of institutions like NOAA, NASA, the Climate Change Science Program and the Climate Change Technology Program. The \$79 billion figure does not include money from other western governments, private industry, and is not adjusted for inflation. In other words, it could be...a lot bigger

8. The Heretics: A Legacy of Independence

By Richard Trzupke, Front Page, Mar 12, 2010 [H/t Don Veazey]

<http://frontpagemag.com/2010/03/12/the-heretics-a-legacy-of-independence/>

It's time to wrap up The Heretics series. We haven't come close to covering all of the scientists and researchers who question the tenets of global warming alarmism, but the small sampling of prominent skeptics featured on these pages should be enough to make it obvious that significant, sincere and scientifically valid arguments exist that refute the Gorethodoxy of so-called "climate change."

In addition to the heretics we have featured, there are legions of others. Atmospheric physicists Fred Singer at the University of Virginia, Richard Lindzen at MIT and legendary meteorologist John Coleman, just to name a few, have been out on the front lines, waging a battle for scientific integrity, for years. The [Heartland Institute](#) ^[1], a cornucopia of information about global warming, has published the names of hundreds of skeptical scientists. More than thirty thousand scientists, including this one, have lent their names to the [Global Warming Petition Project](#) ^[2], declaring that they agree with the following statement:

"We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gasses is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth."

The myth of scientific consensus on global warming, once so prevalent, has been discredited to the point that only die-hard liberal policy makers still cling to it. About [fifty percent of Americans](#) ^[3] now believes that natural planetary trends are responsible for climate change and public support for greenhouse gas regulation continues to dwindle. The alarmists are scrambling to repackage their message in hopes of rekindling the global warming fire, but they face daunting challenges. One can only cry wolf so many times before people start to tune you out.

When Al Gore's disciples attempt to discredit skeptics, aka "denialists" in their world, they usually stick to a couple of themes. The first is to label the individual in question as a corporate stooge, usually with alleged ties to Exxon-Mobil, who has sold out science in exchange for a fat paycheck. The second is to declare that the skeptic is a crackpot who doesn't really understand the science involved and is simply making wild, unverifiable assertions with no basis in reality. Neither claim can survive close scrutiny.

The supposed connection between Exxon-Mobil and skeptics, so near and dear to the hearts of alarmists like Greenpeace, is simply ludicrous. Consider just one example: According to Greenpeace's website Exxon Secrets, the Heartland Institute [is closely tied to the oil giant](#) ^[4]. However, [Heartland points out](#) ^[5] that it has never received more than five percent of its funding from Exxon-Mobil and has not received any donations from the company since 2006.

Skeptic Dr. Roy Spencer works for the University of Alabama and has no ties to Exxon-Mobil or any other corporation. Skeptic Dr. Richard Lindzen is a respected professor at MIT, Steve McIntyre is a retired, independent mining engineer and Anthony Watts is a meteorologist. None of them can be tied to big oil, big coal or any other big business except by employing smears and innuendo. The skeptics, including this one, have been motivated by a deep respect for the scientific method, revulsion at the way

that method has been perverted by alarmists and the fear that taking action to solve the non-existent problem of global warming will do irreparable harm to the global economy and the world's inhabitants.

The second allegation, that skeptics don't know what they are talking about, is equally foolish. Certainly there are those at the fringes of the blogosphere who make unsubstantiated, non-scientific arguments in opposition to global warming dogma. But, it's equally true that there are plenty of people, including mainstream media figures like Thomas Friedman and Chris Matthews, who make equally unsubstantiated, non-scientific arguments in support of Gore's agenda. When it comes to hard science, there is a strong body of legitimate research that suggests that while increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere can affect the climate, that effect is insignificant when compared to natural forces.

That is and has been the core of what skeptics like Spencer, McIntyre and Steve Milloy have been saying for a long time. Every legitimate scientist will acknowledge that human activity can influence our environment. The real question is: How much? There is a growing body of evidence that seems to show that answer to that question is "not much at all." We have the heretics to thank for that answer. Without them, the world would be much farther along toward realizing the economic disaster that would follow if we tried to implement Al Gore's carbon-free utopia in full.

Article printed from FrontPage Magazine: <http://frontpagemag.com>

URL to article: <http://frontpagemag.com/2010/03/12/the-heretics-a-legacy-of-independence/>

URLs in this post:

[1] Heartland Institute: <http://www.heartland.org/environmentandclimate-news.org/index.html>

[2] Global Warming Petition Project: <http://www.petitionproject.org/>

[3] fifty percent of Americans:

http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/current_events/environment_energy/energy_update

[4] is closely tied to the oil giant: <http://www.exxonsecrets.org/html/orgfactsheet.php?id=41>

[5] Heartland points out: <http://www.heartland.org/about/truthsquad.html>

#####