

The Week That Was: 2014-10-05 (May 10, 2014)
Brought to You by SEPP (www.SEPP.org)
The Science and Environmental Policy Project

#####

Quote of the Week: "In war-time, truth is so precious that she should always be attended by a bodyguard of lies." Winston Churchill, **From Bodyguard of Lies** by Anthony Cave Brown (1975)

#####

Number of the Week: \$150 per gallon

#####

9th International Conference on Climate Change

July 7 – 9 -- Las Vegas, Nevada

Includes the Findings of the New Report by the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) *Climate Change Reconsidered II*, Volumes 1, 2, and 3

<http://climateconference.heartland.org/>

#####

SEPP'S APRIL FOOLS AWARD
THE JACKSON

SEPP is conducting its annual vote for the recipient of the coveted trophy, a piece of coal, The Jackson. Readers are asked to nominate and vote for who they think is most deserving following these criteria:

- The nominee has advanced, or proposes to advance, significant expansion of governmental power, regulation, or control over the public or significant sections of the general economy.
- The nominee does so by declaring such measures are necessary to protect public health, welfare, or the environment.
- The nominee declares that physical science supports such measures.
- The physical science supporting the measures is flimsy at best, and possibly non-existent.

The first two recipients, Lisa Jackson and Barack Obama, are not candidates. Due to the late announcement, the voting will close on May 16. Please send your nominee and a brief reason why the person is qualified for the honor to Ken@Haapala.com. Thank you.

At the suggestion of Sonja A. Boehmer-Christiansen, Editor of *Energy & Environment*, nominees can include leaders of big banks and other financial institutions who are advocating global warming/climate change and profiting from the fear created by financing renewables, which are increasing the cost of electricity to the general public.

The nominees are: Senate leader Harry Reid, Jeremy Grantham (for establishing charities that promote global warming/climate change, Ottmar Edenhofer (Co-chair of the IPCC Working Group III), Secretary of State John Kerry, EPA administrator Gina McCarthy and Tom Steyer (for promising vast campaign contributions to Democrats who oppose the Keystone pipeline, after his company made vast profits in promoting coal use in Asia and Australia. Additional nominees are: Al Gore, James Hansen, Senator Barbara Boxer, Vermont Governor Peter Shumlin (for closing nuclear power), Stephan Lewandowski (shoddy work), and The German Government. Further nominees

are John Holdren, German Chancellor Angela Merkel, Harvard President Drew Faust (see link Expanding the Orthodoxy), US Representative Mike Honda (CA) (illogical defense of climate mitigation), former NYC mayor Michael Bloomberg (too many to list), and US Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (an embarrassment to the state of Rhode Island)

We have quite a list of highly qualified candidates. Please vote!

#####

THIS WEEK:

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

NCA: On May 6, the Administration released the anticipated third National Climate Assessment (NCA), *Climate Change Impacts* in the United States. The cover letter to Congress is signed by John P. Holdren, Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and by Kathryn D. Sullivan, Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, NOAA Administrator. The report is the product of the US Global Change Research Program with 13 government agencies participating: Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Energy, Health and Human Services, Interior, State, Transportation as well as the Agency for International Development (USAID), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), National Science Foundation (NSF), and Smithsonian Institution. The report is a slick marketing piece and the web site is very effective as such. The NCA claims that the nation is being damaged by global warming/climate change and it divides the nation into regions to discuss the harms occurring.

Apparently, the Administration has declared war on global warming/climate change/climate disruption, etc. As such, it appears the Administration has taken Churchill's admonition to heart. [Quote of the Week]. A student of war-time propaganda may identify this report as such. The report relies heavily on projections from defective, biased climate models and selective ignorance of climate history of the United States. On his web site, Roy Spencer presents a brief rebuttal to each of the 12 major points. In his December 11, 2013 testimony to the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, John Christy presented evidence contradicting many of the claims in this report. The testimony discussed the defects in the climate models, and the strong warming bias they have. Defective global models are an inappropriate basis for estimating regional impact.

The section of the report on global sea level rise illustrates the lack of scientific rigor in the report (pp 44 & 45). It states that since 1880, when reliable record keeping began, sea levels have risen by about 8 inches. Then goes on to state that: The future scenarios range from 0.66 feet (8 inches, 20 cm) to 6.6 feet (79 inches, 201 cm) by 2100. "These scenarios are not based on climate model simulations, but rather reflect the range of possible scenarios based on other scientific studies." [These studies are not discussed in that section.] "In particular, the high end of these scenarios may be useful for decision-makers with a low tolerance for risk." The report states the more likely range of sea level rise is 1 to 4 feet by 2100 (30 to 122 cm). The report attributes the broad range of values to the uncertainty of the science. Others may attribute the broad range of values to an effort to alarm the general population and give justification to bureaucrats to impose punitive taxes and regulations.

This report may be the most misleading document published by the executive branch of government in a time of peace. For a broad range of comments see links under Challenging the Orthodoxy, Defending the Orthodoxy – The NCA, and Questioning The NCA.

For Only \$7.5 Billion: According to the cover letter, the National Climate Assessment (NCA) is the result of a three-year analytical effort by a team of over 300 experts, overseen by a broadly constituted Federal Advisory Committee of 60 members. Other reports stated that the NCA was 4 or 5 years in the making. Three years is sufficient to establish an estimate of how much the NCA costs. The NCA is the justification for the US Global Change Research Program (USGCRP) and it is the program's principal product. According to reports from the White House, the USGCRP spent about \$7.469 Billion in fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013 (fiscal years end on September 30). Yet, the USGCRP cannot estimate sea level rise 86 years hence within one foot! See links under Questioning The NCA

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/FY12-climate-fs.pdf> and http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/legislative_reports/fcde-report-to-congress.pdf

Realistic Sea Level Rise: Willem P. de Lange and Robert Carter have produced a report of sea level rise that is more realistic and, no doubt, less expensive than the NCA. They suggest a policy for addressing sea level rise that is far less expensive than government policies that may come from the fears promoted in NCA.

A group of scientists using the name Randolph Glacier Inventory have compiled an inventory of all the earth's glaciers. Several studies calculate that if all the glaciers melt, sea levels will rise by about 35 to 47 cm (13.8 to 18.5 inches). This is far less than the 30 to 122 cm (12 to 48 inches) estimate in the NCA. (Note, the rise does not include possible expansion of the oceans due to warming or possible melting of the extremely cold Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets. See links under Questioning the Orthodoxy and Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice

Prolepsis: How we know they know we know they are trying to deceive us? Prolepsis is an argumentative (debate) technique whereby the advocate of a particular position begins by admitting certain weaknesses in order to deflect more severe criticism and/or gain sympathy from the audience. It can work very well, but it alerts others that the advocate is aware of some of the weaknesses in the position. Although not a quote from one of the authors of the NCA, an article discussing NCA in the *Wall Street Journal* gave an excellent example.

*To predict local impacts of climate change, the researchers combined and averaged several different kinds of physical and statistical computer models for the report. Every computer climate simulation has its shortcomings, experts say, **but taken together they can provide a plausible range of possibilities.*** [Boldface added.]

As John Christy illustrated in his testimony, the climate models have a warming bias, ranging from moderate to severe. Any statistic derived from a collection of biased models is also biased. In Christy's graph, the mean of the models clearly shows this bias. Further, any range of values from the biased models is also biased. The use of these procedures create major defects in the NCA. In WUWT, Robert Brown discusses the problem of using biased models in some length. See Article # 1, Challenging the Orthodoxy, and Model Issues.

Northwest US: On his web site, Cliff Mass discusses some of the shortcomings in the NCA in its regional analysis of the Northwest US. Mass is not a global warming skeptic, but he endeavors to be objective. See link under Seeking a Common Ground.

Motivation: Some may ask what motivates the Administration to issue a biased report. It is impossible to determine. However, a quote provided by Howard (Cork) Hayden, may provide some insight.

Paul Ehrlich and John Holdren wrote: "Individual rights must be balanced against the power of the government to control human reproduction. Some people have viewed the right to have children as a fundamental and inalienable right. Yet neither the Declaration of Independence nor the Constitution mentions a right to reproduce." *Ecoscience* (1977). 2 *Population, Resources, Environment* (1970).

The statement totally misrepresents the Constitution as advocated by the Founding Fathers, for example, James Madison. To them, the powers of the central government are few, defined, and limited. The rights of the individuals are broad and not delimited.

Litigation Issues: The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (one step down from the Supreme Court) upheld the EPA's newest limits on airborne particles (soot). "Under the arbitrary and capricious standard, we exercise great deference when we evaluate claims about competing bodies of scientific research," the court wrote. "Petitioners simply have not identified any way in which EPA jumped the rails of reasonableness in examining the science."

The EPA made many unsubstantiated claims as to the health benefits of the new rules. Some of these claims are based on a "science" that has not been disclosed to the public and which members of Congress have been requesting for years. This decision illustrates that the Federal court system is highly biased towards government agencies and will not protect the public from zealous bureaucrats who claim onerous regulations are based on science.

We can fully expect the EPA to use the new NCA as the basis for insisting regulations of carbon dioxide (CO₂) are necessary to protect the public. Already, the EPA and the Department of Energy are falsely asserting that carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) are commercially viable. On May 6, Sweden's Vattenfall, a large state-owned power company with a capacity of 11,300 megawatt in 14 plants in Germany, Denmark, and the Netherlands announced it is dropping its bold, and expensive, program of researching and developing CCS. See links under Litigation Issues and Carbon Schemes

Asthma: On his web site, Number Watch, statistical pioneer John Brignell discusses the callous disregard bureaucrats in England (and the EPA) have for those who actually suffer from childhood asthma. As the air is becoming cleaner, childhood asthma continues to rise. Yet, bureaucrats make false claims regarding the need to make the air ever cleaner. In so doing, they mislead the public and divert resources from understanding and possibly preventing or curing the disease. See link under Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.

El Niño: A warming of parts of the tropical Pacific indicates that an El Niño may be building. Although largely ignored by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), El Niños and the opposite La Niñas apparently have a significant impact on global temperatures, hence global warming. Strong El Niños warm, La Niñas cool. The great temperature spike in 1998 was from a super El Niño. Physicist Donn Rapp has a lucid historical explanation on Climate Etc. Some alarmists are calling for a strong El Niño, as it would restart global warming. Based on the historic data, Joe Bastardi of WeatherBELL Analytics asserts that if it materializes, it will not be strong.

Saturated Fat: For about 50 years, “experts” have been claiming that a healthy diet should not include saturated fats. The claim has become part of the diet program recommended by US health authorities. Recent studies failed to find the supposed link between eating animal fat and heart disease or high cholesterol. Writing in the *Wall Street Journal*, Nina Teicholz exposes the poor quality of the original research. Whether or not saturated fats are an important part of a healthy diet is not the issue here. The issue is how poor research can become generally accepted research for decades. See Article # 4 and Other News that May Be of Interest.

Number of the Week: \$150 per Gallon. According to reports, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found the US Navy paid up to \$150 per gallon for a biofuel jet fuel made from algae. The report stated that currently regular jet fuel costs about \$2.88 per gallon. [Exxon would be continuing its algae program, if it could sell for so high a price.] No doubt, the Navy will dismiss this issue because the amount was only 1,500 gallons.

However, near the end of the report, the GAO brought up three market factors that expose major deficiencies in the entire biofuel program (pp 35 & 36).

Favorable Economics for Competing End Products:

“...currently, end-use products or co-products (such as diesel fuel, naphtha, cosmetics, and plastics) from the same production processes used to produce alternative jet fuels are often cheaper and easier to produce and therefore more profitable as compared to alternative jet fuels.”

Dependence on Commodity Markets:

“Because some alternative jet fuels are made from tradable commodities, the cost of jet fuel production depends on prices in commodity markets. As noted earlier, the price of soybean oil—an input to alternative fuels—has historically exceeded the price of conventional jet fuel.”

Cost of Conventional Jet Fuels:

“Increases in the supply of conventional jet fuels would make it harder for alternative fuels to compete based on price alone.”

In its efforts to make America more energy secure, and ignoring the shale revolution, the Navy is making America, and the world, less food secure. See links under Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Energy -- Other

#####

ARTICLES:

For the numbered articles below, please see this week’s TWTW at: www.sepp.org. The articles are at the end of the pdf.

1. Climate Change Is Harming Economy, Report Says

White House Says Urgent Action Needed; Report Details Effects in Every State

By Alicia Mundy and Colleen McCain Nelson, WSJ, May 6, 2014

http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303417104579545510182551226?mod=rending_now_5

2. Obama's Climate Bomb

He's flogging disaster scenarios to promote his political agenda.

Editorial, WSJ, May 8, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304885404579548453104239932?mg=reno64-wsj>

3. Sacrificing Africa for Climate Change

Western policies seem more interested in carbon-dioxide levels than in life expectancy.

By Caleb Rossiter, WSJ, May 4, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303380004579521791400395288?mg=reno64-wsj>

[SEPP Comment: "Climate justice" creates an injustice.]

4. The Questionable Link Between Saturated Fat and Heart Disease

Are butter, cheese and steak really bad for you? The dubious science behind the anti-fat crusade

By Nina Teicholz, WSJ, May 6, 2014

http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303678404579533760760481486?mod=rending_now_1

#####

NEWS YOU CAN USE:

Challenging the Orthodoxy

A Factual Look at the Relationship Between Climate and Weather

By John Christy, UAH, Dec 11, 2014

<http://docs.house.gov/meetings/SY/SY18/20131211/101589/HHRG-113-SY18-Wstate-ChristyJ-20131211.pdf>

My Initial Comments on the National Climate Assessment

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, May 7, 2014

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2014/05/my-initial-comments-on-the-national-climate-assessment/>

Lennart Bengtsson: He Knows How Little We Know

By Hans Jörg Müller, Basler Zeitung, Translation by Philipp Mueller, GWPF, May 7, 2014

<http://www.thegwgf.org/lennart-bengtsson-he-knows-how-little-we-know/>

Lennart Bengtsson speaks out

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. May 3, 2014

<http://judithcurry.com/2014/05/03/lennart-bengtsson-speaks-out/#more-15421>

The IPCC And Proprietary Rights – Does The Law Trump Justice?

By Tim Ball, WUWT, May 4, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/04/the-ipcc-and-proprietary-rights-does-the-law-trump-justice/>

Defending the Orthodoxy – The NCA

Climate Change Impacts in the United States

U.S. National Climate Assessment

U.S. Global Change Research Program

file:///C:/Users/Owner/Downloads/NCA3_Climate_Change_Impacts_in_the_United%20States_HighRes.pdf

Climate Report Nails Risk Communication

By David Ropeik, Scientific American, May 6, 2014

http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/guest-blog/2014/05/06/climate-report-nails-risk-communication/?utm_source=Weekly+Carbon+Briefing&utm_campaign=5246f54630-Carbon+Brief+Weekly+18+7+137+18+2013&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_3ff5ea836a-5246f54630-215218249

[SEPP Comment: Confuses risk calculation, probability, with is it possible...?]

Climate Disruptions, Close to Home

Editorial, NYT, May 7, 2014

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/08/opinion/climate-disruptions-close-to-home.html?emc=edit_th_20140508&nl=todaysheadlines&nlid=59831859

“Alaska will keep melting” Forests dying from heat!! Control drilling! Etc.

American Doomsday: White House Warns of Climate Catastrophes

By Matthew Deluca, NBC News, May 6, 2014

<http://www.nbcnews.com/science/environment/american-doomsday-white-house-warns-climate-catastrophes-n98011>

National Climate Assessment: 15 arresting images of climate change now and in the pipeline

By Jason Samenow, Washington Post, May 6, 2014

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/capital-weather-gang/wp/2014/05/06/national-climate-assessment-15-arresting-images-of-climate-change-now-and-in-the-pipeline/?utm_source=Weekly+Carbon+Briefing&utm_campaign=5246f54630-Carbon+Brief+Weekly+18+7+137+18+2013&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_3ff5ea836a-5246f54630-215218249

Climate Change in the U.S. in 8 Compelling Charts

To understand the changes that are already occurring and what's projected for the future, here are eight of the report's most compelling graphics that each tell a chapter of the global warming story.

By Brian Kahn, Climate Central, May 6, 2014 [H/t Clyde Spencer]

<http://local.msn.com/climate-change-in-the-us-in-8-compelling-charts>

Does National Climate Assessment lack necessary nuance?

By Jason Samenow, Washington Post, May 6, 2014 [H/t Climate Etc.]

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/capital-weather-gang/wp/2014/05/06/does-national-climate-assessment-lack-necessary-nuance/>

[SEPP Comment: Absolutely!]

How to build a climate resilient United States

By Mat Hope, Carbon Brief, May 7, 2014

http://www.carbonbrief.org/blog/2014/05/building-a-climate-resilient-united-states/?utm_source=Weekly+Carbon+Briefing&utm_campaign=5246f54630-Carbon+Brief+Weekly+18+7+137+18+2013&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_3ff5ea836a-5246f54630-215218249

Recent UNH UCS Press Release raised similar claims to NCA - see our rebuttal

By Staff Writers, ICECAP, May 9, 2014

http://icecap.us/index.php/go/political-climate/recent_unh_ucs_press_release_raised_similar_claims_to_nca_see_our_rebuttal1/

Website Makes 'Our Changing Climate' Easier to Understand

By Keith Wagstaff, NBC News, May 6, 2014 [H/t Clyde Spencer]

<http://www.nbcnews.com/tech/internet/website-makes-our-changing-climate-easier-understand-n98161>

Questioning The NCA

Joe Bastardi on NCA and John Coleman on '600 page litany of doom'

By Joe Bastardi and John Coleman, ICECAP, May 8, 2014

http://icecap.us/index.php/go/new-and-cool/joe_bastardi_on_nca_and_john_coleman_on_600_page_litany_of_doom1/

National Climate Assessment claims sea level rise up to 11X faster than past 2 centuries (which show no acceleration)

By Staff, The Hockey Schtick, May 6, 2014 [H/t Randy Randol]

<http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com/2014/05/national-climate-assessment-claims-sea.html>

The National Climate Assessment: Re-Assessment

By Anthony Cox, The Australian Climate Sceptics, May 7, 2014

<http://theclimatescepticsparty.blogspot.com.au/2014/05/the-national-climate-assessment.html>

Commentary on the salesmanship of uncertain science in the National Climate Assessment report

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 7, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/07/commentary-on-the-salesmanship-of-uncertain-science-in-the-national-climate-assessment-report/>

Examiner Editorial: Obama White House peddling climate fear instead of facts

Editorial, Washington Examiner, May 6, 2014

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/examiner-editorial-obama-white-house-peddling-climate-fear-instead-of-facts/article/2548140>

The Climate Change Debate Is Over, And Environmentalists Lost

By David Harsanyi, The Federalist, May 7, 2014

<http://thefederalist.com/2014/05/07/the-climate-change-debate-is-over-and-environmentalists-lost/>

[SEPP Comment: The debate on science issues is never over but the political debate may be ending.]

Fact Checking the White House's Bogus Climate Assessment

By David Kreutzer, The Foundry, May 6, 2014

<http://blog.heritage.org/2014/05/06/fact-checking-white-houses-bogus-climate-assessment/>

National Climate Assessment report: Alarmists offer untrue, unrelenting doom and gloom

By Marlo Lewis, Fox News, May 6, 2014

<http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2014/05/06/national-climate-assessment-report-alarmists-offer-untrue-unrelenting-doom-and/>

Obama's climate change diversion

By Frank Beckmann, Detroit News, May 9, 2014 [H/t Cooler Heads]

<http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20140509/OPINION01/305090004/0/OPINION01/Obama-s-climate-change-diversion>

GOP rejects grim White House climate change report

By Ben Wolfgang, Washington Times, May 6, 2014

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2014/may/6/fed-report-global-warming-disrupting-americans-liv/>

New Climate Report: Obama's Green Coup?

Editorial, IBD, May 6, 2014

<http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/050614-699829-new-warming-report-seeks-to-create-panic-not-understanding.htm>

What the National Climate Assessment Doesn't Tell You

By Paul Knappenberger and Patrick Michaels, CATO, May 5, 2014

<http://www.cato.org/blog/national-climate-assessment-doesnt-say>

More Obama Climate Lies

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, May 6, 2014

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2014/05/more-obama-climate-lies.html>

Obama's Last Shot – Climate Change – and Why It's Doomed to Fail

By James Delingpole, Breitbart, May 6, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.breitbart.com/Breitbart-London/2014/05/06/Obama-s-Last-Shot-Climate-Change-And-Why-It-s-Doomed-To-Fail>

The 'Cure' for Climate Change Is Far Worse than the Disease

By Nicolas Loris, The Foundry, May 6, 2014

http://blog.heritage.org/2014/05/06/cure-climate-change-far-worse-disease/?utm_source=heritagefoundation&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=morningbell

Questioning the Orthodoxy

New Report Urges Cost-Effective Adaption to Sea-Level Change

By Willem P. de Lange and Robert Carter, GWPF, May 7, 2014

<http://www.thegwpf.org/new-report-urges-cost-effective-adaptation-to-sea-level-change/>

Link to report: Sea-Level Change: Living with uncertainty

By Willem P. de Lange and Robert Carter, GWPF, No date

<http://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2014/05/Sea-level-report.pdf>

De Lange and Carter on sea level

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, May 7, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/5/7/de-lange-and-carter-on-sea-level.html>

[SEPP Comment: See links immediately above.]

Sea Level Rises Are an insignificant Problem to Which We Can Easily Adapt, Says New Report

By James Delingpole, Breitbart, May 7, 2014 [H/t GPWF]

<http://www.breitbart.com/Breitbart-London/2014/05/07/Sea-Level-Rises-Are-An-Insignificant-Problem-To-Which-We-Can-Easily-Adapt-Says-New-Report>
[SEPP Comment: More on de Lange & Carter report.]

Confessions of a 'Lukewarmist'

An ecologist and early member of Greenpeace will speak at a conference of climate-change skeptics.

By Christopher Snow Hopkins, National Journal, May 8, 2014 [H/t Cooler Heads]
<http://www.nationaljournal.com/daily/confessions-of-a-lukewarmist-20140508>

Yes, Ben Adler, there are liberal equivalents to climate change denial

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, May 9, 2014

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2014/05/yes-ben-adler-there-are-liberal-equivalents-to-climate-change-denial/>

What they have done is basically redefined the term “fact” to be anything that Liberals believe is an established fact.

Problems in the Orthodoxy

Inside the sausage factory

Scientists versus diplomats at the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Editorial, The Economist, May 10, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.economist.com/news/science-and-technology/21601813-scientists-versus-diplomats-intergovernmental-panel-climate?fsrc=rss%7Cset>

Seeking a Common Ground

Northwest Climate Change: Did the 2014 National Climate Assessment Get the Story Right?

By Cliff Mass, His Weather Blog, May 8, 2014

<http://cliffmass.blogspot.com/2014/05/northwest-climate-change-did-2014.html>

Do GCMs Model a Flat Earth?

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, May 8, 2014

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2014/05/do-gcms-model-a-flat-earth/>

Now, I really loathe having to defend climate models, because I believe they are not yet useful for making climate predictions. But let's give credit where credit's due. The simplest way I've found to express climate model shortcomings is this: Today's climate models can be tuned to reasonably represent the *average* climate system. But they are, so far, largely useless for what we *really* want to know, that is, how will the climate system change over time?

Review of Recent Scientific Articles by NIPCC

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

The Potential for Polychaetes to Cope with Ocean Acidification

Reference: Calosi, P., Rastrick, S.P.S., Lombardi, C., de Guzman, H.J., Davidson, L., Jahnke, M., Giangrande, A., Hardege, J.D., Schulze, A., Spicer, J.I. and Ganbi, M.-C. 2014. Adaptation and acclimatization to ocean acidification in marine ectotherms: an in situ transplant experiment with polychaetes at a shallow CO₂ vent system. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 368: 10.1098/rstb.2012.0444.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2014/may/6may2014a1.html>

Coccolithophorid Responses to Ocean Warming and Acidification

Reference: Sett, S., Bach, L.T., Schulz, K.G., Koch-Klavsen, S., Lebrato, M. and Riebesell, U. 2014. Temperature modulates coccolithophorid sensitivity of growth, photosynthesis and calcification to increasing seawater pCO₂. *PLOS ONE* 9: e88308.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2014/may/6may2014a2.html>

The Never-Ending Struggle to Simulate the West African Monsoon

Reference: Kothe, S., Luthi, D. and Ahrens, B. 2014. Analysis of the West African Monsoon system in the regional climate model COSMO-CLM. *International Journal of Climatology* 34: 481-493.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2014/may/6may2014a3.html>

African Tropical Rainforest: Flexing Its Muscles in Times of Stress

Reference: Fisher, J.B., Sikka, M., Sitch, S., Ciais, P., Poulter, B., Galbraith, D., Lee, J.-E., Huntingford, C., Viovy, N., Zeng, N., Ahlstrom, A., Lomas, M.R., Levy, P.E., Frankenberg, C., Saatchi, S. and Malhi, Y. 2013. African tropical rainforest net carbon dioxide fluxes in the twentieth century. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 368: 10.1098/rstb.2012.0376.

<http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2014/may/7may2014a1.html>

Models v. Observations

Ocean Vents And Faulty Climate Models

By John Reid, Quadrant, May 3, 2014

<https://quadrant.org.au/opinion/doomed-planet/2014/05/ocean-vents-faulty-models/>

Subaqueous volcanism: ocean vents and faulty climate models

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 4, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/04/subaqueous-volcanism-ocean-vents-and-faulty-climate-models/>

Model Based Extreme Rainfall Claims Not Supported By Actual Data

By Paul Homewood, WUWT, May 7, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/07/model-based-extreme-rainfall-claims-not-supported-by-actual-data/>

More from the empty set

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, May 6, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/5/6/more-from-the-empty-set.html>

[SEPP Comment: Satellite observations are significantly below the multi-model mean rendering the assertion an empty set.]

Model Issues

The Global Climate Model clique feedback loop

By Robert Brown, WUWT, May 7, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/07/the-global-climate-model-clique-feedback-loop/>

Abbott needs to be more pro-science and cut funding to models that don't work

By Jo Nova, Her Blog, May 5, 2014

<http://joannenova.com.au/2014/05/abbott-needs-to-be-more-pro-science-and-cut-funding-to-models-that-dont-work/>

Measurement Issues

How not to measure temperature part 95 – New temperature record of 102° in Wichita, but look where they measure it

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 5, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/05/how-not-to-measure-temperature-part-95-new-temperature-record-of-102-in-wichita-but-look-where-they-measure-it/>

Oops. Indian carbon accounting adds lakes, rivers, and changes tally by 42%. Who's bet billions of dollars on fudgy numbers?

By Jo Nova, Her Blog, May 6, 2014

<http://joannenova.com.au/2014/05/oops-indian-carbon-accounting-adds-lakes-rivers-and-changes-tally-by-42-whos-bet-billions-of-dollars-on-fudgy-numbers/#more-35229>

Changing Weather

Record Lake Superior Ice Cover Still 31%

By Roy Spencer, His Blog, May 9, 2014

<http://www.drroyspencer.com/2014/05/record-lake-superior-ice-cover-still-31/>

[SEPP Comment: More ice than during 1970s ice age fear. This is particularly amusing because the NCA uses the melting of ice in the Great Lakes to buttress its arguments of dangerous global warming/climate change (p. 46).]

20 Years of Winter Cooling Defy Global Warming Claims [In US]

By James Taylor, Forbes, Apr 30, 2014

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2014/04/30/twenty-years-of-winter-cooling-defy-global-warming-claims/>

Again Germany Blames ‘Cold Weather’ For Thwarted Efforts To Fight ‘Global Warming’...Fracking Drives Prices Down

By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, May 9, 2014

<http://notrickszone.com/2014/05/09/again-germany-blames-cold-weather-for-thwarted-efforts-to-fight-global-warming-fracking-drives-prices-down/>

Changing Climate

Australian – Asian rainfall linked to solar activity for last 6000 years

By Jo Nova, Her Blog, May 8, 2014

<http://joannenova.com.au/2014/05/australian-asian-rainfall-linked-to-solar-activity-for-last-6000-years/#more-35176>

Tree rings reveal nightmare droughts in the West

By Staff Writers, Salt Lake City UT (SPX), May 02, 2014

http://www.terraily.com/reports/Tree_rings_reveal_nightmare_droughts_in_the_West_999.html

Nature CAN cope with climate change: Unusual behaviour of plants and animals suggests we've underestimated their ability to adapt, claim studies

By Ellie Zolfagharifard, Mail, UK, May 7, 2014

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2622454/Nature-CAN-cope-climate-change-Unusual-behaviour-plants-animals-suggests-weve-underestimated-ability-adapt-claim-studies.html#ixzz318nRGNS5>

Changing Seas

El Niño Watch issued by NOAA

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 8, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/08/el-nino-watch-issued-by-noaa/>

Ocean data points to strong El Nino: climate scientist

By Colin Packham, Reuters, May 5, 2014 [H/t Clyde Spencer]

<http://news.msn.com/science-technology/ocean-data-points-to-strong-el-nino-climate-scientist>

El Ninos and La Ninas and Global Warming

By Donald Rapp, Climate Etc., May 7, 2014

<http://judithcurry.com/2014/05/07/el-ninos-and-la-ninas-and-global-warming/>

Changing Cryosphere – Land / Sea Ice

The first globally complete glacier inventory has been created

By Staff Writers: Dresden, Germany (SPX), May 08, 2014

http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/The_first_globally_complete_glacier_inventory_has_been_created_999.html

Link to paper: The Randolph Glacier Inventory: a globally complete inventory of glaciers

By W. Tad Pfeffer, et al., Journal of Glaciology, No Date

<http://www.igsoc.org/journal/60/221/j13J176.pdf>

Major Arctic Sea Ice Story Lurking, but Is Anyone Watching?

By Joe Bastardi, Patriot Post, May 1, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://patriotpost.us/opinion/25340>

Climate change not fully to blame for melting sea ice: study

By Bob Weber, The Canadian Press, May 7, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.ctvnews.ca/sci-tech/climate-change-not-fully-to-blame-for-melting-sea-ice-study-1.1810977>

Agriculture Issues & Fear of Famine

Claim: As CO2 levels rise, some crop nutrients will fall

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 7, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/07/claim-as-co2-levels-rise-some-crop-nutrients-will-fall/>

[SEPP Comment: A less than 10% decline in zinc and iron.]

Un-Science or Non-Science?

Spiegel: Experts Say Antarctic Wilkes Basin “Uncorking” Scenario by PIK Sensationalist Scientists Is Unlikely

By P. Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, May 6, 2014

<http://notrickszone.com/2014/05/06/spiegel-experts-say-antarctic-wilkes-basin-uncorking-scenario-by-pik-sensationalist-scientists-is-unlikely/>

Link to questionable paper: Loss of cultural world heritage and currently inhabited places to sea-level rise

By Mareion and Levermann, Environmental Research Letters, Mar 4, 2014

<http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/9/3/034001/article>

[SEPP Comment: Projecting temperatures for the next 2000 years; yet, there is no current trend?]

Claim: Climate change threatens to worsen U.S. ozone pollution

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 6, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/06/claim-climate-change-threatens-to-worsen-u-s-ozone-pollution/>

Research sheds new light on global warming trends

From Press Release, Florida State Univ, May 4, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://phys.org/news/2014-05-global-trends.html>

Link to paper: Evolution of land surface air temperature trend

By Fei Ji, et al. Nature Climate Change, May 4, 2014

<http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nclimate2223.html>

[SEPP Comment: Abstract opens with a sentence that demonstrates ignorance of results from ice cores: "The global climate has been experiencing significant warming at an unprecedented pace in the past century"]

Still Counting Gulf Spill's Dead Birds

By Mark Schrope, NYT, May 5, 2014

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/05/06/science/still-counting-gulf-spills-dead-birds.html?emc=edit_th_20140506&nl=todaysheadlines&nid=59831859

[SEPP Comment: Raising the official count of less than 3000 found dead with visible oil to a modeled count of 800,000. How have the researchers gone about validating their models? Would it be possible that the birds themselves moved away from the spill before they were harmed? Post hoc probabilities!]

Winter Floods Linked to Global Warming

The probability of extreme winter floods appears to have increased by 25 percent compared with pre-industrial levels

By Simon Redfren, Conversation, UK, Via Scientific American, May 2, 2014

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/winter-floods-linked-to-global-warming/>

They compared the results of 12,842 simulations based on the current global sea surface temperatures, with 25,893 results computed on the assumption that global warming had never occurred ...

[SEPP Comment: Let's hope no electrons were killed in this study.]

Lowering Standards

Official statement by ACS: Release of National Climate Assessment demands action

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 7, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/07/official-statement-by-ac-s-release-of-national-climate-assessment-demands-action/>

The Arctic in the Anthropocene: Emerging Research Questions (2014)

By Committee on Emerging Research Questions in the Arctic; Polar Research Board; Division on Earth and Life Studies; National Research Council, 2014

http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18726&utm_medium=email&utm_source=The%20National%20Academies%20Press&utm_campaign=NAP+mail+new+2014.05.06&utm_content=&utm_term=

[SEPP Comment: Selective ignorance of historic changes in Arctic ice.]

Worst BBC show ever?

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, May 6, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/5/6/worst-bbc-show-ever.html>

[SEPP Comment: A check list for recognizing green commercials passed as news.]

Communicating Better to the Public – Exaggerate, or be Vague?

PBI Facebook posts on Stirling’s polar bear that “died of climate change” have disappeared

By Susan Crockford, Polar Bear Science, Apr 30 2014

<http://polarbearscience.com/2014/04/30/pbi-facebook-posts-on-stirlings-polar-bear-that-died-of-climate-change-have-disappeared/>

[SEPP Comment: When a “scientist” exaggerates “to be effective” and is called on it, what should he do? Try to make the exaggerations disappear and blame others.]

Divergence problem solved (allegedly)

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, May 8, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/5/8/divergence-problem-solved-allegedly.html>

[SEPP Comment: The divergence problem was that the more recent tree ring data showed a cooling, contrary to the theme of global warming.]

Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.

A dirge for the dead children

By John Brignell, Number Watch, May 5, 2014

http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2014_may.htm#dirge

See: Hundreds of asthma deaths could be prevented

Two thirds of deaths from the respiratory condition in the UK — including almost all those involving children — might be avoided

By Laura Donnelly, Telegraph, UK, May 5, 2014

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/health/healthnews/10809469/Hundreds-of-asthma-deaths-could-be-prevented.html>

Podesta’s Stabenow Moment

By Joe D’Aleo, ICECAP, May 5, 2014

<http://www.climatechangedispatch.com/podesta-s-stabenow-moment.html>

Houston, We Have No Idea What We’re Talking About

By John Hinderaker, Power Line, May 5, 2014

<http://www.powerlineblog.com/archives/2014/05/houston-we-have-no-idea-what-were-talking-about.php>

[SEPP Comment: Does the president actually believe that a 86% decline in snow pack from one winter to the next is due to global warming? Does Mr. Obama ever look out the window in the winter?]

Global Warming Epic ‘Years of Living Dangerously’ tanks in TV ratings – series ended on Sundays [to continue on Monday’s]

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 8, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/08/global-warming-epic-years-of-living-dangerously-tanks-in-tv-ratings-series-ended/>

Increasing CO2 threatens human nutrition (From the Annals of Hype)

By Jo Nova, Her Blog, May 8, 2014

<http://joannenova.com.au/2014/05/increasing-co2-threatens-human-nutrition-from-the-annals-of-hype/#more-35269>

[SEPP Comment: See link immediately below.]

How Global Warming May Starve Us: More Carbon, Less Nutrition

By Maggie Fox, NBC News, No Date [H/t Clyde Spencer]

<http://www.nbcnews.com/health/health-news/how-global-warming-may-starve-us-more-carbon-less-nutrition-n99481>

[SEPP Comment: A new twist on the decades old claims that adding fertilizers to crops will cause them to be less nutritious. Unable to link to paper.]

Communicating Better to the Public – Go Personal.

Geosciences' green strategy

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, May 5, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/5/5/geosciences-green-strategy.html>

Communicating Better to the Public – Use Propaganda on Children

Compulsory indoctrination in schools

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, May 9, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/5/9/compulsory-indoctrination-in-schools.html>

Expanding the Orthodoxy

Accelerating the Clean-Energy Revolution

By Yoon Sang-Jick and Ernest Moniz (Secretary of DOE), Project Syndicate, May 7, 2014

<http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/yoon-sang-jick-and-ernest-j--moniz-review-the-achievements-of-the-clean-energy-ministerial-ahead-of-the-cem-s-fifth-gathering>

[SEPP Comment: Promoting the Clean Energy Ministerial, a forum for energy ministers of 23 national governments.]

Climate-KIC's Big Idea: Spring 2014 Final

Richard Templer, Director, May 7, 2014 [H/t Sonja A Boehmer-Christiansen]

https://www.eventbrite.com/e/climate-kics-big-idea-spring-2014-final-registration-11234587955?utm_medium=email&utm_source=Grantham+Institute&utm_campaign=4081028-Grantham+Weekly+Update+-+6+May+2014&dm_i=1I0M,2FGXW,B1QQOK,8U1FX,1

[SEPP Comment: Promoting climate change for profit.]

Confronting climate change

By Drew Faust, President, Harvard University, Apr 7, 2014 [H/t Dean Coddington, MBA, Harvard, 1959]

http://www.harvard.edu/president/news/2014/confronting-climate-change?utm_source=news&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=all+alumni+email&utm_content=aad+comm+all+alumni+2014-04-07

[SEPP Comment: Soliciting \$20 Million for Harvard to confront climate change after the US government has spent over \$165 Billion, and has yet to empirically establish the causes of climate change or human responsibility for global warming.]

Democrats make push to enhance military energy security

By Zack Colman, Washington Examiner, May 7, 2014

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/democrats-make-push-to-enhance-military-energy-security/article/2548186>

Such efforts [to limit biofuels] serve as a shot at the biofuels industry, though some military officials say relying on homegrown biofuels has reduced costs by limiting exposure to oil price shocks.

[SEPP Comment: How about food price shocks.]

Questioning Green Elsewhere

Alarmists Overpopulation Strategy? Death by Dung?

By Geoff Brown, The Climate Skeptics Party, May 8, 2014

<http://theclimateskepticsparty.blogspot.com.au/2014/05/alarmists-overpopulation-strategy-death.html>

Funding Issues

Profits(?) of doom

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. May 5, 2014

<http://judithcurry.com/2014/05/05/profits-of-doom/>

[SEPP Comment: Corporations will not get serious about global warming/climate change until they see serious profits in it. Right now only the renewables, wind power, etc. have seen serious money, and it was all from subsidies.]

The Political Games Continue

Issa: EPA 'truly a broken agency'

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, May 7, 2014

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/205443-issa-epa-truly-a-broken-agency>

John Podesta issues warning to GOP on climate regulations

By Brian Hughes, Washington Examiner, May 5, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/john-podesta-issues-warning-to-gop-on-climate-regulations/article/2548084>

Podesta: Congress Can't Stop Obama On Global Warming

By Michael Bastasch, Daily Caller, May 5, 2014

<http://dailycaller.com/2014/05/05/podesta-congress-cant-stop-obama-on-global-warming/>

Litigation Issues

CEI Files Lawsuit against Office of Science and Technology Policy

By Hans Bader, CEI, May 5, 2014

http://www.openmarket.org/2014/05/05/cei-files-lawsuit-against-office-of-science-and-technology-policy/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+Openmarketorg+%28OpenMarket.org%29

Examiner Editorial: Obama's chief science adviser must explain secret emails

Editorial, Washington Examiner, May 5, 2014

<http://washingtonexaminer.com/examiner-editorial-obamas-chief-science-adviser-must-explain-secret-emails/article/2548098>

Court upholds EPA's 2013 renewable fuel mandate

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, May 6, 2014

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/205363-court-upholds-epas-2013-renewable-fuel-mandate>

EPA triumphs in court battle over air pollution

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, May 9, 2014

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/205703-court-upholds-epas-soot-standard>

Science, Free Speech, and the Courts

By Alan Caruba, Warning Signs, May 3, 2014

<http://factsnotfantasy.blogspot.com/2014/05/science-free-speech-and-courts.html>

Subsidies and Mandates Forever

DOE gives offshore wind projects up to \$141 million

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, May 7, 2014

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/205493-doe-gives-offshore-wind-projects-up-to-141-million>

Warren Buffett: ‘Wind Farms Are Useless, I Only Invest For Tax Credit’

Editorial, WSJ, Via GWPF, May 5, 2014

<http://www.thegwfp.org/warren-buffett-wind-farms-are-useless-i-only-invest-for-tax-credit/>

EPA and other Regulators on the March

EPA’s Scandals Go Far Beyond Porn

By Myron Ebell, Global Warming.org, May 9, 2014

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2014/05/09/epas-scandals-go-far-beyond-porn/>

Working Hard or Hardly Working at the EPA

EPA inspector general describes numerous ethical failures at agency

By CJ Ciaramella, Washington Free Beacon, May 7, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://freebeacon.com/issues/working-hard-or-hardly-working-at-the-epa/>

EPA’s “North Star” (aka: Science) Gets Another Poor Grade from National Academies

By the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, National Journal, May 2, 2014

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/library/147896>

Energy Issues – Non-US

The outlook for energy

By Martin Livermore, Scientific Alliance, May 9, 2014

<http://scientific-alliance.org/scientific-alliance-newsletter/outlook-energy>

Link to reports: Energy Outlook

By Staff Writers, ExxonMobil, 2014

<http://corporate.exxonmobil.com/en/energy/energy-outlook>

BP Energy Outlook 2035

By Staff Writers, BP, Jan 2014

http://www.bp.com/content/dam/bp/pdf/Energy-economics/Energy-Outlook/Energy_Outlook_2035_booklet.pdf

[SEPP Comment: In the past, ExxonMobil and BP have provided estimates (assuming no technological breakthroughs) as solid as any organizations.]

The Economic Impact on UK Energy Policy of Shale Gas and Oil – House Of Lords Report

By Economic Affairs Committee, House of Lords, Via GWPF, May 8, 2014

<http://www.thegwpf.org/the-economic-impact-on-uk-energy-policy-of-shale-gas-and-oil-house-of-lords-report/>

Full report: Economic Affairs Committee - Third Report: The Economic Impact on UK Energy Policy of Shale Gas and Oil

By Economic Affairs Committee, House of Lords, Apr 8, 2014

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/ldconaf/172/17202.htm>

Europe softens stance on Canada's oil sands as relations with Russia sour

By Yadullah Hussain, Financial Post, May 8, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

http://business.financialpost.com/2014/05/06/europe-softens-stance-on-canadas-oil-sands-as-relations-with-russia-sour/?_lsa=43fc-cfa0

Putin's Anti-Fracking Campaign

He knows that European greens can help further his dreams of conquest.

By Robert Zubrin, National Review Online, May 5, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.nationalreview.com/article/377201/putins-anti-fracking-campaign-robert-zubrin>

[SEPP Comment: Many in Washington consider Zubrin an astute observer.]

Energy Issues -- US

Carrington-class CME Narrowly Misses Earth

By Dr Tony Phillips for NASA Science News

Huntsville AL (SPX) May 06, 2014

http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Carrington_class_CME_Narrowly_Misses_Earth_999.html

EMP Attack On Power Grid Could Kill 9-In-10

Editorial, IBD, May 9, 2014

<http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/050914-700375-electric-grid-vulnerable-to-emp-attack.htm?p=full>

Link to 2008 report: Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack

By William Graham, et al. Apr 2008,

http://empcommission.org/docs/A2473-EMP_Commission-7MB.pdf

[SEPP Comment: The headline is extreme, but there is no reason not to protect the grid from an EMP. Based on history, a solar event is more likely than dangerous global warming.]

The Grid Is Not the Internet

By Donn Dears, Power for USA, May 6, 2014

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2014/05/06/the-grid-is-not-the-internet/>

It's Fitting for the U.S. to Use More Energy

By Donn Dears, Power for USA, May 9, 2014

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2014/05/09/its-fitting-for-the-u-s-to-use-more-energy/>

The contradiction of Obama's climate policy

By Dana Milbank, Washington Post, May 6, 2014 [H/t Conrad Potemra]

http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/dana-milbank-the-contradiction-of-obamas-climate-policy/2014/05/06/b607e154-d560-11e3-8a78-8fe50322a72c_story.html?hpid=z5

Washington's Control of Energy

'Green' Power Line On Track As Obama Blocks Keystone

By Stephen Moore, IBD, May 5, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://news.investors.com/politics-brain-trust/050514-699653-sunzia-power-line-planned-through-military-missile-base.htm>

Obama doubles down on solar, energy efficiency in climate push

By Laura Barron-Lopez, The Hill, May 9, 2014

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/205669-obama-double-downs-on-solar-energy-efficiency>

Obama pushed to take sides on gas sales

By Alexander Bolton and Laura Barron-Lopez, The Hill, May 9, 2014

<http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/205710-dems-ask-obama-to-take-sides-on-gas-exports-as-energy-bill-teeters>

The British may be coming: As U.S. shuns Canadian energy, UK seeks stronger ties

By Claudia Cattaneo, Financial Post, May 9, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

http://business.financialpost.com/2014/05/09/the-british-may-be-coming-as-u-s-shuns-canadian-energy-uk-seeks-stronger-ties/?_lsa=8824-cbaf

Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?

Oil's Bright Future

By Robert Bryce, Bloomberg, May 7, 2014

<http://www.bloombergtv.com/articles/2014-05-07/oil-s-bright-future>

Environmental Impacts of Shale Gas Extraction in Canada

By Staff Writers, Ottawa, Canada (SPX), May 05, 2014

http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Environmental_Impacts_of_Shale_Gas_Extraction_in_Canada_999.html

Link to report: Environmental Impacts of Shale Gas Extraction in Canada

By John Cherry, et al., Council of Canadian Academies, May 2014

<http://www.scienceadvice.ca/en/assessments/completed/shale-gas.aspx>

Nuclear Energy and Fears

Environmentalists Warm Up to Nuclear Energy

By Walter Russell Mead & Staff, American Interest, May 4, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.the-american-interest.com/blog/2014/05/04/environmentalists-warm-up-to-nuclear-energy/>

Link to report: Climate Solutions: The Role of Nuclear Power

By Doug Vine, C2ES, Apr 28, 2014

<http://www.c2es.org/publications/climate-solutions-role-nuclear-power>

[SEPP Comment: Two questions: how strongly will the environmental groups embrace the apparent change in attitude, and can the damage they have already done be corrected?]

The Incremental, Pragmatic, and Prudent Shift in Green Attitudes

By Michael Shellenberger & Ted Nordhaus, Breakthrough Institute, May 6, 2014 [H/t GWPF]
<http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/voices/michael-shellenberger-and-ted-nordhaus/moderate-environmentalists-go-nuclear>

[SEPP Comment: Statements from former EPA head Carol Browner are questionable.]

Fewer US nuclear plants could curb climate change fight

By Staff Writers, Washington (AFP), May 07, 2014

http://www.nuclearpowerdaily.com/reports/Fewer_US_nuclear_plants_could_curb_climate_change_fight_999.html

Michael Jacobs, senior energy analyst at the Union of Concerned Scientists, said "the renewable energy sector could compensate the loss of energy provided by nuclear plants (but) only if they get the support in tax credit."

[SEPP Comment: Unreliable wind and solar can replace dependable nuclear?]

Alternative, Green ("Clean") Solar and Wind

Bird Vaporization at Ivanpah: Solar Enters Wind Territory

By Wayne Lusvardi, Master Resource, May 7, 2014

<http://www.masterresource.org/2014/05/like-moths-to-a-flame-birds-vaporized-by-ivanpah-solar-mirrors/>

Alternative, Green ("Clean") Energy -- Other

Report: Pentagon Paid \$150 Per Gallon for Green Jet Fuel

GAO report notes exorbitant prices act as de facto subsidy for biofuel firms

By Lachlan Markay, Washington Free Beacon, May 7, 2014 [H/t Timothy Wise]

<http://freebeacon.com/national-security/report-pentagon-paid-150-per-gallon-for-green-jet-fuel/>

Link to report: Alternative Jet Fuels: Federal Activates Support Development and Usage, but Long-term Commercial Viability Hinges on Market Factors.

By Staff Writers: GAO, May 2014

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/663027.pdf>

Biofuels: Land and Water Concerns

By Staff Writers, CO2 Science and SPPI, May 5, 2014

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/originals/biofuels_land_and_water_concerns.html

Link to report: Biofuels: Land and Water Concerns

By Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, May 7, 2014

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/biofuel_concerns.pdf

Carbon Schemes

Sweden's Vattenfall abandons research on CO2 storage

By Staff Writers, Physics.org, May 6, 2014

<http://phys.org/news/2014-05-sweden-vattenfall-abandons-co2-storage.html>

China effort to store CO2 costly, but attempt must be made

Capturing and storing industrial carbon dioxide emissions is seen as a hopeful strategy for slowing down the pace of climate change. But development of the expensive technology is lagging.

By Hal Bernton, Seattle Times, May 3, 2014 [H/t Bill Hirt]

http://seattletimes.com/html/nationworld/2023524392_chinaenergysidexml.html

[SEPP Comment: A three part series.]

Environmental Industry

France definitively bans GM corn

By Staff Writers, Paris (AFP), May 05, 2014

http://www.seeddaily.com/reports/France_definitively_bans_GM_corn_999.html

Fracking Splits Britain's Green Lobby

By Ben Webster, The Times, Via GWPF, May 6, 2014

<http://www.thegwpf.org/fracking-splits-britains-green-lobby/>

Other News that May Be of Interest

Metabolic explanation for the lack of heart effects from dietary fat

By Staff Writers, ACSH, May 5, 2014

<http://acsh.org/2014/05/metabolic-explanation-lack-heart-effects-dietary-fat/>

Technology is often the mother of science, not vice versa

Britain is good at science, but poor at turning technology into industry

By Matt Ridley, Rational Optimist, May 4, 2014

<http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/technology-is-often-the-mother-of-science,-not-vice-versa.aspx>

A Skyscraper-Sized Solar-Wind Tower Could Become North America's Tallest Structure

Can a 2,250-foot-high wind tunnel generate electricity more cheaply than coal?

By Todd Woody, The Atlantic, May 1, 2014 [Toshio Fujita]

<http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/05/can-a-2250-foot-high-solar-wind-tower-generate-electricity-cheaper-than-coal/361524/>

Elon Musk halts deal between USAF and Russian rocket-makers

By Staff Writers, Moscow (Voice of Russia), May 02, 2014

http://www.space-travel.com/reports/Elon_Musk_halts_deal_between_USAF_and_Russian_rocket_makers_999.html

#####

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE:

Cow farts: The Next Alternative Fuel

By Seven Hayward, Power Line, May 5, 2014

<http://www.powerlineblog.com/archives/2014/05/cow-farts-the-next-alternative-fuel.php>

Monday Mirthiness – The Science News Cycle

Posted by Anthony Watts, WUWT, May 5, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/05/05/monday-mirthiness-the-science-news-cycle/>

#####

ARTICLES:

1. Climate Change Is Harming Economy, Report Says

White House Says Urgent Action Needed; Report Details Effects in Every State

By Alicia Mundy and Colleen McCain Nelson, WSJ, May 6, 2014

http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303417104579545510182551226?mod=rending_now_5

Climate change is creating problems for American citizens coast to coast and costing the economy billions of dollars, as extreme weather brings flooding, droughts and other disasters to every region of the country, a federal advisory panel concluded in a report released Tuesday.

The congressionally mandated National Climate Assessment, produced by more than 300 experts overseen by a panel of 60 scientists, pins much of the increase in climate change on human behavior. The report says, however, that it isn't too late to implement policies to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide and methane, and calls on governments at all levels to find ways to lower carbon emissions, particularly from energy production.

The climate-change report notes a rise in extreme weather events, such as 2012's superstorm Sandy, shown flooding Mantoloking, N.J. Associated Press

The document, considered the most comprehensive analysis of the effects of climate change on the U.S., was released by the climate panel after a final vote by the authors Tuesday morning. President Barack Obama is promoting it in a series of events this week that call for action to combat the trend, starting with interviews on Tuesday with television meteorologists.

"This national climate assessment is the loudest and clearest alarm bell to date signaling the need to take urgent action," said John Holdren, assistant to the president for science and technology, during a press call on the report.

Authors of the report, by the Federal National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee, said that since the last climate assessment was released in 2009, newer scientific approaches have emerged that have allowed them to improve data collection. The weather service's latest monitoring satellites can track ice sheets melting, and scientists have newer information on soil moisture, an extensive amount of new climate modeling and methodology, and a greater ability to slice the data by geographic region, a White House official said.

The new assessment is based in part on a compilation of thousands of pages of peer-reviewed climate science published over several years, with an analysis of many overlapping scientific reports that allow readers to see specific regional effects and the impact on certain sectors.

"This is an entirely new assessment that accounts for all of the observations, scientific analyses and the latest results from models of the physics, chemistry, and biology affecting the Earth's climate," said one of the lead authors, Donald Wuebbles, a professor of atmospheric science at the University of Illinois. The assessment, he said, shows how further shifts in each area could hurt sectors of the economy such as transportation or force local populations to move.

The Obama Administration, Tuesday, released a study outlining what it saw as the negative effects of climate change on a wide range of economic and social sectors in America. Jerry Seib discusses the political impact of the report.

The report highlights problems at the community level, detailing the effects from rapidly receding ice in Alaska, to wildfires in the West, to heat waves and coastal flooding in the Northeast. Rising seas in the South put major cities such as Miami at risk, it said. It noted an increase in extreme weather events such as superstorm Sandy, which destroyed much of northern New Jersey's beaches in 2012, and heat waves in the Midwest the same year.

"Every American will find things that matter to them in this report," Mr. Wuebbles said.

The emphasis on local events was a clear attempt to bring home the issue of climate change to Americans at a time when polls show it isn't a priority for them. But some experts question that connection, saying it is a tenuous proposition to connect a localized disaster to a global trend.

The National Climate Assessment was released on Tuesday, and it didn't have good news for Coastal Florida, Miami in particular. Flooding and freshwater contamination are some of the threats facing the city.

To predict local impacts of climate change, the researchers combined and averaged several different kinds of physical and statistical computer models for the report. Every computer climate simulation has its shortcomings, experts say, but taken together they can provide a plausible range of possibilities.

Even so, some climate scientists said that regional climate models are too unreliable to make these local projections with any certainty. "When looking at the regional results of climate models, as we have done, we find the models have essentially no skill," said climate scientist John Christy at the University of Alabama at Huntsville, who tracks global temperature trends using satellite sensors. "The models are well off track in demonstrating accuracy in something as basic as the global atmospheric temperature, much less local events," he said. "Yet the report does not bring out in clear view for the public to see how poorly models have performed."

Some conservatives, even if they don't deny the existence of climate change, feel the White House's emphasis is wrongheaded and will be used as a justification for regulations that will impose new costs on businesses. In the Senate, Republicans took to the floor to criticize the administration.

"I'm sure he'll get loud cheers from liberal elites—from the kind of people who leave a giant carbon footprint and then lecture everybody else about low-flow toilets," said Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell.

White House spokesman Jay Carney declined to respond to the GOP leader's jab but said that denying science is "foolhardy."

"I understand that there is an inclination upon some to doubt the science, despite the overwhelming evidence and the overwhelming percentage, in the 97% range, of scientists who study this issue who agree that climate change is real and that it is the result of human activity," he said.

What is the future of beef in America? According to the National Climate Assessment, it could be pretty grim. Temperature increases could have a significant impact on beef production and prices.

Several authors said the strong warnings in the assessment weren't presented to scare people, but to convey the importance of preparation and mitigation in, for example, U.S. ports.

The authors "show the urgency of climate-change issues in major cities and small towns across the country," said Daniel J. Weiss, senior fellow at the liberal-leaning Center for American

Progress. He said the report is too specific about effects such as droughts, eroding shorelines and flooding to be ignored.

The national climate assessment was mandated by Congress in 1990 as a quadrennial review. Before the 2009 report, there was only one other, in 2000.

While the report doesn't offer specific policies, it does suggest a need for urgency. And it bolsters tough air and water pollution limits promoted by Mr. Obama, administration officials said. Its release could help buffer backlash from new regulations restricting carbon emissions from existing coal-fired power plants, scheduled to be unveiled in the beginning of June.

2. Obama's Climate Bomb

He's flogging disaster scenarios to promote his political agenda.

Editorial, WSJ, May 8, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304885404579548453104239932?mg=reno64-wsj>

Supervising the Earth's climate—or at least believing humanity can achieve such miracles—may be the only political project grandiose enough for President Obama. So it shouldn't surprise that after reforming health care and raising taxes, the White House is now getting the global-warming band back together, though it is still merely playing the old classics of unscientific panic.

On Wednesday the White House released the quadrennial National Climate Assessment, an 829-page report. The theme is that "this is not some distant problem of the future. This is a problem that is affecting Americans right now," as Mr. Obama told lovable weather personality Al Roker.

His "Today Show" interview was one of eight hits with television meteorologists to promote the report, part of a coordinated political campaign to scare Americans into supporting his anticarbon tax-and-regulation agenda. The report is designed to dramatize the supposed immediacy of climate change by concentrating on droughts, floods, heat waves, torrential rains, wildfires, polar-vortex winters and other indicia of the end of days. Everybody "gets" the weather.

But as a marketing exercise, the report has the feel of that infomercial footage of the people who can't crack an egg or perform routine household tasks until they acquire this or that as-seen-on-TV product. The cautious findings of serious empirical climate literature are so obviously exaggerated and colored that the document is best understood as a political tract with a few scientific footnotes.

For instance, the report's "overview" summary asserts that "extreme weather events with links to climate change have become more frequent and/or intense," climate change is already "disrupting people's lives," and "this evidence tells an unambiguous story." Good thing we've been building that ark in the backyard.

But the fine print that few will ever read acknowledges the real uncertainties of something as complex as the planet's atmosphere. "There has been no universal trend in the overall extent of drought across the continental U.S. since 1900," the authors observe. We also learn that "trends in severe storms, including the intensity and frequency of tornadoes, hail, and damaging thunderstorm winds, are uncertain and are being studied intensively." And so on.

The National Climate Assessment matters because it serves as the underlying justification for carbon-related regulations. Introducing bias into this primary source (though it does not make new analytic contributions) will distort the rule-making process across the government for years to come.

The report reveals less about climate than it does about the method of the President who described the night he won the Democratic nomination as "the moment when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." The White House is telling all and sundry that Mr. Obama wants to fill out his last two and a half years in office with action on climate change, but the report shows he doesn't want an open or honest debate.

The crisis mentality of the green industry is not new, and books like "Silent Spring" and "The Population Bomb" inflated ecological problems to elicit a political response. Yet importing this tone into an ostensibly neutral government report corrupts the scientific enterprise, which is supposed to be the gradual displacement of ignorance by knowledge.

Disinterested, objective scientists have the humility to admit that this evolution is contingent and provisional. But climate liberals invoke the authority of science to shut down debate and justify their pre-existing preferences for more government spending, redistribution and control of the economy. The critics are then denigrated as Ptolemys who haven't discovered Copernicus.

Could it be that skeptics have simply concluded that the costs of decarbonizing the U.S. economy exceed the possible gains? Mr. Obama and his green allies are demanding that people who are currently alive make vast economic sacrifices including a lower standing of living in exchange for theoretical benefits that may or may not accrue decades or centuries hence. Americans are supposed to accept diminished economic prospects in return for a climate plan that will be at best pointless when the developing world doesn't go along, and all on the basis of computer models that cannot accurately predict past temperatures, let alone the future.

Inherent scientific uncertainty and the possibility that the models are wrong means that the best insurance policy is economic progress. Floods have been happening since the Old Testament and natural disasters are not unknown in the American experience. California has gone through droughts before and will again. But a more affluent society is better placed to adapt to whatever nature and such byproducts of modernity as fossil fuels oblige humans to confront.

The irony is that to the extent Mr. Obama's agenda damages economic growth, he is leaving the country less prepared for climate change. Gallup recently reported that only a third of Americans worry about global warming and that the share that thinks the threat is exaggerated rose 15 percentage points to 42% over the last two decades. If liberals are wondering why the public is skeptical, one reason is because politicians are abusing science.

3. Sacrificing Africa for Climate Change

Western policies seem more interested in carbon-dioxide levels than in life expectancy.

By Caleb Rossiter, WSJ, May 4, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303380004579521791400395288?mg=reno64-wsj>

[SEPP Comment: "Climate justice" creates an injustice.]

Every year environmental groups celebrate a night when institutions in developed countries (including my own university) turn off their lights as a protest against fossil fuels. They say their goal is to get America and Europe to look from space like Africa: dark, because of minimal energy use.

But that is the opposite of what's desired by Africans I know. They want Africa at night to look like the developed world, with lights in every little village and with healthy people, living longer lives, sitting by those lights. Real years added to real lives should trump the minimal impact that African carbon emissions could have on a theoretical catastrophe.

I've spent my life on the foreign-policy left. I opposed the Vietnam War, U.S. intervention in Central America in the 1980s and our invasion of Iraq. I have headed a group trying to block U.S. arms and training for "friendly" dictators, and I have written books about how U.S. policy in the developing world is neocolonial.

But I oppose my allies' well-meaning campaign for "climate justice." More than 230 organizations, including Africa Action and Oxfam, want industrialized countries to pay "reparations" to African governments for droughts, rising sea levels and other alleged results of what Ugandan strongman Yoweri Museveni calls "climate aggression." And I oppose the campaign even more for trying to deny to Africans the reliable electricity—and thus the economic development and extended years of life—that fossil fuels can bring.

The left wants to stop industrialization—even if the hypothesis of catastrophic, man-made global warming is false. John Feffer, my colleague at the Institute for Policy Studies, wrote in the Dec. 8, 2009, Huffington Post that "even if the mercury weren't rising" we should bring "the developing world into the postindustrial age in a sustainable manner." He sees the "climate crisis [as] precisely the giant lever with which we can, following Archimedes, move the world in a greener, more equitable direction."

I started to suspect that the climate-change data were dubious a decade ago while teaching statistics. Computer models used by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change to determine the cause of the six-tenths of one degree Fahrenheit rise in global temperature from 1980 to 2000 could not statistically separate fossil-fueled and natural trends.

Then, as now, the computer models simply built in the assumption that fossil fuels are the culprit when temperatures rise, even though a similar warming took place from 1900 to 1940, before fossil fuels could have caused it. The IPCC also claims that the warming, whatever its cause, has slightly increased the length of droughts, the frequency of floods, the intensity of storms, and the rising of sea levels, projecting that these impacts will accelerate disastrously. Yet even the IPCC acknowledges that the average global temperature today remains unchanged since 2000, and did not rise one degree as the models predicted.

But it is as an Africanist, rather than a statistician, that I object most strongly to "climate justice." Where is the justice for Africans when universities divest from energy companies and thus weaken their ability to explore for resources in Africa? Where is the justice when the U.S. discourages World Bank funding for electricity-generation projects in Africa that involve fossil fuels, and when the European Union places a "global warming" tax on cargo flights importing perishable African goods? Even if the wildest claims about the current impact of fossil fuels on

the environment and the models predicting the future impact all prove true and accurate, Africa should be exempted from global restraints as it seeks to modernize.

With 15% of the world's people, Africa produces less than 5% of carbon-dioxide emissions. With 4% of global population, America produces 25% of these emissions. In other words, each American accounts for 20 times the emissions of each African. We are not rationing our electricity. Why should Africa, which needs electricity for the sort of income-producing enterprises and infrastructure that help improve life expectancy? The average in Africa is 59 years—in America it's 79. Increased access to electricity was crucial in China's growth, which raised life expectancy to 75 today from 59 in 1968.

According to the World Bank, 24% of Africans have access to electricity and the typical business loses power for 56 days each year. Faced with unreliable power, businesses turn to diesel generators, which are three times as expensive as the electricity grid. Diesel also produces black soot, a respiratory health hazard. By comparison, bringing more-reliable electricity to more Africans would power the cleaning of water in villages, where much of the population still lives, and replace wood and dung fires as the source of heat and lighting in shacks and huts, removing major sources of disease and death. In the cities, reliable electricity would encourage businesses to invest and reinvest rather than send their profits abroad.

Mindful of the benefits, the Obama administration's Power Africa proposal and the World Bank are trying to double African access to electricity. But they have been hamstrung by the opposition of their political base to fossil fuels—even though off-grid and renewable power from the sun, tides and wind is still too unreliable, too hard to transmit, and way too expensive for Africa to build and maintain as its primary source of power.

In 2010 the left tried to block a World Bank loan for a new coal-fired plant in South Africa. Fortunately, the loan was approved (with the U.S. abstaining). The drive to provide electricity for the poor has been perhaps the greatest achievement of South Africa's post-apartheid governments.

Standing on the mountainside at night in Cape Town, overlooking the "Coloured" township of Mitchell's Plain and the African township of Khayelitsha, you can now see a twinkling blanket of bulbs. How terrible to think that so many people in the West would rather block such success stories in the name of unproved science.

Mr. Rossiter directs the American Exceptionalism Media Project. He is an adjunct professor at American University and an associate fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies.

4. The Questionable Link Between Saturated Fat and Heart Disease

Are butter, cheese and steak really bad for you? The dubious science behind the anti-fat crusade
By Nina Teicholz, WSJ, May 6, 2014

http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303678404579533760760481486?mod=trailing_now_1

"Saturated fat does not cause heart disease"—or so concluded a big study published in March in the journal *Annals of Internal Medicine*. How could this be? The very cornerstone of dietary advice for generations has been that the saturated fats in butter, cheese and red meat should be avoided because they clog our arteries. For many diet-conscious Americans, it is simply second nature to opt for chicken over sirloin, canola oil over butter.

The new study's conclusion shouldn't surprise anyone familiar with modern nutritional science, however. The fact is, there has never been solid evidence for the idea that these fats cause disease. We only believe this to be the case because nutrition policy has been derailed over the past half-century by a mixture of personal ambition, bad science, politics and bias.

Our distrust of saturated fat can be traced back to the 1950s, to a man named Ancel Benjamin Keys, a scientist at the University of Minnesota. Dr. Keys was formidably persuasive and, through sheer force of will, rose to the top of the nutrition world—even gracing the cover of Time magazine—for relentlessly championing the idea that saturated fats raise cholesterol and, as a result, cause heart attacks.

This idea fell on receptive ears because, at the time, Americans faced a fast-growing epidemic. Heart disease, a rarity only three decades earlier, had quickly become the nation's No. 1 killer. Even President Dwight D. Eisenhower suffered a heart attack in 1955. Researchers were desperate for answers.

As the director of the largest nutrition study to date, Dr. Keys was in an excellent position to promote his idea. The "Seven Countries" study that he conducted on nearly 13,000 men in the U.S., Japan and Europe ostensibly demonstrated that heart disease wasn't the inevitable result of aging but could be linked to poor nutrition.

Critics have pointed out that Dr. Keys violated several basic scientific norms in his study. For one, he didn't choose countries randomly but instead selected only those likely to prove his beliefs, including Yugoslavia, Finland and Italy. Excluded were France, land of the famously healthy omelet eater, as well as other countries where people consumed a lot of fat yet didn't suffer from high rates of heart disease, such as Switzerland, Sweden and West Germany. The study's star subjects—upon whom much of our current understanding of the Mediterranean diet is based—were peasants from Crete, islanders who tilled their fields well into old age and who appeared to eat very little meat or cheese.

As it turns out, Dr. Keys visited Crete during an unrepresentative period of extreme hardship after World War II. Furthermore, he made the mistake of measuring the islanders' diet partly during Lent, when they were forgoing meat and cheese. Dr. Keys therefore undercounted their consumption of saturated fat. Also, due to problems with the surveys, he ended up relying on data from just a few dozen men—far from the representative sample of 655 that he had initially selected. These flaws weren't revealed until much later, in a 2002 paper by scientists investigating the work on Crete—but by then, the misimpression left by his erroneous data had become international dogma.

In 1961, Dr. Keys sealed saturated fat's fate by landing a position on the nutrition committee of the American Heart Association, whose dietary guidelines are considered the gold standard. Although the committee had originally been skeptical of his hypothesis, it issued, in that year, the country's first-ever guidelines targeting saturated fats. The U.S. Department of Agriculture followed in 1980.

Other studies ensued. A half-dozen large, important trials pitted a diet high in vegetable oil—usually corn or soybean, but not olive oil—against one with more animal fats. But these trials, mainly from the 1970s, also had serious methodological problems. Some didn't control for

smoking, for instance, or allowed men to wander in and out of the research group over the course of the experiment. The results were unreliable at best.

But there was no turning back: Too much institutional energy and research money had already been spent trying to prove Dr. Keys's hypothesis. A bias in its favor had grown so strong that the idea just started to seem like common sense. As Harvard nutrition professor Mark Hegsted said in 1977, after successfully persuading the U.S. Senate to recommend Dr. Keys's diet for the entire nation, the question wasn't whether Americans should change their diets, but why not? Important benefits could be expected, he argued. And the risks? "None can be identified," he said.

In fact, even back then, other scientists were warning about the diet's potential unintended consequences. Today, we are dealing with the reality that these have come to pass.

One consequence is that in cutting back on fats, we are now eating a lot more carbohydrates—at least 25% more since the early 1970s. Consumption of saturated fat, meanwhile, has dropped by 11%, according to the best available government data. Translation: Instead of meat, eggs and cheese, we're eating more pasta, grains, fruit and starchy vegetables such as potatoes. Even seemingly healthy low-fat foods, such as yogurt, are stealth carb-delivery systems, since removing the fat often requires the addition of fillers to make up for lost texture—and these are usually carbohydrate-based.

The problem is that carbohydrates break down into glucose, which causes the body to release insulin—a hormone that is fantastically efficient at storing fat. Meanwhile, fructose, the main sugar in fruit, causes the liver to generate triglycerides and other lipids in the blood that are altogether bad news. Excessive carbohydrates lead not only to obesity but also, over time, to Type 2 diabetes and, very likely, heart disease.

The real surprise is that, according to the best science to date, people put themselves at higher risk for these conditions no matter what kind of carbohydrates they eat. Yes, even unrefined carbs. Too much whole-grain oatmeal for breakfast and whole-grain pasta for dinner, with fruit snacks in between, add up to a less healthy diet than one of eggs and bacon, followed by fish. The reality is that fat doesn't make you fat or diabetic. Scientific investigations going back to the 1950s suggest that actually, carbs do.

The second big unintended consequence of our shift away from animal fats is that we're now consuming more vegetable oils. Butter and lard had long been staples of the American pantry until Crisco, introduced in 1911, became the first vegetable-based fat to win wide acceptance in U.S. kitchens. Then came margarines made from vegetable oil and then just plain vegetable oil in bottles.

All of these got a boost from the American Heart Association—which Procter & Gamble, the maker of Crisco oil, coincidentally helped launch as a national organization. In 1948, P&G made the AHA the beneficiary of the popular "Walking Man" radio contest, which the company sponsored. The show raised \$1.7 million for the group and transformed it (according to the AHA's official history) from a small, underfunded professional society into the powerhouse that it remains today.

After the AHA advised the public to eat less saturated fat and switch to vegetable oils for a "healthy heart" in 1961, Americans changed their diets. Now these oils represent 7% to 8% of all

calories in our diet, up from nearly zero in 1900, the biggest increase in consumption of any type of food over the past century.

This shift seemed like a good idea at the time, but it brought many potential health problems in its wake. In those early clinical trials, people on diets high in vegetable oil were found to suffer higher rates not only of cancer but also of gallstones. And, strikingly, they were more likely to die from violent accidents and suicides. Alarmed by these findings, the National Institutes of Health convened researchers several times in the early 1980s to try to explain these "side effects," but they couldn't. (Experts now speculate that certain psychological problems might be related to changes in brain chemistry caused by diet, such as fatty-acid imbalances or the depletion of cholesterol.)

We've also known since the 1940s that when heated, vegetable oils create oxidation products that, in experiments on animals, lead to cirrhosis of the liver and early death. For these reasons, some midcentury chemists warned against the consumption of these oils, but their concerns were allayed by a chemical fix: Oils could be rendered more stable through a process called hydrogenation, which used a catalyst to turn them from oils into solids.

From the 1950s on, these hardened oils became the backbone of the entire food industry, used in cakes, cookies, chips, breads, frostings, fillings, and frozen and fried food. Unfortunately, hydrogenation also produced trans fats, which since the 1970s have been suspected of interfering with basic cellular functioning and were recently condemned by the Food and Drug Administration for their ability to raise our levels of "bad" LDL cholesterol.

Yet paradoxically, the drive to get rid of trans fats has led some restaurants and food manufacturers to return to using regular liquid oils—with the same long-standing oxidation problems. These dangers are especially acute in restaurant fryers, where the oils are heated to high temperatures over long periods.

The past decade of research on these oxidation products has produced a sizable body of evidence showing their dramatic inflammatory and oxidative effects, which implicates them in heart disease and other illnesses such as Alzheimer's. Other newly discovered potential toxins in vegetable oils, called monochloropropane diols and glycidol esters, are now causing concern among health authorities in Europe.

In short, the track record of vegetable oils is highly worrisome—and not remotely what Americans bargained for when they gave up butter and lard.

Cutting back on saturated fat has had especially harmful consequences for women, who, due to hormonal differences, contract heart disease later in life and in a way that is distinct from men. If anything, high total cholesterol levels in women over 50 were found early on to be associated with longer life. This counterintuitive result was first discovered by the famous Framingham study on heart-disease risk factors in 1971 and has since been confirmed by other research.

Since women under 50 rarely get heart disease, the implication is that women of all ages have been worrying about their cholesterol levels needlessly. Yet the Framingham study's findings on women were omitted from the study's conclusions. And less than a decade later, government health officials pushed their advice about fat and cholesterol on all Americans over age 2—based exclusively on data from middle-aged men.

Sticking to these guidelines has meant ignoring growing evidence that women on diets low in saturated fat actually increase their risk of having a heart attack. The "good" HDL cholesterol drops precipitously for women on this diet (it drops for men too, but less so). The sad irony is that women have been especially rigorous about ramping up on their fruits, vegetables and grains, but they now suffer from higher obesity rates than men, and their death rates from heart disease have reached parity.

Seeing the U.S. population grow sicker and fatter while adhering to official dietary guidelines has put nutrition authorities in an awkward position. Recently, the response of many researchers has been to blame "Big Food" for bombarding Americans with sugar-laden products. No doubt these are bad for us, but it is also fair to say that the food industry has simply been responding to the dietary guidelines issued by the AHA and USDA, which have encouraged high-carbohydrate diets and until quite recently said next to nothing about the need to limit sugar.

Indeed, up until 1999, the AHA was still advising Americans to reach for "soft drinks," and in 2001, the group was still recommending snacks of "gum-drops" and "hard candies made primarily with sugar" to avoid fatty foods.

Our half-century effort to cut back on the consumption of meat, eggs and whole-fat dairy has a tragic quality. More than a billion dollars have been spent trying to prove Ancel Keys's hypothesis, but evidence of its benefits has never been produced. It is time to put the saturated-fat hypothesis to bed and to move on to test other possible culprits for our nation's health woes.

Ms. Teicholz has been researching dietary fat and disease for nearly a decade. Her book, "The Big Fat Surprise: Why Butter, Meat and Cheese Belong in a Healthy Diet," will be published by Simon & Schuster on May 13.

#####