

**The Week That Was: 2014-04-12 (April 12, 2014)**  
**Brought to You by SEPP ([www.SEPP.org](http://www.SEPP.org))**  
**The Science and Environmental Policy Project**

#####

**Quote of the Week:** *One who deceives will always find those who allow themselves to be deceived.* Niccolo Machiavelli [H/t Tim Ball]

#####

**Number of the Week:** \$97,000 annual salary, entry level with undergraduate degree

#####

**9th International Conference on Climate Change**

Press Release, The Heartland Institute, Mar 17, 2014

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

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

#####

**THIS WEEK:**

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

**NIPCC Briefings:** From April 7 to April 10, representatives of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) conducted a series of briefings in Washington, DC, announcing the publication of the new work: **Climate Change Reconsidered II: Biological Impacts**. The briefing team consisted of Craig Idso and Fred Singer, Lead Authors of **Climate Change Reconsidered II**, Joseph Bast of The Heartland Institute, publisher of the NIPCC reports, and Ken Haapala of SEPP. On occasion, they were supplemented by Marlo Lewis of the Competitive Enterprise Institute who spoke on policy impacts, David Kreutzer of the Heritage Foundation who spoke on the bureaucratically contrived Social Cost of Carbon, and Patrick Michaels of CATO moderated the briefing given at CATO.

The general program began with an introduction by Joe Bast of the new volume and of the speakers. In addressing the science, Fred Singer focused on the graph by McNider & Christy that appeared in their editorial published in the February 19, 2014 Wall Street Journal. The graph, titled “Warming Predictions vs. the Real World” is simple and should be easily understood. The graph shows an average of 102 model runs with the start based on 1979 (the beginning of satellite temperature data) as compared with two sets of temperature data from satellites and four sets of temperature data from weather balloons. The greenhouse effect takes place in the atmosphere and this is where it should be most readily observed and measured.

The satellite and balloons observations agree. The models do not. The models greatly overestimate the warming trend. The disparity between observations and models is increasing each year. The atmospheric temperature data shows no warming trend for at least a decade, the surface data show no warming trend for at least 15 years. Models show consistent warming.

Ironically, as the “gap” grew wider, successive UN-Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Assessment Reports (AR) expressed increasing certainty in the existence of dangerous anthropogenic (human-caused) global warming (AGW): namely, it was (greater than)>50% in [AR2-1996], >66% [AR3 2001], >90% [AR4 2007], and >95% [AR5 2013]. Clearly, current

IPCC climate models are inadequate and cannot be used to forecast future temperatures or to establish far-reaching policies.

Conclusion: Government limiting emissions of essential carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is a “policy in search of a problem.”

Ken Haapala followed by showing that the failure of IPCC science is not due to the failure of governments to fund global warming/climate change research. Based on three US government reports, with their categories, the US government expenditures on climate change exceed \$165 Billion, since Fiscal Year (FY) 1993. Expenditures on what the reports identify as climate science exceeds \$35 Billion since FY 1993.

A graph prepared by Nir Shaviv shows there has been no advance in the official scientific understanding of the impact on temperatures from a doubling of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> since the Charney report to the National Academy of Sciences in 1979. Except for a slight bump in the lower range in the IPCC AR4 (2007), since changed back, the estimates remain the same: 1.5°C to 4.5°C, about 3 to 8°F. Studies ignored by the IPCC indicate that any increase in temperatures may be far less.

Clearly, there is something wrong with the assertion (hypothesis) that CO<sub>2</sub> has a significant impact on temperatures or the procedures (methodology) used by the IPCC, or both. [It is probably both. The IPCC mandate is to understand the human influence on climate and it has attempted to do so without first understanding the natural influences on climate. The mandate coupled with the failure to conduct proper hypothesis testing has consistently led to overestimates of the human influence. The IPCC is in a bureaucratic trap (gilded cage) of its own making and it cannot effectively back-down and admit it has been wrong.]

Also, Haapala pointed out that in FY 2013 about 85% of the US expenditures on climate change go to agencies and programs that pretend they can stop climate change, which has been ongoing for hundreds of millions of years.

Fittingly, Craig Idso presented the star of the show – the 1,000 plus page report citing thousands of scientific studies showing that increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is a tremendous benefit to plants, the environment, and humanity. This tome stands up to the bureaucratic science of the IPCC and the contrived notion that invisible CO<sub>2</sub> causes harm. Much of the research of possible harms relies on models that use the upper end of possible values of warming from a doubling of CO<sub>2</sub>, the use of which cannot be justified given the clear failing of these models.

The book has seven chapters and Idso hit the highlights of each. Chapter 1 discusses the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> on plants and soils. It cites over 200 years of research demonstrating that both plant productivity and growth increase with increasing CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the air. A reporter for the Guardian (UK) thought she had a “got you” moment when she pointed out that in the summary of the chapter there is only one reference to 21<sup>st</sup> century work. The actual chapter in the main report contains many pages of citations including a significant number published in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. What the reporter did was emphasize that the IPCC, and others, ignore centuries of work on the benefits of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Chapter 2 goes into detail on studies of the impact of CO<sub>2</sub> on plant characteristics. The principle study methods are to grow plants in CO<sub>2</sub>-enriched air and, in the case of long-lived trees, study

how trees have responded to increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. The key information sought are the rates of photosynthesis, biomass production, and the efficiency of water use. The research finds that the effects are overwhelmingly positive.

Chapter 3 addresses a significant body of research that the IPCC overlooks in its claim that warming will introduce new sources of stress on the biological world, such as forest fires, droughts, and extreme heat events, etc. There is a significant body of research that indicates the opposite. Enhanced CO<sub>2</sub> will make the plants more resilient to stresses such as drought, diseases, insect damage, heavy metals, herbivores, soil salinity, etc.

Chapter 4 examines the likely future impact on plants. It demonstrates how atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment has expanded food production and biosphere productivity since the start of the industrial revolution. Further, it reports how CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment helps plants resist temperature-induced extinction – in direct contrast to IPCC claims that rising temperatures (whatever the cause) will cause a decline in biosphere productivity. The IPCC claims are refuted by the empirical data showing increasing productivity of the biosphere. Except for Antarctica, the vigor of the Earth's terrestrial biosphere has been increasing with time, since industrial revolution, and this increasing vigor extends over the entire globe.

Chapter 5 addresses the impact on terrestrial animals and the false claims by the IPCC of species extinction due to global warming. It points out that the models used are deeply flawed by artificially constrained climate envelopes and assumptions of immobility of species. These incorrect assumptions are routinely contradicted by observations.

Chapter 6 addresses the false notion, so heavily promoted, that the oceans will acidify with increasing CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations and that they will warm to the point of diminishing or destroying aquatic life. The material in chapter 6 directly contradicts these notions and cites hundreds of peer-reviewed research analyses that suggest a much better future in a warmer, CO<sub>2</sub> enriched aquatic world. A warming will increase ocean productivity. Species will adapt, as they have for eons since the earth was warmer and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were greater. Note, this does not mean that the increased CO<sub>2</sub> caused the warmer world.

Chapter 7 finds that overall, a warmer world with increased atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, will be a great benefit to humanity. Cold related deaths are greater than heat related deaths. Further, numerous studies show that after an increase in heat related deaths, the death rates fall, indicating that the deaths would have occurred, but a short time later. The increases in food productivity immensely benefit humanity.

***Climate Change Reconsidered II; Biological Impacts*** describes thousands of peer-reviewed scientific journal articles that do not support, and often flatly contradict, IPCC's pessimistic narrative of 'death, injury, and disrupted livelihoods.' How CO<sub>2</sub> enrichment has effected global food supply is fact, not opinion. The work of the IPCC cannot be considered unbiased science. The public should demand to know why the IPCC is silent or hides the benefits of increased CO<sub>2</sub>.

Joe Bast then concluded the briefings with three take-home points: 1) the IPCC science is failing, the models fail; 2) the failure is not from a lack of government spending; and 3) the environment and humanity benefit from increasing atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, and any slight warming it may cause.

Last week's TWTW discussed three major findings in the IPCC report released on March 31, which were: 1) global warming/climate change will cause disruption of agriculture and the threat of famine; 2) increased atmospheric carbon dioxide will cause ocean acidification (actually a reduction in alkalinity), threatening the oceans as a source of food; and 3) global warming will cause increases over historic sea level rise, threatening those who live on coastal areas. Based on the NIPCC report discussed above, none of these represent a major threat, and do not require a reduction in use of fossil fuels.

See links under Challenging the Orthodoxy – NIPCC. For the Shaviv graph see <http://www.sciencebits.com/AR5-FirstImpressions>

\*\*\*\*\*

**IPCC:** The IPCC report of Working Group III on the mitigation of climate change is due to be released on April 13. Some leaks indicate that it will contain severe recommendations on limiting CO2 emissions. If so, it will be more evidence that the IPCC is a political body, not a scientific one. The IPCC has failed to produce the scientific evidence that human CO2 emissions are causing significant global warming/climate change. Climate models, which have not been validated, and are failing, are not scientific evidence. See Article # 1, links under Defending the Orthodoxy, and Problems in the Orthodoxy.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Is the Sun Rising?** Svensmark's hypothesis that minor variations of sun have a significant influence on the earth's climate is supported by an additional paper, just published. The hypothesis is that high-energy cosmic rays promote the formation of clouds, cooling the earth. An active sun reduces the number of high-energy rays reaching the atmosphere, with the result being a warming of the earth. A dormant sun allows for more rays, cooling the earth. The hypothesis is ignored by the IPCC in its summary of the influences on the earth's climate. On his web site, Anthony Watts has a simplified flow chart explaining the process. See links under Science: Is the Sun Rising?

\*\*\*\*\*

**Propaganda:** Called father of modern advertising, Edward Bernays learned his craft during World War I at the US Committee on Public Information (CPI). The CPI advertised and sold the war to the American people claiming it would "Make the World Safe for Democracy." In the first paragraph of his book, **Propaganda** (1928) Bernays wrote: *The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democracy. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country.*

Andrew Montford (Bishop Hill) and John Shade examined the education system in the UK and the Global Warming Policy Foundation published the findings under the title *Climate Control: Brainwashing in schools*. Montford and Shade wrote: *Gone are the days when the education system hoped to generate young people equipped to form their own opinions on complex scientific sociological and political issues. Instead the education system, subverted by a green political movements, now seeks conformity with environmental orthodoxy, with any challenge to its vivid certainties viewed as transgressions to be ignored or treated with contempt.*

According to Montford and Shade, knowledge is being replaced by propaganda. The Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, reacted quickly, but it remains to be seen if his reaction will be of substance or only for show.

On another side, Judith Curry posted her views on her latest “debate” with alarmist Kevin Trenberth of the US National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR). The occasion was a Conference for World Affairs in Boulder, Colorado. During the question and answer period, the normally restrained Curry commented she regarded presentations like Trenberth’s to be propaganda.

Though it may be distasteful, the term, propaganda, can apply to a great body of the work presented by the IPCC, particularly that resulting from the use of computer models that have not been verified and validated, such as forecasts of dire futures for plants, the environment, and humanity from increasing atmospheric CO2. See links under Communicating Better to the Public – Use Propaganda on Children and Seeking a Common Ground.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Lewandowsky:** The fallout on the withdrawal by the journal *Frontiers* of a discredited paper by Lewandowsky et al. continues to raise controversy. Andrew Montford had particularly devilish comments: *Ugo Bardi, an Italian chemist who seems to have something to do with the Club of Rome, has resigned from the editorial team at Frontiers in disgust, penning a long protest article here... And, as if to put the seal on the conclusion that the paper was bunk, support for Bardi's decision comes from Peter Gleick, a man with long and deep experience in the area of ethical compromise.* Gleick pretended to be a director of The Heartland Institute in order to obtain sensitive information under false pretenses. See links under Challenging the Orthodoxy.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Energy Security:** Russian President Vladimir Putin is forcing Europe to focus on energy security rather than green energy. Security does not come from unreliable sources of electricity that must be backed up by natural gas imports from Russia. See links under Energy Issues – Non-US

\*\*\*\*\*

**Anti-science?** The US House of Representatives, controlled by Republicans who are called anti-science, passed a bill requiring that the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and its National Weather Service (NWS) focus on forecasting weather rather than forecasting climate. Weather is killing people. NOAA/NWS missed Sandy while WeatherBell Analytics caught it nine days in advance. Cliff Mass, who is not a global warming skeptic, explains what happened with NOAA/NWS. See link under Models v. Observations.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Oh Mann!** A Penn State article states that Mr. Mann and his colleagues have found that the current no warming trend is being caused by the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO). Mr. Mann’s work is being financed National Science Foundation. No doubt, Mr. Mann gets far more funding from the government than WeatherBell Analytics whose principals have been discussing the AMO for years. Mr. Mann also finds the current no warming trend is fleeting. We shall see. See link under Oh Mann!

\*\*\*\*\*

**Number of the Week:** \$97,000. *Based on survey data compiled by the National Association of Colleges and Employers, the top-paying undergraduate major in 2013 was petroleum engineering, with an average starting salary of \$97,000.* See Article # 2

#####

## **ARTICLES:**

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

**1. Slash Greenhouse Gases to Meet Climate Goals, U.N. Draft Says**  
Report Also Expected to Suggest Expansion of Renewable Energy

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, Apr 9, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303603904579491620728985540?mg=reno64-wsj>

## **2. How Climate Change Conquered the American Campus**

By Paul Tice, WSJ, Apr 7, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304441304579481200046204022?mg=reno64-wsj>

## **3. EU Industries to Pay Less Into Funds to Finance Renewable Energy**

European Commission Sets Tougher Conditions for Government Subsidies for Renewables

By Vanessa Mock, WSJ, Apr 9, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303873604579491102502305242?mg=reno64-wsj>

## **4. Book Review: 'The Rule of Nobody' by Philip K. Howard**

When a tree fell into a stream in Franklin Township, N.J., it took 12 days and \$12,000 for the necessary permits to remove it.

Book Review by Stuart Taylor, WSJ, Apr 7, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303802104579450140089609468?mg=reno64-wsj>

#####

### **NEWS YOU CAN USE:**

#### ***Science: Is the Sun Rising?***

#### **New Paper Corroborates the Solar-Cosmic Ray Theory of Climate**

By Staff, The Hockey Schtick, Apr 9, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.co.uk/2014/04/new-paper-corroborates-solar-cosmic-ray.html>

Link to paper: Effect of solar variations on particle formation and cloud condensation nuclei

By Fangqun Yu and Gan Luo, Environmental Research Letters, Apr 9, 2014

<http://iopscience.iop.org/1748-9326/9/4/045004/article>

#### **More support for Svensmark's cosmic ray modulation of Earth's climate hypothesis**

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Apr 10, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/04/10/more-support-for-svensmarks-cosmic-ray-modulation-of-earths-climate-hypothesis/>

#### **Fleshing out the cosmoclimatology hypothesis**

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Apr 10, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/4/10/fleshing-out-the-cosmoclimatology-hypothesis.html>

#### **Appearance of Night-Shining Clouds Has Increased**

By Karen Fox, NASA, Apr 10, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.nasa.gov/content/goddard/appearance-of-night-shining-clouds-has-increased/#.UOILAvldV-4>

Link to paper: Analysis of northern midlatitude noctilucent cloud occurrences using satellite data and modeling

By James Russell, et al. Journal of Geophysical Research, Mar 18, 2014

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/2013JD021017/abstract;jsessionid=07F6C0C4B688530DFB26096E7884A411.f02t03>

### ***Suppressing Scientific Inquiry***

#### **The New Politics Of Climate Change: No Space For Deniers**

By Roger Scruton, Forbes, Apr 8, 2014

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/rogerscruton/2014/04/08/the-new-politics-of-climate-change-no-space-for-deniers/>

### ***Challenging the Orthodoxy -- NIPCC***

#### **Climate Change Reconsidered II: Biological Impacts**

Summary for Policy Makers, Nongovernment International Panel on Climate Change, April 2014

<http://heartland.org/media-library/pdfs/CCR-IIb/Summary-for-Policymakers.pdf>

Full Report: <http://heartland.org/media-library/pdfs/CCR-IIb/Full-Report.pdf>

ICSC Press Release: <http://www.newswire.ca/en/story/1226523/new-science-report-debunks-climate-scare>

#### **Fox News Covers Latest Skeptic Climate Report from NIPCC**

Video, Fox News, Apr 9, 2014

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KyOgSLsIDDo&list=UUzp8QIVd\\_hDLfK1LMLDu3dQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KyOgSLsIDDo&list=UUzp8QIVd_hDLfK1LMLDu3dQ)

#### **Deepening divide over climate change sparks fierce debate**

By Doug McKelway, By Fox News, Apr 9, 2014

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2014/04/09/climate-change-fiercely-debated-with-widely-divergent-facts/>

*[SEPP Comment: Coverage of the latest NIPCC report.]*

#### **Fox News: NIPCC report 'Poking Very Large Holes' in Climate Alarmist 'Consensus'**

By Jim Lakely, Somewhat Reasonable, Apr 9, 2014

<http://blog.heartland.org/2014/04/fox-news-nipcc-report-poking-very-large-holes-in-climate-alarmist-consensus/>

#### **Special Report with Bret Baier**

Video, Fox News, Apr 8, 2014

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IA6oFARNYfk&feature=youtu.be>

### ***Challenging the Orthodoxy***

#### **Climate Alarmism? Of Course! The IPCC Was Designed To Create and Promote It.**

By Tim Ball, WUWT, Apr 9, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/04/09/climate-alarmism-of-course-the-ipcc-was-designed-to-create-and-promote-it/>

#### **"No sexing up here" says IPCC**

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Apr 7, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/4/7/no-sexing-up-here-says-ipcc.html>

#### **Ethical confirmations [of Lewandowsky's ethically compromised papers]**

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Apr 9, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/4/9/ethical-confirmations.html>

## **Climate Papers Without Peer**

By Tony Thomas, Quadrant, Apr 6, 2014

<http://quadrant.org.au/opinion/doomed-planet/2014/04/climate-papers-without-peer/>

*[SEPP Comment: More on the discredited Lewandowsky paper and his defenders.]*

## ***Defending the Orthodoxy***

### **UN: greenhouse gas emissions nearly doubled in first decade of 21st century**

Leaked draft shows emissions grew nearly twice as fast from 2000-10 as in previous 30 years – despite economic slowdown

By Suzanne Goldenberg, Guardian, UK, Apr 11, 2014

<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/apr/11/un-greenhouse-gas-emissions-doubled-decade-ipcc-report>

*[SEPP Comment: No mention if climate change doubled.]*

### **UN panel calls for climate change 'enlightenment'**

By Laura Barron-Lopez, The Hill, Apr 7, 2014

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202806-un-panel-calls-for-climate-change-enlightenment>

*[SEPP Comment: Too bad the IPCC does not embrace the human concepts of the age of enlightenment.]*

## ***Questioning the Orthodoxy***

### **Alarmists Blame Conditions on Global warming**

By Larry Bell, Newsmax, Apr 7, 2014 [H/t ICECAP]

<http://www.newsmax.com/LarryBell/global-warming-IPCC/2014/04/07/id/564079/>

### **Are academia and publishing destroying scientific innovation?**

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Apr 8, 2014

<http://judithcurry.com/2014/04/08/are-academia-and-publishing-destroying-scientific-innovation/>

### **Would Plan B work any better than Plan A?**

By Martian Livermore, Scientific Alliance, Apr 11, 2014

<http://scientific-alliance.org/scientific-alliance-newsletter/would-plan-b-work-any-better-plan>

### **Climate Forecasting for the 21st Century**

By Norman Page, WUWT, Apr 7, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/04/07/climate-forecasting-for-the-21st-century/>

*[SEPP Comment: The essay calls for an independent assessment. NIPCC has provided it.]*

### **How did the IPCC's alarmism take everyone in for so long?**

Climate scaremongers are still twisting the evidence over global warming

By Christopher Booker, Telegraph, UK, Apr 5, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/environment/climatechange/10746497/How-did-the-IPCCs-alarmism-take-everyone-in-for-so-long.html>

### **How to convert me to your new religion of Global Warming in 14 easy steps**

By Clipped-Wing Warrior, Jo Nova's Blog, Apr 8, 2014

<http://joannenova.com.au/2014/04/how-to-convert-me-to-your-new-religion-of-global-warming-in-14-easy-steps/>

### **Scare tactics fail climate science, planet**

By Clive Crook, The Spec, Apr 3, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.thespec.com/news-story/4447426-scare-tactics-fail-climate-science-planet/>

### **The game is up for climate change believers**

Charles Moore reviews The Age of Global Warming by Rupert Darwall (Quartet)

By Charles Moore, Telegraph, UK, Apr 6, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/non\\_fictionreviews/10748667/The-game-is-up-for-climate-change-believers.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/books/non_fictionreviews/10748667/The-game-is-up-for-climate-change-believers.html)

### ***Problems in the Orthodoxy***

#### **Obama administration pressuring UN on global warming reports**

By Michael Bastasch, Daily Caller, Apr 7, 2014

<http://dailycaller.com/2014/04/07/obama-administration-pressuring-un-on-global-warming-reports/>

#### **U.S. Seeks Changes to ‘Skewed’ Data in UN Climate Draft**

By Alex Morales, Bloomberg, Apr 4, 2014

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2014-04-04/u-dot-s-dot-concerned-un-may-overstate-cost-of-fighting-climate-change>

*[SEPP Comment: According to the Administration, anything it disagrees with is skewed, biased, or a weapon of mass destruction.]*

#### **We should give up trying to save the world from climate change, says James Lovelock**

By Sarah Knapton, Telegraph, UK, Apr 8, 2014

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/science-news/10752606/We-should-give-up-trying-to-save-the-world-from-climate-change-says-James-Lovelock.html>

### ***Seeking a Common Ground***

#### **Curry versus Trenberth**

By Judith Curry, Climate Etc. Apr 11, 2014

<http://judithcurry.com/2014/04/11/curry-versus-trenberth/#more-15205>

I said I regarded presentations like Trenberth's to be propaganda

#### **A rough ride to the future**

James Lovelock recants his alarmism

Book review by Matt Ridley, Rational Optimist, Apr 38, 2014

<http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/a-rough-ride-to-the-future.aspx>

#### **Adapting to climate change**

Global warming looks like it will be cheaper to cope with than to prevent

By Matt Ridley, Rational Optimist, Apr 6, 2014

<http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/adapting-to-climate-change.aspx>

### ***Models v. Observations***

#### **The Weather Forecasting Improvement Acts Passes the House: What are the Implications?**

By Cliff Mass, Weather Blog, Apr 10, 2014

<http://cliffmass.blogspot.com/2014/04/the-weather-forecasting-improvement.html>

## **The Great Credibility Gap yawns ever wider**

By Christopher Monckton, WUWT, Apr 10, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/04/10/the-great-credibility-gap-yawns-ever-wider/>

## **Changing Weather**

### **UC Geographers Develop a System to Track the Dynamics of Drought**

By Dawn Fuller, UC News, SPX, Apr 10, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

[http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/UC\\_Geographers\\_Develop\\_a\\_System\\_to\\_Track\\_the\\_Dynamics\\_of\\_Drought\\_999.html](http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/UC_Geographers_Develop_a_System_to_Track_the_Dynamics_of_Drought_999.html)

[SEPP Comment: The article uses the drought in September 2011. Except for California, the April 8, 2014 U.S. Drought Monitor is not as emotionally compelling. <http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/>]

## **Changing Climate**

### **The La Brea Tars Pits gets themselves in a sticky wicket over climate change and adaptation**

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Apr 10, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/04/10/the-la-brea-tars-pits-gets-themselves-in-a-sticky-wicket-over-climate-change-and-adaptation/>

## **Changing Earth**

### **Soil microbe GHG feedback ‘less dire than previously thought’**

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Apr 8, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/04/08/microbe-ghg-feedback-less-dire-than-previously-thought/>

Link to paper: Microbial community dynamics alleviate stoichiometric constraints during litter decay

By Christina Kaiser, et al. Ecology Letters, Mar 17, 2014

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ele.12269/abstract>

“Soil microbes are responsible for one of the largest carbon dioxide emissions on the planet, about six times higher than from fossil fuel burning.”

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

### **Researchers: Permafrost Thawing Could Accelerate Global Warming**

Decomposing plants and soil could contribute to an increase in greenhouse gases

By Staff Writer, Newswise, Apr 7, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.universityherald.com/articles/8666/20140407/permafrost-thawing-accelerates-global-warming.htm>

Link to paper: Changes in peat chemistry associated with permafrost thaw increase greenhouse gas production

By Suzanne Hodgkins, et al, PNAS, Apr 7, 2014

<http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2014/04/02/1314641111>

From Abstract: This impact of permafrost thaw on organic matter chemistry could intensify the **predicted** climate feedbacks of increasing temperatures, permafrost carbon mobilization, and hydrologic changes. [Boldface added]

[SEPP Comment: There is no validated climate model, thus the term predicted is wrong. The study is funded with \$400,000 from the Department of Energy?]

## **Social Cost of Carbon Inflated by Extreme Sea Level Rise Projections**

By Patrick J. Michaels and Paul C. "Chip" Knappenberger, CATO, Apr 9, 2014

<http://www.cato.org/blog/social-cost-carbon-inflated-extreme-sea-level-rise-projections>

***Communicating Better to the Public – Make things up.***

**Global warming: Improve economic models of climate change**

Costs of carbon emissions are being underestimated, but current estimates are still valuable for setting mitigation policy, say Richard L. Revesz and colleagues

By Richard L. Revesz, Peter H. Howard, Kenneth Arrow, Lawrence H. Goulder, Robert E. Kopp, Michael A. Livermore, Michael Oppenheimer & Thomas Sterner, Nature, Apr 4, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://www.nature.com/news/global-warming-improve-economic-models-of-climate-change-1.14991>

*[SEPP Comment: These experts have not produced a climate model that works. The models greatly overestimate the impact of carbon dioxide on temperatures. Yet they claim that the future impact of carbon dioxide on climate is being underestimated.]*

**Global Warmism's New Campaign: 'Loss and Damage'**

By Peter Wilson, American Thinker, Apr 7, 2014

[http://americanthinker.com/2014/04/loss\\_and\\_damage.html](http://americanthinker.com/2014/04/loss_and_damage.html)

**Must Read: Walton Francis on the Social Cost of Carbon**

By Marlo Lewis, Global Warming.org, Apr 10, 2014

<http://www.globalwarming.org/2014/04/10/must-read-walton-francis-on-the-social-cost-of-carbon/>

**The Washington Post Corrects, Disingenuously**

By John Hinderaker, Power Line, Apr 8, 2014

<http://www.powerlineblog.com/archives/2014/04/the-washington-post-corrects-disingenuously.php>

*[SEPP Comment: More on the false claim that Koch Industries is a driving force behind the Keystone Pipeline.]*

***Communicating Better to the Public – Go Personal.***

**Green 'smear campaign' against professor who dared to disown 'sexed up' UN climate dossier**

Richard Tol claims he is fighting a sustained attack on his reputation

Professor from Sussex University is a highly respected climate economist

Criticised by campaigners after saying report summary was 'alarmist'

In his opinion, it focused on 'scare stories'

By David Rose, Mail, UK, Apr 5, 2014

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2597907/Green-smear-campaign-against-professor-dared-disown-sexed-UN-climate-dossier.html>

**Left Turns Those Who Dare To Disagree Into Pariahs**

By Charles Krauthammer, IBD, Apr 10, 2014

<http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials-on-the-right/041014-696811-left-turns-those-who-dare-to-disagree-into-pariahs.htm>

***Communicating Better to the Public – Use Propaganda on Children***

**Climate control**

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Apr 8, 2014 [Press Release]

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/4/8/climate-control.html>

[SEPP Comment: See link immediately below.]

### **Climate Control: Brainwashing in schools [UK]**

By Andrew Montford and John Shade, GWPF, 2014

<http://www.thegwpf.org/content/uploads/2014/04/Education-reducedportrait-5.pdf>

### **Some more responses [on the Climate Control paper]**

By Andrew Montford, Bishop Hill, Apr 10, 2014

<http://bishophill.squarespace.com/blog/2014/4/10/some-more-responses.html>

### **Climate Catastrophism For Kiddies**

By Tony Thomas, Quadrant, Apr 9, 2014

<http://quadrant.org.au/opinion/doomed-planet/2014/04/climate-catastrophism-kiddies/>

### **Heads are breaking the law if they preach eco agenda, warns Gove: Education Secretary's 'concern' at report that accuses 'activist' teachers**

Accuses staff of turning pupils into 'foot soldiers of the green movement'

Marks were awarded in exams depended on 'parroting' the green agenda

Many widely-used textbooks included inaccurate examples

By Daniel Martin, Mail, UK, Apr 10, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2601179/Heads-breaking-law-preach-eco-agenda-warns-Gove-Education-Secretarys-concern-report-accuses-activist-teachers.html>

### **Report finds schoolchildren being 'brainwashed' over climate change**

By Scott Craig, Voice of Russia, Apr 8, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

[http://voiceofrussia.com/uk/news/2014\\_04\\_08/Report-finds-schoolchildren-being-brainwashed-over-climate-change-7237/](http://voiceofrussia.com/uk/news/2014_04_08/Report-finds-schoolchildren-being-brainwashed-over-climate-change-7237/)

### **Teachers Breaking the Law Over Climate Change Bias Says Gove Spokesman**

By Andre Walker, Breitbart, Apr 8, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.breitbart.com/Breitbart-London/2014/04/08/Teachers-Acting-Illegally-Over-Climate-Change>

### ***Expanding the Orthodoxy***

### **Britain must increase spending on green energy by ten times in next 15 years to help reduce global warming, says UN**

By Ben Spencer, Mail, UK, Apr 10, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2602120/Britain-increase-spending-green-energy-ten-times-15-years-help-reduce-global-warming-says-UN.html>

### **Obama targets climate change in wildfire strategy**

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Apr 9, 2014

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/203147-obama-targets-climate-change-in-wildfire-strategy>

[SEPP Comment: What used to be called forest fires or prairie fires are now called wildfires – as if they never existed before.]

### ***Questioning European Green***

## **“100 Billion Euros For Nothing! Germany’s CO2 Emissions Haven’t Dropped In 10 Years!”**

By P Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Apr 8, 2014

<http://notrickszone.com/2014/04/08/100-billion-euros-for-nothing-germanys-co2-emissions-havent-dropped-in-10-years/>

## **German AfD Protest Party Calls For Complete Abolishment Of Green Energy Feed-In Act, Citing “Cost Burden”**

By P. Gosselin, No Tricks Zone, Apr 10, 2014

<http://notrickszone.com/2014/04/10/german-afd-protest-party-calls-for-complete-abolishment-of-green-energy-feed-in-act-citing-cost-burden/>

*[SEPP Comment: Are AfD and British UKIP parties somewhat like the US tea party – hated by the establishment?]*

## ***Questioning Green Elsewhere***

### **Solar Land Blues: The Eco Reality of Dilute Energy**

By Robert Bradley Jr., Master Resource, Apr 7, 2014

<http://www.masterresource.org/2014/04/solar-land-blues/#more-30165>

## ***Litigation Issues***

### **CEI Sues EPA Over Stonewalling Records Request**

By Anthony Watts, WUWT, Apr 9, 2014

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2014/04/09/cei-sues-epa-over-stonewalling-records-request/>

## ***Subsidies and Mandates Forever***

### **Commission pushes renewable energy into the free market**

By Staff Writers, EurActiv, Apr 10, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.euractiv.com/sections/energy/commission-pushes-renewable-energy-free-market-301466>

### **New EU rules on energy funding phase out subsidies for renewables**

By Barbara Lewis and Foo Yun Chee, Reuters, Apr 9, 2014

<http://uk.reuters.com/article/2014/04/09/us-eu-funding-energy-idUKBREA3812C20140409>

### **Rep. Welch: Ethanol mandate 'killing' farmers**

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Apr 10, 2014

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/203186-rep-welch-ethanol-mandate-hurts-farmers-small-engines>

*[SEPP Comment: The member of the House who helped write the ethanol mandate and who now calls the ethanol mandate a well-intentioned flop.]*

### **Alarm over EU proposal to cut loose renewable energy firms**

By Nikolaj Nelsen, EUobserver, Apr 9, 2014

<http://euobserver.com/environment/123807>

## ***EPA and other Regulators on the March***

### **EPA Studies and Preordained Conclusions**

By Alex Gimarc, American Thinker, Apr 7, 2014

[http://americanthinker.com/2014/04/epa\\_studies\\_and\\_preordained\\_conclusions.html](http://americanthinker.com/2014/04/epa_studies_and_preordained_conclusions.html)

## ***Energy Issues – Non-US***

### **There Is No Global Energy Solution, Only Local Ones**

Noted Scholar Vaclav Smil Says What We Produce and Use Depends on Where We Are

Transcript by Staff Writer, WSJ, Apr 8, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304432604579473491871812958?mg=reno64-wsj&url=http%3A%2F%2Fonline.wsj.com%2Farticle%2FSB10001424052702304432604579473491871812958.html>

### **Editorial: Energy Security Is Europe's Top Priority**

The Times, Via GWPF, Apr 11, 2014

<http://www.thegwpf.org/editorial-energy-security-is-europes-top-priority/>

### **Amid showdown with energy-rich Russia, calls rise in Europe to start fracking**

By Griff Witte and Anthony Faiola, Washington Post, Apr 7, 2014

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/amid-showdown-with-energy-rich-russia-calls-rise-in-europe-to-start-fracking/2014/04/07/f3616058-2c24-4683-abe3-728a5572debf\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/amid-showdown-with-energy-rich-russia-calls-rise-in-europe-to-start-fracking/2014/04/07/f3616058-2c24-4683-abe3-728a5572debf_story.html)

### **EU gas imports from Russia could drop a quarter by 2020**

By Henning Gloystein, Reuters, Apr 9, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/04/09/us-ukraine-crisis-gas-idUSBREA3818J20140409>

### **Russia Is Crushing Ukraine's Hopes for Energy Independence**

Eastern Ukraine is home to nine-tenths of the country's coal and one of Europe's largest shale-gas deposits. Will the region soon be Moscow's?

By Matt Ford, The Atlantic, Apr 8, 2014

<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/04/russia-is-crushing-ukraines-hopes-for-energy-independence/360281/>

### **Ukraine: Vladimir Putin threatens to turn off the gas**

In threat to switch off Ukraine's gas, Russian president acknowledges gas deliveries to the European Union would also be jeopardized

By David Blair, and Emily Gosden, The Telegraph, UK, Apr 10, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/ukraine/10758766/Ukraine-Vladimir-Putin-threatens-to-turn-off-the-gas.html>

## ***Energy Issues -- US***

### **Peabody Energy: Let's Talk About Energy Inequality (coal for the masses, solar and wind for the elites)**

By Robert Bradley Jr., Master Resource, Apr 8, 2014

<http://www.masterresource.org/2014/04/peabody-energy-inequality/#more-30186>

### **Exporting Natural Gas Update**

By Donn Dears, Power For USA, Apr 11, 2014

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2014/04/11/exporting-natural-gas-update/>

### **How CO2 Distorts the Energy Equation**

By Donn Dears, Power For USA, Apr 8, 2014

<http://dddusmma.wordpress.com/2014/04/08/how-co2-distorts-the-energy-equation/>

*[SEPP Comment: The Public Utility Commission of Minnesota used the bureaucratically proclaimed “social cost of carbon” to justify solar energy. Each winter, the citizens will know who to blame.]*

### **More calls made to learn about past winter's energy price spike**

By Dave Solomon, New Hampshire Union Leader, Apr 2, 2014

<http://www.unionleader.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20140402/NEWS05/140409787>

### ***Washington's Control of Energy***

#### **Scientists, economists urge Obama to reject Keystone XL**

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Apr 7, 2014

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/202836-scientists-economists-urge-obama-to-reject-keystone-xl>

*[SEPP Comment: The working class will benefit!]*

### **Canada Could Bypass U.S. If Pipeline Isn't Approved**

Editorial, IBD, Apr 7, 2014

<http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/040714-696241-obama-refusal-to-approve-keystone-xl-hurts-america.htm?p=full>

### ***Oil and Natural Gas – the Future or the Past?***

#### **Shale revolution reverses global energy flow**

By John Kemp, Reuters, Apr 9, 2014, [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/04/09/shale-usa-idUSL6N0N13JK20140409>

### **Riding shale boom, US to become major LPG supplier to China**

By Staff Writer, Reuters, Apr 10, 2014

<http://www.cnbc.com/id/101571342>

*[SEPP Comment: A possibility.]*

### ***Return of King Coal?***

#### **Drilling date set for North Sea's vast coal reserves**

By Barbara Hodgson, The Journal, Mar 31, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://www.thejournal.co.uk/news/north-east-news/drilling-date-set-north-seas-6896191>

### ***Alternative, Green (“Clean”) Solar and Wind***

#### **The answer is still blowing in the wind**

By John Brignell, Number Watch, Apr 2014

[http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2014\\_april.htm](http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/2014_april.htm)

Link to the NYT Article, Wind Industry's New Technologies Are Helping It Compete on Price

By Diane Cardwell, NYT, Mar 20, 2014

<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/21/business/energy-environment/wind-industrys-new-technologies-are-helping-it-compete-on-price.html?ref=business&r=1>

*[SEPP Comment: Another airborne wind turbine scheme. If Bloomberg were still mayor of New York, would he be calling for the city skies to be filled with such wind turbines?]*

**Lawrence Solomon: North America slow to reverse renewables projects, but its turn will come soon**

Only those in fantasyland should expect a contract to be sacrosanct when one party to the transaction makes the law

By Lawrence Solomon, Financial Post, Apr 4, 2014 [H/t GWPF]

<http://business.financialpost.com/2014/04/04/lawrence-solomon-reversing-renewables/>

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

#### **Stanford scientists discover a novel way to make ethanol without corn or other plants**

Stanford scientists have created a copper-based catalyst that produces large quantities of ethanol from carbon monoxide gas at room temperature.

By Mark Schwartz, Stanford News, Apr 9, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://news.stanford.edu/news/2014/april/ethanol-without-plants-040914.html>

Link to paper: Electroreduction of carbon monoxide to liquid fuel on oxide-derived nanocrystalline copper

By Christina W. Li, Jim Ciston & Matthew W. Kanan, Nature, Apr 9, 2014

<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/vaop/ncurrent/full/nature13249.html>

*[SEPP Comment: At the end article the author presents the real issue: How do you make the carbon monoxide? Burn fossil fuels?]*

#### **US Navy 'game-changer': converting seawater into fuel**

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

[http://www.biofueldaily.com/reports/US\\_Navy\\_game-changer\\_converting\\_seawater\\_into\\_fuel\\_999.html](http://www.biofueldaily.com/reports/US_Navy_game-changer_converting_seawater_into_fuel_999.html)

"For the first time we've been able to develop a technology to get CO<sub>2</sub> and hydrogen from seawater simultaneously, that's a big breakthrough," she said, adding that the fuel "doesn't look or smell very different."

*[SEPP Comment: No explanation on how it works and what is involved. The costs estimates are questionable.]*

### ***Oh Mann!***

#### **Slowdown of global warming fleeing**

By A'ndrea Elyse Messer, Penn State News, Apr 7, 2014 [H/t WUWT]

<http://news.psu.edu/story/310769/2014/04/07/research/slowdown-global-warming-fleeing>

### ***Environmental Industry***

#### **Global Warming Scare Tactics**

By Ted Nordhaus and Michael Shellenberger, NYT, Apr 8, 2014 [H/t Thomas Hayden]

[http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/09/opinion/global-warming-scare-tactics.html?emc=edit\\_th\\_20140409&nl=todaysheadlines&nid=16167125&r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/09/opinion/global-warming-scare-tactics.html?emc=edit_th_20140409&nl=todaysheadlines&nid=16167125&r=1)

*[SEPP Comment: Dire forecasts lead to skepticism. Environmental groups rejecting nuclear and natural gas as a replacement to coal adds to the problem.]*

#### **Science and Panic**

By Anthony Ciani, American Thinker, Apr 9, 2014

[http://americanthinker.com/2014/04/science\\_and\\_panic.html](http://americanthinker.com/2014/04/science_and_panic.html)

### ***Other News that May Be of Interest***

#### **BPA: The Scientists, The Scare, The 100-Million Dollar Surge**

By Trevor Butterworth, Forbes, Apr 9, 2014

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/trevorbutterworth/2014/04/09/bpa-the-scientists-the-scare-the-100-million-dollar-surge/>

### **The Tyranny of Experts**

Easterly's book on aid and autocracy

Book Review by Matt Ridley, Rational Optimist, Apr 5, 2014

[http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/the-tyranny-of-experts-\(1\).aspx](http://www.rationaloptimist.com/blog/the-tyranny-of-experts-(1).aspx)

#####

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

#### **Bill would establish 'victory bonds' for clean energy investment**

By Timothy Cama, The Hill, Apr 9, 2014

<http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/203120-bill-would-establish-victory-bonds-for-clean-energy-investment>

*[SEPP Comment: Contrary to the propaganda, the purpose of the Victory Bonds was not to finance the war, but to prevent inflation by reducing the disposable income of the general population. Will these bonds prevent prosperity?]*

#### **Wildlife still suffers four years after BP oil spill**

By Staff Writers, Washington (AFP), April 08, 2014

[http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Wildlife\\_still\\_suffers\\_four\\_years\\_after\\_BP\\_oil\\_spill\\_999.html](http://www.energy-daily.com/reports/Wildlife_still_suffers_four_years_after_BP_oil_spill_999.html)

*[SEPP Comment: More sea turtles dead last year from the BP Blowout than during the full year immediately after the blowout? What nonsense! The BP blowout relates to the Keystone pipeline? The National Wildlife Federation as claiming this is based on science? The green industry will say anything to try to stop the Keystone pipeline.]*

#####

### **ARTICLES:**

#### **1. Slash Greenhouse Gases to Meet Climate Goals, U.N. Draft Says**

Report Also Expected to Suggest Expansion of Renewable Energy

By Gautam Naik, WSJ, Apr 9, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303603904579491620728985540?mg=reno64-wsj>

Carbon dioxide is the main greenhouse gas, and one of the main sources is the generation of electricity.

*[SEPP Comment: The first clause is false, water vapor is the main greenhouse gas.]*

A key United Nations report is expected to suggest that governments will have to drastically reduce greenhouse-gas emissions to meet international goals to reduce the impact of global warming.

Based on the current trend of emissions, the global temperature is projected to increase by 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) above preindustrial levels in less than three decades, according to a draft summary reviewed by The Wall Street Journal.

Projections suggest that beyond the two-degree point the risks of large and high-impact changes—such as melting of the Greenland ice sheet—could become unacceptably high.

To have a 50-50 chance of avoiding that level, the draft concludes, countries will need to cut emissions by at least 40% by 2050 from 2010 levels.

The report to be presented Sunday in Berlin is the third installment in a comprehensive four-part report by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

It also is expected to offer options to fight climate change, such as expanding the use of renewable energy and storing greenhouse gases underground.

Jean-Pascal van Ypersele, a vice chairman of the IPCC and a physicist at the Université catholique de Louvain in Belgium, declined to comment on the specifics of the report. However, he said its scope would extend beyond an assessment of the challenges of moderating the effects of global warming.

"This report will show that humanity has all the cards in its hands to change the pathway we now are on," he said.

Governments are completing the details of the summary. Although the wording in the final version may be significantly different in places, the underlying data are expected to largely remain the same as the draft summary, which was crafted in December.

The report updates a previous IPCC report on climate mitigation published in 2007, including data up to 2010 and incorporating far more measurements to offer the most comprehensive assessment of its kind.

The Earth has already warmed by about 0.8 degree Celsius since 1900, climate scientists say. In 2010, about 200 governments agreed to reduce emissions so as not to breach the two-degree mark.

"Over the last 10 years, emissions have been increasing rapidly," says Bob Ward, policy and communications director of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment in London. "The two-degree window is still open but it will become more expensive" to achieve.

The draft summary notes that atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases reached a level of about 400 parts-per-million in 2010, and have continued to increase by roughly 2.5 ppm a year. At this pace, the concentration of greenhouse gases will exceed 450 parts per million by 2030.

Significantly, if emissions continue unabated, the level will reach 480 ppm by 2042. At that stage, the draft says, there is a less than two-thirds chance of avoiding warming of more than two degrees.

Projecting out further, the greenhouse gas concentrations level will hit 750 ppm by the end of this century. According to the draft, this likely equates to more than 3 degrees of warming over preindustrial levels.

Carbon dioxide is the main greenhouse gas, and one of the main sources is the generation of electricity. The draft report says that, absent a dramatic improvement in efficiency, direct emissions from the global "energy supply sector" is projected "to double or even triple by 2050."

The IPCC and other groups have been warning about climate change for several decades, but then public response has often been lukewarm. Carbon dioxide emissions continue to rise. Many countries have broken their promises to curtail emissions.

And it is far from clear whether global emissions will substantially decline in coming decades. Even the use of nuclear power, which generates comparatively little by way of greenhouse gases, has declined as a share of global electricity generation since 1993.

Some European countries, such as Germany and Spain, have proposed to cut the large subsidies they provide to renewable energy projects. Meanwhile, more ambitious "geoengineering" projects to suck carbon dioxide out of the air remain experimental or have yet to be tested on a large scale.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **2. How Climate Change Conquered the American Campus**

By Paul Tice, WSJ, Apr 7, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304441304579481200046204022?mg=re-no64-wsj>

Here is a college quiz. While many parts of the U.S. economy struggle to recover from the Great Recession of 2008-09, one domestic industry is experiencing a technology-driven expansion in which American innovations have led to countless new company startups, a surge in hiring and some of the highest-paying entry-level jobs for graduating college seniors.

How are the nation's universities responding so students might prepare for a promising career in this growing and intellectually challenging field? By largely ignoring it. Why? Because the industry is oil and gas.

This fact may surprise the casual campus observer, since almost every U.S. college these days seems to have an energy research institute. Most of these energy think-tanks, however, are run by academic advocates of theories about global warming and man-made climate change, most of whom view energy through green-colored lenses. The research focus is more on promoting the clean, sustainable, renewable, non-CO<sub>2</sub>-emitting energy of the future, as opposed to studying and analyzing the hydrocarbon resources of the here and now.

For some of these programs, the agenda is obvious and stated in bold print over the door. Names such as the Yale Climate & Energy Institute and the Princeton Center for Energy and the Environment make clear that the study of energy needs to be chaperoned and monitored. The labeling is less obvious for others, but the result is the same. Visit the websites of the neutrally named Cornell Energy Institute, MIT Energy Initiative and Penn Center for Energy Innovation, and you would think you were looking at algore.com.

My alma mater, Columbia University, recently launched its own Center on Global Energy Policy, with the mission to "improve the quality of energy policy and energy dialogue through objective, balanced and understandable analysis." The center is headed by Jason Bordoff, former senior director for energy and climate change on the staff of the National Security Council in the Obama administration, who is on record calling for carbon caps and immediate government action to drive down greenhouse-gas emissions. So much for balance.

With all of these research institutes, the messaging is consistent: Fossil-fuel energy is a problem to be solved, a challenge to be overcome, a sector that needs to be transformed and the relic of an

industrial state from which to evolve. The policy prescriptions issued by these think-tanks are often presented as moral imperatives, which helps to cut down on the debate.

More troubling is how this ideological bias filters into the college curriculum, both through the content of introductory natural science courses required of all students and the choice of majors and specialty electives offered by technical undergraduate schools.

Based on survey data compiled by the National Association of Colleges and Employers, the top-paying undergraduate major in 2013 was petroleum engineering, with an average starting salary of \$97,000. How many of the country's top engineering schools offer such a major? Outside of Texas, Colorado and Oklahoma, not many. Often the closest approximation is a bachelor of science degree in Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences or the equivalent, with a handful of classes on petrology and geophysics safely outnumbered by myriad courses on environmental science, climatology, global-warming theory and alternate-energy sources.

The oil and gas industry has been historically volatile and marked by boom-and-bust cycles caused by fluctuating commodity prices, with company prospects often tied to hit-or-miss exploratory drilling. Not surprisingly, the industry has struggled with periodic brain drain since the 1980s as students looking for steady employment and career growth have been turned off by such uncertainty.

Technological advances such as seismic imaging, horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing—all developed by private companies—have removed much of this volatility and changed the nature of the industry to more of a manufacturing operation. But now another source of even greater uncertainty has been injected into the mix: political and regulatory risk. This is one energy lesson that undergraduates are hearing loud and clear from their professors.

How many college students have been discouraged from considering a field in petroleum engineering or traditional energy finance because of the rational concern that the current Environmental Protection Agency-led attack on coal will move next to target oil and gas? Conversely, how many recent undergraduates have been led down the green garden path toward a career in renewable energy, only to receive a hard-knock, real-life economics lesson in the commercial failures of solar, wind, ethanol, battery and fuel-cell technologies?

Obviously, having proponents of man-made-climate-change theory running energy-research institutes at the college level is an example of inmates taking over the asylum, but there is method to this madness. Over the past 25 years, the environmental movement has been very successful using a two-pronged approach to push its anti-fossil-fuel agenda.

The first prong involves leveraging the U.S. courts and executive agencies to directly control the oil and gas industry through government regulation and taxation. The second involves indirect control through thought leadership and opinion-shaping. Culturally and generationally, man-made climate change is becoming accepted wisdom due to the steady indoctrination taking place in our universities.

*Mr. Tice works in investment management and is a former Wall Street energy-research analyst.*

\*\*\*\*\*

### **3. EU Industries to Pay Less Into Funds to Finance Renewable Energy**

European Commission Sets Tougher Conditions for Government Subsidies for Renewables

By Vanessa Mock, WSJ, Apr 9, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303873604579491102502305242?mg=reno64-wsj>

BRUSSELS—Europe's energy-intensive industries scored a victory Wednesday in being largely let off the hook in footing the bill for the transition to an economy that uses less carbon dioxide.

The European Commission watered down some key parts of new rules on government aid aimed at encouraging production of energy from renewable sources, lessening the financial burden on heavy industries and reducing the scale of government subsidies for providers of renewable energy.

The new rules set tougher terms for government subsidies for energy sources such as wind and solar.

The commission, the EU's executive body, said government subsidies for renewables have led to progress on environmental goals, but have also caused "serious market distortions and increasing costs to consumers".

Bowing to intense lobbying pressure from industry, the commission also reduced—compared with its earlier proposals—the payments that chemical, glass, steel and other heavy-energy users will be expected to make into public funds to finance renewables.

Lobby groups have recently cranked up pressure on the commission to address concerns that Europe's high electricity prices are making it impossible for heavy industry to remain competitive on the global stage. They say subsidies schemes for renewables are ramping up energy costs, at a time when they are plummeting in the U.S. thanks to the shale-gas boom.

Addressing those fears, the EU's antitrust chief, Joaquín Almunia, said Europe "should meet its ambitious energy and climate targets at the least possible cost for taxpayers."

Before being announced, the new rules were put to a vote at the commission, a very unusual move that reflects their political sensitivity. Mr. Almunia said there had also been three rounds of public consultations, over 5,000 comments received and "hundreds of bilateral meetings."

The new rules, which will apply from July until the end of 2020, were also the result of pressure from Germany, which is overhauling its own ambitious renewable-energy laws. "Politically, this was the best balance possible," Mr. Almunia said.

But even after a two-year drafting process, environmental groups argued that Mr. Almunia had fallen captor to corporate lobby groups and said the guidelines would undermine the EU's climate-change targets. The bloc's 28 countries have agreed to boost the use of renewables to 20% of the energy mix by 2020 as part of a broader plan to halve carbon emissions by 2030 from 1990 levels.

In all, some 68 branches of industry ranging from textiles to ceramics will have their contributions toward support schemes for renewables capped at 15% of the companies' gross value added—the value of goods and services that a company produces, minus the cost of all inputs such as personnel and raw materials. The cap had been set at 20% in an earlier draft.

But crucially, governments will have the freedom to set a much lower cap of 4% of GVA for electricity-intensive businesses, and as little as 0.5% of GVA for the heaviest users of electricity, such as steelmakers. The last draft of the guidelines had set the cap at 2.5% for the last group.

"For some industrial consumers, it's now even better than the status quo," said Fabio Genoese, a research fellow on energy and climate policy at the Centre for European Policy Studies. "There's been a clear movement since the first drafts [of these guidelines] were circulated in December. I think we can say they'll be very happy."

Companies likely to be affected by the rules declined to comment, saying they had not been published in full. But the rules were broadly welcomed by European industry groups.

"The interests of energy-intensive industries were largely taken into account in these guidelines, meaning the companies in this sector now have a future in Europe," said Annette Loske of VIK, the German association of industrial energy users.

Claude Turmes, a European lawmaker from Luxembourg and a member of the Green Party, described the rules as a "scandalous gift" to industry. "It's now citizens in Europe who will have to pay," he said.

EU ProSun, an industry body representing solar-energy firms, said the guidelines were an "undesirable intervention" in national energy policies. "For the commission, renewable energy seems to be more of a necessary evil that must be contained. Meanwhile, nuclear energy and coal continue to be massively subsidized," said Milan Nitzschke, the group's president.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **4. Book Review: 'The Rule of Nobody' by Philip K. Howard**

When a tree fell into a stream in Franklin Township, N.J., it took 12 days and \$12,000 for the necessary permits to remove it.

Book Review by Stuart Taylor, WSJ, Apr 7, 2014

<http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303802104579450140089609468?mg=reno64-wsj>

Amid the liberal-conservative ideological clash that paralyzes our government, it's always refreshing to encounter the views of Philip K. Howard, whose ideology is common sense spiked with a sense of urgency. In "The Rule of Nobody," Mr. Howard shows how federal, state and local laws and regulations have programmed officials of both parties to follow rules so detailed, rigid and, often, obsolete as to leave little room for human judgment. He argues passionately that we will never solve our social problems until we abandon what he calls a misguided legal philosophy of seeking to put government on regulatory autopilot. He also predicts that our legal-governmental structure is "headed toward a stall and then a frightening plummet toward insolvency and political chaos."

Mr. Howard, a big-firm lawyer who heads the nonpartisan government-reform coalition Common Good, is no conventional deregulator. But he warns that the "cumulative complexity" of the dense rulebooks that prescribe "every nuance of how law is implemented" leaves good officials without the freedom to do what makes sense on the ground. Stripped of the authority that they should have, he adds, officials have little accountability for bad results. More broadly, he argues that the

very structure of our democracy is so clogged by deep thickets of dysfunctional law that it will only get worse unless conservatives and liberals alike cast off their distrust of human discretion.

The rulebooks should be "radically simplified," Mr. Howard says, on matters ranging from enforcing school discipline to protecting nursing-home residents, from operating safe soup kitchens to building the nation's infrastructure: Projects now often require multi-year, 5,000-page environmental impact statements before anything can begin to be constructed. Unduly detailed rules should be replaced by general principles, he says, that take their meaning from society's norms and values and embrace the need for official discretion and responsibility.

Mr. Howard serves up a rich menu of anecdotes, including both the small-scale activities of a neighborhood and the vast administrative structures that govern national life. After a tree fell into a stream and caused flooding during a winter storm, Franklin Township, N.J., was barred from pulling the tree out until it had spent 12 days and \$12,000 for the permits and engineering work that a state environmental rule required for altering any natural condition in a "C-1 stream." The "Volcker Rule," designed to prevent banks from using federally insured deposits to speculate in securities, was shaped by five federal agencies and countless banking lobbyists into 963 "almost unintelligible" pages. In New York City, "disciplining a student potentially requires 66 separate steps, including several levels of potential appeals"; meanwhile, civil-service rules make it virtually impossible to terminate thousands of incompetent employees. Children's lemonade stands in several states have been closed down for lack of a vendor's license.

Conservatives as well as liberals like detailed rules—complete with tedious forms, endless studies and wasteful legal hearings—because they don't trust each other with discretion. Corporations like them because they provide not only certainty but also "a barrier to entry for potential competitors," by raising the cost of doing business to prohibitive levels for small businesses with fresh ideas and other new entrants to markets. Public employees like them because detailed rules "absolve them of responsibility." And, adds Mr. Howard, "lawsuits [have] exploded in this rules-based regime," shifting legal power to "self-interested plaintiffs' lawyers," who have learned that they "could sue for the moon and extract settlements even in cases (as with some asbestos claims) that were fraudulent."

So habituated have we become to such stuff, Mr. Howard says, that government's "self-inflicted ineptitude is accepted as a state of nature, as if spending an average of eight years on environmental reviews—which should be a national scandal—were an unavoidable mountain range." Common-sensical laws would place outer boundaries on acceptable conduct based on reasonable norms that are "far better at preventing abuse of power than today's regulatory minefield."

As Mr. Howard notes, his book is part of a centuries-old rules-versus-principles debate. The philosophers and writers whom he quotes approvingly include Aristotle, James Madison, Isaiah Berlin and Roscoe Pound, a prominent Harvard law professor and dean who condemned "mechanical jurisprudence" and championed broad official discretion. Berlin, for his part, warned against "monstrous bureaucratic machines, built in accordance with the rules that ignore the teeming variety of the living world, the untidy and asymmetrical inner lives of men, and crush them into conformity." Mr. Howard juxtaposes today's roughly 100 million words of federal law and regulations with Madison's warning that laws should not be "so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood."

Practically grabbing the reader by the lapels and shaking him, Mr. Howard declares it "immoral" to allow obsolete and inefficient laws to waste hundreds of billions of dollars that "could be rechanneled to save the oceans, or rebuild America's infrastructure, or pay off debt for the benefit of our children."

Mr. Howard may be faulted for hyperbole—as when he complains of "a governing philosophy that strives to supplant official discretion altogether"—and for omitting context that would show some of the rules he mocks to be not quite as fatuous as he suggests. But these are relatively small sins in a book that drives home large truths.

*Mr. Taylor is a Washington writer and Brookings Institution nonresident fellow.*

#####