

The Week That Was (Aug 8, 2009) brought to you by SEPP

 If you are planning to attend the meetings of the American Chemical Society in Washington DC Aug 16-19, be sure to visit the booth of the **Heartland Institute** and sign up to protest the ACS statement on climate change. If you cannot attend and are a current or former ACS member, contact Dr **Peter Bonk** at peterjbonk@gmail.com
 #####

Quote of the Week:

"To kill an error is as good a service as, and sometimes better than, the establishing of a new truth or fact"
 -- *Charles Darwin*

THIS WEEK

Senate Takes Up Climate Change: *Chemical & Engineering News reports on July 27, 2009*

"A pair of Senate hearings last week focused on jobs, national security, and carbon dioxide as senators continued to debate provisions in a House-passed bill on climate change. Six committees have jurisdiction over the bill, and two of them dug deeper into issues related to climate change on July 21.

Senate Environment & Public Works Committee Chairman [Barbara Boxer](#) (D-Calif.) began her committee's hearing on jobs by stressing climate-change legislation's potential to develop new clean technologies and create millions of jobs. The committee heard from state and local leaders who have created agencies to support new industries and generate so-called green jobs. However, several Republican committee members, namely Sens. [Kit S. Bond](#) (Mo.) and James M. Inhofe (Okla.), expressed their doubts about job creation. They said green jobs simply shift employment away from other sectors, and they warned that clean industries need too much government support, making such green jobs expensive.

On the same day, Sen. [John F. Kerry](#) (D-Mass.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, began his committee's hearing on security by emphasizing the global military threat of climate change.

Senate leadership aims to have a bill completed by late September. In the House, legislation squeaked through last month on a 219 to 212 vote ([C&EN, July 6, page 8](#))."

Meanwhile, the NYT reports on August 6, 2009 that "Climate Bill Is Threatened: Ten moderate Senate Democrats from states dependent on coal and manufacturing sent a letter to President Obama on Thursday saying they would not support any climate change bill that did not protect American industries from competition from countries that did not impose similar restraints on climate-altering gases." One of the ten is newly seated Al Franken from Minnesota, 'biting the hand that fed him.'

It looks to us that the fate of the climate bill may be tied in intimately with the fate of the White House healthcare legislation, which is proving to be surprisingly unpopular. There have been stormy 'Townhall' meetings around the nation, with politicians getting an earful of complaints from an aroused public.

Other political events weighing in heavily on the outcome of the climate bill are the closely watched elections for governor and other state offices in New Jersey and Virginia in November 2009. Their outcome may be taken as a popular referendum on federal legislative initiatives. The two campaigns may likely influence the debates and votes in Congress.

SEPP Science Editorial #24-2009 (8/8/09)

What Caused the PETM (Paleocene-Eocene Temperature Maximum)

One of the striking features of the thermal history of the earth is the unusually rapid and strong warming about 55 million years ago, termed the PETM. It was recently again discussed in a paper by Zeebe et al in *Nature Geoscience online: 13 July 2009 | doi:10.1038/ngeo578*

The paper brought great joy and jubilation to both climate skeptics and climate alarmists. Skeptics latched on to the authors' statement that GH models could not explain the rapid temperature rise in relation to the observed rise of CO₂. Alarmists, on the other hand, warned that such rapid and strong temperature excursions might even be possible today unless we restrain CO₂ emissions.

Of course, it is difficult to be certain about the direction of cause-effect from a correlation of temperature and CO₂, since the data lack adequate time resolution. It might therefore be appropriate to develop a different hypothesis, which happens to make use of two papers I already published (in 1971 and 1988).

Many authors seem to accept that the cause of the temperature rise was the rapid release of methane trapped in clathrates in ocean sediments, which then was oxidized to CO₂. The problem with this simple idea is there may not be sufficient oxygen, particularly in the deep ocean, to accomplish this chemical transformation. This will be particularly true if large bursts of methane are released in bubbles that travel rapidly to the sea surface.

Once in the atmosphere, methane released in these large quantities could survive for a long time, simply by depleting the available hydroxyl (OH) radicals, which exist only in minute concentrations in the steady state. As a consequence, not only would this methane exert a strong GH effect, but large amounts of methane could percolate into the stratosphere, and there be photolyzed by solar ultraviolet radiation to eventually form both water vapor and CO₂, and contribute to destruction of ozone ("*Stratospheric Water Vapour Increase Due to Human Activities.*" *Nature* **233**:543-547. 1971).

These large amounts of water vapor released into the normally dry stratosphere can lead to important consequences, including the formation of cirrus clouds (consisting of ice particles) in the vicinity of the cold tropopause. Tabulated physical measurements give us the 'complex refractive index' of water and ice. Therefore, a direct calculation based on Mie theory can provide the optical properties of the cirrus cloud cover ("*Re-Analysis of the Nuclear Winter Phenomenon.*" *Meteorology and Atmospheric Physics* **38**:228-239. 1988).

If the cloud cover is very thick, it could exhibit an appreciable optical albedo. But my analysis shows that as the cloud thins, it retains a large infrared opacity, sufficient to cut off any thermal radiation from the earth's surface in the IR window of the atmosphere (8-12 microns). Such a GH effect is quite powerful for warming the global climate; it depends, of course, also on the areal coverage of the cirrus cloud. It might be strong enough to enhance the warming of the earth and therefore accelerate a further release of methane from the ocean, a kind of positive feedback that could explain the observed large temperature increase.

But so far all of this is simply hypothesis and speculation. Some obvious questions remain:

- How to test this hypothesis? One would expect to find some evidence concerning anoxic effects in the ocean, including a die-off of marine organisms. The CO₂ increase observed could partly be caused by a degassing of a warming ocean.

- And could such an effect happen now?

Not likely. We have to remember that temperatures near the P-E boundary had been unusually high for long periods of time. In fact, the earth was completely ice-free, including also the polar regions. This is quite different from the present situation. Further, nothing of the sort has happened during the much warmer (compared to today) Holocene Temperature Optimum, 8000-5000 years ago.

1. CO₂ Policy as Pipedream -- Mackubin Thomas Owens

2. Blunt warning about greens under the bed – *The Times*

3. Listening to India: A lesson for Hillary on climate change – *WSJ*

4. Wind energy: Forests of concrete and steel – *Paul Driessen*

5. Obama blocks new energy exploration -- NCPA

6. Labour government to create green jobs -- in China – *The Times*

7. When it comes to global warming, talk of treason is in the air – *Bjorn Lomborg*

8. Time for a new paradigm on climate change? – *Scientific Alliance*

NEWS YOU CAN USE

From “Cooler Heads Digest” of July 24 by **Myron Ebell** (CEI): “A recent whining fundraising appeal from **Fred Krupp** of Environmental Defense Fund confirms that the House was flooded with calls and e-mails opposing Waxman-Markey: For some House offices, their calls overwhelmed the switchboard. Krupp blames it on an organized conspiracy led by **Rush Limbaugh and Sarah Palin** and financed with hundreds of millions of dollars from big polluters. Too bad he doesn’t mention who those big polluters are. As far as I can tell, many of the biggest companies in the U. S. support cap-and-trade and a couple dozen of them belong to the [U. S. Climate Action Partnership](#). EDF is also a member of USCAP and works as a front group for big companies that hope to get rich off the backs of American consumers from the higher energy prices required by cap-and-trade. ‘Hundreds of millions’ has a nice ring, but does anyone actually believe that the opponents of cap-and-trade have even a tenth of the funding of its supporters?”

Can you guess who wrote: “The current rush for large-scale onshore wind developments, connected by a hugely centralized grid system shows a poverty of imagination and thinking rooted in the early 20th Century. If attention continues to be focused on increasing renewable energy targets, without any requirement to demonstrate what each development will achieve in greenhouse gas emissions reductions (including all aspects of the generation and transmission), we face a possible worst-case scenario, where we achieve renewable energy targets through inappropriate developments and at great cost to important environments only to discover that our greenhouse gas emissions are up, along with our energy consumption, and our energy supply is not secure.”

Amazingly, a leading environmental organization, The **John Muir** Trust <http://www.jmt.org/what-we-think.asp>

Wong horse knackered but . . . Carbon Tax is saddled and ready.

A Statement by Mr **Viv Forbes**, Chairman, The Carbon Sense Coalition, Australia.

<http://carbon-sense.com/2009/07/19/carbon-tax-saddled/>

The aging galloper Ration-N-Tax (RAT) from the [Australian environment minister] Wong stable is knackered. Anyone with any economic or political nous knows that the carbon cap proposals are neither politically nor economically possible in Australia or the USA. No electorate in the western world will sit by to see their standard of living reduced until their carbon emissions per capita are equal to those of India or China while they transfer their businesses, jobs and technology to these growing industrial giants of Asia.

From now on, those pushing the RAT scheme are flogging a dead horse. Public opinion is changing swiftly and any time soon even [the White House] will switch his bets.

But the canny handlers anticipated this result and have another nag saddled and ready. The next starter will be Carbon Tax, a donkey with no pedigree, but a determined stayer, which has been in secret training within big business circles. He must be stopped or he will father many sterile mules in Australian industry.

The Climate Change industry is already running stories and conferences on the chances of Carbon Tax winning the Green Derby. (He has a good chance compared to that aged mare from the Wong/[Waxman] stable.) The backers of Carbon Tax love his huge revenue potential.

Just a small carbon tax will fund never ending trips to race meetings in Bali, Rio, Copenhagen, Paris and Kyoto. It will feed the voracious nationalised climate research industry, provide eternal corporate welfare for the alternate energy punters, and allow politicians to continue buying votes with taxes collected from every consumer of electricity, transport, food, cement or anything manufactured in Australia.

Carbon Tax should be knackered for the same reasons that the RAT Scheme is unacceptable it will have *no* climate benefits but it will destroy businesses, real jobs and living standards.

On the costs of U.S. Taxman-Malarkey scheme

http://www.heartland.org/custom/semod_policybot/pdf/25679.pdf

The Competitive Enterprise Institute’s **Marlo Lewis** has unveiled his new film, *Policy Peril: Why Global Warming Policies Are More Dangerous Than Global Warming Itself*. Over the next two weeks, he’ll be posting on globalwarming.org one excerpt from the film a day along with comments and links to newer information that has since come out. The videos present a powerful argument that the global warming debate is very far from over.

The **Marshall Institute** this week released [The Cocktail Guide to Global Warming](#), a succinct compendium of replies to questions about climate change.

If you want a better understanding of Global Warming without the political and media hype, you should click the link below and take the "test". This information is scientific, not political.

<http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/GlobWarmTest/start.html>

Congressman **Blaine Luetkemeyer** (R-MO) has introduced legislation (H.R. 3129) that would prohibit United States contributions to the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). This would save taxpayers \$12.5 million this year and millions more in the years to come.

BELOW THE BOTTOM LINE

Cap&Trade on the Comedy Hour <http://thechillingeffect.org/2009/07/22/video-daily-show-hits-cap-and-trade/>



1. POLICY AS PIPE DREAM

The Waxman-Markey energy bill spells bad news.

By Mackubin Thomas Owens / Boston Herald, August 07, 2009

While the attention of the American public was focused on the circus surrounding the death of Michael Jackson, the House of Representatives was laying the groundwork for picking that same public’s pockets. The Waxman-Markey energy bill, set for debate later this year in the Senate, would hamstring the U.S. economy, raise unemployment and burden taxpayers.

The centerpiece of the legislation is a “cap and trade” provision designed to reduce carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions by raising the price of CO2-intensive goods and services such as gasoline, electricity and many industrial products. Legislation should be subjected to some basic cost-benefit analysis. This bill provides little in the way of benefits to Americans but imposes very high costs.

The goal of the bill is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that allegedly cause “global warming,” or as it is now known, “climate change.” But global temperatures have been decreasing since 1998.

On the benefits side, there is another problem. Even if the United States were to significantly reduce CO2 emissions, it would have little global effect, given that the biggest producers of greenhouse gas emissions are rapidly developing countries such as China and India. And U.S. businesses have reduced such emissions in response to market forces.

On the other hand, the costs of something along the lines of Waxman-Markey are staggering. Carbon-based fuels (oil, coal, natural gas) provide about 85 percent of U.S. energy needs and generate most greenhouse

gases. Companies would need annual allowances issued by the government in order to emit greenhouse gases.

Under the “cap” part of the bill, these allowances would gradually decline. Indeed, Waxman-Markey requires the CO₂ level in 2050 to be 83 percent less than it was in 2005. The “trade” permits utilities and refineries that need extra allowances to buy them from other companies. As the annual allowances allowed by Washington are reduced, their price would rise.

The EPA estimates that the price of a permit would rise from \$20 a ton in 2020 to \$75 a ton by 2050. Companies would pass the extra cost to customers.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that reducing the level of CO₂ to 15 percent less than the total level of emissions in 2005 would increase a household’s annual cost of living by \$1,600.

Meanwhile, American companies would suffer in export markets as American prices rose. Domestic producers would suffer because of competition from imports from countries that do not impose the CO₂ tax.

The idea that we can shift effortlessly from carbon-based fuels to alternative “clean” forms of energy and conservation is a pipedream. Population increases in the United States alone will raise energy demand. If the supply of electricity doesn’t keep pace with demand, brownouts, blackouts or other disruptions would mount.

Western European countries have found that it is very difficult and expensive to reduce carbon emissions. Nearly every western European state has had higher unemployment and energy costs than America, and a weaker overall economy. And the promise of the new “green” economy is proving elusive as well.

Let’s hope the Senate does a better job of cost-benefit analysis than the House. It should not be Washington’s job to wreck the economy.

2. BLUNT WARNING ABOUT GREENS UNDER THE BED

Once the lure of communism seduced the idealistic. Today’s environmental ideologues risk becoming just as dangerous

By Antonia Senior, The Times, July 24, 2009

Britain is, thankfully, an ideologically barren land. The split between Right and Left is no longer ideological, but tribal. Are you a nice social liberal who believes in markets, or a nasty social liberal who believes in markets? [Soviet spy] Anthony Blunt’s memoirs, published this week, reveal a different age, one in which fascism and communism were locked in a seemingly definitive battle for souls.

Blunt talks of the religious quality of the enthusiasm for the Left among the students of Cambridge. There is only one ideology in today’s developed world that exercises a similar grip. If Blunt were young today, he would not be red; he would be green.

His band of angry young men would find Gore where once they found Marx. Blunt evokes a febrile atmosphere in which each student felt his own decision had the power to shape the future. Where once they raged about the fleecing of the proletariat and quaked at the march of fascism, Blunt and his circle, transposed to today’s college bar, would rage about the fleecing of the planet and quake at its imminent destruction. If you squint, red and green look disarmingly similar.

Both identify an end utopia that is difficult to dispute. The diktat from each according to his ability, to each according to his means sounds lovely on paper. Greens promise a world in which we actually survive a coming ecological apocalypse. A desirable outcome, undoubtedly.

But the means to these ends seem similarly insurmountable. Both routes demand an immediate suspension of human nature.

Ideologies often credit man with either more nobility or more venality than he deserves. In reality, he is a mundane creature. He wants a home for himself and those he loves, stocked with food. And he wants to have the right to control his own destiny, own his own stuff, and to acquire more if he can without interference or fear of imminent death. Such low-level acquisitive desires support high concepts: property rights and the rule of law, without which there would be no foundation for democracy.

My desire to live a free, mundane life is a fundamental cog in our messy, glorious, capitalist democracy. It is built on millions of such small entrenched positions. Red-filtered, my desires are despicable and bourgeois and must be beaten out of me with indoctrination or force. Green-filtered, my small desires are despicable acts of ecological vandalism. My house is a carbon factory. My desire to travel, to own stuff, to eat meat, to procreate, to heat my house, to shower for a really, really long time; all are evil.

The word evil is used advisedly. Both the green and red positions are infused with overpowering religiosity. Dissenters from the consensus are shunned apostates. Professor Ian Plimer, the Australian geologist and climate-change sceptic, could not find a publisher for his book *Heaven and Earth*, which questions the orthodoxy about global warming. He is the subject of hate mail and demonstrations. It is entirely immaterial whether he is right or wrong. An environment that stifles his right to a voice is worse than one that is overheating.

Even within the convinced camp, dissent from certain party lines is frowned upon. Nuclear power is the cheapest, greenest alternative to fossil fuels that we possess; yet it is anathema to advocate its proliferation at the expense of wind and sun. Fans of nuclear are the Trotskys of the movement, subject to batterings by verbal ice pick.

The great ecological timebomb is population growth. By 2050 the United Nations demographers expect the world's population to reach 9.2 billion, compared with 6.8 billion today. That's 2.4 billion extra carbon footprints. Half measures seem futile. We all hope for some new technology to rescue us. But what if it never materialises? The logical position is to be a cheerleader for swine flu, but not in my backyard. Do we have to pray for swine flu to ravage foreign children, to save our own from frying in the future?

We are at the early stage of the green movement. A time akin to pre-Bolshevik socialism, when all believed in the destruction of the capitalist system, but were still relatively moderate about the means of getting there. We are at the stage of naive dreamers and fantasists. Russia was home to the late 19th-century Narodnik movement, in which rich sons of the aristocracy headed into the countryside to tell the peasants it was their moral imperative to become a revolutionary class. They retreated, baffled, to their riches when the patronised peasants didn't want to revolt. Zac Goldsmith and Prince Charles look like modern Narodniks, talking glib green from the safety of their gilded lives.

Indulge me in some historical determinism. We, the peasants, are failing to rise up and embrace the need to change. We will not choose to give up modern life, with all its polluting seductions. Our intransigent refusal to choose green will be met by a new militancy from those who believe we must be saved from ourselves. Ultra-green states cannot arise without some form of forced switch to autocracy, the dictatorship of the environmentalists.

The old two-cow analogy is a useful one. You have two cows. The communist steals both your cows, and may give you some milk, if you're not bourgeois scum. The fascist lets you keep the cows but seizes the milk and sells it back to you. Today's Green says you can keep the cows, but should choose to give them up as their methane-rich farts will unleash hell at some unspecified point in the future. You say, sod it, I'll keep my cows, thanks. Tomorrow's green, the Bolshevik green, shoots the cows and makes you forage for nuts.

If the choice is between ecological meltdown or a more immediate curtailment of our freedom, where do those of us who are neither red nor green, but a recalcitrant grey, turn? Back to those small desires, and a

blinkered hope that the choice never becomes so stark. If it does, I'll take my chances with Armageddon.

http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article6725471.ece

3. LISTENING TO INDIA: A LESSON FOR HILLARY ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

WSJ, July 24, 2009

President Obama bills himself on the world stage as an empathetic guy, and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton is a veteran of a famous "listening tour" of her own. Let's hope the Administration was paying attention to India's environment minister when he told Mrs. Clinton a thing or two about climate policy Sunday "There is simply no case for the pressure that we, who have among the lowest emissions per capita, face to actually reduce emissions," Jairam Ramesh told Mrs. Clinton in a closed-door meeting, according to a copy of his remarks distributed after the session. "And as if this pressure was not enough, we also face the threat of carbon tariffs on our exports to countries such as yours."

Mr. Ramesh was simply repeating the widespread consensus in India that it's irresponsible to sacrifice economic growth benefiting hundreds of millions of mostly poor people for the sake of environmental absolutism. India's per-capita GDP is around \$1,000. While its mostly state-owned energy industry is grossly inefficient and the country could benefit from less wasteful energy usage, emissions caps are the wrong way to go. Caps would send prices on energy and other goods higher, not to mention the longer-term damage to economic growth. China conveyed similar concerns at the Group of Eight meeting in Italy earlier this month.

Mr. Ramesh's remarks point to another cost India could bear even if New Delhi resists imposing its own emissions caps: the cost of protectionist measures imposed by developed countries to shield their businesses from the costs of their own national emissions targets. The cap and tax bill recently passed by the U.S. House is explicit in proposing tariffs on goods from countries that don't follow the developed world's anticarbon line.

Instead Mr. Ramesh repeated New Delhi's longstanding call for developed countries to finance the import of expensive green technologies, which would in theory help India reduce emissions without incurring as many out-of-pocket costs. At the same time, India has rejected any calls for legally binding emissions targets.

If this concept sounds familiar, it should. President George W. Bush proposed such a framework almost exactly four years ago. The Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate brought together the U.S., India, China and four other countries to find ways to spread green technologies. Environmentalists derided it at the time, partly because it didn't set mandatory emissions reductions and partly because Mr. Bush had proposed it. It has since dropped off the radar screen, although it's still in operation.

Call it a more honest form of environmentalism. The Indian government recognizes the public would never be willing to shoulder the costs of emissions controls, and that it's unfair to ask millions of poor people to try. Mr. Bush understood that the developed world can best help developing countries green themselves up by supporting freer trade in environmentally friendly technologies. It's a stark contrast to climate politics in today's Washington, where Democrats try to push cap-and-trade through Congress before anyone notices the costs, while special interests slip in protectionist carbon tariffs.

There is still serious scientific debate about the causes, effects and possible solutions for climate change. But if President Obama is determined to tackle the issue anyway, he could do worse than listen to what Mr. Ramesh said.

4. FORESTS OF CONCRETE AND STEEL

Many words could describe wind energy and green jobs. 'Sustainable' is not one of them.

By Paul Driessen

Boone Pickens, Nacel Energy, Vestas Iberia and others have been issuing statements and running ads, extolling the virtues of wind as an affordable, sustainable energy resource. Renewable energy reality is slowly taking hold, however.

Spain did increase its installed wind power capacity to 10% of its total electricity, although actual energy output is 10-30% of this, or 1-3% of total electricity, because the wind is intermittent and unreliable. However, Spain spent \$3.7 billion on the program in 2007 alone, King Juan Carlos University economics professor Gabriel Calzada determined.

It created 50,000 jobs, mostly installing wind turbines, at \$73,000 in annual subsidies per job -- and 10,000 of these jobs have already been terminated. The subsidies have been slashed, due to Spain's growing economic problems, putting the remaining 40,000 jobs at risk.

Meanwhile, the cost of subsidized wind energy and carbon dioxide emission permits sent electricity prices soaring for other businesses causing 2.2 jobs to be lost for every green job created, says Calzada. Spain's unemployment rate is now 17% and rising. That's hardly the success story so often cited by Congress and the Obama Administration.

Across the Channel, Britain's biggest wind-energy projects are in trouble. Just as the UK government announced its goal of creating 400,000 eco-jobs by 2015, major green-energy employer Vestas UK is ending production. All 7,000 turbines that Downing Street just committed to installing over the next decade will be manufactured not in Britain, but in Germany, Denmark and China.

For businesses, existing global warming policies have added 21% to industrial electricity bills since 2001, and this will rise to 55% by 2020, the UK government admits. Its latest renewable energy strategy will add another 15% -- meaning that the total impact on British industry will likely be a prohibitive 70% cost increase over two decades. This is the result of the government's plans to cut carbon dioxide emissions 34% below 1990 levels by 2020, and increase the share of renewables, especially wind, from 6% to 31% of Britain's electricity.

These cost hikes could make British manufacturers uncompetitive, and send thousands more jobs overseas, the Energy Intensive Users Group reports. English steel mills could become unable to compete globally, even at current domestic energy prices, says British journalist Dominic Lawson; but deliberately to make them uncompetitive is industrial vandalism and even madness -- a futile gesture ... and immoral.

On this side of the pond, President Obama and anti-hydrocarbon members of Congress are promoting green energy and jobs, via new mandates, standards, tax breaks and subsidies. However, the United States would need 180,000 1.5-megawatt wind turbines by 2020, just to generate the 600 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity that compliance with the narrowly passed Waxman-Markey global warming bill would necessitate, retired energy and nuclear engineering professor James Rust calculates.

This would require millions of acres of scenic habitat and agricultural lands, and 126 million tons of concrete, steel, fiberglass and rare-earth minerals for the turbines, at 700 tons per turbine; prodigious quantities of concrete, steel, copper and land for new transmission lines; and still more land, fuel and raw materials for backup gas-fired generators. America's new national forests will apparently be made of concrete and steel.

Those miners and drillers would likely be reclassified as green workers, based on the intended purpose of their output. However, the raw materials will probably not be produced in the States, because so many lands, prospects and deposits are off limits and NIMBY litigation will further hamper resource extraction. Air quality laws and skyrocketing energy costs (due to carbon taxes and expensive renewable energy mandates) will make wind turbine (and solar panel) manufacturing in the USA equally improbable. Thus,

manufacturing could well be in China or India, and most green jobs could be for installers, as Spain and Britain discovered.

Posturing has already collided with reality in Texas, the nation's wind energy capital. Austin's GreenChoice program cannot find buyers for electricity generated entirely from wind and solar power. Its latest sales scheme has been a massive flop: after seven months, 99% of its recent electricity offering remains unsold.

Austin officials admit that times have changed, and the recession and falling energy prices may make it impossible for the city to meet its lofty goals. The company's renewable electricity now costs almost three times more than standard electricity, and even eco-conscious consumers care more about the color of their money than the hue of their purported ideology.

Even worse for global warming alarmists and renewable energy advocates and rent seekers, global warming patterns have reversed during the past decade. Satellite data reveal that the planet is cooling, despite steadily rising carbon dioxide levels, and summertime low temperature records are being broken all over the United States.

You'd better hope global warming is caused by manmade CO2 if you're investing in [renewable] sectors, says Daniel Rice, the past decade's best-performing US equity fund manager (BlackRock Energy and Resources Fund). But evidence for manmade catastrophic global warming is dissipating faster than carbon dioxide from an open soda bottle on a hot summer day.

The crucial fact remains: wind and solar are simply not economical without major government subsidies or monstrous carbon taxes. Moreover, cap-and-tax legislation currently being promoted in the House and Senate is not enough to do anything about supposed global warming disasters, notes Rice.

All it does is provide Obama a pass to Copenhagen, where the UN will host a climate change conference in December, Rice says. And those subsidies and taxes would drive energy prices still higher, killing jobs and skyrocketing the cost of everything we eat, drive, heat, cool, grow, make and do.

Congress and the Administration are dragging their feet on nuclear power, closing off access to more resource-rich lands, and imposing layers of new regulations on oil, gas and coal energy -- denying Americans these vast stores of energy and hundreds of billions in revenue that developing them would generate. Meanwhile, slick wind-turbine ad campaigns promote expensive, heavily subsidized, unreliable technologies that only climate activists and company lobbyists would describe as sustainable, affordable, eco-friendly or socially responsible.

The ads and lobbyists seek more mandates, tax breaks and subsidies. Wind promoters want to quiet opponents long enough to get energy and climate legislation enacted before Americans realize how it would drive the price of energy still higher, kill jobs, curtail living standards and liberties, and raise the cost of everything we eat, drive, heat, cool, grow, make and do.

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow and Congress of Racial Equality, and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green Power Black Death.

5. LABOUR GOVERNMENT TO CREATE GREEN JOBS -- IN CHINA

Ben Webster, Environment Editor, The Times, 15 July 2009

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6710815.ece>

One of Britain's biggest employers in the green energy industry is to cease production within hours of a government announcement today pledging as many as 400,000 green jobs by 2015.

Ed Miliband, the Energy and Climate Change Secretary, will claim that Britain will become a world leader in low-carbon technology and manufacturing. He will argue that raising household energy bills to pay for investment in wind, solar and tidal power is justified not only by the dangers of global warming but also the

opportunity to build a new “green economy”.

However, tomorrow morning the Vestas factory in Newport, Isle of Wight, Britain’s only significant manufacturer of wind turbines, will produce its last batch of seven-tonne blades. More than 600 people employed at the plant, and a related facility in Southampton, will be made redundant at the end of the month. All 7,000 turbines that the Government will commit today to installing over the next decade will be manufactured overseas, mainly in Germany, Denmark and China.

FULL STORY at <<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6710815.ece>> *H/t CCNet*

For the future of competitive and cheap green energy, see also "Asian Nations Could Outpace U.S. in Developing Clean Energy", The Washington Post, 16 July 2009

<<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/07/15/AR2009071503731.html>>

6. OBAMA BLOCKS NEW ENERGY EXPLORATION

Although the President regularly expresses verbal support for a comprehensive energy plan, his Administration has demonstrated that no matter how many Americans are out of work, it will continue to take steps to proactively discourage certain types of economic development -- including the creation of natural gas jobs, oil drilling jobs and nuclear jobs, says Doc Hastings, a congressman from central Washington.

Exactly a year ago, President Bush issued an executive order lifting the ban on offshore oil and natural gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and opened the door for new energy production and the creation of millions of new energy jobs in our country. But today -- July 14, 2009 -- a defacto ban remains in place only because the Obama Administration has actively blocked the new five-year leasing program which would open areas for offshore exploration and development, says Hastings.

The Obama Administration's decision has prevented:

- o Americans from enjoying 1.2 million new, well-paying jobs annually across the country and \$70 billion in additional wages each year.
- o And the federal government from receiving over \$2.2 trillion in total tax receipts -- revenue that would go a long way towards addressing the historic \$1.8 trillion deficit that reportedly keeps the President awake at night.

In addition to obstructing the creation of future American energy jobs, the Obama Administration is also eliminating current energy jobs. On February 4th, the Interior Department withdrew areas offered for 77 oil and gas leases in Utah that thousands of Utah citizens were depending on for employment.

Environmentalists may cheer the Obama Administration's obstructionism as a victory against "Big Oil" but the truth is that fewer drilling leases equal lost jobs, higher unemployment, a higher national deficit, and increased dependence on foreign oil, says Hastings.

H/t NCPA

http://townhall.com/columnists/DocHastings/2009/07/14/obama_blocks_new_energy_exploration

7. WHEN IT COMES TO GLOBAL WARMING, TALK OF TREASON IS IN THE AIR

By Bjorn Lomborg, July 16, 2009

Discussions about global warming are marked by an increasing desire to stamp out “impure” thinking, to the point of questioning the value of democratic debate. But shutting down discussion simply means the disappearance of reason from public policy. In March, Al Gore’s science adviser and prominent climate researcher, Jim Hansen, proclaimed that when it comes to dealing with global warming, the “democratic process isn’t working.” Although science has demonstrated that carbon-dioxide from fossil fuels is heating the planet, he claims, politicians are unwilling to follow his advice and stop building coal-fired power plants.

Hansen argues that, “the first action that people should take is to use the democratic process. What is frustrating people, me included, is that democratic action affects elections, but what we get then from political leaders is greenwash.” Although he doesn’t tell us what the second or third action is, he has turned

up in a British court to defend six activists who damaged a coal power station. He argues that we need “more people chaining themselves to coal plants,” a point repeated by Gore.

The Nobel laureate in economics Paul Krugman goes further. After the narrow passage of the Waxman-Markey climate-change bill in the US House of Representatives, Krugman said there was no justification for a vote against it. He called virtually all of the members who voted against it, “climate deniers” who were committing “treason against the planet.”

Krugman said that the “irresponsibility and immorality” of the representatives’ democratic viewpoints were “unforgivable” and a “betrayal.” He thus accused almost half of the democratically elected members of the House, from both parties, of treason for holding the views that they do – thereby essentially negating democracy.

Less well-known pundits make similar points, suggesting that people with “incorrect” views on global warming should face Nuremberg-style trials or be tried for crimes against humanity. There is clearly a trend. The climate threat is so great – and democracies are doing so little about it – that people conclude that maybe democracy is part of the problem, and that perhaps people ought not to be allowed to express heterodox opinions on such an important topic.

This is scary, although not without historical precedent. Much of the American McCarthyism of the 1940s and 1950s was driven by the same burning faith in the righteousness of the mission – a faith that saw fundamental rights abrogated. We would be well served to go down a different path.

Gore and others often argue that if the science of climate change concludes that carbon-dioxide emissions are harmful, it follows that we should stop those harmful emissions – and that we are morally obliged to do so. But this misses half the story. We could just as well point out that since science tells us that speeding cars kill many people, we should cut speed limits to almost nothing. We do no such thing, because we recognize that the costs of high-speed cars must be weighed against the benefits of a mobile society.

Indeed, nobody emits carbon-dioxide for fun. Carbon-dioxide emissions result from other, generally beneficial acts, such as burning coal to keep warm, burning kerosene to cook, or burning gas to transport people. The benefits of fossil fuels must be weighed against the costs of global warming.

Gore and Hansen want a moratorium on coal-fired power plants, but neglect the fact that the hundreds of new power plants that will be opened in China and India in the coming years could lift a billion people out of poverty. Negating this outcome through a moratorium is clearly no unmitigated good.

Likewise, reasonable people can differ over their interpretation of the Waxman-Markey bill. Even if we set aside its masses of pork-barrel spending and analyses that show it may allow more emissions in the US for the first decades, there are more fundamental problems with this legislation.

At a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars annually, it will have virtually no impact on climate change. If all of the bill’s many provisions were entirely fulfilled, economic models show it would reduce the temperature by the end of the century by 0.11 degrees centigrade – reducing warming by less than 4 percent.

Even if every Kyoto-obligated country passed its own, duplicate Waxman-Markey bills – which is implausible and would incur significantly higher costs – the global reduction would amount to just 0.22 degrees centigrade by the end of this century. The reduction in global temperature would not be measurable in a hundred years, yet the cost would be significant and payable now.

Is it really treason against the planet to express some skepticism about whether this is the right way forward? Is it treason to question throwing huge sums of money at a policy that will do virtually no good in a hundred years? Is it unreasonable to point out that the inevitable creation of trade barriers that will ensue from Waxman-Markey could eventually cost the world 10 times more than the damage climate change could ever have wrought?

Today's focus on ineffective and costly climate policies shows poor judgment. But I would never want to shut down discussion about these issues – whether it is with Gore, Hansen, or Krugman. Everybody involved in this discussion should spend more time building and acknowledging good arguments, and less time telling others what they cannot say. Wanting to shut down the discussion is simply treason against reason.

Bjorn Lomborg, the director of the Copenhagen Consensus Center, is an adjunct professor at the Copenhagen Business School, and author of "The Skeptical Environmentalist" and "Cool It: The Skeptical Environmentalist's Guide to Global Warming."

8. TIME FOR A NEW PARADIGM ON CLIMATE CHANGE?

There are two alternative ways to look at how science progresses. In one corner is the concept of the falsifiable hypothesis, credited to Karl Popper. Popper argued that all science is based on hypotheses, which must be tested to destruction. Sound evidence which does not fit with the hypothesis must logically cause it to be rejected. However, the other side of the same coin is that no hypothesis can ever be said to be *proven*. Over time, the body of evidence consistent with a successful hypothesis builds up to the extent that it becomes regarded as a *theory*, for example the theory of General Relativity, or Tectonic Plate theory.

At this stage, theories are treated, to all intents and purposes, as fact. However, even then, quite basic knowledge may, with time, be seen as merely provisional. A classic example is Newtonian mechanics, which fully describes the motion of bodies on the scale we are familiar with, but which breaks down both at the level of elementary particles (hence the development of quantum mechanics) and at a cosmological scale (where relativity comes into play).

Popper used the concept of falsifiability as his criterion for whether something is genuinely scientific or not. Thomas Kuhn, in the other corner of this contest, contributed a different view of how scientists work. He introduced the concept of "normal science" to cover the situation where scientists work on various topics within a central paradigm. In contrast to Popper, the Kuhnian view is that "wrong" results (ie, those which are in conflict with the prevailing paradigm) are considered to be due to errors on the part of the researcher rather than findings which jeopardise the consensus view. However, as conflicting evidence increases, a crisis point is reached where a new consensus view is arrived at: a so-called paradigm shift.

These two philosophical approaches represent the extremes of a spectrum. Popper is the purist, who describes how scientific progress *ought* to work in an ideal world. On the other hand, Kuhn's description is more pragmatic and a more realistic view of what actually happens. When a hypothesis is first put forward, it would be quite easy to discard it if early experimental results falsified it. However, when a consensus builds up over time that a particular view is "correct", it takes plenty of hard evidence to convince people they have been wrong. After all, scientists are only human.

The example often used of this happening in the fairly recent past was the derision which was directed at Wegener's hypothesis of continental drift, when the prevailing scientific view was that land masses were immobile. Although there were some supporters of this view during the first half of the twentieth century, it was only in the 1950s that an understanding of plate tectonics led to the general acceptance that continents are not static. This was a revolutionary shift in thinking, but the paradigm took many years to change.

But Popper's description was more nearly correct in the case of cosmology. In the 1950s, there were two competing primary models of the Universe: the Big Bang and the Steady State. By the mid-60s, the accumulation of evidence led most astronomers to accept that the Big Bang was the hypothesis which gave the better explanation of how the Universe behaves.

Coming now to the more topical and contentious case of climate change, it is clear that science is operating in a Kuhnian fashion. There are a number of observations which would apparently serve to falsify the hypothesised enhanced greenhouse effect. Not least of these are the missing signature of CO₂-driven warming (an enhanced rate of warming in the upper troposphere relative to the Earth's surface) and the lack of warming across the greater part of Antarctica. The response to this - from those who do not simply dismiss the evidence out of hand - is to point instead to evidence which *is* consistent with the AGW hypothesis and to introduce a range of fudge factors such as aerosols to account for the observed lack of correlation between atmospheric carbon dioxide level and average temperatures.

The behaviour of a great many researchers involved in climate change is far from Popperian. Rather than

test their hypothesis by trying to falsify it, they look instead for evidence which supports it and, in a deeply unscientific manner, will often simply dismiss contrary evidence on the basis of minor flaws or criticism. This is research done according to prejudice rather than with an open mind. To compound the error, and because evidence can only be gathered by observation rather than experiment, increasing reliance has been placed on computer models.

Making headlines in the *Guardian* last week was a study not yet even published. Jointly written by Judith Lean of the US Naval Research Laboratory and David Rind of the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and due to appear in *Geophysical Research Letters*, this is billed as the first analysis of the combined impact of human influences (including CO₂ and aerosols), solar radiation, volcanic eruptions and ENSO (the El Nino Southern Oscillation) on global temperatures.

Their main conclusions are that anthropogenic global warming has been masked in recent years by reduced solar activity and a lack of a strong positive El Nino, but that a projected increase in solar activity will cause temperatures to rise at a rate 50% faster than projected by the IPCC. Many readers will of course remember that mainstream researchers have generally downplayed the role of variations in the Sun's output as insignificant in terms of global temperatures, but there now seems to have been a reinterpretation to fit the facts.

But the main criticism of this paper (or at least, what has been reported prior to publication) is that it is not a scientific study but the output of a computer model. The study smacks of damage limitation, of a desire to find some rational explanation for the lack of temperature rise over the past seven or more years. The explanation is that well, yes, natural variation can be important, but that this is only creating a temporary masking effect, soon to disappear. Suspicions about the motivation for the paper are only increased by the *Guardian* headline: "New estimate based on the forthcoming upturn in solar activity and El Nio southern oscillation cycles is expected to silence global warming sceptics".

Highly unlikely, as this is merely hypothesis and, crucially, it is not directly falsifiable. But what is important is that the authors are predicting the return of global warming in the next few years, and that the upward trend will be higher than before. If this does not occur, then we must conclude that their analysis is wrong. If they are wrong, it may be because the coming solar cycle will be a weak one, as many people are predicting. And, if so, the logical conclusion may be that natural cycles are more important than carbon dioxide emissions.

In the meantime, Henrik Svensmark and colleagues from the Danish National Space Centre have published a paper in the same journal which gives support for the hypothesis that cosmic rays, modulated by the solar wind, can indeed alter the degree of cloud cover and hence affect temperature (Svensmark et al; Cosmic ray decreases affect atmospheric aerosols and clouds; *Geophysical Research Letters*; Vol 36, L15101, doi:10.1029/2009GL038429, 2009). Their measurements indicate that cloud cover measured over oceans decreases to a minimum approximately a week after cosmic ray minima. The effect can take large quantities of liquid water out of the atmosphere. This hypothesis may or may not be right, but it remains a working possibility and should certainly not be dismissed lightly.

So, climate science, heavily influenced by global warming politics, continues to adhere to a central paradigm as described by Kuhn. Contrary evidence is clearly not going to be accepted as falsification. It will be fascinating to see what trends there actually are in climate over coming years and, if the predictions of renewed (and faster) global warming come to nothing, then what else will be necessary to cause the crisis which will lead to a paradigm shift. In the meantime, we have to hope that politicians do not take us too far down the road of trying to control the climate based on the current paradigm.

The Scientific Alliance 7th August 2009
 St John's Innovation Centre, Cowley Road, Cambridge CB4 0WS